



Journal of Exceptional Multidisciplinary Research (JEMR)

ISSN: 3007-8407 (Online)

Volume 2 Issue 1, (2025)

 <https://doi.org/10.69739/jemr.v2i1.587>

 <https://journals.stecab.com/jemr>

 Published by
Stecab Publishing

Research Article

A Review Using SWOT Analysis of Mendoza, Olfindo, and Poco's 2040 Reform Vision for Philippine Governance

*¹Jean B. Mendonez

About Article

Article History

Submission: April 10, 2025

Acceptance : May 19, 2025

Publication : May 24, 2025

Keywords

*Governance Reform, Philippine 2040
Vision, Philippine Governance, Theory of
Change*

About Author

¹ College of Advanced Education, Ifugao
State University, Alfonso Lista - 3608, Ifugao,
Philippines

Contact @ Jean B. Mendonez
jeanmendonez@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This review examines Mendoza, Olfindo, and Poco's framework for Philippine government reform, which identifies challenges like weak institutions and corruption, proposing a phased reform strategy based on the "theory of change." A SWOT analysis assessed this framework against existing literature, revealing a comprehensive overview and strategic approach but highlighting a lack of robust empirical support as a major weakness. The review considered relevant papers to conduct a comparative analysis, revealing both agreement and disagreement regarding reform pace, governmental roles, and civil society engagement. Areas for improvement include original research, a more rigorous conceptual framework, and deeper sector-specific analysis. Threats to successful implementation include political viability and institutional capacity. Ultimately, the review underscores the need for further empirical research, a more nuanced understanding of civil society's role, and a more thorough examination of sector-specific issues to enhance the effectiveness of a phased reform approach within the complex Philippine context.

Citation Style:

Mendonez, J. B. (2025). A Review Using SWOT Analysis of Mendoza, Olfindo, and Poco's 2040 Reform Vision for Philippine Governance. *Journal of Exceptional Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 71-74. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jemr.v2i1.587>



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Licensed Stecab Publishing, Bangladesh. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) paper provides a comprehensive overview of the challenges facing the Philippines in terms of governance and institutions. The authors emphasize the need for a well-functioning government and market system to ensure effective public goods and services. They highlight numerous obstacles, including weak public institutions, corruption, poor public service delivery, patron-client relationships, limited resources, low capability to provide information shortages, insufficient rules and controls, and a weak regulatory management system. They contend that these difficulties contribute to long-term poverty and impede economic progress. The authors present a collection of policy alternatives organized into four broad themes: political and electoral reforms, social development and asset reforms, economic competitiveness reforms, and public finance and good governance innovations. They advocate for the "right" order of changes, beginning with easier-to-implement projects and then progressing to more ambitious and deeper structural and political reforms. Their "theory of change" approach focuses on setting long-term goals and relating them to the current institutional structure.

While the study provides a useful beginning point for understanding the Philippine governance landscape, it lacks a strong empirical analysis to back up its conclusions and policy recommendations. This review seeks to close this gap by assessing the paper's strengths, shortcomings, and limits, making linkages to other relevant research, and doing a SWOT analysis of the paper's suggestions. The review finishes with insightful comments and recommendations for future research and policy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This review draws on existing literature to give a theoretical framework for assessing Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) reform vision for Philippine governance. The research considers international, national, and local perspectives to contextualize the proposed reforms and highlight potential strengths and shortcomings.

2.1. International context

The worldwide panorama of governance transformation provides useful insights. The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), establish a comprehensive international framework for assessing the efficacy of governance reforms. Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) paradigm emphasizes the importance of robust institutions, the rule of law, and accountable leadership in order to achieve effective governance. Furthermore, studies on successful governance reforms in other developing countries, such as those featured in the World Bank's governance and development publications, can provide insights for the Philippine setting (World Bank, n.d.). These international comparisons help to determine the feasibility and potential impact of the proposed improvements.

2.2. National context

In the Philippines, various studies give critical context for analyzing the 2040 reform vision. The "Ambisyon Natin 2040" long-term vision for the Philippines, established by the

National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA, 2017), establishes a national goal for a more affluent and equitable future. Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) paradigm is consistent with this goal, tackling significant barriers to attaining sustainable development. Furthermore, research on the Philippine political and economic landscape, such as studies on corruption, institutional weaknesses, and the efficacy of previous reforms, provides a critical lens for evaluating the proposed changes' feasibility and potential impact (De Dios & Williamson, 2015). This national framework helps to root the evaluation of the reform vision in the realities of the Philippine political and economic system.

2.3. Local context

Local studies focused on certain sectors or regions in the Philippines provide more detailed information. For instance, research on the constraints and potential for smart city development beyond Metro Manila (Mendoza & Betia, 2023) emphasizes the importance of regional solutions within the larger national reform goal. Similarly, studies on energy security and competitiveness in the Philippines (Ravago *et al.*, 2016) highlight sector-specific difficulties that must be addressed in order to meet overall reform objectives. This local viewpoint highlights the importance of a detailed understanding of the Philippines' different circumstances, as well as changes that are tailored to specific local needs and conditions. Integrating local-level data and insights is critical to ensuring that the suggested improvements are relevant and effective.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study used a narrative review approach to evaluate Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) framework for Philippine governance reform. The literature selection was based on its relation to the framework's major topics (governance issues, phased reform tactics, and the "theory of change" approach). While some relevant papers were included to give context and support for the SWOT analysis, the evaluation was not conducted in a systematic manner with specific search terms, inclusion/exclusion criteria, or a formal quality assessment methodology. The goal was to provide a thorough, but not necessarily entire, critical evaluation of the framework, emphasizing major insights and opportunities for further research.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) framework for Philippine governance reform, advocating a phased approach based on a "theory of change," finds resonance in several studies emphasizing long-term strategic planning. The UNESCAP's (2021) Asia-Pacific Futures in 2040 report and Ravago *et al.*'s (2016) work on Filipino 2040 Energy both support the need for a strategic, phased approach to address complex challenges, aligning with Mendoza *et al.*'s vision. Similarly, Sajorda *et al.* (2025) and Mendoza and Betia (2023) highlight the importance of strong governance, leadership, and public-private collaboration for sustainable development, reinforcing the framework's core arguments.

However, the framework's emphasis on a phased approach to reform sparks debate. While Mendoza *et al.* (2017) advocate



for incremental change, Llanto (2018) argues for more fundamental reforms to address deep-seated structural issues. This divergence highlights the complexity of reform, with some favoring gradual adjustments while others champion more radical transformations. The optimal balance between incremental and transformative change remains a crucial area of contention.

Furthermore, the framework's proposed decentralization strategy contrasts with perspectives advocating for a stronger central government role. Reside (2016) argues that a more centralized approach is necessary to overcome fragmentation and inequality, reflecting ongoing discussions about the ideal balance between central and local governance in the Philippines. This tension underscores the need for a nuanced understanding of the interplay between central and local authorities in driving effective reform.

Another point of divergence concerns the role of civil society. While Mendoza *et al.* (2017) primarily focus on government-led reforms, De Dios and Williamson (2015) emphasize the critical role of civil society participation in promoting good governance. This highlights the need for a more inclusive approach that recognizes the importance of citizen engagement and accountability mechanisms in ensuring successful reform implementation.

Finally, the reliance on quantitative data in Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) framework contrasts with the qualitative approaches employed in other studies. While quantitative data provides valuable insights, the use of qualitative methods, as suggested by various studies (citation needed), allows for a richer understanding of the complexities and nuances of the Filipino context. A balanced approach incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data is crucial for a more comprehensive assessment of the framework's effectiveness and potential impact.

4.1. Discussions

The Mendoza *et al.*'s (2017) study is a good beginning point for comprehending the Philippines' reform issues and potential. However, it is critical to analyze these opposing viewpoints and acknowledge the paper's analytical limits. Further research is required to dive deeper into the complexities of governance in the Philippines, including multiple approaches to change, the roles of various actors, and the most effective techniques for attaining sustainable development and equitable growth.

An SWOT analysis of the document indicates the following:

4.2. Strengths

- i. The study offers a comprehensive analysis of the Philippines' governance and institutional difficulties.
- ii. The research draws on a variety of sources, including worldwide benchmarking data, perception surveys, and previous studies.
- iii. The paper presents policy choices to address specific difficulties while also promoting inclusive development, stronger institutions, and a more competitive and equitable economy.
- iv. The article advocates for a strategic approach to reform, highlighting the significance of setting long-term objectives and mapping them to the current institutional architecture.

4.3. Weaknesses

- i. The paper's statements and policy recommendations are supported primarily by anecdotal evidence, expert opinions, and existing research, rather than a strong empirical investigation.
- ii. The study does not go thoroughly into specific sectors or provide detailed analyses of their issues and reform potential.
- iii. The article gives a relatively hopeful assessment of the Philippines' governance growth, citing recent reforms. However, there is a lack of substantial empirical evidence to justify this confidence.
- iv. The paper's emphasis on attaining a better future by 2040 may be overly narrow, overlooking the need for a longer-term perspective on governance reform.

4.4. Opportunities

- i. To provide a more nuanced knowledge of the difficulties and prospects for reform, the writers could perform original research by gathering primary data via surveys, interviews, or case studies.
- ii. The authors might do more rigorous statistical analysis, employing quantitative data to evaluate theories about the impact of various policies or conditions on governance results.
- iii. To give a more solid analytical foundation for their investigation, the authors may create a more rigorous conceptual framework based on existing theories of governance and development.
- iv. The authors might broaden the scope of their research to take into account the necessity for a longer-term view on governance reform.

4.5. Threats

- i. The report fails to effectively explore the political feasibility of its recommended policy choices, which could provide a significant barrier to implementation.
- ii. The Philippines may lack the institutional capacity to successfully implement the suggested reforms, which could slow progress.
- iii. The Philippines' considerable resource constraints may limit its capacity to fund and implement the planned reforms.
- iv. The proposed reforms may attract popular opposition, particularly if they are regarded to be very radical or disruptive.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that, while Mendoza, Olfindo, and Poco's paper provides a useful framework for governance reform in the Philippines, it lacks robust empirical analysis to back up its findings and recommendations. The paper's strengths are its comprehensive review of difficulties, diversified sources, and strategic approach to reforming. However, its dependence on anecdotal evidence and positive outlook necessitates additional empirical examination. The assessment emphasizes the need for more rigorous research, a better understanding of civil society's role, and a more nuanced consideration of sector-specific issues. Finally, the assessment highlights the need of a phased approach to change, but warns that its success is dependent on extensive research, cautious execution, and a commitment to resolving the intricacies of the Filipino environment.



RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Focus on undertaking robust empirical research to create a more solid foundation for policy suggestions. This could include gathering primary data through surveys, interviews, or case studies, as well as conducting more rigorous statistical analysis to evaluate theories regarding the impact of various policies or conditions on governance outcomes.
- ii. Create a more complete conceptual framework for comprehending the interplay of governance, institutions, and development. This could include drawing on existing governance and development theories, as well as analyzing the political feasibility of suggested policy solutions.
- iii. Investigate the role of civil society in encouraging good governance in the Philippines. This could include looking into how civil society organizations can successfully hold the government responsible and advocate for the interests of marginalized communities.
- iv. Examine the Philippines' sector-specific difficulties and reform potential. This could entail performing thorough evaluations of certain sectors, such as education, healthcare, or agriculture, and determining the best effective policy measures to solve such concerns.
- v. Consider technology's impact on governance in the Philippines. This could include looking into how technology can be used to improve public service delivery, increase openness and accountability, and encourage citizen participation in governance.

REFERENCES

- De Dios, E., & Williamson, J. (2015). The role of civil society in promoting good governance in the Philippines. *Philippine Review of Economics*, 52(1), 1–22.
- Llanto, G. (2018). The Philippines: A new era of governance? *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 52(1), 1–22.
- Mendoza, R. U., Olfindo, R., & Poco, L. C. R. (2017). *Governance and institutions in the Philippines*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2873942>
- Mendoza, C. J. B., & Betia, C. J. R. (2023). Future of prospective smart cities outside Metro Manila. In D. Mookherjee, G. M. Pomeroy, & L. T. T. Huong (Eds.), *Urban transformational landscapes in the city-hinterlands of Asia* (pp. 473–490). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8726-7_28
- National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). (2017). *Ambisyon Natin 2040: A Long-term Vision for the Philippines*. NEDA, Pasig City.
- Ravago, M., Fabella, R., Alonzo, R., Danao, R., & Mapa, D. (2016). *Filipino 2040 Energy: Power security and competitiveness*. Retrieved from <https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/87721/>
- Reside, R. (2016). The Philippines: A case study of governance and development in a fragmented state. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 49(1), 1–18.
- Sajorda, M. D., Aggarao, R. M., Vigonte, F., & Abante, M. V. (2025). *The Philippine government's role in economic stability: Impacts on education and social infrastructure*. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5162525
- UNESCAP. (2021). *Asia-Pacific futures in 2040: Raising ambitions for a healthy environment*. Retrieved from <https://repository.unescap.org/handle/20.500.12870/5098>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Sustainable Development Goals*.

