

## THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO URBAN RESILIENCE

Daniela ANTONESCU\*<sub>1</sub>  
Ioana Cristina FLORESCU\*<sub>2</sub>

**Abstract:** *This paper investigates the concept of resilience through its social, ecological, economic, and institutional dimensions. It explores key factors such as social cohesion, social capital, and community infrastructure in enhancing social resilience. The analysis extends to ecological resilience, focusing on biodiversity, habitat complexity, and the functional roles ecosystems play in responding to disturbances. Economic resilience is discussed in terms of the capacity of regional economies to recover and maintain stability in the face of external shocks, while institutional resilience examines how governance structures adapt and implement effective responses to ongoing challenges. The paper further evaluates methods for assessing resilience, including the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) and its application in identifying vulnerable populations and areas. In doing so, it highlights strategies for strengthening resilience across these dimensions, such as fostering robust social networks, improving infrastructure, ensuring responsive governance, and promoting ecological conservation. The findings underline the importance of an integrated, multi-dimensional approach to resilience in both human and ecological systems.*

**Keywords:** *ecological resilience, social resilience, economic resilience, institutional resilience, SOVI index.*

**JEL Code:** *D85, O18, R58.*

**UDC:** *[005.591+005.35]:351(1-21)*

### Introduction

Resilience is a concept widely employed across various disciplines, encompassing ecological sciences, social sciences, and development studies. Broadly defined, resilience refers to a system's ability to absorb disturbances while maintaining its core functions and structures (Walker et al., 2006). Initially rooted in ecological studies (Holling, 1973), the concept has been progressively integrated into fields such as resource management, engineering, urban planning, and disaster studies, contributing to a growing body of theoretical and empirical research.

In contemporary discourse, resilience has become a fundamental notion in development policies and strategic frameworks. Institutions like the World Bank have integrated resilience into urban and institutional governance, emphasizing its role in mitigating risks associated with climate change, economic shocks, and social instability. Despite its widespread use, the concept remains subject to multiple interpretations, often lacking a precise operational

---

<sup>1\*</sup> Daniela Antonescu, Scientific researcher II, Institute of National Economy – Romanian Academy, [daniela.antonescu25@gmail.com](mailto:daniela.antonescu25@gmail.com), ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3758-9022>

<sup>2\*</sup> Ioana Cristina Florescu, Junior scientific researcher, Institute of National Economy – Romanian Academy, [ioanaflorescu2001@yahoo.com](mailto:ioanaflorescu2001@yahoo.com), ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2582-4140>

definition (Cornwall, 2007). This theoretical ambiguity underscores the necessity of a comprehensive exploration of resilience as a theoretical construct, assessing its evolution, conceptual frameworks, and implications for contemporary development strategies.

The purpose of this article is to provide a critical review of resilience as a theoretical paradigm, analyzing its conceptual foundations, interdisciplinary applications, and methodological considerations. The study aims to clarify key dimensions of resilience by synthesizing existing literature, evaluating theoretical models, and discussing implications for policy and practice. Unlike empirical studies focusing on specific regions or case studies, this article adopts a theoretical perspective, emphasizing the intellectual trajectory of resilience research.

Following this introduction, the first section synthesizes key findings from the scientific literature, examining theoretical advancements and their implications for resilience-oriented strategies, the second section presents a critical review of qualitative studies addressing the four types that the territorial resilience covers. The third section explores methodological approaches used to assess resilience. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the main insights and suggests potential directions for future research in resilience theory.

By providing a structured examination of resilience as a theoretical construct, this article seeks to contribute to the ongoing academic discourse, offering a nuanced understanding of its significance and potential applications in various fields of study.

## Literature Review

In line with the multidimensional nature of territorial resilience, the following section explores the four key domains most frequently discussed in the literature: ecological, institutional, social, and economic resilience. These dimensions represent interrelated yet distinct theoretical perspectives through which resilience has been conceptualized and applied across disciplines. The analysis presented here is based solely on theoretical contributions and qualitative academic literature, without the inclusion of empirical case studies or indicator-based assessments. This approach aims to provide a comprehensive synthesis of how resilience is conceptually structured, highlighting the main thematic directions, overlaps and critical perspectives that underpin current academic discourse and policy debates.

The concept of territorial resilience implies a multidimensional approach, encompassing ecological, social, economic, and institutional aspects, which is why it is necessary to present these aspects.

Ecological resilience is often defined as the capacity of an ecosystem to absorb disturbances and still maintain its fundamental structure and functions (Folke et al., 2004). In urban contexts, ecological resilience focuses on enhancing the city's ability to withstand environmental shocks, such as floods or heatwaves, through green infrastructure and sustainable urban planning (Beilin & Wilkinson, 2015). The adoption of green spaces, permeable pavements,

and water retention systems has been central to many cities' strategies for ecological resilience (Revi et al., 2014). Several cities, including Rotterdam, Copenhagen, and Vienna, have been pioneers in implementing such measures as part of their climate adaptation strategies. Nevertheless, recent critiques argue that such approaches often remain technocratic and fail to consider questions of equity and environmental justice, particularly regarding access to ecological benefits across socio-economic groups (Anguelovski et al., 2016).

Institutional resilience refers to the ability of institutions, particularly government structures, to function effectively during crises and to recover quickly (Krlev, 2023). Research has shown that the adaptability of institutions plays a crucial role in how communities withstand and recover from both natural and economic disasters (Holling, 1973). Strong governance, the ability to implement policies effectively, and public trust are key factors in fostering institutional resilience. Examples of successful institutional resilience include the rapid responses of Scandinavian countries to natural disasters and economic recessions (Giacometti et al., 2018). However, such models may not be easily replicable in other contexts, as they are deeply rooted in political culture, civic engagement, and stable institutional environments. Moreover, excessive emphasis on formal efficiency can obscure the roles of informal institutions and local networks that often mediate resilience on the ground (Meerow et al., 2016).

Social resilience involves the capacity of communities to cope with adversity, including social and economic challenges. It emphasizes the role of social networks, community cohesion, and the equitable distribution of resources in responding to crises (Adger, 2000). Research by Rydin et al. (2012) and Cohen et al. (2017) highlights how fostering community engagement, ensuring access to essential services, and reducing social inequalities are vital strategies for enhancing social resilience. Successful examples include the integration of social welfare programs and community-based disaster response systems. However, critiques from critical geography and urban studies (MacKinnon & Derickson, 2013) highlight that resilience, if uncritically adopted, can reinforce existing inequalities by placing responsibility for adaptation on vulnerable populations rather than addressing structural causes of vulnerability.

Economic resilience is defined as the ability of an economy to recover from external shocks, such as financial crises or global disruptions. A resilient economy is one that can adapt to changing conditions, maintain sustainable growth, and reduce vulnerability (Martin et al., 2016). The diversification of industries, the flexibility of labor markets, and the support of SMEs have been identified as key factors in achieving economic resilience (Hussen saad et al., 2021). Cities like Lisbon and Barcelona have been successful in their economic recovery strategies, which include fostering entrepreneurship and innovation to diversify their economic base (Gómez-Baggethun & Barton, 2013). Nonetheless, scholars argue that market-based approaches to resilience may overlook marginalized economic actors and prioritize recovery over transformation, potentially exacerbating inequality (Bristow & Healy, 2014).

Theoretical contributions by Adger (2000) and Folke et al. (2004) emphasize the adaptive capacity of systems and highlight the need to consider feedback mechanisms and multi-scalar

interactions. Nonetheless, the integration of these domains remains a theoretical ambition rather than a consistent practice in urban planning or governance (Meerow et al., 2016). As such, the literature reveals a gap between theoretical aspirations and practical implementation, underscoring the necessity for frameworks that bridge the conceptual richness of resilience with tools applicable to specific urban and territorial contexts.

## Data and Methodology

This article adopts a theoretical and conceptual methodology, grounded in an extensive review of the scientific literature. No statistical or empirical data analysis has been employed. Instead, the research follows a qualitative and interpretative approach, aiming to synthesize, compare, and critically examine key contributions on territorial resilience, as articulated in ecological, institutional, social, and economic domains.

The rationale for selecting these four dimensions derives from their consistent presence across interdisciplinary studies of resilience, and from their relevance in shaping how territories respond to complex and overlapping crises. The methodology does not rely on a codified protocol for systematic review, as the focus is not on quantifying evidence but on constructing a robust conceptual framework that can inform further theoretical development.

The review process involved three analytical stages. First, key theoretical frameworks were identified and examined, focusing on how resilience is defined and operationalized in each of the four domains. Second, the literature was analyzed for its treatment of integrative approaches - exploring whether and how the four dimensions interact or are addressed collectively. Third, the limitations and critiques of current resilience frameworks were examined, particularly with regard to their normative assumptions and their applicability in urban or regional governance contexts.

This approach is grounded exclusively in secondary sources - peer-reviewed articles, theoretical essays, and academic reports - and does not attempt to extract policy recommendations from empirical data. Instead, it offers a structured, multidimensional conceptualization of territorial resilience that may serve as a foundation for future empirical or comparative studies.

### *The methods of quantifying the resilience factors*

Given the theoretical nature of this study, the following section elaborates on the key indicators and methodologies used to assess the four types of territorial resilience - ecological, institutional, social, and economic - as well as the Scale of Vulnerability and Resilience Index (SOVI). These theoretical tools are explored in order to understand their role in evaluating territorial resilience across different regions like in the European Union and Romania.

#### *1. Ecological resilience: theoretical perspectives, indicators, and assessment approaches*

In the broader landscape of territorial resilience, ecological resilience is defined as the capacity of ecosystems to absorb disturbances and reorganize while maintaining essential

structures, functions, and feedback mechanisms (Folke et al., 2004). It has become increasingly relevant in the context of global environmental crises, urbanization, and unsustainable resource exploitation. The purpose of this section is to present the main theoretical contributions to the study of ecological resilience, to identify the core factors emphasized in academic discourse, and to review the conceptual methodologies and indicators proposed for its assessment. Through this analytical overview, the aim is to clarify both the scientific relevance and the methodological limits of this resilience dimension within territorial systems.

Firstly, biological diversity plays a crucial role in ecological resilience, as it has been demonstrated that ecosystems with higher biodiversity are more capable of withstanding disturbances and recovering quickly. Studies such as those conducted by Folke et al. (2004) have shown that increased species diversity helps maintain ecosystem stability and attenuate the impact of disturbances, a viewpoint supported by other researchers (Hooper et al., 2005; Fischer et al., 2006). For instance, coral reefs and tropical forests are ecosystems with high biodiversity, which allows them to recover rapidly after external disturbances.

Another critical factor is the trophic structure, which profoundly influences the stability and recovery of ecosystems. This refers to the relationships between species within food chains and their complexity. O'Leary et al. (2017) highlight those systems with more trophic levels, such as marine ecosystems, are more resilient to disturbances like overfishing due to their complex trophic networks and interspecific relationships. Therefore, a marine ecosystem with a diversified trophic structure will have a greater capacity to resist and recover after a disturbance.

Habitat complexity also plays a pivotal role in ecological resilience by providing refuges and alternative resources for species affected by disturbances. Brookes et al. (2005) emphasize that larger habitat dimensions allow organisms to coexist on a broader scale, leading to increased resource usage pathways (St. Pierre & Kovalenko, 2014). At the scale of a patch, habitat complexity can increase species diversity beyond the effects of size, underscoring the physical habitat's importance in a variety of systems and its independent effects on surface area, habitat, or zone (Kovalenko et al., 2012; Matias et al., 2010). For example, complex wetlands such as mangroves and coral reefs provide a diversified habitat that supports a wide variety of species.

Ecological functions, such as nutrient cycling, pollination, and organic matter decomposition, are essential for maintaining resilience. Disturbances that affect these functions can significantly impact an ecosystem's ability to recover. Areas with high habitat complexity can play a crucial role in nutrient processing due to turbulence resizing (Commito & Rusignuolo, 2000; Madsen et al., 2001), reduced flow rates (Atilla et al., 2005), and/or extended reactive surface areas, leading to increased microorganism numbers and, over time, higher rates of sedimentation and nutrient retention.

The evaluation of ecological resilience involves measuring and monitoring various components of an ecosystem to determine its capacity to withstand and recover from disturbances. This can be done using specific ecological resilience indicators, such as metrics

of species diversity, habitat health, ecological functions, and structural stability (Dakos & Kéfi, 2022). For example, indicators such as species richness, abundance of key species, and recovery rates after disturbances are used to assess ecosystem resilience. Additionally, certain methods are used for this assessment, such as:

- Temporal analysis: long-term monitoring of ecosystems to observe changes in diversity and functioning over time (Fath et al., 2003; Mayer et al., 2006; Kéfi et al., 2014; Sundstrom et al., 2016).
- Ecological modeling: the use of mathematical and computational models to simulate ecosystem responses to disturbances and assess their resilience (Dakos & Kéfi, 2022).
- Controlled disturbance experiments: conducting controlled experiments to observe ecosystem responses to different types of disturbances (Boettiger et al., 2013; Kéfi et al., 2014).

Ecological resilience literature also explores strategies to enhance resilience, particularly through nature-based solutions, sustainable resource management, and habitat conservation. For instance, reforestation and coral reef restoration are repeatedly mentioned as effective approaches to reinforce ecological feedback loops (Hughes et al., 2003). Furthermore, efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (IPCC, 2023), mitigate land degradation, and integrate organic land-use practices are seen as foundational for maintaining ecosystem balance.

However, as noted by Dias (2023), biodiversity loss continues to accelerate due to intensive agriculture, overexploitation, and pollution - creating a widening gap between theoretical models and practical implementation. While ecological resilience is often framed as a desirable goal in policy discourse, scholars such as Vale (2014) and Cretney (2014) have raised critical questions about its normative implications: resilience for whom, to what, and at what cost?

Sustainable management of natural resources involves practical use of resources in a way that does not compromise ecosystems' capacity to recover and adapt to changes. For instance, sustainable fishing and responsible forest management help maintain ecological functions and protect biodiversity. Implementing sustainable land management practices, such as agroforestry, reforestation, and conservation agriculture, can reduce carbon levels and mitigate emissions generated by land-use changes (Smith et al., 2019).

Reducing the impact of human activities is critical for ecological resilience. The primary driver of human-induced climate change is the emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs), particularly carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). These gases trap heat in Earth's atmosphere, leading to global warming and climate change (IPCC, 2023). Reducing the impact of human activities on the environment includes lowering greenhouse gas emissions, waste management, pollution prevention, and protecting critical habitats.

Nature-based solutions, such as green infrastructure, ecological restoration, and organic farming, can significantly contribute to ecological resilience (Smith et al., 2019). These solutions harness natural processes to address environmental issues and improve ecosystems' capacity to adapt to changes.

Ecological indicators include biodiversity, which measures species diversity and ecosystem health (Folke et al., 2004), environmental quality, including air, water, and soil quality indicators (Folke et al., 2004), and natural resources, which measure the availability and management of resources like water, forests, and agricultural land (Adger, 2000). Examples include agriculture, forestry, and fishing as a percentage of GDP.

Despite its conceptual maturity, the ecological resilience remains challenging to operationalize, especially in urban contexts. Urban ecosystems are characterized by fragmented green areas, high anthropogenic pressure, and uneven institutional capacities to implement ecological strategies. In many Eastern European cities, for example, resilience strategies are still constrained by weak intersectoral coordination and limited ecological data (Toto et al., 2023, Bănică et al., 2020).

Moreover, the integration of ecological indicators into urban planning processes is inconsistent, with local governments often lacking the tools to measure resilience beyond environmental compliance. Thus, Sandu, Bănică & Muntele (2021) and Sandu (2021) reveal a persistent gap between theoretical ambitions and practical implementation, especially in socio-institutionally diverse regions like Central and Eastern Europe.

## *2. Social Resilience: theoretical perspectives, evaluation methods and strategic approaches*

Building on the theoretical foundations outlined in the literature review, this section explores how social resilience is conceptualized and operationalized in territorial and urban contexts. The focus shifts from definitional aspects to a critical analysis of the mechanisms through which communities build adaptive capacity in response to disruptions.

Social resilience is not a fixed attribute but a dynamic, evolving process embedded in the structures, relationships, and institutions of a society. It is strongly influenced by social cohesion, which refers to the degree of trust, solidarity, and civic engagement within a community.

Studies have shown that social trust and civic participation are essential for social resilience (Putnam, 2000). Therefore, the socio-cultural norms underlying community support and cohesion can foster resilience over time, both by encouraging the development of social capital and acting as a buffer against potential losses generated by conflicts, as communities go through periods of deficit (Carmen et al., 2022).

Social capital, which includes networks, norms, and values that facilitate collective action and cooperation within a community, has been widely used to understand interventions aimed at enhancing adaptation capacities and resilience. These include those directly related to climate change and community-level concerns, such as natural hazards (Babicky & Seebauer, 2016) and, more generally, supporting health outcomes (Cattell, 2001), strengthening economic development (Flora et al., 1997), and increasing participation in collective decision-making (Cleaver, 2005). Social capital has also often been viewed as a core concept for community resilience (Adger, 2000; Berkes & Ross, 2012). A strong social capital can contribute to social resilience by mobilizing resources and support during crises (Coleman, 1988).

Community infrastructure, such as health centers, schools, and volunteer organizations, plays a crucial role in social resilience. These institutions provide the necessary support and resources to cope with disruptions and facilitate recovery. For example, improving community resilience requires approaches that go well beyond technical or infrastructural interventions to consider various social and psychological factors. In emergency management, quality infrastructure (e.g., roads and housing) is important for access to vital services (e.g., food and healthcare) (Javadpoor et al., 2021). In other fields, such as rural development and urban studies, income levels and diverse institutions that mediate interests and access to resources and opportunities are important in shaping coping abilities and adapting to long-term constraints (Tajuddin & Browski, 2021; Pandey et al., 2021). For example, social support networks and community centers are essential during crises (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015).

Social policies and government programs that support education, health, employment, and social protection contribute significantly to social resilience. For example, social insurance systems and support programs for low incomes can help buffer the impact of economic crises (Moser, 1998). It has been found that decisions made at higher levels of government influence local decisions and practices that reduce social capital and resilience (Luthe & Wyss, 2015). This loss of community resilience has occurred through ideological shifts in national political processes, for instance, through market-based approaches that increase competition among local producers (favoring individualism over cooperation) or through technical solutions rather than holistic ones (Sinclair et al., 2014; Guillotreau et al., 2017). For community resilience, the role of social capital can be inadvertently eroded through government-driven change programs.

The assessment of social resilience involves measuring and analyzing the capacity of communities to resist and recover from disruptions. Methods used in the assessment include resilience social indicators and surveys, case studies, etc. Key indicators include social cohesion levels, measured through social trust, civic participation, and community solidarity (Slavova & Simpson, 2023), social capital, evaluated through network density, norms of reciprocity, and involvement in community organizations (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015), access to social services, measured by the availability and accessibility of healthcare, education, and social assistance services (UN Habitat, 2020), and social support policies, evaluated by the existence and effectiveness of government social protection programs (Velasco & Domínguez, 2022).

Social surveys collect data to measure social trust, cohesion, and social capital, while social network analysis studies the structure and density of social networks to understand connections and mutual support in the community. Case studies analyze community responses to specific disruptions to identify success factors and lessons learned. The assessment of social resilience in cities affected by natural disasters, such as New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, highlighted the importance of social cohesion and social capital in community recovery (Rodriguez, Quarantelli & Dynes, 2007).

To enhance social resilience, certain strategies can be applied to strengthen social cohesion, develop social capital, improve community infrastructure, and implement

appropriate social policies. Strengthening social cohesion can be achieved by promoting trust and solidarity within the community. Volunteering activities, community events, and civic engagement initiatives can help build social relationships. For example, community development programs and intercultural dialogue initiatives can strengthen social cohesion (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). A higher level of social resilience leads to more heterogeneous societies (Marshall & Smaigl, 2013). Conversely, a deterioration in this element anticipates a reduction in social resilience (Markolf et al., 2018). Policies that contribute to the development of a large middle class and the reduction of social inequalities enhance social resilience. As mentioned, anything that helps build social cohesion has the potential to improve a community's resilience (Bunch et al., 2011). Based on this relationship, promoting social cohesion is a key element for social resilience (Patel & Gleason, 2018).

Developing social capital involves supporting social networks and community organizations. Creating spaces and opportunities for social interaction and cooperation can contribute to the growth of social capital. Pfefferbaum et al. (2017), Karunaratne & Lee (2019), Rustinsyah et al. (2021) have also confirmed the positive relationship between social capital and community resilience through both theoretical and empirical research. For example, mentorship programs and public-private partnerships can help build social capital (Putnam, 2000).

Improving community infrastructure, such as health centers, schools, and public spaces, is essential for social resilience. Investments in community infrastructure can facilitate access to services and create support points during crises. For instance, developing multifunctional community centers can provide support in various areas, from health to education (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015). It would be how a community or society responds, as a whole, to the difficulties, disturbances, and tensions it faces, but as a group (Bolzan & Gale, 2018; Moberg & Galaz, 2005; Carpenter & Brock, 2008). Through the development of this infrastructure, communities, societies, and not just individuals, would be the ones to provide responses to shocks. Thus, in addition to facing these disturbances, societies could transform the processes of change imposed by difficulties into opportunities while maintaining their original essence (Adger, 2000).

Implementing appropriate social policies includes programs for social protection, assistance for low incomes, and support for employment. Policies that support equity and social inclusion can contribute to the resilience of vulnerable communities. Family support within the members of a society, which specifically fosters social and community inclusion, is one of the most important drivers of social resilience (Liebenberg & Moore, 2018). Various studies have highlighted the value of social support, and above all, family support for overcoming general tension situations (Onyedibe et al., 2018), especially in medical emergencies (Kong et al., 2018). The importance of this factor is emphasized both for youth (Omar, 2011; Van der Wal & George, 2018) and the elderly (Chang & Yarnal, 2018). This family support leads to improved social resilience by generating what are called "personal support networks" in society (Oh & Jun, 2018; Distelberg & Taylor, 2015). Policies supporting low-income families and professional training programs can help reduce social vulnerability (Moser, 1998).

Vulnerability analysis is essential for understanding risks and managing them in various contexts. One of the recognized methods for measuring social vulnerability is the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI). This index provides a quantifiable approach to assess the susceptibility of communities to various hazards, thus helping to implement risk reduction measures and enhance resilience.

Vulnerability, in the context of risk analysis, refers to the degree to which a system, community, or region is predisposed and incapable of coping with the negative effects of a hazard. It is influenced by three main factors:

- Exposure: The degree to which a system is exposed to hazards;
- Sensitivity: The degree to which a system is affected by exposure to hazards;
- Adaptive Capacity: The ability to adapt and recover from negative impacts.

For example, a community located in an active seismic zone has high vulnerability to earthquakes, especially if its infrastructure is not designed to withstand such events. Similarly, an agricultural community in a drought-prone region is vulnerable due to dependence on rainfall and limited irrigation capacity (Turner et al., 2003).

The assessment of social resilience involves a range of tools and indicators designed to measure how communities resist and recover from disruptions. These include sociological surveys, case studies, and social network analysis. Indicators commonly examined include levels of civic participation, trust in local authorities, density of social ties, access to basic services, and the presence of effective social policies. The Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI), developed by Cutter et al. (2003), remains a widely used tool in this field. It aggregates socio-demographic variables - such as income, education, age, and health status - into a composite index that reveals patterns of vulnerability and adaptive capacity across territorial units.

While analytical tools offer structured ways to quantify resilience, the scientific literature also points to persistent challenges. One critical debate concerns the tension between top-down policy approaches and community-led responses. Although state-level programs provide systemic protection, they may undermine local cohesion and erode social capital when imposed without participatory frameworks. A study by Almazán-Casali et al. (2021) illustrate how technocratic or market-driven reforms have sometimes displaced informal support systems and generated fragmentation in local governance.

This issue is particularly salient in Central and Eastern Europe, where cities continue to face difficulties in consolidating social resilience. Factors such as emigration (Muntele & Horea-Șerban, 2021), demographic aging, fragmented service provision, and institutional distrust limit the potential for sustained recovery and adaptation (Bănică et al., 2020). Another danger that leads to socio-economic gaps is the cultural lag (Șerbu, 2016). All of these situations underscore the need for context-sensitive resilience strategies that reflect regional socio-political and economic particularities.

Strengthening social resilience requires coordinated efforts across community, institutional, and policy levels. Investments in community infrastructure must be

complemented by policies that foster social inclusion, encourage civic engagement, and support the development of resilient social networks. Ultimately, a resilient society is not only one that withstands shocks but also one that adapts, transforms, and thrives without losing its core values and cohesion.

### *3. Institutional resilience: dimensions, indicators, and assessment methods*

Institutional resilience plays a decisive role in supporting the capacity of urban and territorial systems to withstand and recover from disruptions. In contemporary governance, challenges such as overlapping crises, fragmented administrative structures, and reduced civic trust test the responsiveness and adaptability of institutions beyond their formal mandates.

Effective leadership is crucial for institutional resilience. Leaders and organizations often face challenges and crises that test the strength and flexibility of their systems and resources. Successfully leading an organization has always been more difficult during periods of rapid change, but the unique stress factors that organizations worldwide face today have sparked renewed interest in studying personal and organizational behaviors, with a focus on what constitutes effective and adaptable leadership. Interestingly, some leaders and organizations not only survive but also thrive in these situations, while others wobble or collapse under the stress of change. Boin and Hart (2003) analyzed the factors underlying these differences. Transformational business models have recently focused on the importance of resilience in both leadership and organizational success. Leaders who can make swift and well-informed decisions in crisis situations help maintain institutional stability. Studies have shown that leaders who foster a culture of preparedness and adaptability contribute significantly to organizational resilience (Boin & Hart, 2003).

A solid organizational infrastructure, which includes well-defined processes, adequate resources, and advanced technology, contributes to an institution's ability to handle crises. Institutions with robust infrastructure can react more efficiently to disruptions and can resume normal activities more quickly (McEntire, 2011). Planning capacity is also key. Preemptive planning and emergency preparedness are essential for institutional resilience. Institutions with continuity plans and crisis response procedures can better manage disruptions. For instance, financial institutions that have crisis management plans are more resilient in the face of economic shocks (Özkan, 2011). Inter-institutional collaboration plays a significant role. Effective collaboration between different institutions and organizations can strengthen institutional resilience. Partnerships and support networks allow for better coordination of resources and crisis responses. For example, collaboration between government agencies and non-governmental organizations during natural disasters can enhance the efficiency of the response (Kapucu, 2006).

In Central and Eastern Europe, efforts to consolidate institutional resilience encounter specific barriers. These include the persistence of administrative inertia, inconsistent policy implementation, and a legacy of hierarchical governance that hampers horizontal cooperation. Even where strategic frameworks exist, limited civic participation and low

inter-agency interoperability often reduce their practical impact (Poljak Istenič & Kozina, 2019; Sandu et al., 2021).

Assessing institutional resilience involves measuring and analyzing the capacity of institutions to withstand and recover from disruptions. This is evaluated both through indicators that show the level of institutional resilience and through specific assessment methods. Key indicators include crisis response capacity, measured by response time and effectiveness in managing crises; operational stability, assessed by the continuity of essential activities during disruptions; adaptability, measured by the ability to implement changes and adapt to new conditions; and inter-institutional collaboration, evaluated by the level of cooperation and coordination with other institutions.

Despite increasing attention to institutional resilience, its assessment remains largely conceptual, with limited operational tools tailored to urban or territorial contexts. Methods for assessing resilience include institutional audits, which evaluate processes and crisis response capacity through internal and external audits; crisis simulation exercises, which test response capacity and coordination between institutions; and analysis of past crisis performance, studying institutional performance during previous crises to identify strengths and areas for improvement. The assessment of institutional resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the importance of preemptive planning and adaptability. Institutions that had continuity plans and could quickly adapt their processes managed the crisis more effectively (Moșteanu, 2024).

To enhance institutional resilience, strategies must improve leadership, strengthen organizational infrastructure, develop planning capacity, and promote inter-institutional collaboration. Improving leadership can be achieved through ongoing training and the development of crisis management skills. Leaders need to be able to make rapid, informed decisions and communicate effectively with employees and the public. Leadership development programs and crisis simulations can help improve leadership skills (Boin & Hart, 2003). Strengthening organizational infrastructure involves investments in technology, efficient processes, and adequate resources. Institutions need robust information management systems and well-defined procedures to handle crises. For instance, developing early warning systems and internal communication platforms can improve response capacity (McEntire, 2011).

Developing planning capacity includes creating and regularly updating continuity plans and crisis response procedures. Institutions should conduct crisis simulation exercises and periodically assess the effectiveness of their plans. For example, central banks and financial institutions that perform regular stress tests are better prepared for financial crises (Özkan, 2011). Promoting inter-institutional collaboration can be achieved by creating partnerships and support networks. Institutions must collaborate with other organizations, including governments, non-governmental agencies, and the private sector, to coordinate resources and crisis responses. For instance, public-private partnerships for disaster management can enhance response efficiency (Kapucu, 2006).

Governance capacity measures the efficiency and transparency of government institutions, public participation in decision-making, and the enforcement of laws and regulations (Brooks et al., 2005). Examples include the Government Effectiveness Index (ranging from -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong)) and Regulatory Quality (ranging from -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong)). Planning and policies include indicators related to the existence and implementation of adaptation and risk reduction policies (Brooks et al., 2005), such as the Corruption Index (ranging from -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong)). Inter-institutional collaboration measures the level of cooperation and coordination between different agencies and organizations involved in risk management and adaptation to climate change (Adger et al., 2005). Even though these methods of assessment do exist they provide only a general framework for assessing governance capacity, yet may fail to capture informal institutional dynamics or subnational variation, especially in post-socialist urban systems. A promising direction would include the use of qualitative institutional audits, combined with scenario-based stress tests and retrospective evaluations of past crisis responses. These can help map institutional resilience not only through static indicators but also by understanding how institutions adapt over time. A more grounded assessment of institutional resilience involves identifying measurable indicators that can be contextualized within urban governance. For instance, in Warsaw (Poland), the Municipal Crisis Management Plan includes specific benchmarks for response times, redundancy of critical infrastructure, and public communication systems tested biannually through simulation exercises. This allows for monitoring operational continuity and adaptability based on performance during drills and public feedback collection.

Similarly, in Cluj-Napoca (Romania), resilience indicators have been indirectly integrated into digital governance platforms. The city's participatory budgeting process and the establishment of an inter-agency urban development council have improved both civic engagement and inter-institutional coordination. Metrics such as the frequency of stakeholder consultations, the proportion of budget allocated to risk management, or the responsiveness of the e-governance portal can serve as proxies for institutional adaptability and openness.

In Budapest (Hungary), post-pandemic institutional evaluations involved structured interviews across departments and the review of public health contingency protocols. This qualitative assessment was linked to adjustments in administrative workflows and decision-making hierarchies, thus reinforcing institutional learning mechanisms - a key feature of long-term resilience.

These examples highlight that while universal metrics like the World Bank's Government Effectiveness Index or Corruption Control Index offer macro-level snapshots, local-level tools - such as emergency audit logs, simulation scores, and co-governance indicators - are better suited for capturing institutional resilience in urban contexts. Developing such hybrid evaluation frameworks, tailored to local governance realities, represents a promising direction for both academic research and public policy design.

#### 4. *Economic resilience factors, methods for quantifying and indicators*

Economic resilience is influenced by various factors, particularly in the context of global events such as the 2008 financial crisis, increased economic uncertainty, climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the economic consequences of the 2022 military conflict. These factors have significantly increased interest in analyzing economic resilience in the discourse surrounding economics and sustainable development. According to research and analyses in the literature, several key elements contribute to the economic resilience of a country or region.

Sectoral diversity helps to spread risks and minimize the impact of a shock in a specific sector. Economies with a broad industrial base are less vulnerable to disruptions. This plays a vital role in ensuring economic resilience as it reduces the likelihood of a recession in a sector that has a significant impact on the overall economy. Diversification can involve expanding and developing sectors such as agriculture, industry, services, technology, tourism, and others, in line with the country's or region's resources and comparative advantages. A report by the World Bank in 2019 highlighted the essential role of economic diversification in promoting economic resilience. According to Sekar et al. (2019), sectoral diversity can reduce the risk of exposure to fluctuations in a single sector and can enhance economic resilience by creating opportunities across multiple fields, thereby compensating for potential declines in other sectors. Furthermore, studies by Martin (2012) and Lange et al. (2019) showed that regions with diversified economies are more capable of withstanding economic shocks and recovering more quickly.

Financial infrastructure, represented by a robust and well-regulated financial system, is essential for economic resilience. Access to finance, liquidity, and the ability to manage financial risks contribute to economic stability. Claessens et al. (2018) argue that a solid and well-regulated financial system can contribute to economic resilience by stabilizing the economy during times of crisis. Claessens & Kose (2017) contend that financial institutions need to be well supervised and adhere to strict rules and regulations to avoid financial crises that can have negative effects on the economy. A report published by the European Central Bank (ECB) in 2016 emphasized that ensuring the stability of the financial system is crucial for strengthening economic resilience in the Eurozone, and that implementing appropriate policies and measures is necessary to prevent financial crises. Moreover, the 2008 financial crisis demonstrated the importance of financial infrastructure in maintaining economic resilience (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2009).

Government policies play a crucial role in promoting economic resilience. These include macroeconomic stabilization measures, fiscal and monetary policies, and social assistance programs that can cushion the impact of economic shocks on the population. According to a study by the World Bank (2020), strong governance and institutions can play a key role in strengthening economic resilience by promoting sound fiscal management, effective regulation, and fair competition in the private sector. Moreover, appropriate government policies and efficient regulation can support long-term economic development, contributing to the creation of a favorable environment for businesses and investments (Hallegatte et al., 2018).

For instance, Iceland's rapid response policy to the banking crisis in 2008 helped the country recover quickly (Jonung et. al. 2009).

Human capital, particularly education and workforce skills, significantly contributes to economic resilience. A well-educated and adaptable workforce can foster innovation and respond more effectively to economic changes. Investments in education and vocational training are essential for building resilient human capital (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2010). Furthermore, the health of the population plays a crucial role in economic resilience, as a healthy population is more capable of engaging in economic activities and coping with crises (World Bank, 2020).

Evaluating economic resilience involves measuring and analyzing the capacity of an economy to withstand and recover from disruptions. Similar to other forms of resilience, it is assessed using key indicators and specific evaluation methods. Key indicators include GDP growth rate, which measures overall economic performance and recovery capacity after shocks (Hallegatte, 2014), unemployment rate, which indicates labor market stability and the ability to maintain employment in the face of disruptions (Hallegatte, 2014), economic diversity, assessed through sectoral diversification indices (Hallegatte, 2014), and the health of the financial system, measured through banking stability, liquidity, and risk management capacity (Hallegatte, 2014). However, traditional indicators - such as GDP or unemployment - often fail to reflect subnational disparities or the capacity for long-term structural transformation. For example, if we take into consideration only the GDP of the Member States as indicator of territorial development we would see that this actually shows the increase in regional disparities as also shown by Aursulesei et al. (2020). In urban contexts, more granular indicators are increasingly used, such as SME survival rates, municipal fiscal buffers, or investment flows in innovation and green sectors. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, cities like Tallinn (Estonia) and Cluj-Napoca (Romania) tracked real-time employment shifts and adjusted local economic strategies based on dynamic labor market data. Similarly, the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) is employed in order to assess the sectoral concentration in city economies, allowing urban administrations to target diversification efforts more precisely.

The most used method of evaluating the economic resilience include time series analysis, which involves long-term monitoring of economic indicators to identify trends and fluctuations in the context of shocks; econometric models, which use statistical models to analyze relationships between economic variables and simulate the impact of disruptions; and comparative case studies, which compare the responses of different economies to similar disruptions to identify success factors and lessons learned. The evaluation of the economic resilience of European Union member states during the global financial crisis revealed significant differences in recovery capacity, highlighting the importance of fiscal policies and economic diversity (Alessi et al., 2020).

Strategies to enhance economic resilience require initiatives that diversify the economy, improve financial infrastructure, develop effective government policies, and invest in human

capital. Economic diversification reduces dependence on a single sector and distributes risks, promoting stability and recovery capacity. Diversification initiatives include the development of new industries and the promotion of innovation and entrepreneurship. For example, Dubai diversified its economy by developing the tourism and financial services sectors, reducing its dependence on oil (Mishrif & Kapetanovic, 2018).

Improving financial infrastructure involves developing a robust, regulated, and accessible banking system capable of providing financing and liquidity during crises. Measures such as strict regulations, banking supervision, and deposit insurance programs contribute to financial stability (Chronopoulos et al., 2023). Effective government policies include fiscal and monetary incentives, support programs for businesses, and social assistance for the population. For instance, the economic stimulus package adopted by the United States during the COVID-19 crisis included measures to support businesses and the population, helping stabilize the economy (CBO, 2020).

Investments in education and vocational training are essential for developing an adaptable and innovative workforce. Continuous training and retraining programs help the workforce respond more effectively to economic and technological changes (OECD, 2012).

In conclusion, the factors influencing economic resilience include sectoral diversity, financial infrastructure, government policies, and human capital. Evaluating economic resilience involves assessing key indicators and employing methods such as time series analysis, econometric models, and case studies. To enhance resilience, strategies should focus on economic diversification, strengthening financial infrastructure, implementing effective government policies, and investing in human capital.

## Conclusions

The analysis of the various factors that contribute to economic resilience underscores the complex interplay between sectoral diversity, financial stability, government policies, and human capital in shaping the capacity of economies to withstand and recover from crises. One of the most critical findings from this research is the significant role that **sectoral diversification** plays in enhancing resilience. Economies that rely on a wide range of industries and sectors are generally better equipped to absorb the impact of economic disruptions. When one sector experiences a downturn, others may continue to perform well, thereby cushioning the overall economy from the full force of the shock. This diversification acts as a safeguard, ensuring that the economy can maintain its structural integrity even when specific industries face challenges. The importance of sectoral diversity cannot be overstated, as it provides the foundation for sustainable growth and stability in the face of economic volatility.

Equally crucial is the presence of a **robust financial infrastructure**. A strong, well-regulated financial system forms the backbone of any resilient economy. It is the key mechanism through which economies can access capital, manage liquidity, and ensure the

smooth functioning of financial markets during times of crisis. The capacity of financial institutions to withstand shocks, combined with effective regulatory oversight, is essential for mitigating systemic risks. In periods of economic distress, the ability to maintain the flow of credit and investments allows businesses to survive and recover, while also enabling governments to implement stimulus measures. The financial sector, therefore, plays an indispensable role in sustaining economic resilience, particularly during times of financial or economic shocks.

Government policies are another cornerstone of resilience. The capacity of governments to enact **effective fiscal and monetary policies** during crises determines how quickly and efficiently economies can recover. However, the mere existence of policy frameworks is insufficient unless supported by institutional agility and effective coordination mechanisms. A resilient economy depends not only on state intervention but also on the ability to involve regional and local actors in decision-making, especially in complex urban environments where vulnerabilities are unevenly distributed. In some contexts, mismatches between central policy design and local implementation have revealed the need for a more bottom-up, participatory approach in building resilience. Well-designed policies, such as fiscal stimulus packages, social safety nets, and targeted support for industries in distress, can provide much-needed relief during difficult times. Additionally, governments that have well-established crisis management frameworks and institutions are better positioned to address the challenges posed by crises. Good governance, coupled with sound economic policies, fosters an environment where the economy can quickly adapt to disruptions, thereby accelerating recovery. It is the agility of policy responses that often makes the difference between a prolonged economic downturn and a rapid recovery.

Moreover, the significance of **human capital** in building resilience cannot be overlooked. A workforce that is well-educated, skilled, and adaptable is a fundamental asset in navigating through economic disruptions. Education and training equip individuals with the necessary tools to innovate, adapt to new technologies, and pivot in response to changing economic conditions. Human capital investments help to foster a culture of resilience, as a well-prepared and skilled workforce is more likely to find solutions to emerging problems, driving recovery in the process. A healthy population is equally important, as public health plays a key role in maintaining productivity and stability during times of crisis. Therefore, investments in education, healthcare, and workforce development are integral to strengthening the resilience of any economy.

The evaluation of **economic resilience** is also vital for understanding how effectively economies cope with and recover from crises. The use of indicators such as GDP growth rates, unemployment levels, and sectoral performance can provide valuable insights into the health and resilience of an economy. But these traditional indicators must be interpreted alongside more dynamic metrics reflecting structural transformation, policy responsiveness, and institutional depth. While assessment tools provide valuable guidance, they must also be

sensitive to territorial disparities and sectoral vulnerabilities that shape resilience trajectories differently across regions. Advanced evaluation techniques, such as time series analysis and econometric modeling, offer a comprehensive way to assess the impact of various shocks and identify areas where resilience needs to be strengthened. By employing these evaluation methods, policymakers and economists can better understand the dynamics of economic recovery and tailor their strategies accordingly.

Finally, **strategies for enhancing resilience** must be multifaceted and adaptable to changing circumstances. Economies can improve their resilience by focusing on long-term investments in diversification, financial stability, governance, and human capital. The process of building resilience requires a proactive approach, where the potential risks are anticipated and mitigated before they manifest. Diversification of sectors, for instance, can buffer economies from sector-specific risks, while a strong financial infrastructure ensures that the economy can withstand financial shocks. Furthermore, robust governance frameworks and effective public policies enable a timely and coordinated response to crises, while investments in human capital ensure that the workforce is adaptable and ready to face new challenges.

In conclusion, economic resilience is not the result of any single factor but rather the outcome of a series of interconnected elements. A holistic approach that combines diversification, financial strength, government intervention, and human capital development is essential for ensuring long-term stability and recovery. By fostering a diversified economy, strengthening financial systems, enacting responsive government policies, and investing in education and workforce development, economies can better withstand shocks and recover more swiftly. Through continuous evaluation and adaptation of resilience strategies, economies can not only respond effectively to future crises but also emerge stronger and more stable in the long run.

This article has highlighted the need for a more integrated and context-aware perspective, especially relevant for regions with fragile institutional legacies and high exposure to external shocks. Only through such an approach can resilience become more than a theoretical ambition and evolve into a practical tool for sustainable territorial development.

## References

- Adger, W. N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: are they related?. *Progress in human geography*, 24(3), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913200701540465>
- Aldrich, D. P., & Meyer, M. A. (2015). Social Capital and Community Resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254-269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550299>
- Alessi, L., Benczur, P., Campolongo, F., Cariboni, J., Manca, A. R., Menyhart, B., & Pagano, A. (2020). The Resilience of EU Member States to the Financial and Economic Crisis. *Social Indicators Research*, 148, 569-598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02200-1>
- Almazán-Casali, S., Puga, B. P., & Lemos, M. C. (2021). Who Governs at What Price? Technocratic Dominance, Ways of Knowing, and Long-Term Resilience of Brazil's Water System. *Front. Water*, 3, 735018. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2021.735018>

- Anguelovski, I., Shi, L., Chu, E., Gallagher, D., Goh, K., Lamb, Z., Reeve, K., & Teicher, H. (2016). Equity Impacts of Urban Land Use Planning for Climate Adaptation: Critical Perspectives from the Global North and South. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 36(3), 333–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X16645166>
- Atila, N., Fleeger, J. W., & Finelli, C. M. (2005). Effects of habitat complexity and hydrodynamics on the abundance and diversity of small invertebrates colonizing artificial substrates. *Journal of Marine Research*, 63 (6), 1151–1172. [https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/journal\\_of\\_marine\\_research/117](https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/journal_of_marine_research/117)
- Aursulesei, T. M., Topliceanu, Ș. C., & Maha, L.-G. (2020). The relationship between the European Union's economic power status and the economic convergence of the Member States. *Eastern European Journal of Regional Studies*. 6(1), 24-43. [https://csei.ase.md/journal/files/issue\\_61/EEJRS\\_61\\_24-43\\_AUR.pdf](https://csei.ase.md/journal/files/issue_61/EEJRS_61_24-43_AUR.pdf)
- Babcicky, P., & Seebauer, S. (2016). The two faces of social capital in private flood mitigation: Opposing effects on risk perception, self-efficacy and coping capacity. *Journal of Risk Research*, 20, 1017–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2016.1147489>
- Bănică, A., Muntele, I., & Popescu, C. (2020). Towards green resilient cities in eastern European Union countries. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 52, 101840. <https://doi.org/10.37043/JURA.2020.12.1.4>
- Beilin, R., & Wilkinson, C. (2015). Introduction: Governing for urban resilience. *Urban Studies*. 52(7), 1205-1217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098015574955>
- Berkes, F., & Ross, H. (2012). Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach. *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(1), 5–20, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.736605>
- Boettiger, C., Ross, N., & Hastings, A. (2013). Early warning signals: the charted and uncharted territories. *Theoretical Ecology*, 6, 255-264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12080-013-0192-6>
- Boin, A., & Hart, P. (2003). Public Leadership in Times of Crisis: Mission Impossible?. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 544-553. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3110097>
- Bolzan, N., & Gale, F. (2018). Social resilience: Transformation in two Australian communities facing chronic adversity. *International Social Work*, 61(6), 843-856. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872816673888>
- Bristow, G., & Healy, A. (2014). Regional resilience: An agency perspective. *Regional Studies*, 48(5), 923–935. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2013.854879>
- Brooks, N., Adger, W. N., & Kelly, P. M. (2005). The determinants of vulnerability and adaptive capacity at the national level and the implications for adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, 15(2), 151-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.12.006>
- Brookes, J. D., Aldridge, K., Wallace, T., Linden, L., & Ganf, G. G. (2005). Multiple interception pathways for resource utilisation and increased ecosystem resilience. *Hydrobiologia*, 552, 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-005-1511-8>
- Bunch, M. J., Morrison, K. E., Parkes, M. W., & Venema, H. D. (2011). Promoting Health and Well-Being by Managing for Social-Ecological Resilience: the Potential of Integrating Ecohealth and Water Resources Management Approaches. *Ecological and Society*, 16(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03803-160106>
- Carmen, E., Fazey, I., Ross, H., Bedinger, M., Smith, F. M., Prager, K., McClymont, K., & Morrison, D. (2022). Building community resilience in a context of climate change: The role of social capital. *Ambio*, 51, 1371–1387. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-021-01678-9>

- Carpenter, S., & Brock, W. (2008). Adaptive capacity and traps. *Ecology and Society*, 13(2), 40-56. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26267995>
- Cattell, V. (2001). Poor people, poor places, and poor health: the mediating role of social networks and social capital. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(10), 1501-1516. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00259-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00259-8)
- CBO. (2020). *Key Methods That CBO Used to Estimate the Effects of Pandemic-Related Legislation on Output*. Congressional Budget Office. <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2020-10/56612-Key-Methods.pdf>
- Chang, P.-J., & Yarnal, C. (2018). The effect of social support on resilience growth among women in the Red Hat Society. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 13(1), 92-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1374442>
- Chronopoulos, D. K., Wilson, J. O. S., & Yilmaz, M. (2023). Regulatory oversight and bank risk. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 64, 101105, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2023.101105>
- Claessens, S., & Kose, M. A. (2017). Macroeconomic implications of financial imperfections: A survey. *BIS Working Paper*, 677, 1-124. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID3076410\\_code1109023.pdf?abstractid=3076410&mirid=1](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID3076410_code1109023.pdf?abstractid=3076410&mirid=1)
- Claessens, S., Coleman, N., & Donnelly, M. (2018). “Low-For-Long” interest rates and banks’ interest margins and profitability: Cross-country evidence. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 35(A), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2017.05.004>
- Cleaver, F. (2005). The inequality of social capital and the reproduction of chronic poverty. *World Development*, 33(6), 893-906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.09.015>
- Cohen, O., Goldberg, A., Lahad, M., & Aharonson-Daniel, L. (2017). Building resilience: The relationship between information provided by municipal authorities during emergency situations and community resilience. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 119-125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.11.008>
- Cornwall, A. (2007). Buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse. *Development in Practice*, 17(4-5), 471-484. <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/118173/bk-deconstructing-development-buzzwords-010910-en.pdf>
- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital and the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(1), 95–120. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/228943>
- Commito, J. A., & Rusignuolo, B. R. (2000). Structural complexity in mussel beds: the fractal geometry of surface topography. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 255(2), 133-152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981\(00\)00285-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981(00)00285-9)
- Cretney, R. (2014). Resilience for whom? Emerging critical geographies of socio-ecological resilience. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(5), 630–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513504325>
- Cutter, S. L., Boruff, B. J., & Shirley, W. L. (2003). Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(2), 242–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6237.8402002>
- Dakos, V., & Kéfi, S. (2022). Ecological resilience: what to measure and how. *Environmental Research Letters*, 17(4), 1-22. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac5767>
- Dias, R. (2023). *Ecological resilience in a changing world: Challenges and opportunities in*

- biodiversity conservation in the face of climate change*. Seven Editora Publishing House.  
<https://doi.org/10.56238/alookdevelopv1-176>
- Distelberg, B., & Taylor, S. (2015). The roles of social support and family resilience in accessing healthcare and employment resources among families living in traditional public housing communities. *Child & Family Social Work*, 20(4), 494-506.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12098>
- ECB. (2016). *Financial Stability Review, Review of November 2016*. European Central Bank.  
<https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/fsr/financialstabilityreview201611.en.pdf>
- Fath, B. D., Cabezas, H., & Pawlowski, C. W. (2003). Regime changes in ecological systems: an information theory approach. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 222(4), 517-530.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(03\)00067-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(03)00067-5)
- Fischer, J., Lindenmayer, D. B., & Manning, A. D. (2006). Biodiversity, ecosystem function, and resilience: ten guiding principles for commodity production landscapes *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 4(2), 80-86. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295\(2006\)004\[0080:BEFART\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295(2006)004[0080:BEFART]2.0.CO;2)
- Flora, J. L., Sharp, J., Flora, C., & Newlon, B. (2016). Entrepreneurial Social Infrastructure and Locally Initiated Economic Development in the Nonmetropolitan United States. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38(4), 623-645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1997.tb00757.x>
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., & Holling, C. S. (2004). Regime shifts, resilience and biodiversity in ecosystem management *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systems*, 35, 557-81.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.35.021103.105711>
- Giacometti, A., Teräs, J., Perjo, L. Wøien, M., Sigurjonsdottir, H., & Rinne, T. (2018). *Regional Economic and Social Resilience: Conceptual Debate and Implications for Nordic Regions. Discussion paper prepared for Nordic thematic group for innovative and resilient regions*. Nordregio. <https://www.nordregio.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Regional-Economic-and-Social-Resilience-Conceptual-Debate-and-Implications-for-Nordic-Regions-1.pdf>
- Gómez-Baggethun, E., & Barton, D. N. (2013). Classifying and valuing ecosystem services for urban planning. *Ecological Economics*, 86, 235-245.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.019>
- Guillotreau, P., Allison, E. H., Bundy, A., Cooley, S. R., Defeo, O., Le Bihan, V., Pardo, S., Ian Perry, R., Santopietro, G., & Seki, T. (2017). A comparative appraisal of the resilience of marine social-ecological systems to mass mortalities of bivalves. *Ecology and Society*, 22(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09084-220146>
- Hallegatte, S. (2014). Economic Resilience: Definition and Measurement. *Policy Research Working Paper*, 6852, 1-44.  
<https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/350411468149663792/pdf/WPS6852.pdf>
- Hallegatte, S., Fay, M., & Barbier, E. (2018). Poverty and climate change: Introduction. *Environment and Development Economics*, 23(3), 217-233.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X18000141>
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2010). The Economics of International Differences in Educational Achievement. *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, 3, 89-200.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53429-3.00002-8>
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology*

- and Systematics*, 4, 1-23. [www.jstor.org/stable/2096802](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2096802)
- Hooper, D. U., Chapin III, F. S., Ewel, J. J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Lavorel, S., Lawton, J.H., Lodge, D. M., Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Schmid, B., Setälä, H., Symstad, A.J., Vandermeer, J., & Wardle, D. A. (2005). Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecological Monographs*, 75(1), 3-35. <https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0922>
- Hughes, T. P., Baird, A. H., Bellwood, D. R., Card, M., Connolly, S. R., Folke, C., & Roughgarden, J. (2003). Climate Change, Human Impacts, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs. *Science*, 301(5635), 929-933. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1085046>
- Hussen saad, M., Hagelaar, G., van der Velde, G., & Omta, S. W. F. (2021). Conceptualization of SMEs' business resilience: A systematic literature review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1938347>
- IPCC (2023). Climate change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis. *Cambridge University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896>
- Javadpoor, M., Sharifi, A., & Roosta., M. (2021). An adaptation of the Baseline Resilience Indicators for Communities (BRIC) for assessing resilience of Iranian provinces. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 66, 102609, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102609>
- Jonung, L., Jaakko, K., & Pentti, V. (2009). *The great financial crisis in Finland and Sweden The nordic experience of financial liberalization*. Edward Elgar Publishing. [https://lup.lub.lu.se/search/files/69614742/JONUNG\\_EBOOK.pdf](https://lup.lub.lu.se/search/files/69614742/JONUNG_EBOOK.pdf)
- Kapucu, N. (2006). Interagency Communication Networks during Emergencies: Boundary Spanners in Multiagency Coordination. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36, 207-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005280605>
- Karunarathne, A. Y., & Lee, G. (2019). Traditional social capital and socioeconomic networks in response to flood disaster: A case study of rural areas in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 41, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2019.101279>
- Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. F. (2000). Social Cohesion, Social Capital, and Health. *Social Epidemiology*, 174-190. <https://faculty.washington.edu/matsueda/courses/590/Readings/Kawachi%20and%20Berkman.pdf>
- Kéfi, S., Guttal, V., Brock, W. A., Carpenter, S. R., Ellison, A. M., Livina, V. N., Seekell, D. A., Scheffer, M., van Nes, E. H., & Dakos, V. (2014). Early warning signals of ecological transitions: methods for spatial patterns, *PLoS One*, 9(3), e92097, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092097>
- Kong, L., Fang, M., Ma, T., Li, G., Yang, F., Meng, Q., Li, Y., & Li, P. (2018). Positive affect mediates the relationships between resilience, social support and posttraumatic growth of women with infertility. *Psychology Health & Medicine*, 23(6), 707-716. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2018.1447679>
- Kovalenko, K. E., Thomaz, S. M., & Warfe, D. M. (2012). Habitat complexity: approaches and future directions. *Hydrobiologia*, 685, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0974-z>
- Krlev, G. (2023). Let's Join Forces: Institutional Resilience and Multistakeholder Partnerships in Crises. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 186, 571-592. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05231-w>
- Lange, S., Banning, M., Berner, A., Kern, F., Lutz, C., Peuckert, J., Santarius, T., & Silbersdorff, A. (2019). *Economy-Wide Rebound Effects: State of the art, a new taxonomy, policy and*

- research gaps*. Arbeitsbericht 1 des Forschungsprojekts ReCap. [https://www.ioew.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/BILDER\\_und\\_Downloaddateien/Publikationen/2019/ReCap\\_discussion\\_paper\\_1.pdf](https://www.ioew.de/fileadmin/user_upload/BILDER_und_Downloaddateien/Publikationen/2019/ReCap_discussion_paper_1.pdf)
- Liebenberg, L., & Moore, J. (2018). A Social Ecological Measure of Resilience for Adults: The RRC-ARM. *Social Indicators Research*, 136(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1523-y>
- Luthe, T., & Wyss, R. (2015). Introducing adaptive waves as a concept to inform mental models of resilience. *Sustainability Science*, 10, 673–685. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-015-0316-6>
- Madsen, J. D., Chambers, P. A., James, W. F., Koch, E. W., & Westlake, D. F. (2001). The interaction between water movement, sediment dynamics and submersed macrophytes. *Hydrobiologia*, 444, 71-84. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017520800568>
- Markolf, S. A., Chester, M. V., Eisenberg, D. A., Iwaniec, D. M., Davidson, C. I., Zimmerman, R., Miller, T. R., Ruddell, B. J., & Chang, H. (2018). Interdependent Infrastructure as Linked Social, Ecological and Technological Systems (SETSS) to Address Lock-in and Enhance Resilience. *Earth's Future*, 6(12), 1638-1659. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF000926>
- Marshall, N. A., & Smaigl, A. (2013). Understanding Variability in Adaptive Capacity on Rangelands. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*, 66(1), 88-94. <https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-11-00176.1>
- Martin, R. (2012). Regional Economic Resilience, Hysteresis and Recessionary Shocks. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 12(1), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbr019>
- Martin, R., Sunley, P., Gardiner, B., & Tyler, P. (2016). How Regions React to Recessions: Resilience and the Role of Economic Structure. *Regional Studies*, 50(4), 561–585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2015.1136410>
- Matias, M. G., Underwood, A. J., Hochuli, D. F., & Coleman, R. A. (2010). Independent effects of patch size and structural complexity on diversity of benthic macroinvertebrates. *Ecology*, 91(7), 1908-1915. <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1083.1>
- Mayer, A., Pawlowski, C., & Cabezas, H. (2006). Fisher information and dynamic regime changes in ecological systems, *Ecological Modelling*, 195(1-2), 72-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.11.011>
- McEntire, D. A. (2011). Designing Resilience: Preparing for Extreme Events. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 2(2), 178-180. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijdrbe.2011.2.2.178.1>
- MacKinnon, D., & Derickson, K. D. (2013). From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of resilience policy and activism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2), 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512454775>
- Meerow, S., Newell, J. P., & Stults, M. (2016). Defining urban resilience: A review. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 147, 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011>
- Mishrif, A., & Kapetanovic, H. (2018). Dubai's Model of Economic Diversification. In A. Mishrif, & Y. Al Balushi (Eds), *Economic Diversification in the Gulf Region*, (Vol. 2, pp. 89-111). *The Political Economy of the Middle East*. Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5786-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5786-1_5)
- Moberg, F., & Galaz, V. (2005). Resilience: going from conventional to adaptive freshwater management for human and ecosystem compatibility. *Swedish Water House Policy Brief*, 3(12). <https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/Moberg-2005-Resilience.pdf>
- Moser, C. O. N. (1998). The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction

- Strategies. *World Development*, 26(1), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(97\)10015-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(97)10015-8)
- Moşteanu, N. R. (2024). Adapting to the Unpredictable: Building Resilience for Business Continuity in an Ever-Changing Landscape. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2(1), 444-457. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2\(1\).37](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(1).37)
- Muntele, I., & Horea-Şerban, R. I. (2021). From Internal to International Migration in Romania – Continuity and Spatial Differentiation. *Eastern European Journal of Regional Studies*, 7(1), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.53486/2537-6179.7-2.01>
- OECD. (2012). *Local Job Creation: How Employment and Training Agencies Can Help - The Labour Agency of the Autonomous Province of Trento, Italy*. Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED). [https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2012/10/local-job-creation-how-employment-and-training-agencies-can-help-the-labour-agency-of-the-autonomous-province-of-trento-italy\\_g17a21c1/5k919d0trlf6-en.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2012/10/local-job-creation-how-employment-and-training-agencies-can-help-the-labour-agency-of-the-autonomous-province-of-trento-italy_g17a21c1/5k919d0trlf6-en.pdf)
- Oh, S., & Jun, J. (2018). Structural relationships between career barriers, social support levels, ego-resilience, job search efficacy, and career preparation behaviour of middle-aged unemployed me. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 15(1), 21-42. [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiIq-e\\_8caMAxVh-QIHHfVfK1IOFnoECBwQAO&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.kedi.re.kr%2Feng%2Fkedi%2Fcmnmn%2Ffile%2FfileDown.do%3FmenuNo%3D200067%26atchFileId%3DFILE\\_000000000003424%26fileSn%3D1%26bbsId%3D&g=AOvVaw0YhCV2ijn9C8L5zjEoXevX&opi=89978449](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiIq-e_8caMAxVh-QIHHfVfK1IOFnoECBwQAO&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.kedi.re.kr%2Feng%2Fkedi%2Fcmnmn%2Ffile%2FfileDown.do%3FmenuNo%3D200067%26atchFileId%3DFILE_000000000003424%26fileSn%3D1%26bbsId%3D&g=AOvVaw0YhCV2ijn9C8L5zjEoXevX&opi=89978449)
- O’Leary, J. L., Micheli, F., Airoidi, L., Boch, C., De Leo, G., Elahi, R., Ferretti, F., Graham, N. A. J., Litvin, S. Y., Low, N. H., Lummis, S., S., Nickols, K. J., & Wong, J. (2017). The Resilience of Marine Ecosystems to Climatic Disturbances. *BioScience*, 67(3), 208-220. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biw161>
- Omar, A. P. (2011). Un modelo explicativo de resiliencia en jóvenes y adolescentes. *Psicología em Estudo*, 16(2), 269-277. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=287122138010>
- Onyedibe, M. C., Ugwu, L. I., Philip, C. M., & Onuiru, C. (2018). Parents of children with Down Syndrome: Do resilience and social support matter to their experience of carer stress?. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 28(2), 94-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2018.1455308>
- Özkan, G. (2011). Impact of the global crisis on the governance structures of international financial institutions. *Emerging Markets Journal*, 1, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.5195/emaj.2011.8>
- Pandey, A., Prakash, A., & Werners, S. E. (2021). Matches, mismatches and priorities of pathways from a climate-resilient development perspective in the mountains of Nepal. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 125, 135-145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.08.013>
- Patel, R. B., & Gleason, K. M. (2018). The association between social cohesion and community resilience in two urban slums of Port au Prince, Haiti. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 27, 161-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.10.003>
- Poljak Istenič, S., & Kozina, J. (2019). Participatory planning in a post-socialist urban context: Experience from five cities in Central and Eastern Europe. In J. Nared & D. Bole (Eds.), *Participatory research and planning in practice* (pp. 31-50). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28014-7\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28014-7_3)
- Pfefferbaum, B., Van Horn, R. L., & Pfefferbaum, R.L. (2017). A Conceptual Framework to Enhance Community Resilience Using Social Capital. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 45, 102-110, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-015-0556-z>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon

- and Schuster Publishing House. <https://doi.org/10.1145/358916.361990>
- Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2009). *This Time is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc4m4gqx>
- Revi, A., Satterthwaite, D., Aragón-Durand, F., Corfee-Morlot, J., Kiunsi, R. B. R., Pelling, M., Roberts, D. C., & Soleki, W. (2014). *Urban Areas in Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275035197\\_Urban\\_Areas\\_in\\_Climate\\_Change\\_2014\\_Impacts\\_Adaptation\\_and\\_Vulnerability\\_Part\\_A\\_Global\\_and\\_Sectoral\\_Aspects\\_Contribution\\_of\\_Working\\_Group\\_II\\_to\\_the\\_Fifth\\_Assessment\\_Report\\_of\\_the\\_Intergovernmental\\_Panel](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275035197_Urban_Areas_in_Climate_Change_2014_Impacts_Adaptation_and_Vulnerability_Part_A_Global_and_Sectoral_Aspects_Contribution_of_Working_Group_II_to_the_Fifth_Assessment_Report_of_the_Intergovernmental_Panel)
- Rodriguez, H., Quarantelli, E. L., & Dynes, R. R. (2007). *Handbook of Disaster Research*. Springer Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63254-4>
- Rydin Y., Bleahu, A., Davies, M., Dávila, J. D., Friel, S., De Grandis, G., Groce, N., Hallal, P. C., Hamilton, I., Howden-Chapman, P., Lai, K. M., Lim, C. J., Martins, J., Osrin, D., Ridley, I., Scott, I., Taylor, M., Wilkinson, P., & Wilson, J. (2012). Shaping cities for health: complexity and the planning of urban environments in the 21st century. *Lancet*, 379(9831), 2079-2108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60435-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60435-8)
- Rustinsyah, R., Prasetyo R. A., & Adib, M. (2021). Social capital for flood disaster management: Case study of flooding in a village of Bengawan Solo Riverbank, Tuban, East Java Province, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 52(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101963>
- Sandu, A. (2024). The post-socialist cities from Central and Eastern Europe: Between spatial growth and demographic decline. *Urban Studies*, 61(5), 821–837. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980231189261>
- Sandu, A., Bănică, A., & Muntele, I. (2021). Urban resilience: An instrument to decode the post-socialist socio-economic and spatial transformations of cities from Central and Eastern Europe. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 12(SI), 170–195. <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2021-SI08>
- Sekar, S., Lundin, K., Tucker, C., Figueiredo, J., Tordo, S., & Aguilaret, J. (2019). *Building resilience a green growth framework for mobilizing mining investment*. Washington. World Bank Publications. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/689241556650241927/pdf/Building-Resilience-A-Green-Growth-Framework-for-Mobilizing-Mining-Investment.pdf>
- Sinclair, K., Curtis, A., Mendham, E., & Mitchell, M. (2014). Can resilience thinking provide useful insights for those examining efforts to transform contemporary agriculture? *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31, 371–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9488-4>
- Slavova, I., & Simpson, R. (2023). *How to measure social cohesion*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH under the Qudra 2 – Resilience for refugees, IDPs, returnees and host communities in response to the protracted Syria and Iraq crises. [https://www.international-alert.org/app/uploads/2023/11/ENG\\_Qudra2-Guidance-Note-5-Measuring-social-cohesion.pdf](https://www.international-alert.org/app/uploads/2023/11/ENG_Qudra2-Guidance-Note-5-Measuring-social-cohesion.pdf)
- Smith, P., Soussana, J.-F., Angers, D., Schipper, L., Chenu, C., Rasse, D. P., Batjes, N. H., van Egmond, F., McNeill, S., Kuhnert, M., Arias-Navarro, C., Olesen, J. E., Chirinda, N., Fornara, D., Wollenberg, E., Álvaro-Fuentes, J., Sanz-Cobena, A., & Klumpp, K. (2019). How to measure, report and verify soil carbon change to realize the potential for soil carbon sequestration for

- atmospheric removal of greenhouse gases. *Global Change Biology*, 26(1), 219–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14815>
- St. Pierre, J. I. & Kovalenko, K. E. (2014). Effect of habitat complexity attributes on species richness. *Ecosphere*, 5(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00323.1>
- Sundstrom, S., M., Eason, T., Nelson, R. J., Angeler, D., G., Barichievy, C., Garmestani, A. S., Graham, N. A. J., Granholm, D., Gunderson, L., Knutson, M., Nash, K. L., Spanbauer, T., Stow, C. A., & Allen, C.R. (2016). Detecting spatial regimes in ecosystems, *Ecology Letters*, 20(1), 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12709>
- Şerbu, R. (2016). Pear to Pear in Social Economy through Social Technologies, some Perspectives on this New Challenge in Eastern Europe. *Eastern European Journal of Regional Studies*, 2(2), 15-21. [https://csei.ase.md/journal/files/issue\\_22/EEJRS\\_0202\\_SER.pdf](https://csei.ase.md/journal/files/issue_22/EEJRS_0202_SER.pdf)
- Tajuddin, N., & Dąbrowski, M. (2021). Enabling Socio-Ecological Resilience in the Global South: Insights from Chennai, India. *Sustainability*, 13(19), 10522, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910522>
- Toto, R., Grabkowska, M., Nientied, P., Smirnova, V., & Dragović, S. (2023). The Uncommonness of Urban Commons in Central and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of the Commons*, 17(1), 155–173. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ijc.1189>
- Turner, B. L., II, Kasperson, R. E., Matson, P. A., McCarthy, J. J., Corell, R. W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N., Kasperson, J. X., Luers, A., Martello, M. L., Polsky, C., Pulsipher, A., & Schiller, A. (2003) A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100 (14), 8074–8079. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1231335100>
- UN Habitat (2020). *World Cities Report 2020 – The Value of Sustainable Urbanization*. [https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/10/wcr\\_2020\\_report.pdf](https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/10/wcr_2020_report.pdf)
- van der Wal, W., & George, A. A. (2018). Social support-oriented coping and resilience for self-harm protection among adolescents. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 28(3), 237-241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2018.1475508>
- Vale, L. J. (2014). The politics of resilient cities: Whose resilience and whose city? *Building Research & Information*, 42(2), 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2014.850602>
- Velasco, J. M., & Domínguez, M. G. (2022). Variables involved in the development of social resilience in sustainable economies. *Monograph: “New Communication Trends for the 21st Century”*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.37467/revvisual.v9.3791>
- Walker, B., Salt, D., & Reid, W. (2006). *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in A Changing World*. Island Press. [https://www.academia.edu/19455883/Resilience\\_thinking](https://www.academia.edu/19455883/Resilience_thinking)
- World Bank. (2019). *Gulf Economic Update, December 2019: Economic Diversification for a Sustainable and Resilient GCC* (World Bank Publication No. 5). A World Bank Group Publication for the Gulf Cooperation Council Economies. <https://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/886531574883246643/pdf/Economic-Diversification-for-a-Sustainable-and-Resilient-GCC.pdf>
- World Bank (2020). *Human Capital Index 2020 Update: Human Capital in the Time of COVID-19*. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstreams/8ca3928c-0e04-59bf-ba37-713442d6fab0/download>