

MIGRATION AND RESILIENCE

EXPLORING THE STOCK OF KNOWLEDGE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY: 2000 - 2016

By Marshia Akbar & Valerie Preston

May 2019



*Marshia Akbar is a post-doctoral research fellow in the Department of Geography at York University.

**Valerie Preston is a professor in the department of Geography at York University and principal investigator for the BMRC-IMRU Partnership.



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

Executive Summary

The term ‘resilience’ generally refers to the capacity of individuals, communities and systems to survive in the face of stress and shocks, and even transform when conditions require (Hall and Lamont 2013). Although, migration is almost always associated with disruptions and challenges, the application of the concept in relation to migrant settlement and integration is comparatively recent (Falicov 2005). In this context, a deeper understanding of how various risk and protective factors as well as social institutions contribute to migrant resilience is crucial for developing effective policy and practice. The literature review documents current debates and research findings regarding migrant resilience to achieve three goals: 1) to compare and evaluate various theoretical approaches to resilience, 2) to identify measures of resilience, and 3) to assess the small literature that focuses on resilience in relation to migrant integration. Special consideration was given to literature that provides critical insights into theories and measurement of resilience, and uses the concept of ‘resilience’ to analyze migrant experiences. The review drew on journals, books, reports and websites published between 2000 and 2016.

Major Findings

A. Resilience: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches

Current definitions of resilience are shaped by two major theoretical approaches: social-ecological resilience and social resilience. The social-ecological approach emphasizes the adaptation processes of individuals, communities and regions in relation to external threats (Adger 2000; Cretney 2014; Luthar 2006). Scholars point out that the social-ecological approach is agent-centric and neglects the influence of social structures, institutional inequalities and power relations (Adger 2000; Joseph 2013; Leadbeater et al. 2005; VanderPlaat 2015). In contrast, the social resilience approach stresses the transformative capacities of individuals and groups in dealing with challenges and recognizes how power relations and social justice concerns may shape resilience. Many contemporary scholars have used this approach to understand the experiences of people who are marginalized due to institutional racism and sexism (Leadbeater et al. 2005; VanderPlaat 2015). Many scholars argue that few empirical case studies reflect the transformative approach inherent in social resilience (Adger 2000; Cretney 2014; MacKinnon and Derickson 2012).

B. Indicators and Measurement of Resilience

Multiple indicators are used to assess and monitor the resilience of various social entities. Researchers have developed around twenty different resilience scales to evaluate levels of resilience for various age groups (young, adolescent and elderly). The selection of indicators is shaped by how resilience is conceptualized and defined, the availability of data and the socio-environmental contexts of social entities. Despite their widespread use, some scholars argue that indicators are selective and their interpretation is based on general assumptions about how social, environmental, economic and political systems work (Ahern et al. 2006; Schipper et al. 2015; Windle et al. 2011). As such, indicators do not fully reflect the experiential aspects of resilience. Reflexivity is emphasized by critical scholars (Windle et al. 2011) who argue that researchers need to be aware of the short-comings of resilience indicators and acknowledge the challenges of capturing the dynamic characteristics of resilience.

C. Migration and Resilience

To examine migrant resilience, studies often analyze how migrants draw on motivational aspirations and resources to deal with discrimination and other adaptive challenges related to accessing employment, education and affordable housing (Thomas 2013; Michail 2013; Lester & Nguyen 2015; Lee 2005). In general, various personal traits (self-esteem, motivation, optimism, intellect, coping skills, and competence) and many collective resources (community pride, ethnic networks, cultural practices, spiritual and faith-based networks) are recognized as protective factors that strengthen migrants' capacity to overcome challenges. Critically, this body of work highlights the extensive support networks within migrant families and communities that help them overcome settlement challenges. With a few exceptions (Voicu and Comşa 2014; Simich et al. 2012; Maiter and Stalker 2011), the responsibilities of government and non-governmental organizations are not emphasized in the literature. Diverse methods, both quantitative and qualitative, are used to investigate the links between objective and subjective understandings of individual and collective forms of resilience (Gray et al. 2015; Michail 2013; Xia et al. 2005). Although most studies are grounded in the social approach to resilience, empirical analyses emphasize the adaptive capacities of migrants rather than their transformative and participatory capacities.

Conclusions

The review highlights three themes in research about migration and resilience:

- The complexity of the social and institutional dynamics inherent in theoretical notions of resilience,
- The lack of consensus about the best indicators and scales for measuring resilience, and
- The small number of studies that use resilience to investigate migration and settlement challenges.

While the concept of social resilience is complex, ambiguous and multifaceted, it allows for potentially fruitful perspectives on the understanding of human actions in the face of challenges. One of the strengths of the concept of social resilience is that it emphasizes the embeddedness of social actors within specific social and institutional contexts. As such, the concept possesses real potential for addressing power relations and institutional inequality. To strengthen a critical approach to social resilience and its applicability in migration studies, researchers need to engage in an intersectional analysis and incorporate the subjective experiences of diverse individuals, groups and institutions. Adopting a mixed method approach would allow researchers to address variations in resilience and pathways to resilience that arise from diverse types of adversities and varied transformative capacities. Future research also needs to take account of how hegemonic discourses can dictate interpretations of migrant resilience.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Development of the Review and Bibliography	1
1.2. Organization of the Literature by Themes	2
Section 2: A Critical Reflection on Major Themes	2
2.1 Resilience: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches	2
2.1.1 The social-ecological approach	3
2.1.2 The social approach to resilience	4
2.2 Definition of Social Resilience: Questions and Debates.....	5
2.2.1 Resilience of what?	5
2.2.2 Resilience from what?	6
2.2.3 How to be resilient?.....	6
2.2.4 Resilience for what?	7
2.2.5 How to develop and enhance resilience?	8
Section 3: Indicators and Measurement of Resilience.....	9
3.1 Indicators of Resilience	9
3.2 Resilience Scale.....	10
3.3 Methods	10
Section 4: Migration and Resilience.....	11
4.1 Migrants, Challenges and Resilience	11
4.2 Resilience and Migrant Youth.....	12
4.3 Resilience and Migrant Women.....	12
4.4 Securitization and Resilience of Migrant Receiving Societies	13
Section 5: Conclusions	13
Appendix A: Migration and Resilience: Literature from 2000-2016 by Themes with Abstracts.....	15
Appendix B: Migration and Resilience: Literature from 2000-2016, Alphabetical by Author....	38
Appendix C: A List of Definitions of Resilience.....	42

Migration and Resilience: Exploring the Stock of knowledge Review of Literature and Bibliography from 2000 to 2016

Section 1: Introduction

In the last decade the term ‘resilience’ has become increasingly prominent in efforts to understand and analyze the capacity of individuals, communities and systems to survive, adapt, and grow in the face of stress and shocks, and even transform when conditions require (Hall and Lamont 2013). The application of the concept in relation to migrant settlement and integration is comparatively recent. Economic, cultural and social conditions in the current world are influenced significantly by international migration. Migration however, is almost always associated with disruptions and challenges. Migrants¹ experience some degree of loss and grief: loss of family and friends, language, customs and rituals (Falicov 2005). Many migrants also experience economic marginalization, social isolation and cultural alienation due to systemic structural barriers that restrict their ability to access resources and rebuild their lives after migration. In this context, a deeper understanding of how various risk and protective factors as well as social institutions contribute to migrant resilience is crucial to influence policy, and practice. Reviewing literature, this paper documents current debates and research findings regarding migrant resilience and illustrates how migrant individuals and communities draw upon individual and collective resources to overcome social, economic and personal challenges. The objectives of the literature review were threefold: to review conceptual and theoretical approaches to resilience, to identify measures of resilience and to gather literature that focuses on resilience in relation to migrant integration. The objectives are addressed through organizing the discussions into five sections. The first section describes the ways in which I collected and organized literature. In the second section, I provide a comparative analysis of the major theories of resilience with a specific focus on the definitions and concepts of social resilience. The third section investigates the significance of resilience indicators and scales in social research. I then illustrate how migrant resilience is conceptualized and explored in empirical studies in the fourth section. Finally, the fifth section outlines the concluding remarks highlighting the main findings of the literature review.

1.1 Development of the Review and Bibliography

This review and bibliography was undertaken as a part of the SSHRC partnership research project titled “Migration and Resilience in Urban Canada: Discovering Strengths and Building Capacities. To achieve the objectives, special consideration was given to literature that provides critical insights into theories and measurement of resilience, and uses the concept of ‘resilience’ to analyze migrant experiences. Literature published between 2000 and 2016 is reviewed for this paper. The search for relevant material was based on a review of journals,

¹ In this paper, I use the term ‘migrants’ to indicate a wide range of people who lives outside their country of origin with citizen status, permanent residency status, temporary status, refugee status or no status at all.

books, reports and websites. In total, 58 published documents were reviewed². Google scholar was used as the main search tool to assemble literature.

1.2. Organization of the Literature by Themes

The bibliography of reviewed literature is organized into two appendices, by themes with abstracts from journal articles and other publications in Appendix A and alphabetically by author in Appendix B. A list of definitions of resilience taken from the reviewed literature is provided in Appendix C. The list expands an earlier list published in 2013 by the Community and Regional Resilience Institute (CARRI) in a report titled ‘Definitions of Community Resilience: An Analysis’. The current list adds definitions of resilience in published articles since 2013.

The documents were assigned to three categories: definitions of resilience and theoretical approaches, measurement of resilience, and migrants and resilience. The categorization was done to address the objectives of the study, particularly to investigate how various theories and measures of resilience have been applied to study migrant resilience. The category ‘migrants and resilience’ is subdivided into four categories that reflect specific research themes. In the list below, the number of documents in each category and subcategory is indicated. The categories are to a certain extent arbitrary and some documents could be included in more than one category. However, the categorization reflects the main point of view of the documents.

Major Themes:

- A. Resilience: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches (24)
- B. Measurement of Resilience (5)
- C. Migrants and Resilience (29)
 - Migrants, Challenges and Resilience (16)
 - Resilience and Migrant Youth (3)
 - Resilience and Migrant Women (5)
 - Securitization and Resilience of Migrant Receiving Societies (5)

Section 2: A Critical Reflection on Major Themes

2.1 Resilience: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches

‘Resilience’ is discussed in many academic disciplines and research fields including engineering, biology, psychology and social sciences. Although there is consensus that the term is originated from the Latin word ‘resilare’ which means a ‘leap backwards’, it is theorized differently in different disciplines (Adger 2000). Contradictory discussions have emerged in several studies that question the significance of resilience as a concept for the study of society and human struggles. Central to most contemporary debates are the distinctions between

² In total, 11 key words were used to select the documents: Resilience, Definition of Resilience, Resilience theory, Social-ecological resilience, Social resilience , Resilience measurement, Resilience scale, Resilience indicators , Resilience and migration, Resilience and Immigrants, and Migrant resilience

‘engineering’ and ‘ecological’ approaches to resilience and how these approaches have shaped the notion of ‘social resilience’. Stuart L. Pimm’s (1984) concept of ‘engineering resilience’ denotes the ability of a system to efficiently resist against external influences and ‘bounce back’ to a well-defined state of equilibrium. In contrast to the notion of engineering resilience, Holling’s (1973) concept of ‘ecological resilience’ proposes that ecosystems “do not have one static point of equilibrium, but rather a zone of stability that allows for the re-organization of a system to absorb change and continually exist and function even in the face of disturbance and change” (Cretney 2014: 628). Holling’s emphasis on multiple stable states laid the foundation for different interpretations of adaptation in ecosystems. Drawing on the notion of ‘adaptive cycle’, Holling (1973) describes the renewal of the eco-system and emergence of new trajectories indicating the dynamic adaptive interplay between sustaining and developing with change (Folke 2006). The ecological view of resilience emphasized attributes such as flexibility and persistence that enable an eco-system to live with external disruptions (Adger 2000; Cretney 2014; Luthar 2006).

2.1.1 The social-ecological approach

The concept of resilience has entered into the discourse of social research from studies that stress the interconnections between ecological and social systems. Proposing the Social and Ecological System (SES) approach, Adger (2000) suggests that the ways in which individuals and communities adapt to environmental change is a crucial component linking social and ecological resilience. Empirical studies used the SES approach to understand the persistence of ecological systems in the face of human interventions and investigate the interrelations between human livelihoods and ecosystems (Adger 200; Martin-Breen and Anderies 2013; Ungar 2012).

Since the beginning of the 1990s scholars have turned their attention to explore whether social units, particularly communities, might be able to withstand external social and environmental threats by utilizing their experiences and knowledge. In the 1990s resilience has become popular in psychology to study how individuals particularly, children overcome traumatic experiences³. The term resilience is applied in the social science literature as an analytical tool to measure the adaptation processes of individuals, communities and regions in relation to terrorism, environment hazards (cyclone, flood) and economic difficulties resulting from the 2008 financial crisis. Indeed, many of these studies employed a social-ecological approach to capture human resilience in dealing with adversity, a perspective criticized by many scholars (Cretney 2014; Dagdeviren et al. 2016; Joseph 2013; Keck & Sakdapolrak 2013; Leadbeater 2005; Liebenberg and Ungar 2009; Lorenz 2013).

Criticisms:

Three major criticisms dominate the literature. First, it has been argued that humans have distinct capacities for imagination, interpretation and creativity which enable them to prepare for and adapt to adversity and change in ways that are absent in ecological communities. The influence of the agency of individuals and communities on shaping the processes and outcomes of resilience through these capacities are overlooked in the SES approach. Analyzing the resilience of social system through the lens of ecological systems often fails to recognize the crucial roles that social factors and institutions play in societies (Leadbeater et al. 2005). The second issue concerns the roles of social institutions in shaping the ways in which social actors

³ The literature on psychological resilience is not included in this paper.

respond to adversity. Scholars point out that resilience is an agent-centric concept when applied to individuals and communities, neglecting the influence of social structures, such as gender, race, class status, the operation of markets and the role of the state (Adger 2000; Joseph 2013; VanderPlaat 2015). Drawing on structure-agency debates, studies highlight how the resilience of social actors is embedded into the social conditions within which they acquire and exercise their capacities to withstand social and environmental disruptions (Leadbeater et al. 2005; Magis 2010). The work in this area further suggests that the notion of resilience is being influenced by neoliberal norms and values that aim to decrease state involvement and to increase self-reliance by promoting willing, adaptable and resilient neoliberal subjects (Adger 2000; Joseph 2013). In this way, individuals and communities are provided with responsibility without power and resources to adapt to challenges. Consequently, the human capacity to transform social structures within which the challenges are often embedded is not scrutinized in most studies. To what extent institutions are resilient to change is also less explored.

The third criticism highlights the lack of acknowledgement of politics, power, and inequality in the SES approach. Emphasis is given to how unequal social relations and access to resources determine which individuals and communities can and cannot be resilient. Resilience is identified in these studies as a social construct and a product of power relations rather than an attribute that people inherently possess. Cretney (2014) highlights how the discourse of resilience is shaped by dominant social values that define the meanings of adversity, risk and resilience. Describing how adversity and disadvantage are socially constructed and sustained by hegemonic discourse, scholars stress alternative discourses of resilience that promote social justice concerns and transformative notions of self, community and society (Cretney 2014; Joseph 2013; MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). These critiques highlight the need to recognize how the concentration of power and privilege influences the dominant, control over resources and decision making which in turn, shapes the outcomes of resilience or a lack of it, both at institutional and individual levels.

2.1.2 The social approach to resilience

Underlining the criticisms, scholars have proposed a critical ‘social approach’ in which resilience is defined as a dynamic process, rather than as a specific state or attribute of a social entity. Among many definitions of social resilience, the most cited definition is proposed by Hall and Lemont (2013: 2) who describe social resilience as “the capacity of groups of people bound together in an organization, class, racial group, community or nation to sustain and advance their well-being in the face of challenges to it”. This perspective goes beyond the notion of adaptation to adversity by encompassing advancement and transformation of individuals and groups. Scholars suggest that social resilience can be better understood by considering human agency, social justice, power relations, discourses and social institutions. Some of the studies adopt feminist and critical race theories to address how power relations and institutional discrimination shape social resilience (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013; Luthar 2006; Magis 2010; Murray Nettles et al. 2000). In addition, emphasizing the embeddedness of social actors in their particular time- and place-specific social and institutional environments, the social approach recognizes the relational aspects of social resilience.

The alternative vision of ‘social resilience’ overcame the main limitations of the SES approach by: 1. taking account of the interrelations among individuals, groups and institutions

and addresses the removal of structural barriers, 2. countering neoliberal discourses by recognizing institutional power relations and social justice concerns that shape resilience, 3. highlighting transformative capacities of individuals and groups in dealing with challenges, 4. emphasizing resilience-facilitating interventions that enhance capacities of individuals, groups and organizations to deal with challenges more competently, and 5. encouraging social learning, civic engagement and participative decision-making. As such, the social approach to resilience has been used by contemporary scholars to understand the experiences of the poor and marginalized. Various non-governmental and grassroots organizations in North America and Europe have also adopted social resilience as an analytical framework for designing community-driven programs to deal with social and environmental and issues (Plodinec et al. 2014).

A recent thread of literature has suggested using the term ‘resourcefulness’ instead of resilience “to problematize both the uneven distribution of material resources and the associated inability of disadvantaged groups and communities to access the levers of social change” (MacKinnon and Derickson 2012: 263). The notion promotes a more bottom-up effort to enhance the capacities of groups, communities and organizations to engage in democratic dialogue and generate alternative agendas that challenge existing top-down power relations. Emphasis is given to establishing empirically driven operational definitions of resilience that account for diverse meanings and pathways to resilience for different individuals and groups within specific social contexts. Despite extensive theoretical developments, many argue that the empirical case studies often do not reflect the transformative and bottom-up approach to social resilience inherent in discussions of resourcefulness.

2.2 Definition of Social Resilience: Questions and Debates

The literature review indicates that there is no single standard definition of social resilience. Resilience is conceptualized differently depending on the disciplinary background of the researchers, theoretical foundation and the objectives of the research. The use of the term by a variety of disciplines over the last four decades has engendered differing definitions of resilience. In fact, a wide range of definitions are also evident within social research (Appendix C). Despite their variations, most of the proposed definitions imply positive functioning of a system over the passage of time in the aftermath of some form of adversity. However, the theoretical shift from social-ecological to a critical social approach to resilience encouraged many scholars to re- evaluate the concept in relation to social context. Many argue that the concept of resilience is much more complex and multi-layered in practice than the ways in which it is articulated in most definitions. Scholars have examined the following questions:

2.2.1 Resilience of what?

Several studies classified the definitions of resilience by scrutinizing the unit of analysis. Although all definitions of social resilience concern social entities and systems, community resilience has become a prominent focus in the literature to the extent that ‘social systems’ are often replaced with ‘communities’. It is assumed that communities can develop resilience by actively building and engaging the capacities of their members to deal with social and environmental disruptions (Magis 2010; Plodinec 2009; Plodinec et al. 2014). In addition,

studying resilience at the community level enables researchers to shed light on institutional contexts that influence social resilience (Adger 2000).

A few studies emphasize individuals' capacities and responses to adverse circumstances (Rutter 2000; Southwick et al. 2014). These studies stress how family circumstances and household structures enable and/or restrict the capacities of individuals' to deal with challenges. Reviewing the diverse units of analysis, scholars suggest that the empirical investigation of social resilience needs to be approached from multiple levels that include diversity and inter-relations among individual, family, and community levels (Leadbeater et al. 2005; Lorenz 2013; Luthar 2006; Taylor and Wang 2000). Including social institutions in the analysis is also evident in the work of some researchers (Shaw 2012; Southwick et al. 2014). These studies stress the need for investigating the roles of human agency as well as institutions including local and state governments in dealing with adverse situations.

2.2.2 Resilience from what?

The concept of resilience does not make sense without the presence of some form of adverse circumstances. Numerous terms are used in the definitions such as: adversity, change, unforeseen circumstance, challenge, risk, problem, disturbance, threat, shock, hardship, disruption, stress, uncertainty, extreme event, hazard, unanticipated danger, crisis, violence, setback, negative experience, and disaster to indicate the adverse circumstances that trigger resiliency of social entities. The SES approach generally assumed the risks and threats as external to the system in which ecological and social communities belong. In contrast, the social approach stresses how threats might also emerge from societies 'internal functioning' or from interaction between the two. How unequal social relations and gender, class and race-based discrimination embedded within a society restrict the opportunities and choices of certain marginalized individuals and groups is highlighted. For example, language barriers, a lack of social connections, limited knowledge of their rights in a new country may restrict migrants' chances of recovery from economic hardship. Resilience in these studies is conceptualized as a 'purposive response to the structural realities of social inequality' (Schafer et al. 2009: 232; VanderPlaat 2015). As VanderPlaat (2015) points out, the aim of critical resilience research "is to tease out and illuminate the relationship between systemic structures and social ecologies and how social inequality produced by the former is reproduced in the latter".

Besides deconstructing the source of challenges, questions have also been raised about the temporal dimension of external and internal challenges. Distinctions are made between rapid-onset threats (e.g. cyclone) and continuous threats (e.g. discrimination). Some scholars highlight the importance of defining resilience in relation to everyday experience while others advocate using the term to study sudden shocks and crisis. In addition, some studies stress the need for studying the experience of multiple sudden and steady adversities (Keck and Sakdapolrak 2013).

2.2.3 How to be resilient?

Crucial questions have also emerged about immediate and long-term responses towards adversity (Stark 2014). Different definitions of resilience used diverse terms to define the response of social entities when faced with adverse situations. For example resilience is conceptualized as the ability of social unit(s) to adapt, absorb, overcome, navigate, deal with, adjust to, respond to, undergo, tolerate, withstand, cope with, mitigate, limit the impact of,

manage some form of undesirable social and environmental circumstances. Despite using a wide range of terms, most of the definitions reflect the idea of adaptation emphasized in the SES approach. Evaluating these definitions, Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) illustrate three different interpretations of resilience: 1. coping capacities: the ability of social actors to cope with and overcome all kinds of adversities, 2. adaptive capacities: their ability to learn from past experiences and adjust themselves to future challenges in their everyday lives and transformative capacity and, 3. transformative capacities: their ability to craft sets of institutions that foster individual welfare and sustainable societal robustness towards future crises.

While coping capacity is a post-adversity short-term response, adaptive and transformation capacities can be manifested for long periods of time. Critical social research emphasizes transformative capacities - also labelled as 'participative capacities' by Lorenz (2010)- in order to recognize and enhance people's ability to participate in decision making processes, access social and economic resources, and influence institutions which in turn would ensure their individual and collective welfare and strengthen their resilience towards future adversity (Magis 2010).

One branch of research distinguishes definitions of resilience related to adaptation from resistance (Stark 2014; MacKinnon and Derickson 2013; Luthar 2006; Magis 2010; Murray Nettles et al. 2000). This distinction is associated with the anticipated outcomes of resilience. The two responses are differentiated based on the degree of change and the outcome they suggest. While adaptive capacities imply survival and recovery from adversity by either bouncing back to a previous state or renewing and retaining somewhat similar structures and functions through preventive measures, transformative capacities entail resistance and proactive measures, and progressive change in existing structures and practices to thrive and attain a better state. So far, no study has provided an in-depth assessment of the interrelations between the three trajectories of social resilience: coping, adaptive and transformative capacities. They are often considered as isolated responses shaped by the challenges that social actors experience or the degree of agency they exercise. Which actions are more or less effective in the face of various types of adversities are not explored fully in the literature.

2.2.4 Resilience for what?

Another important question is related to the ultimate goals of being 'resilient'. Studies question whether being resilient is the ability to bounce back to the exact same state after some shock, to absorb the shock and maintain somewhat similar functions, to adapt to the shock and achieve a different state (Adger 2000, 2010; Folke 2006). A significant portion of work on resilience, using the SES framework, has focused on the capacity of a system to adapt and change while remaining within critical parameters. This notion is regarded as a 'conservative' view of resilience since it does not ...for structural change and transformation (Shaw 2012). On the other hand, studies that are grounded in a social resilience approach stress the capacity to transform, re-organization and development in the post-shock phase. The possibility of turning shocks into opportunity and 'bouncing forward' to a better state is also stressed in these studies (Folke 2006; Shaw 2012). The notion of 'bouncing forward' is seen as more effective and dynamic in terms of bringing about radical and fundamental social change. Combining these perspectives, some scholars suggest that resilience is about the ability to know when to adapt and when to change. Recent work reveals that the ability to define adversity and shock, and desired

outcomes is significantly shaped by different cultural and socio-economic settings (VanderPlaats 2015). Cultural meanings and value judgments are critical in shaping how individuals and groups perceive adversity and respond to adversity, and what they seek to accomplish by being resilient.

2.2.5 How to develop and enhance resilience?

Most definitions of resilience start with “‘the capacity to’ and the ‘the ability to’...”. Some scholars consider ‘capacity’ as an inherent attribute of social entities while others see it as an emergent and dynamic property that appears only in the face of a threat. Still others, drawing on a phenomenological view, defined resilience as a process through which capacity can be developed and enhanced. This notion is articulated in the literature by contrasting “Being vs Becoming” (Plodinec 2009). Those who support a process-oriented notion argue that resilience is socially produced, constructed and conditioned. Research also revealed that the resilience of social entities is embedded within wider social-structural contexts. Favorable social conditions such as access to social networks, economic resources and social services, and decision making power facilitate resilient actions among individuals, families and communities (Dagdeviren et al. 2016; MacKinnon and Derickson 2013; Luthar 2006; Magis 2010; Murray Nettles et al. 2000; Plodinec et al. 2014; Shaw 2012). Several scholars link community capacities to social capital by emphasizing how social support networks play key roles by enabling adaptation to and recovery from disruptions (Adger 2000; Cretney 2014). Research centers such as the Community and Regional Resilience Institute (CARRI) in the USA and Resilience Research Centre (RRC) in Canada have initiated various interventions to enhance resilience.

Diverse factors such as: the state, institutional inequalities, the interrelations between various social units as well as social agents and structures, and a participatory approach are considered crucial attributes of interventions that will enhance the capacities of individuals, groups and institutions. Leadbeater et al. (2005) summarizes four issues that need to be considered in future research to have a better understanding of resilience:

“a) the diversity of individual, family, and community responses to adverse circumstances rather than just generalized population risks; b) the strengths, competencies, and resources needed for dealing with adversities rather than just the deficits, pathologies, and deviance that can result from them; c) the long-term pathways or lifespan trajectories that are affected by variations in response to adversities rather than just the immediate outcomes; and d) on the inter-relations among individual, family, and community levels of development rather than just the characteristics of adapted individuals”.

The importance of location and spatial scale to the process of resilience is stressed in recent studies. Researchers have shown how socio-spatial attributes such as, physical infrastructure, jobs opportunities, and the demographic, social and economic characteristics of a location – be it a neighborhood, city, region, and nation- significantly influence resilience (Magis 2010; MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) propose the term ‘translocality’ to capture cross-scale dynamics in the analysis of social resilience. Emphasizing the influence of ongoing globalization on human lives they conceive social resilience as the outcome of diverse local embeddedness of social actors. More research is required to demonstrate the significance of a geographic perspective to resilience.

Section 3: Indicators and Measurement of Resilience

Various resilience frameworks comprising multiple indicators are used in empirical research to facilitate, assess and monitor the resilience of various social entities. Researchers developed a wide range of resilience scales as instruments to represent various levels of resilience indicators. Around twenty types of resilience scales are reported in the literature, applied to various age groups (young, adolescent and elderly) to measure stress, anxiety, and self-esteem. No agreement however, exists among scholars regarding the best resilience indicators and the most accurate methods of measuring resilience. In this section, I shed light on the debates regarding resilience indicators, the effectiveness of resilience scales and the methods associated with collecting data to measure resilience.

3.1 Indicators of Resilience

Indicators are described as ‘measureable proxies’ that represent various aspects of resilience. Diverse indicators based on a set of assumptions about the study topic have been used in the literature to monitor and measure resilience. The selection criteria for indicators reflect how resilience is conceptualized and defined. In addition, the types of data and the socio-environmental contexts of social entities influence how researchers derive indicators to measure resilience. For example, Nettles et al. (2000) examined the impact of social resources on the resilience outcomes of children and adolescents. They used indicators such as, children’s relationship with parents and teachers, their participation in extracurricular activities, and their exposure to violence to measure resilience. The indicators were selected based on studies that demonstrated how support from family, parents, and teachers enhance students’ academic performance and protects them from the negative effects of stressful events. Using a five point scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never), the study measured students’ experiences of stressful events and how often they received help from parents and teachers. In another study, Magis (2010) used nine indicators: community resources, development of community resources, engagement of community resources, active agents, collective action, strategic action, equity and impact to measure community resilience. The resilience indicators were selected by analyzing the transcripts of ten focus group discussions. Through content analysis, the study identified these indicators to draw out observable and measurable aspects of community challenge and resilience. The two studies reflect how resilience is conceptualized and measured in relation to the ways in which the subject of analysis, adversity and the expected outcome of being resilient were conceptualized. The studies emphasize how context dependency provides researchers greater flexibility in deriving resilience indicators (Ahern et al. 2006; Wagnild et al. 2009).

Despite widespread use of resilience indicators in empirical studies, some scholars argue that indicators cannot offer accurate and detailed information about resilience. Indicators are often selected and interpreted based on general assumptions about how social, environmental, economic and political systems work and what needs to be measured (Ahern et al. 2006; Schipper et al. 2015; Windle et al. 2011). Generalized assumptions about gender, race, age, and ethnicity are often considered as resilience criteria. As such, indicators do not fully reflect the experiential aspects of resilience. In addition, researchers often fail to distinguish indicators that measure input, processes and outcomes of resilience. The distinctions between various types of indicators is crucial to monitor and measure how various resilience enhancing interventions influence the actions of social entities (Windle et al. 2011). Researchers also question the rationale for deciding how many indicators are required to describe resilience and how to define the most important indicators. Most researchers agree that due to multiple interpretations of

resilience, it is difficult to effectively select indicators and develop assessment framework to measure resilience (Windle et al. 2011).

Considering the drawbacks, scholars have proposed various ideas to develop more effective resilience framework. For example, Ahern et al. (2006) suggest a sector-specific framework of indicators. They highlight how examining individual protective factors (courageous coping, hope and spiritual perspective), family protective factors (family atmosphere and family support and resources), and social protective factors (health resources and social integration) are crucial to understand and measure resilience (self-esteem, self-transcendence, and confidence/mastery) of adolescents. Addressing the questions of whose resilience and to what is also crucial while deriving resilience indicators. In addition, the importance of reflexivity is emphasized by scholars (Windle et al. 2011). To ensure reflexivity researchers need to be aware of the shortcomings of measuring resilience and acknowledge the limitations of capturing the dynamic characteristics of resilience. The proposed ideas encourage researchers to adopt a critical approach to resilience measurement framework.

3.2 Resilience Scale

Over the years scholars have developed various scales to measure levels of resilience. In general, these scales are used to assign numeric values to qualitative attributes of indicators. Two studies have evaluated the significance and effectiveness of resilience scales for various age groups. Reviewing six resilience scales⁴, Wagnild et al. (2009) concluded that ‘The Resilience Scale’⁵ is the most reliable tool to measure resilience due to its applicability for a wide range of population of different ages, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds. The simplicity of ‘The Resilience Scale’ is its main strength. In a similar vein, Windle et al. (2011) reviewed fifteen resilience scales. The main goal was to evaluate how well they reflect the complexity of the concept and its temporal dimension. They identified five scales⁶ that are useful for examining resilience across multiple levels. None of the scales included the temporal dimension of resilience. The scales also lack the capacity to detect whether an intervention changes resilience. In summary, authors did not find any ‘gold standard’ among fifteen measures of resilience. The studies stress the need for scales that capture the relations between quantitative scores and qualitative perspectives on resilience.

3.3 Methods

Another crucial point outlined in the literature is related to data collection methods and the study sample. Questionnaire surveys have been the most popular sources of data for measuring

⁴ The six scales reviewed are: Baruth Protective Factors Inventory, Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale, Resilience Scale for Adults, Adolescent Resilience Scale, Brief-Resilient Coping Scale and Resilience Scale.

⁵ The Resilience Scale (RS) is a 25-item scale using a 7-point rating (1–7). The scale has two factors, personal competence and acceptance of self and life, which measure the construct of resilience. The authors state that their psychometric evaluation supports the internal consistency reliability and concurrent validity of the scale (Wagnild & Young, 1993). Although originally tested with adult subjects, numerous studies have validated that the scale has worked well with samples of all ages and ethnic groups.

⁶ The five scales that measure resilience across multiple levels: the CYRM, the RSA, the Resilience Scale of the California Healthy Kids Survey, the READ and the YR: ADS).

resilience. Several studies indicate that how the questions are framed and the setting and circumstances in which a questionnaire is administered significantly shape the assessment information (Schipper et al. 2015; Windle et al. 2011). In this regard, several scholars recommend qualitative feedback on survey questions. This initiative could enhance questionnaire design that reflects cultural perspectives and opinions of target groups. Positive opinions towards the questionnaire would ensure high participation rate of target groups and reduce non-response rates and missing data. More recent analysis emphasizes the merits of qualitative methods for measuring resilience (Schipper et al. 2015; Magis 2010). Content analysis and discourse analysis are considered more effective methods to capture human experiences associated with social resilience. Qualitative methods allow researchers to shed light on unequal social relations that influence people's perceptions and actions, and shape their subjective interpretations of resilience (ibid).

Section 4: Migration and Resilience

The literature on migrant resilience reflects the debates surrounding theoretical and methodological approaches to resilience. Drawing on an agent-centric notion, most studies have focused on how migrants adapt to various settlement challenges. With a few exceptions (Voicu and Comşa 2014; Simich et al. 2012; Maiter and Stalker 2011), the responsibilities of government and non-government institutions are not emphasized in the literature. The following subsections describe how migrant resilience is conceptualized and explored in the literature with a particular focus migrant youth and women who often face various settlement challenges. I also highlight studies that emphasize resilience of migrant receiving societies.

4.1 Migrants, Challenges and Resilience

Resilience of migrants from diverse ethnic backgrounds (Black, Latino, Chinese, Filipino, South Asian, and Russian) in North America, Europe and Asia is scrutinized in relation to a wide range of issues including social, economic and psychological stressors associated with settlement and integration process. Migrant resilience is regarded as successful outcomes to the serious threats towards adaptation and development. To examine successful integration most studies examine the ways in which migrants draw on motivational aspirations and resources to deal with discrimination and adaptive challenges related to accessing employment, education and affordable housing (Thomas 2013; Michail 2013; Lester & Nguyen 2015; Lee 2005). A thread of literature examines the risk of stress and depression for vulnerable migrant groups, such as refugees and gays/lesbians, who had been exposed to violence, war and trauma before migration (Arnetz et al. 2013; Simich et al. 2012; Gray et al. 2015). In general, various personal traits (self-esteem, motivation, optimism, intellect, coping skills, and competence) and collective resources (community pride, ethnic networks, cultural practices, spiritual and faith-based networks) are recognized as protective factors that strengthen migrants' capacity to overcome challenges. By demanding settlement services that reflect their cultural values and practices, exercising voting rights and pursuing education many migrants exercise resiliency against institutional systems (Maiter and Stalker 2011; Owens and Lynch 2012; Trueba 1998; Voicu and Comşa 2014).

While most studies focus on manifestations of resilience at the level of either individual or community, some of the studies focus on family strengths and resilience. Love, care and empathy based relations are key factors that enable families to withstand integration challenges

(Falicov 2005; Cardoso and Thompson 2010). How the interrelations between multiple social units: individual, family, community, shape migrants' ability to address social and economic discrimination is also addressed in a few studies (Simich et al. 2012; Michail 2013; Gray et al. 2015). Critically, this body of work highlights the extensive support networks within migrant families and communities that help them overcome challenges they face in the course of resettlement.

Diverse methods are used to analyze the challenges and opportunities related to resilience. A mix of qualitative and quantitative methods is used in several studies to unpack the links between objective and subjective understandings of both individual and collective forms of resilience (Gray et al. 2015; Michail 2013; Xia et al. 2005). Although most studies are grounded in social approach to resilience, the analysis emphasizes the adaptive capacities of migrants rather than their transformative and participatory capacities.

4.2 Resilience and Migrant Youth

The social discrimination experienced by racialized migrant youth and their resilience to overcome social exclusion and mental stress remain a prominent topic in the literature. The case studies capture how anti-immigrant sentiment and stereotypical rhetoric that associates Latinos with undocumented illegal migrants and Muslims with terrorists create psychological stress among migrant youth in the USA and the UK (Alcantara 2013; Mythen 2012). Because of their racial and religious identities and migration status many children and adolescents in migrant families are often considered as a threat to national security. As such, the studies show that the institutional racism and stress experienced by some migrant youth are embedded within existing social structures. Strengthening family relations, community solidarity and creating an alternative space to express opinions within their own communities are effective measures to overcome their mental stress (Alcantara 2013; Mythen 2012; Rumbaut 2000). However, family and community support does not challenge and eradicate discriminatory practices that are embedded within social institutions. In order to address the root cause of institutional inequality government and non-government organizations need to adopt non-discriminatory policies and programs.

Although the adaptive capacity of migrant youth is highlighted, their capacity to resist is also mentioned (Mythen 2012). Their transformative capacity is not explored that much because the studies are mainly framed by an ecological approach to resilience. Diverse methods, such as interviews, focus group discussions and surveys are used to understand everyday experiences. Multiple quantitative and qualitative methods are also applied (Rumbaut 2000). The rationale for using multiple methods is not explained in most studies. None of the studies used any scale to measure resilience. The authors valorize personal narratives over numerical measurements. Using qualitative methods allowed researchers to reflect on the dynamic and subjective understandings of resilience in relation to migrant youth.

4.3 Resilience and Migrant Women

Racialized migrant women continue to face social and economic challenges throughout the migration and settlement process. For migrant women, resilience involves overcoming the current and past difficulties of relocation, such as psychological and physical losses, economic hardship, access to education, food security, mental health issues and race and gender-based discrimination. Various individual, family and community level indicators have been used to

identify and measure factors that facilitate coping strategies (Babatunde-Sowole 2016; Rashid and Gregory 2014; Lee et al. 2008; Raffaelli et al. 2012; van der Ham 2014). Besides adaptive capacities, structural constraints, strengths-based interventions, and preventive measures are highlighted in a few studies (van der Ham 2014; Rashid and Gregory 2014).

Comparative analysis of women's experiences before and after migration is emphasized to generate a more holistic knowledge of their resilience across place and time (Rashid and Gregory 2014). Most case studies of migrant women adopt a subjective and relational interpretation of resilience. Social capital often defined as resources embedded within the family and community is recognized as the most effective resilience enhancing factor. As such, the interrelationships between individual, family and community are emphasized by researchers. Multiple and mixed methods are used to measure migrant women's resilience. Adopting qualitative methods allows researchers to explore how racialized migrant women constitute resilience in relation to their personal and family circumstances (van der Ham 2014; Rashid and Gregory 2014).

4.4 Securitization and Resilience of Migrant Receiving Societies

Securitization has become a top priority for many nations. Building resilient societies is central to many counter-terrorism strategies (Government of Canada 2013; Bourbeau 2015a and 2015b). International migration is frequently constructed as a threat to security in anti-terrorism discourses. The links between migration, resilience and security dominate the discourses of securitization partly due to the stereotypical views of immigrants from certain religious and ethnic backgrounds whose cultural practices are seen as a security issue. The rise of radical Islam within Muslim societies has also contributed to heightened anti-immigrant discourses. The recent surge of migration from war torn Middle Eastern countries to North America and Europe has intensified the security concerns and debates about anti-terrorism strategies, and ultimately securitization of migration through implementing strict screening process.

A resilience approach to securitization targeting migrants is criticized as on the grounds that this approach alienates certain migrant groups and increases their vulnerability (Bourbeau 2015a and 2015b). An alternative pathway to address securitization and migrant integration through positive attitudes towards migrants is emphasized by Mollenkopf and Pastor (2012, 2013). The discussions highlight how instead of constructing migrants as threats, focusing on their contributions to economy and society would prevent social fragmentation and increase resilience of the society as a whole against security threats.

Section 5: Conclusions

Reviewing literature three aspects of resilience are highlighted in the first three sections of this paper. The first aspect involves the complexity in understandings of social and institutional dynamics within theoretical notions of social resilience. The second aspect relates to the ways that various definitions of resilience are questioned and deconstructed, while the third aspect scrutinizes the effectiveness of indicators and scales used to measure resilience. While the concept of social resilience is complex, ambiguous and multifaceted, it allows for new perspectives on the understanding of human actions in the face of challenges. One of the strengths of the concept of social resilience is that it emphasizes a flexible and dynamic process

of adaptation and transformation, rather than a fixed attribute of social entities. This notion emphasizes the embeddedness of social actors within specific social and institutional contexts. As such, social resilience concept possesses enormous potential for addressing power relations and institutional inequality, and transformative capacities. Future research needs to take into account how power and hegemonic discourses play crucial roles to dictate the meanings and processes of resilience.

The fourth section of the paper reflects on studies that used the term resilience to investigate migration and settlement challenges. Despite its popularity in other social studies, the concept of social resilience is not much explored in relation to the adaptive and transformative capacities of migrants. A handful of studies that focused on migrants' resilience document how they utilize individual, family and community resources to withstand challenges related to employment, education, housing and social exclusion. As such, these studies highlight the interrelations between different levels of social units and the significance of social networks. Using multiple methods, these studies shed light on abstract as well as subjective interpretations of resilience. However, an agent-centric notion is articulated in most studies while describing successful settlement of migrants. Structural constraints and the responsibilities of government and non-government institutions are not emphasized in the literature.

To strengthen a critical approach to social resilience and its applicability in migration studies, researchers need to emphasize the transformative capacity of migrants with regard to their settlement and integration challenges. A focus on dynamic links between social actors and institutions would allow researchers to go beyond the adaptive capacities of migrants by exploring the roles of institutions in enhancing migrant resilience and recognizing how migrants influence institutional policies and practices. To identify migrants' strengths and build their capacities future research needs to 1) engage in an intersectional analysis and incorporate the subjective experiences of diverse individuals, groups and institutions, 2) adopt a mixed method approach to address variations in resilience and pathways to resilience that arise from diverse types of adversities and varied transformative capacities, and 3) take account of how hegemonic discourses can dictate interpretations of migrant resilience.

Appendix A: Migration and Resilience: Literature from 2000-2016 by Themes with Abstracts

The abstracts are taken from journal articles and other publications that are reviewed in this paper.

1. Resilience

a. Definitions and Theoretical Approaches

Adger, W.N., 2000. Social and Ecological Resilience: Are They Related?. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), pp.347-364.

This article defines social resilience as the ability of groups or communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political and environmental change. This definition highlights social resilience in relation to the concept of ecological resilience which is a characteristic of ecosystems to maintain themselves in the face of disturbance. There is a clear link between social and ecological resilience, particularly for social groups or communities that are dependent on ecological and environmental resources for their livelihoods. But it is not clear whether resilient ecosystems enable resilient communities in such situations. This article examines whether resilience is a useful characteristic for describing the social and economic situation of social groups and explores potential links between social resilience and ecological resilience. The origins of this interdisciplinary study in human ecology, ecological economics and rural sociology are reviewed, and a study of the impacts of ecological change on a resource-dependent community in contemporary coastal Vietnam in terms of the resilience of its institutions is outlined.

Cretney, R., 2014. Resilience for Whom? Emerging Critical Geographies of Socio-ecological Resilience. *Geography Compass*, 8(9), pp.627-640.

Resilience has fast become a popular catchphrase used by government, international finance organisations, NGOs, community groups and activists all over the globe. Despite its widespread use, there remains confusion over what resilience is and the purpose it serves. Resilience can, in some cases, speak to a desire to successfully respond and adapt to disruptions outside of the status quo. However, this conceptualisation of resilience is far from uncontested. Emerging research has shown a lack of consideration for power, agency and inequality in popular and academic use of these frameworks. Criticism has also been raised regarding the use of resilience to justify projects informed by neoliberal ideologies that aim to decrease state involvement, increase community self-reliance and restructure social services. Despite this, resilience is being used by community and activist groups that aim to address local and global environmental and social issues. With this critical insight, the need has arisen to question what is being maintained, for whom and by whom, through these discourses of resilience. In this review, I trace the evolution of the concept

in the literature. Building on this, I discuss three interpretations of the resilience paradigm in current academic, political and activist arenas. I conclude by discussing possible future directions for critical geographic perspectives of resilience.

Dagdeviren, H., Donoghue, M. and Promberger, M., 2016. Resilience, Hardship and Social Conditions. *Journal of Social Policy*, 45(01), pp.1-20.

This paper provides a critical assessment of the term ‘resilience’ – and its highly agent-centric conceptualization – when applied to how individuals and households respond to hardship. We provide an argument for social conditions to be embedded into the framework of resilience analysis. Drawing on two different perspectives in social theory, namely the structure-agent nexus and path dependency, we aim to demonstrate that the concept of resilience, if understood in isolation from the social conditions within which it may or may not arise, can result in a number of problems. This includes misidentification of resilience, ideological exploitation of the term and inability to explain intermittence in resilience.

Folke, C., 2006. Resilience: The Emergence of A Perspective for Social-Ecological Systems Analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), pp.253-267.

The resilience perspective is increasingly used as an approach for understanding the dynamics of social–ecological systems. This article presents the origin of the resilience perspective and provides an overview of its development to date. With roots in one branch of ecology and the discovery of multiple basins of attraction in ecosystems in the 1960–1970s, it inspired social and environmental scientists to challenge the dominant stable equilibrium view. The resilience approach emphasizes non-linear dynamics, thresholds, uncertainty and surprise, how periods of gradual change interplay with periods of rapid change and how such dynamics interact across temporal and spatial scales. The history was dominated by empirical observations of ecosystem dynamics interpreted in mathematical models, developing into the adaptive management approach for responding to ecosystem change. Serious attempts to integrate the social dimension is currently taking place in resilience work reflected in the large numbers of sciences involved in explorative studies and new discoveries of linked social–ecological systems. Recent advances include understanding of social processes like, social learning and social memory, mental models and knowledge–system integration, visioning and scenario building, leadership, agents and actor groups, social networks, institutional and organizational inertia and change, adaptive capacity, transformability and systems of adaptive governance that allow for management of essential ecosystem services.

Hall, P.A. and Lamont, M. (eds), 2013. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. Cambridge University Press.

This book is an effort to assess developments in a neo-liberal era spanning the past three decades of global history. We want to know what consequences neo-liberal ideas and policies have for social, economic and political life. Instead of seeing neo-liberalism as a development with homogenous effects across space and time, we view it as a more open-ended stimulus that provoked a diversity of responses. Although neo-liberal initiatives improved the lives of some

people, it also posed profound challenges to the well-being of many groups, communities and individuals as more intense market competitions reallocated resources and market logics worked their way into even more spheres of life. We are interrelated in the ways in which groups sustained their well-being in the face of such challenges, and we see this as a problem of social resilience. Although our focus here is one the response to neoliberalism, we conceptualize social resilience broadly to encompass the capacities of societies to cope with many kinds of challenges.

Social resilience is an essential characteristics of what we call successful societies- namely, societies that provide their members with the resources to live healthy, secure and fulfilling lives. We are especially interested in understanding the sources of social resilience, and we look for them in the institutional and cultural resources that groups and individuals mobilize to sustain their well-being. Our approach to social resilience can be contrasted with influential perspectives that emphasize the psychological qualities needed to cope with various types of shocks. We are less interested in individual traits than in the social and cultural frameworks underpinning resilience, and we are skeptical about the efforts of some grounds to finding individual resilience the solutions to social problems. Even though many working class Americans believe they should find within themselves the psychological resources to deal with structural insecurity and rising inequality, we look for the institutional and cultural roles that underpins resilience in the wider social environment.

Joseph, J., 2013. Resilience as Embedded Neoliberalism: A Governmentality Approach. Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses. 1(1), pp.38-52.

This article looks at resilience as a form of governmentality. In particular, it is concerned to show that resilience, despite its claims to be about the operation of systems, is, in practice, closer to a form of governance that emphasizes individual responsibility. It traces this line of argument through looking at a range of documents and policy statements. The Anglo-Saxon understanding of resilience, in particular, is best understood as a neoliberal form of governmentality that places emphasis on individual adaptability. It fits with neoliberalism's normative way of mobilising social agents. This account is defended against a more philosophical claim that resilience is part of a post-liberal shift.

Keck, M., & Sakdapolrak, P., 2013. What is Social Resilience? Lessons Learned and Ways Forward. Erdkunde, 5-19.

Over the last decade, a growing body of literature has emerged which is concerned with the question of what form a promising concept of social resilience might take. In this article we argue that social resilience has the potential to be crafted into a coherent analytic framework that can build on scientific knowledge from the established concept of social vulnerability, and offer a fresh perspective on today's challenges of global change. Based on a critical review of recently published literature on the issue, we propose to define social resilience as being comprised of three dimensions: 1. Coping capacities - Uiz ability of social actors to cope with and overcome all kinds of adversities; 2. Adaptive capacities - their ability to learn from past experiences and adjust themselves to future challenges in their everyday lives; 3. Transformative capacities - their ability to craft sets of institutions that foster individual welfare and sustainable societal robustness towards future crises. Viewed in this way, the search for ways to build social resilience - especially in the livelihoods of the poor and marginalized - is revealed to be not only a technical, but also a political issue.

Leadbeater, B., Dodgen, D. and Solarz, A., 2005. The Resilience Revolution: A Paradigm Shift for Research and Policy. pp. 47–63 in *Resilience in Children, Families, and Communities: Linking Context to Practice and Policy*, edited by R. Dev. Peters, B. Leadbeater, and R. J. McMahon. New York: Kluwer.

This research raises questions about several time-honored and fundamental principles of scientific research and challenges our past, almost exclusive, emphasis on large-scale generalizability; comparisons between groups of individuals with successful versus unsuccessful outcomes; and characteristics of individuals. It focuses our attention on the diversity of responses to adverse experiences, and we need to know more about the characteristics of the adversities themselves. We also need to undertake individual, family, and community levels of analyses, and to investigate long-term processes of change that support and sustain adaptive functioning in the long term. To make these differences in focus concrete in an example, we can consider the research on domestic violence. This research has traditionally investigated the personality or behavioral characteristics of men who assault their intimate partners in contrast to other men or of women who remain in abusive relationships in contrast to women who leave. From a resilience perspective, we need to know more about the competencies as well as the family and community resources of women (actually the majority) who leave abusive relationships.

Liebenberg, L. and Ungar, M., (eds.) 2009. *Researching Resilience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

A survey of what we know about the experiences of children growing up under stress would quickly reveal an abundant literature that details disease, disorder and dysfunction. What we know far less about the ways in which large number of young people not only survive stressful environments but also thrive in spite of the risks to which they are exposed. The experience of health under stress, and the dynamic processes that contribute to positive development, have come to be known as resilience (Masten 2001; Unger 2005). Researchers concerned with the study of resilience have had to be innovative in their methods. In this volume we have brought together researchers curious about how to study young people's developmental pathways to well-being. Though in many ways this book shares similarities with that of researchers concerned with vulnerability, researching resilience has become common enough to merit a discussion of its own. Ironically, we can't study resilience without studying risk. Resilience is the positive end of the developmental continuum that occurs for children who experience both acute and chronic exposure to stressors like poverty, abuse, war, violence, neglect, drug addictions, mental illness, disability, marginalization, racism, and myriad of other ways their well-being is threatened. Studying resilience requires that we assess the level of risk posed to children which means we must close enough to vulnerable individuals to understand their lives within the culture and context within which they live.

Lorenz, D. F., 2013. The Diversity of Resilience: Contributions from A Social Science Perspective. *Natural Hazards*, 67(1), pp.7-24.

The paper presents contributions to the widespread resilience paradigm from a social science perspective. Certain aspects of social systems, especially their symbolic dimension of meaning, need to be taken into account in the endeavor to research coupled social–ecological systems. Due to the symbolic dimension, disasters are defined as the failure of future expectations, and social resilience is defined as the social system property of avoiding or withstanding disasters.

In relation to this, three capacities of social systems (adaptive, coping, and participative) that constitute resilience are presented. The adaptive capacity is the property of a system in which structures are modified to prevent future disasters, whereas the coping capacity is the system's property of coping with calamitous processes that occurred in the past. The participative capacity is a measure of the system's ability to change its own structures with regard to interventions by other systems, decreasing the system's resilience. The concept of resilience provides important epistemological and political insights and can help overcome an orientation tied together with the concept of vulnerability that blocks social capacities for the mitigation of disasters.

Luthar, S. S., 2006. Resilience in Development: A Synthesis of Research Across Five Decades, Cicchetti, Dante (ed.); Cohen, Donald J. (ed.), 2006. Developmental psychopathology, Vol 3: Risk, Disorder, and Adaptation (2nd ed.) (pp. 739-795). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc, xvi, 944 pp.

In this chapter, we describe the major developments in the field of resilience since its inception more than 40 years ago. The chapter is organized in four sections, the first one presenting a brief history of work on resilience. The second section is devoted to elucidating critical features of research on this construct, highlighting three sets of issues: definitions and operationalization of the two constructs at its core, protective and vulnerability factors; distinctions between the construct of resilience and related constructs, such as competence and ego resiliency; and differences between resilience research and related fields, including risk research, prevention science, and positive psychology. The third section of the chapter is focused on major findings on vulnerability and protective factors. These are discussed not only in terms of the specific factors found to modify risk within three broad categories--attributes of the family, community, and child--but also in terms of factors that exert strong effects across many risk conditions and those more idiosyncratic to specific risk contexts. The final section includes a summary of extant evidence in the field along with major considerations for future work on resilience across the life span.

MacKinnon, D. and Derickson, K. D., 2013. From Resilience to Resourcefulness: A Critique of Resilience Policy and Activism. *Progress in Human Geography*. 37(2), pp.253-270.

This paper provides a theoretical and political critique of how the concept of resilience has been applied to places. It is based upon three main points. First, the ecological concept of resilience is conservative when applied to social relations. Second, resilience is externally defined by state agencies and expert knowledge. Third, a concern with the resilience of places is misplaced in terms of spatial scale, since the processes which shape resilience operate primary at the scale of capitalist social relations. In place of resilience, we offer the concept of resourcefulness as an alternative approach for community groups to foster.

Magis, K., 2010. Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23(5), pp.401-416.

Change is a constant force, in nature and in society. Research suggests that resilience pertains to the ability of a system to sustain itself through change via adaptation and occasional transformation. This article is based on the premises that communities can develop resilience by actively building and engaging the capacity to thrive in an environment characterized by change,

and that community resilience is an important indicator of social sustainability. Community resilience, as defined herein, is the existence, development, and engagement of community resources by community members to thrive in an environment characterized by change, uncertainty, unpredictability, and surprise. The U.S. Roundtable on Sustainable Forests commissioned a research project to develop a theoretically and empirically based definition of community resilience as well as an associated measurement instrument. In this article, the research is presented, the emergent definition and dimensions of community resilience are posited, and the Community Resilience Self-Assessment is introduced.

Martin-Breen, P and Anderies, J. M., 2011. Resilience: A Literature Review. Retrieved December 24, 2013.

Resilience has, in the past four decades, been a term increasingly employed throughout a number of sciences: psychology and ecology, most prominently. Increasingly one finds it in political science, business administration, sociology, history, disaster planning, urban planning, and international development. The shared use of the term does not, however, imply unified concepts of resilience nor the theories in which it is embedded. Different uses generate different methods, sometimes different methodologies. Evidential or other empirical support can differ between domains of application, even when concepts are broadly shared. The review centres on three resilience frameworks, of increasing complexity: Engineering Resilience (or ‘Common Sense’ resilience); Systems Resilience, called Robustness in economics; and Resilience in Complex Adaptive Systems. Although each framework has historical roots in particular disciplines, the frameworks themselves can be applied to any domain: Engineering Resilience is utilised in some child development studies; Systems Resilience is often used in governance and management; and the Complex Adaptive Systems approach has been applied to economics, innovation in technology, history, and urban planning. Thus different frameworks along the spectrum offer a choice of perspective; the acceptability of trade-offs between them, and not subject matter, will ultimately determine which perspective is chosen.

Murray Nettles, S., Mucherah, W., & Jones, D. S., 2000. Understanding Resilience: The Role of Social Resources. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 5(1-2), pp.47-60.

Using the resilience literature as a theoretical framework, this article discusses research on the influence of social resources such as parent, teacher, and school support on the resilient outcomes of children and adolescents. Findings from several projects conducted at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk indicate that access to social resources such as caring parents who have high expectations for their children and are involved in their children’s schooling, participation in extracurricular activities (e.g., after-school sports), and supportive relationships with teachers have positive benefits for students’ academic performance. This article also reports results that show children’s perceived exposure to violence has significant negative effects on their mathematics and reading performance on a standardized exam. The findings demonstrate the importance of social resources and highlight the need for effective programs of intervention.

Plodinec, M.J., 2009. Definitions of Resilience: An Analysis. Oak Ridge: Community and Regional Resilience Institute (CARRI).

Resilience (derived from the Latin *resalire*, to spring back) has become an important term in the language of many disciplines ranging from psychology to ecology. Unfortunately, there is no commonly accepted definition of resilience that is used across all disciplines. The purpose of this note is to analyze the more widely used definitions in terms of their core concepts. The definitions which are most valuable in terms of improving the ability of communities to recover after disasters explicitly or implicitly contain the following five core concepts: Attribute: resilience is an attribute of the community. Continuing: a community's resilience is an inherent and dynamic part of the community. Adaptation: the community can adapt to adversity. Trajectory: adaptation leads to a positive outcome for the community relative to its state after the crisis, especially in terms of its functionality. Comparability: the attribute allows communities to be compared in terms of their ability to positively adapt to adversity.

Plodinec, M.J., Edwards, W.C. and White, R.K., 2014. Applications of a “Whole Community” Framework for Enhancing Community or Campus Resilience. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 18, pp.9-16.

The Community and Regional Resilience Institute (CARRI) has developed a unique approach to community resilience based on a “Whole Community” concept. It treats communities as a collection of systems, each with its own resilience. CARRI has applied its approach to two kinds of communities: civil communities, and institutions of higher education (IHEs). For both civil communities and IHEs, CARRI carried out a pilot program. For each participant, their leadership directed an assessment of the resilience of the component systems to the types of changes most relevant to that community. Each assessment provided suggestions for filling any gaps identified as part of the assessment. The pilot for the seven IHEs followed that for the seven civil communities and was able to take advantage of lessons learned from the first. These two pilot programs led to the following conclusions:

- CARRI's systems-based approach is both understandable and usable by both types of communities. In practice, it seemed to provide a natural way to look at a community.
- In general, IHEs were able to make better use of the approach than civil communities. This is due, in part, to the improvements made in the IHE pilot program based on the civil communities' results. However, it also reflects the more hierarchical nature of IHEs, the tighter coupling of systems within an IHE and greater discretion in the use of resources in an IHE.
- College campuses can be crucial catalysts for enhancing the resilience of civil communities.
- Leadership is a key, perhaps *the* key, element in the success of a community resilience initiative.

Rutter, M., 2000. Resilience Reconsidered: Conceptual Considerations, Empirical Findings, and Policy Implications.

Reviews the literature on the concept of resilience in children. The topic of individual resilience is one of considerable importance with respect to public policies focused on the prevention of either mental disorders or developmental impairment in young people. In planning preventive policies, it is important to ask whether it is more useful to focus on the risks that render children vulnerable to psychopathology or on the protective factors that provide for resilience in the face

of adversity. Topics covered include methodological considerations in the study of resilience, studies directly focusing on resilience, processes associated with resilience, and associated policy implications.

Shaw, K., 2012. The Rise of the Resilient Local Authority?. *Local Government Studies* 38(3), pp.281-300.

The term resilience is increasingly being utilised within the study of public policy to depict how individuals, communities and organisations can adapt, cope, and ‘bounce back’ when faced with external shocks such as climate change, economic recession and cuts in public expenditure. In focussing on the local dimensions of the resilience debate, this article argues that the term can provide useful insights into how the challenges facing local authorities in the UK can be reformulated and reinterpreted. The article also distinguishes between resilience as ‘recovery’ and resilience as ‘transformation’, with the latter's focus on ‘bouncing forward’ from external shocks seen as offering a more radical framework within which the opportunities for local innovation and creativity can be assessed and explained. While also acknowledging some of the weaknesses of the resilience debate, the dangers of conceptual ‘stretching’, and the extent of local vulnerabilities, the article highlights a range of examples where local authorities – and crucially, local communities – have enhanced their adaptive capacity, within existing powers and responsibilities. From this viewpoint, some of the barriers to the development of resilient local government are not insurmountable, and can be overcome by ‘digging deep’ to draw upon existing resources and capabilities, promoting a strategic approach to risk, exhibiting greater ambition and imagination, and creating space for local communities to develop their own resilience.

Southwick, S.M., Bonanno, G.A., Masten, A.S., Panter-Brick, C. and Yehuda, R., 2014. Resilience Definitions, Theory, and Challenges: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5.

In this paper, inspired by the plenary panel at the 2013 meeting of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies, Dr. Steven Southwick (chair) and multidisciplinary panelists Drs. George Bonanno, Ann Masten, Catherine Panter-Brick, and Rachel Yehuda tackle some of the most pressing current questions in the field of resilience research including: (1) how do we define resilience, (2) what are the most important determinants of resilience, (3) how are new technologies informing the science of resilience, and (4) what are the most effective ways to enhance resilience? These multidisciplinary experts provide insight into these difficult questions, and although each of the panelists had a slightly different definition of resilience, most of the proposed definitions included a concept of healthy, adaptive, or integrated positive functioning over the passage of time in the aftermath of adversity. The panelists agreed that resilience is a complex construct and it may be defined differently in the context of individuals, families, organizations, societies, and cultures. With regard to the determinants of resilience, there was a consensus that the empirical study of this construct needs to be approached from a multiple level of analysis perspective that includes genetic, epigenetic, developmental, demographic, cultural, economic, and social variables. The empirical study of determinates of resilience will inform efforts made at fostering resilience, with the recognition that resilience may be enhanced on numerous levels (e.g., individual, family, community, culture).

Stark, D., 2014. On Resilience. *Social sciences*, 3(1), 60-70.

This commentary reviews key themes posed by papers in this Special Issue and points to open questions. For example, does resilience in socio-technical systems degrade with use or, like immune systems, is resilience upgraded with use? Similarly, is resilience about *responding* in the face of the rare event? Or, is it being *prepared* for the rare event? Is it useful to think about the evolution of resilience? What are the risks posed by models of risk? That is, do models to reduce vulnerability to risk, increase vulnerability? What is the role of reflexivity in the analysis of resilience?

Taylor, R. D. and Wang, M. C., (eds.) 2000. *Resilience Across Contexts: Family, Work, Culture, and Community*. Psychology Press.

A number of societal risks pose serious challenges to the well-being of families, many of which cut across divisions of class and race. These challenges include changes in the labour market and economy, the increasing participation of mothers in the labour force, the changing nature of family structure and the composition of households, and the increase in the number of immigrant families. Key institutions in the lives of families can play a significant role in fostering families' capacity to adapt to the potential challenges they face. Places of employment, schools, community agencies and other educational and social services providing institutions have resources and expertise to provide supportive mechanisms that foster resilience in children and families with multiple and highly adverse life circumstances that place them at risk. The concept of resilience-promoting interventions has emerged from research indicating the prospect of some children and families surviving serious life-threatening adversities without lasting damage. Such children and families tend to be motivated, independent, resourceful, and self-determined, and possess good interpersonal and cognitive problem-solving skills. Research focusing on furthering our understanding of the factors that influence resilience development can contribute to our capacity for designing interventions and public policies that will ultimately benefit all children and families. Much is known from research and practical applications of what works to promote resilience of children and families who live in a variety of high-risk life situations. It is in the context of broadening our understanding of how to magnify the circumstances known to enhance healthy development and educational success of children and youth in at-risk circumstances that this volume was conceived.

Ungar, M., 2012a. Social Ecologies and Their Contribution to Resilience. pp. 13-31 in *The Social Ecology of Resilience: A Handbook of Theory and Practice*, edited by M. Ungar. New York: Springer.

More than two decades after Michael Rutter (1987) published his summary of protective processes associated with resilience, researchers continue to report definitional ambiguity in how to define and operationalize positive development under adversity. The problem has been partially the result of a dominant view of resilience as something individuals have, rather than as a process that families, schools, communities and governments facilitate. Because resilience is related to the presence of social risk factors, there is a need for an ecological interpretation of the construct that acknowledges the importance of people's interactions with their environments.

VanderPlaats, M., 2015. Activating the Sociological Imagination to Explore the Boundaries of Resilience Research and Practice. *School Psychology International*, p.0143034315615938.

Traditionally, the field of resilience research, especially as it relates to children and youth, has been well ensconced in the discipline of psychology. Sociologists, when they do engage with the

concept, tend to do so at the level of the community. In recent years, an increasing number of scholars have called for a construction of resilience and resilience-promoting interventions that recognizes the importance of context and culture for the positive development of youth living in stressful circumstances. As such, the social ecologies surrounding a youth and the responsiveness of interventions within these ecologies are argued to be as important, if not more so, than the risk and protective factors characterizing the individual. This shift in gaze from the individual to systemic structures creates important challenges for practitioners such as school psychologists and opens up an interesting discursive space for sociologists to participate in the exploration and explication of what the concept of resilience is all about. In this article I explore how a sociological perspective can enrich the discourse and how the activation of the sociological imagination can serve to expand the boundaries of resilience research and school psychology practice.

b. Measurement of Resilience

Ahern, N.R., Kiehl, E.M., Lou Sole, M. and Byers, J., 2006. A Review of Instruments Measuring Resilience. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 29(2), pp.103-125.

The objectives of the study were to evaluate the psychometric properties and appropriateness of instruments for the study of resilience in adolescents. A search was completed using the terms resilience and instruments or scales using the EBSCO database (CINAHL, PreCINAHL, and Academic Search Premier), MEDLINE, PsychINFO and PsychARTICLES, and the Internet. After instruments were identified, a second search was performed for studies reporting the psychometric development of these instruments. Using inclusion and exclusion criteria, six psychometric development of instrument studies were selected for a full review. A data extraction table was used to compare the six instruments.

Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J.M. and Abel, N., 2001. From Metaphor to Measurement: Resilience of What to What?. *Ecosystems*, 4(8), pp.765-781.

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. The operational indicators of resilience have, however, received little attention in the literature. To assess a system's resilience, one must specify which system configuration and which disturbances are of interest. This paper compares resilience properties in two contrasting SES, lake districts and rangelands, 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 coevolved 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.

Schipper, E. L. F., & Langston, L., 2015. A Comparative Overview of Resilience Measurement Frameworks: Analysing Indicators and Approaches. Overseas Development Institute, London.

We examined 17 sets of indicators of resilience found in internationally recognised resilience frameworks. The purpose was to understand what the indicators actually say about resilience, and this required a working definition of resilience against which to assess the indicators. Following a review of the literature, we identified three criteria (Learning, Options, Flexibility) that cover key dimensions of resilience that recur in the literature. We complemented the literature review with written interviews with eight key informants in the field. We then looked at the indicators to see whether they aligned with our criteria of resilience, and the nature of this alignment. The analysis identified a number of issues that may contribute to the broad discussion on resilience and resilience indicators. We found that the criteria selected for the analysis were generally well aligned with the indicator sets. The analysis furthermore showed that: (1) each framework is strongly influenced by its conceptual entry point, making a comparison only partially possible and justifying the development of further frameworks; (2) there is a clear gap between the theory on resilience and the way in which the indicators focus on well-being and general development factors; and (3) indicators may not always provide a complete picture of resilience.

Wagnild, G., 2009. A Review of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 17(2), pp.105-113.

The purpose of this article is to review 12 completed studies that have used the Resilience Scale (Wagnild & Young, 1993). Completed studies were identified through *PubMed* and *CINAHL*. Studies that identified Resilience Scale scores, sample descriptions, and tested relationships between the Resilience Scale and study variables were selected for inclusion. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .72 to .94 supporting the internal consistency reliability of the Resilience Scale. Hypothesized relationships between the Resilience Scale and study variables (e.g., forgiveness, stress, anxiety, health promoting activities) were supported strengthening the evidence for construct validity of the Resilience Scale. In the studies reported here, the Resilience Scale has been used with a variety of individuals of different ages, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds. The Resilience Scale has performed as a reliable and valid tool to measure resilience and has been used with a wide range of study populations.

Windle, G., Bennett, K.M. and Noyes, J., 2011. A Methodological Review of Resilience Measurement Scales. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 9(1), p.1.

Background: The evaluation of interventions and policies designed to promote resilience, and research to understand the determinants and associations, require reliable and valid measures to ensure data quality. This paper systematically reviews the psychometric rigour of resilience measurement scales developed for use in general and clinical populations.

Methods: Eight electronic abstract databases and the internet were searched and reference lists of all identified papers were hand searched. The focus was to identify peer reviewed journal articles

where resilience was a key focus and/or is assessed. Two authors independently extracted data and performed a quality assessment of the scale psychometric properties.

Results: Nineteen resilience measures were reviewed; four of these were refinements of the original measure. All the measures had some missing information regarding the psychometric properties. Overall, the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, the Resilience Scale for Adults and the Brief Resilience Scale received the best psychometric ratings. The conceptual and theoretical adequacy of a number of the scales was questionable.

Conclusion: We found no current 'gold standard' amongst 15 measures of resilience. A number of the scales are in the early stages of development, and all require further validation work. Given increasing interest in resilience from major international funders, key policy makers and practice, researchers are urged to report relevant validation statistics when using the measures.

2. Immigrants and Resilience

a. Immigrants, Challenges and Resilience

Arnetz, J., Rofa, Y., Arnetz, B., Ventimiglia, M. and Jamil, H., 2013. Resilience as a Protective Factor against the Development of Psychopathology among Refugees. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 201(3), p.167.

Refugee research to date has predominantly focused on factors that make refugees more vulnerable for developing posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and /or psychological distress. Few papers have studied potential protective factors such as resilience. A targeted non-random sample of Iraqi refugees (n=75) and a control group of non-Iraqi Arab immigrants (n=53) were recruited from a number of Iraqi/Arab community institutions in Michigan to complete a questionnaire that included measures for psychological distress, PTSD symptoms, exposure to trauma, and resilience. Refugees reported significantly more PTSD symptoms (T-test, $p<.01$) and psychological distress ($p<.05$) compared to immigrants. There was no difference in resilience between the two groups. In linear regression, pre-migration exposure to violence was a significant predictor of psychological distress ($p<.01$) and PTSD symptoms ($p<.01$). After controlling for migrant status and violence exposure, resilience was a significant inverse predictor of psychological distress ($p<.001$) but not of PTSD. Resilience is associated with less trauma-related psychological distress and should be considered in assessing risk and protective factors among victims of war-related violence.

Aroian, K.J. and Norris, A.E., 2000. Resilience, Stress, and Depression among Russian Immigrants to Israel. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 22(1), pp.54-67.

This article reports the relationships between resilience, demographic characteristics, immigration demands, and depression in a sample of 450 adult Russian immigrants to Israel. Contrary to theories of how resilience is related to psychological outcomes, no support was found for resilience modifying or mediating the relationship between the demands of

immigration and depression. Resilience did, however, increase the risk of not being depressed by about twofold ($p < .0001$).

Cardoso, J.B. and Thompson, S., 2010. Common Themes of Resilience among Latino Immigrant Families: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 91(3), pp.257-265.

Although there is a plethora of research on resiliency, there are few studies that examine this concept in Latino immigrant families in the United States. Using key terms such as immigrant, Hispanic, Latino, and resiliency, a systematic literature review was conducted to identify characteristics of resilience and understand how these factors uniquely protect Latino immigrant families against stressors related to the migration and assimilation processes. Research on resilience among Latino immigrant families indicates 4 major domains: individual characteristics, family strengths, cultural factors, and community supports. A deeper understanding of how these risk and protective factors contribute to resilience with Latino immigrant families will increase the cultural competence of policy, practice, and research with this population. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

Falicov, C. J., 2005. Ambiguous Loss: Risk and Resilience in Latino Immigrant Families. pp. 197- 206 in *The New Immigration: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by C. Suarez-Orozco, M. Suarez- Orozco, and D. B. Qin-Hilliard. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Latino immigrants, like many other immigrants, experience to one degree or another, loss, grief and mourning. These experiences have been compared with the processes of grief and mourning precipitated by the death of loved ones. (Shuval, 1982; Warheit et al, 1985; Grinberg and Grinberg, 1989; Volkan and Zintl, 1993). Here, I will argue, however, that migration loss has special characteristics that distinguish it from other kinds of losses. Unlike the clear-cut, inescapable fact of death, migration as loss is both larger and smaller. It is larger because migration brings with it losses of all kinds: gone are family members and friends who stay behind, gone is the native language, the customs and rituals, the land itself. The ripples of these losses touch the extended kin back home and reach into the future generations born in the new land. Yet, migration loss is also smaller than death, because despite the grief and mourning of physical, cultural and social separation, the losses are not absolutely clear, complete and irretrievable. Furthermore, immigrants seldom migrate towards a social vacuum. A relative, friend or acquaintance usually waits on the other side to help with work, housing, and guidelines for the new life. A social community and ethnic neighborhood reproduces in pockets of remembrance, the sights, sounds, smells, and tastes of one's country. All of these elements create a mix of emotions: sadness and elation, losses and restitution, absence and presence that make grieving incomplete, postponed, ambiguous. In this paper, I attempt to integrate concepts from family systems theory (ambiguous loss, boundary ambiguity, relational resilience) with concepts from studies on migration, race and ethnicity (familism, biculturalism, double consciousness) to deepen our understanding of the risks and resiliences accompanying migration loss for Latinos. I propose that an inclusive, both/and approach, rather than an either/or choice, to the dilemmas of cultural and family continuity and change increases family resilience in the face of multiple migration losses. While Latinos share many similarities in the aspects of family coping with loss addressed in this paper, each family has a particular "ecological niche" created by combinations of nationality, ethnicity, class, education, religion or occupation, and by their individual personal histories.

Gray, N.N., Mendelsohn, D.M. and Omoto, A.M., 2015. Community Connectedness, Challenges, and Resilience among Gay Latino Immigrants. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55(1-2), pp.202-214.

To date, relatively little psychological research has focused on the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) Latino/a immigrants to the United States. This qualitative study used face-to-face semi-structured interviews to explore the unique sources of stress, challenges, as well as opportunities and factors related to resilience among 13 gay Latino first- and second-generation immigrants. Iterative coding of interview transcripts revealed four key themes, each of which is illustrated with verbatim quotes: (1) feelings of connectedness to the LGBT community, (2) feelings of connectedness to the Latino/a community, (3) intersectional challenges and strategies, and (4) well-being, strength, and resilience. As suggested by these themes, gay Latino immigrants have distinct sources of stress and conflict, many of them associated with community memberships, but also draw on unique sources of support and adaptive thoughts and behaviors in facing stressors. Implications for studying risk and resilience factors among stigmatized populations, including LGBT individuals and immigrants, are discussed.

Lee, R.M., 2005. Resilience against Discrimination: Ethnic Identity and Other-group Orientation as Protective Factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(1), p.36.

This study investigated the resilience of 84 Korean American college students in the context of perceived ethnic discrimination. Two cultural resources, multidimensional ethnic identity and other-group orientation, were hypothesized as protective factors that moderate the negative effects of discrimination. Only 1 aspect of ethnic identity was found to have a moderation effect. Specifically, ethnic identity pride operated as a protective-reactive factor that moderated the effects of discrimination on depressive symptoms and social connectedness but not on self-esteem. Ethnic identity pride and perceived discrimination had first-order effects on self-esteem. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved).

Lester, T.W. & Nguyen, M.T., 2015. The Economic Integration of Immigrants and Regional Resilience. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Available at: <http://brr.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Lester-Nguyen-immigrant-integration.pdf>.

This article explores variation in the economic integration of immigrants across U.S. metropolitan areas and tests a basic hypothesis that greater economic integration promotes regional resilience. Here we construct two quantitative indexes of occupational diversity as primary indicators of economic integration and develop a conceptual framework of social, economic, and spatial factors that are likely to shape occupational diversity at the regional scale. We conduct an exploratory quantitative analysis in two steps. First, we model labor market diversity in 2000 with metro level data drawn primarily from the Building Resilient Regions (BRR) database. Next, we use the occupational diversity indexes as dependent variables and assess whether greater occupational diversity among immigrants led to greater economic resilience between 2000 and 2010, as measured by changes in unemployment rate and real wage growth. We find some evidence that immigrants in regions that have more broadly integrated immigrants (across occupations) were relatively more resilient in the face of the economic shocks of the Great Recession.

Michail, D., 2013. Social Development and Transnational Households: Resilience and Motivation for Albanian Immigrants in Greece in the Era of Economic Crisis. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 13(2), pp.265-279.

This paper examines the ways in which the Greek economic crisis has affected the social development of Albanian immigrants in both the sending and the host country. It focuses on transnational households and family development projects and examines the degree of resilience and the power of motivation that drives people's reactions during the crisis, comparing first- and second-generation immigrants. My research focuses mainly on those Albanian immigrants who by the third year of the economic crisis still live in Greece. The empirical analysis is based on primary data derived from participant observation, a semi-structured questionnaire with second-generation migrants and in-depth interviews amongst first- and second-generation Albanian immigrants residing in both urban and rural areas in Greece.

Maiter, S. and Stalker, C., 2011. South Asian Immigrants' Experience of Child Protection Services: Are we Recognizing Strengths and Resilience?. *Child & Family Social Work*, 16(2), pp.138-148.

Ethno-racial minority families who come in contact with child protection services face unique challenges that include different ideas about appropriate child rearing practices, possibly different definitions of child maltreatment, the possibility of racial biases and service provision that does not address their particular needs. Ethno-racial minority immigrants encounter additional barriers to services associated with the challenges of settlement in a new cultural environment. Although considerable research has explored these issues, knowledge of the experiences of ethno-racial families who have been in contact with child protection is limited. The current paper provides insights from a qualitative study that explored the experiences of one ethno-racial group (South Asians) in Canada. Findings suggest a variety of reasons that families come into contact with the child protection system, and the characteristics of the sample highlight their difficult financial and employment circumstances. Themes include participants' desire to be better informed about the reasons for child protection involvement and about what they can expect from the worker and the agency. They also identified a wish for services that not only recognize their cultural diversity but also respond to the needs of the whole family. In-home services were especially appreciated. The findings reveal the resilience and personal agency among participants that can be enhanced through strength-based approaches to practice. Helping others, establishing community networks and developing needed services were avenues of resilience identified.

Owens, J. and Lynch, S.M., 2012. Black and Hispanic Immigrants' Resilience against Negative-ability Racial Stereotypes at Selective Colleges and Universities in the United States. *Sociology of Education*, 85(4), pp.303-325.

Stereotype threat is a widely supported theory for understanding the racial achievement gap in college grade performance. However, today's minority college students are increasingly of immigrant origins, and it is unclear whether two dispositional mechanisms that may increase susceptibility to stereotype threat are applicable to immigrants. We use survey data to examine whether and how negative-ability stereotypes affect the grades of 1,865 first-, second-, and third-generation or higher (domestic) minority students at 28 selective American colleges. Structural equation model results indicate that first-generation immigrants are highly resistant to both

dispositional identity threat mechanisms we consider. Second-generation immigrants experience only certain dispositional elements of identity threat. Drawing on research in social psychology, we suggest immigrants tend to resist stereotype threat in part due to the primacy of their immigrant identities and their connectedness to the opportunity structure of mainstream society.

Simich, L., Roche, B. and Ayton, L., 2012 Defining Resiliency, Constructing Equity. A Research Report. Wellesley Institute.

Resilience is often described as an individual attribute, but emerging research suggests that contextual and cultural factors are just as significant and can offer important insights for community mental health. In this report we examine the local understandings that have emerged about resilience related to refugee resettlement in three refugee communities in Toronto. This pilot research offers an important snapshot of the lives of forced migrants as they adapt to a new environment, bringing to the forefront some of the mechanisms that individuals and communities draw upon to begin to address trauma, instability and the challenges of rebuilding their lives in a new context. Resilience emerges in two distinctive ways. One is deeply personal whereby resilience is shaped by personal attributes, experiences and histories. The other is informed more by the perceptions and expectations of the social world that surrounds refugees and forced migrants (including family, social networks and community). The personal characteristics that people identify as key markers of resilience are valuable in rebuilding individual lives but also in building community, whereas the more external characteristics of resilience help to create support networks within communities. Participants identified some clear “tactical enablers” to support resilience locally, including supporting specialized services and local neighbourhood groups that can aid in meaningful settlement. Getting involved locally in settlement communities as well as wider communities were also highlighted as tools of resiliency, creating opportunities for people to take action on issues that matter to them. Problematically, community supports are limited in their ability to address the social determinants of health. System-wide impediments such as racism and discrimination can act as barriers to both individual and collective forms of resilience. Importantly, different migration histories may mean that there are distinctive needs and different forms of resilience available to refugees at different time points. Where migrant communities are not well established, many people demonstrate a willingness to adapt as needed, drawing on informal sources within the larger community. The insights gathered in this report contribute to our understanding of the sources of health promoting knowledge and practice across communities. Critically, this work may help us move towards crafting local solutions that are shaped by community members for issues that refugees face in resettlement.

Thomas, R., 2013. Resilience and Housing Choices among Filipino Immigrants in Toronto. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 13(4), pp.408-432.

In Canada, where immigration plays a major role in population growth, immigrants’ housing choices and settlement patterns have been extensively researched. Using a case study of Filipino immigrants in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, this paper demonstrates that choices such as affordable rental housing may contribute to flexibility and mobility in increasingly competitive labour and housing markets. The study, using descriptive statistics from Census data and interviews with Filipino immigrants, found that structural changes in immigration, housing and labour market policy over the past few decades have affected immigrants’ housing choices. These structural changes, combined with Filipinos’ resilience strategies, have resulted in housing patterns that are responsive to constantly changing household and labour market characteristics.

Trueba, E.T., 1998. Mexican Immigrants from El Rincon: A Case Study of Resilience and Empowerment. *TESOL Journal*, 7(3), pp.12-17.

The narratives of three Mexican immigrants to El Rincon, a fictitious name for a California town, illustrate the process of empowerment fostered by education. Narratives include those of a mother, a fourth-grade teacher, and a high school student aspiring to an engineering degree. Cultural context, working conditions, and the role of language in empowerment are considered. (MSE).

Tse, S. and Liew, T., 2004. New Zealand Experiences: How is Community Resilience Manifested in Asian Communities?. *eCOMMUNITY: International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 2(1).

This paper explores the notion of resilience at a community level, and is based on data collected as part of an ongoing research project. Specifically, the viability of community resilience as a concept is examined, including visible signs for its manifestation. The context is the diverse Asian community in the Auckland suburb of Glen Innes, which has grown since the late 1990s. We examine how this Asian community in Glen Innes demonstrates resilience and how preliminary data may bolster our general understanding of community resilience. Possible future directions for research and initiatives are also discussed.

Voicu, B. and Comşa, M., 2014. Immigrants' Participation in Voting: Exposure, Resilience, and Transferability. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(10), pp.1572-1592.

Resilience, exposure and transferability are the most common explanations of immigrant political mobilisation in the context of the host society. They are based on assumptions about socialisation and institutionalisation, which are common to native-born groups as well. They lead to hypotheses about the impact of 'cultures of voting turnout.' This paper tests these hypotheses through cross-classified multilevel logistic regression analysis of immigrants' voting intentions. The method is new to the analysis of voting behaviour, and allows the comparison of immigrants of multiple origin groups in multiple host countries. This paper provides support for exposure effects: living in a society where most people cast ballots in national elections increases the odds that immigrants are willing to vote. Transferability is not evident, as coming from a culture of high turnout actually lowers the probability of voting. Such impact is not mediated by the length of stay or by the political opportunity structure specific to immigrants, but is stronger in systems of compulsory voting.

Xia, Y., Zhou, Z.G. and Xie, X., 2005. Strengths and Resilience in Chinese Immigrant Families: An Initial Effort of Inquiry, Department of Child, Youth and Family Studies, University of Nebraska.

The landscape of American demography has changed dramatically since the middle of the 20th century. Research indicates that the number of immigrants to the United States will continue to increase rapidly over the next three decades (Day, 1996). As the immigrant population grows, so does the necessity for family researchers to build theories to describe and explain the experiences of the new immigrant families. The research that we present here is aimed at expanding the knowledge base in relation to the resilience of newcomers in the Midwest; this study involved the use of both qualitative (holistic) and quantitative (scientific) methods. Our specific objectives

in this case study are to identify the strengths of new Chinese immigrant families and to add to the family strengths model.

b. Resilience and Immigrant Youth

Alcantara, D., 2013. Latino Youth Experiences of Immigrant Policy, Enforcement, and Exclusion: Exploring Risk and Resilience.

This study aims to document the lived experiences of Latino youth as they navigate environments that are impacted by anti-immigrant sentiment and increased documentation enforcement. The current literature, while limited, suggests that anti-immigrant sentiment and increased enforcement compound other stressors experienced by Latino immigrants to negatively impact the mental health of children, youth and adults (APA, 2012; Suarez-Orozco et al., 2011; Yoshikawa, 2011). However, the literature has not systematically explored the experiences of children and youth who are affected personally or vicariously through impacts on their community. When studies do focus on the contextual and psychological factors, they do not address the ways in which Latino youth confront discrimination by creating alternative spaces in order to foster resilience and empowerment. Increasingly, developmental literatures and those focused on physical and mental health impacts of social discrimination use ecological models to address the interweaving of social experiences as these impact both private, psychological dimensions, and external, realistic dimensions of lived experiences. To address the gap in the literature, this study applied an ecological approach to Latino immigrant youth experiences of stressors associated with documentation status, applying these frameworks first to review relevant interdisciplinary literatures in ways that explore social factors and psychological impacts, and then to guide areas of inquiry exploring youth experiences.

Mythen, G., 2012. Identities in the Third Space? Solidity, Elasticity and Resilience amongst Young British Pakistani Muslims. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(3), pp.393-411.

Over the last decade the issue of identity has been prevalent in discussions about British Muslims, with the events of 9/11 serving as a touchstone for media debates about religious, national and cultural affiliations. The 7/7 terrorist attacks in the UK led to young British Pakistanis being subjected to intense public and institutional scrutiny and wider political concerns being expressed about the failure of multiculturalism. Young British Pakistanis have thus had to negotiate and maintain their identities in an environment in which they have been defined as a threat to national security whilst simultaneously being pressurized to align with 'core British values'. Within this context, we convey the findings of a qualitative study involving British Pakistanis living in the North-west of England. In presenting the experiences and perspectives of participants, three interconnected processes salient to the maintenance of identity are delineated: solidity, elasticity and resilience. Having unpacked these processes, we draw upon Bhabha's third space thesis to explore the political potentiality of and the limits to hybridic identities.

Rumbaut, R.G., 2000. Profiles in Resilience: Educational Achievement and Ambition among Children of Immigrants in Southern California. In *National Invitational Conference on "Resilience Across Contexts: Family, Work, Culture, and Community."*, Mar, 1998, Temple U, Philadelphia, PA, US; This chapter is a revision of a paper presented at the aforementioned conference.. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Reports on some of the latest results of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), which studies the educational performance and social, cultural, and psychological adaptation of children of immigrants during the 1990s. Eighth and ninth grade students were surveyed and interviewed. This chapter is limited to and focuses on the educational performance and aspirations of the youths in the San Diego area. A portrait of the children is given. The portrait includes the socioeconomic status and neighborhood contexts, family structure and the quality of family relationships, patterns of achievement, and patterns of ambition. The predictors of achievement and ambition are also discussed. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved).

c. Resiliency and Immigrant Women

Babatunde-Sowole, O., Power, T., Jackson, D., Davidson, P.M. and DiGiacomo, M., 2016. Resilience of African Migrants: An Integrative Review. *Health Care for Women International*, pp.1-18.

African migrant women represent a rapidly growing cohort of new arrivals in many countries. Many of these women demonstrate strength and resilience throughout the stressful migration process. In this integrative review, we explore the literature on African migrants' resilience using an ecological framework. Nine peer-reviewed journal articles and six grey literature documents were reviewed. Key internal and external factors in achieving resilience were identified, discussed, and diagrammatically represented using Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Framework under micro-, meso-, exo-, and macro-levels. Our findings show that the capacity for resilience demonstrated during migration could have implications for policy and practice.

Lee, Hei-Sung, Stephen L. Brown, Mary M. Mitchell, and Glenn R. Schiraldi., 2008. Correlates of Resilience in the Face of Adversity for Korean Women Immigrating to the US. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 10(5):415–22.

Objectives - To explore the association between resilience and psychosocial variables of theoretical relevance such as self-esteem, optimism, religiousness, cultural interdependency, and belief in higher education in a population of elderly Korean women and their daughters who experienced great adversity. Methods- Surveys were conducted with 200 elderly Korean women and 170 of their daughters in several community locations. Results- Both mothers and daughters experienced great adversities in their lives such as psychological and physical losses from war as well as current and past difficulties with relocation. The mothers' bivariate correlations indicate that self-esteem, optimism, religiousness, and cultural interdependency were significantly correlated with resilience. Length of time in the US, age entering the US, physical and psychological war-related adversities, current relocation difficulties, self-esteem, optimism, cultural interdependency, and belief in education were all significantly associated with daughters' resilience. In linear regression, self-esteem and optimism were significant predictors of resilience in both mothers and daughters. Conclusions Self-esteem and optimism deserve further attention as psychological factors that may increase the likelihood of developing resilience. Implications of these findings for health professionals are discussed.

Raffaelli, M., Tran, S.P., Wiley, A.R., Galarza-Heras, M. and Lazarevic, V., 2012. Risk and Resilience in Rural Communities: The Experiences of Immigrant Latina mothers. *Family Relations*, 61(4), pp.559-570.

Immigrants from Latin America are increasingly settling in rural U.S. communities that welcome them as workers but are often unprepared to address their needs and promote their well-being. Building on recent descriptive studies, we examined factors associated with individual and family well-being in a sample of 112 immigrant Latina mothers (mean age 34.5 years, 93% Mexican) who completed in-person interviews. Mothers who reported a more negative community climate reported lower levels of individual and family well-being (life satisfaction, financial well-being, and food security). Composite measures of economic and social capital were positively related to family well-being; unexpectedly, mothers with higher levels of human capital reported lower levels of life satisfaction. Discussion focuses on implications of results for future research, theory-building, and practice.

Rashid, R. and Gregory, D., 2014. 'Not Giving up On Life': A Holistic Exploration of Resilience among a Sample of Immigrant Canadian Women. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 46(1), pp.197-214.

We explored the experiences of immigrant women and their journeys before and after coming to Canada and focused on their resilience in overcoming challenges faced during their resettlement process. Considering the many challenges recent immigrant women encountered during their settlement and the associated potential for negative impact, it was important to focus on how the participants withstood adversity and demonstrated resilience. Qualitative methodology made use of repeated in-depth person-centered interviews ($n=14$) with five women who recently migrated to Canada under immigrant status (other than refugee). Thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data set. Three major themes emerged from the data: Life before Canada; A journey of compound stressors; and Resilience: Not giving up on life. The study extends the literature on immigrants' resilience in two ways. First, the study moved beyond an exploration of post-migration experience and considered women's lives before and after migration to render a more holistic understanding of their resilience. Second, the study examined how resilience was constituted among the women within their spousal-dyads, and their families. To understand an immigrant woman's resilience is also to understand her life prior to arrival in Canada, the resilience of her marriage and that of her family. Finally, suggestions for future research are also addressed in this study.

van der Ham, A.J., Ujano-Batangan, M.T., Ignacio, R. and Wolffers, I., 2014. Toward Healthy Migration: An Exploratory Study on the Resilience of Migrant Domestic Workers from the Philippines. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 51(4), pp.545-568.

Domestic workers face many migration-related stressors that affect their mental health. Currently there is an emphasis in the literature on these workers' problems and vulnerability, while there is little insight into factors that positively affect their mental health. In this study, we describe a range of factors that potentially contribute to the resilience of female domestic workers from the Philippines, and explore their relation to stress and well-being. The study used an explorative, mixed-methods design. First, data were collected using questionnaires ($n=500$) to assess self-perceived stress levels, well-being, personal resources, and social resources. Then, findings from the questionnaires were validated and elaborated on in a workshop ($n=23$) and two focus groups ($n=13$; $n=8$). Results show that participants perceived their well-being abroad as relatively good, while they also experienced high levels of stress. Workers used a variety of resources in dealing with stress. Socially oriented coping strategies and spirituality seemed to play an important role as personal resources, while the influence of reasons for migration was less clear.

Employers and (access to) social networks appeared important in determining social resources. Social resources were more often related to stress and well-being than were personal resources. Findings from this study can help to design strengths-based interventions aimed at improving the well-being of female domestic workers and preventing mental health problems. The environmental factors and structural constraints that provide the context for resilience should be further explored as they influence the ability to mobilize resources.

d. Securitization and Resilience of Immigrant Receiving Society

Bourbeau, P., 2015. Resiliencism and Security Studies: Initiating a Dialogue. In Thierry Balzacq (ed.) *Contesting Security, Strategies and Logics*. 173- 188.

In recent years, a great deal has been written in the scholarly literature about the role of resilience in our social world. This scholarship has sparked vivid theoretical debates in psychology, criminology, social work, and political geography about the nature of resilience and how scholars should go about studying it. Yet, International Relations and security studies have been relatively absent from the vibrant discussion. The term is employed but rarely unpacked, let alone theoretically analyzed. This chapter outlines some necessary steps of convergence, enabling a coherent framework for a resiliencist approach to the study of the securitization process. The bulk of the chapter suggests distinguishing between three types of resilience, discusses the added-value of the approach, and illustrates the set of arguments with the case of the securitization of migration in France and in Canada.

Bourbeau, P., 2015. Migration, Resilience and Security: Responses to New Inflows of Asylum Seekers and Migrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(12), pp.1958-1977.

The ubiquity of resilience—the process of patterned adjustments adopted by a society or an individual in the face of endogenous or exogenous shocks—across the broad social sciences spectrum is undisputable. Yet, migration scholars have been relatively absent from this vibrant discussion. The present article suggests a theorisation of the link between migration, resilience and security by examining ways in which resilience precedes a socially constructed understanding of international migration as a security issue. The article explores how the surge in worldwide refugee numbers and associated mass migration phenomena were not only interpreted as a shock in post-Cold War France, but also instrumentalised by dominant discourses to underscore the necessity of adopting a particular pattern of adjustments to uphold the status quo against changes provoked by these migratory events. The social construction of refugee movements and mass migration as a significant disturbance requiring France to opt for a resilient strategy has led, ultimately, to the securitisation of migration. In a broader sense, the article presents a new lens through which to analyse situations and conditions in which resilience has led to and induced the securitisation of migration.

Government of Canada., 2013. *Building Resilience Against Terrorism: Canada's Counter-Terrorism Strategy*. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada.

The first priority of the Government of Canada is to protect Canada and the safety and security of Canadians at home and abroad. *Building Resilience Against Terrorism*, Canada's first Counter-terrorism Strategy, assesses the nature and scale of the threat, and sets out basic principles and elements that underpin the Government's counter-terrorism activities. Together,

these principles and elements serve as a means of prioritizing and evaluating the Government's efforts against terrorism. The overarching goal of the Strategy is to counter domestic and international terrorism in order to protect Canada, Canadians and Canadian interests.

Mollenkopf, J. and Pastor, M., 2013. Struggling over Strangers or Receiving with Resilience? The Metropolitics of Immigrant Integration. Building Resilient Regions. Urban Institute Washington, DC.

Our study of regional resilience in the face of immigrant “shocks” seeks to better understand the key factors and strategies behind it and promote a new metropolitics of immigrant integration. (In this respect, it is a companion to the paper by Lester and Nguyen in this session.) We believe that positive responses to new immigrants will generate better long-term regional results in economic growth (Benner and Pastor 2012:48) and we can point to many small declining mill towns that have been helped to rebound by new immigration. We also believe that deliberate actions to reduce social fragmentation and promote of civil society by encouraging receptivity and reducing rigidity in the face of demographic change produce positive gains for regions and for America. And all of this is increasingly not decreasingly relevant as the federal government seems poised to launch a brand new experiment in immigrant integration: the legalization of a very large share of more than 11 million undocumented immigrants.

Pastor, M. and Mollenkopf, J., 2012. Struggling over Strangers or Receiving with Resilience? The Metropolitics of Immigrant Integration. Pp. 100-47 in *Urban and Regional Policy and Its Effects*, volume 4: *Building Resilient Regions*, edited by M. Weir, N. Pindus, H. Wial, and H. Wolman. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

This paper summarizes the findings of the book we are preparing, with colleagues, on the relationship between immigrant integration and metropolitan “resilience” as part of the larger Building Resilient Regions project. We view international migration one of the key “shocks” affecting America’s urban and metropolitan areas. Like any other shock, it can produce benefits: immigrants add to the labor force, contribute taxes, and start new businesses. However, when the immigrant “shock” is large and fast and/or consists mainly of low-income and poorly educated individuals, particularly those without authorization, cities, metropolitan regions, and states generally have good reason to worry. And because there is geographic variation in immigrant presence, there will necessarily be geographic variation in local response. Our study of regional resilience in the face of immigrant “shocks” seeks to better understand the key factors and strategies behind it and promote a new metropolitics of immigrant integration. (In this respect, it is a companion to the paper by Lester and Nguyen in this session.) We believe that positive responses to new immigrants will generate better long-term regional results in economic growth (Benner and Pastor 2012:48) and we can point to many small declining mill towns that have been helped to rebound by new immigration. We also believe that deliberate actions to reduce social fragmentation and promote of civil society by encouraging receptivity and reducing rigidity in the face of demographic change produce positive gains for regions and for America. And all of this is increasingly not decreasingly relevant as the federal government seems poised to launch a brand new experiment in immigrant integration: the legalization of a very large share of more than 11 million undocumented immigrants.

Appendix B: Migration and Resilience: Literature from 2000-2016, Alphabetical by Author

- Adger, W.N., 2000. Social and Ecological Resilience: Are They Related?. *Progress In Human Geography*, 24(3), pp.347-364.
- Ahern, N.R., Kiehl, E.M., Lou Sole, M. and Byers, J., 2006. A Review of Instruments Measuring Resilience. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 29(2), pp.103-125.
- Alcantara, D., 2013. Latino Youth Experiences of Immigrant Policy, Enforcement, and Exclusion: Exploring Risk and Resilience.
- Arnetz, J., Rofa, Y., Arnetz, B., Ventimiglia, M. and Jamil, H., 2013. Resilience as a Protective Factor Against the Development of Psychopathology among Refugees. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 201(3), p.167.
- Aroian, K.J. and Norris, A.E., 2000. Resilience, Stress, and Depression among Russian Immigrants to Israel. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 22(1), pp.54-67.
- Babatunde-Sowole, O., Power, T., Jackson, D., Davidson, P.M. and DiGiacomo, M., 2016. Resilience of African Migrants: An Integrative Review. *Health Care for Women International*, pp.1-18.
- Bourbeau, P., 2015. Resiliencism and Security Studies: Initiating a Dialogue. In Thierry Balzacq (ed.) *Contesting Security, Strategies and Logics*. 173- 188.
- Bourbeau, P., 2015. Migration, Resilience and Security: Responses to New Inflows of Asylum Seekers and Migrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(12), pp.1958-1977.
- Cardoso, J.B. and Thompson, S., 2010. Common themes of resilience among Latino immigrant families: A systematic review of the literature. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 91(3), pp.257-265.
- Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J.M. and Abel, N., 2001. From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what?. *Ecosystems*, 4(8), pp.765-781.
- Cretney, R., 2014. Resilience for Whom? Emerging Critical Geographies of Socio-ecological Resilience. *Geography Compass*, 8(9), pp.627-640.
- Dagdeviren, H., Donoghue, M. and Promberger, M., 2016. Resilience, Hardship and Social Conditions. *Journal of Social Policy*, 45(01), pp.1-20.
- Falicov, C. J., 2005. Ambiguous Loss: Risk and Resilience in Latino Immigrant Families. pp. 197- 206 in *The New Immigration: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by C. Suarez-Orozco, M. Suarez- Orozco, and D. B. Qin-Hilliard. New York: Taylor and Francis. BOOK.
- Folke, C., 2006. Resilience: The Emergence of a Perspective for Social–ecological systems analyses. *Global environmental change*, 16(3), pp.253-267.
- Government of Canada. 2013. *Building Resilience Against Terrorism: Canada's Counter-Terrorism Strategy*. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada.
- Gray, N.N., Mendelsohn, D.M. and Omoto, A.M., 2015. Community Connectedness, Challenges, and Resilience among Gay Latino Immigrants. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55(1-2), pp.202-214.
- Hall, P.A. and Lamont, M. eds., 2013. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, J., 2013. Resilience as Embedded Neoliberalism: A Governmentality Approach. *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses*. 1(1), pp.38-52.
- Keck, M., & Sakdapolrak, P., 2013. What is Social Resilience? Lessons Learned and Ways Forward. *Erdkunde*, 5-19.

- Leadbeater, B., Dodgen, D. and Solarz, A., 2005. The Resilience Revolution: A Paradigm Shift for Research and Policy. pp.47–63 in *Resilience in Children, Families, and Communities: Linking Context to Practice and Policy*, edited by R. DeV. Peters, B. Leadbeater, and R. J. McMahon. New York: Kluwer.
- Lee, Hei-Sung, Stephen L. Brown, Mary M. Mitchell, and Glenn R. Schiraldi. 2008. Correlates of Resilience in the Face of Adversity for Korean Women Immigrating to the US. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 10(5), pp.415–22.
- Lee, R.M., 2005. Resilience Against Discrimination: Ethnic Identity and Other-group Orientation as Protective Factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(1), p.36.
- Lester, T.W. & Nguyen, M.T., 2015 The Economic Integration of Immigrants and Regional Resilience. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Available at: <http://brr.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Lester-Nguyen-immigrant-integration.pdf>.
- Liebenberg, L. and Ungar, M (eds.). 2009. *Researching Resilience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lorenz, D. F., 2013. The Diversity of Resilience: Contributions from A Social Science Perspective. *Natural Hazards*, 67(1), pp.7-24.
- Luthar, S. S., 2006. Resilience in Development: A Synthesis of Research Across Five Decades, Cicchetti, Dante (Ed); Cohen, Donald J. (Ed), 2006. *Developmental Psychopathology, Vol 3: Risk, Disorder, and Adaptation* (2nd ed.) (pp.739-795). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc, xvi, 944 pp.
- MacKinnon, D. and Derickson, K. D., 2013. From Resilience to Resourcefulness: A Critique of Resilience Policy and Activism. *Progress in Human Geography*. 37(2), pp.253-270.
- Magis, K., 2010. Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23(5), pp.401-416.
- Maiter, S. and Stalker, C., 2011. South Asian Immigrants' Eexperience of Child Protection Services: Are We Recognizing Strengths and Resilience?. *Child & Family Social Work*, 16(2), pp.138-148.
- Martin-Breen, P and Anderies, J. M., 2011. Resilience: A Literature Review. Retrieved December 24, 2013.
- Michail, D., 2013. Social Development and Transnational Households: Resilience and Motivation for Albanian Immigrants in Greece in the Era of Economic Crisis. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 13(2), pp.265-279.
- Mollenkopf, J. and Pastor, M., 2013. Struggling over Strangers or Receiving with Resilience? The Metropolitics of Immigrant Integration. *Building Resilient Regions*. Urban Institute Washington, DC.
- Murray Nettles, S., Mucherah, W., & Jones, D. S., 2000. Understanding Resilience: The Role of Social Resources. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* (JESPAR), 5(1-2), pp.47-60.
- Mythen, G., 2012. Identities in the Third Space? Solidity, Elasticity and Resilience amongst Young British Pakistani Muslims. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(3), pp.393-411.
- Owens, J. and Lynch, S.M., 2012. Black and Hispanic Immigrants' Resilience against Negative-Ability Racial Stereotypes at Selective Colleges and Universities in the United States. *Sociology of Education*, 85(4), pp.303-325.
- Pastor, M. and Mollenkopf, J., 2012. Struggling Over Strangers or Receiving with Resilience? The Metropolitics of Immigrant Integration. Pp. 100-47 in *Urban and Regional Policy*

- and Its Effects*, volume 4: *Building Resilient Regions*, edited by M. Weir, N. Pindus, H. Wial, and H. Wolman. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Plodinec, M.J., 2009. Definitions of resilience: An Analysis. Oak Ridge: Community and Regional Resilience Institute (CARRI).
- Plodinec, M.J., Edwards, W.C. and White, R.K., 2014. Applications of a “Whole Community” Framework for Enhancing Community or Campus Resilience. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 18, pp.9-16.
- Raffaelli, M., Tran, S.P., Wiley, A.R., Galarza-Heras, M. and Lazarevic, V., 2012. Risk and Resilience in Rural Communities: The Experiences of Immigrant Latina Mothers. *Family Relations*, 61(4), pp.559-570.
- Rashid, R. and Gregory, D., 2014. 'Not Giving Up on Life': A Holistic Exploration of Resilience among A Aample of Immigrant Canadian Women. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 46(1), pp.197-214.
- Rumbaut, R.G., 2000. Profiles in Resilience: Educational Achievement and Ambition among Children of Immigrants in Southern California. In *National Invitational Conference on" Resilience Across Contexts: Family, Work, Culture, and Community."*, Mar, 1998, Temple U, Philadelphia, PA, US; *This chapter is a revision of a paper presented at the aforementioned conference.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Rutter, M., 2000. Resilience Reconsidered: Conceptual Considerations, Empirical Findings, and Policy Implications.
- Schipper, E. L. F., & Langston, L., 2015. A comparative overview of resilience measurement frameworks: Analysing indicators and approaches. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Shaw, K., 2012. The rise of the resilient local authority?. *Local Government Studies* 38(3), pp.281-300.
- Simich, L., Roche, B. and Ayton, L. 2012. Defining Resiliency, Constructing Equity. A research Report. Wellesley Institute.
- Southwick, S.M., Bonanno, G.A., Masten, A.S., Panter-Brick, C. and Yehuda, R., 2014. Resilience Definitions, Theory, and Challenges: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5.
- Stark, D., 2014. On Resilience. *Social sciences*, 3(1), pp.60-70.
- Taylor, R. D. and Wang, M. C. (Eds.) (2000). *Resilience Across Contexts: Family, Work, Culture, and Community*. Psychology Press.
- Thomas, R., 2013. Resilience and Housing Choices among Filipino Immigrants in Toronto”. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 13(4), pp.408-432.
- Tse, S. and Liew, T., 2004. New Zealand Experiences: How is Community Resilience Manifested in Asian Communities?. *eCOMMUNITY: International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 2(1).
- Trueba, E.T., 1998. Mexican Immigrants from El Rincon: A Case Study of Resilience and Empowerment. *TESOL Journal*, 7(3), pp.12-17.
- Ungar, M., 2012. Social Ecologies and Their Contribution to Resilience. pp.13-31 in *The Social Ecology of Resilience: A Handbook of Theory and Practice*, edited by M. Ungar. New York: Springer.

- van der Ham, A.J., Ujano-Batangan, M.T., Ignacio, R. and Wolffers, I., 2014. Toward Healthy Migration: An Exploratory Study on the Resilience of Migrant Domestic Workers from the Philippines. *Transcultural psychiatry*, 51(4), pp.545-568.
- VanderPlaat, M., 2015. Activating the Sociological Imagination to Explore the Boundaries of Resilience Research and Practice. *School Psychology International*, p.0143034315615938.
- Voicu, B. and Comşa, M., 2014. Immigrants' Participation in Voting: Exposure, Resilience, and Transferability. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(10), pp.1572-1592.
- Wagnild, G., 2009. A review of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of nursing measurement*, 17(2), pp.105-113.
- Windle, G., Bennett, K.M. and Noyes, J., 2011. A Methodological Review of Resilience Measurement Scales. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 9(1), p.1.
- Xia, Y., Zhou, Z.G. and Xie, X., 2005. Strengths and Resilience in Chinese Immigrant Families: An Initial Effort of Inquiry, Department of Child, Youth and Family Studies, University of Nebraska.

Appendix C: A List of Definitions of Resilience

First Author, Year	Domain	Definition*
Holling, 1973	Ecological	Resilience determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters, and still persist
Adger, 2003	Ecological and social	The ability to persist (i.e., to absorb shocks and stresses and still maintain the functioning of society and the integrity of ecological systems) and the ability to adapt to change, unforeseen circumstances, and risks
Adger, 2005	Ecological and social	The capacity of linked social-ecological systems to absorb recurrent disturbances ... so as to retain essential structures, functions, and feedbacks
Quinlan, 2003	Ecological and social	Resilience consists of (1) the amount of change a system can undergo and still retain essentially the same structure, function, identity , and feedbacks on function and structure, (2) the degree to which a system is capable of self-organization (and reorganize after disturbance), and (3) the degree to which a system expresses capacity for learning and adaptation
Allenby, 2005	Ecological and social	The capability of a system to maintain its function and structure in the face of internal and external change and to degrade gracefully when it must
Gunderson, 2005	Ecological and social	The return or recovery time of a social-ecological system, determined by (1) that system's capacity for renewal in a dynamic environment and (2) people's ability to learn and change (which, in turn, is partially determined by the institutional context for knowledge sharing, learning, and management, and partially by the social capital among people).

World Resources Institute, 2008	Ecological and social	Resilience is ‘the capacity of a system to tolerate shocks or disturbances and recover’ and argues that this depends on the ability of people to ‘adapt to changing conditions through learning, planning, or reorganization’
Adger, 2000	Community	The ability of communities to withstand external shocks to their social infrastructure
<i>Adger (2000, p. 16)</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>“The ability of groups, or communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political and environmental change.”</i>
<i>Magis (2010)</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>Community resilience is the existence, development, and engagement of community resources by community members to thrive in an environment characterized by change, uncertainty, unpredictability, and surprise.</i>
<i>CARRI (2013)</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>Community resilience is the capability to anticipate risk, limit impact, and bounce back rapidly through survival, adaptability, evolution, and growth in the face of turbulent change.</i>
Comfort, 1999	Community	The capacity to adapt existing resources and skills to new systems and operating conditions
Mileti, 1999	Community	(The ability to) withstand an extreme event without suffering devastating losses, damage, diminished productivity, or quality of life without a large amount of assistance from outside the community
Bruneau, 2003	Community	The ability of social units to mitigate hazards, contain the effects of disasters when they occur, and carry out recovery activities in ways that minimize social disruption and mitigate the effects of future earthquakes
Godschalk, 2003	Community	A sustainable network of physical systems and human communities, capable of managing extreme events; during disaster, both must be able to survive and function under extreme stress.

Timmerman, 1981	Community	A system's capacity to absorb and recover from the occurrence of a hazardous event; reflective of a society's ability to cope and to continue to cope in the future
Wildavsky, 1991	Community	The capacity to cope with unanticipated dangers after they have become manifest, learning to bounce back
Brown, 1996	Community	The ability to recover from or adjust easily to misfortune or sustained life stress
Paton, 2001	Community	The capability to bounce back and to use physical and economic resources effectively to aid recovery following exposure to hazards
Center for Community Enterprise, 2000	Community	Intentional action to enhance the personal and collective capacity of its citizens and institutions to respond to, and influence the course of social and economic change
Chenoweth, 2001	Community	The ability to respond to crises in ways that strengthen community bonds, resources, and the community's capacity to cope
Ahmed, 2004	Community	The development of material, physical, sociopolitical, socio-cultural, and psychological resources that promote safety of residents and buffer adversity
Coles, 2004	Community	A community's capacities, skills, and knowledge that allow it to participate fully in recovery from disasters
Pfefferbaum, 2005	Community	The ability of community members to take meaningful, deliberate, collective action to remedy the impact of a problem, including the ability to interpret the environment, intervene, and move on
Liu, 2007	Community	The capability to retain similar structures and functioning after disturbances for continuous development
Perrings, 2006	Community	The ability of the system to withstand either market or environmental shocks without losing the capacity to allocate resources efficiently
UN/ISDR, 2005	Community	The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt , by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure

Ganor, 2003	Community Individual	The ability of individuals and communities to deal with a state of continuous long term stress; the ability to find unknown inner strengths and resources in order to cope effectively ; the measure of adaptation and flexibility
Kimhi, 2004	Community Individual	Individuals' sense of the ability of their own community to deal successfully with the ongoing political violence
Norris, 2008	Community Individual	A process linking a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of functioning and adaptation after a disturbance
Masten, 1990	Individual	The process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances Individual
Egeland, 1993	Individual	The capacity for successful adaptation, positive functioning, or competence ...despite high-risk status, chronic stress, or following prolonged or severe trauma
Butler, 2007	Individual	Good adaptation under extenuating circumstances; a recovery trajectory that returns to baseline functioning following a challenge
<i>Okech (2012, p. 431)</i>	<i>Individual</i>	<i>The author identified resilience in those 'who possess strengths that assist them in recovering from negative experiences; benefit from and contribute to a network of relationships in their communities; seek to restore order and balance to their lives during crises'.</i>
<i>Milne (2013, p. 7)</i>	<i>Individual</i>	<i>The ability to overcome setbacks and risks of financial and social exclusion</i>
<i>Dagdeviren (2016)</i>	<i>Individual</i>	<i>Resilience is often considered to reflect traits such as attitude and the abilities of individuals to deal with hardship.</i>
<i>F. Walsh (1996, p. 263)</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Family resilience seeks to identify and foster key processes that enable families to cope more effectively and emerge hardier from crises or persistent stresses, whether from within or from outside the family</i>
<i>Ungar (2006, p. 55)</i>	<i>Multiple Social Units</i>	<i>Resilience is 'both an individual's capacity to navigate to health resources [agency] and a condition of the individual's family,</i>

			community and culture to provide these resources in culturally meaningful ways [availability and access].
Shaw (2012)	Multiple Units	Social	Resilience 'depict how individuals, communities and organisations can adapt, cope, and 'bounce back' when faced with external shocks such as climate change, economic recession and cuts in public expenditure
Colbourne (2008, p. 3)	Multiple Units	Social	A resilient person, household, organization or community would have the ability to change practices and structures in the aftermath of a major event or change. As a result, the person or entity is not only able to function in the new environment, but also has the capacity to anticipate and prepare for the possibility of similar shocks and surprises in the future
Glavovic et al. (2003, 291)	Multiple Units	Social	Social resilience is "the capacity to absorb [...] change – the ability to deal with surprises or cope with disturbances.
Pelling(2003, p. 48)	Multiple Units	Social	Social resilience is "a product of the degree of planned preparation undertaken in the light of a potential hazard, and of spontaneous or premeditated adjustments made in response to felt hazard, including relief and rescue"
Hall and Lemont (2013, p.2)	Social		Social resilience refers to the capacity of groups of people bound together in an organization, class, racial group, community or nation to sustain and advance their well-being in the face of challenges to it.
Cutter et al. (2008)	Social		Social resilience as "the ability of a social system to respond and recover from disasters" and states that it "includes those inherent conditions that allow the system to absorb impacts and cope with an event, as well as post-event, adaptive processes that facilitate the ability of the social system to re-organize, change, and learn in response to a threat."
Glavovic et al. (2003, p. 290)	Social		Social resilience is basically "influenced by [...] institutions [...] and networks that enable people to access resources, learn from experiences and develop constructive

		<i>ways of dealing with common problems”</i>
<i>Obrist et al. (2010, p. 289)</i>	<i>Social</i>	<i>Social resilience “as the capacity of actors to access capitals in order to not only cope with and adjust to adverse conditions (that is, reactive capacity) but also search for and create options (that is, proactive capacity) and thus develop increased competence (that is, positive outcomes) in dealing with a threat”.</i>
<i>Adger (2000, p.354)</i>	<i>Social</i>	<i>“Social resilience is institutionally determined, in the sense that institutions permeate all social systems and institutions fundamentally determine the economic system in terms of its structure and distribution of assets”.</i>
Kofinas, 2003	Social	Two types of social resilience: (1) a social system's capacity to facilitate human efforts to deduce the trends of change, reduce vulnerabilities, and facilitate adaptation; and (2) the capacity of a [social-ecological system] to sustain preferred modes of economic activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions of resilience written in ‘Normal’ style are taken from the list published by the CARRI and those written in ‘Italic style’ are taken from other sources. 		