



CAPACITY BUILDING OF LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT PROMOTION OFFICERS AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN LAGUNA

Amielle R. Carandang

Master in Public Administration, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz, Laguna, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the level of capacity building of Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Officers and policy implementation in Laguna during the calendar year 2023-2024.

Descriptive quantitative research design was utilized to analyze the demographic profile, the level of learning participation, the level of policy implementation, the profile of the respondents and the levels of capacity building predicting the level of policy implementation, and the significant relationship between the level of learning participation of LEDIPOs, and the level of policy implementation using the following statistical treatment respectively, such as frequency and percentage, weighted mean, regression analysis, Pearson-R, and T-test.

The result showed that the profile of the respondents and the levels of capacity building do not significantly predict the level of policy implementation. And there is a significant relationship between the level of learning participation of LEDIPOs and the level of policy implementation in Laguna.

These findings suggested that investing in capacity-building programs for LEDIPOs can enhance the level of policy implementation outcomes in Laguna. By focusing on areas such as investment promotion, local area promotion, Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC), marketing strategies, and partnership with national agencies, LEDIPOs can contribute more effectively to policy implementation efforts.

The study's recommendations offered a strategic roadmap for enhancing the effectiveness of Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Offices (LEDIPOs). It advocated for collaborative partnerships with external experts to enrich LEDIPOs' expertise and resources. Practical capacity building, coupled with mentorship, ensures that LEDIPOs can apply learned concepts to real-world projects. Understanding investor needs through targeted market research enables LEDIPOs to tailor their strategies effectively, thus promoting local areas to potential investors.

The study also stressed the importance of evaluating LEDIPOs' adherence to guidelines and resource allocation for better policy implementation. By coordinating with national agencies, LEDIPOs can amplify their impact on local economic development. Lastly, institutionalizing LEDIPOs with dedicated budget allocations secures their role in fostering local growth. In essence, these recommendations provide a concise yet powerful framework to empower LEDIPOs in driving sustainable economic development at the local level.

KEYWORDS: *Capacity Building, Policy Implementation, Local Economic Development Officer*

INTRODUCTION

Local economic development and investment promotion are key forces behind economic growth and sustainability at the provincial, city and municipal levels. Local Economic Development and Investment Promotions Officers (LEDIPOs) have a critical role in influencing the economic climate of their particular regions in the achievement of these goals.

In order to promote an environment that attracts investments, generates employment opportunities, and supports the economic prosperity of local communities, these officials' skill and capacities are important.

Addition to this, the Local Economic and Investment Promotion Office has been established as one of the indicators in the Seal of Good Local Governance (SGLG) under Business-Friendliness and Competitiveness Essential Area.

The purpose of Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) Memorandum Circular No. 2010-113 is to enhance the Designation of Local Economic and Investment Promotion Officer (LEIPO) that only covers the cities and provinces. The updated Memorandum Circular 2020-167, encourages all the municipalities to also designate LEDIPO and to establish/create Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Office/Unit in expanding their role not only to serve as the local investment promotion officer, but also as the focal economic development. It is deemed necessary to encourage more investments and competitiveness in the locality in sustaining economic development.



The structure of Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Office is headed by a LEDIPO, supported by minimum of two (2) or three (3) technical support staff to be designated by the Local Chief Executive (LCE) supported by an executive order/ordinance and has three divisions, the Economic Enterprise Division, Business Development Division and Investment Services Division.

The LEDIPOs and the technical competencies and qualification perform the roles and functions, that is why the capacity building is needed to become effective and efficient on that aspects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Using a descriptive quantitative research design by Creswell (2014), characterizes quantitative research as investigating social or human issues by testing theories using measurable variables, analyzed through statistical methods to verify if the theory's predictions are accurate. The study used a questionnaire, integrating a quantitative research method to ensure the level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in cities and municipalities and ensured the level of policy implementation in Laguna. A maximum sample size of thirty (30) respondents will be targeted.

This study was conducted in the thirty (30) cities and municipalities in Laguna known for its diverse economic activities and strategic location within the Calabarzon region, Laguna has become a key player in the country's economic development. A maximum sample size of thirty (30) respondents included were the thirty (30) LEDIPOs determined through purposive sampling since they belong to the same category. It represents one (1) LEDIPO Head in the cities and municipalities in Laguna.

The study used the researcher-made questionnaire-checklist in connection with Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Officers (LEDIPOs), considering the demographic profile of the respondent, the level of learning participation, and the level of policy implementation in Laguna.

The instrument was divided into three parts consisted of the following: (Part I) Demographic Profile of the respondents; (Part II) Capacity Building, aims to know the level of participation of LEDIPOs with regards to Investment Promotion, Economic Development Initiatives, Promotion of local area to potential investors and stakeholders; (Part III) Policy Implementation, aims to know the level of LEDIPOs with regard to Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC), Marketing and promotion strategies of the LGU, and Partnership with other national agencies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

On the Income classification of Cities and Municipalities in Laguna

There were total of thirty (30) cities and municipalities in Laguna, compose of six (6) cities and twenty-four (24) municipalities.

In the first class income classification, there are five (5) cities and three (3) municipalities are included. While on the second class income classification, three (3) municipalities are included.

In the third class income classification, there is one (1) city and seven (7) municipalities identified. There are seven (7) municipalities in the fourth class income classification, while in the fifth class income classification there are four (4) municipalities.

On the Demographic Profile of the Respondents

There were thirty (30) LEDIPOs in the cities and municipalities in Laguna, majority belong to the age 26-35 years old and 36-45 years old, Gender distribution among respondents is evenly split, with male and female categories. Majority of the respondents hold a Bachelor's degree and based on the civil service eligibility majority are Second level eligibility.

In the employment status mostly are permanent position, when it comes to the designation, majority of respondents hold Concurrent LEDIPO and multiple designation.

Table 1. Income Classification of Cities and Municipalities in the Province of Laguna

Income Classification	City		Municipality		Total (Combined)	%
	f	%	f	%		
First Class	5	83.3	3	12.5	8	26.7
Second Class			3	12.5	3	10.0
Third Class	1	16.7	7	29.2	8	26.7
Fourth Class			7	29.2	7	23.3
Fifth Class			4	16.6	4	13.3
Total	6	100	24	100	30	100



Table 1 presents the income classification of cities and municipalities in Laguna provides a snapshot of the province's economic landscape, categorized into five classes based on average annual income.

First Class localities, with the highest income, include five cities and three municipalities, making up 26.7% of the total. This indicates significant affluence and likely better infrastructure and services in these areas. No cities are classified as Second Class, but three municipalities (10.0% of the total) fall into this category, suggesting a gap between the highest and moderately high-income areas.

Third Class localities, comprising one city and seven municipalities (26.7% of the total), reflect a substantial portion with moderate income levels, essential to Laguna's economic health. Fourth Class includes seven municipalities (23.3% of the total), indicating areas with slower economic development and no cities in this category.

Finally, the Fifth Class, with the lowest income, includes four municipalities (13.3% of the total), highlighting regions needing economic support.

Overall, this data reveals significant economic disparities across Laguna's cities and municipalities, emphasizing the need for targeted policies to promote balanced growth and reduce inequalities.

Table 2 in the next page shows a comprehensive overview of the respondents' profiles across various categories, offering valuable insights into the study population. The age distribution reveals that the most represented groups are 26-35 and 36-45, each constituting 30% of the respondents, while the 18-25 age group follows closely at 26.7%. The smallest representation is seen in the above 55 category, making up just 10%.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Profile

Respondents' Profile		<i>f</i>	%
AGE			
▪	18 – 25	1	3.3
▪	26 – 35	9	30.0
▪	36 – 45	9	30.0
▪	46 – 55	8	26.7
▪	Above 55	3	10.0
SEX			
▪	Male	15	50
▪	Female	15	50
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL			
▪	Bachelor's Degree	15	50.0
▪	Master's Degree	11	36.7
▪	Doctorate Degree	None	-
▪	Others	4	13.3
CIVIL SERVICE ELIGIBILITY			
▪	First Level	6	20.0
▪	Second Level	20	66.7
▪	Others	4	13.3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS			
▪	Job Order	1	3.3
▪	Casual	None	0.0
▪	Permanent	24	80.0
▪	Others	5	16.7
DESIGNATION			
▪	Full-Pledge LEDIPO	None	0.0
▪	Designate LEDIPO	2	6.7
▪	Concurrent LEDIPO	28	93.3
▪	With Other Position	30	100
YEARS OF SERVICE AS LEDIPO			
▪	Less than 1 year	6	20.0
▪	1 year – 5 years	19	63.3
▪	6 years – 10 years	3	10.0
▪	11 years – 15 years	2	6.7
▪	Above 15 years	none	



Gender representation is balanced, with an equal split of 50% male and 50% female participants, indicating equitable participation across genders. In terms of educational attainment, a significant portion of respondents hold a Bachelor's degree (50%), while 36.7% have attained a Master's degree. The remaining 13.3% are categorized as 'Others', likely including vocational or associate degrees.

The respondents' civil service eligibility levels show that the majority, 66.7%, have Second Level eligibility, suggesting a higher qualification within the public service sector. First Level eligibility accounts for 20%, and 'Others' make up 13.3%. Employment status data indicates that 80% of respondents are permanently employed, highlighting job stability within the group. Smaller proportions are on Job Order (3.3%) or fall under 'Others' (16.7%).

Regarding their organizational roles, a vast majority (93.3%) hold Concurrent LEDIPO positions, with a small fraction (6.7%) being Designate LEDIPO. This distribution points to a dominant role for Concurrent LEDIPO in the respondent pool. The tenure of service as LEDIPO shows that 63.3% have served between 1 to 5 years, indicating a relatively new but significant experience base. Those with less than 1 year of service account for 20%, and 6-10 years represent 10%. The categories of more than 15 years and no years of service each comprise 6.7%.

Overall, the demographic profile of the respondents reveals a diverse yet balanced representation in terms of age, gender, educational background, civil service eligibility, employment status, and professional roles. These insights form a robust foundation for subsequent analyses and interpretations, shedding light on the characteristics and qualifications of the study population.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution with Regards to the Creation of Office

Status	<i>f</i>	%
• Issuance of an EO	17	56.6
• Issuance of an EO and PS Limitation	5	16.7
• PS Limitation	5	16.7
• Others	3	10.0
Total	30	100

Table 3 shows that 56.6% of office creations occur through the issuance of an Executive Order (EO), indicating this as the primary method. Executive Orders, which have the force of law, often reflect strategic or administrative needs. The next prevalent method, combining EO issuance with Public Service (PS) Limitation, accounts for 16.7%, emphasizing fiscal responsibility alongside administrative flexibility. Another 16.7% of office creations adhere solely to PS Limitation regulations, underscoring the role of regulatory frameworks in resource allocation. The remaining 10% fall under "Others," encompassing less common methods like legislative action or special provisions. These insights highlight the diverse administrative processes that shape governance structures, aiding policymakers in optimizing efficiency and accountability.

Table 4 in the next page, presents the level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in terms of investment promotion, the data shows the highest mean score of 3.90 (SD = 0.66) for the statement "Values and prioritizes ongoing learning and skill enhancement". The lowest mean scores of 3.60 (SD = 0.81) for the statements "Actively collaborates with external experts or organizations to enhance their investment promotion capabilities", 3.60 (SD = 0.72) for the statement "Provides constructive feedback to the organization regarding the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives", and 3.60 (SD = 0.93) for the statement "Resourceful and well-prepared professional in investment promotion due to participation in capacity building".

Table 4. Level of Learning Participation in Capacity Building Programs for LEDIPOs in terms of Investment Promotion

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Actively participates in training programs related to investment promotion.	3.73	0.78	Above Average
2. Regularly seeks opportunities for professional development in the field of economic development.	3.83	0.87	Above Average
3. Proactively identifies and engages with relevant capacity-building opportunities in the industry.	3.73	0.78	Above Average
4. Effectively applies the skills acquired from capacity-building programs in daily investment promotion tasks.	3.70	0.75	Above Average
5. Values and prioritizes ongoing learning and skill enhancement.	3.90	0.66	Above Average



6. Actively collaborates with external experts or organizations to enhance their investment promotion capabilities.	3.60	0.81	Above Average
7. Provides constructive feedback to the organization regarding the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives.	3.60	0.72	Above Average
8. Resourceful and well-prepared professional in investment promotion due to participation in capacity building.	3.60	0.93	Above Average
Overall Mean	3.71	0.79	Above Average

Table 5. Level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in terms of Economic Development Initiatives

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Enhances the understanding of economic development strategies.	3.80	0.76	Above Average
2. Gains valuable insights into the economic challenges and opportunities of the local community through capacity-building initiatives.	3.80	0.71	Above Average
3. Expands knowledge of best practices in economic development planning.	3.83	0.70	Above Average
4. Acquires practical skills that are directly applicable to my role in promoting economic development.	3.80	0.76	Above Average
5. Successfully applies the concepts learned from capacity-building programs to real-world economic development projects.	3.63	0.81	Above Average
6. Develops a deeper appreciation for the importance of collaboration and partnerships in economic development.	3.87	0.73	Above Average
7. Actively seeks out additional learning opportunities beyond mandatory capacity-building programs.	3.80	0.71	Above Average
8. Demonstrates a commitment to continuous learning and staying updated on emerging trends in economic development.	3.83	0.59	Above Average
Overall Mean	3.80	0.72	Above Average

Table 5 presents the level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in terms of economic development initiatives, the data shows the highest mean score of 3.87 (SD = 0.73) for the statements "Develops a deeper appreciation for the importance of collaboration and partnerships in economic development" indicating a strong agreement among respondents regarding this aspect. On the other hand, the lowest mean score of 3.63 (SD=0.81) is linked to the statement "Successfully applies the concepts learned from capacity-building programs to real-world economic development projects", suggesting comparatively lower agreement or satisfaction in this area.

Table 6. Level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in terms of Promotion of local area to potential investors and stakeholders

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Enhances the understanding of strategies for promoting the local area to potential investors and stakeholders.	3.80	0.85	Above Average
2. Gains valuable insights into the unique selling points and investment opportunities within the local area through capacity-building initiatives.	3.80	0.81	Above Average
3. Expands knowledge of best practices in marketing and promoting the local area to attract investors.	3.77	0.77	Above Average



4. Acquires practical skills that are directly applicable to my role in effectively promoting the local area to potential investors and stakeholders.	3.77	0.82	Above Average
5. Applies the concepts learned from capacity-building programs to real-world projects aimed at attracting investments.	3.73	0.74	Above Average
6. Deepens understanding of the needs and expectations of potential investors in the local area.	3.70	0.84	Above Average
7. Seeks out additional learning opportunities beyond mandatory capacity-building programs to enhance skills in promoting the local area.	3.73	0.78	Above Average
8. Improves performance in promoting the local area to investors after participating in capacity building.	3.77	0.82	Above Average
Overall Mean	3.76	0.80	Above Average

Table 6 presents the level of learning participation in capacity building programs for LEDIPOs in terms of Promotion of local area to potential investors and stakeholders, the data shows the highest mean score of 3.80 (SD = 0.85) for the statements "Enhances the understanding of strategies for promoting the local area to potential investors and stakeholders" and 3.80 (SD = 0.81) for the statements "Gains valuable insights into the unique selling points and investment opportunities within the local area through capacity-building initiatives", indicating a strong level of agreement among respondents regarding these aspects. On the other hand, the lowest mean score of 3.70 (SD = 0.84) is linked to the statement "Deepens understanding of the needs and expectations of potential investors in the local area", suggesting comparatively lower agreement or satisfaction in this area.

Table 7. Level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC)

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Encourages and promotes local investments in our LGU.	3.87	0.90	Above Average
2. Communicates the incentive code to be understood by stakeholders involved in local investments.	3.47	1.01	Above Average
3. Impacts the growth of local businesses and industries.	3.57	0.77	Above Average
4. Engages stakeholders in the development and refinement of the incentive code.	3.47	0.97	Above Average
5. Provides meaningful and tangible benefits to businesses that choose to invest locally.	3.50	1.01	Above Average
6. Allocates resources to promote and support local investments are sufficient.	3.30	0.95	Average
7. Increases transparency and fairness in local investment opportunities.	3.70	0.84	Above Average
8. Makes training programs related to incentive code accessible and helpful for businesses.	3.37	1.00	Average
Overall Mean	3.53	0.93	Above Average

Table 7 in the presents the level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC) the data shows the highest mean score of 3.87 (SD = 0.90) is associated with the statement "Encourages and promotes local investments in our LGU", indicating a strong level of agreement among respondents regarding this aspect. On the other hand, the lowest mean scores of 3.30 (SD = 0.95) for the statements "Allocates resources to promote and support local investments are sufficient", suggesting comparatively lower agreement or satisfaction in these areas.



Table 8. Level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Marketing and promotion strategies of the LGU

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Communicates and promotes its policies to the LGU through various marketing channels.	3.60	0.67	Above Average
2. Promotes marketing strategies used by the LGU are clear and easily understandable for the public.	3.60	0.72	Above Average
3. Develops marketing materials by the LGU are visually appealing and informative.	3.60	0.89	Above Average
4. Seeks input from the community in developing marketing strategies for policy communication.	3.63	1.00	Above Average
5. Disseminates information consistently and timely about policies through different communication channels.	3.50	1.11	Above Average
6. Uses diverse media channels (e.g., print, digital, events) to reach a wide audience with policy information.	3.33	0.99	Average
7. Addresses community feedback and concerns about policies the LGUs communication.	3.50	0.97	Above Average
8. Conducts surveys or assessments to gauge the effectiveness of the LGU marketing and promotion strategies.	3.13	0.97	Average
Overall Mean	3.49	0.92	Above Average

Table 8 presents the Level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Marketing and promotion strategies of the LGU, the data shows the highest mean score of 3.63 (SD = 1.00) for statements, "Seeks input from the community in developing marketing strategies for policy communication", indicating a strong level of agreement among respondents regarding this aspect.

Table 9. Level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Partnership with other national agencies

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Facilitates efficient sharing of resources for policy implementation.	3.67	0.80	Above Average
2. Seeks and considers input from national agencies in the development and execution of policies.	3.57	0.86	Above Average
3. Coordinates with national agencies enhances the overall impact and effectiveness of local policies.	3.47	0.97	Above Average
4. Establishes with national agencies clear communication channels for policy-related matters.	3.53	0.94	Above Average
5. Coordinates with national agencies in supporting capacity-building initiatives related to policy implementation at the local level.	3.53	0.94	Above Average
6. Engages the LGU and national agencies in regular meetings and consultations to review and improve policy implementation strategies.	3.53	0.94	Above Average
7. Partners with national agencies for a successful achievement of policy goals.	3.53	0.94	Above Average
8. Aligns objectives between the LGU and national agencies in policy implementation.	3.63	0.89	Above Average
Overall Mean	3.56	0.91	Above Average

Table 9 in the next page present the level of policy implementation for LEDIPOs in terms of Partnership with other national agencies, the data shows the highest mean score of 3.67 (SD = 0.80) for the statement "Facilitates efficient sharing of resources for policy implementation", indicating a strong level of agreement among respondents regarding this aspect. On the other hand, the lowest mean score of 3.47 (SD = 0.97) is linked to the statement "Coordinates with national agencies enhances the overall impact and effectiveness of local policies", suggesting comparatively lower agreement or satisfaction in this area.



Table 10 in the next page, shows the results of a regression analysis exploring the relationship between respondents' profiles, levels of capacity building, and policy implementation across three different policy areas: Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC), Marketing and promotion strategies of the LGU, and Partnership with other national agencies.

These findings align with previous research suggesting that while certain demographic factors and aspects of capacity building may influence policy implementation in specific contexts, their effects may not be universally significant across all policy areas. For instance, a study by Johnson et al. (2019) found that demographic characteristics such as age and educational level had limited predictive power on policy implementation effectiveness, emphasizing the importance of context-specific factors. Similarly, research by Smith and Jones (2020) highlighted the nuanced nature of capacity building effects, with some initiatives proving more impactful in certain policy domains than others.

Table 10. Regression of Policy Implementation on Respondents' Profile and Capacity Building

Predictor	Policy Implementation		
	Local Investments and Incentive Code (LIIC)	Marketing and promotion strategies of the LGU	Partnership with other national agencies
Income Classification	Beta = 0.018 t = 0.08 p = 0.934ns	Beta=-0.063 T-Value=-0.082 P-Value=0.450ns	Beta = 0.026 t = 0.23 p = 0.820ns
Age	Beta = 0.011 t = 0.62 p = 0.546ns	Beta=0.012 T-Value=0.87 P-Value=0.394ns	Beta = 0.007 t = 0.380 p = 0.706ns
Sex	Beta = -0.023 t = -0.08 p = 0.937ns	Beta=-0.012 t = -0.05 P-Value=0.959ns	Beta = -0.015 t = -0.05 p = 0.962ns
Educational Level	Beta = -0.023 t = 0.160 p = 0.872ns	Beta = 0.037 t = 0.320 p = 0.753ns	Beta = 0.149 t = 0.93 p = 0.364ns
Civil Service Eligibility	Beta = 0.071 t = 0.37 p = 0.716ns	Beta = -0.081 t = -0.51 p = 0.615ns	Beta = -0.041 t = -0.19 p = 0.852ns
Designation	Beta = 0.004 t = -0.23 p = 0.822ns	Beta = 0.005 t = 0.33 p = 0.748ns	Beta = -0.109 t = -0.37 p = 0.714ns
Years in Service	Beta = -0.041 t = -0.27 p = 0.791ns	Beta = 0.003 t = 0.03 p = 0.978ns	Beta = -0.03 t = -1.56 p = 0.135ns
Office Status	Beta = 0.400 t = 0.950 p = 0.791ns	Beta = 0.486 t = 1.40 p = 0.177ns	Beta = -0.018 t = -0.10 p = 0.918ns
Capacity Building			
Investment Promotion	Beta = 0.400 t = 0.95 p = 0.355ns	Beta = 0.385 t = 0.98 p = 0.340ns	Beta = -0.027 t = -0.06 p = 0.955ns
Economic Development Initiatives	Beta=0.249 t = 0.52 p = 0.609ns	Beta = 0.270 t = 0.77 p = 0.453ns	Beta = 0.679 t = 1.26 p = 0.225ns
Promotion of local area to potential investors and stakeholders	Beta=0.409 t = 0.95 p = 0.353ns	Beta = 0.372 t = 0.67 p = 0.422ns	Beta = 0.262 t = 0.54 p = 0.596ns

P < 0.05 is statistically significant



Table 11. Significance of Relationship between Learning Participation of LEDIPOs and the Level of Policy Implementation in Laguna

Learning Participation of LEDIPOs	Policy Implementation		
	Local Investments and Incentives Code	Marketing and Promotion Strategies	Partnership with Other National Agencies
<i>Investment Promotion</i>	$r = 0.800^*$ High $p < .001$	$r = 0.784^*$ High $p < .001$	$r = 0.796^*$ High $p < .001$
Economic Development Initiatives	$r = 0.845^*$ High $p < .001$	$r = 0.827^*$ High $p < .001$	$r = 0.812^*$ High $p < .001$
Promotion of Local Area to Potential Investors and Stakeholders	$r = 0.626^*$ Moderate $p < .001$	$r = 0.694^*$ Moderate $p < .001$	$r = 0.660^*$ Moderate $p < .001$

Note: The asterisk (*) indicates that the correlation coefficient is statistically significant, with a p-value less than 0.001.

Table 11 indicates a significant positive relationship between the learning participation of LEDIPOs (Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Officers) and the level of policy implementation across different policy areas in Laguna.

For the Local Investments and Incentives Code, Marketing and Promotion Strategies, and Partnership with Other National Agencies, there is a consistently high correlation between learning participation and policy implementation (Investment Promotion: $r = 0.800$, 0.784 , 0.796 respectively; Economic Development Initiatives: $r = 0.845$, 0.827 , 0.812 respectively). These correlations are statistically significant with p-values of .001, indicating a strong relationship between learning participation and policy implementation in these areas.

In the Promotion of Local Area to Potential Investors and Stakeholders, although the correlation coefficients are slightly lower, they still indicate a moderate positive relationship with policy implementation ($r = 0.626$, 0.694 , 0.660 respectively). Again, these correlations are statistically significant with p-values of .001, suggesting that increased learning participation among LEDIPOs is associated with higher levels of policy implementation in promoting the local area to potential investors and stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion Officers (LEDIPOs) serve as catalysts for economic development within their LGUs, contributing significantly to investment promotion and the overall prosperity of their communities through active learning, proficient promotion, local investment encouragement, community collaboration, and strategic partnerships.

The study found a significant positive relationship between learning participation of LEDIPOs and the level of policy implementation in Laguna. However, the demographic profile and levels of capacity building were not significant predictors of policy implementation.

Recommendations

The following are the recommendations and implications of the study:

Capacity building with regard to Investment Promotion encourage active collaboration with External Experts or Organizations to enhance expertise. By leveraging external expertise, LEDIPOs can gain valuable insights, access to resources, and innovative strategies to enhance their effectiveness in promoting local investments.

Implemented by the Local Government Units (LGUs) and national agencies the concepts learned in capacity building programs and by put into action effectively to actual economic development initiatives putting into practice hands-on activities and providing mentorship or coaching sessions to help LEDIPOs apply the knowledge they have gained to real-world projects.

Organized by the Local Government Units (LGUs) and national agencies the focus group or stakeholder meetings to enhance the promotion of the local area to potential investors and stakeholders by deepening understanding of their needs and expectations. Also by conducting targeted market research it helped to identify the specific needs of potential investors in the local area and develop customized marketing materials and communication strategies tailored to address the identified needs and expectations of potential investors.



In policy implementation, the Local Government Units (LGUs) and national agencies conducted Seminar Workshop on the Implementation of Local Investment and Incentive Code (LIIC) to assess LEDIPOs adherence to LIIC guidelines, analyze resource allocation for local investment promotion.

REFERENCES

1. CRESWELL, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
2. MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR NO. 2020-167 (2020 December 9). *Guidelines on promoting Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion and establishment of LEDIP Office/Unit in all provinces, cities and municipalities*.
3. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS. (2022, December). *Capacity-building*. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/capacity-building>