



Key References

FROM VULNERABILITY TO SOCIAL RESILIENCE



Key words

RESILIENCE – SOCIAL ECOLOGY SYSTEMS APPROACH	2
RESILIENCE – PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH	5
TOWARDS SOCIAL RESILIENCE	8
LIVELIHOODS APPROACH	10
VULNERABILITY	12

RESILIENCE – SOCIAL ECOLOGY SYSTEMS APPROACH

Adger, W. N. (2003).

Building resilience to promote sustainability. An agenda for coping with globalisation and promoting justice. Bonn: IHDP.

Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C. (Eds.) (2003).

Navigating Social-Ecological Systems. Building Resilience for Complexity and Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J. M. & Abel, N. (2001).

From Metaphor to Measurement: Resilience of What to What? *Ecosystems*, 4 765-781.

Abstract: Resilience is the magnitude of disturbance that can be tolerated before a socioecological system (SES) moves to a different region of state space controlled by a different set of processes. Resilience has multiple levels of meaning: as a metaphor related to sustainability, as a property of dynamic models, and as a measurable quantity that can be assessed in field studies of SES. Most studies that explore resilience-related ideas have used resilience as a metaphor or theoretical construct. The operational indicators of resilience have, however, received little attention in the literature. Much more insight could be gained from empirical analyses, which would require an operational, measurable concept of resilience. The purpose of this paper is to explore the possibilities and limitations of measurable operational definitions of resilience for SES. The authors address this issue by, first, providing the background of two case studies, one from the lake districts of North America and one from the rangelands of New South Wales in Australia, that are used throughout the paper to inform and focus the discussion. Next, they discuss the concepts of resilience and the adaptive cycle in the context of models for each of the examples to show that useful parallels can be drawn between radically different SES. Then, they attempt to develop pathways by which some useful resilience measures for SES might be devised. Finally, they describe some of the pitfalls and limitations of resilience measures and offer some remarks on the future of work in this area. To assess a system's resilience, one must specify which system configuration and which disturbances are of interest. This paper aims to compare resilience properties in the two contrasting case studies with respect to the following three general features: (a) The ability of an SES to stay in the domain of attraction is related to slowly changing variables, or slowly changing disturbance regimes, which control the boundaries of the domain of attraction or the frequency of events that could push the system across the boundaries. Examples are soil phosphorus content in lake districts woody vegetation cover in rangelands, and property rights systems that affect land use in both lake

districts and rangelands. (b) The ability of an SES to self-organize is related to the extent to which reorganization is endogenous rather than forced by external drivers. Self-organization is enhanced by co-evolved ecosystem components and the presence of social networks that facilitate innovative problem solving. (c) The adaptive capacity of an SES is related to the existence of mechanisms for the evolution of novelty or learning. Examples include biodiversity at multiple scales and the existence of institutions that facilitate experimentation, discovery, and innovation.

URL:

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/lu5mxqkxbbkly62/?p=0d324d59009b46bbb53b67904f13bd3c&pi=6>

Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C. S., Walker, B., et al. (2002).

Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformation. pp. 1-74). Stockholm: The Environmental Advisory Council to the Swedish Government.

Holling, C. S. (1973).

Resilience and stability of ecological systems. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4, 1-23.

URL:

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.00245>

Schoon, M. (2005).

A Short Historical Overview of the Concepts of Resilience, Vulnerability, and Adaptation. Working Paper W05-4. Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis pp. 1-17). Indiana University.

Abstract: Reviewing the literature used as "seed" documents in the visualization mapping exercise outlined in "Scholarly Networks on Resilience, Vulnerability and Adaptation within the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change", a compilation of definitions for the three concepts was recorded. This paper seeks to identify trends in the definitions of the three concepts - resilience, vulnerability, and adaptation - found in the seminal literature over the past 30 years. . The attempt here is to build upon the IHDP-sponsored research of the past year and identify interesting developments in the literature. A challenge of this inquiry has been in fixing the conceptual boundaries of the study and retaining only usage of the terms within the human dimensions of global environmental change. The Appendix to this paper provides the specific definitions used. Each of the three terms has colloquial usage as well as historical meaning across a variety of scholastic literatures ranging from psychological studies to purely ecological analyses to business publications. We

have rigorously maintained a focus only on the human dimensions of global change regardless of source. Even so, many of the key records cite literature far beyond these boundaries, and some of the most interesting findings relate to the evolution of use of these terms from fields outside of the study of human dimensions of global change. Several remarkable findings emerged from this review. First, resilience scholars have the most singular definition, based almost exclusively on the work of C.S. Holling. Second, literature on vulnerability emerges from three distinct fields and appears to becoming more concise over time. Third, adaptation literature, as it relates specifically to the human dimensions of global environmental change comes forward as a newer concept more constrained by definition than by practice. Finally, as emerges in the citation analyses conducted in the "Scholarly Networks" paper, recent literature within each concept has begun to cross-reference the other concepts.

URL: http://www.indiana.edu/~iupolsci/gradcv/schoon/historical_critique.pdf

Vogel, C. (2006).

Editorial: Forward: Resilience, vulnerability and adaptation: A cross-cutting theme of the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change. *Global Environmental Change*, 16, 235-236.

URL: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VFV-4KFMM81-3&_user=946149&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&acct=C000049002&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=946149&md5=a1eac7e21a1f66db9962507af5d22e05

Walker, B., Salt, D., & Reid, W. (2006).

Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World.: Island Press.

RESILIENCE – PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

Barton, W. H. (2005).

Methodological challenges in the study of resilience. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *Handbook for Working with Children and Youth - Pathways to resilience across cultures and contexts*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Garmezy, N. (1976).

Vulnerable and invulnerable children: Theory, research and intervention. Washington DC: American Psychology Association.

Luthar, S. S. (Ed.) (2003).

Resilience and Vulnerability. Adaptation in the Context of Childhood Adversities. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Luthar, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000).

The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 857-885.

URL: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1903337>

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000).

The construct of resilience: a critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543-562.

Abstract: This paper presents a critical appraisal of resilience, a construct connoting the maintenance of positive adaptation by individuals despite experiences of significant adversity. As empirical research on resilience has burgeoned in recent years, criticisms have been levied at work in this area. These critiques have generally focused on ambiguities in definitions and central terminology; heterogeneity in risks experienced and competence achieved by individuals viewed as resilient; instability of the phenomenon of resilience; and concerns regarding the usefulness of resilience as a theoretical construct. We address each identified criticism in turn, proposing solutions for those we view as legitimate and clarifying misunderstandings surrounding those we believe to be less valid. We conclude that work on resilience possesses substantial potential for augmenting the understanding of processes affecting at-risk individuals. Realization of the potential embodied by this construct, however, will remain constrained without continued scientific attention to some of the serious conceptual and methodological pitfalls that have been noted by sceptics and proponents alike

URL: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1885202>

Masten, A. S. (2001).

Ordinary magic - Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227-238.

Abstract: The study of resilience in development has overturned many negative assumptions and deficit-focused models about children growing up under the threat of disadvantage and adversity. The most surprising conclusion emerging from studies of these children is the ordinariness of resilience. An examination of converging findings from variable-focused and person-focused investigations of these phenomena suggests that resilience is common and that it usually arises from the normative functions of human adaptational systems, with the greatest threats to human development being those that compromise these protective systems. The conclusion that resilience is made of ordinary rather than extraordinary processes offers a more positive outlook on human development and adaptation, as well as direction for policy and practice aimed at enhancing the development of children at risk for problems and psychopathology

URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11315249>

Ungar, M. (2005).

Introduction. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *Handbook for Working with Children and Youth: Pathways to Resilience across Cultures and Contexts* pp. xv-xxxix). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications Inc.

Werner, E. E. (1993).

Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai Longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5, 503-513.

URL:

<http://faculty.mwsu.edu/psychology/dave.carlston/Child/Undergrad/resilience.pdf>

Werner, E. E. (1995).

Resilience in development. *Current directions in psychological sciences*, 4, 81-84.

URL:

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119254357/abstract?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0>

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982).

Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (2001).

Journeys from childhood to midlife. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wolkow, K. E., & Ferguson, H. B. (2001).

Community factors in the development of resiliency: considerations and future directions. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 37(6), 489-498.

Abstract: Researchers have questioned why some children and adolescents are more resilient than others in the face of adversity and have identified several protective factors. The present paper focuses on one of these variables, namely, support from caring adults in the community. We present a brief review of this component of the resiliency literature along with a discussion of some of the issues and challenges raised by the findings. It is suggested that the evidence is substantial enough and the possible rewards associated with exploiting these findings considerable enough to warrant mounting wide-scale community-based efforts to assist vulnerable youth.

URL:

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11504142

TOWARDS SOCIAL RESILIENCE

Abel, T. (2007).

Cultural Capital in Health Promotion. In D. V. Mc Queen & I. Kickbusch (Eds.), Health and Modernity. The Role of Theory in Health Promotion: Springer Verlag.

Bartley, M., Schoon, I., Mitchell, R., & Blane, D. (2006).

Resilience as an asset for healthy development. In E. Ziglio & M. Morgan (Eds.), Health Assets and the social determinants of health. Venice: WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development.

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/capabilityandresilience/resilienceasanassetforhealthydevelopment.doc>

Bourdieu, P. (1984).

Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986).

The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Giddens, A. (1979).

Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1984).

Elements of the theory of structuration. In A. Giddens (Ed.), The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harpham, T., Grant, E., & Thomas, E. (2002).

Measuring social capital within health surveys: key issues. *Health Policy and Planning*, 17(1), 106-111.

Abstract: With growing recognition of the social determinants of health, social capital is an increasingly important concept in international health research. Although there is relatively little experience of measuring social capital, particularly in developing countries, there are now a number of studies that allow the identification of some key issues that need to be considered when measuring social capital. After summarizing definitions and the rise of interest in the link between social capital and health, measures used in key studies of social capital and health are presented. Some important issues are then considered: obtaining a sufficiently comprehensive measure which empirically captures the latest theoretical developments in the field (particularly the

concepts of cognitive, structural, bonding and bridging social capital); moving from the individual to the ecological level; consideration of confounding factors, and validity and reliability.

URL:

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11861592

Jenkins, R. (1992).

Pierre Bourdieu. London: Routledge.

Obrist, B., Iteba, N., Lengeler, C., Makemba, A., Mshana, C., Nathan, R., et al. (2007).

Access to health care in contexts of livelihood insecurity: a framework for analysis and action. *PLoS Med*, 4(10), 1584-1588.

URL:

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17958467

Popitz, H. (1992).

Das Konzept der Macht. In H. Popitz (Ed.), *Phänomene der Macht* pp. 11-39). Tübingen: Mohr.

Rapport, N., & Overing, J. (2007).

Agency. In N. Rapport & J. Overing (Eds.), *Social and Cultural Anthropology. The Key Concepts*. pp. 3-11). London: Routledge.

Rapport, N., & Overing, J. (2007).

Power. In N. Rapport & J. Overing (Eds.), *Social and Cultural Anthropology. The Key Concepts*. pp. 337-345). London: Routledge.

Scott, W. R. (2008).

Lords of the Dance: Professionals as Institutional Agents. *Organization Studies*, 29, 219-238.

Silva, E., & Edwards, R. (2003).

Operationalizing Bourdieu on Capitals: A Discussion on "The Construction of the Object". Economic and Social Research Council Research Methods Programme, Working Paper 7.

LIVELIHOODS APPROACH

Chambers, R. (1995).

Poverty and livelihoods: whose reality counts? *Environment and Urbanization*, 7 (1), 173-204.

Abstract: This paper explores how professionals' universal, reductionist and standardized views of poverty differ from those of the poor themselves. Poverty line thinking concerned with income-poverty and employment thinking concerned with jobs, project Northern concerns on the South, where the realities of the poor are local, diverse, often complex and dynamic. Examples illustrate how poor people's criteria differ from those assumed for them by professionals. The paper also discusses neglected dimensions of deprivation including vulnerability, seasonality, powerlessness and humiliation. In the new understandings of poverty, wealth as an objective is replaced by wellbeing and "employment" in jobs by livelihood. The final sections argue for altruism and reversals to enable poor people to analyze and articulate their own needs, and they conclude with the implications for policy and practice of putting first the priorities of the poor.

URL: http://www.archidev.org/article.php3?id_article=333

Chambers, R., & Conway, R. G. (1991).

Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century. IDS Discussion paper 296.

DFID. (2000).

Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets. Section 4 (4.8-4.13): Methods (Vulnerability context, Livelihoods assets, PIP, Livelihoods strategies and outcomes). London: DFID.

URL: http://www.livelihoods.org/info/info_guidancesheets.html

Geiselhart, K., Gwebu, T., & Krüger, F. (2008).

Children, adolescents, and the HIV and AIDS Pandemic: Changing Inter-Generational Relationships and Intra-Family Communication Patterns. *Children Youth & environments (Special Edition: Children and disasters)*, 18(1), 99-125.

URL:

http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/18_1/18_1_04_HIV_AIDSPandemic.pdf

Glavovic, B., Scheyvens, R., & Overton, J. (2002).

Waves of adversity, layers of resilience. Exploring the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. 3rd Biennial Conference of the International Development Studies Network of Aotearoa, NZ, 5-7 Dec. 2002. Aotearoa, NZ.

URL:

http://www.devnet.org.nz/conf2002/papers/Glavovic_Overton_Scheyvens.pdf

Hussein, K. (2002).

Livelihoods Approaches Compared: A Multi-Agency Review of Current Practice. (p. 59). London: DFID/ODI Publication.

Abstract: This paper was commissioned by DFID's Sustainable Livelihoods Support Office (SLSO) to update the brief paper drafted by Carney et al. in 1999 comparing the use of Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches (SLA) across four development agencies and to accompany a further paper by Carney charting progress in SLA and possibilities for change. This paper aims to build on the 1999 paper, exploring the use of SLA in a broader range of organisations and highlighting issues emerging from experience in new areas.

URL: http://www.livelihoods.org/static/khusein_NN165.html

Krüger, F. (2003).

Handlungsorientierte Entwicklungsforschung: Trends, Perspektiven, Defizite. *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen*, 147 (1), 6-15.

Abstract: Verwundbarkeit ist seit einigen Jahren ein Schlüsselbegriff handlungsbezogener Ansätze der geographischen Entwicklungsforschung. Vulnerabilitätskonzepte sind vor allem von Organisationen der Entwicklungspraxis sukzessive zu so genannten Livelihood-Modellen ausgebaut worden. Der Beitrag zeichnet diese Konzeptionen nach und erweitert sie um einige theoretische Vorstellungen zu Institutionen und Risikohandeln, die derzeit Eingang in die Entwicklungsforschung finden.

Russel, S. (2005).

Illuminating cases: understanding the economic burden of illness through case study household research. *Health Policy and Planning*, 20(5), 277-289.

URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16000367>

VULNERABILITY

Adger, N. W. (2006).

Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 268-281.

Abstract: This paper reviews research traditions of vulnerability to environmental change and the challenges for present vulnerability research in integrating with the domains of resilience and adaptation. Vulnerability is the state of susceptibility to harm from exposure to stresses associated with environmental and social change and from the absence of capacity to adapt. Antecedent traditions include theories of vulnerability as entitlement failure and theories of hazard. Each of these areas has contributed to present formulations of vulnerability to environmental change as a characteristic of social-ecological systems linked to resilience. Research on vulnerability to the impacts of climate change spans all the antecedent and successor traditions. The challenges for vulnerability research are to develop robust and credible measures, to incorporate diverse methods that include perceptions of risk and vulnerability, and to incorporate governance research on the mechanisms that mediate vulnerability and promote adaptive action and resilience. These challenges are common to the domains of vulnerability, adaptation and resilience and form common ground for consilience and integration.

URL:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TOC%236020%232006%23999839996%23628651%23FLA%23&_cdi=6020&_pubType=J&_auth=y&_acct=C000049002&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=946149&md5=aa6cad207a74de264491ab460bee080a

Chambers, R. (1989).

Editorial Introduction: Vulnerability, Coping and Policy. *IDS Bulletin*, 20 (2), 1-7.

URL:

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/121649877/abstract?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0>

Delor, F., & Hubert, M. (2000).

Revisiting the concept of 'vulnerability'. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50(11), 1557-1570.

Abstract: The terms 'vulnerable' and 'vulnerability' are used more and more frequently in the areas of both social science research into and prevention of HIV/AIDS, but certain difficulties arise when it comes to applying this concept to actual situations at the heart of which individuals or groups are more exposed to HIV. The concept of vulnerability must thus be clarified to reinforce its heuristic capacity and political and practical relevancy. The first part of this paper is devoted to presenting a heuristic matrix of vulnerability, used in

previous research among people living with HIV/AIDS (PWHAs) and to extracting three levels of intelligibility, that is to say, first the social trajectory level, then the level on which two or more trajectories intersect, and finally that of the social context. Each of the elements belonging to these three levels must be described both objectively and subjectively. The identity construction processes are then proposed as particular observation and 'gelling' points for these various levels taken as a whole. In the second part of the paper, we have reviewed how the concept of 'vulnerability' has been defined and used in other fields, notably disaster, famine, and mental health, paying special attention to the crucial points in the debates that are raging in these fields. We have also shed light on a few concepts that are frequently associated with vulnerability, such as victimization, insecurity, and risk. In the third part, we have summarized our approach to vulnerability as a relevant concept for elucidating risk-taking processes and designing intervention programmes. The importance of analysing the inter-individual differences, the variability in time and the relational dimension of all social vulnerability has been stressed

URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10795963>

Gassel-Gintz, M. (2006).

Overview of different Vulnerability Approaches and Definitions. IP 1 Conceptual framework and methodologies for research on syndrome mitigation. Working Paper 5. Bern.

URL: <http://www.nccr-north-south.unibe.ch/document/document.asp?ID=3819&Context=NCCR&refTitle=the+NCCR+North-South&subcon=Pub&SearchText=cassel-gintz&SearchCategory=%25&submit=Search!>

Heijmans, A. (2001).

'Vulnerability': A Matter of Perception. Benfield Hazard Research Centre, Department of Earth Sciences, University College London.

Abstract: Disaster response agencies increasingly use the concept of 'vulnerability' to analyze processes and conditions that lead to disasters, and to identify disaster responses. Because no common definition of 'vulnerability' exists, agencies use the concept in the way that best fits their usual practice. Ironically, 'vulnerability' is not a concept that grassroots communities use. They approach recurrent 'adverse events' as part of 'normal life', while rare or new disasters are dealt with from a perspective of survival. People take risk-related decisions from a range of alternatives based on local knowledge, past experience, experiments, opportunities and existing coping mechanisms. While outsiders might label two households as equally vulnerable - because they live in apparent similar conditions - the two households might still perceive risk differently and, as a consequence, prefer different risk reduction measures. The degree of perceived risk varies greatly among households and depends on

class, gender, location, and other particular conditions shaped by economic, social and political processes. Communities at risk would benefit from a framework that links poverty, disaster risk reduction and development efforts. People's participation is essential and should be empowering to address the root causes of their vulnerability.

URL:

http://www.abuhrc.org/Pages/index.aspxdisaster_studies/working_papers/pdfs/workingpaper4.pdf

Luers, A. L. (2005).

The surface of vulnerability: An analytical framework for examining environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, 15(3), 214-223.

Abstract: This paper introduces an analytical framework for evaluating the vulnerability of people and places to environmental and social forces. The framework represents the relative vulnerability of a variable of concern (e.g. such as agricultural yield) to a set of disturbing forces (e.g. climate change, market fluctuations) by a position on a three-dimensional analytical surface, where vulnerability is defined as a function of sensitivity, exposure, and the state relative to a threshold of damage. The surface is presented as a tool to help identify relative vulnerability in order to prioritize actions and assess the vulnerability implications of management and policy decisions.

URL:

<http://www.cababstractsplus.org/google/abstract.asp?AcNo=20053169211>

Obrist, B., & Tanner, M. (2002).

Risk and Vulnerability-Some Conceptual Considerations. NCCR Integrated Training Course. Äschried, Switzerland.

Pelling, M. (2003).

The Vulnerability of Cities. Natural Disasters and Social Resilience. London: Earthscan.

Villagran De Leon, J. C. (2006).

Vulnerability. A Conceptual and Methodological Review. SOURCE (Studies of the University: Research, Counsel, Education). Bonn: UNU-EHS.

URL: <http://www.ehs.unu.edu/file.php?id=191>