Asian Journal of Community Services (AJCS)
Vol. 4, No. 12 2025: 1067-1078

Reframing Community Resilience: Examining Systemic Factors Behind Flood Vulnerability in the Philippines

Janflor Mc.Louie S. Ullero[1*], John Christopher V. Dela Cruz[2], Joana Marie S. Delos Reyes[3], Jamaica V. Furaque[4]
National University, Philippines
Corresponding Author: Janflor Mc.Louie S. Ullero janflor.ullero@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Resilience, Flood Vulnerability, Public Systems, Structural Conditions, Philippines

Received : 16, October
Revised : 18, November
Accepted: 20, December

©2025 Ullero, Dela Cruz, Delos Reyes, Furaque: This is an open-access article distributed under the termsof the Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional.

A B S T R A C T

This study examines the idea of community resilience in relation to flooding in the Philippines and presents a critical reading of how this concept is shaped by wider structural and institutional conditions. Public discussions often describe resilience as an inherent strength of Filipino communities, yet a careful reading of government reports, scientific studies, and policy documents shows a more complex situation. Many of these sources describe recurring problems such as incomplete or deteriorating flood control structures, delays in the completion of planned projects, weak coordination among responsible offices, and limited access to reliable information about long-term flood management. These conditions shape the real environment in which communities must face repeated flooding events.

DOI prefik: https://doi.org/10.55927/ajcs.v4i12.504
ISSN-E: 2962-1496
https://srhformosapublisher.org/index.php/ajcs

INTRODUCTION

Flooding remains one of the most persistent and disruptive environmental challenges in the Philippines, and it continues to shape not only the physical landscape but also the social and moral imagination of communities that confront it year after year. In many parts of the country, especially in densely populated regions like Metro Manila, floods recur with such regularity that they have become part of everyday memory and expectation. Public discourse often presents this recurring hardship through the language of resilience, portraying Filipinos as capable of enduring repeated losses while maintaining optimism and communal solidarity. This narrative is reinforced in media reports, official statements, and even in academic discussions that praise community strength despite chronic exposure to danger. However, a closer examination of publicly available research and policy documents reveals a more complicated picture. Several studies show that flooding is rooted in structural issues that lie beyond the control of individuals, and these issues significantly shape the meaning and limits of resilience (Dulawan et al., 2024).

A review of environmental and governance literature shows that many of the conditions that intensify flood risk in the Philippines stem from long standing gaps in planning, coordination, and infrastructure management. Reports on flood risk management in Metro Manila identify barriers such as incomplete drainage systems, outdated infrastructure, unclear institutional mandates, and inconsistent implementation of long-term plans (Mercado et al., 2020). These barriers reveal that vulnerability is not solely a matter of geography or climate but is also deeply tied to institutional decision making. In this sense, resilience cannot be understood as an independent trait of communities because their ability to adapt is shaped by systems that either support or undermine their safety. Government audits and policy analyses further highlight delays in public works, insufficient maintenance of existing structures, and the uneven distribution of resources among agencies responsible for flood mitigation. These patterns complicate the idealized view of resilience and invite a more critical reflection on how people are expected to endure conditions that have been shaped by institutional weaknesses.

Public discussions often emphasize community stories of survival, yet they seldom focus on the systemic failures that influence the frequency and severity of floods. Recent reports, for instance, point out that large scale flood control projects sometimes fail to meet their objectives due to poor workmanship, lack of oversight, or misalignment between plans and on the ground realities (Context News, 2025). These failures result in structures that provide temporary relief but eventually deteriorate, leaving communities exposed once again. Investigative work on climate governance has also argued that genuine resilience requires accountability and long-term state commitment, both of which are often lacking in existing flood management programs (East Asia Forum, 2025). When these systemic issues remain unaddressed, the burden of adaptation shifts to ordinary citizens who must repeatedly repair, reorganize, and rebuild their lives without meaningful institutional support.

Studies in social vulnerability provide a deeper philosophical entry point into this issue. Research on household perspectives in flood prone areas shows that the persistence of vulnerability is tied not only to physical exposure but also to limited access to secure housing, constrained economic opportunities, insufficient public information, and weak institutional presence in high-risk zones (Water, 2024). These findings highlight that resilience emerges from conditions that communities do not fully choose or control. At the same time, sociological analyses of flood affected settlements reveal that people often remain in flood prone areas due to social attachment, livelihood proximity, or lack of affordable alternatives (Porio, 2011). In these settings, resilience is not a heroic trait, but an obligation imposed by circumstances. It becomes a way of living within limits that have been shaped by long term structural inequalities.

Against this background, the celebration of resilience becomes ethically and philosophically troubling. When resilience is praised without acknowledging the systemic factors that repeatedly endanger communities, it risks placing moral weight on individuals instead of institutions. It encourages a form of admiration that obscures the need for structural reform. The narrative of resilience may unintentionally normalize suffering by presenting repeated adaptation as evidence of cultural strength. Yet the sources surveyed in this study suggest that resilience, if it is to carry real meaning, must be tied to effective governance, reliable infrastructure, and transparent long-term planning. A clearer and more honest understanding of resilience requires recognition that people can thrive only when the systems around them function well enough to reduce harm rather than simply expect them to endure it.

This study therefore argues that resilience in the Philippine context should be reframed as a shared responsibility between communities and the institutions that shape their environment. Public systems, not merely personal virtues, determine whether resilience leads toward security or traps communities in cycles of loss and recovery. By examining publicly available research, government documents, policy analyses, and scholarly discussions, this paper brings together multiple strands of evidence to present a more integrated understanding of resilience. It suggests that a philosophical reading of resilience must confront the tension between public praise and institutional shortcomings. Only by addressing this tension can the discourse of resilience move away from romanticizing endurance and toward demanding structural conditions that allow communities to live with dignity, safety, and real prospects for long term stability.

IMPLEMENTATION AND METHODS

This study used a qualitative and analytical research design that focused on examining how publicly available literature, policy documents, and academic studies construct the idea of resilience in relation to flooding in the Philippines. The goal of this approach was not to measure resilience directly but to understand the structural and institutional conditions described in existing sources and to analyze how these conditions shape the recurring experience of flood vulnerability. Since the study is philosophical in nature, its methodology emphasizes interpretation, critical analysis, and synthesis rather than empirical measurement or field-based data gathering.

The first stage of the methodology involved selecting credible, peer reviewed, and policy relevant sources. The literature included journal articles published in Environmental Hazards, the APN Global Change Research Bulletin, Urban Water Journal, and other reputable publications, along with policy briefs, government reports, and academic discussions produced by recognized institutions. These sources were chosen because they provide detailed examinations of flood risk, governance, vulnerability, and institutional behavior in the Philippine context. Selection was guided by relevance, reliability, and the extent to which the sources offered insight into structural conditions that shape resilience. The aim was to create a body of literature that represented multiple perspectives, including governance analysis, systems modeling, vulnerability assessment, and comparative regional studies.

The second stage consisted of a close reading of the selected materials. This reading focused on identifying recurring themes related to governance, infrastructure, institutional coordination, community conditions, social vulnerability, and environmental planning. Particular attention was given to how each source described the roles of public institutions, the performance of flood control systems, and the social and environmental factors that influence community adaptation. This stage also considered the language used in the literature to describe resilience and vulnerability, recognizing that terms like resilience often carry moral and cultural connotations that shape public perception.

The third stage involved thematic synthesis. Findings from different sources were organized into clusters of recurring ideas, such as the influence of governance quality on flood risk reduction (Latham et al., 2024; Lopez & Moreno, 2024), the structural roots of social vulnerability (Dulawan et al., 2024; Guingab et al., 2025), the systemic nature of resilience (Gotangco et al., 2020), and the broader regional context of risk drivers and adaptation (Opdyke et al., 2025). This synthesis allowed the study to identify connections among the sources and to show how these connections reveal deeper structural patterns that shape flood experiences in the Philippines. The purpose of this stage was not simply to summarize the literature but to examine the philosophical implications of the patterns found, particularly in relation to public responsibility and the ethics of resilience.

In the final stage, the study applied a philosophical lens to interpret the synthesized findings. This interpretive approach sought to understand how the structural conditions described in the literature inform the meaning of resilience and vulnerability. It also examined the tension between the public celebration of community strength and the persistent structural limitations noted in policy and academic sources. Through this lens, resilience was analyzed not only as a descriptive term but also as a concept with ethical significance. This stage allowed the study to develop a critical discussion that links empirical findings with normative concerns about justice, responsibility, and the dignity of affected communities.

This methodological way allowed the study to draw insight from existing research while situating these insights within a reflective and critical analysis. By focusing on publicly available sources and applying philosophical interpretation, the study provides an examination of resilience that is grounded, coherent, and sensitive to the realities faced by communities in the Philippines.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of publicly available literature, policy briefs, and research studies produced several clear results that challenge dominant narratives of community resilience in the Philippines. These results show that resilience is neither a simple cultural strength nor an isolated community trait. Instead, resilience emerges from structural conditions that are shaped by local governance, institutional coordination, infrastructural performance, social vulnerability, and long-term environmental planning. The findings are consistent across sources and reveal a pattern of systemic limitations that repeatedly place communities in positions where resilience becomes necessary rather than optional.

Governance Directly Influences Resilience Outcomes

The studies examined in this research consistently show that governance quality determines whether flood control systems succeed or fail. Latham et al. (2024) identify specific governance archetypes that shape how decisions are made, how actors coordinate, and how resources are distributed. Their simulations demonstrate that weak institutional cooperation and fragmented planning produce poorer flood risk reduction outcomes. Lopez and Moreno (2024) provide further empirical evidence through their case study of Zamboanga City. They document that strategic governance suffers when agencies lack clear mandates, when planning is inconsistent, and when institutional support fluctuates. These real observations show that governance structures create the conditions in which resilience either strengthens or collapses. Communities do not merely “bounce back” on their own. They respond within systems that have already determined what support they will receive and what vulnerabilities they must navigate.

Vulnerability is Socially Produced and Amplified by Structural Conditions

Dulawan et al. (2024) demonstrate that social vulnerability to floods in Metro Manila arises from a combination of physical exposure, socioeconomic constraints, and institutional support levels. Their framework identifies adaptive capacity as one of the most important components of resilience, yet they show that adaptive capacity is restricted when communities lack access to stable public services, reliable drainage systems, and coordinated disaster information. Similarly, Guingab et al. (2025) report that flood prone barangays in Northern Philippines exhibit strong communal practices but remain vulnerable due to gaps in public communication, inconsistent preparedness programs, and variable support from barangay officials. These findings confirm that resilience is not simply an inherent trait but a response to structural pressures that individuals and households cannot control.

Flood Risk is Influenced by Interacting Institutional and Environmental Systems, Not Isolated Failures

Gotangco et al. (2020) show through system dynamics modeling that resilience is an emergent property of interconnected subsystems, including drainage performance, social networks, local government actions, and resource availability. Their model reveals that failure in one subsystem, such as drainage maintenance, produces cascading effects on other subsystems that affect household resilience. This systemic understanding is further supported by Opdyke et al. (2025), whose comparative study shows that both Indonesia and the Philippines face similar patterns of risk due to governance challenges, rapid urbanization, and inconsistent adaptation financing. These studies confirm that flood risk cannot be reduced through small, isolated interventions. Instead, resilience requires structural coherence across systems that often operate independently or even in conflict with one another.

Nature-Based Solutions are Significantly Underutilized Despite their Potential to Strengthen Long Term Resilience

Contreras (2025) argues that nature-based solutions such as watershed rehabilitation, wetland restoration, and green urban infrastructure provide long term, sustainable reductions in flood risk. His policy analysis shows that these strategies remain marginal in national and local flood planning despite strong evidence of their effectiveness. The underutilization of these approaches reflects an institutional tendency to favor engineered solutions, even when these solutions are prone to delays, degradation, or design failures. This finding suggests that resilience is limited by the types of solutions institutions prioritize and the political and economic incentives that influence these choices.

Public Narratives of Resilience are Contradicted by Institutional Weaknesses Revealed In The Literature

The analysis of Chong et al. (2025) reveals that while Filipinos consistently express confidence in their ability to withstand disasters, they also show concerns about the adequacy of institutional support. Their findings show a split between self-perceived resilience and trust in public systems. This tension is central to the philosophical critique developed in this study. Communities continue to act with strength and cooperation, yet their resilience is repeatedly tested by systemic limitations that have been documented across governance, planning, infrastructure, and communication. The literature shows that resilience is necessary not because communities are naturally prepared, but because institutions repeatedly fail to prevent or reduce the impacts of flooding.

Taken together, these results challenge the glorified narrative of Filipino resilience. The reviewed literature shows that resilience is not an isolated cultural virtue, but a response conditioned by governance structures, environmental management, and the quality of public systems. The expectation that communities must repeatedly demonstrate resilience functions as a moral demand placed on populations who are already operating within structurally constrained environments.

From a philosophical lens, these findings reveal a deeper ethical concern. The continuous celebration of resilience risks obscuring the institutional deficiencies documented in the literature. When resilience is framed as a cultural characteristic, the burden of adaptation is shifted away from institutions and toward the very communities affected by structural failures. This framing disguises the accountability of public systems whose governance patterns, planning processes, and infrastructural performance play a major role in sustaining flood vulnerability.

Furthermore, the literature shows that communities do not want resilience for its own sake. They want stability, security, and the presence of functioning systems that prevent avoidable suffering. Their resilience becomes meaningful when it is supported by coherent governance, nature-based solutions, long term planning, and reliable public information. It becomes burdensome when it must compensate for institutional shortcomings.

Thus, the results of the analysis demonstrate that resilience is both a descriptive and normative concept. It describes how communities respond, but it also raises ethical questions about why they must respond so frequently and with so little systemic support. The literature urges a shift in the discourse: from celebrating resilience to examining the structures that make resilience necessary.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study set out to examine the idea of resilience within the context of flooding in the Philippines through a critical analysis of publicly available research, policy documents, and academic discussions. The findings reveal that resilience, widely celebrated as a defining trait of Filipino communities, is far more complex than popular narratives suggest. The literature shows that resilience emerges within conditions shaped by governance structures, social vulnerabilities, infrastructural performance, and environmental planning. In this sense, resilience is not only a community response but also a mirror that reflects the strengths and weaknesses of the systems that surround it.

The reviewed research consistently demonstrates that governance plays a decisive role in shaping flood outcomes. Studies on local governance models and strategic management reveal that coordination, institutional clarity, and long-term planning significantly affect the capacity of communities to withstand and recover from floods. When governance systems are fragmented or inconsistent, resilience becomes more difficult to sustain. These findings challenge the notion that resilience arises naturally from cultural strength. Instead, they show that resilience is deeply tied to how institutions function, how decisions are made, and how public resources are managed.

The literature also makes clear that social vulnerability is produced through structural forces that go beyond the physical hazard itself. The conditions that place communities in flood prone areas, limit their access to infrastructure, or restrict their adaptive capacity are shaped by socioeconomic constraints and uneven public support. These structural realities remind us that communities do not simply "choose" to be resilient; they respond to conditions shaped by long standing inequalities and institutional limitations. Resilience, in this context, becomes a demand placed on people who have limited influence over the systems that determine their exposure to risk.

Another important contribution of the literature is its emphasis on the systemic nature of resilience. Analyses using system dynamics show that resilience emerges from interactions among various subsystems, and failure in one area produces cascading effects throughout the whole system. This perspective reinforces the idea that resilience must be approached holistically. Improvements to infrastructure or disaster information systems cannot succeed without parallel improvements in governance, planning, and resource coordination.

The findings also highlight the underutilized potential of nature-based solutions. These approaches, which emphasize ecological restoration and sustainable design, provide long term benefits that complement engineered structures. Their limited adoption shows that institutional priorities remain aligned with short term responses rather than integrated, long term strategies that strengthen environmental resilience.

Altogether, the evidence reviewed in this study points to a necessary reframing of resilience. Celebrating resilience without addressing systemic weaknesses risks normalizing repeated suffering and shifting responsibility from institutions to the communities themselves. A more honest understanding of resilience recognizes that communities thrive not only through their own strength but through stable, transparent, and coordinated public systems. Resilience becomes meaningful when it reflects shared responsibility rather than repeated adaptation to structural shortcomings. This study concludes that improving flood resilience in the Philippines requires more than encouraging community action. It requires institutional reform, long-term planning, and a recognition that resilience is shaped by the systems that either support or constrain human dignity and safety.

The findings of this study show that community resilience to flooding in the Philippines is shaped by structural conditions that extend beyond individual or cultural effort. Based on this conclusion, several recommendations can be made to strengthen resilience in ways that reflect shared responsibility between communities and the institutions that shape their environment.

First, institutions should adopt a more transparent and coordinated approach to flood management. The literature reveals recurring problems caused by fragmented roles, unclear mandates, and inconsistent communication among agencies. Strengthening interagency coordination is therefore essential. This requires clear lines of responsibility, regular information sharing, and long-term planning that does not shift with administrative changes. Such coordination is not merely a managerial concern but an ethical one, since institutional clarity directly influences the safety and well-being of communities.

Second, public infrastructure must be maintained and evaluated through consistent and evidence-based processes. Many studies reviewed in this paper highlight the importance of drainage systems, flood control structures, and early warning mechanisms. These systems fail when maintenance is irregular or when projects remain incomplete. Institutions should therefore prioritize integrity in implementation and establish monitoring practices that ensure that infrastructures function as intended. Resilience suffers when communities must compensate for persistent infrastructural gaps.

Third, social vulnerability must be addressed as a central component of flood resilience. Vulnerability is not only a product of environmental hazard but also of economic limits, insecure housing, and unequal access to information. Programs aimed at reducing vulnerability should therefore support households through accessible information systems, livelihood stability, and relocation efforts grounded in dignity and fairness. Strengthening social conditions reduces the burden placed on communities to "adapt" to circumstances they did not choose.

Fourth, the integration of nature-based solutions should be expanded. Research shows that watershed protection, green spaces, and ecological restoration contribute meaningfully to long term flood risk reduction. These measures complement traditional engineering approaches and provide benefits that extend beyond flood control, including improved water quality and community wellbeing. Institutions should therefore adopt environmental strategies that recognize the interconnectedness of ecological and social systems.

Finally, public narratives on resilience should shift toward a more honest recognition of structural responsibility. While community strength is admirable, it is not a substitute for effective governance. Public communication should acknowledge the institutional factors that shape vulnerability and avoid framing resilience as a burden that communities must carry alone. This narrative shift encourages accountability and fosters a more balanced understanding of what resilience requires.

Together, these recommendations emphasize that resilience is a shared achievement that depends on functioning systems, ethical governance, and long-term institutional commitment. Strengthening resilience therefore means strengthening the structures that support human life, dignity, and security in the face of recurring floods.

REFERENCES

Chong, R. M. B., et al. (2025). Evolving disaster resilience in the Philippines: Insights from the 2021 and 2023 World Risk Poll. Environmental Hazards. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420925002390

Chong, R. M. B., Tangunan, D. N., Toyado, D. M., & Elegado, A. F. K. (2025). Evolving disaster resilience in the Philippines: Insights from the 2021 and 2023 World Risk Poll on socio economic, regional, and systemic factors. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2025.105415.

Context News. (2025). How flood control projects fail the poor in the Philippines. https://www.context.news/climate-risks/how-flood-control-projects-fail-the-poor-in-the-philippines.

Contreras, A. P. (2025). Nature based solutions to reduce flood risk in the Philippines (Policy Brief No. 25–25). University of the Philippines Los Baños.

Dulawan, J. M. T., et al. (2024). A systematic framework for assessing social vulnerability to floods (SVF) in Metro Manila. Environmental Hazards. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420924005405 .

East Asia Forum. (2025). Climate resilience in the Philippines starts with accountability. https://eastasiaforum.org/2025/10/15/climate-resilience-in-the-philippines-starts-with-accountability.

Gotangco, C. K., See, J., Dalupang, J. P., Ortiz, M., Porio, E., Narisma, G., Yulo Loyzaga, A., & Dator Bercilla, J. (2020). Quantifying resilience to flooding among households and local government units using system dynamics: A case study in Metro Manila. Asia Pacific Network for Global Change Research Bulletin. https://www.apn-gcr.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/f5b0f34a0e4a8bb997e7e4e341c876c7.pdf.

Guingab, R. S., Cureg, M. C., & Santiago, R. B. S. (2025). Assessing the disaster vulnerability, preparedness and resilience of selected flood prone barangays in the Northern Region of the Philippines. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(2), 4319–4331. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9020338.

Latham, Z., et al. (2024). Archetypes of local governance for flood risk reduction: A serious game simulation from the Philippines. Environmental Hazards. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210670724004578 .

Latham, Z., Barrett Lennard, G., & Opdyke, A. (2024). Archetypes of local governance for flood risk reduction decision making under uncertain climate change futures. Sustainable Cities and Society, 112, 105632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2024.105632.

Lopez, I. F., & Moreno, F. (2024). Strategic governance of flood and drought management: A case study of Zamboanga City, Philippines (MPRA Paper No. 122804). Munich Personal RePEc Archive. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/122804/1/MPRA_paper_122804.pdf.

Mercado, J. M. R., et al. (2020). Interrelationships of barriers to integrated flood risk management adaptation in Metro Manila. Urban Water Journal. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2212420919317303.

Opdyke, A., et al. (2025). Comparing flood risk drivers and adaptation responses in Indonesia and the Philippines. APN Global Change Research Bulletin. https://www.apn-gcr.org/bulletin/article/comparing-flood-risk-drivers-and-adaptation-responses-in-indonesia-and-the-philippines.

Porio, E. (2011). Vulnerability, adaptation, and resilience to floods among marginal riverine communities in Metro Manila. Asian Journal of Social Science, 39(3), 425–445.

Water. (2024). Social drivers of flood vulnerability in Metro Manila. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/16/6/799