Equitable Access to Opportunities

The Science of Resilience

RRC - Evaluation and Training Institute

Table of Contents

Definition

Opportunities

Opportunities in this context can be defined as the conditions that increase the capacity for people to show resilience in contexts where they may be marginalized (Didkowsky & Ungar, 2016). Examples include age appropriate work and employment opportunities and education systems that are meaningful to students and that encourage teachers to engage and advocate for their student. In short, opportunities are the set of circumstances that make it possible to do something.

Opportunity has also been defined as "the availability of specific institutional, material, or human resources that might be employed in the negotiation of structured constraints. Opportunity, then, can be registered through the availability of institutionalized and noninstitutionalized resources" (O'Connor, 2002, p. 857). Opportunities in this sense are *created by* structures, institutions, policies, social interactions, and their expression in a particular space and time (O'Connor, 2002, p. 856). Creating opportunities therefore includes the provisions of resources, the institutionalization of support, and the structuring of access (O'Connor, 2002). In short, opportunities are defined as the availability and use of resources that mitigate constraint which in turn highlights the relationship between opportunities and resources.

In speaking to community resilience specifically, Ungar (2011) uses the notion of 'opportunity structures' to highlight this point. With reference to young people Ungar (2011) states that "which resources are available and accessible to which young people is a decision made by service providers and governments who exert more influence on social policy than those being served" (p. 1743). Opportunities therefore are inextricably linked to resources and their distribution. Thus, while some opportunities may be the result of chance or luck, opportunities are also structured and mediated by sources outside of an individual's immediate control.

Access to Opportunities

Opportunity does not equate to *access* to opportunity. While opportunities are defined are a set of circumstances that creates space for something to happen, access is more closely related to self-determination in that a lack of access may restrict a person's ability to something (Transforming Agency Access and Power, 2018). Access in this way can be defined as "the ability to obtain material and immaterial benefits from things" (as cited in Calderon-Contreras & White, 2020).

Similarly, the existence of an opportunity does not mean a person will necessarily be able to navigate to and make use of that opportunity. In an analysis of social-ecological

systems, Langridge, Christian-Smith, and Lohse (2006) make a similar distinction. They argue that access refers to "an expanded array of means, processes, and relations within society […] that delineate how a community gains, controls, and maintains access". These can include structural and relational processes, social relations, and rights. In this sense opportunities are mediated by the type of access that an individual or group may have. The authors also argue that access is not static but rather is a complex and dynamic process that can change over time and across contexts (Langridge, Christian-Smith, & Lohse 2006).

Definitions such as these that emphasize the structural and relational mechanisms behind access to opportunities bring issues of power and inequality into focus (Calderon-Contreras & White, 2020). Thus, in discussing access to opportunities it is important to also consider the extent to which inequality is created or maintained by differential access to opportunities.

Equitable Access to Opportunities

Equity is concerned with how the moral equality of people can be realized and places focus on the needs of those that are disadvantaged by inequalities of opportunity (Matin, Forrester, & Ensor, 2018, p. 197). While 'equitable' connotes fairness, it does not equate to 'equal'. This is to say that equitable can be defined as not unduly benefiting or hindering any particular person(s) or group(s) but is not the same thing as equal, as in even or balanced (Ontario Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health, 2019).

Equitable access to opportunities may therefore mean providing additional resources or support to those that face certain barriers so they can access opportunities as easily as those who do not face barriers (Ontario Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health, 2019). Thus, equitable access to opportunities determines not only the availability of opportunities, but the ability to draw upon or make use of that opportunity as well.

Relationship to Resilience

Access to Opportunities and Resilience

One way in which opportunities are related to resilience is through the creation of circumstances in which a person can develop skills and capabilities that help to build resilience. For instance, Masten and Reed (2005) stipulate that in order to develop and foster resilience, young people need opportunities to experience success and achievement at all ages. Such opportunities for achievement in turn feed 'the mastery motivation system' which has been shown to positively effect resilience (Masten & Reed, 2005, 84; for relationship between mastery and resilience see Bandura, 1977 and Ungar, 2004). Similarly, while decision making is related to resilience, it is also in part predicated on the *opportunities* that a person has to practice and develop this trait. [See our write-up on Opportunities to Make Decisions for

Oneself]. Similarly, in speaking to resilience in the context of disaster recovery, Abramson et al. (2015) note that access to and engagement with social resources can activate inherent individual resilience attributes. They argue that social support can activate resilience processes by "helping with perspective taking for reasoning and problem solving; promoting positive emotions and attitudes associated with resilience (e.g., self-esteem, self-efficacy, optimism); facilitating adaptive coping behaviors; helping to regulate negative emotional states through providing respite; and/or helping to find a greater meaning or purpose in the situation" (Abramson et al., 2015, p. 8). In this sense opportunities are related to resilience insofar as they help stimulate other attributes (ie. personal and social competencies and disposition) that help build resilience.

However, the authors also stipulate two main pathways through which social resources can activate resilience processes, both of which are predicated on *access* to resources. The first pathway is one in which resource deficits are addressed by increasing individual or community assets or facilitating access to them. The second pathway is one in which the provision of formal or informal social resources enhances or activates positive adaptive traits. The relationship between provision and access to resources and resilience is significant in this context given the interconnections between opportunities and resources (see definition above). The pathways suggested by Ambramson et al. (2015) are similar to recent definitions of resilience in which access is a critical component that mediates the extent to which opportunities will be utilized and useful for resilience. For example, Ungar (2011) defines resilience "not as an individual's capacity to withstand adversity, but instead as the capacity of individuals to **access** [*emphasis added*] the resources they need to sustain well-being and the capacity of their communities and governments to provide them with what they need in ways that are meaningful" (p. 1743). Thus, improving resilience requires not only the provision of opportunities and services, but necessitates that they are provided in such a way that an individual is able to successfully make use of them. This definition of resilience also highlights the role of communities and governments to ensure that this type of access in provided. In this sense resilience is not solely defined by an individual's ability to navigate towards beneficial opportunities and resources, but rather is a dialectical relationship between the individual and their environment.

Didkowsky and Ungar (2016) highlight several areas of the structural design of communities that can be looked to when seeking to improve young people's access to opportunities for positive psychosocial development. These include the following:

- Housing density (quantitatively, as well as the quality of housing)
- Quality and quantity of social, physical, and mental health supports in the area
- The kinds and costs of transportation systems
- Quality of recreational facilities and schools

In highlighting these areas, the authors draw attention to the need to build 'resilience-enabling environments' in which people have access to the opportunities and resources they need. This highlights the importance of a person's environment in shaping how access (or the lack thereof) to opportunities impacts resilience.

Similarly, O'Connor (2012) argues that access to opportunities functions as a resilience risk factor that can be mitigated or exacerbated in difference circumstances. They explain that, in creating opportunity, it is possible to constrain and reduce risk and that conversely, in denying opportunity risk is exacerbated. From this interpretation the denial of access to opportunity functions as a risk factor to resilience, where the provision of access to opportunity has the potential to function as a protective factor of resilience. The focus therefore is not solely on the individual attributes that are enhanced through access to opportunities. Rather, access to opportunities more broadly is understood to be helpful in building resilience. Thus, while access to opportunities is indirectly related to resilience in its capacity to act as an 'activator' of individual traits, O'Connor (2012) proposes that access to opportunities has a more direct relationship to resilience.

Cheunwattana and Meksawat (2002) provide an example of this direct relationship in their description of a library train for homeless youth project. The initiative is aimed at facilitating access to education resources while also providing a safe and supportive environment for at-risk young people. The project was carried out in Thailand and providing access to education resources and support by constructing libraries in old train carriages. This project is cited by Theron and Malindi (2010) as an example of how the promotion of youth resilience is rooted in access to community assets. This example also demonstrates that improving access to opportunities may require grappling with inequities in access. Given that the target youth in this project did not have the same access to education services as non-homeless youth, the project required the provision of services in such a way that they were able to readily and meaningfully access them. Since youth in this example were unable to access traditional education and social supports, provisions were made to make such supports more readily available and accessible to them. Thus, while this example is not indicative of *equality*, given that additional resources and concession were made for the youth under study, it is an example of an effort to provide more *equitable* access to opportunities.

Equitable Access to Opportunities and Resilience

Equitable access has been related to resilience to the extent that disadvantage is associated with poor resilience outcomes. Equity in this sense is closely related to 'socioeconomic adversity', defined as "the constellation of factors to which children may be exposed when growing up, such as poor living conditions, overcrowding, or lack of material resources" (Schoon & Bynner, 2003, p. 22). As Schoon and Bynner (2003) argue, children raised in socioeconomic disadvantaged families (i.e., socioeconomic adversity), are more at risk of manifesting a variety of adjustment problems when compared to more socioeconomically

advantaged peers. Similarly, Masten and Reed (2005) argue that the biggest difference between young people who grow up in the middle class and those that are raised in relative poverty is "in the richness of opportunities for achievement" (P. 84). Thus, *in*equity negatively effects resilience when a person is disadvantaged as a result. This is in contrast to those who occupy privileged positions as a result of inequity. As Masten and Reed (2005) explain, such positions correlate with a more positive relationship between inequity and resilience. Yet this is not to say that inequity should be maintained for the benefit of some. Rather, studies have shown that improved equity positively correlates with resilience for all. For instance, in a review of systems level resilience, Bahadur, Ibrahim, and Tanner (2013) found that communities with higher degrees of equity were generally more resilient (here defined as the ability to recover the impacts of climate change) than those with lower degrees of equity. They highlight that equitable distribution of resources results in stable livelihoods, sustained economic growth, workforce productivity, amongst others as potentially positive contributions to community resilience.

Recently scholars have begun to question the predominately individualized subjectivity of resilience research and practice. In Harrison's (2012) critique, the issue is not resilience per se, but rather the 'use and abuse' of the concept. They argue that resilience in the way it is commonly used focuses predominately on psychological dispositions and personality traits as protective factors to the exclusion of analysis of the ways that these are influenced by wider structural considerations. Furthermore, they argue that this limitation is significant because it depoliticizes resilience while simultaneously shifts responsibility onto the individual. Similarly, Hart et al. (2016) critique the use of 'resilience' insofar as it becomes "a vehicle for the responsibilization of individuals in place of social structures and governing institutions" (p. 3). This is to say that the *direct* relationship between equity and resilience is obscured by individualizing norms of resilience rhetoric.

The logic of 'causes of 'causes' in which equity indirectly affects resilience only insofar it is a cause for other causes (ie. the personal capacity and behaviour of individuals) has also been questioned. For example, Hart et al. (2016) argue that "abstracted from context, resilience takes on the appearance of an independent variable separable from higher level political and economic factors, and structural accountability becomes deniable, or at least ignorable" (p. 5). In this sense structural considerations are significant to resilience not only for their indirect impact on personal dispositions and traits, but rather for their *direct* ramifications on resilience. This critique echoes Bottrell's (2009) assertion that "the significance of societal context has been minimized in resilience research as contexts such as poverty, racism or other discrimination are treated as factors of low socio-economic status, race, ethnicity and so on and often controlled out of variable interactive calculations" (p. 324). Thus, both authors argue in favour of considering inequality as a variable related to resilience in and of itself. Likewise, in relation to mental health and well-being, Friedli (2012) argues that a focus on resilience may "serve to disguise or distract from analysis of social structures that result in and maintain inequalities in power, wealth and privilege and the impact of these inequities on population

mental health" (p. 1). Thus, the individual and the social cannot be viewed as separate entities but rather are best understood in relation to resilience as mutually constitutive.

Following from this argument, authors have highlighted the need for more attention to the power relations inherent within resilience. Bottrell (2013) makes this argument in stating that individualistic conceptions of resilience obscure "historical and more recent structural inequities that are fundamental barriers to the wellbeing of the poor and blames and penalises them for what are intertextually deemed to be their failings, deficits and unhealthy dependencies". Similarly, Matin et al. (2018) critique resilience literature and research on the basis that it underestimates issues of equity and power and its failure to attend to 'distributive and power dimensions'. Thus, understanding the relationship between inequity and resilience requires closer scrutiny of the power relations that determine who has access to which resources, who acquires what skills, who makes decisions, and who is excluded (Mercy Corps, 2014), a task that is arguably not yet complete.

Some have also argued that even the more social-ecologically based approaches to resilience fall short of fully addressing the societal, systemic, and institutionalized contexts that create and sustain inequities. For instance, Bottrell (2009) argues that while Ungar (2006) is attentive to the voices and perspectives of the youth whose resilience is in question to reimagine normative conceptualizations of resilience, he still ultimately ends up individualizing their discourses. Bottrell (2009) argues that this tendency is significant insofar as it can result in discounting or delegitimizing young people's critique and social process based in their collective experiences of configurations of power. As such, a full understanding of the ways that inequities affect their lives and their relationship to resilience is obscured.

Some argue that the limited understanding of the relationship between equity and resilience stems from neoliberal imperatives of personal rather than social or structural change that are inherent in resilience research and practice. Aranda and Hart (2015) argue that "individual efforts targeted at systemic inequalities are radically at odds with the dominant logic that prioritizes individual choice and responsibility for change" (356). Bottrell (2013) similarly argues that resilience and neoliberalism are 'twinned texts' and as such cannot be read as separate from one another.

Bottrell (2009) argues in favour of challenging "the social logic of inequalities that underpin individual odds in resilience calculations" (324). Similar critiques of this nature are weary of the growing emphasis on resilience in policy and academia on the grounds that it may undervalue the 'hidden cost' of resilience (Harrison, 2012). This is to say that when focused primarily on individualized subjectivity, resilience may come to be associated with policy or program prescriptions that shift responsibility away from the public sphere. For instance, de Lint and Chazal warn that "although development psychology studies of resilience consider the individual relatively holistically and locate them contextually within broader environments and social structures, they nevertheless direct interventions towards the individual rather than seeking structural reforms." (p. 161). In speaking to youth resilience specifically, Didkowsky and

Ungar cite Mortimer and Larson (2002) to argue that "what remains to be emphasized is the ways in which differences in family, wealth, and other inequalities affecting access to resources, influence the paths young people taken" (p. 50). Thus, while inequality is broadly recognized as having a direct impact on resilience, the specific ways in which it does so (outside of impacting personal capacities and capabilities) are less clear.

Matin et al. (2018) have offered the notion of 'equitable resilience' to address the limitations of individualizing tendencies within resilience research and practice. They define equitable resilience as:

> that form of resilience which is increasingly likely when resilience practice takes into account issues of social vulnerability and differential access to power, knowledge, and resources; it requires starting from people's own perception of their position within their human-environmental system, and it accounts for their realities and for their need for a change of circumstance to avoid imbalances of power into the future. (p. 202)

In addition to issues of power this definition also highlights the importance of context to the relationship between equity and resilience. To this end Theron and Malindi (2010) argue that resilience is a contextually embedded phenomenon that is "continuously, and reciprocally shaped by socio-cultural resources" (p. 719) and therefore is best defined as an ecosystemic transaction. Similarly, Sanders and Munford (2007) state that implicit models of intervention for social and community work (including resilience) are likely to assume an individualistic, problem-oriented approach. However, they argue that 'problems' cannot be abstracted from the wider social circumstances that they arose from and are embedded in and therefore attempts to address behaviour without attending to wider structural circumstances are likely to be ineffective. To address the contextual nature of the relationship between equity and resilience this definition suggests "starting from people's own perception of their position within their human-environmental system" (Matin et al., 2018, p. 198). To this end Hart et al. (2016) argue that "new forms of contextualized, egalitarian knowledge production and exchange are more appropriate for understanding the multifaceted dynamic nature of adversity, resilience, inequalities, and transformational change" (p. 6). Thus, to better understand the relationship between equity and resilience means to include people's own perceptions and understandings of how they experience inequity (or equity) in their lives.

Interventions

With the above relationship to resilience in mind, Hart et al. (2016) suggest that approaches to building resilience should address both individual and structural elements while acknowledge that the range of individual strategies may be determined by broader political and economic factors. The authors give the example that "healthy eating may not be possible for someone on a low income due to the often higher price of "healthy" foods than "junk" foods, and is not necessarily about their individual conscious unwillingness to adopt a diet that the

government tells them will be better for their health" (p. 5). They therefore suggest that "it is time for resilience to go beyond understanding how individuals cope with adversity, to challenge the structures that create disadvantages in the first place, and contribute to the development of a new wave of research that unites resilience research and practice development with social justice and activism" (p. 5).

It should be noted that the types of programming and research that Hart et al. (2016) advocate for are in contrast to systems level resilience building (ie. efforts to promote and build resilient cities, resilient communities, urban resilience, etc.). This is because although Hart et al. (2016) recognize the importance of challenges the structures that create disadvantage, they are still primarily concerned with how an *individual* is able to overcome adversity. This is different than systems-level resilience in which the object of focus is how a system as a whole is able to cope with and respond to external adversities.

Below are two examples of efforts to integrate more social justice-minded goals with resilience research and practice. While they are not specific interventions per se, given that improving equitable access to resources includes efforts to challenge the structures that create and sustain inequality, these examples offer a starting point for interventions.

Boingboing

The stated aim of Boingboing is "to model and promote resilience research and practice that challenges social inequalities" and is advertised as being strongly rooted in a social justice agenda. Boingboing runs regular resilience forums, develops resilience frameworks, books, and other material, and offers training and talks on resilient approaches to life's challenges.

The main framework offered by Boingboing is the Resilient Framework which is based on the set of ideas and practices developed by Boingboing's lead researchers. The framework is said to combine a resilience research evidence base with idea gleaned from practical experience with disadvantaged children and families. Other versions of this framework include an interactive resilience framework for schools, the Resilience Framework for Primary School children, the Resilience Framework for Adults, the Family Resilience Framework. All version can be found at https://www.boingboing.org.uk/resilience/resilient-therapy-resilience-framework/

Location

While Boingboing provides online resources to be used in a variety of contexts, all research is conducted closely with the University of Brighton's Centre of Resilience for Social Justice. Some places in which projects using Boingboing's tools and resources have been implemented include various regions across the United Kingdom and South Africa.

Population

Children, young people, families, and adults exposed to social disadvantage and inequalities. The majority of Boingboing's work is stated to be with children, young, people, and

families but note an increasing demand for more information regarding adult practitioner resilience.

Project goals

While Boingboing's aim is "to model and promote resilience research and practice that challenges social inequalities", the main objectives are as follows:

- To facilitate and promote a socially just approach to advancing resilience research and practice
- To provide opportunities for all Boingboingers to develop their skills and reach their potential
- To model and promote the benefits and practice of meaningful co-production

Project design

The Boingboing approach is grounded in practices of co-production and communities of practice. Co-production is described as a highly participative version of 'engagement' that "utilises the experience, knowledge and skills of a range of stakeholders to design, produce and deliver better services and resources". It is also described as a value-based approach that "views the people who use a service as assets with important knowledge and skills that can be harnessed to promote positive change". Some of the values and principles of co-production are:

- It is inclusive, with steps taken to ensure that everyone can be meaningfully involved.
- It is asset or strengths-based, recognising, respecting and building on the capabilities and contributions of everyone involved.
- It is also based on mutuality and co-operation to achieve a shared goal or interest and reciprocity, where everyone who has contributed gets something back.
- It changes how those that the service is provided for are seen by those who provide the service – less as passive recipients and more as capable, active agents.
- It requires those with hierarchical or executive power to listen actively to those with less hierarchical power.

Communities of practice are groups of people that cut across traditional organizational barriers and hierarchies to being all perspectives to bear on a particular topic. The purpose of communities of practice is to generate new ways of thinking about and building resilience. They aim to avoid privileging one type of knowledge over another (ie. professional knowledge over lived experience).

Evaluation

Boingboing's Learning Programme includes delivery of information and training events and its different features are said to be evaluated to improve and develop the work further. While no evaluation reports are available, Boingboing states that aspects they evaluate include: the impact and effectiveness of the learning resources used; routine collection of participant

evaluation questionnaires after events; attendee pre and post knowledge assessments; participant experiences of including parent trainers in session delivery.

Boingboing also states that is evaluating its Communities of Practice by investigating how Communities of Practice create vehicles for knowledge transfer that embed the learning and strengthen the capacity of the university, statutory and community sectors to work resiliently.

Lastly, Boingboing is engaged in an evaluation of the generalizable versus context specific aspects of the Resilience Framework across Western (UK) and non-Western (Malaysia and Turkey) cultures. The objective is to be able to adapt the Resilience Framework for non-Western life orientations.

Toronto Youth Equity Strategy (TYES)

In an effort to address youth involvement in violence and crime, the city of Toronto implemented the Toronto Youth Equity Strategy (TYES). It is a multi-year framework that was adopted by the City Council in 2014.This strategy is designed to "support positive youth development and equitable access to meaningful opportunities". It is based on the idea that vulnerable youth often do not have equitable access to the supports and opportunities they need to change their lives for the better. The TYES was created by panel of community volunteers form neighbourhoods across the city and an external panel comprised of members of youth serving and youth advocacy organizations in consultation with community leaders and creative engagement with vulnerable youth.

The full report can be found at: https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/9062-Attachment-1-TYES-Creative-Report.pdf

Location

Toronto, ON, Canada

Population

Young people (aged 13-19) who are most vulnerable to involvement in serious violence and crime.

Project goals

The purpose of the TYES is ultimately to provide better servicing to vulnerable youth in order to prevent and reduce violence and crime. The TYES sets out principles to guide future decisions and endorses six key planning principles to guide action: equitable access and outcomes, complexity of vulnerability, positive youth development, age-friendly cities, collaborative action, and accountability. The intent of the Strategy is to better coordinate youth service delivery and identify specific service enhancements to achieve better equity.

Project design

The Strategy identifies 28 key issues and for each issue several broad recommendations were made for the City to follow. Each action developed under the strategy is guided by the principle that not all of the city's youth live in the same context of opportunity and support and therefore is designed to support equitable access for youth.

Evaluation

An external evaluation of the Strategy is not available. However, in 2018 the City of Toronto reported the following progress:

84 of the 110 possible actions have either been implemented or are being implemented. Four recommendations are no longer relevant due to a program closing, or because an initial consideration of the recommendation determined it to be not helpful. Twenty-two recommendations have not been implemented, because they were not prioritized within the existing resources or they did not receive additional resources.

Implementation of the TYES has also reportedly contributed to an increase in youth programming such as the expansion of several youth spaces and the initiation of the first Extra Judicial Measures initiative in Ontario. Despite these achievements, the City has also been criticized for falling behind on the recommendations in the Strategy due to a lack of funding and political will to implement the Strategy's suggestions (Pagliaro, 2018).

Assessment

Hart et al. (2016) draw attention to the lack of measures available to capture inequity and resilience in stating that resilience-focused measurements "should extend beyond the individual aspects of the person's ecology such as the social, institutions, and cultural and community contexts in which they live". Given this deficit the authors suggest that future measurements should attempt to capture emancipatory elements such as advocacy and activism, both in relation the self and others. Some examples they include are whether participants take part in political activities, for example, voting, lobbying around inequalities, community advocacy; or whether the resilience program they attended had wider effects for their community, for example, raising awareness of mental health.

While there is not yet a readily available measurement to capture this suggestion by Hart et al. (2016), one potential way to measure these aspects would be to rely on the subjective experiences of the individuals in question. For instance, using a basic Likert scale, individuals could be prompted to rate statements on how accessible they feel different opportunities are to them. A rating scale could be used to subsequently measure how they perceive their access to opportunities in relation to others (peers, community members, etc. For the suggestions by Hart et al. (2019) such scales could look like the following:

To what extent do the statements below describe you?					
	Not at All	A Little	Somewhat	Quite a Bit	A Lot/ Very
1. I have access to opportunities to participate in political activities	1	2	3	4	5
2. I will not face any barriers in being able to vote in the next election*	1	2	3	4	5
3. I can access opportunities to lobby around inequalities that are meaningful to me	1	2	3	4	5

*Based on the assumption that the individual is of legal voting age

To what extent do you feel that the following statements are true?					
	Not True at All		Somewhat True		Very True
1. My peers have more opportunities to participate in political activities than me	1	2	3	4	5
2. My peers have better opportunities to participate in political activities than me	1	2	3	4	5
3. My peers will face the same type of barriers that I do when voting	1	2	3	4	5
4. My peers will face more barriers than me when voting	1	2	3	4	5
5. My peers have the same access to opportunities to lobby around inequalities that I do	1	2	3	4	5

If administered together such scales would be able to capture not only the degree to which an individual feels they are able to access different opportunities, but also the extent to which they feel they have more or less access than their peers. The referent in the second scale could also be adapted to capture different relations. For example, instead of peers the questions could be in relation to colleagues, friends, community members, family members, or others. Questions could also include a variety of different referents in order to capture how an individual feels their access to opportunities compares to a range of different groups. Similarly, the types of opportunities included in the scale could stretch beyond the suggestions by Hart et al. (2016) to include questions regarding access to education opportunities, health services, work and employment prospects, skills development opportunities, etc.

Focusing measurements on a person's subjective experiences of equitable access to opportunities helps to capture the contextual nature of the relationship between equity and resilience. It also follows Jones' (2019) argument that subjective approaches to resilience measurements are useful and viable additions to a predominately objective tradition of measurement. However, as Jones (2019) argues, there is still value in objective measurements of resilience, and ideally measurements would capture both subjective and objective components.

The Human Opportunity Index (HOI) is a measurement used to assess how individual circumstances can affect a person's access to basic opportunities (Sanoussi, 2017). It is a measure of the extent to which a society provides universal access to essential goods and services, and how equitable access is distributed across individuals (The World Bank, 2014). The HOI was developed by the World Bank and was first presented in 2009 (de Barros, Ferreira, Molinas Vega, Chanduvi, 2009). The HOI provides data for Latin America and the Caribbean and where substantial data sets are available it can also be used in other geographic contexts as well (see IS Global for example).

Given the relationship between equity and socioeconomic adversity, measurements of socio-economic status (SES) and subjective social status (SSS) may also be relevant. While SES includes resource-based measures (educational attainment, total family income, wealth, etc), absolute poverty measures, and relative poverty measures, SSS measures a person's perception of their social standing using categories such as 'working class' or 'middle class' or perceptions of their social position relative to others based on income, education, etc (American Psychological Association, 2014). The resource-based portion of SES can be captured by measures that ask individuals to indicate the highest grade or year of school completed, combined total income of their household, accumulated assets, and other related components. Absolute poverty can be measured using existing indices in the context being assessed (ie. the Market Based Measure in Canada, the Federal Poverty Thresholds or Federal Poverty Levels in the U.S.). Relative poverty can be measured by asking individuals to indicate their unmet needs, such as whether they have insufficient food or whether they have endured psychological distress due to financial difficulties (American Psychological Association, 2014).

In addition, although not yet adopted into a useable measure, the introduction of *psychopolitical validity* has been proposed as a new measure for the evaluation of a social justice agenda in resilience work (Prilleltensky, 2008; Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2005). This combination refers to the psychological and political influences that interact to promote wellness, perpetuate oppression, or generate resistance and liberation and thus help explain suffering and well-being. The proponents of this measure propose two types of psychopolitical validity: epistemic and transformational. While psychological factors refer to the subjective life of a person and political factors refer to the collective experience of an individual or group, both emphasize the role of power (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2005). They state that epistemic psychopolitical validity can be applied to research whereas transformational psychopolitical validity is more appropriately applied to social interventions.

The authors offer the following questions that can be used to attend to transformative validity in social interventions:

- Do interventions promote psychopolitical literacy?
- Do interventions educate participants on the timing, components, targets, and dynamics of best strategic actions to overcome oppression?

- Do interventions empower participants to take action to address political inequities and social injustice within their relationships, settings, communities, and states and at the international level?
- Do interventions promote solidarity and strategic alliances and coalitions with groups facing similar issues?
- Do interventions account for the subjectivity and psychological limitations of the agents of change?

In following these questions, the authors state that interventions should seek "not only to ameliorate social conditions but also to alter the configurations of power that deprive citizens of their rights" and thus to "create the conditions for resilience to be nurtured and to flourish" (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2005, p. 101).

References

Abramson, D. M., Gratton, L. M., Mayer, B., Colten, C. E., Arosemena, F. A., Rung, A., Lichtveld. M. (2015). The Resilience Activation Framework: A conceptual model of how access to social resources promotes adaptation and rapid recovery in post-disaster settings. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 41*(1), 42-57.

American Psychological Association. (2014, May). *Measuring socioeconomic status and subjective social status*. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/class/measuring-status

Aranda, K., & Hart, A. (2015). Resilient moves: Tinkering with practice theory to generate new ways of thinking about using resilience. *Health, 19*(4), 355-371.

Bahadur, A. V., Ibrahim, M., & Tanner, T. (2013). Characterizing resilience: Unpacking the concept for tackling climate change and development. *Climate and Development, 5(*1), 55-65.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.

Boingboing. (2013, July 22). Evaluation of aspects of our resilience Communities of Practice. *Boingboing.* Retrieved from https://www.boingboing.org.uk/evaluation-resilience-communities-practice/

Boingboing. (2013, July 22). Evaluation of aspects of our Resilience Learning Programme. *Boingboing.* Retrieved from https://www.boingboing.org.uk/evaluation-resilience-learning-programme/

Boingboing. (2017, January 20). Co-production in promoting resilience – What does this mean for schools? *Boingboing.* Retrieved from https://www.boingboing.org.uk/co-production-promoting-resilience-schools/

Bottrell, D. (2009). Understanding 'marginal' perspectives: Towards a social theory of resilience. *Qualitative Social Work, 8*(3), 321-339.

Bottrell, D. (2013). Responsibilised resilience? Reworking neoliberal social policy texts. *M/C Journal, 16*(5).

Calderon-Contreras, R., & White, C. S. (2020). Access as the means for understanding social-ecological resilience: Bridging analytical frameworks. *Society & Natural Resources, 33*(2), 205-223.

Cheunwattana, A., & Meksawat, P. (2002). Small is beautiful: The Library Train for homeless youth. *Library Management, 23*(1/2), 88-92.

City of Toronto. (2018, December 4). *Backgrounder: Toronto Youth Equity Strategy (TYES)*. Retrieved from https://www.toronto.ca/home/media-room/backgrounders-other-resources/backgrounder-toronto-youth-equity-strategy-tyes/

de Barros, R. P., Ferreira, F. H. G., Molinas Vega, J. R., & Chanduvi, J. S. (2009). *Measuring inequality of opportunities in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, DC: Palgrave Macmillan; The World Bank.

de Lint, W., & Chazal, N. (2013). Resilience and criminal justice: Unsafe at low altitude. *Critical Criminology, 21*(2), 1557-176.

Didkowsky, N., & Ungar, M. (2016). A social ecological approach to understanding resilience among rural youth. In U. Kumar (Ed.), *The Routledge international handbook of psychosocial resilience* (pp. 46-58). New York, NY: Routledge.

Friedli, L. (2012). CS06-03 – Mental health, resilience and inequalities: A social determinants perspective. *European Psychiatry, 27*(1), 1-1.

Harrison, E. (2012). Bouncing back? Recession, resilience and everyday lives. *Critical Social Policy, 33*(1), 97-113.

Hart, A., Gagnon, E., Eryigit-Madzwamuse, S., Cameron, J., Aranda, K., Rathbone, A., & Heaver, B. (2016). Uniting resilience research and practice with an inequalities approach. *SAGE Open, 6*(4), 1-13.

IS Global. *A report from sub-Saharan Africa: Chapter 2: Methodology*. Retrieved from https://www.isglobal.org/documents/10179/5808952/Chapter_2.pdf/4558885d-290c-489d-a946-553b34622c34

Jones, L. (2019). Resilience isn't the same for all: Comparing subjective and objective approaches to resilience measurement. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews, 10*(1), 1-19.

Langridge, R., Christian-Smith, J., & Lohse, K. A. (2006). Access and resilience: Analyzing the construction of social resilience to the threat of water scarcity. *Ecology and Society, 11*(2), 18. [online] URL: https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/art18/

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. J. (2005). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Matin, N., Forrester, J., & Ensor, J. (2018). What is equitable resilience? *World Development, 109*, 197-205.

Mercy Corps. (2014). *Rethinking resilience: Prioritizing gender integration to enhance household and community resilience to food insecurity in the Sahel*. Retrieved from https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/Mercy%20Corps%20Gender%20and%20Resilience%20September%202014.pdf

O'Connor, C. (2002). Black women beating the odds from one generation to the next: How the changing dynamics of constraint and opportunity affect the process of educational resilience. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(4), 855-903.

Ontario Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health. (2019, October*). Quality standard for youth engagement*. Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from https://www.cymh.ca/ye_standard

Pagliaro, J. (2018, October 12). Toronto is falling behind on its own plans to help at-risk youth. *The Toronto Star.* Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com/news/city_hall/2018/10/12/amid-spike-in-shootings-toronto-is-falling-behind-on-its-own-plans-to-curb-youth-violence.html

Prilleltensky, I. (2008). The role of power in wellness, oppression, and liberation: The promise of psychopolitical validity. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(2), 116-136.

Prilleltensky, I., & Prilleltensky, O. (2005). Beyond resilience: Blending wellness and liberation in the helping professions. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *Handbook for working with children and youth: Pathways to resilience across cultures and contexts* (pp. 89-103). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sanders, J., Munford, R. (2007). Speaking from the margins – Implications for education and practice of young women's experiences of marginalization. *Social Work Education, 26*(2), 185-199.

Sanoussi, Y. (2017). Measurement and analysis of inequality of opportunity in access of maternal and child health care in Togo. *BMC Health Services Research, 17*(Suppl 2), 82-87.

Schoon, I., & Bynner, J. (2003). Risk and resilience in the life course: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Journal of Youth Studies, 6*(1), 21-31.

Transforming Agency Access and Power. (2018, January 30). Opportunity vs. access: What does it mean for inclusion? *World Learning.* Retrieved from https://www.worldlearning.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/49-TAAP-Tuesday-Newsletter-January-30-2018.pdf

The World Bank. (2014). *LAC Equity Lab: Human Opportunity Index*. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/lac-equity-lab1/equality-of-opportunities/hoi

Theron, L. C., & Malindi, M. J. (2010). Resilience street youth: A qualitative South African study. *Journal of Youth Studies, 13*(6), 717-736.

Ungar, M. (2004). From experiences of power to mental health. In *Nurturing hidden resilience in troubled youth* (pp. 140-170). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Ungar, M. (2011). Community resilience for youth and families: Facilitative physical and social capital in contexts of adversity. *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*(9), 1742-1748.

R2

For more information about R2 or to discover how you can bring the program to your organization, business or educational setting, please contact us.

Paul McGuinness

Operations Manager

✉ rrc@dal.ca
📞 (902) 494-8482

Michael Ungar, PhD

Director

✉ michael.ungar@dal.ca
📞 (902) 229-0434

RRC - Evaluation
and Training Institute