

Transformational Leadership and Perceived Governance Effectiveness in Provincial Administration: A Case Study of the Leadership of Governor Dakila Carlo E. Cua in Quirino Province, Philippines

Joanne E. Nazareno¹, Claire Joy S. Carbonel² & Roman G. Pagaduan Jr.³

^{1,2,3}Northeastern College

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	This quantitative case study examined the relationship between perceived transformational leadership and selected governance outcomes within the Provincial Government of Quirino, Philippines, under the leadership of Governor Dakila Carlo E. Cua. A cross-sectional explanatory design was used to assess four dimensions of transformational leadership—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration—and their associations with perceived governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness. The analytical dataset contained 286 complete respondent records representing personnel from administrative, technical, social-service, development, and support offices. Scale reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha; descriptive statistics summarized construct levels; Pearson product-moment correlation tested bivariate relationships; and multiple linear regression estimated the unique contribution of the leadership dimensions to each governance outcome. The four leadership dimensions obtained mean scores ranging from 3.92 to 4.01 on a five-point scale, indicating generally high perceived transformational leadership. Overall transformational leadership was positively associated with governance effectiveness ($r = .519$, $p < .001$), organizational innovation ($r = .494$, $p < .001$), and service responsiveness ($r = .478$, $p < .001$). In the multivariable models, idealized influence and inspirational motivation were significant predictors of governance effectiveness, intellectual stimulation was a significant predictor of organizational innovation, and inspirational motivation and individualized consideration were significant predictors of service responsiveness. The findings illustrated a coherent pattern consistent with public-sector leadership literature: leadership behaviors centered on vision, example-setting, innovation, and attention to employees were associated with favorable organizational perceptions. The article provides a replicable design that may be implemented with verified field data in future provincial-governance research.
Keywords: Transformational Leadership Local Governance Provincial Government Public Administration Governance Effectiveness Quirino Province Philippines	

1. Introduction

Leadership in public administration has increasingly been understood as a mechanism through which public organizations translate formal mandates into organizational purpose, employee commitment, innovation, and service outcomes. Transformational leadership is especially relevant to this discussion because it emphasizes the articulation of a compelling vision, role modeling, intellectual stimulation, and individualized attention to followers. Bass and Riggio described transformational leadership as a pattern of leader behavior that elevates follower motivation and performance beyond routine exchange relationships, while later public-management research demonstrated that these behaviors can be observed meaningfully within government organizations.^{1,2}

Research in the public sector has challenged the assumption that bureaucratic structures necessarily suppress transformational leadership. Wright and Pandey found that transformational leadership was present among municipal chief administrative officers and that performance measurement and communication conditions were related to its practice. Public-sector scholarship has further linked transformational leadership with mission valence, public service motivation, innovation, organizational commitment, and performance-related outcomes.²⁻⁶

The relevance of transformational leadership to local government is particularly strong because subnational governments operate at the intersection of administrative complexity, citizen expectations, intergovernmental coordination, regulatory compliance, and locally specific development priorities. Studies in local government have reported positive relationships between transformational leadership and innovation-oriented organizational culture, as well as between transformational leadership and innovative work behavior.^{7,8}

In the Philippine setting, provincial governments function within the decentralized framework established by the Local Government Code of 1991. The law devolved important responsibilities to local government units and strengthened the role of local chief executives in planning, service delivery, resource administration, and local development. The governance environment has subsequently been reinforced by performance-assessment mechanisms such as the Seal of Good Local Governance (SGLG), which was institutionalized through Republic Act No. 11292 and assesses local government performance across multiple areas including

financial administration, disaster preparedness, social protection, health, education, business friendliness, peace and order, environmental management, tourism and culture, and youth development.^{9–11}

Quirino Province provides a pertinent setting for examining leadership and governance. Recent public records identify Dakila Carlo E. Cua as Governor of Quirino, and national league records identify him as National Chairman of the League of Provinces of the Philippines for the 2025–2028 term. DILG Region II also reported in 2025 that the Provincial Government of Quirino had been an eight-time SGLG recipient, providing a documented institutional context in which leadership, governance systems, and organizational performance can be examined without equating awards or public recognition with causal proof of individual leadership effectiveness.^{12–14}

That distinction is important. Governance performance is produced by institutions rather than by a single officeholder alone. Provincial outcomes may reflect the work of department heads, career civil servants, elected boards, municipalities, national agencies, civil-society partners, fiscal conditions, and inherited administrative systems. A defensible leadership study therefore requires careful separation between employee perceptions of leadership behavior and broader claims about causal responsibility for public outcomes. The present study addressed this issue by treating transformational leadership as a perceptual organizational construct and by analyzing its statistical relationship with perceived governance effectiveness, innovation, and service responsiveness rather than attributing all provincial performance directly to the governor.

The study was informed by a stream of public-administration research showing that mission-centered and transformational forms of leadership can shape motivation and organizational outcomes. Paarlberg and Lavigna argued that transformational practices can activate public service values, while Wright, Moynihan, and Pandey showed that transformational leadership can enhance mission valence. More recent systematic work has similarly emphasized the importance of leadership practices that connect employees with public-service purpose.^{4,5,15}

Accordingly, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

- What was the perceived level of transformational leadership in terms of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration?
- What were the perceived levels of governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness?
- Was overall transformational leadership significantly related to governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness?
- Which dimensions of transformational leadership significantly predicted governance effectiveness?
- Which dimensions of transformational leadership significantly predicted organizational innovation and service responsiveness?

The null hypotheses stated that transformational leadership was not significantly related to the three governance outcomes and that its individual dimensions did not significantly predict those outcomes. All statistical tests used an alpha level of .05.

2. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework treated transformational leadership as the principal explanatory construct. Following established theory, it consisted of four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized influence referred to leader behavior that communicated values, integrity, and example-setting; inspirational motivation concerned the communication of direction and collective purpose; intellectual stimulation concerned encouragement of new approaches and critical problem solving; and individualized consideration concerned attention to employee development and work-related needs.^{1,3}

Three criterion variables were examined. Governance effectiveness referred to employee perceptions of clarity of direction, coordination, accountability, implementation discipline, and organizational capacity to achieve public objectives. Organizational innovation referred to perceived support for new ideas, process improvement, learning, and adaptive problem solving. Service responsiveness referred to perceived timeliness, accessibility, coordination, and sensitivity of provincial services to stakeholder needs. These outcomes were selected because prior public-sector studies have associated transformational or mission-oriented leadership with performance, innovation, employee motivation, and public-service outcomes.^{5,7,8,16}

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

The study used a quantitative, cross-sectional explanatory case-study design. The case-study boundary was the Provincial Government of Quirino under the incumbent gubernatorial administration. A quantitative design was appropriate because the research questions required estimation of construct levels, statistical associations, and predictive relationships among leadership and governance variables. The cross-sectional approach measured perceptions at a single analytical period and therefore supported association testing but not strong causal inference.

3.2 Population, Sampling, and Respondent Profile

The analytical dataset consisted of 286 complete respondent records representing personnel assigned across administrative, technical, development, social-service, and support functions. The intended sampling logic was proportionate representation across major provincial offices, with eligibility limited to personnel who had sufficient organizational exposure to evaluate leadership communication, administrative direction, innovation climate, and service processes. Because the analysis focused on organizational perceptions, the unit of analysis was the individual employee response.

Table 1. Respondent Profile (n = 286)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Sex	Female	164	57.3

RESEARCH ARTICLE

	Male	122	42.7
Employment status	Permanent	196	68.5
	Non-permanent/other	90	31.5
Years in government service	Less than 5 years	74	25.9
	5–10 years	83	29.0
	11–15 years	58	20.3
	More than 15 years	71	24.8
Functional cluster	Administrative/support	78	27.3
	Technical/development	74	25.9
	Health/social services	69	24.1
	Field/operations and other	65	22.7

3.3 Research Instrument

The instrument was organized into three parts. The first recorded basic respondent characteristics. The second measured transformational leadership using four subscales aligned with the canonical dimensions of the construct. The wording was adapted conceptually rather than reproducing proprietary Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire items. The third measured governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness. All construct items used a five-point agreement scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The instrument was designed to capture employee perceptions rather than objective performance indicators.^{1,3}

Content validity was addressed by aligning each item with an explicit construct definition and by eliminating items that mixed multiple ideas. Construct scores were computed as the arithmetic mean of their component items. Higher scores indicated stronger perceived transformational leadership or more favorable perceptions of the corresponding governance outcome.

3.4 Reliability and Statistical Treatment

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Descriptive analysis used frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Means were interpreted using the following descriptive bands: 4.21–5.00, very high; 3.41–4.20, high; 2.61–3.40, moderate; 1.81–2.60, low; and 1.00–1.80, very low. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to estimate the direction and strength of linear relationships between overall transformational leadership and each governance outcome. Multiple linear regression was then used to estimate the unique contribution of the four leadership dimensions to each criterion variable.

Before regression analysis, the dataset was screened for missingness, extreme values, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. Variance inflation factors were below conventional concern thresholds and residual diagnostics did not indicate severe departures from linear-model assumptions. Standardized regression coefficients (β), R^2 , F statistics, and two-tailed p values were reported. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = .05$.

4. Results

4.1 Reliability of the Measures

Table 2. Internal Consistency of the Study Measures

Scale	No. of items	Cronbach's α	Interpretation
Idealized influence	4	.815	Good
Inspirational motivation	4	.823	Good
Intellectual stimulation	4	.842	Good
Individualized consideration	4	.802	Good
Governance effectiveness	5	.905	Excellent
Organizational innovation	5	.921	Excellent
Service responsiveness	5	.921	Excellent

The reliability coefficients ranged from .802 to .921, indicating satisfactory to excellent internal consistency. The four leadership dimensions all exceeded .80, while each governance-outcome scale exceeded .90. These coefficients supported aggregation of the item responses into construct means for subsequent analysis.

4.2 Perceived Transformational Leadership

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Transformational Leadership

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Inspirational motivation	4.01	.34	High	1
Idealized influence	3.98	.34	High	2
Intellectual stimulation	3.94	.33	High	3
Individualized consideration	3.92	.35	High	4
Overall transformational leadership	3.96	.31	High	—

The overall mean of 3.96 indicated a high level of perceived transformational leadership. Inspirational motivation obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .34$), suggesting that employees generally perceived strong communication of direction, collective

purpose, and organizational aspiration. Idealized influence also obtained a high mean ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .34$), indicating favorable perceptions of example-setting and value-oriented leadership.

Intellectual stimulation ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .33$) and individualized consideration ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .35$) were likewise rated high. Although the differences among the four dimensions were small and should not be overstated, the pattern suggested that vision communication and role-modeling were somewhat more prominent in the ratings than individualized developmental attention.

The result was consistent with public-sector research that has found transformational leadership to be observable within bureaucratic environments rather than restricted to private organizations. It also aligned with local-government studies linking transformational leadership with innovation-oriented culture and employee willingness to engage in adaptive behavior.^{2,7,8}

4.3 Perceived Governance Outcomes

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Governance Outcomes

Outcome	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Governance effectiveness	3.76	.46	High
Organizational innovation	3.63	.48	High
Service responsiveness	3.84	.45	High

All three governance outcomes were rated within the high range. Service responsiveness obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .45$), followed by governance effectiveness ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .46$) and organizational innovation ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .48$). The pattern indicated that respondents perceived the provincial administration most favorably in responsiveness and somewhat less strongly, though still positively, in innovation.

The dispersion of responses was moderate, with standard deviations below .50 for all outcomes. This suggested that the favorable averages were not produced solely by a small cluster of extreme ratings. Nevertheless, the scores remained perceptual measures and were not substitutes for objective audit indicators, service-delivery metrics, or independent citizen satisfaction data.

Public governance frameworks such as the SGLG provide a separate, externally assessed perspective on local-government systems. DILG describes the SGLG as an institutionalized recognition program using multiple governance areas and outcome-oriented criteria. Such external measures are useful for triangulation, but they evaluate institutional performance and should not be interpreted as direct measures of an individual leader's transformational behavior.^{10,11}

4.4 Relationships Between Transformational Leadership and Governance Outcomes

Table 5. Correlation of Overall Transformational Leadership with Governance Outcomes

Outcome	r	p value	Decision	Interpretation
Governance effectiveness	.519	< .001	Reject H_0	Moderate positive
Organizational innovation	.494	< .001	Reject H_0	Moderate positive
Service responsiveness	.478	< .001	Reject H_0	Moderate positive

Overall transformational leadership was positively and significantly correlated with all three governance outcomes. The strongest relationship was observed with governance effectiveness ($r = .519$, $p < .001$), followed by organizational innovation ($r = .494$, $p < .001$) and service responsiveness ($r = .478$, $p < .001$). The null hypotheses of no linear association were therefore rejected for all three outcomes.

These coefficients indicated moderate rather than near-perfect relationships. This was substantively important because it suggested that leadership perceptions explained only part of the variation in governance perceptions. Institutional systems, work-unit management, resources, intergovernmental coordination, professional capacity, and other contextual factors likely contributed independently to the outcomes.

The direction of the associations was consistent with previous evidence. Kim and Yoon found that senior managers' transformational leadership was positively related to perceptions of an innovation-driven culture in local government, while Wright and colleagues linked transformational leadership to mission valence and public-service motivation. Studies in other public-sector settings have similarly reported positive links between leadership behaviors and employee or organizational performance outcomes.^{5,7,16}

4.5 Predictors of Governance Effectiveness

Table 6. Multiple Regression Predicting Governance Effectiveness

Predictor	Standardized β	t	p
Idealized influence	.234	3.03	.003
Inspirational motivation	.217	2.87	.005
Intellectual stimulation	.091	1.16	.246
Individualized consideration	.058	.74	.462
Model statistics	$R^2 = .277$	$F(4,281) = 26.96$	$p < .001$

The four leadership dimensions jointly explained 27.7% of the variance in governance effectiveness, $F(4, 281) = 26.96$, $p < .001$. Idealized influence ($\beta = .234$, $p = .003$) and inspirational motivation ($\beta = .217$, $p = .005$) were significant unique predictors after the four dimensions were considered simultaneously. Intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration were not statistically significant unique predictors in this model.

The findings suggested that perceptions of governance effectiveness were especially associated with leadership behaviors involving credibility, example-setting, and articulation of a shared direction. Because the predictors were intercorrelated components of a broader leadership construct, the nonsignificance of some dimensions did not imply that they were unimportant in isolation; rather, their unique contribution was smaller after shared variance with the other dimensions was controlled.

This pattern corresponded with theories of transformational leadership in which value-based influence and inspirational communication help align followers with collective goals. In public organizations, mission clarity can be particularly important because employees are expected to connect administrative tasks with broader public purposes and legally defined responsibilities.^{1,4,5}

4.6 Predictors of Organizational Innovation

Table 7. Multiple Regression Predicting Organizational Innovation

Predictor	Standardized β	t	p
Idealized influence	.192	2.46	.015
Inspirational motivation	.070	.91	.366
Intellectual stimulation	.247	3.10	.002
Individualized consideration	.061	.76	.449
Model statistics	$R^2 = .253$	$F(4,281) = 23.76$	$p < .001$

The model predicting organizational innovation was statistically significant and explained 25.3% of the variance, $F(4, 281) = 23.76$, $p < .001$. Intellectual stimulation was the strongest unique predictor ($\beta = .247$, $p = .002$), followed by idealized influence ($\beta = .192$, $p = .015$). Inspirational motivation and individualized consideration were not significant unique predictors after the other leadership dimensions were controlled.

The result supported the conceptual expectation that innovation was most directly associated with leadership that encouraged questioning, problem solving, experimentation, and consideration of alternative approaches. Idealized influence also contributed, indicating that employees may have been more willing to support change when innovation was associated with credible and value-consistent leadership.

These findings were aligned with local-government evidence showing that transformational leadership and supportive climates for creativity are related to innovation-oriented culture. Research in metropolitan and local-government settings has also found transformational leadership to be associated with innovative work behavior and organizational learning conditions.^{7,8}

4.7 Predictors of Service Responsiveness

Table 8. Multiple Regression Predicting Service Responsiveness

Predictor	Standardized β	t	p
Idealized influence	.085	1.07	.284
Inspirational motivation	.171	2.18	.030
Intellectual stimulation	.126	1.56	.122
Individualized consideration	.170	2.08	.039
Model statistics	$R^2 = .230$	$F(4,281) = 21.03$	$p < .001$

The four leadership dimensions explained 23.0% of the variance in service responsiveness, $F(4, 281) = 21.03$, $p < .001$. Inspirational motivation ($\beta = .171$, $p = .030$) and individualized consideration ($\beta = .170$, $p = .039$) were significant predictors. Idealized influence and intellectual stimulation were not statistically significant unique predictors in the multivariable model.

The combination of inspirational motivation and individualized consideration was substantively plausible for service responsiveness. A clearly communicated public-service direction can establish shared priorities, while attention to employee needs and development may strengthen the capacity of frontline and support personnel to respond to citizens and partner institutions. The results nevertheless reflected perceptions and could not establish that leadership alone caused responsive services.

Public-administration research has emphasized that leadership practices can shape public service motivation and job performance, while network-oriented and mission-oriented leadership can help employees connect organizational roles with external stakeholders and service objectives. The present pattern was consistent with that broader literature.^{4,15,16}

5. Discussion

The study produced three central findings. First, the four dimensions of transformational leadership were rated at a high level. Second, governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness were also rated highly. Third, transformational leadership was moderately and positively associated with all three governance outcomes, with specific dimensions showing different predictive patterns across the outcome models.

The high level of inspirational motivation suggested that vision communication and collective direction were salient features of the leadership environment represented in the dataset. Transformational leadership theory proposes that leaders can influence organizational behavior by connecting individual work with a broader purpose and by communicating confidence in shared goals. In public administration, this mechanism is particularly relevant because public employees operate within missions that are not reducible to financial exchange.^{1,4}

The importance of idealized influence in the governance-effectiveness model also fit the public-sector context. Governance requires consistency between formal rules, administrative decisions, and normative expectations of integrity and accountability. A leader perceived as credible and value-consistent may strengthen employee confidence in organizational direction. However, idealized influence should not be interpreted as personal popularity; analytically, it referred to perceived behavior associated with example-setting and values.^{1,2}

Intellectual stimulation emerged as the strongest predictor of organizational innovation. This result closely paralleled the logic of previous local-government research. Kim and Yoon reported that transformational leadership and climates supportive of creativity were associated with innovation-driven culture in the Seoul Metropolitan Government, and later research in local administrative organizations has continued to examine the links among transformational leadership, innovation, and transparency.^{7,17}

The service-responsiveness model showed a different pattern: inspirational motivation and individualized consideration were significant. This finding suggested that responsive administration may depend not only on strategic direction but also on how leaders support employees in executing that direction. Provincial services are delivered through diverse offices with different professional roles, and responsiveness can require both alignment around service priorities and sufficient attention to the operational needs of personnel.

The observed correlations were meaningful but not large enough to support a leader-centric explanation of governance. This restraint is important in public-administration research. Local-government performance emerges from institutional arrangements, professional bureaucracy, elected and career leadership, fiscal capacity, regulatory systems, and interorganizational networks. The SGLG itself evaluates a wide set of governance areas, illustrating that local performance is multidimensional and institutionally embedded.^{10,11}

In relation to Quirino Province, recent official records provide evidence of an institutional environment with documented governance recognition and active provincial administration. DILG Region II reported that Quirino had been an eight-time SGLG recipient, while provincial procurement records identify the governor's office as responsible for substantial administrative and development-fund allocations. These records provide useful contextual information but do not independently establish the causal effect of the governor's leadership on organizational outcomes.

The distinction between context and causality also applies to external recognition of public officials. Public surveys, awards, league positions, and media reports may be relevant descriptive indicators, but they are not interchangeable with peer-reviewed measurement of transformational leadership. A scientific assessment therefore benefits from triangulating employee surveys with objective performance metrics, citizen surveys, administrative records, and independent governance audits.¹²⁻¹⁴

6. Implications for Provincial Governance

The findings suggest several management implications that can be tested empirically in a future research. First, strategic communication should connect provincial programs with a clear and stable public-service mission. Second, innovation systems should encourage employees to propose process improvements, experiment within legal and ethical boundaries, and share lessons across offices. Third, leaders should preserve channels for individualized support, professional development, and problem escalation because responsiveness often depends on the capacity of employees closest to operational bottlenecks.

Fourth, governance assessment should combine leadership-perception measures with independent indicators. Examples include budget execution, procurement timeliness, audit observations, disaster-preparedness metrics, health and social-service coverage, business-processing times, citizen complaint resolution, and SGLG results. A multi-source approach would reduce common-method bias and make it possible to test whether favorable leadership perceptions correspond with measurable public outcomes.

Finally, political and administrative neutrality should be protected in data collection. Employees must be able to provide positive, neutral, or critical assessments without fear that responses will affect employment or access to benefits. Such safeguards are particularly important when research concerns a sitting elected official because socially desirable responding can inflate leadership and performance estimates.

7. Conclusion

The study presented a quantitative framework for examining transformational leadership in provincial governance through the case of Quirino Province. Within the analytical dataset, transformational leadership was rated highly and was positively associated with governance effectiveness, organizational innovation, and service responsiveness. Different dimensions contributed to different outcomes: idealized influence and inspirational motivation were most salient for governance effectiveness; intellectual stimulation was most salient for innovation; and inspirational motivation and individualized consideration were significant for service responsiveness.

References

- [1] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [2] Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2010). Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(1), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup003>
- [3] Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261–295. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4)
- [4] Paarlberg, L. E., & Lavigna, B. (2010). Transformational leadership and public service motivation: Driving individual and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 710–718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02199.x>
- [5] Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review*, 72(2), 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x>
- [6] Trottier, T., Van Wart, M., & Wang, X. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00865.x>
- [7] Kim, S., & Yoon, G. (2015). An innovation-driven culture in local government: Do senior manager's transformational leadership and the climate for creativity matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014568896>
- [8] Asiedu, M. A., Anyigba, H., Ofori, K. S., Ampong, G. O. A., & Addae, J. A. (2021). Leadership and innovative work behaviour within Ghanaian metropolitan assemblies: Mediating role of resource supply. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 34(7), 765–782. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-01-2021-0005>
- [9] Republic of the Philippines. (1991). Republic Act No. 7160: Local Government Code of 1991. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

- [10] Republic of the Philippines. (2019). Republic Act No. 11292: Seal of Good Local Governance Act of 2019. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [11] Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2024). Seal of Good Local Governance: 2024 governance areas and assessment framework. DILG.
- [12] Provincial Government of Quirino. (2025). Indicative Annual Procurement Plan Summary, Calendar Year 2025. Provincial Government of Quirino.
- [13] Department of the Interior and Local Government Region II. (2025, March 7). Quirino Province inaugurates SGLGIF projects to boost tourism and infrastructure. DILG Region II.
- [14] Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2025). National leagues' officials: League of Provinces of the Philippines, 2025–2028. DILG.
- [15] Christensen, R. K., Paarlberg, L., & Perry, J. L. (2017). Public service motivation research: Lessons for practice. *Public Administration Review*, 77(4), 529–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12796>
- [16] Schwarz, G., Eva, N., & Newman, A. (2020). Can public leadership increase public service motivation and job performance? *Public Administration Review*, 80(4), 543–554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13182>
- [17] Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity. (2025). Transformational leadership cultivating innovation and transparency in local government organisations, Thailand, 11(3), 100626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100626>
- [18] OECD. (2001). *Public Sector Leadership for the 21st Century*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264195035-en>
- [19] Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976618>
- [20] Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public service motivation: A systematic literature review and outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 414–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12505>