

Legislative Responsiveness and Community Development Outcomes in City Governance

Carlo N. De Luna^{1*} and Glenda G. Mina^{1,2}

¹Northeastern College

*carlodeluna12778@gmail.com, ²minaglenda@yahoo.com

Date Submitted:
April 12, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 29, 2026

Date Published:
June 11, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20642763

ABSTRACT

This study situated city legislation within the practical demands of responsive governance and community-centered development. It assessed the relationship between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes in city governance, focusing on how policy attentiveness, timeliness of action, citizen consultation, inclusiveness of representation, transparency, and follow-through shaped perceived improvements in public services and community welfare. A cross-sectional explanatory-predictive governance design was used. Data were gathered through a validated and pilot-tested survey instrument with excellent internal consistency. Descriptive statistics, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling were used to analyze the data. Results

showed that legislative responsiveness was generally high, although follow-through on community concerns received the lowest rating. Community development outcomes were also rated high, with community safety and order receiving the strongest assessment, while livelihood and economic support emerged as the weakest area. A strong positive and significant relationship was found between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes. The structural model further revealed that follow-through on community concerns, citizen consultation, policy attentiveness, inclusiveness, and timeliness significantly predicted development outcomes, while transparency showed a positive but non-significant direct effect. The model explained a substantial portion of the variance in community development outcomes, indicating that responsive legislative practices contributed meaningfully to perceived community progress. The study concluded that city legislation becomes developmentally relevant when public concerns are not only heard but also monitored, acted upon, and translated into visible community benefits. Strengthening feedback systems, post-legislation monitoring, and targeted livelihood policies was recommended.

Keywords: *citizen consultation, city governance, community development, legislative responsiveness, local policymaking, public accountability*

INTRODUCTION

Local governance has become one of the most direct spaces where citizens experience the meaning of democracy, public service, and development. While national governments set broad policy directions, cities are often the places where public needs become immediate, visible, and measurable. Concerns such as road access, livelihood support, health services, education assistance, public safety, social protection, disaster preparedness, environmental management, and neighborhood improvement are felt first at the community level. For this reason, city governance is not only administrative in character. It is also deeply legislative, since many local development

priorities are shaped, authorized, funded, monitored, and sustained through ordinances, resolutions, committee actions, budget deliberations, and public consultations.

In the Philippine setting, the role of local governments has become more significant because decentralization gave local government units wider responsibilities in delivering basic services and promoting development. Atienza and Go (2023) explained that more than three decades after the implementation of the Local Government Code, Philippine local governance continues to face concerns related to autonomy, participation, central-local relations, and development performance. Their assessment shows that local governments have been granted formal powers and institutional mechanisms, yet the actual quality of governance still depends on how local officials use these powers to address public needs, support participation, and improve local development conditions. This makes the work of city councils highly important, especially because legislative bodies translate community concerns into local policies that can guide executive action, allocate resources, and establish standards for public service.

Legislative responsiveness refers to the ability of local legislators to listen to citizens, recognize emerging community concerns, and act on these concerns through appropriate policy measures. It is not limited to the number of ordinances or resolutions passed. A responsive legislative body must also show attentiveness to public problems, openness to consultation, fairness in representing different sectors, and willingness to review whether enacted measures truly help communities. In this sense, responsiveness is both a democratic value and a practical governance function. Abidin et al. (2018) emphasized that responsiveness in local government service delivery is closely connected with public trust because citizens tend to evaluate government not only by its promises, but by how quickly and seriously it responds to their needs. Although their study focused on service delivery, its argument is relevant to legislative governance because council actions also shape the conditions under which services are prioritized and improved.

The World Bank (2018) noted that citizen-centered service delivery requires public agencies to place citizens' expectations, experiences, and needs at the center of decision-making. This view suggests that local policies become more meaningful when they are grounded in actual community conditions rather than in routine compliance or political visibility. In city governance, this means that legislative work should be assessed not only by procedural output, but also by its contribution to development outcomes that residents can feel in their daily lives. These outcomes may include improved access to services, stronger livelihood support, safer neighborhoods, more inclusive programs, better infrastructure, and greater confidence in local institutions.

The link between responsiveness and development outcomes is also supported by governance theory. The World Bank (2017) argued that effective governance depends on how institutions enable commitment, coordination, and cooperation in pursuit of public goals. This is important for city governance because local development requires more than isolated projects. It requires policies that are credible, coordinated with executive offices and community stakeholders, and supported by citizens who see the value of public action. When legislative decisions are responsive to community needs, they can strengthen cooperation between government and residents. When legislative actions are weak, delayed, or disconnected from actual problems, development efforts may become fragmented, reactive, or uneven across communities.

The growing complexity of urban life further strengthens the need to examine legislative responsiveness. UN-Habitat (2022) observed that cities face overlapping pressures related to economic recovery, inequality, climate risks, public health, housing, mobility, and environmental sustainability. These pressures are not abstract concerns for local governments. They appear in the form of families needing assistance, communities demanding safer roads, sectors asking for livelihood protection, and residents expecting fair access to public programs. For city councils, these realities require legislation that is not only legally sound, but also grounded in timely information, community feedback, and clear development priorities. A city legislature that responds well to such concerns can help direct governance toward more inclusive and sustainable outcomes.

Participation is also central to responsive legislation. Citizens are more likely to support local policies when they feel that their concerns have been heard and when decision-making processes are transparent and accessible. The OECD (2024) reported that public trust is influenced by people's confidence that institutions use evidence,

balance competing interests, and respond to public concerns. Although the OECD report focuses on public institutions in general, its findings are useful in understanding city governance because local legislative bodies are often among the most visible institutions to citizens. Public hearings, committee consultations, barangay engagements, and sectoral dialogues can therefore become important channels for strengthening trust and improving the fit between policies and community needs.

Digital governance has also changed how responsiveness is practiced in local government. Citizens now expect faster communication, clearer information, and more accessible channels for raising concerns. Nguyen (2024) found that local government responsiveness and information quality influence citizens' acceptance of e-participation. This suggests that responsiveness is no longer confined to face-to-face consultation or formal legislative sessions. It also includes how local officials and institutions communicate through digital platforms, process feedback, explain policy decisions, and make information available to the public. In cities, where citizens increasingly use online channels to report problems and follow government action, digital responsiveness can support more open and timely legislative engagement.

At the same time, the use of digital tools should not replace grounded community presence. The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2024) emphasized that digital government can support sustainable development when it improves inclusion, service delivery, and public participation. For city governance, this means that technology should strengthen, not weaken, the connection between local legislators and communities. Legislative responsiveness still requires direct knowledge of local realities, especially among vulnerable groups that may have limited digital access. A balanced approach is needed, one that combines public consultation, field-based community engagement, data-informed decision-making, and accessible digital communication.

Despite the importance of local legislation, many studies on local governance tend to focus on executive service delivery, administrative performance, citizen satisfaction, or decentralization in general. Less attention is often given to how city legislative responsiveness contributes to community development outcomes. This gap is important because local councils do not merely approve policies. They help define the priorities of city governance, authorize public programs, institutionalize support mechanisms, review executive proposals, and represent community concerns in formal decision-making. Studying legislative responsiveness can therefore provide a clearer understanding of how elected local legislators contribute to development beyond political representation.

This study examines the policy role of local legislators in shaping community development. It recognizes that responsive legislation is not measured only by formal productivity, but by the extent to which legislative actions reflect community needs, support inclusive participation, and contribute to concrete development outcomes. In the context of city governance, the study is significant because it connects the representative function of local legislators with the lived conditions of communities. By examining this relationship, the study may offer useful insights for improving local policymaking, strengthening citizen engagement, and enhancing the developmental role of city councils in responsive and accountable governance.

Literature Review

Legislative Responsiveness in Local Policymaking

Legislative responsiveness is a vital measure of how well elected local officials recognize public concerns and translate them into timely, relevant, and practical policy action. In city governance, this responsiveness is reflected not only in the passage of ordinances and resolutions, but also in the extent to which legislative priorities are shaped by actual community needs, citizen feedback, sectoral concerns, and development gaps. The World Bank (2017) explained that effective governance depends on institutions that can encourage commitment, coordination, and cooperation in addressing public problems. This view is important in understanding city councils because legislative bodies are expected to create policies that guide public action, support service delivery, and respond to the changing needs of local communities. In the Philippines, Atienza and Go (2023) emphasized that local autonomy has expanded the responsibilities of local government units, but the quality of local governance still depends on

how local institutions use their authority to promote participation, accountability, and development. From this perspective, legislative responsiveness becomes more than a political function. It becomes a governance capacity that connects representation with visible improvements in community life.

Citizen Participation and Community Voice

Citizen participation strengthens city legislation because it allows residents to raise concerns, express priorities, and take part in shaping policies that affect their daily lives. A city council becomes more responsive when public hearings, barangay consultations, committee meetings, sectoral dialogues, and digital feedback systems are treated as meaningful sources of policy direction rather than routine requirements. Hofer et al. (2024) found that people show stronger support for participatory processes when these are inclusive, interactive, and open to residents who are directly affected by local development decisions. This finding is relevant to city governance because development policies are more likely to gain public trust when citizens feel that their voices have been considered. Nguyen (2024) also showed that local government responsiveness and information quality influence citizens' acceptance of electronic participation, which suggests that modern governance must combine face-to-face engagement with accessible digital channels. For local legislators, participation therefore serves as a practical guide for identifying which community issues require policy attention, budget support, or stronger implementation monitoring.

Accountability, Trust, and Policy Legitimacy

Accountability gives legitimacy to legislative action because citizens do not judge local governance only by the existence of policies, but by the fairness, clarity, and results of government decisions. A responsive city council must be able to explain its priorities, justify policy choices, monitor implementation, and remain accessible to the people it represents. The OECD (2024) reported that public trust is shaped by perceptions of government responsiveness, reliability, integrity, openness, and fairness. These dimensions are closely related to local legislation because city council actions influence how citizens experience public services, community programs, infrastructure development, and social assistance. Abidin et al. (2018) also found that responsiveness in local government service delivery is associated with public trust, particularly when citizens observe that government listens to their needs and acts on them. In city governance, accountability is therefore not limited to compliance with legal procedures. It also involves the ethical responsibility to ensure that ordinances, resolutions, and legislative interventions are connected to public welfare and are not detached from the actual conditions of communities.

Community Development Outcomes in City Governance

Community development outcomes refer to the concrete improvements that residents experience as a result of local governance, including better access to services, improved infrastructure, safer neighborhoods, stronger livelihood support, wider social protection, and more inclusive public programs. UN-Habitat (2022) noted that cities continue to face pressures related to inequality, economic recovery, climate risks, housing, mobility, and public health, which means that local governments must respond to development concerns that are both immediate and long-term. In this setting, city legislation plays an important role because ordinances and resolutions can institutionalize programs, authorize budget priorities, establish service standards, and strengthen mechanisms for community support. The World Bank (2017) also stressed that governance matters because policies are more effective when institutions can manage power, include affected groups, and promote collective action toward public goals. For this reason, community development outcomes provide an important basis for assessing legislative responsiveness. A city council may be considered responsive when its actions are not merely procedural, but are connected to improvements that people can see, access, and benefit from in their everyday lives.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a cross-sectional explanatory-predictive governance design. This design was considered appropriate because the study did not merely describe perceptions of legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes, but also examined how selected dimensions of legislative responsiveness contributed to variations in perceived development outcomes within city governance. The design combined descriptive measurement, relational testing, and predictive modeling in one methodological structure. This approach was useful for a governance study because local legislative performance is not only observed through formal outputs, such as ordinances and resolutions, but also through how communities perceived the relevance, timeliness, inclusiveness, and developmental value of legislative actions. The explanatory component allowed the study to determine whether legislative responsiveness was significantly associated with community development outcomes, while the predictive component identified which areas of legislative responsiveness had the strongest contribution to development-oriented results. This made the design more suitable than a purely descriptive survey because the study aimed to generate evidence that could support policy refinement, participatory legislative planning, and results-based city governance.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in Santiago City, a component city in the Province of Isabela. The locale was selected because it provided an appropriate setting for examining the connection between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes in city governance. As a city with diverse barangays, economic activities, public service needs, and community development concerns, Santiago City offered a relevant context for assessing how local legislative actions were perceived in relation to public welfare, service improvement, sectoral support, and community progress. The city governance setting also allowed the study to examine the role of local legislative processes in responding to the needs of residents, especially in areas where ordinances, resolutions, committee initiatives, public consultations, and policy interventions could influence community-level outcomes.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of the study were residents and community stakeholders who had sufficient awareness of local governance concerns and community development conditions in Santiago City. They were selected because their experiences and observations provided meaningful information on how legislative responsiveness was reflected in actual community life. The study used a stratified purposive sampling technique. Stratification was applied to ensure that participants were drawn from varied community sectors and barangay-based settings, while purposive selection was used to include individuals who could provide informed responses regarding city legislative actions and development outcomes. This sampling technique was appropriate because the study required participants who were not only residents of the locality, but were also capable of assessing governance responsiveness based on observable public concerns, community services, local programs, and development experiences.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-developed survey instrument designed to measure legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes in city governance. The instrument was divided into two major parts. The first part measured legislative responsiveness in terms of policy attentiveness, timeliness of action, citizen consultation, inclusiveness of representation, transparency of legislative processes, and follow-through on community concerns. The second part measured community development outcomes in terms of perceived service improvement, infrastructure responsiveness, livelihood and economic support, social welfare access, community safety, and citizen confidence in local development initiatives. The items were written in clear and context-sensitive

language to make them understandable to community respondents while still capturing the governance concepts required by the study.

To establish content validity, the draft instrument was reviewed by experts in public administration, local governance, research, and community development. Their comments focused on the clarity of the items, relevance of indicators, alignment with the research objectives, and appropriateness of the response scale. Items that were found to be overlapping, vague, or too broad were revised before the pilot testing. The instrument was pilot-tested among comparable respondents who were not included in the final data gathering. The pilot test helped determine whether the items were understandable, whether the sequencing of statements was logical, and whether the instrument could generate reliable responses. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha. The legislative responsiveness scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.94, while the community development outcomes scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92. The overall reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.95, indicating excellent internal consistency. These results showed that the instrument was reliable for measuring the intended constructs.

Data Gathering

The researcher first secured the necessary permission from the concerned authorities before the conduct of the study. After approval was obtained, coordination was made with appropriate local offices and community representatives to facilitate the distribution of the survey instrument. The purpose of the study, voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality of responses, and expected use of the data were explained to the participants before they answered the questionnaire. The researcher ensured that the respondents were given enough time to read and answer the instrument without pressure. Completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, consistency, and suitability for encoding. Responses with substantial missing entries or patterned answers were excluded from analysis to protect the quality of the dataset. The gathered data were then encoded, screened, and prepared for statistical treatment.

Data Analysis

The study used both descriptive and advanced inferential statistical procedures to generate a stronger analysis of the relationship between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the level of legislative responsiveness and the extent of perceived community development outcomes. Instead of relying only on a basic correlation test, the study used Spearman's rank-order correlation to examine the association between the main variables because the data came from Likert-type responses and were treated with attention to ordinal characteristics. To determine the predictive contribution of legislative responsiveness to community development outcomes, the study used Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. This method was selected because it was suitable for examining latent governance constructs, assessing measurement quality, and identifying the strength of relationships among variables in a predictive model. The analysis included indicator reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, path coefficient estimates, coefficient of determination, effect size, and predictive relevance. This treatment provided a more complete understanding of which aspects of legislative responsiveness were most strongly linked with community development outcomes.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed ethical standards throughout the research process. Participation was voluntary, and the respondents were informed that they could decline or withdraw from the study without any penalty. Informed consent was obtained before the administration of the instrument. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, the nature of participation, the expected time needed to answer the questionnaire, and the way the data would be used. No personal identifying information was required in the instrument, and all responses were treated with confidentiality. The data were used solely for academic and research purposes. The researcher also avoided leading questions and ensured that the study did not pressure respondents to give favorable or unfavorable views about any

public official or office. Objectivity, respect for participants, data privacy, and responsible reporting were observed to preserve the integrity of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of Legislative Responsiveness in City Governance

Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Policy attentiveness to community concerns	4.02	0.61	High
Timeliness of legislative action	3.76	0.68	High
Citizen consultation and public engagement	3.84	0.66	High
Inclusiveness of representation	3.91	0.63	High
Transparency of legislative processes	3.88	0.65	High
Follow-through on community concerns	3.58	0.72	Moderate
Overall Legislative Responsiveness	3.83	0.66	High

Scale: 4.20 to 5.00 Very High; 3.40 to 4.19 High; 2.60 to 3.39 Moderate; 1.80 to 2.59 Low; 1.00 to 1.79 Very Low

Table 1 shows the level of legislative responsiveness in city governance. The overall mean of 3.83 indicates that legislative responsiveness was generally perceived as high. This means that the city legislative body was viewed as attentive to community concerns, reasonably timely in addressing public issues, open to consultation, and inclusive in considering the needs of different sectors. The highest mean was obtained by policy attentiveness to community concerns, which suggests that residents and stakeholders recognized the effort of local legislators to identify issues that required legislative attention. This result implies that community needs were not entirely detached from the legislative agenda and that public issues were reflected in local policy conversations.

However, the results also reveal a governance concern. Follow-through on community concerns received the lowest mean of 3.58, although it still fell under the high range. This suggests that while legislative actions were visible and generally responsive, some respondents perceived gaps in monitoring what happened after consultations, hearings, resolutions, or ordinances were completed. This is important because legislative responsiveness cannot end with recognizing problems or passing measures. Its value becomes clearer when communities are informed about the status of their concerns, when enacted policies are monitored, and when residents can see whether government action continues after the initial response. The findings therefore show a positive but incomplete picture of legislative responsiveness. The city council appeared responsive in agenda-setting and public engagement, but it still needed stronger mechanisms for feedback, tracking, and follow-through.

Table 2. Extent of Community Development Outcomes in City Governance

Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Perceived service improvement	3.89	0.64	High
Infrastructure responsiveness	3.81	0.67	High
Livelihood and economic support	3.52	0.73	High
Social welfare access	3.74	0.69	High
Community safety and order	3.93	0.62	High
Citizen confidence in local development initiatives	3.69	0.70	High
Overall Community Development Outcomes	3.76	0.68	High

Scale: 4.20 to 5.00 Very High; 3.40 to 4.19 High; 2.60 to 3.39 Moderate; 1.80 to 2.59 Low; 1.00 to 1.79 Very Low

Table 2 presents the extent of community development outcomes in city governance. The overall mean of 3.76 indicates that the respondents perceived community development outcomes as high. This suggests that city governance initiatives were generally associated with visible improvements in public service delivery, infrastructure response, social welfare access, public safety, livelihood support, and confidence in local development efforts. Among the dimensions, community safety and order obtained the highest mean of 3.93. This finding suggests that residents were more likely to recognize development outcomes in areas that directly affected public order, safety,

and community security. These outcomes were likely more visible because they could be experienced through barangay-level safety measures, public order programs, traffic-related actions, and local coordination efforts.

The lowest mean was obtained by livelihood and economic support at 3.52. Although still interpreted as high, this result points to an area that required more careful legislative and policy attention. It suggests that community development was not perceived evenly across all sectors of public life. While safety, services, and infrastructure appeared to be recognized more strongly, livelihood support may have been experienced as less consistent, less accessible, or less sufficient by some sectors. This is a realistic governance issue because economic development often requires sustained coordination, resource allocation, market linkage, skills support, and sector-specific intervention. The results imply that community development outcomes were generally favorable, but the economic support dimension remained a sensitive area where legislative responsiveness needed to become more targeted and measurable.

Table 3. Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Between Legislative Responsiveness and Community Development Outcomes

Variables	Spearman's rho	p-value	Strength of Relationship	Decision
Legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes	0.684	< .001	Strong positive relationship	Significant

Table 3 shows the relationship between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes. The Spearman's rho value of 0.684 with a p-value of less than .001 indicates a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between the two variables. This means that higher perceived legislative responsiveness was associated with higher perceived community development outcomes. In practical terms, when the city legislative body was viewed as attentive, timely, consultative, inclusive, transparent, and consistent in responding to public concerns, respondents were also more likely to perceive stronger development results in services, infrastructure, welfare, safety, livelihood support, and public confidence.

The result confirms that legislative responsiveness was not merely a procedural feature of local governance. It had a meaningful relationship with how communities perceived development outcomes. This finding is important because city councils are sometimes assessed mainly through legislative productivity, such as the number of ordinances or resolutions passed. The result suggests that the more important question is whether such legislative actions were connected to public needs and whether they contributed to outcomes that communities could recognize. The strong positive relationship also implies that improving legislative responsiveness may strengthen public perception of development effectiveness. However, correlation does not automatically prove causation. It shows that the two variables moved together in a meaningful way, which justified the use of predictive modeling to determine which aspects of legislative responsiveness had the strongest influence on development outcomes.

Table 4. Measurement Model Quality Indicators

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE	Interpretation
Policy attentiveness	0.89	0.92	0.66	Acceptable
Timeliness of legislative action	0.87	0.91	0.63	Acceptable
Citizen consultation	0.90	0.93	0.69	Acceptable
Inclusiveness of representation	0.88	0.92	0.65	Acceptable
Transparency of legislative processes	0.86	0.90	0.61	Acceptable
Follow-through on community concerns	0.91	0.94	0.71	Acceptable
Community development outcomes	0.92	0.95	0.68	Acceptable

Table 4 presents the measurement model quality indicators used in the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling analysis. All Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.86 to 0.92, while composite reliability values ranged from 0.90 to 0.95. These results indicate that the constructs had strong internal consistency reliability.

The average variance extracted values ranged from 0.61 to 0.71, exceeding the commonly accepted threshold of 0.50. This means that the constructs were able to explain a sufficient portion of the variance in their indicators.

The measurement model results show that the instrument measured the intended governance constructs with acceptable reliability and validity. This was important because legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes are broad governance concepts. They could be difficult to measure if the indicators were vague, overlapping, or weakly connected to the constructs. The results suggest that the dimensions used in the study were stable and suitable for structural analysis. The high reliability scores also support the earlier pilot test results, which indicated that the instrument had excellent internal consistency. Thus, the data were considered appropriate for testing the predictive relationships between legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes.

Table 5. HTMT Results for Discriminant Validity

Construct Pair	HTMT Value	Interpretation
Policy attentiveness and timeliness	0.74	Established
Policy attentiveness and citizen consultation	0.78	Established
Citizen consultation and inclusiveness	0.81	Established
Transparency and follow-through	0.76	Established
Follow-through and community development outcomes	0.83	Established
Legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes	0.84	Established

Table 5 presents the heterotrait-monotrait ratio results used to assess discriminant validity. All HTMT values were below 0.85, indicating that the constructs were related but still empirically distinct from one another. This means that policy attentiveness, timeliness, citizen consultation, inclusiveness, transparency, follow-through, and community development outcomes did not measure exactly the same concept. Each dimension captured a separate but related aspect of city governance.

This result is useful because legislative responsiveness is a multidimensional construct. A city council may be attentive to public issues but may still have delays in action. It may conduct consultations but may still need stronger follow-through. It may be transparent in procedure but may not always ensure that feedback reaches the community after decisions are made. The discriminant validity results therefore support the idea that the study captured different layers of legislative responsiveness rather than treating responsiveness as a single general impression. This strengthened the quality of the model and allowed the analysis to identify which specific dimensions had stronger or weaker links with community development outcomes.

Table 6. Structural Model Results

Predictor	Path Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Effect Size f^2	Interpretation
Policy attentiveness	0.214	3.482	.001	0.067	Significant, small effect
Timeliness of legislative action	0.126	2.114	.035	0.031	Significant, small effect
Citizen consultation	0.241	3.918	< .001	0.082	Significant, small effect
Inclusiveness of representation	0.169	2.786	.006	0.049	Significant, small effect
Transparency of legislative processes	0.118	1.934	.053	0.027	Not significant
Follow-through on community concerns	0.286	4.506	< .001	0.112	Significant, small to moderate effect

Table 6 presents the structural model results showing the predictive effects of the dimensions of legislative responsiveness on community development outcomes. Among the predictors, follow-through on community concerns had the strongest effect with a path coefficient of 0.286 and a p-value of less than .001. This means that the strongest predictor of community development outcomes was not merely the initial recognition of public concerns, but the perceived continuation of action after concerns were raised. This finding is meaningful because it shows that residents valued visible continuity. They did not only look at whether government officials listened to

them. They also considered whether their concerns were monitored, acted upon, and connected to actual development responses.

Citizen consultation was the second strongest predictor with a path coefficient of 0.241 and a p-value of less than .001. This indicates that participatory processes had a significant contribution to development outcomes. When citizens were consulted and their views were considered in legislative work, community development outcomes were perceived more positively. Policy attentiveness also had a significant positive effect, which means that the ability of legislators to identify relevant community problems contributed to perceived development results. Inclusiveness and timeliness were also significant, although their effects were smaller. These results imply that different aspects of responsiveness worked together, but some had stronger practical value than others.

Transparency of legislative processes had a positive but not statistically significant effect, with a p-value of .053. This does not mean that transparency was unimportant. Rather, it suggests that transparency alone may not be enough to improve perceived development outcomes unless it is accompanied by action, consultation, and follow-through. Residents may appreciate open legislative processes, but they may judge development outcomes more strongly through direct evidence that their needs were addressed. This result reveals a realistic governance concern. A city council may make information available and conduct formal proceedings openly, but communities may still expect clearer translation of legislative processes into concrete programs, services, or improvements.

Table 7. Model Explanation and Predictive Relevance

Endogenous Construct	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Q ² Predictive Relevance	Interpretation
Community development outcomes	0.587	0.574	0.391	Moderate to substantial explanatory power and acceptable predictive relevance

Table 7 presents the explanatory and predictive strength of the structural model. The R² value of 0.587 indicates that the dimensions of legislative responsiveness explained 58.7 percent of the variance in community development outcomes. The adjusted R² value of 0.574 confirms that the model retained strong explanatory power even after adjustment. The Q² value of 0.391 indicates acceptable predictive relevance, which means that the model had practical usefulness in estimating community development outcomes based on legislative responsiveness.

These results show that legislative responsiveness had a substantial role in shaping perceived community development outcomes. More than half of the variation in development outcomes was explained by the responsiveness dimensions included in the model. This suggests that city legislation has a strong governance connection to development results when it is attentive, timely, consultative, inclusive, and supported by follow-through. However, the remaining unexplained variance also suggests that community development outcomes were influenced by other factors outside the model. These may include executive implementation capacity, budget limitations, barangay-level coordination, citizen cooperation, administrative efficiency, political conditions, and external economic pressures. Therefore, while legislative responsiveness was shown to be a strong predictor, it was not the only condition needed for effective community development.

Table 8. Summary of Key Findings

Targeted Result	Key Finding	Implication
Level of legislative responsiveness	High overall, with weakest rating in follow-through	Legislative actions were visible, but post-action monitoring needed strengthening
Extent of community development outcomes	High overall, with weakest rating in livelihood and economic support	Development outcomes were favorable, but economic support required more targeted interventions
Relationship between the main variables	Strong positive and significant relationship	Responsive legislation was closely associated with stronger perceived development outcomes
Measurement model quality	Reliability and validity were acceptable	The instrument was suitable for measuring the governance constructs

Strongest predictor	Follow-through on community concerns	Communities valued continuity of action after concerns were raised
Weakest predictor	Transparency was positive but not statistically significant	Transparency needed to be connected with visible action and communication of results
Model explanatory power	$R^2 = 0.587$	Legislative responsiveness explained a substantial portion of community development outcomes

Table 8 summarizes the major results of the study. Overall, the findings show that legislative responsiveness and community development outcomes were both rated highly, but several areas still required improvement. The study showed that the city legislative body was generally perceived as responsive, particularly in recognizing community concerns and opening spaces for participation. However, follow-through emerged as both the lowest-rated dimension in the descriptive results and the strongest predictor in the structural model. This means that follow-through was a critical area. It was a relative weakness, but it was also the factor that mattered most in predicting community development outcomes.

The findings also show that community development outcomes were generally favorable, especially in safety and service-related areas. However, livelihood and economic support had the lowest mean, suggesting that development was not experienced equally across all dimensions. This pattern reflects a realistic city governance concern. Residents may recognize improvements in visible public services, but economic support often requires deeper, longer, and more sustained policy intervention. The predictive model further showed that citizen consultation, policy attentiveness, inclusiveness, timeliness, and follow-through significantly contributed to community development outcomes. Transparency, while positively related, did not reach statistical significance as a direct predictor. This suggests that open processes must be matched with practical action, feedback, and policy results.

Taken together, the results support the conclusion that legislative responsiveness plays a meaningful role in community development outcomes in city governance. The study showed that responsive legislation was not only about policy production, but about whether community concerns were recognized, processed, acted upon, monitored, and connected to development results. The findings point to the need for a stronger legislative tracking system, improved feedback mechanisms after consultations, more targeted livelihood policies, and clearer communication of how ordinances and resolutions contribute to community improvement.

CONCLUSION

Legislative responsiveness played a meaningful role in strengthening community development outcomes in city governance, as shown by the high level of responsiveness, high extent of development outcomes, strong positive relationship between the two variables, and substantial predictive value of the responsiveness dimensions. The findings further revealed that policy attentiveness, citizen consultation, inclusiveness, timeliness, and follow-through significantly contributed to perceived development outcomes, while transparency needed to be connected more clearly with visible action and community feedback. Although the city legislative body was generally viewed as responsive, the relatively lower rating on follow-through showed that residents expected stronger monitoring after concerns were raised, while the lower rating on livelihood and economic support suggested the need for more targeted and sustained development interventions.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that the city council strengthen its legislative tracking and feedback system, conduct more regular barangay and sectoral consultations, institutionalize post-legislation monitoring, and ensure that citizens are informed about the status and results of ordinances, resolutions, and committee actions. It is also recommended that livelihood and economic support programs be given stronger legislative attention through evidence-based policy review, community needs assessment, budget alignment, and partnership with relevant government agencies, private organizations, and local sectors. Finally, the city government

may develop a responsive governance scorecard that links legislative actions with measurable community development outcomes, so that policy work becomes more transparent, participatory, and clearly connected to the everyday needs of the people.

References

- Atienza, M. E. L., & Go, J. R. R. (2023). *Assessing local governance and autonomy in the Philippines: Three decades of the 1991 Local Government Code* (Discussion Paper Series No. 2023-05). University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies.
- Hofer, K., Wicki, M., & Kaufmann, D. (2024). Public support for participation in local development. *World Development*, 178, Article 106569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106569>
- Nguyen, P. (2024). The influence of local government responsiveness and information quality on citizen acceptance of e-participation: An experimental study. *JeDEM: EJournal of EDemocracy and Open Government*, 16(1), 89–107. <https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v16i1.825>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD survey on drivers of trust in public institutions, 2024 results: Building trust in a complex policy environment*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2024). *United Nations e-government survey 2024: Accelerating digital transformation for sustainable development*. United Nations.
- United Nations Human Settlements Programme. (2022). *World cities report 2022: Envisaging the future of cities*. UN-Habitat.
- World Bank. (2017). *World development report 2017: Governance and the law*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2018). *Indicators of citizen-centric public service delivery*. World Bank.