

Contents

List of Contributors *xi*

1 Introduction *i*

Hugh Deeming

1.1 Book Content *2*

References *3*

Section I Conceptual and Theoretical Underpinnings to Community Disaster Resilience *5*

2 Understanding Disaster Resilience: The emBRACE Approach *9*

Thomas Abeling, Nazmul Huq, Denis Chang-Seng, Jörn Birkmann, Jan Wolfertz, Fabrice Renaud, and Matthias Garschagen

2.1 Introduction *9*

2.2 Resilience: Concept *9*

2.2.1 Resilience in the Social Domain *10*

2.2.2 Resilience: An Outcome or a Process? *11*

2.2.3 Resilience on Individual and Collective Levels *11*

2.3 Resilience: Methodology *12*

2.3.1 Social/Political Resilience *12*

2.3.2 Linking Biophysical and Social Resilience *14*

2.4 Resilience: Indicators *15*

2.5 Gaps and Challenges *17*

2.5.1 Challenges in the Transition from Ecology to Social Science *17*

2.5.2 The Role of Power *18*

2.5.3 Representation of Community *19*

2.5.4 Transformation *20*

2.5.5 Resourcefulness *21*

2.6 Conclusion *22*

References *22*

3 Mobilising Resources for Resilience *27*

Cheney Shreve and Maureen Fordham

3.1 Introduction *27*

3.2 Background: Origins of Livelihoods Thinking *27*

3.2.1 Successes of SLAs: Changing the Way Development was Done *29*

3.2.2	Key Criticisms and the Evolution of Livelihoods Thinking	30
3.2.3	A Closer Look at Social Capital: Background and Key Critiques	31
3.2.4	Summary	33
3.3	Resilience and Livelihoods Thinking	34
3.3.1	Why Disasters?	34
3.3.2	Livelihoods and Disaster Vulnerability	35
3.4	Influence of Livelihoods Thinking on Contemporary Disaster Resilience	36
3.4.1	Linking to Sustainable Livelihoods: Resources and Capacities	36
3.4.2	Community Actions	37
3.4.3	Community Learning	38
3.4.4	Summary	38
	References	39
4	Social Learning and Resilience Building in the emBRACE Framework	43
	<i>Justin Sharpe, Åsa Gerger Swartling, Mark Pelling, and Lucy Pearson</i>	
4.1	Introduction	43
4.2	What is Meant by Social Learning?	44
4.3	Capacities for Social Learning	46
4.4	Social Learning at the Individual Level	49
4.5	Social Learning at the Community Level	49
4.6	Social Learning and Resilience Outcomes in the emBRACE Project	52
4.7	How Social Learning Provides Opportunities for Sharing Adaptive Thinking and Practice	54
4.8	Conclusion	56
	References	56
5	Wicked Problems: Resilience, Adaptation, and Complexity	61
	<i>John Forrester, Richard Taylor, Lydia Pedoth, and Nilufar Matin</i>	
5.1	Introduction	61
5.2	A Brief History of Policy 'Mess' and 'Wickedness'	62
5.2.1	'Super-Wicked' Problems	63
5.3	Resilient and Adaptive Responses to Mess	64
5.4	Clumsy Solutions Linking DRR/DRM and CCA: A Mini Case Study	66
5.5	An emBRACE Model of Complex Adaptive Community Resilience	69
5.6	Conclusion	71
	References	72
Section II Methods to 'Measure' Resilience – Data and Indicators		77
6	The emBRACE Resilience Framework: Developing an Integrated Framework for Evaluating Community Resilience to Natural Hazards	79
	<i>Sylvia Kruse, Thomas Abeling, Hugh Deeming, Maureen Fordham, John Forrester, Sebastian Jülich, A. Nuray Karanci, Christian Kuhlicke, Mark Pelling, Lydia Pedoth, Stefan Schneiderbauer, and Justin Sharpe</i>	
6.1	Introduction	79
6.2	Conceptual Tensions of Community Resilience	81

6.3	Developing the emBRACE Resilience Framework	82
6.3.1	Deductive Framework Development: A Structured Literature Review	82
6.3.2	Inductive Framework Development: Empirical Case Study Research	83
6.3.3	Participatory Assessment Workshops with Stakeholder Groups	83
6.3.4	Synthesis: An Iterative Process of Framework Development	83
6.4	The Conceptual Framework for Characterising Community Resilience	84
6.4.1	Intracommunity Domains of Resilience: Resources and Capacities, Action, and Learning	84
6.4.1.1	Resources and Capacities	84
6.4.1.2	Actions	86
6.4.1.3	Learning	88
6.4.2	Extracommunity Framing of Community Resilience	89
6.4.2.1	Disaster Risk Governance	89
6.4.2.2	Non-Directly Hazard-Related Context, Social-Ecological Change, and Disturbances	90
6.5	Discussion and Conclusion	91
6.5.1	Interlinkages between the Domains and Extracommunity Framing	91
6.5.2	Application and Operationalisation of the Framework in Indicator-Based Assessments	91
6.5.3	Reflections on the Results and emBRACE Methodology and Limits of the Findings	91
	References	92
7	Disaster Impact and Land Use Data Analysis in the Context of a Resilience-Relevant Footprint	97
	<i>Marco Pregnolato, Marcello Petitta, and Stefan Schneiderbauer</i>	
7.1	Introduction	97
7.2	Data and Methodology	99
7.2.1	Data	99
7.2.2	Methodology	99
7.3	Results	102
7.3.1	National Scale	102
7.3.2	Regional Scale: Analysis of Landslides that Occurred Near a Change in LULC	103
7.3.3	Subnational Scale: Analysis of HTI Changes	107
7.3.4	Subnational Scale: Analysis of the LULC Changes in Time Domain	108
7.4	Conclusions and Discussions	108
7.4.1	Is There Any Relationship Between LULC and Landslide Events?	108
7.4.2	Is There Any Relationship Between a Change in LULC and a Landslide Event?	109
7.4.3	Is It Possible to Use LULC Data as a Footprint for Landslide Events?	109
7.4.4	Is It Possible to Use Disaster Footprint and Susceptibility for Resilience Research?	109
7.5	Conclusion	110
	References	110

8	Development of Quantitative Resilience Indicators for Measuring Resilience at the Local Level	113
	<i>Sebastian Jülich</i>	
8.1	Introduction	113
8.2	Stages of Indicator Operationalisation	114
8.3	Quantitative Indicator Development	116
8.4	Residence Time as Partial Resilience Indicator	117
8.5	Awareness through Past Natural Disasters as Partial Resilience Indicator	118
8.5.1	Single Factor Time	119
8.5.2	Single Factor Intensity	120
8.5.3	Single Factor Distance	121
8.5.4	Combination of the Three Single Factors	121
8.6	Warning Services as Partial Resilience Indicators	122
8.7	Conclusion	123
	References	124
9	Managing Complex Systems: The Need to Structure Qualitative Data	125
	<i>John Forrester, Nilufar Matin, Richard Taylor, Lydia Pedoth, Belinda Davis, and Hugh Deeming</i>	
9.1	Introduction	125
9.2	Mapping of Social Networks as a Measure of Community Resilience	127
9.2.1	Assessing Resilience Using Network Maps: The emBRACE Experience	128
9.3	Agent-Based Models	131
9.3.1	Two Case Studies of ABM in emBRACE	132
9.4	Other Qualitative Data-Structuring Methodologies	134
9.5	Discussion	134
9.6	Conclusion	136
	References	136
10	Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Indicators for Assessing Community Resilience to Natural Hazards	139
	<i>Daniel Becker, Stefan Schneiderbauer, John Forrester, and Lydia Pedoth</i>	
10.1	Introduction	139
10.2	Current Indicator-Based Approaches for Assessing Community Resilience	140
10.3	From Concept to Assessment: The emBRACE Approach	142
10.3.1	Using Indicators for Assessing Community Resilience within emBRACE	142
10.3.2	The Process of Grounding our Indicators	143
10.4	Systematisation of Indicators	145
10.5	Deriving Key Indicators of Community Resilience	148
10.6	Conclusion	151
	References	151

Section III Empirically Grounding the Resilience Concept 155

- 11 Resilience, the Limits of Adaptation and the Need for Transformation in the Context of Multiple Flood Events in Central Europe 159**
Christian Kuhlicke, Anna Kunath, Chloe Begg, and Maximilian Beyer
- 11.1 Introduction 159
- 11.2 Key Concepts for the Case Study 161
- 11.3 Insights into the Case Study Settings and Methods 162
- 11.3.1 Flood Risk Management in Saxony and Bavaria 162
- 11.3.2 Methods of Case Study Research – Description of Empirical Work 163
- 11.3.2.1 Interviews 163
- 11.3.2.2 Household Survey 163
- 11.4 Results of the Interviews: Resilience, Learning, and Transformation 165
- 11.5 Results of the Household Survey: Resilience, Limits of Adaptation, and Responsibility 167
- 11.5.1 Impacts of (Multiple) Flood Experience 167
- 11.5.2 Perception of Responsibility in Flood Risk Management 170
- 11.5.3 Attitudes towards Participation 171
- 11.6 Community Resilience and the Idea of Transformation 172
- References 173
- 12 River and Surface Water Flooding in Northern England: The Civil Protection-Social Protection Nexus 177**
Hugh Deeming, Belinda Davis, Maureen Fordham, and Simon Taylor
- 12.1 Introduction 177
- 12.2 Conceptualising Community 179
- 12.3 Methods 181
- 12.4 Results 182
- 12.4.1 Rural Resilience 182
- 12.4.2 Urban Resilience 185
- 12.4.2.1 Keswick 185
- 12.4.2.2 Cockermouth 189
- 12.4.2.3 Workington 191
- 12.5 Discussion and Conclusions 192
- References 194
- 13 The Role of Risk Perception and Community Networks in Preparing for and Responding to Landslides: A Dolomite Case Study 197**
Lydia Pedoth, Richard Taylor, Christian Kofler, Agnieszka Elzbieta Stawinoga, John Forrester, Nilufar Matin, and Stefan Schneiderbauer
- 13.1 Introduction 197
- 13.2 Badia and the Alpine Context 198
- 13.3 Two Types of Communities and a Mixed Method Approach 201
- 13.4 Risk Perception, Risk Attitude, and Response Behaviour 203

13.4.1	Risk Behaviour Profiles	204
13.4.1.1	Temporal Variation in People's Perception of Response and Recovery Actions	206
13.5	Community Networks	209
13.6	Conclusions and Discussion	214
	References	217
14	The Social Life of Heatwave in London: Recasting the Role of Community and Resilience	221
	<i>Sebastien Nobert and Mark Pelling</i>	
14.1	Introduction	221
14.2	Methodology	222
14.2.1	Community Resilience or Resilience from Community?	223
14.2.1.1	Community and the Elderly	223
14.2.1.2	Resilience and Community Ties	224
14.2.2	Rethinking the Normatives of Heatwave Management: Family, Social Ties, and the Collectivity	225
14.2.2.1	Loneliness, Social Networks, and Community	226
14.2.2.2	Rethinking Social Network and Social Capital as Vulnerability Factors	227
14.2.2.3	Social Capital, Fragmented Community, and New Vulnerability	230
14.3	Conclusion	231
	References	232
	Further Reading	234
15	Perceptions of Individual and Community Resilience to Earthquakes: A Case Study from Turkey	237
	<i>A. Nuray Karanci, Gözde İkizer, Canay Doğulu, and Dilek Özceylan-Aubrecht</i>	
15.1	Introduction	238
15.2	Context of the Case Study	239
15.2.1	Van: The Earthquakes and Sociodemographic Context	239
15.2.2	Adapazarı/Sakarya: The Earthquake and Sociodemographic Context	240
15.2.3	Risk Governance Setting in Turkey	240
15.3	Main Aims and Research Questions	241
15.4	Methodological Approaches	241
15.4.1	In-Depth Interviews	242
15.4.2	Focus Groups	242
15.5	Perceptions of Resilience According to the emBRACE Framework	242
15.5.1	Resources and Capacities	244
15.5.2	Learning	250
15.5.3	Context	252
15.6	Discussion and Conclusions	252
	References	254
	Conclusions	257
	Index	261