

Exploring the Administrative Implications of Developmental Models on Good Governance in the Philippines

Romel Brual-Basilan, DPA^{1, 2, 3}

¹Lyceum of the Philippines University: Batangas, Batangas, Philippines

²Batangas State University: The National Engineering University, Batangas, Philippines

³Sangguniang Bayan ng Bauan-LGU Bauan, Bauan, Batangas, Philippines

**Corresponding author: Romel Brual-Basilan, DPA, romelmama1917@yahoo.com*

Copyright: © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: This study examined the administrative implications of various developmental models on good governance in the Philippines. Grounded in the principles of the 1987 Philippine Constitution, it analyzed how modernization, neoliberal, participatory, and sustainable development frameworks shaped administrative systems and influenced governance outcomes. The modernization model emphasized bureaucratic rationalization and centralized planning to enhance institutional efficiency. In contrast, the neoliberal model promoted market liberalization, privatization, and deregulation, which increased efficiency but often conflicted with constitutional commitments to equity and social justice. The participatory model, institutionalized through the Local Government Code of 1991, advanced decentralization, citizen engagement, and collaborative governance, reflecting constitutional values of democracy and inclusiveness. Meanwhile, the sustainable development model integrates economic, social, and environmental dimensions to ensure long-term progress and ecological accountability. Findings revealed that while each model offered distinct administrative strengths, their effectiveness depended on how well governance systems translated constitutional principles—accountability, transparency, participation, efficiency, and equity—into practice. Persistent challenges such as bureaucratic inefficiency, corruption, and uneven policy implementation hindered the realization of good governance. The study concluded that effective governance emerged from harmonizing developmental frameworks with constitutional mandates and administrative realities. Sustaining inclusive progress required a flexible, participatory, and accountable bureaucracy capable of balancing efficiency with social justice. Ultimately, developmental models functioned best as complementary strategies that upheld the Filipino people's welfare through ethical, transparent, and inclusive governance.

Keywords: Governance; Public administration; Developmental models; Decentralization; Sustainability

Online publication: November 14, 2025

1. Introduction

Governments globally adopt various developmental models to guide national growth, social transformation, and institutional reforms. These models—extending from modernization and neoliberal frameworks to participatory and sustainable development approaches—serve as roadmaps for policy direction and public sector management.

In the Philippines, the pursuit of national development has long been intertwined with the practice of governance. Governments adopt different developmental models to achieve economic growth, social transformation, and institutional modernization. However, the real test lies in the administrative dimension—whether these models can be translated into effective governance that upholds accountability, transparency, equity, and citizen participation. The relationship between developmental models and good governance is not merely theoretical; it is mediated by administrative structures, processes, and capacities ^[1–3].

The 1987 Philippine Constitution embeds the core principles of good governance—accountability, transparency, participation, equity, and efficiency—within its framework for national development. It mandates that administrative systems translate developmental models into concrete governance mechanisms that empower citizens, promote social justice, and ensure institutional integrity. Therefore, any developmental model applied in the Philippines must conform to these constitutional mandates to achieve inclusive and sustainable national progress ^[2–3].

Also, with its evolving institutions, constitutional commitment to social justice, and ongoing reforms in decentralization and transparency, the Philippine government exemplifies the continuous struggle to balance developmental aspirations with good governance principles.

This study examines how developmental models shape administrative systems and what implications this bears for good governance. It explores the necessity of institutional reforms, citizen participation, accountability mechanisms, and capacity-building efforts within the bureaucracy. By linking developmental frameworks with the principles of good governance—such as transparency, equity, efficiency, and the rule of law—the study highlights how administrative choices can either strengthen or hinder the realization of inclusive and sustainable development.

2. Objectives of the study

The study generally aimed to explore the administrative implications of developmental models for good governance in the Philippines.

More specifically, it aimed to: identify and understand the dominant developmental models adopted by the Philippine government (e.g., modernization, neoliberal, participatory, and sustainable development models); analyze the administrative dimensions and implications of these developmental models in terms of bureaucratic structure, policy implementation, and institutional reform; evaluate the extent to which these models uphold the core principles of good governance—accountability, transparency, participation, equity, and efficiency—as enshrined in the 1987 Philippine Constitution; assess how administrative capacity and governance mechanisms translate developmental goals into effective public service delivery; and lastly, propose policy and administrative strategies that align developmental models with the constitutional mandates of good governance and inclusive national development.

3. Literature review

3.1 Research locale

This study is situated in the Philippines, a democratic and republican state in Southeast Asia composed of 18 regions, 82 provinces, 149 cities, and 1,493 municipalities. The country's governance framework operates under the 1987 Constitution, which established a unitary presidential system with three coequal branches: the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judiciary.

Public administration in the Philippines functions within a decentralized governance system, guided by the Local Government Code of 1991 (Republic Act No. 7160), which grants local autonomy to provinces, cities, municipalities, and barangays. This decentralization enables the study of developmental models and governance practices both at the national (policy formulation and institutional reform) and local levels (implementation and citizen participation).

The research focuses on the national government's administrative institutions and other key agencies responsible for development planning and policy implementation, as well as local government units (LGUs) that serve as the frontlines of governance and service delivery.

According to Bernas, the 1987 Philippine Constitution was designed to establish a government anchored on accountability, transparency, and social justice ^[1]. Governance in the Philippines is defined by the interaction of institutions, policies, and processes through which public authority is exercised and development goals are pursued.

The Philippines follows a presidential form of government, where the President serves as both head of state and head of government, supported by a Cabinet responsible for policy execution and administrative management. The Congress (Senate and House of Representatives) enacts laws, while the Judiciary ensures the rule of law and constitutional compliance. Governance is also supported by constitutional commissions—such as the Commission on Audit (COA), Civil Service Commission (CSC), and Commission on Elections (COMELEC)—which safeguard accountability, professionalism, and fairness in public service ^[2].

Philippine governance embodies the core principles of good governance, namely: Accountability and Transparency — mandated by Article XI of the Constitution and reinforced by anti-corruption agencies and the Office of the Ombudsman; Participation and Inclusiveness — citizens, civil society, and local organizations are recognized as key actors in governance, as seen in participatory budgeting and community-based programs; Effectiveness and Efficiency — public institutions are expected to deliver quality services and implement reforms aligned with national development plans such as *Ambisyon Natin 2040*; and Equity and Social Justice — development policies must ensure equitable access to opportunities and resources, prioritizing marginalized groups.

The Philippine bureaucracy is the administrative machinery that translates development policies into public programs. Guided by developmental frameworks (modernization, neoliberalism, participatory, sustainable development), the bureaucracy must balance efficiency with equity, and growth with social justice. The government has implemented reforms such as Civil Service Professionalization through merit-based hiring and performance management; E-Governance and Digital Transformation for improved service delivery and transparency; and Decentralization and Devolution, empowering local governments to address community needs.

Despite institutional reforms, governance in the Philippines continues to face challenges such as bureaucratic inefficiency, corruption, weak policy coordination, and uneven development outcomes. These issues highlight the importance of exploring how different developmental models—modernization, neoliberal, participatory, and

sustainable approaches—affect the administrative capacity to achieve good governance.

The Philippines provides a rich and complex context for studying the administrative implications of developmental models on governance. With its evolving institutions, constitutional commitment to social justice, and ongoing reforms in decentralization and transparency, the Philippine government exemplifies the continuous struggle to balance developmental aspirations with good governance principles ^[4].

3.2. Good governance principles in the 1987 Philippine Constitution

The 1987 Philippine Constitution establishes several fundamental obligations and principles that collectively form the foundation of good governance.

Article XI, Section 1 emphasizes accountability and integrity by declaring that “public office is a public trust” and mandates that all public officers must remain accountable to the people while serving with responsibility, integrity, loyalty, efficiency, patriotism, and justice.

The Constitution also upholds transparency and the right to information, ensuring that citizens have access to government actions and records. Article II, Section 28 adopts a policy of full public disclosure of all transactions involving public interest, while Article III, Section 7 guarantees the people’s right to information on matters of public concern.

Furthermore, the Constitution promotes participation, recognizing the essential role of non-governmental, community-based, and sectoral organizations in national development, as provided in Article II of the Declaration of Principles and State Policies. Equally significant is its commitment to equity and social justice, which is reflected in multiple provisions advocating for social order, poverty alleviation, workers’ rights, and equal access to public services. Finally, the principle of efficiency is embedded in the constitutional expectation that public servants deliver adequate services and promote general welfare effectively—implied in the same Article XI, Section 1—underscoring the State’s duty to ensure responsive and competent governance ^[5].

3.3. A summary of constitutional provisions and corresponding governance principles, together with their administrative implications

Article II – Declaration of Principles and State Policies. This article provides the philosophical basis for development, governance, and administration in the Philippines, as cited in the following sections:

Section 1. “*The Philippines is a democratic and republican State. Sovereignty resides in the people, and all government authority emanates from them.*” Implication: Establishes that any developmental model or governance reform must be people-centered and participatory. It emphasizes that public administration must serve citizens’ welfare, aligning with participatory and inclusive development models.

Section 9. “*The State shall promote a just and dynamic social order that will ensure the prosperity and independence of the nation and free the people from poverty through policies that provide adequate social services, promote full employment, a rising standard of living, and an improved quality of life for all.*” Implication: This section provides the constitutional mandate for development planning, reflecting modernization and sustainable development models. It requires administrators to implement development policies aimed at equity, efficiency, and inclusiveness.

Section 10. “*The State shall promote social justice in all phases of national development.*”. Implication: Highlights that economic and administrative reforms must advance equity and fairness, a key principle in both sustainable and participatory models.

Section 14. *“The State recognizes the role of women in nation-building and shall ensure the fundamental equality before the law of women and men.”* Implication: Administrative processes must integrate gender equity, ensuring inclusiveness in governance and development programs.

Section 23. *“The State shall encourage non-governmental, community-based, or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation.”* Implication: Institutionalizes citizen participation and civil society engagement — key administrative mechanisms in participatory development models.

Article XI – Accountability of Public Officers. This article institutionalizes accountability and transparency, core elements of successful governance, as cited in the following sections:

Section 1. *“Public office is a public trust. Public officers and employees must, at all times, be accountable to the people, serve them with utmost responsibility, integrity, loyalty, and efficiency, act with patriotism and justice, and lead modest lives.”* Implication: Sets the ethical and administrative standard for governance. Administrators are required to uphold accountability, integrity, and efficiency—principles central to the implementation of any developmental model.

Sections 2–3. These sections establish mechanisms for impeachment and the Ombudsman. Implication: Provide institutional tools for anti-corruption, transparency, and rule of law, ensuring administrative accountability in the execution of development programs.

Article XII – National Economy and Patrimony

Section 1. *“The goals of the national economy are a more equitable distribution of opportunities, income, and wealth; sustained increase in the amount of goods and services produced by the nation for the benefit of the people; and an expanding productivity as the key to raising the quality of life for all.”* Implication: Encourages balanced development and efficiency—principles underlying modernization and sustainable development models. Administratively, this requires evidence-based policymaking and long-term planning.

Section 9. *“The State shall promote a just and dynamic social order... through policies that provide adequate social services, promote full employment, and improve the quality of life for all.”*

Implication: Calls for strategic policy formulation and institutional reforms to ensure that administrative systems serve inclusive and equitable development.

Article XIII – Social Justice and Human Rights. This article is particularly aligned with participatory and equity-based developmental models.

Section 1. *“The Congress shall give highest priority to the enactment of measures that protect and enhance the right of all the people to human dignity, reduce social, economic, and political inequalities...”* Implication: Administrators must integrate social justice and inclusiveness into development planning and public programs.

Section 15. *“The State shall protect and promote the right to health of the people and instill health consciousness among them.”* Implication: Public administration must ensure efficient delivery of social services—an essential component of good governance.

Article X – Local Government

Section 2. *“The territorial and political subdivisions shall enjoy local autonomy.”*

Implication: Supports decentralization, a major administrative implication of participatory and sustainable development models. Local autonomy enhances responsiveness and accountability in governance.

Section 3. *“The Congress shall enact a local government code which shall provide for a more responsive and accountable local government structure.”* Implication: The Local Government Code of 1991 operationalized this principle, promoting administrative efficiency and citizen participation at the local level.

Article III – Bill of Rights, Section 7. *“The right of the people to information on matters of public concern shall be recognized.”* Implication: Constitutional basis for transparency, open data, and e-governance initiatives—core aspects of modern administrative reforms under good governance principles.

3.4. Developmental models and their administrative implications on good governance in the Philippines

Developmental models in public administration are frameworks or approaches that guide how governments plan, implement, and evaluate policies and programs for national development. Examples include: Modernization model (focus on industrialization, technology, urbanization); Participatory/People-centered model (focuses on empowerment and inclusiveness); Neo-liberal model (market-oriented, privatization, PPPs); and Sustainable development model (balancing economic, social, and environmental goals). These models shape how administration functions, delivers services, and upholds governance principles.

3.4.1. Modernization model

The modernization model emerged in the post–World War II era, emphasizing industrialization, technological advancement, and bureaucratic rationalization as the main drivers of national development. It assumes that developing countries can achieve progress by following the same path taken by Western nations—moving from traditional to modern societies.

Key principles: Economic growth through industrialization and urbanization; Strong central planning and state-led initiatives; Professional and merit-based bureaucracy; Institutional capacity building and technological innovation.

Administrative implications: In the Philippines, modernization theory influenced the creation of centralized agencies and bureaucratic reforms, particularly during the 1950s–1970s. The approach emphasized efficiency, meritocracy, and institutional strengthening. However, it sometimes led to over-centralization and technocratic governance, which limited citizen participation.

Relation to good governance: While modernization promoted efficiency and institutional order, it needed to be balanced with transparency, accountability, and participation, as mandated under Section 1 of Article XI — Accountability of Public Officers. This article institutionalizes accountability and transparency, core elements of good governance, which are stated as follows:

“Public office is a public trust. Public officers and employees must, at all times, be accountable to the people, serve them with utmost responsibility, integrity, loyalty, and efficiency, act with patriotism and justice, and lead modest lives.” ^[6].

3.4.2. Neoliberal model

According to Babb, the neoliberal development model became a dominant transnational policy framework emphasizing market liberalization, deregulation, and privatization, and minimal state intervention ^[7]. It aligns with global trends promoted by the World Bank and IMF through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs).

Key principles: Free-market economy and global trade integration; Reduction of government intervention in the economy; Privatization of state enterprises; Deregulation and fiscal austerity.

Administrative Implications. This model led to downsizing of public bureaucracy, promotion of public–private partnerships, and emphasis on efficiency and performance management. However, it also risked weakening

regulatory institutions and social protection mechanisms, raising concerns about equity and social justice.

Relation to good governance: In the Philippine context, neoliberal reforms promoted efficiency but sometimes conflicted with constitutional principles of equity and social justice stated under Article II, Section 9 and Article XIII. Thus, administrative systems had to strike a balance between efficiency and inclusivity ^[7-8].

3.4.3. Participatory development model

According to Blair, the participatory model emerged as a response to the limitations of top-down modernization and neoliberal approaches ^[9]. It emphasizes citizen empowerment, decentralization, and stakeholder involvement in governance and development processes.

Key principles: Bottom-up planning and decision-making; Decentralization and local autonomy; Empowerment of civil society and grassroots organizations; Transparency and public accountability.

Administrative implications: In the Philippines, this model was institutionalized through the Local Government Code of 1991 (Republic Act 7160), which promoted decentralized governance and local development councils. It strengthened public participation and accountability mechanisms in line with the 1987 Constitution's Article X on local autonomy ^[10].

Relation to good governance: The participatory model aligns directly with the constitutional values of democracy, transparency, accountability, and people's participation (Article II, Sections 23–28). Administratively, it encourages collaborative governance and responsive local leadership ^[11].

3.4.4. Sustainable development model

The sustainable development model integrates economic, social, and environmental goals to ensure long-term, inclusive progress ^[12]. In the Philippines, this approach was institutionalized through the Philippine Agenda 21 in 1996 and aligned with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and environmental stewardship ^[13-14].

Key principles: Balance between economic growth, social equity, and environmental protection; Intergenerational responsibility and ecological stewardship; Policy coherence and multi-sector collaboration; Institutional accountability for sustainability outcomes.

Administrative implications: This model requires cross-sectoral coordination and environmentally conscious governance, influencing agencies like the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and local environmental councils. It also promotes transparency in environmental reporting and participatory environmental governance.

Relation to good governance: As Lopez explains, sustainable governance in the Philippines requires inter-agency coordination and participatory mechanisms to ensure policy coherence and ecological balance ^[14].

3.5. Summary of administrative implications in governance

Research shows that administrative capacity determines whether developmental models can deliver governance outcomes. For instance, the developmental state model in East Asia emphasized merit-based bureaucracy and long-term planning, which strengthened governance institutions. In contrast, neoliberal reforms often demanded administrative restructuring through downsizing and outsourcing, creating both opportunities for efficiency and risks for public accountability.

Among the implications on good governance principles are as follows: Accountability (Stronger monitoring

and evaluation systems); Transparency (Open data initiatives and ICT use); Rule of Law (Institutionalizing reforms and anti-corruption measures); Participation (Greater citizen engagement in planning and implementation); Effectiveness & Efficiency (Adoption of performance-based management); Equity & Inclusiveness (Focus on poverty reduction and social development); and Consensus-Oriented (Collaboration among government, private sector, and civil society).

The administrative implications of developmental models on good governance can be summarized as follows:

Strengthening accountability and transparency: Models that emphasize decentralization and participation encourage governments to open decision-making processes to public scrutiny, reinforcing trust in institutions.

Balancing efficiency and equity: While neoliberal models enhance efficiency, they risk neglecting equity unless complemented by social safety nets. Participatory and sustainable development models ensure inclusiveness and justice.

Institutionalizing reforms: Developmental models push governments to institutionalize reforms, whether through regulatory frameworks (neoliberalism), capacity-building programs (modernization), or environmental policies (sustainability).

Adaptive administration: In an interconnected world, administrators must adapt global developmental frameworks—such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—to local realities, balancing international commitments with domestic priorities.

4. Analysis

The administrative implications of each developmental model are unique and influence the operation of public administration and governance in the Philippines. The modernization model underscores the necessity of centralized planning agencies, technocratic expertise, and robust state intervention to facilitate institutional reform and industrialization ^[1–2]. Conversely, the neoliberal model redefines the state's role by transferring numerous functions to the private sector and emphasizing regulatory supervision, public-private partnerships (PPPs), and contract management, thereby fostering market-driven governance and efficiency ^[10–11].

The importance of inclusive decision-making and grassroots involvement in policy formation and execution is emphasized by the participatory development model, which advocates for the construction of systems for consultation, public engagement, and local empowerment ^[12–13]. In order to strike a balance between economic growth, social fairness, and environmental conservation, the sustainable development model emphasizes the requirement of cross-sectoral cooperation and long-term planning capabilities ^[14]. All these models show how the pursuit of good governance has changed the dynamic between developmental agendas and administrative institutions ^[4–5].

The relationship between developmental models and good governance in the Philippines reveals a dynamic interaction between administrative structures, constitutional mandates, and socio-political realities. Each developmental model—modernization, neoliberalism, participatory, and sustainable development—presents distinct administrative implications that shape how governance principles are practiced within public institutions ^[4].

The modernization model, which historically directed early Philippine development initiatives, prioritized bureaucratic rationalization, central planning, and meritocratic administration ^[2]. It enhanced institutional capacity and professionalism; it also entrenched a top-down governance model that restricted citizen engagement. This model adhered to ideals of efficiency and effectiveness but required a balance with transparency and involvement

as mandated by Article XI of the 1987 Constitution ^[3, 5].

The neoliberal model, influenced by globalization and structural adjustment programs, introduced privatization, deregulation, and public-private partnerships ^[10]. While these reforms enhanced efficiency and fiscal discipline, they often challenged the constitutional commitment to equity and social justice under Article XIII ^[3]. Administrative reforms under neoliberalism demanded leaner government structures and performance-based management, but sometimes weakened regulatory capacities and accountability mechanisms, particularly in social sectors ^[11].

The participatory development model addressed the shortcomings of centralization and market-driven governance. The Philippines codified decentralization and citizen engagement with the Local Government Code of 1991 (Republic Act 7160), reflecting the constitutional values of democracy and local autonomy (Article X) ^[12]. This concept promoted inclusivity, grassroots empowerment, and collective accountability in governance ^[13]. Nonetheless, obstacles such as capacity deficiencies within local government units (LGUs) and inequitable resource allocation continue to impede its complete actualization ^[4].

The sustainable development model represents the most holistic approach, integrating economic growth with social equity and environmental protection ^[14]. Administratively, this model calls for inter-agency coordination, participatory governance, and environmental accountability ^[14]. It promotes transparency in policymaking and the responsible use of resources, directly linking administrative efficiency with long-term sustainability ^[15].

Across these models, the administrative implications converge on key dimensions of good governance ^[5]:

Accountability and Transparency: Institutional mechanisms such as the Office of the Ombudsman, COA, and CSC ensure public accountability and integrity, though enforcement remains inconsistent ^[3, 5].

Participation and Inclusiveness: Decentralization and civil society engagement demonstrate progress, but genuine empowerment requires stronger institutional support and capacity-building ^[12].

Efficiency and Effectiveness: Modernization and neoliberal reforms enhanced administrative performance, but they must remain anchored in constitutional values to avoid exclusionary outcomes ^[1, 10].

Equity and Social Justice: Sustainable and participatory models address inequality, yet bureaucratic inefficiencies and political constraints still limit equitable outcomes ^[4, 14].

Consequently, the analysis highlights that the success of any developmental model in the Philippines ultimately depends on the administrative capacity to translate constitutional principles into practice. The 1987 Constitution provides not only the normative framework but also the evaluative standard for determining whether development efforts truly embody good governance ^[3, 5].

5. Conclusion

The study of developmental models demonstrates that administrative implications are critical in shaping governance outcomes. Developmental models are neither intrinsically good nor harmful; their influence is determined by how administrative systems put them into reality ^[4]. Good governance develops from responsible, transparent, participative, and equitable administrative systems ^[5].

The challenge for policymakers and administrators is to balance efficiency with inclusiveness, global aspirations with local realities, and long-term planning with immediate service delivery ^[14-15]. In the end, the success of developmental models is assessed not solely in economic terms, but also in their capacity to institutionalize beneficial governance and improve the well-being of citizens ^[1, 4].

This study concludes that developmental models significantly shape the administrative landscape of

governance in the Philippines. While modernization and neoliberal models advanced institutional efficiency and economic growth, they often required recalibration to align with the Constitution's social justice and equity provisions^[3, 10]. Meanwhile, participatory and sustainable development models strengthened democratic governance, citizen involvement, and intergenerational accountability but demanded greater administrative competence and coordination^[12, 14].

Effective governance arises not alone from the adoption of a developmental model but from the synthesis of its principles with constitutional mandates and administrative realities^[5]. Effective governance in the Philippines necessitates a flexible, accountable, and participatory bureaucracy that can reconcile efficiency with equality, economic growth with social justice, and national priorities with local requirements^[4].

To sustain inclusive development, administrative systems must continue to institutionalize transparency, strengthen local capacities, and promote evidence-based policymaking^[15]. Developmental models should serve as complementary frameworks rather than competing paradigms—guided by the enduring constitutional values of accountability, participation, efficiency, transparency, and equity^[3, 5].

The interaction between developmental models and good governance illustrates that effective public administration is a technical and ethical pursuit, necessitating both institutional reform and a moral obligation to serve the Filipino populace with integrity, responsibility, and justice^[6].

Acknowledgments

The researchers extend their deepest gratitude to Dr. Ma. Leticia Jose Cabaña-Basilan, his mentor and wife, for his research endeavors. Gratitude is also extended to the Lyceum of the Philippines University — Batangas, Batangas State University — The National Engineering University, and the Sangguniang Bayan ng Bauan — LGU Bauan, for their invaluable guidance, expertise, and unwavering support throughout the conduct of this study. Their mentorship and commitment to academic excellence served as a source of inspiration and direction in completing this research.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Bernas JG. The 1987 Philippine Constitution: A Reviewer-Primer. Rex Book Store, Manila.
- [2] Cruz IS, 2015, Philippine Governance and the Constitution. Central Book Supply, Quezon City.
- [3] De Leon HD, De Leon HD Jr., 2019, Textbook on the Philippine Constitution. Rex Book Store, Manila.
- [4] Brillantes AB Jr., Fernandez MT, 2011, Theory and Practice of Public Administration in the Philippines: Concerns for an Innovative Public Administration, thesis, UP National College of Public Administration and Governance.
- [5] Reyes D, 2019, Public Administration in the Philippines: The Quest for Excellence in Governance. New Day Publishers, Quezon City.
- [6] Brillantes AB Jr., 2011, Good Governance and Institutional Reform in the Philippines. University of the Philippines Press, Manila.
- [7] Babb S, 2013, The Washington Consensus as Transnational Policy Paradigm: Its Origins, Trajectory and Likely Successor. *Review of International Political Economy*, 20(2): 268–297.

- [8] Bello W, 2004, *The Anti-Development State: The Political Economy of Permanent Crisis in the Philippines*, thesis, University of the Philippines.
- [9] Blair H. Participation and Accountability at the Periphery: Democratic Local Governance in Six Countries. *World Development*. 2000;28(1):21–39.
- [10] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2015, *Human Development Report 2015: Work for Human Development*. UNDP, New York.
- [11] Lopez RG, 2020, Sustainable Development Governance in the Philippines: Challenges and Prospects. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1): 45–60.
- [12] Republic of the Philippines, 1991, *Local Government Code of 1991 (Republic Act No. 7160)*. Congress of the Philippines, Manila.
- [13] United Nations, 1996, *Philippine Agenda 21: A National Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Manila.
- [14] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2015, *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Implementation in the Philippines: Country Report*. UNDP, New York.
- [15] Brillantes AB Jr., Fernandez MT, 2011, Decentralization and Governance Reform in the Philippines. *Asian Review of Public Administration*. 22(2): 31–55.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.