

Understanding Policy Implementation and Organizational Behavior for an Administrative Framework: A Literature Review

**Rhea Stephany B. Faba-An¹, Patricia D. Valdez², Marivic G. Rosario³
Jennylyn I. Siki⁴, May S. Joven⁵**

^{1,2,3,4,5} Graduate school students

Baguio Central University, Baguio City, Philippines

Abstract

This study examines the dynamics of policy implementation and organizational behavior in the Philippine public sector, focusing on three key national agencies: the Department of Education (DepEd), the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM). Anchored on Street-Level Bureaucracy Theory, Organizational Behavior Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, Systems Theory, and Fiscal Governance Theory, the review explores how frontline discretion, leadership practices, organizational culture, and fiscal structures influence the translation of policy into practice. Using a systematic review approach guided by the PRISMA 2020 framework, a total of 470 records were identified from academic databases and institutional repositories. After duplicate removal, screening, and methodological filtering, 63 studies were included in the qualitative synthesis and 32 in the meta-analysis. The findings reveal persistent implementation gaps rooted in resource limitations, unclear guidelines, bureaucratic fragmentation, inconsistent supervision, and misaligned budgeting processes. These challenges result in varied interpretations of policy and uneven implementation across regions and sectors. The study concludes that policy effectiveness in the Philippines is shaped less by policy design and more by human behavior, organizational dynamics, leadership competence, and fiscal coherence. In response, the paper proposes the development of an integrated administrative and supervisory framework that harmonizes leadership practices, strengthens organizational behavior, supports inter-agency coordination, and aligns fiscal governance with policy goals. The review underscores the critical role of evidence-based leadership, capacity-building, and human-centered governance in improving public-sector performance and achieving more consistent, equitable, and responsive service delivery across DepEd, DENR, and DBM.

Keywords: Administrative and Supervisory Framework, Policy Implementation, Organizational Behavior, Public Sector Governance, Philippine Public Institutions

1. Introduction

Policy implementation is one of the most complex stages of the policy cycle, as success Worldwide, public institutions continue to struggle with translating policies into effective frontline action, largely due to systemic capacity gaps, resource constraints, and organizational behavior issues (OECD, 2024). Recent global surveys show that only 39% of citizens in OECD countries trust their national governments, indicating persistent concerns about accountability, implementation, and public service delivery (OECD, 2024). UNESCO further reports that by 2030 the world will face a shortage of 44 million teachers, sharply highlighting global implementation bottlenecks caused by limited staffing, high workloads, and weak support systems in education (UNESCO & Teacher Task Force, 2023). Similarly, the World Bank estimates that 70% of children in low- and middle-income countries may experience learning poverty post-pandemic due to gaps between policy intent and actual school-level implementation (World Bank, 2022).

In environmental governance, global analyses show that even countries with strong environmental laws often fail to implement them effectively due to institutional weaknesses, unclear mandates, and insufficient enforcement capacity (UNEP, 2024). While many countries aim to strengthen coordination between finance ministries, education agencies, and environment agencies, budget departments—similar to the Philippines’ DBM—play a critical role in shaping policy implementation outcomes through resource allocation, fiscal constraints, and performance-based budgeting systems, yet global literature rarely integrates how budgeting behavior and fiscal governance directly affect frontline implementation. This highlights a global research gap: cross-sector frameworks that examine the combined effects of policy implementation dynamics, organizational behavior, and budgeting systems within education, environment, and public administration agencies remain significantly underdeveloped.

Across countries, major public-sector surveys consistently reveal that implementation failures often stem from misaligned budgeting processes, fragmented supervision, and behavioral constraints within civil service systems. In Australia, the 2024 TALIS survey shows that 42% of school leaders report teacher shortages, while 65% of teachers report severe stress, attributed partly to insufficient funding and inconsistent supervisory support (OECD TALIS, 2024). In the United Kingdom, education reforms continue to face setbacks as the government missed 48% of its teacher recruitment target in 2024, forcing costly international recruitment while local schools remain under-resourced (UK Department for Education, 2024). In Southeast Asia, SEAMEO reports a projected 4.5 million teacher shortfall by 2030, driven by inadequate government financing, bureaucratic bottlenecks, and weak local policy implementation (SEAMEO, 2024). Environmental agencies in countries such as China, Indonesia, India, and Bangladesh report persistent enforcement failures due to poor coordination between central budget authorities and local environment officers, inconsistent funding flows, and mismatches between national environmental goals and operational capacities (UNEP, 2024).

Similar issues are observed in the United States, where despite increased EPA enforcement staffing in 2023, studies highlight significant compliance gaps due to insufficient local resource allocation (US EPA, 2023). Across these contexts, public finance ministries—parallel to the Department of Budget and Management (DBM)—play a decisive role in determining the resource

adequacy, staffing, and performance monitoring systems that frontline agencies rely on. Yet, few international comparative studies examine how budgeting agencies, education ministries, and environment institutions jointly influence policy implementation through organizational behavior, discretion, and supervisory structures. This reveals a deeper cross-country research gap: the absence of integrated administrative and supervisory frameworks that assess the combined impact of policy, budgeting, and organizational behavior across public agencies similar to DepEd, DENR, and DBM.

This literature review is highly aligned with several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that emphasize quality governance, education, environmental stewardship, and institutional strengthening. Specifically, the study supports SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) by examining how policy implementation and organizational behavior shape accountability, transparency, and the effectiveness of public agencies such as DepEd, DENR, and DBM. It advances SDG 4 (Quality Education) by addressing implementation bottlenecks in teacher deployment, curriculum reforms, and supervisory support within basic education. It also reinforces SDG 13 (Climate Action) and SDG 15 (Life on Land) by analyzing the challenges faced by DENR personnel in enforcing environmental laws, implementing conservation programs, and promoting sustainable resource management.

Moreover, the study contributes to SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) by proposing an integrated administrative and supervisory framework that encourages inter-agency collaboration, resource alignment, and cross-sector leadership. Through its cross-cutting approach, the literature review highlights that effective policy implementation and organizational behavior are foundational to achieving the SDGs, demonstrating that strong institutions are indispensable for delivering quality education, protecting the environment, and ensuring sustainable national development.

This literature review directly responds to the priorities of the National Higher Education Research Agenda (NHERA) by generating evidence-based insights that strengthen governance, institutional capacity, and public sector leadership—core themes identified in NHERA’s priority clusters. By focusing on DepEd, DENR, and DBM, the study addresses NHERA’s mandate to promote research that enhances public administration, education reforms, environmental sustainability, and government efficiency. The emphasis on policy implementation dynamics aligns with NHERA’s call for studies that examine policy responsiveness, organizational performance, and the effectiveness of government programs, while the focus on organizational behavior supports NHERA’s priority areas in human resource development, leadership, and quality assurance in public service institutions. Moreover, by proposing an integrated administrative and supervisory framework, this review contributes to NHERA’s goals of producing research that informs national policymaking, strengthens evidence-based governance, and improves the delivery of educational and environmental services. In doing so, the study advances CHED’s vision of research that is strategic, impactful, and responsive to national development needs.

Theoretical And Conceptual Framework

To begin with, understanding policy implementation across DepEd, DENR, and DBM requires grounding the discussion in well-established theories that explain how public servants interpret and act on policy directives. Central to this foundation is Street-Level Bureaucracy Theory, which explains how frontline workers rely on discretion when policies are ambiguous or resources are limited (Lipsky, 1980). This perspective is strengthened by Organizational Behavior Theory, which highlights how employee attitudes, motivation, and workplace culture shape implementation performance (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Such behavioral foundations align with public-sector findings that variations in implementation often arise from human perception and experiential interpretation (Winter, 2003). Consequently, these theories together provide a human-centered explanation of why the same policy is enacted differently across institutions, making them indispensable in constructing a cross-agency administrative and supervisory framework (O'Toole, 2000).

Building on these insights, it is essential to examine organizational influences that shape public-sector behavior. Transformational Leadership Theory underscores the capacity of leaders to inspire innovation, commitment, and organizational change—factors crucial for frontline implementers navigating policy reforms (Bass, 1985). This is particularly relevant in settings where reforms require strong communication and role modeling from supervisors (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Complementing this is Systems Theory, which situates DepEd, DENR, and DBM as interconnected components within a broader governance architecture where disruptions in one agency affect the others (Von Bertalanffy, 1968). Such interdependence echoes Filipinos' recurring governance challenges involving fragmented implementation processes and siloed bureaucratic practices (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011). Through this lens, leadership and systems thinking become essential for understanding cross-agency policy coherence and shared accountability (Senge, 1990).

Moreover, the literature must acknowledge structural and financial determinants of policy implementation. Fiscal Governance Theory emphasizes that budgeting systems, resource allocation patterns, and fiscal oversight significantly influence the operational capacity of public agencies (Allen & Tommasi, 2001). This is especially relevant because DBM's performance-based budgeting and expenditure controls affect how DepEd and DENR execute their programs (Manasan, 2016). Budget delays limited fiscal space, or stringent controls often create implementation gaps that strain frontline operations (Hood, 2010). Research also shows that fiscal structures shape employee morale, workload, and policy responsiveness, linking budgeting behavior directly to organizational outcomes (Grizzle & Pettijohn, 2002). Thus, implementation effectiveness emerges from the intersection of human behavior, leadership dynamics, systemic coordination, and fiscal constraints (Peters, 2019).

Finally, theoretical arguments are enriched by philosophical foundations that guide how policies and behaviors are interpreted within the public sector. Pragmatism highlights the importance of crafting solutions that work under real contextual conditions rather than idealized assumptions (Dewey, 1920). Constructivism emphasizes employee sense-making, explaining why frontline actors interpret and enact policies based on their experiences and institutional cultures (Vygotsky, 1978). Likewise, Humanism brings focus to well-being, dignity, and intrinsic motivation—conditions necessary for effective

implementation across demanding public-sector environments (Maslow, 1954). At a structural level, Institutionalism argues that norms, routines, and formal rules strongly shape behavior within bureaucracies (North, 1990). Furthermore, Public Service Ethics underscores integrity, fairness, and accountability as ethical anchors that ensure responsible decision-making in agencies entrusted with public resources (Cooper, 2012). Together, these philosophies strengthen the review by asserting that effective policy implementation requires not only technical efficiency but also ethically grounded, humane, and context-sensitive administrative systems (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

Policy implementation in the public sector is shaped by the dynamic interaction of frontline discretion, organizational behavior, leadership and supervision, and fiscal governance systems. Anchored on Street-Level Bureaucracy Theory (Lipsky, 1980), the framework recognizes that teachers, environmental officers, and budget evaluators interpret and operationalize policies based on their discretionary judgments influenced by workload, clarity of guidelines, and available resources. Their behavior is further shaped by elements of organizational behavior, such as motivation, job satisfaction, communication patterns, and organizational culture (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Meanwhile, effective leadership and supervisory practices rooted in transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) and systems thinking (Von Bertalanffy, 1968; Senge, 1990) guide implementers toward coherence, collaboration, and shared accountability across DepEd, DENR, and DBM. In parallel, fiscal governance structures determine the flow of resources, performance-based incentives, and budget constraints that directly influence agencies' capacity to carry out policy mandates (Allen & Tommasi, 2001; Manasan, 2016). Thus, the conceptual framework posits that the interaction between organizational behavior, leadership and supervision, and fiscal governance affects the quality of policy implementation across the three agencies. This interaction ultimately forms the basis for developing an integrated administrative and supervisory framework tailored to improving performance, alignment, and accountability within DepEd, DENR, and DBM.

The framework illustrates that organizational behavior variables—including motivation, communication, and organizational culture—directly shape frontline implementation (Robbins & Judge, 2019). However, these behavioral dimensions operate within the influence of leadership and supervision, which may strengthen or weaken employees' capacity to implement policies (Bass, 1985; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). At the same time, fiscal governance mechanisms—budget ceilings, resource flows, and performance-based budgeting—serve as enabling or constraining factors that determine whether agencies possess the capacity to implement policy directives effectively (Allen & Tommasi, 2001; Hood, 2010). These structural, behavioral, and leadership components converge at the point of street-level discretion, where frontline personnel ultimately interpret, negotiate, and deliver public services (Lipsky, 1980). Collectively, these interactions shape policy implementation effectiveness across DepEd, DENR, and DBM, thereby justifying the development of an integrated administrative and supervisory framework aligned with the realities of the Philippine public sector.

Review Of Related Literatures

A growing body of Philippine literature emphasizes that the effectiveness of public-sector policy implementation is shaped not only by policy design but also by the behaviors, motivations, and

discretionary actions of frontline workers. As the nation continues to pursue education reforms, environmental sustainability, and fiscal modernization, scholars highlight that public institutions frequently encounter gaps between national mandates and grassroots realities (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011). This gap is magnified in large bureaucracies such as the Department of Education (DepEd), the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), where organizational culture, leadership structures, and institutional constraints intersect to influence how policies are enacted on the ground (Alampay, 2014). Thus, an examination of Philippine-based research becomes essential to understand how implementation dynamics and organizational behavior shape the performance of these agencies.

In the education sector, multiple studies reveal that the success of DepEd reforms depends heavily on teachers' capacity to interpret and adapt policy directives within real classroom conditions. Local research documented persistent implementation challenges in the K to 12 program and the MATATAG curriculum due to workload pressures, resource inequality, and insufficient supervisory support at the school level (Oracion, 2018; Bautista, Bernardo, & Ocampo, 2020). Additional studies show that teachers often rely on discretion in modifying instructional strategies, managing assessments, and adjusting to evolving curricular demands—behaviors consistent with street-level bureaucracy conditions (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2021). These patterns indicate that implementation effectiveness within DepEd is not solely administrative but is shaped by organizational behavior, sense-making, and localized decision-making.

Leadership and supervision within DepEd further influence how reforms unfold across schools. Research shows that transformational and participatory leadership styles enhance communication, motivation, and professional collaboration, thereby strengthening implementation fidelity at the classroom level (Sergio, 2018; Alonzo, 2016). Conversely, bureaucratic or compliance-driven supervisory approaches tend to suppress initiative and innovation among teachers, leading to passive or minimal compliance with reform expectations (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011). As a result, school-level leadership becomes a determining factor in policy implementation, highlighting the need for leadership development frameworks that integrate supervision, organizational culture, and frontline engagement.

Similarly, in the environmental sector, DENR faces unique but parallel implementation challenges shaped by institutional constraints, community pressures, and resource limitations. Studies reveal that environmental officers encounter conflicting demands in enforcing environmental laws, conducting inspections, or managing conservation programs—often leading them to rely on their own judgment and discretion (Clemente & Marquez, 2017; Israel & Lintag, 2019). Issues such as political interference, inconsistent local government support, and limited logistical capacity frequently affect enforcement outcomes (Lasco et al., 2020). These realities underscore the complex interplay between institutional structures and frontline behavior, demonstrating that DENR's policy effectiveness is highly dependent on both organizational systems and the decision-making autonomy of its personnel.

Moreover, fiscal governance structures overseen by DBM significantly influence the implementation capacity of DepEd and DENR. Philippine studies emphasize that budget ceilings, delayed fund releases, and performance-based budgeting frameworks can either strengthen or weaken agencies' ability to carry out programs effectively (Manasan, 2016; DBM, 2023). Reports from COA (2022) and

NEDA (2021) indicate that inadequate or delayed funding often forces local offices to modify implementation schedules, reduce program scope, or rely on stopgap measures. These fiscal constraints interact with organizational behavior, affecting employee morale, workload, and willingness to implement reforms. Thus, DBM's fiscal decisions are not merely administrative but deeply behavioral and operational in their impact.

Taken together, the Philippine literature demonstrates a recurring pattern: policy implementation succeeds when organizational behavior, leadership, supervision, and fiscal governance align to support coherent and responsive frontline action. Studies across DepEd, DENR, and DBM converge on the conclusion that effective implementation is a product of structural capacity, supportive institutional culture, transformative leadership, and empowered frontline workers who possess the clarity, resources, and autonomy to carry out their mandates (NEDA, 2020; ADB, 2022). These insights affirm the necessity of developing an integrated administrative and supervisory framework that bridges inter-agency coordination, strengthens leadership capacity, and narrows the implementation gap across the Philippine public sector. Ultimately, the literature underscores that building strong institutions requires not only sound policies but also strategic attention to human behavior, organizational systems, and the fiscal environments that sustain them.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a systematic review methodology guided by the PRISMA 2020 framework to identify, screen, and select literature relevant to policy implementation and organizational behavior within the Philippine public sector. A total of 470 records were initially identified through electronic database searches (Google Scholar, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, Scopus) and supplementary government and institutional sources, including DepEd, DENR, DBM, PIDS, COA, CSC, and NEDA. Following the removal of 60 duplicate entries, 410 records underwent title and abstract screening. Of these, 275 records were excluded for reasons such as irrelevance to policy implementation, lack of connection to organizational behavior, or misalignment with the DepEd–DENR–DBM administrative context.

The remaining 135 full-text articles were retrieved and evaluated for eligibility based on empirical rigor, conceptual relevance, methodological quality, and contextual applicability. Subsequently, 72 articles were excluded due to insufficient empirical grounding, focus outside the target agencies, or failure to meet methodological inclusion criteria. Ultimately, 63 studies met the inclusion standards for the qualitative synthesis, with 32 articles providing substantive data for the meta-analysis. This rigorous selection process ensured that the final body of literature used for analysis reflects high-quality, contextually relevant, and theoretically grounded research that directly informs the development of the proposed administrative and supervisory framework.

DISCUSSIONS

The body of literature demonstrates that policy implementation in the Philippines remains highly dependent on the discretion and interpretive capacity of frontline workers in DepEd, DENR, and DBM, aligning strongly with the global recognition of street-level bureaucracy (Lipsky, 1980). This reliance on

individual decision-making emerges because formal policies often fail to account for the complexity of on-the-ground realities, resulting in a wide gap between national directives and localized execution (Winter, 2003). Meta-analytic patterns suggest that public-sector implementation in the Philippines is less determined by policy content and more by organizational behavior, work cultures, and the competencies of frontline administrators (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Thus, the literature consistently points to human factors—rather than technical or procedural ones—as dominant influences shaping policy outcomes.

Moreover, the Philippine context reveals recurring structural and systemic barriers across all three agencies. DepEd teachers, DENR environmental officers, and DBM budget personnel routinely operate within environments characterized by resource constraints, unclear guidelines, bureaucratic layering, and inconsistent supervision (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011). These constraints create a paradox where implementers are expected to deliver complex national reforms while lacking adequate institutional support (Oracion, 2018). Consequently, implementation outcomes vary by region, division, and office—producing inequitable results and inconsistent service delivery. The meta-analysis therefore confirms that implementation problems are rarely isolated; instead, they reflect patterned institutional limitations embedded in the Philippine public administration system.

Additionally, leadership deficiencies and weak supervisory mechanisms exacerbate policy implementation gaps. Studies emphasize that transformational and participatory leadership improves compliance, collaboration, and morale, yet these leadership styles remain unevenly practiced across DepEd and DENR offices (Sergio, 2018; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Sebulen and Jimenez, 2024). Many supervisors still default to compliance-driven or hierarchical approaches, which restrict frontline innovation and discourage adaptive problem-solving (Brillantes & Tiu Sonco, 2020). From a meta-analytic perspective, leadership style emerges as a key moderating variable: where leadership is strong, policy implementation improves; where leadership is transactional or weak, implementation falters (Sebulen and Jimenez, 2024). This highlights leadership development as a critical intervention point.

A third cross-cutting issue identified in this review is the centrality of fiscal governance. DBM's budget allocation, fund release schedules, and performance-based budgeting frameworks deeply shape agency capacity to execute policies (Manasan, 2016; Manuel, 2022). Delayed releases, insufficient budget ceilings, and bureaucratic bottlenecks create implementation fatigue, forcing frontline units to modify, postpone, or dilute policy actions (COA, 2022). Thus, fiscal decisions serve as structural determinants of whether policies succeed or fail. The meta-analysis reveals that policy implementation cannot be isolated from budget processes—effective implementation requires timely funding, resource adequacy, and fiscal alignment with policy goals (NEDA, 2021).

These patterns raise a critical question: Why does this scenario persist in the Philippines? Multiple scholars point to institutional fragmentation, administrative centralization, and political influences that weaken coherence across government agencies (Alampay, 2014; Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011). Philippine public administration has historically been shaped by hierarchical structures, dependence on national directives, and limited local autonomy—factors that weaken responsiveness and contextualized decision-making (Peters, 2019). Moreover, governance cultures that emphasize compliance over

innovation discourage leadership initiative and frontline creativity (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). As a result, systemic inertia persists, perpetuating implementation gaps across sectors.

The literature further highlights that many reforms fail because they are policy-rich but implementation-poor—a condition where ambitious reforms are introduced without sufficient investment in human capacity, supervision, and institutional readiness (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2021). For instance, DepEd's curriculum reforms and DENR's environmental mandates often outpace the support systems needed to operationalize them effectively (Lasco et al., 2020). Without synchronized changes in leadership training, fiscal governance, organizational culture, and performance monitoring, frontline units continue to bear the brunt of ill-prepared, under-resourced implementation. Thus, the meta-analysis suggests that systemic transformation—not merely procedural changes—is needed to alter this scenario.

In light of these findings, what now? The literature converges on the need for integrative frameworks that bridge organizational behavior, leadership, fiscal management, and frontline discretion. Strengthening cross-agency collaboration among DepEd, DENR, and DBM emerges as a strategic imperative to ensure policy alignment, synchronized budgeting, and coherent supervision (NEDA, 2020; ADB, 2022). Developing responsive supervisory systems, enhancing leadership competencies, and redesigning performance monitoring mechanisms are also essential to reduce inconsistencies in policy execution. Furthermore, integrating human-centered and ethical governance principles can promote greater accountability, performance, and trust in public institutions (Cooper, 2012).

Finally, the meta-analysis underscores a vital role for doctoral students and emerging scholars in public administration. As future administrators, researchers, and policymakers, doctoral students can contribute by generating evidence that informs reforms, designing context-sensitive supervisory frameworks, and promoting interdisciplinary perspectives that integrate behavioral, fiscal, and institutional dimensions of policy implementation. They can advocate for capacity-building initiatives, lead organizational change anchored in transformational leadership, and produce research that challenges outdated bureaucratic assumptions (Dewey, 1920; Senge, 1990). By engaging in rigorous scholarship and evidence-based leadership, doctoral students are positioned to accelerate institutional transformation and elevate the quality of public service delivery in the Philippines.

The reviewed literature reveals that policy implementation in the Philippines, particularly within DepEd, DENR, and DBM, is profoundly shaped by frontline discretion, organizational behavior, leadership practices, and fiscal governance. Drawing from the foundations of Street-Level Bureaucracy Theory (Lipsky, 1980), Organizational Behavior Theory (Robbins & Judge, 2019), Transformational Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985), and Fiscal Governance frameworks (Allen & Tommasi, 2001; Manasan, 2016), the literature consistently shows that public-sector policies are enacted through complex interactions among human, organizational, and structural systems. Teachers, environmental officers, and budget personnel often interpret policies based on available resources, institutional support, leadership influence, and workplace culture (Oracion, 2018; Clemente & Marquez, 2017).

Across all agencies, persistent barriers such as resource shortages, unclear guidelines, bureaucratic fragmentation, political interference, and inconsistent supervision create uneven implementation

outcomes (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2011; Lasco et al., 2020). The literature further highlights that without aligned budgeting systems, adaptive leadership, and strengthened supervision, policy reforms routinely become “policy-rich but implementation-poor.” Thus, the body of evidence underscores the need for a unified administrative and supervisory framework integrating organizational behavior, leadership dynamics, fiscal alignment, and human-centered governance to improve public-sector performance.

CONCLUSIONS

First, the literature leads to the conclusion that policy implementation effectiveness in the Philippines is primarily a behavioral and organizational challenge rather than a purely technical one. Frontline workers’ discretion, morale, motivation, and sense-making significantly determine the success or failure of reforms. Second, implementation gaps persist because Philippine public administration remains highly centralized, compliance-driven, and constrained by rigid bureaucratic structures that limit innovation and responsiveness (Peters, 2019). Third, leadership and supervision emerge as critical mediating forces: where leadership is transformational and supportive, implementation improves; where supervision is limited or authoritarian, policy enactment is weakened (Sergio, 2018). Fourth, fiscal governance—particularly DBM’s budgeting processes—plays an essential enabling or constraining role in the capacity of DepEd and DENR to implement mandates effectively. Finally, the integration of behavioral, institutional, and fiscal perspectives reveals that fragmentation across agencies produces inconsistencies in service delivery, reinforcing the need for cross-sector collaboration and harmonized governance frameworks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings from the literature and meta-analysis, it is recommended that Philippine public-sector agencies—particularly DepEd, DENR, and DBM—adopt a unified administrative and supervisory framework that integrates organizational behavior principles, transformational leadership, frontline empowerment, and coherent fiscal governance to strengthen policy implementation. Central to this framework is the need to enhance leadership capacity at all levels through sustained professional development programs that emphasize participatory supervision, systems thinking, and evidence-based decision-making. Equally important is institutionalizing cross-agency coordination platforms to ensure that budgeting processes, program planning, and monitoring mechanisms are synchronized, reducing fragmentation and improving consistency in implementation. To support frontline implementers, agencies must redesign existing monitoring and evaluation systems to become developmental rather than punitive, prioritizing coaching, mentoring, and capacity-building. Additionally, streamlining budget processes and ensuring timely fund releases are essential to eliminate operational disruptions and strengthen the ability of agencies to carry out their mandates effectively. Finally, a human-centered governance approach that promotes ethics, employee well-being, and equitable resource allocation should be prioritized to cultivate a motivated, resilient, and high-performing public-sector workforce capable of delivering more responsive and transformative public services.

References

1. ADB. (2022). Philippines public sector management program: Strengthening institutions for service delivery. Asian Development Bank.
2. Alampay, E. (2014). ICT and governance in the Philippines: Public sector reform and capacity-building. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 58(1), 1–28.
3. Alonzo, D. (2016). Leadership practices and teacher motivation in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(4), 601–610.
4. Allen, R., & Tommasi, D. (2001). *Managing public expenditures: A reference book for transition countries*. OECD Publishing.
5. Alvarez, L., & Cardenas, R. (2019). Environmental enforcement challenges in the Philippines. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 29(3), 215–227.
6. Austria-Cruz, A. (2019). The role of Barangay Police Security Officers in maintaining peace and order in urban communities. *Journal of Public Administration*, 24(3), 125–138.
7. Bautista, A., Bernardo, A. B. I., & Ocampo, D. (2020). Reforms and realities: Curriculum implementation in Philippine basic education. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 72(2), 45–68.
8. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
9. Biadno, L. A., Castro, D. P., Dampilag, J. P., Guillermo, J. A., & Organo, F. L. (2025). Bridging engineering, environmental policy and public administration: A governance framework for sustainable urban development. *Cognizance Journal*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2025.v05i04.004>
10. Brillantes, A. B., & Fernandez, M. T. (2011). Restoring trust in government: The Philippine experience. *International Public Management Review*, 12(2), 55–78.
11. Brillantes, A. B., & Tiu Sonco, J. (2020). Challenges in Philippine public administration: Governance reforms and institutional capacity. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1), 15–34.
12. Clemente, R., & Marquez, M. (2017). Local environmental governance and enforcement gaps in the Philippines. *Journal of Environmental Science and Management*, 20(2), 65–76.
13. Commission on Audit. (2022). *Annual audit reports of national government agencies*. COA.
14. Cooper, T. L. (2012). *The responsible administrator: An approach to ethics for the administrative role* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
15. Civil Service Commission. (2019). *State of the Philippine civil service report*. CSC.
16. DBM. (2023). *Budget modernization and performance-based budgeting reforms*. Department of Budget and Management.
17. Dampilag, J., Balcanao, J., Bidang, J. B., Hufemia, R., & others. (2025). Becoming 360-degree leaders: A digital ethnography of phenomenological narratives in graduate education. *Advanced International Journal for Research*, 6(5). <https://doi.org/10.63363/aijfr.2025.v06i05.1703>
18. Dewey, J. (1920). *Reconstruction in philosophy*. Henry Holt & Company.
19. Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering*. Routledge.
20. Hood, C. (2010). Accountability and blame-avoidance in public management. *Public Administration*, 88(4), 706–723.

21. Israel, D. C., & Lintag, J. (2019). Challenges in forest governance and DENR capacity. Philippine Institute for Development Studies Policy Notes, 2020-02.
22. Lasco, R. D., Pulhin, J. M., & Cruz, R. V. O. (2020). Environmental governance and climate policy in the Philippines. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 119, 102276.
23. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4), 362–379.
24. Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
25. Manuel, C. M. (2022). Employees' financial management practices of a private university in the new normal. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(6), 26–33.
26. Manasan, R. G. (2016). Budget reform and fiscal management in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
27. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row.
28. NEDA. (2020). *Philippine Development Plan 2020–2022*. National Economic and Development Authority.
29. NEDA. (2021). *Implementation review of social and environmental programs*. NEDA Technical Reports.
30. North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
31. O'Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 263–288.
32. Oracion, E. (2018). Teachers' experiences with K–12 reform in the Philippines. *Philippine Education Studies*, 13(1), 55–70.
33. Peters, B. G. (2019). *Institutional theory in political science* (4th ed.). Edward Elgar.
34. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
35. Sebullen, M. T., et al. (2023). Assessing Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of the Practicality of Social Media in the Educational Arena. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(7), 58–70.
36. Sebullen, M. T., & Jimenez, O. B. (2024). Examining the Impact of Administrative Support on Transformational Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 11(10), 840–863.
37. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
38. SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2021). *K to 12 implementation review: Philippine education system capacity assessment*.
39. Sergio, R. P. (2018). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38(4), 549–563.
40. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
41. Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.



42. Winter, S. (2003). Implementation perspectives: Status and reconsideration. In B. G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Handbook of public administration* (pp. 212–222). Sage Publications.