

Understanding the three levels of resilience: Implications for extremism

Saskia Ryan¹, Maria Ioannou¹, and Merle Parmak¹

¹Department of Psychology, *The University of Huddersfield*

Article accepted for publication in *Journal of Community Psychology* - 1 February 2018

manuscript accepted for publication

Abstract

The huge growth in expenditure on counter-extremism and counter-terrorism policy post 9/11 (Dawson & Guinnessy, 2002; Lum, Kennedy & Sherley, 2006; Silke, 2004) has seen buzz-words such as ‘resilience’ integrated without clear framing or the underpinning of empirical evidence. The issue addressed by the current paper is twofold; the framing of resilience within policy is not such that it clearly relates to extremism and, the subsequent lack of understanding that exists on the relationships between the three levels of resilience under this framing. The National Resilience Scale (Kimhi, Goroshit & Eshel, 2013) is applied alongside measures of community and individual resilience to test the hypothesis that all three levels would positively correlate with one another. The hypothesis was supported in study one, but not study two with community resilience negatively correlating with both individual and national resilience. The implications of this conceptual framework are discussed, primarily the impact on contemporary policy, specifically around extremism and terrorism.

Keywords: Individual Resilience, Community Resilience, National Resilience, Extremism, Terrorism, Multiple Regression, Policy

Understanding the Three Levels of Resilience: Implications for Countering-Extremism

Whilst 2001 may seem an age away, there is no doubt that the date of September 11th of that year has had a profound impact on governments and law enforcement agencies across the world. Not least in the huge growth in expenditure on counter-terrorism strategies (Guinnessy & Dawson, 2002; Issues in Science & Technology, 2002; Lum, Kennedy & Sherley, 2006; Silke, 2004) and the scrutiny to which law enforcement and intelligence agencies are under in relation to protecting their homelands (Gill, 2006). During this time, there have been many policy developments in relation to countering-extremism and countering terrorism; The integration of ‘resilience building’ has taken many forms and has, in this endeavour, been aimed at individuals, communities and the nation. However, the conceptualisation of resilience appears blurred and a lack of understanding around what exactly is referred to by resilience may be hindering the full potential of integrating such a rhetoric within security and social policy. An increased understanding around the associations between different levels of resilience may enable priorities for preparations and future interventions which are supported by, and developed out of, empirical evidence (Kimhi, 2014). The current paper proposes a reframing of the three levels of resilience and presents an exploration these, as distinct but related concepts, in the United Kingdom, going on to discuss how this knowledge can inform policies and strategies in counter-extremism and counter-terrorism.

Resilience in Policy

Resilience is a concept with far reaching implications and although dubbed yet another ‘political buzzword’, it is integrated firmly within multiple public policies (Joseph, 2013) having been introduced into the contingency policies of many institutions (Cabinet Office, 2008a; 2008b; Coaffee, Murakami, Wood & Rogers, 2008; Goldstein, 2012; Martin, 2012; Newman,

Beatley & Boyer, 2009). This, of course, has not been without criticism (see, for example, MacKinnon & Derickson, 2012). Yet the scope of resilience has grown exponentially. The term is now used across disciplines in work concerned with the interactions between people and nature (see, for examples, Berkes & Folke, 1998; Holling, Gunderson & Light, 1995; Redman, 1999; Gunderson, 2001) and as such is seen as a ‘bridging concept’ between the natural and social sciences (Davoudi, Shaw, Haider, Quinlan, Peterson & Wilkinson, 2012). With a move toward a concept that holds multiple levels of meaning, from the metaphorical to the specific (Carpenter, Walker, Anderies & Abel, 2001) the critique of its use is not only understandable, but well justified.

Post- 9/11 the amount of expenditure dedicated to the protection of nations from extremism and terrorism increase exponentially (Guinnessy & Dawson, 2002; Issues in Science & Technology, 2002; Lum, Kennedy & Sherley, 2006; Silke, 2004). Part of this expenditure has been the development of policy and interventions aimed at preventing violent extremism. In the US, the introduction of a Strategic Implementation Plan for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States placed emphasis on the building of community resilience in countering violent extremism (The White House Officer of Press Secretary, 2011). In the UK, the release of Countering International Terrorism: The United Kingdom’s Strategy in 2006 (HM Government, 2006) and the subsequent CONTEST strategy (HM Government, 2014) also place emphasis on resilience building. However, resilience as a concept and even more so as a political buzzword has not been properly conceptualised in this context. CONTEST in itself has not gone without criticism (Thomas, 2010; 2016), not least because the understanding of the concepts within are clouded which only adds to the difficulty of evaluating its use. Hence,

gaining clarity on what is actually meant by such concepts in this context is likely to contribute to the full potential of their implementation.

Individual resilience

When resilience is applied to extremism at the individual level there are two main directions for strategies; building individual resilience to overcome a terror attack (Fredrickson, Tugade, Waugh & Larkin, 2003; Miller, 2013) and building individual resilience to reject an extremist rhetoric (Bonnell et al., 2011). The former appears more closely linked to the work in this area, being associated with coping in the aftermath of a traumatic experience. The latter, less so, and the relationships between resilience and adopting extremist rhetoric's are unclear at present. Yet the increase in popularity of resilience building interventions continues (Bonnell et al., 2011). Building resilience at the level of the individual is reflected in the Prevent strand of the UK Governments approach to countering extremism, CONTEST (HM Government, 2014).

Of the three levels of resilience discussed within this paper, individual resilience has received the most attention (Bonanno, Galea, Bucciarelli & Vlahov, 2007). Fraser, Glainsky and Richman (1999) argue that because individuals are malleable, resilience must be distinguished from simple survival. Survival does not ensure healthy functioning, and survivors may become immobilised by anger or absorbed by victimisation (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). Individual resilience has subsequently been defined as the individual's ability to maintain a stable level of functioning following traumatic events and as such a 'trajectory of healthy functioning across time' (Bonanno, 2005, p.136). As a concept then, some argue individual resilience should only be used to refer to 'unpredicted or markedly successful adaptation to negative life events, trauma, stress, and other forms of risk' (Fraser et al., 1999, p.136). Further, Luthar (2006) argues that resilience is never directly measured, but is inferred from evidence of two distinctive dimensions;

significant adversity and positive adaptation. However, the later doesn't at all incorporate the 'process by which people can overcome or resist negative influences' as outlined by Bonnell et al., (2001). Of course, the former explicitly incorporates an adaptation to other form of risk, so here the risk or threat is the adoption of extremist attitudes and vulnerability to potential radicalisation. In terms of positive adaptation this can be understood as an individual's rejection of such and the reduction of vulnerability to radicalisation. This reframing of individual resilience is based on the reframing already published by Ellis and Abdi (2017) of community resilience. Bonnell et al's thinking around individual resilience and extremism is coherent, and it is clear that such thinking has informed existing critical social policy. Nevertheless, there is little to no research, and certainly no empirical research to the authors knowledge that examines individual resilience in this vain. It should be noted, 'negative influences' is open to dispute, and whilst an important discussion to undertake, is beyond the scope of the current exploratory paper. Here, we are framing resilience as a potential for the reduction of vulnerability to extremism.

Community resilience

In defining community resilience there is the added issue of defining community. Community is a term, which can be seen as such an ingrained concept in everyday life that is often used without hesitation or consideration of what it actually means. Norris et al, (2008) propose that in defining community resilience they accept that typically 'a community is an entity that has geographic boundaries and shared fate' (p.128). This is generally the consensus within the community resilience literature also, where community refers to neighbourhoods and geographically defined areas (Aldrich, 2012). However, the continued modernisation of society means that not all situations, where an understanding of community resilience may be useful, are guaranteed to impact a community defined by geographical boundaries. This is certainly true in

the context of a cyber-terror attack (Parks & Duggan, 2011), where instead, the ‘community’ may be users of a certain information system (Jormakka & Molsa, 2005). When considering resilience building as a counter-measure for extremism, the same problem arises, a community may be the online community in which an individual is most susceptible to radicalisation. A broader definition of community may be appropriate in light of the lack of scope to really explore the meaning of community here. Lee and Newby (1983) devised three definitions; community as a ‘geographical expression’, as a ‘local social system’ and, finally ‘identity and commonality’ as a group of individuals. This trio of definitions integrates the idea that not all communities are spatially defined by geographical location, and instead may be defined by the values they hold or collective action they possess. Moreover, social psychologists have emphasised the importance of psychological sense of community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Sarson, 1974). Psychological sense of community builds on the idea of group cohesiveness and seeks to identify the factors at play when an individual is part of a ‘community’ and feels part of that ‘community’. McMillan and Chavis (1986) propose four elements that underpin this sense of community; membership, influence, integration and fulfilment of needs, and shared emotional connection. Psychological sense of community is discussed as relating to both subgroups such as religion or for example, animal rights activists, which are formed or exist on the basis of shared characteristics, and also to larger encompassing groups for which many subgroups may belong to such as nationality. The concept of psychological sense of community has been used to inform many community-based interventions, especially in relation to crime (for example, see Aiyer, Zimmerman, Morrel-Samuels & Reischl, 2014), highlighting the view of communities as being critical to violence prevention across a spectrum of violence types (Ellis & Abdi, 2017). Community-based interventions also draw upon the importance of developing strong bonds in preventing violence.

Social control theory, introduced by Hirschi (1969), proposes the presence of strong familial, community and societal bonds are fundamental in violence prevention. Such bonds not only convey the social norms and expectations but also act as a motivator for abiding by those norms. Of course, extremism itself and the attitudes underpinning such is partly defined upon the basis of a violation of social norms (Kruglanski, Gelfand, belanger, Shevaland, Hetiarachi & Gunaratna, 2014). It is likely that the conveyance of social norms and expectations are particularly important in the countering of extremism.

Even in an attempt to overcome the issue of defining community there are still various definitions of community resilience (see, for review, Norris et al, 2008). In these definitions, there are two important features that underpin the consensus. Firstly, that resilience is better conceptualised as an ability or process than an outcome (Pfefferbaum, Reissman, Pfefferbaum, Klomp & Gurtwitch, 2005). Secondly, that resilience is better conceptualised as an adaptability than as stability (Waller, 2001). Subsequently, Norris et al., (2008) offer the following definition of community resilience: ‘a process linking a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of functioning and adaptation after a disturbance’ (p.131). The understanding of community resilience as a way of preparing for disaster, be it man made or otherwise, has been broadly embraced within research and policy circles (Pfefferbaum, Pfefferbaum & Van Horn, 2015). However, only recently have researchers begun to shift the focus to community resilience as a means of countering-extremism. Ellis and Abdi (2017) discuss in detail community resilience building as an intervention for violent extremism. Ellis and Abdi (2017) suggest ‘the challenge or threat can be understood as the potential for violent extremists to recruit individuals to their cause and potentially even engage in violence; successful adaptation to this threat would be a

community that comes together in such a way that its members are no longer vulnerable to the threat' (p. 291).

National resilience

A new avenue of investigation that has gained the interest of psychological researchers is resilience in the context of a wider societal phenomenon (Barnett, 2004; Chemtob, 2005). The concept of national resilience, which has sometimes been collapsed alongside community resilience as social resilience (Cacioppo, Reis & Zautra, 2011), is broad and seemingly addresses the issue of society's sustainability and strength in several diverse realms (Obrist, Pfeiffer & Henley, 2010). The concept emerged through an acknowledgement that it is not only military capacity that defines a nation's power, but also political-psychological aspects (Barnett, 2004; Canetti, Waismel-Manor, Cohen & Rapaport, 2014; Kimhi & Eshel, 2009). It is however, the least understood (Canetti et al., 2014) especially from an applied perspective (Obrist et al., 2010). Four main social components have been attributed to national resilience (Ben-Dor, Pedahzur, Canetti-Nisim & Zaidise, 2002); patriotism, optimism, social integration, and trust in political and public institutions. Together, it is proposed these related factors underpin national resilience and allow for it to be measured using a psychological questionnaire that includes items pertaining to each factor (Kimhi & Eshel, 2009) in the same way measures exist for both individual resilience (Connor & Davidson, 2003) and community resilience (Leykin et al., 2013). It should be noted, the factorial structure of national resilience is not consistent throughout the literature, with other studies showing the presence of five factors, (Kimhi & Eshel, 2009), albeit similar to the four components previously proposed; trust in the prime minister and the government, patriotism, coping with a national crisis, social justice and trust in national

institutions. Parmak (2015) further highlights the need to develop a greater conceptual understanding of national resilience and measures through which it can be explored.

Research has also shown that a number of variables may predict community and national resilience. Kimhi, Goroshit & Eshel (2013) explored the extent to which four antecedent variables were able to predict sources of resilience, finding that community type, age, levels of religiosity and preparedness all significantly predicted community and national resilience. However, this investigation was carried out among a specific sample in Israel comprising of Kibbutz members, Moshav members, village inhabitant and town dwellers. It is therefore not yet determinable whether community and national resilience would operate the same way in other cultures. As with community resilience, the majority of the exploration has been from the perspective of resilience building to cope with severe adversity. There is no previous literature to the authors knowledge that frames all three levels of resilience as concepts that may have important implications for the rejection of extremist attitudes. As has been done with individual resilience here, and community resilience (Ellis & Abdi, 2017) so then, may National Resilience, be reframed to view the threat or challenge as the wider network in which an individual may be exposed to or recruited in to extremism. Successful adaptation equates to the nation coming together, formed by each community and individual, to reduce vulnerability of its members to the threat. In reality it is likely that such a relationship is far more complex, and although all three levels may correlate one another there are likely many further factors to explore. The result of immigration is that, especially within the UK, the presence of a multinational society has emerged, which is also reflected in the increased use of rhetoric within public discourse around multiculturalism (Parmak, 2015). The impact of this not only on national resilience, but also on community resilience is particularly important to understand when making recommendations for

public policy. Parmak (2015) discusses that within multinational societies, the cohesiveness of ‘in groups and out groups’, and the categorisation of ‘us and them’ may diminish the overall resilience at the national level.

Associations Between the Three Levels

It would seem logical to consider that as communities and societies are made up of individuals, that the individual themselves would play a significant role in resilience at the level of the community. Likewise, nations are made up of communities and so it would also seem logical to consider that communities would play a significant role in resilience at the level of the nation. However, there is no empirical evidence to suggest that alone, individual resilience predicts community resilience and in turn national resilience. As Patterson, Well and Patel (2010) discuss most decision processes are informed by a complex array of interactions between individuals, the communities they are in and the environment in which they are in.

Only recently has research begun to examine the associations between all three levels of resilience (Kimhi et al., 2013; Kimhi, 2014). Kimhi (2014) found that individual, community and national resilience were all positively correlated with each other, but that their low common variance also emphasised their distinctiveness.

The Current Study

The place for resilience within UK policy is not questioned here, instead the key problem presented is twofold; in order to target extremism, the framing of threat and adaptation needs to be refocused, and a lack of understanding around how the three levels of resilience as separate concepts are associated (Kimhi, 2014). This paper has made an attempt to reframe both individual resilience and national resilience based on the reframing of community resilience by Ellis and Abdi (2017). By defining the threat as extremism and successful adaptation as

vulnerability reduction, the current paper aims to explore all three levels and discuss the implications to future intervention and policy in the area of counter-extremism. In doing so, data is also analysed to assess the validity and reliability of measures of resilience. Based on the literature discussed and previous explorations of the associations it is hypothesised that all three levels of resilience will be positively correlated with one another. As this paper is the first exploration of the three levels of resilience in the UK, two studies are presented, an initial piloting of the three resilience scales on a student population and a second study on a larger sample of the general population. Accordingly, the current analysis is a preliminary exploration of the data obtained.

manuscript accepted for publication

Methodology

Design

The aim of the research is to understand how the three levels of resilience relate to each other in the United Kingdom under the framing of threat as extremism. The aim was deliberately broad to enable an initial exploration of these concepts and to determine the reliability of the National Resilience Scale (Kimhi et al., 2013) that had not previously been conducted on a UK sample. Based on the previous literature it was hypothesised that all three levels of resilience will be positively correlated with one another. The studies adopted a cross-sectional design in order to support this examination of the three levels of resilience. Study one involved a pilot of the scales being used on a sample of undergraduate student. Data was collected using paper-based survey administration. Study two involved the scales being used on a sample of the general population. Data was collected using both web-based distribution and paper-based administration to facilitate a larger response to be reached whilst minimizing costs (Greenlaw & Brown-Welty, 2009).

Sample – Study One

A sample of 134 undergraduate students was utilised for the initial piloting of the scale. The majority of participants were born in the United Kingdom (84%). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 55. The gender distribution was 85% female respondents and 15% male respondents. Across the sample 9.7% reported belonging to a very small community, 24.6% to a small community, 28.4% to a small/medium community, 22.4% to a medium/large community, 7.5% to a large community and 6.7% to a very large community; 56.7% of respondents said they were secular in relation to religiosity, 16.4% traditional, 23.9% religious and .7% very religious; 50.7% stated they followed no religion, 23.9% Christianity, 18.7% Islam, and 4.5% other.

Sample – Study Two

A mixed methods approach to sampling was used to obtain responses from 355 individuals. The majority of participants were born in the United Kingdom (83.7%). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 74. The gender distribution was 65.4% female respondents and 34.6% male respondents. Across the sample 36.3% reported belonging to a very small community, 8.7% to a small community, 6.8% to a small/ medium community, 9.3% to a medium/ large community, 3.9% to a large community and 34.9% to a very large community; 62% of respondents said they were secular in relation to religiosity, 20.3% traditional, 10.1% religious, and 7.6% very religious; 54.4% stated they followed no religion, 26.8% Christianity, 3.1% Islam, and 15.7% other.

Measures

Three scale constructs were used to assess the associations between the three levels of resilience alongside demographics. Both the Conjoint Community Resilience Assessment Measure, CCRAM (Leykin et al., 2013) and the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC, Connor & Davidson, 2003), short version (Green et al., 2014) have previously been tested for reliability among UK samples.

National Resilience

The current scale was devised based on the earlier version by Kimhi, Goroshit and Eshel (2013). The scales consisted of 25 items pertaining to trust in the prime minister and the government, patriotism, coping with national crises, social justice and trust in national institutions. The 6-point response scale ranges from 1= very strongly disagree to 6=very strongly agree. The scale's reliability was found to be highly reliable in both studies (25 items; $\alpha=.89$ & $\alpha=.92$ retrospectively).

Community resilience

Community resilience was measured by a short version of the community resilience scale developed by the Conjoint Community Resilience Assessment Measure (CCRAM) (Leykin et al., 2013). This scale consists of 10 items pertaining to identification with one's community, trust in municipal authorities and confidence in the community's ability to withstand adversities. The 5-point scale ranges from 1 = does not agree at all to 5 = totally agree. The scale's reliability was found to be highly reliable in both studies (10 items; both $\alpha=.88$).

Individual resilience

Individual resilience was measured by the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC, Connor & Davidson, 2003), short version (Green et al., 2014). The scale consists of 14 statements which require the respondent to indicate on a scale of 1-7 the extent to which they agree or disagree with each in relation to how they have felt in the last month. The scale's reliability was found to be highly reliable in both studies (14 items; $\alpha=.88$ & $\alpha = .91$ retrospectively).

Results

Study One

Reliability Analysis

Internal Consistency

To measure internal consistency Cronbach's α was used, coefficients above 0.70 are agreed to reflect good internal consistency (Clark & Watson, 1995). Cronbach's α for all scales are presented in Table 1. The main scale for which it was important to check internal consistency, was the National Resilience Scale, as this is the first sample for which it has been used in the United Kingdom. The National Resilience Scale was found to have high internal consistency; $\alpha = .90$.

Associations among the three levels of resilience

Correlations

The relationships between the three levels of resilience were investigated using Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient, see Table 1. All three relationships were found to be significant. A strong positive correlation between national resilience and community resilience was found, $r = .58$, $n = 134$, $p < .01$, with high levels of national resilience associated with higher levels of community resilience. A weak positive correlation was found between community resilience and individual resilience, $r = .20$, $n = 134$, $p < .05$, with high levels of community resilience associated with high levels of individual resilience. A weak positive correlation was found between national resilience and individual resilience, $r = .30$, $n = 134$, $p < .01$, with high levels of national resilience associated with high levels of individual resilience. Showing that the associations between community resilience and national resilience are stronger

than the associations between national and individual resilience, and between community and individual resilience.

Multiple Regression

A multiple regression was performed to investigate how well individual resilience and community resilience predict national resilience, see Table 2.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. Since a no a priori hypotheses had been made to determine the order of entry of the predictor variables, a direct method was used for the multiple linear regression analysis. The two independent variables explained 37% of variance in national resilience ($F(2, 131) = 38.44, p < .001$). In the final model both predictor variables were statistically significant, with community resilience recording a higher Beta value ($\beta = .54, p < .001$) than individual resilience ($\beta = .19, p < .01$).

Study Two

Reliability Analysis

Internal Consistency

To measure internal consistency Cronbachs α was used, coefficients above 0.70 are agreed to reflect good internal consistency (Clark & Watson, 1995). Cronbachs α for all scales are presented in Table 1. The main scale for which it was important to check internal consistency, was the National Resilience Scale, as this is the first sample for which it has been used in the United Kingdom. The National Resilience Scale was found to have high internal consistency; $\alpha = .92$.

Table 1.

Alpha Cronbach and Pearson correlations among research variables for both study one and study two.

Variable	α	Community resilience	Individual resilience
Study one			
National resilience	.89	.58**	.30**
Community resilience	.88		.20*
Individual resilience	.88		
Study two			
National resilience	.92	-.244**	.173**
Community resilience	.87		-.341**
Individual resilience	.91		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Associations among the three levels of resilience

Correlations

The relationships between the three levels of resilience were investigated using Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient, see Table 1. All three relationships were found to be significant. Individual resilience showed a weak positive correlation with national resilience, $r = .173$, $n = 355$, $p < .001$. Community resilience showed a weak negative correlation with national resilience, $r = -.244$, $n = 355$, $p < .001$. Community resilience showed a medium negative correlation with individual resilience, $r = -.341$, $n = 355$, $p < .001$. Showing that an increase in

community resilience is associated with a decrease in individual resilience and national resilience. Increases in individual resilience however is associated with an increase in national resilience.

Multiple Regression

A multiple regression was performed to investigate how well individual resilience and community resilience predict national resilience, see Table 2.

Table 2.

Multiple Regression for study one and study two

	R^2	β	B	SE	CI 95% (B)
Study one					
Model	.37***				
Community Resilience		.54***	1.52	.20	1.13/1.91
Individual Resilience		.19**	.51	.19	.14/.89
Study two					
Model	.06**				
Community Resilience		-.19**	-.52	.15	-.83/-.22
Individual Resilience		.11*	.25	.12	.01/.49

* $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$, *** $P < .001$

Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. Since a no a priori hypotheses had been made to determine the order of entry of the predictor variables, a direct method was used for the multiple

linear regression analysis. The two independent variables explained 6.1% of the variance in national resilience $F(2, 352) = 11.37, p < .001$. In the final model both predictors were statistically significant, with community resilience recording a higher Beta value ($\beta = -.19, p < .001$) than individual resilience ($\beta = .11, p < .01$).

manuscript accepted for publication

Discussion

Previous findings show three distinct but related levels of resilience; individual, community and national (Kimhi, 2014). Whilst some research has collapsed the latter two and investigated these under societal resilience, literature in this area suggests that there is enough distinction between these two to warrant developing an understanding of them as separate concepts (Ben-Dor et al., 2002; Kimhi, 2014). The current study aimed to investigate the three levels among the UK population as an initial conceptual exploration after the reframing of these to the issue of extremism, to give future direction to research in this area with specific focus on the implications such an understanding holds for policy makers, especially in an age where national security and, extremism and terrorism specifically has such importance.

Exploring the Three Levels of Resilience

The current exploration of national, community and individual resilience among a UK sample firstly found the three scales of resilience to be highly reliable in both samples. In relation to the second aim, the current study examined the associations between the three levels of resilience.

Based on the significant correlations found between the three levels in both samples we may assume, whilst related, these represent independent structures, supporting previous research (Kimhi, 2014). However, the relationships between the three levels of resilience operated differently in study one and study two. Within study one the hypothesis of each level of resilience being positively correlated with the others was supported. Among undergraduate students, community resilience and national resilience were most strongly related, again showing similar results to those previously found (Kimhi, 2014). However, in study two the hypothesis was not supported. This further exploration of the three levels of resilience, conducted among the

general population, found community resilience was to be negatively correlated with both individual and national resilience, whilst national resilience maintained a positive correlation with individual resilience. This indicates there are important differences in the role communities play in national resilience dependent on the sample being examined.

One explanation for this may lie in the understanding of psychological sense of community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). This finding may suggest that the underpinning elements of a psychological sense of community are distinct to sub-groups as discussed in the review of the literature, and that it may be these that indicate why communities may be so valuable in violence prevention (Aiyer et al., 2014), as opposed to wider interventions at the level of the nation. However, this does not explain why the relationship differed among the student sample and the general population. So then, may resilience be best viewed as constructs that relate differently to one another dependent on context rather than levels that build upon one another.

Another explanation for this difference in findings is the impact of immigration on the UK and as such the emergence of a multinational society (Parmak, 2015). It may be that within a small sample of university students the impact of the multinational society, group cohesiveness and associated group categorisations was lessened. However, when a larger sample of the general population was examined, we may have seen the effect detailed by Parmak (2015) in that these factors may diminish the overall resilience at the national level. Likewise, when comparing these findings to those found by Kimhi (2014), where Israel is not an emerging multinational society. What was particularly interesting here however, was that individual resilience remained positively correlated with national resilience yet not with community resilience. This indicates

that it is something within the resilience of the community that may diminish when considering oneself as an individual or part of the nation.

Predicting Resilience

In order to fully explore the three levels a multiple regression was carried out using individual and community resilience as predictive factors on the basis the correlations would indicate that if resilience at one level changes then resilience at the next level will change. This analysis revealed that when both individual resilience and community resilience were regressed on to national resilience, community resilience was the better predictor in both study one and study two. Despite significance, the strength to which individual resilience predicts national resilience was found to be low, suggesting that there are important factors beyond the individual, and beyond the community that should be considered in the development of resilience building strategies within UK policy. The differences between the findings among a student sample and a general population sample were particularly important here and highlight the differences that may occur when examining societal issues among specific populations (Druckman & Kam, 2009) and offering direction for future explorations to determine why such differences in this context occur. The findings here do however, within both samples, emphasise the importance of specificity in any resilience building rhetoric around the level at which it is intended to operate and the level/s at which it aims to have impact. The findings suggest that building resilient individuals alone, or even building resilient communities does not complete the picture in building national resilience, highlighting the complexity of interactions between individuals, communities and their environment (Patterson et al., 2010). However, the findings do indicate that there are relationships between the three that with further understanding may be drawn upon, together, to develop future interventions targeting all three levels and operating in cohesion.

From this, it would be an appropriate direction to begin to explore which further factors are predictors of not only national resilience, but resilience at all three levels to inform future resilience building strategies. Further, in the general population, for which social policies apply, community resilience may in fact have negative consequences on national resilience, for here although community resilience remained the better predictor, the direction was negative in a general population sample. This may to some extent, be a reflection of the differences between individuals and groups in how they define community (Charles & Davies, 2005). It is important that policies work together, by seeing the bigger picture, policy makers may be better equipped to develop interventions that work coherently in achieving overall goals. Research has previously shown how current policy is failing to do this in the area of communities and extremism (Thomas, 2010) yet there doesn't appear to be a strategy to address such.

The Conceptual Framework

Together, the findings indicate a framework by which all three levels of resilience relate to each other, and that at each level the predictive ability of one predicting the next is stronger. Although the direction of prediction may differ among samples. This goes beyond previous research that discussed the associations in terms of how they correlate to one another (Kimhi, 2014) and begins to explore the relationships at a greater depth. The findings also indicate that there is value in further exploration of predictors of resilience at each level to inform and develop such a framework, especially in consideration of the reframing of resilience to extremism. That is, the threat as extremism or extremist attitudes and adaptation as individuals, communities and the nation coming together in such a way that they and their members are no longer vulnerable to the threat (Ellis & Abdi, 2017). Resilience at one level alone is not enough to predict resilience at the others, as shown in previous research that found specific demographics can predict resilience

at the level of the nation (Kimhi et al., 2013). Variables such as community size, religiosity, sex and age are likely to play a significant role in the prediction of resilience (Kimhi et al., 2013). Further, it is likely that certain events, such as a terror attack, impact resilience at all three levels in different ways, both in the short term and the long term. Such events, at least in the short term, have a significant impact on the way outgroups are categorised (Skitka, Bauman & Mullen, 2004) and as previously highlighted by Parmak (2015) polarization of attitudes can escalate in a very short timeframe after such events occur. Therefore, not only should attention be given to how the three levels of resilience operate within multinational societies at times of ‘normality’ as done here but also as to how events such as terror attacks influence this both in the immediate post event period, but also longitudinally (Coaffee, 2013).

Practical Implications

With regard to determining what works in relation to social policy and specific strategies, a greater understanding of the concepts on which they are based also allows for greater transparency and increased direction for conducting evaluations. This is not being ignorant to the need for, at times, developing and publishing certain policies and strategies despite the lack of an evidence base. Such times when the public look for something to be done, quickly. But, where possible this should encourage the uptake of primary empirical research and those creating such policies should be open to continuous development of such strategies on the back of such evidence bases. There should be a greater focus on moving away from myopic policies and towards long-term strategies that are based on evidence, clear for practitioners to apply and subject to evaluation to determine validity upon different populations. The findings that the three levels of resilience are independent structures, which supports the previous literature (Kimhi, 2014) also has important implications. The understanding of each of the three constructs of

resilience alongside how they are associated, and interact with each other has the potential to inform more specific strategies of ‘resilience building’ that are able to draw on evidence around which level of resilience may be most effective to target for the intended outcome. Whilst research shows there is some evidence of building resilience at different levels in countering-extremism and terrorism (Bonnell et al., 2011; Coaffee & Rogers, 2008; Coaffee & Wood, 2006; Fredrickson et al., 2003; Haimes et al., 2008; Hardy, 2015 Miller, 2013) the current paper gives direction for further investigation as to how the three levels of resilience can be best used to both inform and evaluate interventions in this area. This is not limited only to current directions in building individual resilience to reject extremist rhetoric’s (Bonnell et al., 2011), but also, it is our contention that especially when related to a wider understanding of resilience it may also be applied to various stages within pathways to violent action such as attempts to recruit individuals. The power that an in-depth understanding of resilience may hold when applied to policies aimed to counter certain rhetoric’s and behaviours should not be underestimated. The reframing of resilience to refer explicitly to the threat of adopting an extremist rhetoric also allows for more direct implications to be discussed and a clearer understanding of what is being modelled.

Limitations and Future Directions

The difference in direction of relationships found in study one and study two warrants further exploration in order to determine why community resilience in one situation positively correlates with national resilience and in another negatively correlates. It is an interesting finding that shows the importance of recognizing the potential implications of using narrow samples in researching societal issues. A greater focus on the meaning of community and the role of the

community to an individual offers an avenue of exploration to further develop the understanding of resilience here and these differences.

It was highlighted in the introduction that the factorial structure underpinning national resilience has been different across studies (Ben-Dor et al., 2002; Kimhi & Eshel, 2009). A full exploration of the National Resilience Scale (Kimhi et al., 2013) was beyond the scope of the current paper that aimed to assess initial reliability and associations, however a full exploration of the scale will allow for a greater understanding of national resilience and the factors underpinning such when applied to a UK sample.

Conclusion

The current study reframed both individual resilience and national resilience, as had previously been done for community resilience (Ellis & Abdi, 2017). The current study applied the National Resilience Scale (Kimhi et al., 2013) to a UK sample alongside measures of community and individual resilience to determine whether it could be a suitable measure for National Resilience outside of Israel where the majority of testing has taken place. Ultimately, findings suggest that the scale is reliable when used on a UK sample. Further, the findings showed three distinct concepts which was consistent with previous research (Kimhi, 2014), although the relationship between national and community resilience appears to be stronger among a UK sample and the direction of the relationship varies dependent on population. As a concept applied to policy, resilience has the potential to have wide-ranging implications. The findings of the current study indicate that it should not be haphazardly applied to social policy, especially in relation to counter-extremism where it appears to refer to both the individual and the wider society, without trying to develop the understanding around the three levels of resilience as independent concepts.

Ultimately, any strategy or intervention, where resilience is a factor, should not fail to distinguish between the three constructs. Further, it encourages an increased interest in examining resilience within the UK with consideration of the three levels and how such an understanding can inform policy aimed to counter-extremism. Whilst the focus here has been narrow, the practical implications of such an understanding have a much wider reach both within policy circles and beyond.

manuscript accepted for publication

References

- Aldrich, D. P. (2012). *Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aiyer, S. M., Zimmerman, M. A., Morrel-Samuels, S., & Reischl, T. M. (2015). From broken windows to busy streets: A community empowerment perspective. *Health Education & Behavior*, 42(2), 137-147.
- Barnett, M. D. (2004). Congress must recognize the need for psychological resilience in an age of terrorism. *Families, Systems, & Health*, 22(1), 64-66.
- Ben-Dor, G., Pedahzur, A., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Zaidise, E. (2002). The role of public opinion in Israel's national security. *American Jewish Congress: Congress Monthly*, 69(5), 13-15.
- Berkes, F., & Folke, C. (1998). Linking social and ecological systems for resilience and sustainability. *Linking social and ecological systems: management practices and social mechanisms for building resilience*, 1, 13-20.
- Bonanno, G. A. (2005). Resilience in the face of potential trauma. *Current directions in psychological science*, 14(3), 135-138.
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2007). What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources, and life stress. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 75(5), 671 – 682.
- Bonnell, J., Copestake, P., Kerr, D., Passy, R., Reed, C., Salter, R., & Sheikh, S. (2011). *Teaching approaches that help to build resilience to extremism among young people*. OPM and National Foundation for Educational Research. ISBN: 978-1-84775-919-1
- Cabinet Office (2003) *Dealing with Disaster*. (revised 3rd ed) London: Cabinet Office

Cabinet Office (2008a) *National Risk Register*. London: Cabinet Office

Cabinet Office (2008b) *Realising Britains' potential: Future Strategic Challenges for Britain*. London: Cabinet Office

Cacioppo, J.T., Reis, H.T., & Zautra, A.J. (2011). Social resilience. *American Psychologist*, 66, 43-51.

Canetti, D., Waismel-Manor, I., Cohen, N., & Rapaport, C. (2014). What does national resilience mean in a democracy? Evidence from the United States and Israel. *Armed Forces & Society*, 40(3), 504-520.

Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J. M., & Abel, N. (2001). From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what? *Ecosystems*, 4(8), 765-781.

Charles, N., & Davies, C. A. (2005). Studying the particular, illuminating the general: community studies and community in Wales. *The Sociological Review*, 53(4), 672-690.

Chemtob, C. M. (2005). Finding the gift in the horror: Toward developing a national psychosocial security policy. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 10, 721-727.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, 7(3), 309 – 319

Coaffee, J. (2006). From counterterrorism to resilience. *European Legacy*, 11(4), 389-403.

Coaffee, J. (2013). Towards next-generation urban resilience in planning practice: from securitization to integrated place making. *Planning Practice & Research*, 28(3), 323-339.

Coaffee, J., & O'Hare, P. (2008). *Urban Resilience and National Security: The Role for Planning*.

Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers Urban Design and Planning 161 December 2008

Issue DP4. Paper: 800034

- Coaffee, J., & Wood, D. M. (2006). Security is coming home: Rethinking scale and constructing resilience in the global urban response to terrorist risk. *International Relations*, 20(4), 503-517.
- Coaffee, J., Wood, D. M., Rogers, P., & Wood, D. M. M. (2008). *The Everyday Resilience of the City: how cities respond to terrorism and disaster*. Springer.
- Coaffee, J., & Rogers, P. (2008). Rebordering the city for new security challenges: from counter-terrorism to community resilience. *Space and Polity*, 12(1), 101-118.
- Daniels, H., Leadbetter, J., Warmington, P., Edwards, A., Martin, D., Popova, A., & Brown, S. (2007). Learning in and for multi-agency working. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4), 521-538.
- Davoudi, S., Shaw, K., Haider, L. J., Quinlan, A. E., Peterson, G. D., Wilkinson, C., & Davoudi, S. (2012). Resilience: a bridging concept or a dead end? “Reframing” resilience: challenges for planning theory and practice interacting traps. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 299-333.
- Dawson, J., & Guinnessy, P. (2002). Terrorism drives Bush RD money to defense and NIH; other science funding flat in Fiscal 2003. *Phys. Today*, 30-36.
- Druckman, J. N., & Kam, C. D. (2009). Students as experimental participants: A defense of the 'narrow data base'. *Institute for Policy Research Northwestern University*, WP-09-05.
- Ellis, B. H., & Abdi, S. (2017). Building community resilience to violent extremism through genuine partnerships. *American Psychologist*, 72(3), 289.
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global environmental change*, 16(3), 253-267.
- Fraser, M. W., Galinsky, M. J., & Richman, J. M. (1999). Risk, protection, and resilience: Toward a conceptual framework for social work practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 23 (3), 131-143.

- Fredrickson, B. L., Tugade, M. M., Waugh, C. E., & Larkin, G. R. (2003). What good are positive emotions in crisis? A prospective study of resilience and emotions following the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11th, 2001. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(2), 365 – 376
- Gill, P. (2006). Not Just Joining the Dots But Crossing the Borders and Bridging the Voids: Constructing Security Networks after 11 September 2001 The initial version of this article was presented to the ESRC Seminar “Networks, Mobilities and Borders in the Global System”, Oxford Brookes University, January 2005. *Policing & Society*, 16(1), 27-49.
- Goldstein, B. E. (2012). *Collaborative resilience: Moving through crisis to opportunity*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Greenlaw, C., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009). A comparison of web-based and paper-based survey methods: testing assumptions of survey mode and response cost. *Evaluation Review*, 33(5), 464-480.
- Gunderson, L.H., 2001. Managing surprising ecosystems in southern Florida. *Ecological Economics*, 37, 371–378
- Haimes, Y. Y., Crowther, K., & Horowitz, B. M. (2008). Homeland security preparedness: Balancing protection with resilience in emergent systems. *Systems Engineering*, 11(4), 287-308.
- Hardy, K. (2015). Resilience in UK counter-terrorism. *Theoretical Criminology*, 19(1), 77-94.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). A control theory of delinquency. *Criminology theory: Selected classic readings*, 289-305.
- HM Government (2006) *Countering International Terrorism: The United Kingdom’s Strategy*. Retrieved from:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/272320/6888.pdf
- HM Government (2010a) *Working Together to Protect Crowded Spaces*. London: TSO

HM Government (2010b) *Crowded Places: The Planning System and Counterterrorism*. London: TSO

H.M Government. (2014). CONTEST, UK Strategy for Countering Terrorism: Annual Report for 2014.

Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/contest-uk-strategy-for-countering-terrorism-annual-report-for-2014>

Holling, C. S., Gunderson, L. H., & Light, S. (1995). *Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems*.

New York: Columbia University Press.

Jormakka, J., Molsa, J.V. (2005) Modelling information warfare as a game. *Journal of Information*

Warfare, 4(2), 12 – 25

Joseph, J. (2013). Resilience as embedded neoliberalism: a governmentality approach. *Resilience*, 1(1),

38-52.

Kimhi, S. (2014). Levels of Resilience: Associations among Individual, Community and National

Resilience. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 21 (2), 164 -170

Kimhi, S., & Eshel, Y. (2009). Individual and public resilience and coping with long-term outcomes of

war. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, 14, 70-89

Kimhi, S., Goroshit, M., & Eshel, Y. (2013). Demographic variables as antecedents of Israeli community

and national resilience. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(5), 631-643

Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R.

(2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Political Psychology*, 35(S1), 69-93.

Lee, D., & Newby, H. (1983). *The Problem of Sociology: an introduction to the discipline*. Oxford:

Psychology Press.

- Lum, C., Kennedy, L. W., & Sherley, A. (2006). Are counter-terrorism strategies effective? The results of the Campbell systematic review on counter-terrorism evaluation research. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2(4), 489-516.
- MacKinnon, D., & Derickson, K. D. (2013). From resilience to resourcefulness A critique of resilience policy and activism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2), 253-270
- Martin, R. (2012). Regional economic resilience, hysteresis and recessionary shocks. *Journal of economic geography*, 12(1), 1-32.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of community psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- Newman, P., Beatley, T., & Boyer, H. (2009). *Resilient cities: responding to peak oil and climate change*. Island Press.
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American journal of community psychology*, 41(1-2), 127-150.
- Obrist, B., Pfeiffer, C., & Henley, R. (2010). Multi-layered social resilience: A new approach in mitigation research. *Progress in Development Studies*, 10(4), 283-293.
- Parks, R. C., & Duggan, D. P. (2011). Principles of cyberwarfare. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 9(5), 30-35.
- Parmak, M. (2015). National resilience in multinational societies. *Resiliency: Enhancing Coping with Crisis and Terrorism*, 119, 60 - 70.
- Patterson, O., Weil, F., & Patel, K. (2010). The role of community in disaster response: conceptual models. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 29(2), 127-141.

- Pfefferbaum, B., Pfefferbaum, R. L., & Van Horn, R. L. (2015). Community resilience interventions: Participatory, assessment-based, action-oriented processes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 238-253.
- Pfefferbaum, B. J., Reissman, D. B., Pfefferbaum, R. L., Klomp, R. W., & Gurwitch, R. H. (2008). Building resilience to mass trauma events. In *Handbook of injury and violence prevention* (pp. 347-358). Springer US.
- Redman, C. L. (2005). Resilience theory in archaeology. *American Anthropologist*, 107(1), 70-77.
- Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. Jossey-Bass.
- Silke, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Research on Terrorism: Trends, achievements and failures*. London: Routledge.
- Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Mullen, E. (2004). Political tolerance and coming to psychological closure following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks: An integrative approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(6), 743-756.
- The White House, Office of Press Secretary. (2011) *Strategic implementation plan for empowering local partners to prevent violent extremism in the United States*. Retrieved from: https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2016_strategic_implementation_plan_empowering_local_partners_prev%20%282%29.pdf
- Thomas, P. (2010). Failed and friendless: the UK's 'Preventing Violent Extremism' programme. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 12(3), 442-458.
- Thomas, P. (2016). Youth, terrorism and education: Britain's Prevent programme. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 35(2), 171-187.

Walker, B., Carpenter, S., Anderies, J., Abel, N., Cumming, G., Janssen, M., & Pritchard, R. (2002).

Resilience management in social-ecological systems: a working hypothesis for a participatory approach. *Conservation ecology*, 6(1), 14.

Waller, M. A. (2001). Resilience in ecosystemic context: Evolution of the concept. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71(3), 290-297.

Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The Resilient Self*. New York: Villard Books

manuscript accepted for publication