Gender and Perceptions of Influence in Policy-Making: Findings from the Philippine Bureaucracy

PROSERPINA D. TAPALES*

In a survey conducted among career executive officers of the Philippine bureaucracy, gender is not actually a significant variable as far as perception of influence in policy formulation is concerned. Both male and female higher civil servants perceive themselves as exercising considerable influence in policy making and the satisfaction they derive from such self-image is an essential factor in their continued stay in the government service.

Introduction

Kenneth Meier, in *Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policy-making in the Fourth Branch of the Government*, said that although the primary function of bureaucracy is the execution of public policy, implementation "contains the roots of additional power," because "law can never be so specific that the function of the bureaucracy is to fill the gap of official policy."[1] He also observed that changes in the environment require some bureaucratic discretion in policy implementation.

James Anderson gave the same view in *Public Policy-Making* when he stressed that "administrative agencies often operate under broad and ambiguous mandates that leave them with numerous discretion to decide what should or should not be done."[2] They are actually performing what he calls administrative policy-making, since bureaucratic expertise provides "a wealth of opportunity to exert itself and to influence policy,"[3] and since many policy proposals are developed by officials.[4]

Anderson listed the following functions as bureaucratic and administrative decision-making: rule-making, adjudication, law enforcement, and program operations. A similar function is "the burden of securing compliance with public policies, which rests primarily with administrative agencies."[5]

---

*Associate Professor of Public Administration, University of the Philippines and Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Northern Illinois University.

In La Palombara's *Bureaucracy and Political Development,* Fritz Morstein Marx identified the higher civil servants as "an action group in western political development," since they perform the important tasks of providing technical expertise, giving policy counsel, performing the function of public management, as well as that of program formulation in the political organs of government.[6]

The political role of the bureaucracy was also revised conceptually by mid-twentieth century theoreticians who debunked the politics/adminis-tration dichotomy originally put forward by the founding fathers of the dis-cipline.[7] In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the recognition of the admi-nistrator's role in the allocation of values prompted the development of a new public administration paradigm which called for activist rather than neutral administrators who would make decisions on the basis of the social relevance of policies and programs.[8] A more recent version of this is advo-cacy administration, a term used by Melville Branch to describe the type of public management of administrators who recommend and fight for certain policies and argue against others, having their own professional values as basis for their advocacy.[9]

In the Philippines, Raul de Guzman noted the important role of the bureaucracy under martial law as drafters of policy and subsequently im-plemented by Presidential Decree or Letter of Instruction.[10] This trend has continued even after martial law was lifted through what are generally introduced as Cabinet bills at the *Batasang Pambansa* (National Assembly). This role in policy implementation was described by Gaudioso Sosmena in this light:

> . . . the (central) bureaucracy . . . is a major instrument for achieving policy objectives. It can facilitate, impede, or modify policy outputs.[11]

The important roles of policy initiation and implementation are per-formed by the higher civil servants, or those in the third level of the Phil-ippine bureaucracy. These are the CESOs or Career Executive Service Offi-cers who perform or are trained to perform policy-making functions, from assistant directors of bureaus, regional offices, service offices, semi-auto-nomous units, and corporate units; to assistant and deputy ministers and corporate vice-presidents. The rest are bureau directors, regional directors, and service directors, corporate managers, and heads of semi-autonomous offices known under various titles such as administrator or chairman.

Methodology

This paper shall ascertain whether top administrators really perform political roles. To achieve this, two samples were drawn from among men

and women CESOs in the National Capital Region (NCR). The total women in NCR offices at headquarters and regional offices, as culled from Civil Service Commission statistics, is 496. For a universe of 500, the statistical sample suggested by Fr. Frank Lynch in his handbook for social science research is 81.[12] The total number of male CESOs from the NCR is 1,806. The sample used for both populations was 81, based on the women sample. The men were surveyed as a control group for purposes of comparison. To make room in case of protocol wastage, the samples were raised to 90 for both. The total samples used for analysis were 89 women and 88 men, or 177 in all.

For purposes of the survey, the head of an agency which is usually filled by political appointees was included, first because she was a woman, and more importantly because she rose from the ranks of the Career Executive Service. There are two high-ranking women in this survey, and they outrank all the male respondents—one a Commission Chairman and the other a Deputy Minister.

Six interviewers were sent to different government offices in Metropolitan Manila to administer the questionnaires to a random sample drawn from lists of CESOs provided by the personnel offices of a government agency visited. However, strict randomization was not followed because of the busy schedules of the CESOs. Substitution from among those in the list was allowed.

The questionnaire consisted of four parts: socio-economic background; functions performed; perception of women's roles; and perceptions of influence in policy-making. This article discusses the last item.

Perception of influence in policy-making was correlated with variables of position, nature of office/unit, educational qualifications and, above all, gender. Frequency distribution and regression were the analytical methods utilized. For purposes of statistical analysis, convenient classifications used were: assistant chief of office; chief of bureau; and chief of service. Assistant chief denoted a lower rank in relation to the chief of office. Chief of bureau is used to denote line units and chief of service for staff units. This has posed some difficulties in view of the fact that the line/staff function is clear in some ministries while this distinction is unclear in others. For instance, in the Ministry of Local Governments, the staff units are called service (e.g., legal service, planning service) and the line units are termed bureaus (e.g., Bureau of Local Government, Bureau of Community Development). Moreover, there are agencies which have no bureaus (e.g., the Civil Service Commission, a staff agency, has only offices and services, like the Planning and Management Service and the Office of Recruitment, Examination, and Appointment). Government corporate managers were classified as bureau chiefs or service chiefs according to their office functions. Never-

theless, for purposes of classification by nature of unit or agency, the classifications cited by the respondents were not used by them. A Deputy Minister, by virtue of her staff functions in personnel management was therefore classified under chief of service, while a Commission Chairman was classified under chief of bureau. This is one disadvantage of categorization as some information gets lost in reclassification.

Survey Findings

A description of respondents in the survey is provided below.

Table 1. Positions Held by Respondents

Position Title	Male Number	% of total	% Holding Position	Female Number	% of total	% Holding Position	Total Number	%
Assistant Chief	23	26.1	41.8	32	36.0	58.2	55	31.1
Chief of Bureau	35	39.8	58.3	25	28.0	41.7	60	33.9
Chief of Service	30	34.1	48.4	32	36.0	52.6	62	35.0
TOTAL	88	100.0		89	100.0		177	100.0

As Table 1 shows, there are more women than men in the assistant chief category (32 or 36% as against 23 or 26.1%). There are more men in the chief of bureau or line category (39.8% or as against 25 women or 28%). When the two genders are compared by position, the figures show more women in the assistant chief category (58.2% women as against 41.8% men), and an almost reversal of figures for chief of bureau (defined here as performing line functions). There are slightly more women in the chief of service category.

When compared with responses to the question on the position held, more women are also seen in the category of immediate assistant to the head of office (28 or 31.5% as against 20 or 22.8% for the men). This implies that women are more prone than men to assume apprentice-like positions. Table 2 shows further differentiations.

Table 2. Last Positions Held by Respondents

Last Position Held	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Immediate assistant to head of unit	20	22.8	28	31.5	48	27.1
Similar position at another unit	16	18.2	10	11.2	26	14.7
Another position in same agency	47	53.4	44	49.4	91	51.4
Others	5	5.6	7	7.9	12	6.8
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	100.0	177	100.0

The positions above were collapsed from wider categories, again for statistical purposes. Assistant to the head of office includes immediate assistant and staff assistant to the head of office. Similar position connotes similarities in function between present and previous positions, whether in the same agency or in another agency. Another position in same agency connotes promotion within the same agency, whether for that unit or in another. The category "others" is used to describe lateral entry from the private sector or the academe.

Table 2 shows that the majority of the respondents were promoted from lower positions within the agency (91 or 51.4%); there are no significant differences between men and women. A large proportion (48 or 27.1%) were appointed to their present jobs from their former position of assistant. A small proportion (26 or 14.7%) occupied similar positions in another unit of the same agency or in another agency. Of these, 11 are from the same agency and 15 are from another agency. (Because these were collapsed together, using similarity of functions as basis, the latter figures do not appear in the table.) Only 12 (6.8%) entered laterally the bureaucracy, specifically from the private sector and academe.

As Table 2 indicates, most of the respondents were familiar with the functions of the positions they currently hold because they previously occupied positions with similar functions. This shows that Filipino higher civil servants are not very mobile.

More women have served in the category of immediate assistant to the head of office than men (31.5% of the women as against 22.8% of the men). On the other hand, slightly more men assumed their current positions from

a similar position at another unit and from another position in the same agency. When compared with the preceding table, this finding suggests that women tend to assume apprenticeship positions before getting to the office of the unit head, an experience not shared by many men.

Nature of Unit

For nature of unit, the respondents' replies were used as basis for classification. Line units are those directly responsible for meeting the objectives of the organization, while staff units are those which assist the line units in meeting the agency's tasks. Nevertheless, there are units which have both line and staff functions. In their own agency headquarters, they are staff to the head of office for certain policies, but to the regional offices and local government units they are line in that they directly implement policies and programs. An example is the National Educational Testing Center of the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports. It develops and designs different examinations, coordinates their administration, and provides vital advisory service to the Minister. At the regional and local levels, it administers exams, monitors implementation of related policy, and maintains standards. Table 3 shows the nature of the respondents' units.

Table 3. Nature of Functions of Respondents' Units

Nature of Unit	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
line	17	19.3	14	15.8	31	17.5
technical staff	15	17.1	29	32.6	44	24.9
administrative staff	13	14.8	9	10.1	22	12.4
line/staff	43	48.8	37	41.5	80	45.2
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	100.0	177	100.0

In order to better distinguish between staff functions, staff is classified here as either technical or administrative support to the head of office. Table 3 shows that there are more female than male respondents in the technical staff category (29 or 32.6% as against 15 or 17.1%). Conversely, slightly more male respondents are in the administrative staff category (13 or 14.8% versus 9 or 10.1% for female respondents). Administrative staff positions include legal service and administrative service chief. Technical staff positions are those that are directly policy determining in pursuit of the agency's functions. For instance, an Office of the Secretary to a Commission prepares agenda and conducts studies to help the Commission decide on which cases to adjudicate, or offices overtly called technical assistant groups perform similar duties. A majority of the respondents, however, classified their units as combined line and staff.

Participation in Policy Formulation

Respondents were asked whether they participate in policy formulation directly, indirectly, or not at all. A large majority (158 or 89.3%) said they participate directly. This can be seen in Table 4.

The category of direct participation includes actual policy initiation or actual drafting of policy proposals that are submitted to the head of office who is not a career civil servant. Indirect participation includes such activities as giving suggestions to the head of office, inclusion of policy proposals in agenda, or commenting on policy proposals. Table 4 shows no apparent distinction in gender in terms of participation in policy formulation. This was investigated further using multiple regression. Since respondents took part in more than one mode, Table 4 shows only the frequencies.

Table 4. Perceived Participation in Policy Formulation

Perception	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes, directly	76	86.4	82	92.1	158	89.3
Yes, indirectly	10	11.4	6	6.7	16	9.0
No	2	2.2	1	1.1	3	1.7
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	99.9*	177	100.0

*Does not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 5 shows that 83.1% of the women perceive their involvement in "actual initiation of policy" as compared to some 78.4% of the men. The proportions are about equal for drafting of policy proposals and recommending policy. However, a larger proportion of women said they commented on policy proposals (93.3% as against 85.2% of the men). Of these categories, the manner which can be considered most important is actual initiation of policy, a function perceived by more men than women.

For all respondents, recommending policy, a less assertive form of policy formulation, is participated in by the largest proportion. Commenting on policy proposals ranks next, another less active form of policy formulation.

In the "other" category, respondents generally mentioned indirect means like placing items in the agenda and analyzing project feasibility. Participation in more than one mode of policy formulation is evident among the respondents of both sexes. Nonetheless, the most active and the most direct form of participation is performed by 143 of the 177 respondents.

Table 5. Perceived Manner of Participation in
Policy Formulation

Manner	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	% of 88	Number	% of 89	Number	% of 177
Actual initiation of policy	69	78.4	74	83.1	143	80.1
Drafting of policy proposals	70	79.5	69	77.5	139	78.5
Commenting on policy proposals	75	85.2	83	93.3	158	89.3
Recommending policy	81	92.1	85	95.5	166	93.8
Other	17	19.3	14	15.7	31	17.5

Involvement in Policy Implementation

When asked if they were involved in the implementation of policy initiated by them, the majority replied that they were. A total of 153 (86.4%) of them said they are, while only three (1.7%) said they are not. For 21 of the respondents, mostly in staff positions, the question was not considered applicable. Table 6 shows the responses.

Table 6. Involvement in the Implementation of
Projects Formulated

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	81	92.1	72	81.0	153	86.4
No	1	1.1	2	2.2	3	1.7
Not Applicable	6	6.8	15	16.8	21	11.9
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	100.0	177	100.0

Involvement in both processes of policy formulation and implementation definitely suggests more active participation in the policy process. Though policy formulation is more political in the sense of having a hand in the allocation of resources and values, policy implementation increases this political influence in the sense of seeing the project through.

Table 7 shows the perceived manner of participation by respondents in the implementation of policy initiated. Those who were involved in policy implementation used several methods of participation—defining rules, specifying details, modifying rules to suit situations, acting as resource persons, seeking funds, planning various stages of the work, monitoring results, evaluating results, and some other more specific means. Because many of them were involved in more than one mode, Table 7 only presents frequencies.

Table 7. Perceived Manner of Participation in
Implementation of Policy Initiated

Manner of Participation	Male		Female			
	Number	% of 88	Number	% of 89	Total	% of 177
defining rules	59	67.0	61	68.5	120	67.8
specifying details	56	63.6	54	60.7	110	62.1
modifying rules	44	50.0	42	47.2	86	48.6
acting as resource person	43	48.9	36	40.4	79	39.5
seeking funds	28	31.8	27	30.3	55	31.1
planning stages of work	45	51.1	43	48.3	88	49.7
monitoring results	60	68.2	56	62.9	116	65.5
evaluating results	53	60.2	48	54.0	101	57.1
other	16	18.2	6	6.7	22	12.4

Perception of participation in policy implementation is similar among men and women, except for serving as resource person (48.9% of the men versus 40.4% of the women), monitoring results (68.2% for the men and 62.9% for the women), evaluating results (60.2% for the men and 54.0% for the women, and others). Defining rules of implementation is the area where women participate more, but the proportion is only slightly larger. More respondents considered defining rules as an area of participation in the implementation of policy. This is the most important step, because setting up rules for implementation is effectively like determining policy.

The answers to these questions imply perception of influence in both policy formulation and implementation. To cross-check these claims, a question on the projects actually initiated by the respondents was asked.

Each one who claimed to have influenced policy formulation was able to cite projects actually initiated by them. Those who claimed they participated in the implementation of the policies they initiated were able to cite the outcome of their projects and the time span traversed by these projects from initiation to implementation by law, order and decree.

Manner of Implementation

As Table 8 shows, policies initiated by the respondents were implemented through various methods: laws and statutes which include parliamentary acts and presidential decrees which have the force of law, executive orders, memorandum circulars, and letters of instruction. More than one method was used in some cases. For instance, a presidential decree sets the general provisions and a letter of instruction gives details of implementation.

In the first category, presidential decrees and parliamentary acts are high in the Philippine hierarchy of law. Only 6.6% of the policies initiated by the bureaucrats were actually implemented in this manner. However, 19.9% were implemented through other pronouncements of the President (executive orders and letters of instruction). Many of the policies which affect central and regional offices of the agency were carried out through memorandum circulars issued by the agency head. Almost 35% were implemented utilizing a combination of methods, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8 reveals that many of the respondents played active roles in the implementation of policies they recommended. This can be illustrated by some examples.

Table 8. Manner of Implementation of Policies
Initiated by the Respondents

Manner of Implementation	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Presidential Decree or Act of Parliament	6	7.6	4	5.6	10	6.6
Letter of Instruction and Executive Order by President	15	19.0	15	20.8	30	19.9
Memorandum Circular by Ministry Head	27	34.2	32	44.4	59	39.1
More than one method	31	39.2	21	29.2	52	34.4
TOTAL	79	100.0	72	100.0	151*	100.0

*Others did not initiate policy.

For instance, when the then chairman of the Civil Service Commission introduced her nationwide performance evaluation of government employees, she played an active role in its implementation, even at that time when she was only Director of the Planning Service. She initiated it as her reentry plan from the Career Executive Service Development Program (CESDP), submitted it to her then Chairman, who persuaded the President to sign a decree calling for a nationwide performance evaluation. She played an active role in organizing the committees assigned to evaluate each agency. Each committee was composed of one member from the agency, one from the Civil Service Commission, one from the private sector, one from the academe, and an administrator from another agency. The evaluation committee met with the heads of agencies at the start of the project and submitted their reports to them at the end, as well as to the Civil Service Commission. In the presidential decree drafted by her, funds for the project were provided by the agencies themselves. The project was highly successful and merited her a CESO award. Its success was attributable to the innovative project she initiated, the resources she was able to command and organize, and the leadership she lent to the endeavor.

The CESDP trains higher civil servants to be development managers. They are required to submit a reentry plan for implementation, for which they are monitored and evaluated within six months. They defend these proposals before the training faculty, who then assess the feasibility of the project, as well as the leadership qualities that the project may require. Small, meaningless programs are rejected. In the installation of deep wells in minority areas, for instance, the emphasis is laid not on getting the wells built, but on the leadership exercised to coordinate various agencies in the effort, and in the education of the community to maintain the well. In the establishment of a media center, monitoring goes beyond construction, it focuses on the cultural changes that the center can bring to the community. These activities call for continuing involvement and leadership on the part of the CESO.

To implement the policies they initiate or help initiate, the respondents use different resources within their control, or use persuasion. The most common means of implementation is the memorandum circular which is distributed to the different branches of the agency. Other methods used are external to the agency's resources, such as those done through the political institutions of government—presidential decrees or proclamations, executive orders, or acts of parliament. In most cases, more than one method is used.

Considerable persuasion goes into the implementation process. As shown in Table 9, 76.8% of the respondents (136) answered that they are able to have their suggestions implemented most of the time. Twenty-six, or 14.7%, replied that they can have them implemented sometimes. Only four (2.3%) said that they do not have that capability. A number, however, chose

not to answer (11 or 6.2%). The high percentage of respondents who perceive that they can have their suggestions carried out most of the time may be accounted for by their own perception of potency in their position as well as their actual influence on their agency heads. Those who did not respond may have reasons for not wanting to comment on the problems they may encounter with their heads or peers. Although the replies may be influenced by the desire among the respondents to show their potency and influence, their reliability is cross-checked by the projects they enumerated as initiated by them or the different ways in which they participated in policy formulation and implementation.

Table 9. Perceived Ability to Have Suggestions Carried Out

Ability to Persuade	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes, most of the time	68	77.3	68	76.4	136	76.8
Sometimes	14	15.9	12	13.5	26	14.7
No	2	2.3	2	2.2	4	2.3
No response	4	4.5	7	7.9	11	6.2
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	100.0	177	100.0

The preceding five tables reflect no differences in the replies of male and female respondents on their perceived ability to influence policy through policy formulation and implementation.

Gender and Type of Policy Initiated

It should also be mentioned at this juncture that the policies and programs initiated by the respondents have no distinction in terms of gender propensities. They are directly related to the actual functions of the agencies they represent. For instance, in the financial agencies, the programs deal with tax codification, new budget techniques, and training for financial management. In social development agencies, the programs initiated are along the lines of college entrance examinations, social facilities planning, and media dissemination of welfare information. Only in the gender-related Bureau of Women and Minors are policies directly geared towards women. That agency made news a few years ago with a program of organizing hospitality girls (euphemisms for bar and night club hostesses).

When the question on influence was followed up by another question carried out, 113 attributed the ease to the fact that their own positions gave

them the responsibility for performing the task itself, while 98 pointed to the opportunities allowed by their office to implement policy. Another 89 mentioned with pride the full confidence the heads of their agencies have in them. As can be gleaned from these figures, many respondents cited more than one reason.

Influencing Policy through Policy Formulation

To find out whether gender is associated with policy formulation, the dependent variable of participation in policy formulation was regressed on three other variables—position, nature of unit, and highest grade completed. Table 10 shows the results of the regression.

Table 10. Regression Coefficients of Four Variables Affecting Participation in Policy Formulation

Independent variables	Multiple R	R^2	Simple R	r^2
Position	0.01073	0.01151	−0.10730	0.01151
Gender	0.11307	0.01278	0.04245	0.00180
Nature of Unit	0.22347	0.04994	0.19323*	0.01195
Highest Grade Completed	0.27519	0.07573	0.15994*	0.02559

*$p < .05$

Multiple R, or the combined impact of the variables, show very small values, although in the R values, highest grade completed shows a higher association with policy formulation. When simple R, or the correlation of each variable with the dependent variable is used, a slightly higher correlation is exhibited by two variables, nature of unit and highest grade completed, as against the other variables.

The values are too small to make any conclusions. Nevertheless, it can be said that there is no ground for concluding that gender is correlated with participation in policy formulation. It may be inferred that women perceive their potent roles in policy formulation much as men do.

Those who have closely observed Philippine administrative behavior may be better able than the casual observer to appreciate this finding. There are many women in the government, and social development agencies have more women than other agencies. Even in agencies where the women in the higher civil service are fewer in number than men, they perform the tasks that their job descriptions entrust to them, gender of occupant notwith-

standing. Whether cynics disagree about the regression results is not import-
ant. What is significant is that Filipino women government administrators
perceive their influence in policy formulation in the same way as the men
do; they do not feel they are any less influential.

The variable "highest grade completed" exhibits higher values for R and
r, the highest among the regression coefficients. However, its value is too low
to make a conclusion that it is associated with the ability to formulate policy.

The Bureaucracy as Venue for Influencing Policy

The statistics above may be further reflected in the tables, which show
the respondents' perceptions of job satisfaction.

Asked why they joined the government, the overwhelming majority
(126) replied that they joined because of the ability to influence decisions.
The next most cited reason is public service.

Table 11 shows that more men considered the ability to influence
decisions as the reason for joining the government, while an equal number
of men and women cited security of tenure as an important consideration.
Convenient time schedule was indicated by an equal number of men and
women, thus, making it difficult to assert that women join the public sector
more because of the convenience of managing the home while employed.
Also, less women considered the ability to perform family responsibilities
while working as an important reason for joining the government.

Table 11. Why Respondents Joined the Government

Reason	Male	Female	Total
security of tenure	36	36	72
good salary	12	14	26
first available job	37	25	62
public service	59	51	110
ability to influence decisions	66	60	126
convenient time schedule	7	7	14
less physical demands	6	7	13
ability to perform family responsibility	21	12	33
advice of spouse/parent	6	9	15
prestige	25	16	41

When related to Table 12 on the factors that make a person in govern-
ment happy, ability to influence policy was also cited by many respondents
(124), although it is second to the ability to exercise one's profession (cited

PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

by 147). Security of tenure follows next (88), good salary next (64), prestige next (58), with ability to perform family responsibilities last (54). More women than men attribute happiness in government to the ability to influence policy (66 as against 58), an indication of their awareness of the influential role they play in policy-making.

Table 12. Factors Considered to Make a Person
in the Government Happy

Factors	Male	Female	Total
security of tenure	46	42	88
good salary	30	34	64
ability to influence policy	58	66	124
ability to exercise profession	71	76	147
ability to perform family responsibilities	26	28	54
prestige	29	29	58

This perception of potency in policy-making and the other reasons respondents consider important in making a person in government happy may account for their lack of enthusiasm to leave the government service, as shown in Table 13. The majority are not thinking of leaving the government at all.

Table 13. Willingness of Respondents to take Jobs
Outside the Government

Willingness	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	22	25.0	17	19.1	39	22.0
No	53	60.2	57	64.0	110	62.2
Depends	13	14.8	15	16.9	28	15.8
TOTAL	88	100.0	89	100.0	177	100.0

The proportion for those not desiring to leave the government is similar for both sexes, although there are more men willing to leave than women (25% as against 19.1%). This may imply more reluctance of women to change jobs rather than lack of happiness in their present positions, or, it may imply that women are less confident of their job opportunities in the private sector.

Conclusions

Policy-making is a process which involves both the political and the administrative institutions of government. In the bureaucracy, the notion of

separation between politics and administration has been shown to be un-realistic, as far as the policy-making process is concerned. The bureaucracy performs both policy formulation and policy implementation, and therefore, also undertakes a political function.

This article has shown that both men and women in the higher civil service in the Philippines perform substantial roles in the policy process, in the sense that they see themselves involved in policy formulation and implementation. There are no differences seen as far as their influence in policy-making is concerned.

Multiple regression reinforced the findings in the frequency and per-centage tables that there are not enough grounds for concluding any gender differentiation as far as participation in policy formulation is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis that educational qualifications determine in-fluence cannot be accepted because of the low values of the regression results, although they weigh heaviest among the variables tested.

This perception of potency and influence may be responsible for the satisfaction of the higher civil servants, both male and female, regarding their jobs. The survey findings suggest that Filipino higher civil servants feel that they exercise influence in policy-making, and this feeling makes them stay in the government bureaucracy. This feeling, moreover, may be based on facts about the extent of their influence, from programs and policies they actually initiate or in the implementation of which they play a major role.

Lastly, as far as gender is concerned, the women assert the same satis-faction expressed by the men about working in government. Like the men, they see themselves as peforming an important role in policy formulation and implementation. Gender is thus not a significant variable in affecting perceptions in policy formulation, as far as the Filipino bureaucrats are concerned.

Endnotes

[1] Kenneth J. Meier, *Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policy-Making in the Fourth Branch of Government* (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1979).

[2] James E. Anderson, *Public Policy-Making* (New York: Praeger, 1975), p. 93.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Joseph La Palombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

[7]The first paradigm in public administration is the politics/administration dichotomy propounded by Woodrow Wilson in his seminal essay "The Study of Administration" which appeared in the *Political Science Quarterly* in June 1887, and amplified by Frank Goodnow in *Politics and Administration* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1900). Paul Appleby in *Policy and Administration* (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1949) saw the interrelationship between politics and administration.

[8]The new public administration was a paradigm which swept the 1960s and 1970s with the prescription for administrators who are not value-neutral but are committed to values of social equity, relevance, and responsiveness. See Frank Marini (ed.), *Toward a New Public Administration* (New York: Chandler Publishing, 1971).

[9]Melville C. Branch, "Sins of City Planners," *Public Administration Review* (January-February 1982).

[10]Raul P. de Guzman and Associates, "Public Policy-Making under Martial Law," (Manila: College of Public Administration, SPAR Series), 1976.

[11]Gaudioso C. Sosmena, Jr., "Center and Locality: A Philippine Experience in Policy Implementation," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (April 1980), p. 186.

[12]Frank Lynch, *et al.*, PSSC Social Survey Series No. 2, *Data Gathering by Social Survey* (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1974), ch. 4, p. 18.