



Title	An Empirical Study of the Relations between Residents' Trust and Performance of Local Government : Case of the Philippines
Author(s)	Nishimura, Kenichi
Citation	多文化社会と留学生交流 : 大阪大学国際教育交流センター研究論集. 2024, 28, p. 23-34
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/94687">https://doi.org/10.18910/94687</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

# An Empirical Study of the Relations between Residents' Trust and Performance of Local Government

— Case of the Philippines —

Kenichi Nishimura\*

## Abstract

This study examines how trust in local government is related to local government performance, using the Philippines as a case. Literature discussing the issue of trust in government show that there is relationship between trust in government and government performance. Grimmelikhuijsen and Knies (2017) suggest that factors indicating efficiency and transparency of government affect trust in government. Houston et al. (2016), who analyzed the relationship between trust in government and performance for 21 countries in North America and Europe, found a correlation between the two. Houston and Harding (2013) indicate the importance of increasing the competence of government for improving trust. Regarding the Philippines, Brillantes and Fernandez (2011) point out that inefficiency and ineffectiveness in delivery of services decline trust in government. On the other hand, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) point out that while government performance has a certain impact on trust in government, existing levels of trust in government can also affect perceptions of government performance. Given the above points, we examine the relationship between trust in local governments and their performance in the Philippines. For this purpose, we use the results of our 2019 public opinion survey on the local governance and perform statistical analysis.

**【Key words】** Philippines, trust in local government, local government performance, public opinion

## 1 Introduction

This study examines how trust in local government is related to the performance of local governments – city/municipality<sup>1)</sup> – in the Philippines.

Trust in government is an issue that continues to receive attention globally. For example, the World Happiness Report that is published every year uses trust in the state as one indicator of people's well-being. The issue of trust in government began to attract attention in the 1950s as a factor related to the

legitimacy of government. Today, trust in the quality of public services has become important in relation to administrative performance management and performance measurement. In the background of this is the fact that it is necessary to refer to the evaluation of the service by the general public, who are the recipients of the service, in the provision of public services, and in doing so, trust in the government is an important factor (Akizuki 2010: 70). And today, as decentralization has progressed worldwide, with various administrative powers being devolved from

\* Associate Professor, Center for International Education and Exchange, Osaka University

central government to local governments and the financial autonomy of local governments being strengthened, attention is increasingly focused on the performance of local governments, and in this connection, the issue of trust in local government has also come to be emphasized.

## 2 Trust in Government and its Performance

Literature discussing the issue of trust in government show that there is relationship between trust in government and government performance. Christensen and Lægreid (2005), who used the data from a survey conducted in Norway in 2001, concluded that citizens who are satisfied with particular public services trust public institutions more than those who are generally dissatisfied. Downe et al. (2013) analyzed the relationship between performance and trust in British local councils and concluded that councils with lower levels of misconduct and better performance generally enjoyed higher levels of public trust. Grimmelikhuijsen and Knies (2017) suggest that factors indicating efficiency and transparency of government affect trust in government. Houston et al. (2016), who analyzed the relationship between trust in government and performance for 21 countries in North America and Europe, found a correlation between the two. Houston and Harding (2013) also indicate the importance of increasing the competence of government for improving trust.

Zhao and Hu (2015), who conducted an analysis of trust in Chinese city governments, found that the quality of public services and the citizens' satisfaction with government transparency are the factors that are positively correlated with trust. Kim et al. (2020), focusing on the case of South Korea, examined how financially decentralized governance can enhance the trust in government not only at the national level but also at the local level, said that trust in government would increase through the effective delivery and quality improvement of public services and programs that are likely to be well received by constituents. In Japan, trust in govern-

ment affects government performance. Fujii (2006), who examined the relationship between public works projects by Japan's central government and government trust, points out that "ensuring transparency" and the attitude of "carrying out public works for a good cause" increase residents' trust in government and make it easier to implement public works projects. Oyama (2010) argued that the most significant factor defining government trust is government performance. Murayama et al. (2021) also found that prefectures in Japan with stronger ties among residents and higher government trust had lower mortality rates from new coronavirus infection, based on a survey conducted between August and September 2020. Goldfinch et al. (2022), suggesting that satisfaction with services provided by local government and positive perceptions of policy process are associated with trust, pointed out that local governments need to produce good results in service provision in order to increase trust. They argue that "trust in local government in Japan is related to perceived performance and citizen satisfaction" (Goldfinch et al. 2022). Regarding the Philippines, Brillantes and Fernandez (2011) point out that inefficiency and ineffectiveness in delivery of services decline trust in government.

On the other hand, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) point out that while government performance has a certain impact on trust in government, existing levels of trust in government can also affect perceptions of government performance, regardless the actual quality of service delivery. Grimmelikhuijsen (2012) also argue that the underlying image of government is important for trust in government, and the outcomes of government performance are only a partial factor in determining the degree of trust.

Given the above points, I examine the relationship between trust in local governments and their performance in the Philippines. For this purpose, I use the results of the 2019 Opinion Survey on Local Governance in the Philippines and perform statistical analysis.

### 3 Research Questions

As we saw in the introduction, the prevailing view is that there is a positive correlation between trust in the government and performance of local governments. On the other hand, however, there are arguments that it is not clear whether the actual performance of government is strongly related to trust in government.

Therefore, in this paper, I set the following research questions. First, is there a correlation between residents' satisfaction with the performance of public service delivery by local governments - cities and municipalities - and trust in them? Second, is there a positive correlation between local government performance as measured by the central government and residents' trust in the government?

### 4 Data

The data I utilize for analysis are a survey data on public opinion about local governance we collected in the Philippines in 2019 and a performance evaluation indicator for local governments collected by the central government of the Philippines.

#### 4-1 2019 Opinion Survey on Local Governance in the Philippines

The population of our survey data consists of individuals over the age of 20 in all 1,515 cities and municipalities, excluding the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao. Sample size is 2400 which is selected by multistage random sampling method. Distribution of survey sites is as follows. 55 local governments are from Luzon, 13 are from Visayas, and 12 from Mindanao out of a total of 80. And 34 are cities and 46 are municipalities<sup>2)</sup>.

#### 4-2 Performance Indicator measured by the Central Government

As a performance measure for local governments as measured by the central government, we adopted "Government Efficiency" from the competi-

tiveness index of local governments used by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI).

According to the DTI, "Governmental Efficiency refers to the quality and reliability of government services and government support for effective and sustainable productive expansion" and is composed of "Compliance to National Directives", "Presence of Investment Promotion Unit", "Compliance to ARTA Citizens Charter", "Capacity to Generate Local Resource", "Capacity of Health Services", "Capacity of School Services", "Recognition of Performance", "Getting Business Permits", "Peace and Order", and "Social Protection" (DTI n.d.). I chose this indicator because, as can be seen from the above, "Government Efficiency" encompasses both the administrative performance and the performance of public services. All the cities and municipalities in the Philippines have been given a "Government Efficiency" indicator since 2014, and I used the 2019 data for my analysis.

### 5 Method of Analysis

I use the model to test whether there is a correlation between satisfaction with local government public services and trust in local government, and whether there is a correlation between local government performance and trust in local government. For the analysis, dependent and independent variables will be extracted from the survey data and the performance scores developed by the Philippine central government.

The dependent variables are the strength of trust in city and municipal government. It is shown in five levels from 'trust completely' to 'not trust at all'. Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of trust strength.

As an independent variable, I extracted data on residents' satisfaction with local government public services. The items of public services that I will take up for my analysis are "City/municipality government as a whole", "Garbage management", "Facilities/services of public health office and local government-owned hospital", "City/municipality road conditions",

**Table 1 Trust in local governments (N=2400)**  
Question: Do you trust the city/municipal government?

	F	%
Not trust at all	50	2.1
Not trust very much	149	6.2
Neutral	631	26.3
Trust somewhat	920	38.3
Trust completely	645	26.9
missing value	5	0.2
Total	2400	100.0

“Facilities/services of public primary school and high school”, “Tree planting, environment conservation”, “Condition of public market” and “Corruption eradication”. I excluded from the analysis those local government services that are only relevant to limited part of residents. For example, “Subsidy for the small and medium-scale enterprise”, “Drainage and irrigation condition”, “Instruction and guidance on farming, fishing, plantation, forestry”, “Issuance of business permit”, etc. were excluded from the analysis. Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of the level of satisfaction with the local government services.

Another indicator related to trust in local government is “Government Efficiency”. This indicator was extracted from the DTI data for 80 cities and municipalities. The distribution of “Government Efficiency” scores for the 80 cities and municipalities has a lowest score of 4.05 and a highest score of 20.79, with a mean of 11.11 and a standard deviation of 2.448.

As described above, using the level of residents’ trust in local government - city and municipality - as the dependent variable and residents’ satisfaction with local government public services and the central government’s assessment score on local government efficiency as the independent variable, I perform an ordinal logistic regression analysis to determine how local government performance is related to residents’ trust in local government.

## 6 Analysis and Results

I hypothesize that the more satisfied residents are with the local government’s public services, the higher their trust in the local government. I also hypothesize that the higher the central government’s

**Table 2-1 Level of Satisfaction with the Service of City/municipality Government (N=2400)**  
Question: How satisfied are you with the following city/municipality government services?

	City/municipality government as a whole		Garbage management		Facilities/services of public health office and local government-owned hospital		City/municipality road conditions	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
0 Strongly dissatisfied	15	0.6	96	4.0	51	2.1	28	1.2
1	15	0.6	45	1.9	28	1.2	21	0.9
2	17	0.7	42	1.8	32	1.3	21	0.9
3	33	1.4	59	2.5	47	2.0	42	1.8
4	54	2.3	65	2.7	64	2.7	69	2.9
5 Neutral	642	26.8	449	18.7	503	21.0	423	17.6
6	253	10.5	181	7.5	211	8.8	197	8.2
7	317	13.2	274	11.4	324	13.5	360	15.0
8	445	18.5	412	17.2	456	19.0	492	20.5
9	176	7.3	209	8.7	215	9.0	265	11.0
10 Strongly satisfied	427	17.8	548	22.8	464	19.3	476	19.8
99 Don’t know	6	0.3	20	0.8	5	0.2	6	0.3
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0

**Table 2-2 Level of Satisfaction with the Service of City/municipality Government (N=2400)**  
 Question: How satisfied are you with the following city/municipality government services?

	Facilities/services of public primary school and high school		Tree planting, environment conservation		Condition of public market		Corruption eradication	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
0 Strongly dissatisfied	4	0.2	30	1.3	22	0.9	106	4.4
1	3	0.1	26	1.1	15	0.6	47	2.0
2	9	0.4	30	1.3	28	1.2	52	2.2
3	23	1.0	59	2.5	53	2.2	66	2.8
4	29	1.2	57	2.4	60	2.5	89	3.7
5 Neutral	282	11.8	591	24.6	487	20.3	618	25.8
6	167	7.0	207	8.6	254	10.6	171	7.1
7	303	12.6	271	11.3	328	13.7	261	10.9
8	576	24.0	321	13.4	473	19.7	315	13.1
9	325	13.5	166	6.9	229	9.5	153	6.4
10 Strongly satisfied	668	27.8	442	18.4	413	17.2	456	19.0
99 Don't know	11	0.5	200	8.3	38	1.6	66	2.8
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0

evaluation score of local government efficiency, the higher the people's trust in local government. This is because "Government Efficiency" is a measure of administrative performance, such as "Compliance to National Directives" and "Capacity to Generate Local Resource" as well as performance of public services such as "Capacity of Health Services", "Capacity of School Services", "Getting Business Permits", "Peace and Order", and "Social Protection", and is therefore considered to have some linkage with residents' satisfaction with public services. An ordinal logistic regression analysis is performed to test the validity of this hypothesis with respect to city and municipality.

Firstly, I saw the "Model Fitting Information" to check how well this model explains the dependent variables. The probability of significance was zero for both city and municipality. Therefore, I consider both city and municipality case in our analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.

From Table 3, which shows the results of the analysis on city and municipality, the following can be said. First, the relationship between the level of residents' satisfaction with local government perfor-

mance and their trust in local government is complex. Looking at individual public services, trust in local government is significantly higher when satisfaction with "Facilities/services of public health offices and local government-owned hospitals", "City/municipality road conditions" and "Corruption eradication" is high. On the other hand, trust in local government is significantly lower when satisfaction with "Garbage management" is high. And for "Facilities/services of public primary schools and high schools", "Tree planting, environment conservation" and "Conditions of the public market", there is no significant correlation between high levels of satisfaction with services and level of trust in local government. On the other hand, the higher the level of satisfaction with city/municipality government as a whole, the higher the trust in local governments significantly.

Second, regarding the relationship between the performance score of local governments by the central government and residents' trust in local governments, I found results that differed from my hypothesis. That is, the higher the "Government Efficiency" score, the lower the trust in the local

Table 3 Parameter Estimates for city/municipality

		B	Etd. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower	Upper
Threshold	[q32c = 1]	-1.409	0.300	22.003	1	0.000	-1.998	-0.820
	[q32c = 2]	0.060	0.276	0.047	1	0.828	-0.481	0.601
	[q32c = 3]	1.931	0.275	49.215	1	0.000	1.391	2.470
	[q32c = 4]	3.740	0.284	172.939	1	0.000	3.182	4.297
Location	Government Efficiency 2019	-0.037	0.016	5.150	1	0.023	-0.069	-0.005
	City/municipality government as a whole	0.244	0.023	111.588	1	0.000	0.198	0.289
	Garbage management	-0.055	0.018	9.253	1	0.002	-0.090	-0.020
	Facilities/services of public health office and local government-owned hospital	0.078	0.021	13.500	1	0.000	0.037	0.120
	City/municipality road conditions	0.091	0.022	16.494	1	0.000	0.047	0.135
	Facilities/services of public primary school and high school	-0.012	0.027	0.199	1	0.655	-0.066	0.042
	Tree planting, environment conservation	0.008	0.020	0.142	1	0.706	-0.032	0.047
	Condition of public market	0.030	0.023	1.738	1	0.187	-0.014	0.074
	Corruption eradication	0.055	0.017	11.016	1	0.001	0.023	0.088

Link function: Logit

government significantly.

As we have seen, although the results of my analysis tend to support the first hypothesis—the higher the level of satisfaction with the local government's public services, the higher the trust in the local government, some types of public services did not support the hypothesis. On the other hand, as for the second hypothesis—the higher the local government's efficiency evaluation score, the higher the public's trust in local government—the result of my analysis is contrary to the hypothesis.

## 7 Discussion

### 7-1 Satisfaction with public services and trust in local governments

First, I found that high level of satisfaction with "city/municipality government as a whole" lead to high level of trust in local government. This is something that can be easily predicted. If people are satisfied with the performance of the local government as a whole, it means that they are generally satisfied with the public services provided by the

local government, and it can be assumed that people have a high level of trust in the government that provides overall good services.

On the other hand, when it comes to the level of satisfaction with individual public services, it cannot be said unconditionally whether it will lead to trust in local governments. Below, we examine the relationship between satisfaction with individual public services and trust in local governments.

#### 7-1-1 Public services with positive correlation between satisfaction with local government performance and trust in local government

##### (1) Facilities/services of public health office and local government-owned hospital

The Philippines has a shortage of hospital beds compared to other ASEAN countries. Especially in rural areas the situation is more serious (Flores 2020). Actually, in isolated remote areas, it is difficult to provide adequate medical services due to the lack of medical facilities and staff (Collado 2019). Therefore, the accessibility to the well equipped and

staffed public health office and local government-owned hospitals is valuable. Such circumstances are considered to be behind the correlation between high satisfaction with “facilities and services of public health office and local government-owned hospital” and high trust in local governments.

#### (2) City/municipality road conditions

Collado (2019), in his paper stating that hospital facilities and medical services are inadequate in isolated and remote areas, points out that for residents of rural and isolated areas, access to limited number of hospitals is not easy. This problem is related to the issue of the maintenance of road network.

In the Philippines, there are national roads under the jurisdiction of the national government and local roads under the jurisdiction of local governments. Needless to say, roads are an indispensable infrastructure for people's daily lives, so maintaining the road network properly and keeping the roads in good condition is an important task for governments, both central and local.

Regarding the condition of these roads, Asian Development Bank (2012) presents the results of the assessment as of 2009–2010. According to this report, 45% (approximately 14,200 km) of the total length of national roads were rated as being in ‘good’ condition, while only about 20% (approximately 35,300 km) of the total 176,300 km of local roads were rated as being in ‘good’ condition (ADB 2012: 2). This fact shows that it is not easy for local governments to develop and maintain roads.

The reasons cited for the poor condition of the road network under local government jurisdiction is the lack of financial, technical and administrative capacity of local governments (ADB 2012: 6–7). These factors are always a problem for local governments in the Philippines. Therefore, if a city/municipality can overcome these problems to some extent by some means, including innovative measures, and implement effective policies and projects, it will be able to maintain roads to the satisfaction of its residents and its capacity will be appreciated by them.

From the above, it can be inferred that high levels of satisfaction with road conditions are directly linked to high levels of trust in local governments.

#### (3) Corruption eradication

Corruption is one of the most serious problems in the Philippines. And Corruption continues to be pervasive, despite various laws and codes of conduct regulating corruption, including the 1987 Constitution, and many public officials have been exposed and penalized for corruption. It has also been pointed out that the corruption that is rampant in the Philippines is a significant impediment to efficiency (Gonzales 2021: 47–49). This means that not only is it quite difficult for the Philippine government, including local governments, to root out corruption, but it is also a source of poor government performance. Under these circumstances, the general public widely shares the perception that public officials are corrupt (Gonzales 2021: 48). If that is the case, it is expected that the public will find it difficult for the government to eradicate corruption by itself, and that people's expectations of the government regarding this issue is low.

Based on the above assumptions, if residents are highly satisfied with the eradication of corruption, they will perceive that the government is performing beyond their expectations, and residents will have a higher level of trust in the local government. Furthermore, if the eradication of corruption removes factors that hinder government efficiency and improves government performance, it is conceivable that residents' trust in local governments will increase even further.

#### **7-1-2 Public services with no correlation between satisfaction with local government performance and trust in local government**

##### **(1) Facilities/services of public primary school and high school**

In the Philippines, education is under the jurisdiction of the national government. The Department of Education has jurisdiction over primary and secondary education. Nevertheless, local govern-

ments also have jurisdiction over primary and secondary education, including improving school facilities and providing for educational needs. “The funding that each local government uses to fulfill its basic education responsibilities comes primarily from a surcharge on local property taxes that goes into a Special Education Fund (SEF) managed by a local school board (LSB)” (Australian Aid 2016: 1). However, the commitment of local governments to primary education is not large and is even declining (Australian Aid 2016).

In addition to this, a major public concern regarding primary and secondary education is the extension of the years of primary and secondary education from 10 to 12 years (this is called K-12). In particular, there is a great deal of interest in the curriculum changes caused by K-12, their educational effects, and the burden on each family that accompanies the extension of years of education. For example, the K-12 curriculum has been noted to have an overall negative reaction among multiple stakeholders, including students, teachers, and parents (Almerino et al. 2020). Curriculum is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education, so the target of people’s criticism is the central government, not the local government.

Based on the discussion above, it is considered that the level of satisfaction with “Facilities/services of public primary school and high school” is not directly related to the evaluation and trust in the local government itself.

## (2) Tree planting, environment conservation

Environment, especially climate change, is one of the most pressing issue for people. Tree planting, which is regularly implemented by each local government, is also part of climate change countermeasures.

However, when it comes to environmental issues, people’s indifference is often seen as a problem. For example, the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) once stated that while science can make some contribution to curbing climate change, it cannot address people’s indifference to

environment, suggesting that people’s attitudes make it difficult to address environmental issues (Santos 2015). Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) recently released a statement lamenting the large amount of trash left by people who spent their Christmas holidays at a park in Metro Manila. The statement says “The mountain of garbage collected at Rizal Park after Christmas reflects not only the lack of discipline among Filipinos, but also our attitude of indifference to solid waste management issues and the environment in general” (DENR 2019).

People’s indifference to environmental issues may mean that even if local government shows good performance in environmental policies and projects, this will not lead to a higher level of trust in local government.

## (3) Condition of public market

My analysis also shows that the level of satisfaction with “condition of public market” does not affect the level of trust in local government. Local governments generally play a role in improving and maintaining the environment of the market by collecting fees from the stores that operate in the public market. Therefore, if the market is clean, bright, and comfortable, the satisfaction of store staff and customers should increase, and trust in the city and municipality, which plays a role in maintaining the environment, should increase, but that is not the case.

A possible explanation for this is that the maintenance of the market environment is not the sole responsibility of the local government, but also that of the individual store owners. Therefore, people may not necessarily value the local government as the only actor that contributes to the maintenance of a public market environment. Another possible reason is that at least customers are not particular about the conditions of the public market, as they have a variety of choices other than the public market as a place to purchase goods.

### **7-1-3 Public services with negative correlation between satisfaction with local government performance and trust in local government: Garbage management**

Garbage management is an important public service that is closely related to people's everyday lives. Garbage management includes processes such as garbage collection, transportation to garbage collection sites, and landfilling, but what residents see directly is the garbage collection stage. Garbage collection is not necessarily a task directly performed by the city or municipality. It is often carried out by barangays, or in the case of subdivisions (gated villages) by contractors contracted by home owners' associations. Rather, the fact that cities and municipalities do not adequately manage garbage may be the background behind entrusting garbage collection to contractors.

Considering this, it is possible that the fact that residents are highly satisfied with garbage management represented by garbage collection is not an evaluation of the garbage management capabilities of the city or municipality.

### **7-2 "Government Efficiency" and trust in local governments**

One notable result of my analysis is that when the people's trust in the local government is high, the score of "Government Efficiency" of each local government is significantly low. This is contrary to the assumption made by literature on trust that government performance must be improved in order to increase trust in government. The following points may be considered as the factors that led to such results.

First, people's satisfaction may not accurately reflect the actual performance of local government. Akizuki (2010) points out that although general public can make good judgments about impressions, such as whether hospitals are providing good care and whether roads are properly cleaned, they do not always evaluate governments correctly, and they are often ignorant of the details of governmental activities, such as specific budget allocations (Akizuki

2010: 83). Considering the issues of this paper based on Akizuki's discussion, it may be possible to say that residents, while ignorant of the actual state of administrative activities, have a high evaluation of the administration and place greater trust in it. For example, the general public may not know whether local government is implementing "Compliance to National Directives" which is one of the indices of "Government Efficiency". If this is the case, even though a local government receives a low rating in "Compliance to National Directives," residents may rate it highly and strongly trust it due to factors such as approachability to the government.

Second, the high level of trust that residents have in local governments may actually discourage them from improving the quality of their administration. Akizuki (2010) summarizes the findings of previous studies on the relationship between government performance and trust, stating that a certain degree of distrust of government makes government more responsive and encourages government to reform (Akizuki 2010: 72). In other words, it is possible that citizens' uncritical trust in the government deprives local governments of their motivation for administrative reform, which in turn worsen government performance.

## **8 Conclusion**

Trust in government is important. Because it increases public support for government policies, increases the effectiveness of policies, and encourages people to comply with government regulations. This suggests that there is a correlation between high satisfaction with government performance and high trust in the government. Although literature indicates that there is a complex relationship between trust in government and government performance, the prevailing view is that there is a positive correlation between trust and performance. In response to these arguments, this paper analyzes the relation between residents' satisfaction with local government performance, the central government's performance evaluation of local governments, and trust in

local governments in the Philippines.

In terms of the relationship between satisfaction with local government performance and trust in local government, the following points were found. Regarding public services such as health center and hospital services and road maintenance, which are directly connected to residents' daily lives and of which residents have a high level of interest, there is a high level of trust in local governments that can appropriately provide these services. As for the eradication of corruption, which people perceive to be widespread and a long-standing problem in the Philippines, it was found that there is a high level of trust in local governments, which have achieved good results in the difficult task of eradicating corruption.

Based on these findings, it can be said that when people are highly satisfied with public services that are closely related to residents' lives or that are perceived to be difficult for local governments to implement, they also have high trust in local governments.

On the other hand, this study revealed that even if residents' satisfaction level is high, trust in local governments does not increase for policies in which residents have little interest, such as the environment, or for policies in which entities other than local governments are also involved in implementation, such as education and maintenance of public markets.

Furthermore, regarding garbage management, it is not only cities and municipalities that are responsible for collecting garbage that the general public sees on a daily basis, but also barangays and contractors, and it can be that we are measuring their satisfaction with collection activities, including barangays and contractors. In this case, there is a possibility that residents are not necessarily satisfied with the garbage management of the city or municipality itself, and as a result, their trust in them may decrease.

Evaluation by the central government on the "Government Efficiency" shows a different picture to the residents' satisfaction with the performance of

local government. This is due to the difference between residents' subjective satisfaction levels and evaluations based on objective indicators. And as mentioned above, it must be noted that residents' satisfaction with various public services is not necessarily an evaluation of city or municipality. Furthermore, since trust in local governments is a subjective evaluation of residents, it does not show a clear correlation with evaluations based on objective indicators.

Therefore, we must be careful when looking at the relationship between local government performance and trust in local governments, keeping in mind that local governments that enjoy high trust may not necessarily perform well. And also, when looking at the relationship between residents' high level of satisfaction with public services and trust in local governments, it is important to note that residents who are satisfied with services do not necessarily trust in local government itself.

### Acknowledgments

This research was supported by JP15H02600 (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research A, Comparative Study on the Perception of Constituents on Local Governance in Southeast Asia: Comparison Between the Philippines and Indonesia) and JP20H04425 (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research B, Analysis on Local Governance and Opinion in Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and the Philippines).

This paper is a revised version of the manuscript presented at the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration 2023 Conference held at National Convention Center, Hanoi, Vietnam on October 16–20, 2023.

### Notes

- 1) I exclude province from the analysis because my survey which is used for this analysis directly targeted city and municipality.
- 2) See Nishimura (2024) for details on sampling methods and field interviews.

### References

Akizuki, Kengo (2010). "Trust in Local Governments: Focusing on the Attitudes of Local Government Offi-

cials (Chiho Seifu niokeru Shinrai — Chiho Koumuin no Ishiki wo chushintoshite)", *Annals Political Science* 61(1): 68–84, [https://doi.org/10.7218/nenpousei\\_jigaku.61.1\\_68](https://doi.org/10.7218/nenpousei_jigaku.61.1_68)

Almerino, P. M., Ocampo, L. A., Abellana, D. P. M., Almerino, J. G. F., Mamites, I. O., Pinili, L. C., Tenerife, J. J. L., Sitoy, R. E., Abelgas, L. J., and Peteros, E. D. (2020). "Evaluating the Academic Performance of K-12 Students in the Philippines: A Standardized Evaluation Approach", *Education Research International* Vol. 2020: 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8877712>

Asian Development Bank (2012). *Philippines: Transport Sector Assessment, Strategy, and Road Map*, Asian Development Bank.

Australian Aid (2016). "Assessing the Role Played by Local Government in Supporting Basic Education in the Philippines", *Philippines Education Note* 7, World Bank Group: 1–12.

Brillantes, Alex B. Jr., and Maricel T. Fernandez (2011). "Restoring Trust and Building Integrity in Government: Issues and Concerns in the Philippines and Areas for Reform", *International Public Management Review* 12(2): 55–80.

Christensen, Tom and Lægreid, Per (2005). "Trust in Government: The Relative Importance of Service Satisfaction, Political Factors, and Demography", *Public Performance & Management Review* 28(4): 487–511.

Collado, Zaldy C (2019). "Challenges in public health facilities and services: evidence from a geographically isolated and disadvantaged area in the Philippines", *Journal of Global Health Reports* 2019(3), doi:10.29392/joghr.3.e2019059

Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) (2019). *DENR: RIZAL PARK TRASH REFLECTS PINOYS' INDIFFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENT* (Decembre 30, 2019), Department of Environment and Natural Resources. <https://www.denr.gov.ph/index.php/news-events/press-releases/1397-denr-rizal-park-trash-reflects-pinoys-indifference-to-environment> [accessed on July 20, 2023]

Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) (n.a.). *CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES COMPETITIVENESS INDEX 2022 RANKINGS*, <https://cmci.dti.gov.ph/index.php> [accessed on June 15, 2023]

Downe, J., Cowell, R., Chen, A. and Morgan, K. (2013). "The determinants of public trust in English local government: how important is the ethical behaviour of elected councillors?", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 79(4): 597–617.

Flores, Lj (2020). "Hospitals in the Philippines: Where they are – and aren't", RAPPLER (May 23, 2020), <https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/in-depth/261439-locations-mapping-hospitals-healthcare-facilities-philippines> [accessed on July 20, 2023]

Fujii, Satoshi (2006). "Public Trust in Government: Building Trust through Public Works for a Good Cause (Seifu ni taisuru Kokumin no Shinrai)", *Proceedings of JSCE* 807/IV-70: 29–41.

Goldfinch, S., Yamamoto, K. and Aoyagi, S. (2022). "Does process matter more for predicting trust in government? Participation, performance, and process, in local government in Japan", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Published online: May 18, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221099395>

Gonzales, Christian F. (2021). "A broken vow: an examination of the cases of Corruption in the Philippines", *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 2(1): 47–65.

Grimmelikhuijsen, Stephan (2012). "Linking transparency, knowledge and citizen trust in government: an experiment", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 78(1): 50–73.

Grimmelikhuijsen Stephan and Knies E. (2017). "Validating a scale for citizen trust in government organizations". *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83(3): 583–601.

Houston, David J. & Lauren Howard Harding (2013). "Public Trust in Government Administrators: Explaining Citizen Perceptions of Trustworthiness and Competence", *Public Integrity* 16(1): 53–76.

Houston, David J., Nurgul R. Aitalieva, Andrew L. Morelock & Chris A. Shults (2016). "Citizen Trust in Civil Servants: A Cross-National Examination", *International Journal of Public Administration* 39(14): 1203–1214.

Kim, S., Lee, Y. and Kim, T. (2020). "The relationship between fiscal decentralization and trust in government: evidence from the South Korean case", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 88(2), <https://doi.org/10.1177/002085232093325>

Murayama H., Nakamoto I., and Tabuchi T. (2021). "Social Capital and COVID-19 Deaths: An Ecological Analysis in Japan". *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18(20), 10982: 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182010982>

Nishimura, Kenichi (2024). "What Factors Promote Participation in Local Governance", *Journal of Multicultural Education and Student Exchange* 28 (in

press): 11–21.

Oyana, Kousuke (2010). “Factors on the Government and Citizen Sides of Administrative Trust: Focusing on Data from the World Values Survey 2005 (Gyoseishinrai no Seifugawa to Shimigawa no Youin)”, *The Annals of Japanese Political Science*

*Association* 61(1): 31–48.

Santos, T. G. (2015). “CBCP head: Science can’t root out indifference to nature”, *Philippine Daily Inquirer* (June 18, 2015), <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/699224/cbcp-head-science-cant-root-out-indifference-to-nature> [accessed on July 20, 2023]