

Resilience Across Developmental, Socioeconomic, And Community Contexts: Integrative Models, Protective Processes, And Implications For Human Thriving

Dr. Elena Marković

Department of Social Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

VOLUME02 ISSUE01 (2025)

Published Date: 13 May 2025 // Page no.: - 32-38

ABSTRACT

Resilience has emerged as one of the most influential and contested constructs in the social, behavioral, and developmental sciences, serving as a conceptual bridge between individual adaptation, social structure, and broader systems of inequality. Across decades of scholarship, resilience has been framed alternately as a personal trait, a dynamic process, a developmental outcome, and a multilevel interaction between individuals and their environments. This article develops an integrative, theoretically grounded examination of resilience that spans individual development, family systems, socioeconomic conditions, and community and national contexts. Drawing exclusively on established scholarship, the analysis situates resilience within historical and contemporary debates while critically engaging with competing models and methodological approaches. Central to this discussion is the distinction between resilience as mere survival and resilience as thriving, a conceptual linkage that foregrounds growth, competence, and long-term well-being rather than short-term adaptation alone (Carver, 1998).

The article synthesizes perspectives from developmental psychology, public health, sociology, and economics to demonstrate how resilience operates across ecological levels, from neurobiological regulation and psychological coping to social capital, institutional capacity, and economic stability. Particular attention is paid to adolescents and children exposed to chronic risk, including poverty, family substance abuse, and structural inequality, where resilience is often unevenly distributed and deeply shaped by access to protective resources (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005; Masten & Obradović, 2006). At the same time, the analysis extends beyond individual and family-level processes to consider community disaster resilience, national economic vulnerability, and the resilience of small states to external shocks, highlighting conceptual parallels across disciplines (Briguglio, 2014; Plough et al., 2013).

Methodologically, the article adopts a qualitative, theory-driven synthesis, critically examining measurement tools such as resilience scales, socioeconomic indices, and vulnerability frameworks, while addressing their limitations and epistemological assumptions (Wagnild, 2009; Kumar et al., 2013). The results are presented as an interpretive integration of findings rather than empirical data, emphasizing patterns, contradictions, and theoretical convergence across fields. The discussion advances a multilevel resilience framework that reconciles individual competence with structural constraint, arguing that resilience should not be romanticized as invulnerability but understood as context-dependent adaptation with ethical and policy implications. Ultimately, the article contributes to resilience scholarship by offering a comprehensive, cross-disciplinary account that clarifies conceptual ambiguities, critiques reductionist interpretations, and outlines future directions for research and practice aimed at fostering not only survival but sustained human thriving.

Keywords: Resilience; Thriving; Socioeconomic Risk; Developmental Psychology; Community Resilience; Vulnerability.

INTRODUCTION

Resilience has become a central organizing concept in contemporary scholarship concerned with human adaptation under conditions of adversity, risk, and uncertainty. Its appeal lies in its apparent ability to reconcile two historically opposed narratives within the social sciences: one emphasizing vulnerability, deficit, and pathology, and the other highlighting competence, strength, and growth. Early research on risk and maladaptation tended to focus on the cumulative negative effects of poverty, family disruption, and social marginalization, often portraying individuals exposed to such conditions as inevitably destined for poor outcomes

(Adler & Ostrove, 1999). Against this deterministic backdrop, the emergence of resilience research marked a paradigmatic shift by documenting cases in which individuals, families, and communities demonstrated positive functioning despite substantial adversity (Werner, 2000). This shift did not deny the reality of structural inequality but instead complicated linear models of risk by introducing the possibility of adaptive processes that interrupt or mitigate negative trajectories.

The conceptual expansion of resilience, however, has generated persistent debate regarding its definition, scope, and ethical implications. At its most basic level, resilience has been described as the capacity to withstand

stress and recover from adversity, yet such a definition risks reducing a complex, dynamic phenomenon to a static attribute of individuals (Rutter, 2006). More nuanced models emphasize resilience as a process unfolding over time through interactions between individuals and their environments, thereby aligning the construct with developmental and ecological perspectives (Bronfenbrenner, 1992; Masten & Obradović, 2006). Within this process-oriented view, resilience is not something one simply “has” but something that emerges through exposure to challenge, access to protective resources, and opportunities for meaningful engagement. This distinction is particularly salient when considering the difference between resilience as mere survival and resilience as thriving, a conceptual linkage that underscores growth, mastery, and enhanced functioning following adversity rather than simple return to baseline (Carver, 1998).

The relevance of resilience extends beyond individual development to encompass families, communities, and even national economies. In public health and disaster studies, resilience has been invoked to describe the capacity of communities to absorb shocks, reorganize, and continue functioning in the face of crises such as natural disasters or economic downturns (Plough et al., 2013). Similarly, in economic development and international studies, resilience has been conceptualized as the ability of states, particularly small or economically vulnerable ones, to withstand external shocks and maintain growth trajectories (Briguglio, 1995; Briguglio, 2016). Although these applications differ in scale and disciplinary language, they share a common concern with adaptive capacity under constraint, suggesting that resilience may serve as a unifying framework across levels of analysis.

Despite its widespread use, resilience remains a contested construct, with critics arguing that it can be employed ideologically to shift responsibility for coping onto individuals while obscuring structural causes of adversity (Béné et al., 2014). From this perspective, celebrating resilience without addressing the conditions that necessitate it risks normalizing inequality and injustice. Proponents counter that resilience research, when properly contextualized, highlights the importance of protective systems and supportive environments rather than glorifying individual endurance alone (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). This tension underscores the need for careful theoretical articulation and empirical grounding, particularly in policy-relevant domains such as education, health, and social welfare.

Within developmental psychology, resilience research has been especially influential in studies of children and adolescents exposed to high-risk environments. Longitudinal investigations have demonstrated that protective factors such as supportive caregiving, effective

schools, and community engagement can foster competence even under conditions of chronic stress (Wolin & Wolin, 1995; Werner, 2000). These findings have challenged deficit-oriented models and informed intervention strategies aimed at strengthening assets rather than merely reducing risks. At the same time, emerging evidence from psychobiological research suggests that adaptive functioning in one domain may coexist with hidden costs in others, such as elevated physiological stress responses, complicating simplistic narratives of resilience (Brody et al., 2013). Such findings reinforce the importance of integrating psychological, biological, and social perspectives to capture the full complexity of adaptive processes.

Measurement has been another focal point of debate within resilience scholarship. The development of standardized scales has facilitated empirical research but has also raised questions about construct validity and cultural sensitivity (Wagnild & Young, 2009). Quantitative indices of socioeconomic status and vulnerability, such as revised income-based scales or economic vulnerability indices, provide valuable contextual data yet may fail to capture lived experience and relational dimensions of resilience (Kumar et al., 2013; Briguglio & Galea, 2010). These methodological challenges highlight the need for pluralistic approaches that combine qualitative insight with quantitative rigor, particularly when resilience is invoked across diverse populations and settings.

The present article addresses these conceptual, theoretical, and methodological issues through an integrative, cross-disciplinary analysis of resilience. Drawing exclusively on established literature, it seeks to synthesize insights from developmental psychology, public health, sociology, and economics to construct a coherent framework that accounts for resilience at multiple ecological levels. Central to this endeavor is the argument that resilience should be understood not as an exceptional quality possessed by a few but as a dynamic, context-dependent process shaped by access to resources, institutional support, and opportunities for meaning-making (Carver, 1998; Masten & Obradović, 2006). By situating individual adaptation within broader social and economic structures, the article aims to reconcile competing perspectives and clarify the conditions under which resilience contributes to genuine thriving rather than superficial adjustment.

In articulating this framework, the article identifies a critical gap in the literature: the tendency for resilience research to remain siloed within disciplinary boundaries, limiting its explanatory power and practical relevance. Developmental studies often focus on micro-level processes without fully engaging with macroeconomic or policy contexts, while economic analyses of vulnerability may neglect psychological and relational dimensions of adaptation (Davies & Tonts, 2010; Briguglio, 2014).

Addressing this gap requires a deliberate effort to integrate theories, concepts, and findings across fields, thereby enriching our understanding of how resilience operates in complex, real-world systems. The sections that follow undertake this task by outlining the methodological approach, presenting an interpretive synthesis of findings, and engaging in an extended discussion of theoretical implications, limitations, and future directions.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological orientation of this study is grounded in qualitative, theory-driven synthesis rather than empirical data collection, reflecting the article's aim to integrate and critically analyze existing scholarship on resilience across multiple disciplines. This approach is particularly appropriate given the conceptual breadth of resilience and the diversity of contexts in which it has been studied, ranging from individual psychological adjustment to national economic stability (Rutter, 2006; Briguglio, 2016). By systematically engaging with foundational and contemporary literature, the methodology seeks to illuminate patterns, tensions, and points of convergence that may not be apparent within single-discipline analyses.

The primary methodological strategy involves interpretive analysis of peer-reviewed theoretical and empirical studies that have shaped the understanding of resilience in developmental psychology, public health, and economic development. Rather than aggregating findings through statistical meta-analysis, the study emphasizes conceptual coherence and theoretical depth, allowing for nuanced examination of how resilience is defined, operationalized, and evaluated across contexts (Masten & Obradović, 2006). This choice reflects recognition that resilience is not a unitary construct amenable to simple quantification but a multidimensional phenomenon whose meaning varies depending on theoretical assumptions and research goals (Carver, 1998).

A key component of the methodology is the deliberate inclusion of scholarship that addresses both protective and risk processes. Studies focusing on adolescent development under conditions of poverty, family substance abuse, and social marginalization are examined alongside research on socioeconomic status, health disparities, and economic vulnerability (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005; Adler & Ostrove, 1999). This integrative lens enables exploration of how individual-level resilience is embedded within broader structural conditions, thereby avoiding reductionist interpretations that attribute adaptive outcomes solely to personal qualities.

The analysis also incorporates ecological systems theory

as a guiding framework for organizing and interpreting the literature (Bronfenbrenner, 1992). This framework posits that development and adaptation occur through interactions among multiple systems, including the microsystem of family and peers, the mesosystem of institutions such as schools, and the macrosystem of cultural, economic, and political structures. Applying this perspective to resilience research allows for systematic examination of how protective factors operate at different levels and how disruptions or supports in one system can cascade across others (Masten & Obradović, 2006). In methodological terms, this means attending not only to individual outcomes but also to relational processes, community resources, and policy environments.

Measurement issues are addressed through critical review of commonly used instruments and indices. Psychological measures such as resilience scales are examined in terms of their theoretical assumptions, psychometric properties, and applicability across populations (Wagnild, 2009; Wagnild & Young, 2009). Socioeconomic measures, including revised income-based status scales and economic vulnerability indices, are analyzed for their capacity to capture structural constraints relevant to resilience (Kumar et al., 2013; Briguglio & Galea, 2010). Rather than privileging one type of measure, the methodology highlights complementarities and limitations, emphasizing the need for triangulation in resilience research.

The interpretive process involves iterative reading and thematic coding of the selected literature, with attention to how key concepts such as risk, protection, adaptation, and thriving are articulated and linked. Through this process, recurring themes are identified, including the role of supportive relationships, the importance of institutional stability, and the ethical implications of framing resilience in contexts of inequality (Béné et al., 2014; Plough et al., 2013). These themes are then synthesized into a coherent narrative that traces the evolution of resilience theory and its application across domains.

Methodological rigor is maintained through explicit acknowledgment of the limitations inherent in a literature-based analysis. The absence of original empirical data means that conclusions are contingent on the quality and scope of existing research, which itself reflects historical and cultural biases in scholarship (Rutter, 2006). Additionally, the reliance on published studies may underrepresent marginalized perspectives or non-Western contexts, despite efforts to include research on diverse populations and small states (Briguglio, 1995). These limitations are not viewed as weaknesses but as integral considerations that inform the interpretive stance of the study and underscore the need for ongoing empirical and theoretical work.

Ethically, the methodology is informed by sensitivity to the

potential misuse of resilience discourse. By foregrounding structural factors and emphasizing thriving rather than mere endurance, the analysis seeks to avoid narratives that implicitly blame individuals or communities for failing to adapt to unjust conditions (Carver, 1998; Béné et al., 2014). This ethical orientation shapes both the selection of literature and the interpretive emphasis, reinforcing the view that resilience research should inform policies and practices aimed at reducing risk and enhancing equity rather than simply celebrating coping.

In sum, the methodological approach of this article is designed to provide a comprehensive, theoretically grounded synthesis of resilience scholarship that respects the complexity of the construct and its diverse applications. Through qualitative integration, ecological framing, and critical engagement with measurement and ethics, the methodology lays the foundation for the interpretive results and discussion that follow, offering a robust platform for advancing understanding of resilience as a multilevel, context-dependent process.

RESULTS

The results of this integrative analysis are presented as a descriptive and interpretive synthesis of patterns and themes that emerge consistently across the reviewed literature. Rather than reporting empirical findings in a conventional statistical sense, this section articulates how resilience has been observed, conceptualized, and interpreted across developmental, socioeconomic, and community contexts, with particular attention to points of convergence and tension among scholarly perspectives (Masten & Obradović, 2006). The findings are organized around core dimensions of resilience, including adaptive competence, protective processes, contextual dependency, and the distinction between survival and thriving.

A prominent pattern in the literature is the recurrent association between resilience and adaptive competence in key developmental domains. Studies of children and adolescents exposed to chronic risk consistently demonstrate that positive outcomes are possible when individuals have access to supportive relationships, effective institutions, and opportunities for skill development (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005; Wolin & Wolin, 1995). These outcomes often manifest as academic achievement, social competence, and psychological well-being, challenging assumptions that adversity inevitably leads to dysfunction. Importantly, such competence is not uniform across domains; individuals may function well in some areas while experiencing difficulties in others, underscoring the multidimensional nature of resilience (Silk et al., 2007).

The literature further reveals that resilience is deeply

embedded in relational processes rather than residing solely within individuals. Protective factors such as warm caregiving, mentoring relationships, and cohesive communities emerge as consistent predictors of adaptive outcomes across studies (Werner, 2000; Masten & Obradović, 2006). These relational resources facilitate emotion regulation, problem-solving, and meaning-making, enabling individuals to navigate stressors more effectively. This finding aligns with process-oriented models of resilience, which emphasize dynamic interactions over static traits (Rutter, 2006). It also reinforces the argument that resilience should be conceptualized as a systemic phenomenon rather than an individual attribute (Carver, 1998).

Another salient result concerns the role of socioeconomic context in shaping resilience trajectories. Research on socioeconomic status and health highlights the pervasive influence of material resources, social position, and cumulative disadvantage on developmental outcomes (Adler & Ostrove, 1999). While resilience processes can mitigate some negative effects of poverty, they do not eliminate structural inequalities, and adaptive functioning often depends on access to external supports such as quality education and healthcare (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). This finding challenges interpretation of resilience that imply equal opportunity for adaptation across contexts and underscores the importance of structural interventions alongside individual-level supports.

Physiological and psychobiological studies add further complexity to the results by revealing potential hidden costs of resilience. For example, research on rural youth facing socioeconomic adversity demonstrates that outward indicators of competence may coexist with elevated allostatic load, suggesting that sustained effort to cope with stress can have long-term health implications (Brody et al., 2013). This pattern complicates celebratory narratives of resilience by highlighting trade-offs between short-term adaptation and long-term well-being. It also supports conceptual distinctions between resilience as functioning and resilience as thriving, the latter implying not only competence but also sustainable health and growth (Carver, 1998).

At the community and societal levels, resilience is consistently associated with institutional capacity, social cohesion, and economic diversification. Public health studies of disaster resilience emphasize the importance of coordinated systems, clear communication, and inclusive governance in enabling communities to absorb and recover from shocks (Plough et al., 2013). Similarly, economic analyses of vulnerability and resilience in small states reveal that diversification, policy flexibility, and social investment enhance adaptive capacity in the face of external shocks (Briguglio, 1995; Briguglio, 2014). These findings parallel individual-level resilience processes, suggesting structural analogies across levels of analysis.

Measurement-related results indicate both progress and persistent challenges in operationalizing resilience. Psychological resilience scales provide useful tools for assessing perceived coping and adaptability but may oversimplify complex processes or reflect culturally specific assumptions (Wagnild, 2009). Socioeconomic and vulnerability indices capture contextual risk but may fail to account for informal support systems and subjective experience (Kumar et al., 2013; Briguglio & Galea, 2010). The literature thus converges on the need for multidimensional measurement approaches that integrate individual perceptions with objective indicators of context.

Finally, a critical theme emerging from the results is the ethical and political dimension of resilience discourse. Several scholars caution that emphasizing resilience without addressing underlying causes of adversity risks legitimizing inequality and shifting responsibility onto those most affected (Béné et al., 2014). Conversely, when resilience is framed as a collective capacity supported by equitable policies and institutions, it can inform transformative approaches to social development (Plough et al., 2013). This tension underscores the normative implications of resilience research and sets the stage for deeper theoretical discussion.

DISCUSSION

The integrative findings outlined above invite a comprehensive theoretical discussion that situates resilience within broader debates about adaptation, inequality, and human development. Central to this discussion is the recognition that resilience is neither a fixed trait nor a universally positive outcome but a context-dependent process shaped by interactions among individuals, relationships, institutions, and structural conditions (Masten & Obradović, 2006). By examining resilience across multiple levels of analysis, the literature challenges simplistic interpretations and calls for a more nuanced, ethically informed framework.

One of the most significant theoretical contributions of resilience research lies in its reorientation of developmental science away from deficit-based models toward strength-informed perspectives. Early studies documenting positive outcomes among children exposed to adversity disrupted deterministic assumptions and opened space for considering protective processes and adaptive systems (Werner, 2000). However, the subsequent proliferation of resilience discourse has raised concerns about conceptual dilution and ideological misuse. As critics note, resilience can become a rhetorical device that celebrates coping while leaving structural inequities intact (Béné et al., 2014). Addressing this critique requires careful articulation of what resilience entails and, equally important, what it does not.

The distinction between resilience as survival and resilience as thriving provides a valuable lens for navigating these tensions. Survival-oriented definitions emphasize recovery and maintenance of functioning, whereas thriving-oriented models highlight growth, meaning, and enhanced capacity following adversity (Carver, 1998). This distinction has profound implications for both theory and practice. If resilience is defined narrowly as the absence of pathology, interventions may aim merely to prevent failure. In contrast, a thriving-oriented perspective encourages investment in opportunities that enable individuals and communities to flourish, even in the presence of risk. The literature reviewed here suggests that thriving is contingent on access to sustained resources and supportive environments, reinforcing the importance of structural factors (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005).

Ecological systems theory offers a unifying framework for integrating these insights. By conceptualizing development as embedded within nested systems, this perspective highlights how resilience processes at one level depend on supports at others (Bronfenbrenner, 1992). For example, individual coping strategies are shaped by family relationships, which in turn are influenced by community institutions and broader socioeconomic conditions. This systemic view aligns with findings from public health and economic resilience research, where institutional capacity and policy context play decisive roles in adaptive outcomes (Plough et al., 2013; Briguglio, 2014). Theoretical integration across disciplines thus reveals resilience as a multilevel phenomenon characterized by structural parallels.

The psychobiological evidence on hidden costs of resilience further complicates the theoretical landscape. Findings that adaptive behavior may coexist with physiological stress responses challenge assumptions that resilience is unequivocally beneficial (Brody et al., 2013). From a theoretical standpoint, this suggests that resilience processes may involve trade-offs, particularly in contexts of chronic adversity where sustained effort is required to maintain competence. Integrating these insights with thriving-oriented models underscores the need to consider long-term sustainability and health, not just short-term functioning (Carver, 1998).

Measurement debates also carry theoretical significance. The reliance on self-report scales reflects an implicit assumption that resilience is a subjective experience, while socioeconomic indices emphasize objective context (Wagnild, 2009; Kumar et al., 2013). Theoretical coherence requires acknowledging that resilience encompasses both subjective and objective dimensions, necessitating mixed-method approaches. Moreover, cultural context shapes both the expression and evaluation of resilience, raising questions about the universality of existing measures (Rutter, 2006).

Addressing these issues is essential for advancing theory and ensuring that resilience research remains inclusive and relevant.

At the societal level, the application of resilience concepts to economic vulnerability and national development illustrates both the promise and perils of cross-disciplinary borrowing. Economic resilience frameworks highlight diversification, flexibility, and social investment as protective factors, echoing principles identified in developmental research (Briguglio, 1995; Davies & Tonts, 2010). Yet, translating these principles across levels requires caution to avoid oversimplification. Theoretical dialogue between disciplines can enrich understanding but must respect contextual specificity and scale.

The ethical implications of resilience theory merit particular attention. When resilience is framed as an individual responsibility, it risks reinforcing neoliberal narratives that valorize self-reliance while minimizing collective obligation (Béné et al., 2014). Conversely, when resilience is understood as a collective capacity supported by equitable policies and institutions, it can inform transformative social change. The literature supports the latter interpretation, emphasizing that resilience is fostered through investment in education, health, and social cohesion rather than through exhortations to endure (Plough et al., 2013; Adler & Ostrove, 1999).

Limitations of the existing literature also shape theoretical interpretation. Many studies focus on specific populations or contexts, limiting generalizability. Additionally, resilience research has historically been concentrated in certain regions, potentially overlooking diverse cultural models of adaptation. Recognizing these limitations underscores the need for comparative and cross-cultural research that expands theoretical horizons (Rutter, 2006). Future research should also explore longitudinal pathways to thriving, integrating psychological, biological, and social indicators to capture the full complexity of resilience processes.

In synthesizing these perspectives, the discussion advances a multilevel, ethically grounded framework of resilience that reconciles individual agency with structural constraint. Such a framework recognizes that resilience emerges through dynamic interactions among people and systems, that it may involve costs as well as benefits, and that its ultimate value lies in enabling not only survival but sustainable human flourishing (Carver, 1998). By situating resilience within broader debates about inequality and development, this framework offers a robust foundation for future scholarship and practice.

CONCLUSION

This article has undertaken an extensive, integrative examination of resilience as a multilevel, context-dependent process that spans individual development, socioeconomic conditions, and community and national systems. Drawing exclusively on established scholarship, the analysis has demonstrated that resilience cannot be reduced to a personal trait or celebrated uncritically as evidence of individual strength. Instead, resilience emerges through dynamic interactions among protective relationships, institutional supports, and structural conditions, with outcomes ranging from mere survival to genuine thriving (Masten & Obradović, 2006; Carver, 1998).

By synthesizing perspectives from developmental psychology, public health, and economic development, the article has highlighted conceptual parallels across disciplines while also acknowledging tensions and limitations. The distinction between resilience as functioning and resilience as thriving provides a critical lens for evaluating adaptive outcomes and underscores the ethical imperative to address underlying causes of adversity rather than simply applauding coping. Ultimately, the findings affirm that fostering resilience requires sustained investment in equitable systems that enable individuals and communities not only to endure but to flourish across the life course.

REFERENCES

1. Adler, N. E., & Ostrove, J. M. (1999). Socioeconomic status and health: What we know and what we don't. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 896(1), 3–15.
2. Briguglio, L. (1995). Small island states and their economic vulnerabilities. *World Development*, 23(9).
3. Wagnild, G. (2009). A review of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 17(2), 105–113.
4. Plough, A., Fielding, J. E., Chandra, A., Williams, M., Eisenman, D., Wells, K. B., Law, G. Y., Fogleman, S., & Magaña, A. (2013). Building community disaster resilience: Perspectives from a large urban county department of public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(7), 1190–1197.
5. Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 26, 399–419.
6. Brody, G. H., Yu, T., Chen, E., Miller, G. E., Kogan, S. M., & Beach, S. R. (2013). Is resilience only skin deep? Rural African Americans' socioeconomic status-related risk and competence in preadolescence and psychological adjustment and allostatic load at age 19. *Psychological*

Science, 30.

Review, 98(1), 439–457.

7. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
8. Béné, C., Newsham, A., Davies, M., Ulrichs, M., & Godfrey-Wood, R. (2014). Resilience, poverty and development. *Journal of International Development*, 26(5), 598–623.
9. Kumar, B. R., Dudala, S. R., & Rao, A. R. (2013). Kuppaswamy's socio-economic status scale—a revision of economic parameter for 2012. *International Journal of Research and Development of Health*, 1(1), 2–4.
10. Carver, C. S. (1998). Resilience and thriving: Issues, models, and linkages. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(2), 245–266.
11. Rutter, M. (2006). Implications of resilience concepts for scientific understanding. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094(1), 1–2.
12. Davies, A., & Tonts, M. (2010). Economic diversity and regional socio-economic performance. *Geographical Research*, 48, 223–234.
13. Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (2009). The Resilience Scale. The Official Home of the Resilience Scale.
14. Werner, E. E. (2000). Protective factors and individual resilience. In *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (Vol. 2, pp. 115–132).
15. Briguglio, L., & Galea, W. (2010). Updating and augmenting the Economic Vulnerability Index. Occasional Paper, University of Malta.
16. Silk, J. S., Vanderbilt-Adriance, E., Shaw, D. S., Forbes, E. E., Whalen, D. J., Ryan, N. D., & Dahl, R. E. (2007). Resilience among children and adolescents at risk for depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19(03), 841–865.
17. Briguglio, L. (2014). A vulnerability and resilience framework for small states. Commonwealth Secretariat.
18. Wolin, S., & Wolin, S. (1995). Resilience among youth growing up in substance-abusing families. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 42(2), 415–429.
19. Masten, A. S., & Obradović, J. (2006). Competence and resilience in development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094(1), 13–27.
20. Cerra, V., & Saxena, S. C. (2008). Growth dynamics: The myth of economic recovery. *American Economic*
21. Briguglio, L. (2016). Exposure to external shocks and resilience of countries: Evidence from global indicators. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 43(6).