











ARTICLE

Participatory Ecosystem Management Spearheaded by Community Leaders: Policy-Driven Feedback Mechanism from Local Constituents

Anesito L. Cutillas^{1, 2*} , Ruby Ann B. Maniwang³ , Kyza L. Quimpan⁴ , Syra C. Cinco⁵ , Niño Jerry M. Basaca⁶ , Jao V. Duran⁵ , Rocky A. Marco⁵ , Enrique E. Balili Jr.⁷ , Ybony C. Cutillas⁸ , Jason V. Chavez⁹ 

¹ College of Arts and Sciences & College of Education, Cebu Technological University-Argao Campus, Argao 6021, Philippines

² Center for Social Innovation, Cebu Technological University-Argao Campus, Argao 6021, Philippines

³ Science Department, Liloan National Technical-Vocational High School, Liloan 6612, Philippines

⁴ Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Southern Leyte State University-Main Campus, Sogod 6606, Philippines

⁵ Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Visayas State University Tolosa (VSU Tolosa), Tolosa 6503, Philippines

⁶ Hilongos National Vocational School, Hilongos 6524, Philippines

⁷ Faculty of Social Science Education, Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus Campus, Tomas Oppus 6605, Philippines

⁸ College of Technology and Engineering, Cebu Technological University-Argao Campus, Argao 6021, Philippines

⁹ University Centre for Environmental Studies and Sustainable Development (UCBS), University of Warsaw, 00-927 Warsaw, Poland

ABSTRACT

Anchored on the Social-Ecological Systems (SES) framework and Arnstein's Ladder, this study explores how community leaders operationalize participatory ecosystem management to facilitate adaptive governance in Cebu, Philippines. While national frameworks mandate involvement, the transition to feedback-driven actions is often

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Anesito L. Cutillas, College of Arts and Sciences & College of Education, Cebu Technological University-Argao Campus, Argao 6021, Philippines; Center for Social Innovation, Cebu Technological University-Argao Campus, Argao 6021, Philippines; Email: jasonchavez615@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 7 November 2025 | Revised: 4 January 2026 | Accepted: 16 January 2026 | Published Online: 13 May 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/re.v8i3.12696>

CITATION

Cutillas, A.L., Maniwang, R.A.B., Quimpan, K.L., et al., 2026. Participatory Ecosystem Management Spearheaded by Community Leaders: Policy-Driven Feedback Mechanism from Local Constituents. *Research in Ecology*. 8(3): 101–112. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/re.v8i3.12696>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

hampered by institutional unreadiness and bureaucratic delays. This research investigates the governance-ecology coupling, examining how local leaders act as knowledge filters between grassroots biophysical data and formal policy decision-making. Using a qualitative descriptive design, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 20 key stakeholders, including strategic decision-makers, technical monitors, and community sensors situated in ecologically sensitive zones. Thematic analysis reveals that localized stewardship—specifically, regular clean-up drives—and multi-channel digital reporting via platforms like Facebook Messenger function as systemic sensors. These mechanisms detect ecological thresholds regarding waste accumulation and erosion, triggering tangible outcomes such as adaptive budget allocations for canal dredging and stricter waste ordinances. However, scale mismatches, administrative rigidity, and social friction within communities impede this feedback integration. The study concludes that hybridizing Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) with digital reporting elevates participation from tokenism to resilience-building knowledge co-production. These findings offer a transferable “Community Leader as Sensor” framework for the Global South, demonstrating that empowering local intermediaries to short-circuit command chains can effectively bridge the gap between rigid institutions and rapid ecological change.

Keywords: Participatory; Ecosystem; Policy-Driven; Constituents

1. Introduction

Environmental sustainability in the Philippines increasingly depends on the active participation of local communities that directly interact with and rely upon their surrounding ecosystems. As an archipelagic nation rich in biodiversity yet highly vulnerable to ecological degradation, the Philippines faces pressing challenges such as deforestation, soil erosion, and watershed depletion^[1,2]. To address these, national frameworks like the Local Government Code of 1991 (RA 7160) were established to institutionalize community participation in environmental governance. However, the efficacy of such frameworks relies on viewing governance and ecology not as separate domains, but as a coupled Social-Ecological System (SES), where institutional responsiveness directly dictates ecosystem resilience^[3].

Modern ecosystem management requires a transition from static policy-making to adaptive governance capable of responding to non-linear ecological dynamics. This shift necessitates the integration of local agency and bottom-up governance to ensure policy effectiveness^[4]. In this context, community leaders do not merely fulfill bureaucratic mandates; they act as critical social sensors within the SES. By filtering grassroots data regarding biophysical changes—such as soil erosion rates or watershed depletion, these leaders modulate the system’s response to external pressures. This localized filtration process creates

a significant pressure for change that permeates upward, forcing high-level institutional frameworks to realign official objectives with the practical realities identified by community leaders^[3].

The resolution of complex ecological challenges depends on a dual approach where technical data is bolstered by the active participation and situated knowledge of local constituents^[5]. By adopting a framework of open participation, ecosystem management can utilize a wider array of perspectives necessary for resolving environmental crises that traditional, siloed science often struggles to address^[5]. However, despite the existence of national frameworks, the effectiveness and consistency of participatory ecosystem management remain uneven across localities. In many areas, feedback from the community level does not adequately translate into concrete policy adaptations, revealing a gap between policy formulation and on-the-ground implementation^[6]. Furthermore, there is a significant disparity in sustainability discourse; over 65% of collaborative models originate in the Global North, often failing to account for the institutional unreadiness and bureaucratic rigidity characteristic of the Global South^[7]. This necessitates a shift toward hybrid and multi-level governance structures that bridge the gap between national mandates and local implementation^[8].

While existing research acknowledges the importance of participatory governance, there is limited empirical analysis of how feedback mechanisms actually influ-

ence adaptive outcomes at the intersection of policy and ecology. Most studies focus on procedural involvement—such as tree planting—rather than as a feedback-driven process that informs governance. To bridge these institutional gaps, effective partnerships must rely on governance structures that prioritize target alignment and robust protocols for engaging diverse stakeholders ^[7].

This study is anchored on Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation Theory ^[9], yet it acknowledges modern critiques arguing that Arnstein’s binary power dynamics often fail to capture the complex, non-linear interactions inherent in SES management ^[10]. The emergence of digital communication has further eroded the clear-cut boundaries between different stages of participation, rendering strictly hierarchical models less applicable to contemporary civic interactions ^[10,11]. Furthermore, a professional conceit often exists in governance where officials overestimate the level of influence they grant to citizens ^[10].

Responding to the need for a more systemic analysis, this study examines how community leaders spearhead participatory ecosystem management through on-the-ground environmental monitoring, reporting systems, and coordination with local authorities. It analyzes how policy-driven feedback mechanisms function as coupling devices that translate local ecological observations into adaptive and sustainable governance practices. The investigation focuses on barangays located in ecologically sensitive areas, including upland forest zones, watershed-adjacent communities, and coastal areas. By analyzing the role of community leaders as intermediaries between biophysical signals and administrative action, the research identifies effective participatory models that enhance the system’s capacity for responsiveness and recovery.

2. Literature Review

The Social-Ecological Systems Framework in Ecosystem Management. Participatory ecosystem management (PEM) is increasingly recognized as a vital approach to environmental sustainability, particularly where communities directly depend on natural resources. The adoption of a Social-Ecological Systems (SES) lens allows for a multidimensional appraisal of the interactions between human actors and biophysical domains, facilitat-

ing a holistic understanding of systemic complexity that traditional, siloed research often misses ^[12]. Crucially, SES theory posits that ecological systems are not linear; they are prone to regime shifts where a system may cross an irreversible threshold if feedback mechanisms fail to detect stress signals in time ^[13].

In the Philippine context, PEM has been institutionalized through frameworks such as the Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) Program and the Local Government Code of 1991 (RA 7160). The complete picture of social-ecological health remains incomplete without qualitative factors, such as the intrinsic motivations of stakeholders and spiritual values, that dictate how communities actually respond to ecological stress. Consequently, sustained conservation depends on the system’s ability to couple these local human-centric drivers with institutional responses to moderate the negative impacts of land-use change ^[13].

Integrating LEK and TEK into Governance. Monitoring and reporting mechanisms at the community level form the backbone of adaptive governance. The integration of Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) is categorized as a prerequisite for transformative governance because it provides the high-resolution data necessary for precise system modulation ^[14]. When local observations are treated as primary evidentiary sources rather than anecdotal data, they facilitate the achievement of specific Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly regarding terrestrial biodiversity ^[14]. Empirical evidence suggests that merging Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) with modern technical tools, such as remote sensing and real-time biometric monitoring, results in superior biodiversity outcomes by creating a hybrid validation mechanism ^[15,16]. In the Philippines, this is increasingly facilitated by the high adoption rate of digital communication platforms for environmental data transmission ^[17].

In the Philippines, this is increasingly enabled by the high adoption rate of digital communication platforms for environmental data transmission. However, a structural divergence persists: orthodox policy frameworks often marginalize this high-frequency local data in favor of static, lower-resolution bureaucratic reports. This marginalization weakens the system’s overall adaptive capacity, even though indigenous observations often offer superior longi-

tudinal insights into resource preservation ^[16].

Policy-Driven Feedback Mechanisms and Adaptive Governance. Feedback mechanisms linking local communities to higher policy levels are central to avoiding ecological collapse. Adaptive governance theory argues that the resilience of an ecosystem is contingent upon the speed at which governance structures can process and react to ecological feedback ^[18–22].

In the Philippines, barangay assemblies serve as institutionalized venues for this exchange ^[21,23]. However, the study of these mechanisms validates the necessity of viewing feedback not just as a status update, but as a second derivative of management speed—a mechanism that amplifies the momentum of ecological recovery ^[19,24,25]. Despite their potential, disruptions in the information relay can introduce systemic blind spots ^[18]. If the feedback loop is dampened by bureaucratic friction, the divergence between ground reality and recorded data precipitates flawed policy interventions. This suggests that the governance response time is frequently compromised by external socio-technical mediators, effectively decoupling policy intentions from their final ecological consequences ^[19].

Institutional Alignment and the Challenges of Multi-Level Coordination. Successful environmental coordination treats local communities as active partners rather than passive followers ^[26]. However, a fundamental challenge in multi-level governance is the scale mismatch between centralized mandates and localized ecological realities. In centralized systems, the transfer of financial resources and environmental tasks from national to local levels is rarely linear; for national policies to be effective, higher-level governments must allow sufficient flexibility for local authorities to innovate and adapt rules to specific biophysical environments ^[27]. Coordination often breaks down due to a lack of shared evaluation metrics. Metrics of community compliance may not always align with actual ecological restoration, creating a data dissonance where bureaucratic targets are met, but ecosystem health continues to decline ^[19,27].

While successful examples in the Philippines include local ordinances on waste management that emerged from grassroots consultations, coordination frequently fails when local governments simply replicate best practices without context-specific adaptation ^[26]. This need for dis-

ting, localized understanding is supported by research in social psychology, where discourse analysis reveals that message patterns are deeply rooted in specific cultural and religious contexts as such ignoring these local nuances leads to policy failure ^[28]. Furthermore, effective coordination requires established paths for local feedback and learning to flow back up to national policy-makers ^[26]. Researchers argue that imprecise policy definitions act as noise in this feedback loop, allowing institutional leaders to claim progress based on superficial data while avoiding the substantive legislative evolution required for genuine climate resilience ^[26].

Institutional Barriers and the Global North/South. Sustaining participatory ecosystem management requires overcoming significant institutional hurdles. A critical disparity exists in sustainability discourse; over 65% of collaborative models originate in the Global North, suggesting a need for significant adaptation in the Global South ^[7]. Government organizations in the Global South often suffer from institutional unreadiness, where bureaucratic structures lack the capacity to process bottom-up feedback despite legal mandates for participation ^[29]. This disconnect is often driven by a professional conceit, where officials overestimate the influence they grant to citizens, keeping participation trapped in the lower rungs of tokenism ^[10]. Furthermore, centralized laws designed for stability often struggle to legally or practically include local voices without disrupting established protocols. Consequently, when government departments operate in silos, the feedback provided by a community leader is often lost in transmission ^[12]. To resolve this, scholars recommend shifting from command-and-control models to polycentric governance, where local constituents are empowered to manage specific ecological variables directly, thereby shortening the feedback loop and enhancing system agility ^[30].

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study utilizes a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the interface between local leadership and ecological stability in Cebu province, Philippines. This approach is appropriate as it moves beyond quantifying participation to examining the causal mechanisms—specif-

ically how community leaders operationalize participatory ecosystem management and facilitate policy-driven feedback. By focusing on the qualitative nuances of leadership and feedback, the design allows for a rigorous exploration of the governance interface where local ecological knowledge meets institutional policy.

3.2. Population and Sampling

The study population consists of individuals situated at the critical node of ecosystem management within ecologically sensitive barangays in Cebu province, Philippines. These study sites encompass high-risk ecological zones, specifically upland forest reserves, watershed-adjacent communities, and coastal barangays actively engaged in mangrove rehabilitation and biodiversity protection. A purposive sampling technique was employed to select twenty (N = 20) participants based on their direct engagement in adaptive management processes and their capacity to influence governance outcomes. To ensure a systemic perspective, the sample includes three distinct functional groups: strategic decision-makers, such as barangay chairpersons and environment committee heads responsible for resource allocation; technical monitors, including designated Barangay Environmental Officers and enforcement teams who conduct biophysical inspections; and community sensors, represented by members of people’s organi-

zations and local volunteers who perform daily ecological monitoring. Data collection was conducted until theoretical saturation was achieved, a point determined when the interviews yielded no new insights regarding the feedback loops between community observations and policy responses.

3.3. Instrument

Data were collected through semi-structured interview guides designed to elicit detailed narratives regarding the operationalization of feedback mechanisms. To ensure structural alignment with the study’s framework, the instrument focused on two core analytical domains. The first domain probed the specific mechanics of localized stewardship, including the methods of environmental monitoring, reporting protocols for violations, and the vertical coordination strategies used to align with municipal authorities. The second domain examined the channels of communication used to elevate grassroots data and inquired into tangible governance outcomes, specifically seeking instances where local feedback triggered adaptive policy shifts, as well as the systemic barriers impeding this translation. The instrument was subjected to expert review by a specialist in environmental governance to ensure construct validity and cultural relevance. **Table 1** presents the list of guide questions used by this research study.

Table 1. Interview guide questions.

Objectives	Interview Question
<p>1. To examine how community Leaders implement participatory ecosystem management through localized environmental monitoring, reporting, and coordination with authorities.</p>	<p>1. What environmental activities or monitoring practices are regularly conducted in your community (e.g., tree inventory, mangrove protection, clean-up drives, or waste segregation initiatives)?</p> <p>2. How do community leaders gather and report environmental issues such as illegal logging, soil erosion, or flooding incidents to the local government or DENR?</p> <p>3. How does your community coordinate with municipal or provincial offices when it comes to implementing environmental ordinances or projects?</p>
<p>2. To analyze how policy-driven feedback Mechanisms help translate community environmental data and experiences into adaptive and sustainable governance practices.</p>	<p>1. What ways or channels are available for your community to give feedback or recommendations to the local government regarding environmental issues (e.g., barangay assemblies, consultations, joint committees)?</p> <p>2. Can you share an instance where your community’s feedback or request led to a change, ordinance, or new environmental initiative?</p> <p>3. What challenges do you encounter when relaying local environmental concerns to policy-makers, and how are these usually resolved or followed up?</p>

3.4. Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission was secured from relevant barangay offices and community organizations. The interviews were scheduled at times convenient for the participants and conducted either face-to-face or virtually, depending on accessibility and logistical considerations. Each interview was audio-recorded with participants' consent, and field notes were taken to capture non-verbal cues and contextual observations. To ensure data triangulation, field notes were utilized to capture the physical context of the study sites, providing a layer of observational verification to the verbal narratives. All participants were assured of confidentiality, and pseudonyms were used to protect their identities. The use of field notes alongside recorded interviews provided a layer of data triangulation, ensuring that the participants' verbal narratives were interpreted accurately within the physical and social context of their respective barangays. The researcher also followed up as necessary to clarify responses and ensure completeness of the data collected.

3.5. Data Analysis

Data collected from interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns in community leadership and feedback. The coding process was primarily guided by Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation to categorize the depth of engagement, distinguishing between procedural involvement and substantive power-sharing. However, to capture the systemic complexity of the findings, the analysis subsequently integrated the Social-Ecological Systems (SES) framework as an interpretative lens. This dual analytical approach allowed the researcher to move beyond merely classifying participation levels to identifying specific "coupling points" where governance actions directly influenced ecological trajectories. To ensure robustness, member checking was employed to verify that these interpretations accurately reflected the participants' experiences, while triangulation with field notes confirmed the biophysical context of the reported activities.

4. Results

Research Objectives 1: To examine how communi-

ty leaders implement participatory ecosystem management through localized environmental monitoring, reporting, and coordination with authorities.

Theme 1: Localized Monitoring Practices and Grassroots Stewardship

Participatory ecosystem management in the study areas is operationalized through a regime of localized stewardship, where community routines function as early-warning systems for ecological stress. The findings indicate that localized activities, specifically regular weekend clean-up drives, serve as a critical knowledge filter for identifying systemic ecological issues such as waste accumulation and drainage failures before they escalate into larger municipal problems. These efforts are not isolated incidents but are part of a barangay-led waste segregation framework that utilizes public announcements and social media to institutionalize proper disposal habits among residents. Furthermore, leaders work in tandem with the city environment office to ensure that these localized efforts align with biophysical standards and legal mandates. This stewardship framework is bolstered by an intergenerational component, specifically through the mobilization of youth volunteers who bridge the gap between community labor and formal environmental education. Simultaneously, specialized monitoring teams conduct technical inspections of drainage systems and waterways. These proactive measures are designed to prevent illegal dumping and ensure unobstructed water flow, while targeted awareness sessions educate residents on the natural flood-prevention roles of mangroves and upland forests. When technical complexities arise, these local teams trigger formal coordination with the city environment office for professional intervention.

"In our community, we regularly conduct clean-up drives especially after weekends when waste tends to accumulate, and we work with the city environment office to make sure waste is disposed of properly and to learn more about sustainable practices."

"As a youth volunteer, I join coastal clean-ups and recycling drives in our barangay; we also participate in awareness programs in schools and use social media to share tips on how to segregate waste properly and motivate others."

“Our team checks drainage systems and waterways regularly to prevent illegal waste dumping and to make sure that water flow remains unobstructed, while also conducting sessions to educate residents about the importance of mangroves and trees.”

Theme 2: Multi-Channel Reporting and Data Collection Strategies

The process of gathering environmental data has evolved into a sophisticated sensor network that emphasizes evidentiary weight and rapid institutional response. Respondents detailed a heavy reliance on community-sourced reporting via digital platforms like text and Facebook Messenger, effectively turning the local constituency into active sensors for ecosystem health. To ensure these reports are actionable, leaders utilize a rigorous on-site validation process where volunteers gather high-resolution evidence, including photos, GPS coordinates, and witness accounts. This encoded data serves as a longitudinal log that helps track recurring systemic vulnerabilities, such as soil erosion or chronic flooding, which are then prioritized for Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) intervention. Formal institutional monitoring complements these community-led reports through targeted inspections of vulnerable zones. Barangay officials, supported by local village guards, monitor risk-prone riverbanks for illegal activities, using standardized checklists to create a formal audit trail for the Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office (MENRO). This coordinated approach ensures that destructive activities are identified instantly and verified by on-site teams, preventing institutional oversight.

“We rely heavily on community reports through text and Facebook Messenger; once verified with photos and GPS coordinates, we include it in our monitoring log and forward it to DENR, especially for protected areas.”

“Our barangay officials conduct regular inspections in risk-prone areas for illegal logging or riverbank erosion; we immediately record the location, gather photos or videos, and hold meetings to review results and recommend clearing or tree-planting.”

“We use social media to monitor concerns where people message us with photos or tagged posts, and

we help amplify these issues by endorsing them to the barangay and organizing youth-led events so the younger generation becomes more engaged.”

Theme 3: Inter-Institutional Linkages and Coordination

The implementation of environmental ordinances is sustained through structured inter-institutional coupling and the formalization of resource-sharing between local and municipal levels. Respondents highlighted that regular coordination meetings with MENRO serve as the primary alignment platform for integrating barangay-level projects, such as river clean-ups and reforestation, with broader municipal sustainability goals. This coordination is formalized through the submission of accomplishment reports and photo documentation to ensure administrative transparency, alongside requests for technical support such as seedlings and specialized monitoring tools. Beyond administrative reporting, these partnerships involve active manpower mobilization that empowers local actors. Respondents described deep-seated partnerships with the Local Government Unit (LGU) where community volunteers provide the necessary on-the-ground presence for information dissemination, effectively extending the reach of municipal governance. Ultimately, community leaders act as the vital link between grassroots initiatives and higher-level enforcement, ensuring that violations like illegal logging are immediately relayed to the DENR and that localized policies are strictly enforced through joint monitoring schedules.

“We conduct regular coordination meetings with MENRO to align our programs like waste segregation and tree planting, while also participating in joint planning sessions to ensure our projects match the environmental goals of the city.”

“We partner with the LGU by offering manpower and community engagement support; we assist in information dissemination to make sure residents understand environmental ordinances and support skills training like composting workshops.”

“We serve as the link between community initiatives and the local government, immediately relaying reports of violations like illegal logging to MENRO or DENR and coordinating documentation to ensure concerns are properly recorded.”

Research Objectives 2: To analyze how policy-driven feedback mechanisms help translate community environmental data and experiences into adaptive and sustainable governance practices.

Theme 1: Institutionalized Channels for Participatory Deliberation

The translation of local ecological data into governance actions is facilitated by a multi-tiered system of deliberative platforms that allow for the co-production of environmental solutions. The findings identify barangay assemblies as the primary institutional feedback loop, where grassroots observations regarding critical issues, such as improper waste disposal and systemic flooding risks, are not merely discussed but formally codified into administrative records for elevation to municipal agencies like MENRO and the DENR. This process ensures that neighborhood-level concerns are integrated into broader technical and budgetary frameworks rather than remaining isolated complaints. Furthermore, the inclusion of specialized forums allows technical experts to assist community leaders in identifying priority areas, effectively turning raw community observations into actionable policy recommendations. Simultaneously, regular reporting during municipal meetings enables barangay focal persons to present data-backed updates, supported by photos and maps, directly to higher authorities, ensuring that localized environmental concerns are aligned with municipal resource allocation.

“Barangay assemblies are our primary venue for discussing environmental concerns, where youth and other sector representatives propose environment-related activities like recycling programs or tree-planting initiatives that are then forwarded to MENRO and DENR.”

“We attend planning workshops organized by NGOs or the LGU to provide recommendations for environmental conservation; these sessions also allow us to

request capacity-building support, such as training on climate-smart farming.”

“We conduct regular reporting during municipal meetings to endorse environmental observations from the barangay, ensuring our concerns are aligned with municipal plans and budgets for timely action from higher authorities.”

Theme 2: Tangible Governance Outcomes and Adaptive Policy Translation

The efficacy of policy-driven feedback is most evident in its capacity to trigger substantive legislative and budgetary adaptations within the local government structure. Respondents detailed instances where community narratives regarding chronic flooding, bolstered by hazard reports and photographic evidence, resulted in a direct policy shift from reactive clean-ups to the enactment of stricter waste segregation ordinances with defined penalties. Crucially, this feedback led to adaptive resource allocation, where specific portions of the barangay budget were institutionalized for regular canal dredging and strategic signage, resulting in measurable improvements in local flood control. Beyond infrastructure, feedback mechanisms facilitate ecological restoration by empowering specific demographic groups to drive innovation. Youth-led initiatives effectively utilized community surveys to secure LGU endorsement for green spaces, demonstrating that structured feedback mechanisms allow community-identified needs to dictate the pace and focus of ecological recovery efforts.

“During an assembly, residents presented photos of plastic waste blocking canals; in response, the council passed a stricter waste ordinance and allocated a portion of the budget for regular dredging and clean-up drives.”

“Our youth organization saw the need for green spaces over commercial zones, so we gathered signatures and conducted a survey to support our proposal for a mini-park, which the LGU and NGOs then supported with seedlings.”

“Residents posted photos of riverbank trash on social media to call attention to the issue, leading the local government to launch a regular monthly river clean-up drive that has significantly improved the cleanliness of our water flow.”

Theme 3: Structural and Social Impediments to Adaptive Governance

Despite the identification of successful outcomes, systemic hurdles, ranging from administrative rigidity to social capital friction, impede the seamless integration of community feedback. Bureaucratic delay serves as a primary structural barrier, where reports of urgent issues like

illegal dumping often get trapped in complex administrative layers or stalled by limited manpower. To mitigate these delays, community leaders must engage in persistent collective pressure strategies, often collaborating with NGOs to ensure that local reports are acknowledged within the administrative chain. The social complexity of local governance introduces further barriers, particularly regarding the enforcement of environmental regulations within small, interconnected communities. The findings indicate that reporting violators often creates significant social tension; this is typically resolved by positioning the barangay council as a neutral mediator and utilizing anonymous reporting channels to bypass social barriers. Finally, to overcome chronic resource scarcity, communities adopt hybrid funding models, coupling institutional support with private sector sponsorship to sustain labor-intensive restoration tasks.

“Many of us face delays due to complex administrative procedures or limited staff; to address this, we conduct repeated follow-ups and collaborate with youth groups to ensure reports reach the officers who can take action.”

“Reporting environmental violators creates social tension when they are neighbors or relatives, so we hold town hall meetings to explain regulations and establish ways to report issues without exposing the reporter’s identity.”

“Budget constraints often limit the scope of environmental programs, so we reach out to companies and cooperatives for sponsorship, while NGOs and youth groups provide the manpower and seedlings needed for restoration.”

5. Discussion

The findings of this study necessitate a re-evaluation of participatory ecosystem management, moving beyond the linear power dynamics of Arnstein’s Ladder to a Social-Ecological Systems (SES) perspective. While traditional frameworks often categorize localized activities, such as tree inventories and waste monitoring, as functional participation at the lower rungs of power, this study demonstrates that these activities serve a critical biophysical function. In the ecologically sensitive barangays studied, community stewardship acts as a knowledge filter

that prevents the social-ecological system from falling into traps or undesirable pathways^[13]. Because SES trajectories are non-linear, the real-time observations provided by local constituents regarding riverbank erosion or clogged waterways function as essential systemic sensors. These sensors detect when a system is approaching an ecological threshold^[13], providing the specific evidentiary justification required for governance institutions to adapt regulatory structures before a crisis occurs^[19]. Thus, community leaders do not merely participate in governance; they operationalize a dynamic feedback model that amplifies the momentum of ecological recovery, effectively serving as a second derivative of management speed^[19].

A key contribution of this study to ecological debates is the identification of the governance-ecology coupling, where the resilience of a biophysical system is directly dependent on the porosity of the governance structure managing it. The transition to multi-channel digital reporting observed in the study reflects a hybridization of knowledge systems that tightens this coupling. When community leaders utilize digital tools to transmit high-resolution data, such as GPS coordinates of illegal logging, they effectively short-circuit the traditional command chain, allowing for rapid interventions that match the temporal scale of the ecological threat. This contradicts orthodox sustainability discourse that often marginalizes local insights; instead, merging Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) with real-time biometric monitoring results in a hybrid validation mechanism that creates more precise forest governance than singular scientific approaches^[16]. Unlike the broad “Citizens as Sensors” concept which focuses on mass data volume, the “Community Leader as Sensor” framework observed here introduces a critical verification layer. The leader acts as a smart node, filtering noise and converting raw observations into administrative evidence. By treating local observations as technical data rather than anecdotal stories, these feedback loops bridge the structural divergence that typically exists between slow-moving bureaucratic models and rapidly changing indigenous landscapes^[16].

Despite the potential for adaptive governance, the findings highlight that institutional unreadiness remains a primary deployment bottleneck in the Global South^[29]. The reported delays in responding to erosion and waste accumulation are not merely procedural inefficiencies; they

represent a structural decoupling where centralized laws struggle to integrate grassroots voices without disrupting established protocols^[30]. This disconnection is exacerbated by disruptions in the information relay; if the feedback provided by a community leader is lost between siloed government departments, the resulting policy intervention is inevitably flawed or delayed, creating a systemic blind spot^[18]. This confirms that the transformation of field-level metrics into legislative change is not automatic but is contingent upon a political-economic architecture that prioritizes decentralized innovation over centralized command^[18]. Furthermore, social tensions and budget constraints act as friction points that prevent the comprehensive mapping of community behaviors, suggesting that resilience requires a shift in the bureaucratic role from controlling to empowering, specifically through the creation of community funds that allow local actors to bypass institutional rigidity^[30].

While anchored in the Philippine experience, these findings offer a transferable model for other Global South contexts characterized by high biodiversity, limited institutional capacity, and strong social capital. “Community Leader as Sensor” framework is highly applicable to similar archipelagic or agrarian nations where centralized monitoring is logistically unfeasible due to geographic fragmentation. Specifically, the mechanism of hybridizing LEK with digital reporting provides a blueprint for regions facing the dual challenge of rapid environmental degradation and bureaucratic inertia. This suggests that in resource-constrained governance systems, investing in the transmission channels, such as digital reporting protocols and leader training, may yield higher resilience returns than investing solely in centralized physical infrastructure^[29]. Ultimately, this research offers a pathway for transforming local governance from a rigid administrative function into an adaptive, ecologically responsive system.

6. Conclusion

The study concludes that in ecologically sensitive areas of the Global South, community leaders serve a function far more critical than administrative support; they act as the primary social sensors within the Social-Ecological System (SES). The evidence gathered here indicates that

localized stewardship activities, ranging from waste monitoring to habitat inspections, function as essential feedback mechanisms that identify environmental risks before they cross irreversible thresholds. Consequently, the effectiveness of participatory ecosystem management is defined not merely by the frequency of activities conducted, but by the structural integrity of the feedback loops that allow grassroots knowledge to drive municipal resource allocation and substantive legislative change.

To transition from a centralized management model to a more adaptive governance system, local government units must prioritize the institutionalization of digital environmental dashboards. Rather than relying on sporadic or informal reports, the establishment of a standardized platform for encoding GPS-tagged photos and field observations would ensure that grassroots data becomes an immutable part of the administrative record. Furthermore, to mitigate the institutional unreadiness identified in the study, municipal governments should explore hybrid governance models, such as the establishment of dedicated community environment funds. This decentralization of fiscal authority would directly address the bureaucratic delays and administrative rigidity that currently stifle local innovation, empowering barangay councils to implement small-scale restoration projects independently.

While grounded in the Philippine context, this “Community Leader as Sensor” framework offers a transferable model for other developing nations characterized by high biodiversity and limited state capacity. It suggests that in regions where centralized monitoring is logistically unfeasible, the hybridization of Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) with digital reporting offers a cost-effective pathway to resilience. Future research should build on this by conducting longitudinal assessments to determine the resilience of these feedback mechanisms across different political cycles. Ultimately, this study posits that for environmental governance to be truly sustainable, it must evolve from a rigid, top-down structure into a coupled system where governance speed matches the pace of ecological change.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conception,

design, data collection, analysis, and writing of this study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to the non-interventional nature of the research, which focused on professional public duties and general community environmental practices rather than sensitive personal data.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

The data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to extend their sincere gratitude to the barangay officials, community volunteers, and indigenous representatives who participated in this study for their valuable time, cooperation, and insights during the data collection process.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Barrientos, A.A., 2025. Encouraging environmental sensitivity and Earth science performance: Perceptions from first-year teacher education students. *Journal of Environmental & Earth Sciences*. 7(4), 180–192. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/jees.v7i4.8039>
- [2] Pulhin, J.M., Ramirez, M.A.M., Garcia, J.E., et al., 2024. Contextualizing sustainable forest management and social justice in Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) in the Philippines. *Forest Policy and Economics*. 165, 100589. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tfp.2024.100589>
- [3] May, C.K., 2022. Complex adaptive governance systems: A framework to understand institutions, organizations, and people in socio-ecological systems. *Socio-Ecological Practice Research*. 4(1), 39–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-021-00101-7>
- [4] Jafari, G., Omidvar, B., Ardestani, M., et al., 2025. A resilience-based framework for attuning integrated water resources management strategies in social-ecological systems of river basins. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*. 16(11), 3545–3565. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2025.271>
- [5] Austen, K., Janssen, A., Wittmayer, J.M., et al., 2024. The potential of citizen science to transform science: Lessons for a sustainable future. *People and Nature*. 6(2), 435–445. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10614>
- [6] Ceneciro, C.C., 2025. Characterizing workshops promoting motivated engagement and retention beyond the sessions: Experiential narratives from education, language and social science instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(4), 51–65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8373>
- [7] Nzeyimana, B.S., Gandhi, J., Tiwari, S., et al., 2025. Bridging gaps in sustainability: HEI-industry collaborations for accelerating SDGs. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 529, 146768. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2025.146768>
- [8] Yasmin, T., Farrelly, M.A., Rogers, B.C., 2022. Hybrid and multi-level adaptive governance for sustainable urban transformations. *Frontiers in Water*. 4, 756273. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2022.756273>
- [9] Arnstein, S.R., 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 35(4), 216–224. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- [10] Sharma, V., 2025. Revisiting Arnstein's A Ladder of Citizen Participation: Strengths and limitations in the 21st century. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 16(2), 75–80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52711/2321-5828.2025.00012>
- [11] Weymouth, R., Hartz-Karp, J., 2019. Participation in planning and governance: Closing the gap between satisfaction and expectation. *Sustainable Earth*. 2(1), 5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42055-019-0012-y>

- [12] You, C., Qu, H., Guo, L., 2024. A framework of composite factors for assessing ecosystem service supply drivers: A sustainable socio-ecological perspective. *Ecological Indicators*. 169, 112811. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2024.112811>
- [13] Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Hayes, T., Corbera, E., et al., 2024. Looking back to shape the future: Trajectories and resilience of social–ecological systems in the Global South. *Ambio*. 53(12), 1715–1721. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-024-02087-4>
- [14] Radio, A.H., 2025. Transformative governance based on local ecological knowledge is impossible without genuine inclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities in NW Patagonia. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine*. 21(1), 9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13002-024-00751-3>
- [15] Mialhe, F., Gunnell, Y., Ignacio, J.A.F., et al., 2015. Monitoring land-use change by combining participatory land-use maps with standard remote sensing techniques: Showcase from a remote forest catchment on Mindanao, Philippines. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*. 36, 69–82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2014.11.007>
- [16] Kembo, T.R., Utete, B., 2025. Local ecological knowledge (LEK) reveals the drivers and barriers for sustainable conservation of protected forest biodiversity. *Sustainable Environment*. 11(1), 2505338. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/27658511.2025.2505338>
- [17] Gurney, G.G., Darling, E.S., Ahmadi, G.N., et al., 2021. Equity in environmental governance: Perceived fairness of distributional justice principles in marine co-management. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 124, 23–32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.022>
- [18] Wei, T., Li, H., Miao, J., 2025. Integration and development path of smart grid technology: Technology-driven, policy framework and application challenges. *Processes*. 13(2), 595. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/pr13020595>
- [19] Boasson, E.L., Peters, G.P., Tosun, J., 2025. Policy-driven acceleration of climate action. *PLOS Climate*. 4(5), e0000626. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000626>
- [20] Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., et al., 2005. Adaptive governance of social–ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 30, 441–473.
- [21] Chavez, J.V., Garil, B.A., Padirque, C.B., et al., 2024. Assessing innovative and responsive young leaders in public service: Lens from community clientele. *Environment and Social Psychology*. 9(9), 2876. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2876>
- [22] Chaffin, B.C., Gunderson, L.H., 2015. Emergence, institutionalization and renewal: Rhythms of adaptive governance in complex social-ecological systems. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 165, 81–87. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.09.003>
- [23] Pulhin, J.M., Dizon, J.T., Cruz, R.V.O., et al., 2008. Tenure Reform on Philippine Forest Lands: Assessment of Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts. College of Forestry and Natural Resources: Los Baños, Philippines. Available from: <https://hdl.handle.net/10568/20173>
- [24] Nasution, M.S., Rusli, Z., Heriyanto, M., et al., 2025. Green governance and institutional resilience: Strengthening environmental policies. *Frontiers in Political Science*. 7, 1631249. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1631249>
- [25] Mundoli, S., Sanfui, A., Nagendra, H., 2023. Pestilential or productive? Tracking two centuries of environmental change and current perceptions about ecosystem services of the East Kolkata Wetlands. *Urbanisation*. 8(2), 143–163. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/24557471231202389>
- [26] Guo, Y., Li, S., 2025. Multi-level governance of low-carbon tourism in rural China: Policy evolution, implementation pathways, and socio-ecological impacts. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*. 12, 1482713. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2024.1482713>
- [27] Li, C., Xu, Y., Jiang, M., et al., 2025. Low-carbon city development from a multi-level governance perspective: A comparative study of Shenzhen, China and the City of Darebin, Australia. *Global Public Policy and Governance*. 5(1), 1–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43508-024-00105-5>
- [28] Chavez, J.V., Cuilan, J.T., Adalia, H.G., 2024. Message patterns through discourse analysis on the concept of apology and forgiveness during Ramadan among college students practicing Islam. *Environment and Social Psychology*. 9(3), 2043. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i3.2043>
- [29] Das, D.K., 2025. Digital technology and AI for smart sustainable cities in the global south: A critical review of literature and case studies. *Urban Science*. 9(3), 72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci9030072>
- [30] Araujo-Vizueté, G., Robalino-López, A., 2025. A systematic roadmap for energy transition: Bridging governance and community engagement in Ecuador. *Smart Cities*. 8(3), 80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities8030080>