

Copyright © 2023 by Cherkas Global University



Published in the USA  
 International Journal of Media and Information Literacy  
 Issued since 2016  
 E-ISSN 2500-106X  
 2023. 8(2): 324-338

DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2023.2.324  
<https://ijmil.cherkasgu.press>



## The Informational Components of Social Resilience Within Realization of the UN Sustainable Development Goals

Andrii E. Lebid <sup>a, b, \*</sup>, Vitalii V. Stepanov <sup>a</sup>, Mykola S. Nazarov <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

<sup>b</sup> Cherkas Global University, Washington, DC, USA

### Abstract

Implementation of the UN Sustainable Development Goals is an important tool to modernize Ukraine. The transforming effect may be enhanced via combination of tasks of the UN Sustainable Development Goals with principles and approaches to ensuring the Ukrainian national resilience. Here, the concept of social resilience requires researching specifically with focus on the triad “person – community – state”. In this triangle, we can single out key threats to social resilience, which correlates with Ukraine’s realizing the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Social resilience determines the implementation progress for 3 of 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals: Strong Health (N<sup>o</sup>3); Stable Development of Cities and Communities (N<sup>o</sup>11); Peace and Justice (N<sup>o</sup>16). Thus, to realize these goals, the state policy must be based on firmer social resilience with necessary indexes.

**Keywords:** social resilience, national resilience, Sustainable Development Goals, basic service, citizen participation, collaborative planning, adult literacy, discriminatory, teacher training, society, politics.

### 1. Introduction

Having approved the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Goals in 2015, the world committed again its aspiration to this important issue. As UN members, 193 signers assumed responsibility for ensuring sustainable, comprehensive and long-term growth, social integration and environment protection. The aim was intended to achieve on the partnership and peace basis.

The Agenda are an all-purpose act of changing character. It supports observance of human rights. That is an ambitious plan of UN actions to overcome poverty, inequality and environment problems. The document appeals to general prosperity of humanity and Earth. It urges the world to make efforts in building stable and predictable societies.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adoption was the consequence of multilateral negotiations from the UN Environment Protection Conference (1972) till the UN Sustainable Development Summit (2015). For over 40 years, the international community had been trying to solve sharp ecological, social and economic challenges. That resulted in conclusion it is national governments who should be primarily responsible for the Agenda implementation.

The Agenda basis is several principles: universality, inclusiveness, equality, etc. Regardless of their income, all countries must contribute to reach common sustainable development. The document concerns all countries.

The Agenda are considered as useful for everybody. It aims at providing aid for all people

\* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [a.lebid@socio.sumdu.edu.ua](mailto:a.lebid@socio.sumdu.edu.ua) (A. Lebid)

(irrespective of residence; as to certain needs and vulnerability factors). To track the implementation progress, local and disaggregated data are extremely required.

The Agenda treat all 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as interconnected and indivisible. Everybody should follow them impartially.

People of any community, race, sex, ethnos, identity, etc. are invited to the Sustainable Development participation. To broaden the Goals implementation worldwide, the multilateral partnership is improved for mobilization and exchange of knowledge, experience, technologies and financial resources.

There are five main components of the Agenda:

- people;
- planet;
- prosperity;
- peace;
- partnership ([2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 2015](#)).

These components are regarded within three dimensions: social integration; economic growth; environment protection. With the Agenda adoption, the Sustainable Development idea was reconsidered. Subsequently, we have two more components: partnership and peace. The social resilience may be achieved only via their full interaction.

Correspondingly, such an interaction state creates a basis for strategic decisions on the global, national and local levels. Thus, social-political, economic, cultural, ecological and other consequences should be included for resilience achievement. Besides, the Sustainable Development policy must base any Agenda activity on partnership with proper realization tools.

## 2. Materials and methods

In 2017, Ukraine finished adapting the 2030 Agenda Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) approved on 25 September 2015 by 193 UN member countries during the Sustainable Development Summit in New York. That resulted in prepared tasks and indexes to monitor and predict for 2020, 2025 and 2030.

These goals and tasks should integrate efforts in economic growth, social justice and reasonable natural resource management. The guidelines were defined for further strategic planning in sectoral policies. To trace the SDGs progress, a set of key indexes was established with estimated values in 2020, 2025 and 2030.

The statistical and sectoral analysis, open sources and data systems, etc. provided an informational base to monitor SDGs and process data of statistics and administration. The current indexes were analyzed for the further SDGs supervision according to national tasks.

The practical task settlement in reaching the SDGs requires a corresponding analytical provision. That concerns different data sources and complex approaches to research risks and factors of social, economic and ecological stability. Consequently, prevention measures can be defined.

The systemic approach to the SDGs progress includes various data types. They determine the progress scope itself, the direct and indirect cause-effect relations, the most influential factors of state policy making.

In selecting the national SDGs indexes, we attempted to find a proper balance between extra national data and index accountability. To minimize the index number, we preferred the multitask indexes. The priority was the indexes whose statistical data are collected and developed officially according to approved standards. The SDGs indexes have objective and subjective indicators.

## 3. Discussion

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Goals offer a complex approach to understand and solve urgent issues and threats properly.

SDGs do not reflect the full or brief content of the 2030 Agenda. They rather define main influence spheres to reach Sustainable Development. 17 Goals should be regarded as inherent elements of systemic configuration. SDGs are “growth points” that may contribute to the world welfare significantly.

Formed via political consultations and being imperfect, the SDGs show the sharpest global challenges. With respect to achieving certain results, the Goals assist in interpreting the main 2030 Agenda values.

The 2030 Agenda makes it possible to think in a creative and innovative way for solving

current development issues. A special attention in the Agenda realization is paid to the SDGs informing rise. However, these efforts are insufficient to provide long-term changes. It is a deep probe into the 2023 Agenda that is the key condition to implement SDGs. Having approved the Agenda, the UN members assumed the responsibility to carry out an ambitious plan of actions. The latter requires the public, private and scientific coordination. Every person must contribute to reach the common life resilience.

L. Camacho (Camacho, 2015: 18-23) explains difficulties in interpreting the notion “sustainable development”. From his perspective, that is a result of differentiating all 17 SDGs by at least two categories. Some of the Goals end in themselves; some of them are instrumental in achieving the others. The former concerns poverty elimination, healthy life-style, etc. Moreover, it is a demographic situation that is a relevant aspect of realizing the SDGs. That influences both development and resilience.

T. Pogge and M. Sengupta (Pogge, Sengupta, 2015) note that the SDGs positive character does not correspond to the self-declared purpose – the international effort coordination to overcome any type of poverty. The authors propose 10 ways of raising the Agenda and SDGs performance on the international level (including the responsibility for their observance). It is argued that the global poverty volume has been constantly reduced. However, one cannot say exactly if that is the moral progress or not. On the other hand, governments should carry out complex institutional reforms to achieve the SDGs.

Another paper by T. Pogge and M. Sengupta (Pogge, Sengupta, 2016) correlates the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The authors single out several contexts of them. Firstly, we should focus on historical comparison of the SDGs-MDGs correspondence. Here, the moral significance matters: the present welfare prevails over the past beggary. Secondly, neither the SDGs nor the MDGs define the progress means clearly. Also, they do not differentiate “the responsibility succeeding zones”. Poverty may be eliminated through the strict duty distribution among governments and local authorities. Thirdly, although the SDGs appeal to inequality reduction, this aim is going to be reached only after 2029. Such a delay can cause a huge poor mortality with the rich benefiting from national and supranational landscapes.

M. Wynn and P. Jones (Wynn, Jones, 2021) find that the SDGs were created and improved for a stabler future transition till 2030. The UN have urged all governments to reach these ambitious Goals with focus on the private sector in this aspect. The authors assess different approaches of 8 main industries to the SDGs implementation. Other broader issues of the SDGs success are discussed as well.

M. Bexell and K. Jönsson (Bexell, Jönsson, 2017) devote their article to key responsibility problems of the SDGs. The proposed conceptual scheme aims at more systemic research of the SDGs. Here, three responsibility aspects are defined: reason, duty, accountability. That structures the analysis of the main UN Summit SDGs acts: “Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” and “The Addis Ababa Action Agenda”. Within these three aspects, responsibility is oriented to state and national respect. The aspects are interconnected and may be studied further.

A. Chapman (Chapman, 2017) evaluates healthcare tasks and their conformity with the SDGs. The author notes that the SDGs creators did not reflect in the UN acts the law protection approach to the healthcare SDGs realization. The article deals with disadvantages of human right protection and their consequences for achieving SDGs. The paper focuses on some special medical tasks: children’s healthcare, reproductive performance, elimination of health obstacles, general access to healthcare services and remedies.

S. Fukuda-Parr (Fukuda-Parr, 2016) differentiates between the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in detail. The main distinctive feature consists in three realization aspects: purpose, conception, policy. From the researcher’s perspective, it is the actualization of gender issues that is extremely important for the MDGs-to-SDGs transition. To a certain extent, the SDGs can solve the MDGs drawbacks via a broader and more transformative approach. Thus, the SDGs more properly represent the challenges, opportunities and risks of the 21st century with the need for structural changes in the world economics. In contrast to the MDGs, the SDGs usually focus on the qualitative rather than quantitative development indexes. Their implementation depends on permanent advocacy to increase the authority accountability.

K. Lewin (Lewin, 2019) investigates the SDGs within the education sustainable development. The world community may play a significant role in promoting both the education sustainable

development and education improvement for the common sustainable development itself. The education sustainable development provides conditions when educational systems can ensure enlightenment rights and create infrastructure, learning materials, staff and other resources. Here, the study motivation is fundamental.

Another important question is how the Sustainable Development Goals are introduced into separate local communities. Horne R. et al. (Horne et al., 2020) examined the intersectoral partnerships to promote the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda. Also, they analyzed the United Nations Global Compact – Cities Program. The urban agglomeration vitality and its role for the SDGs were examined. The conducted research of several urban matrixes represents the efficiency of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda. As common platforms for large interested groups, they are a necessary condition to promote local resilience projects.

Analyzing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with measures to keep a balance between economic progress and environment protection, Shulla K., Filho W. et al. (Shulla et al., 2019) find it reasonable to eliminate contradictions between developed and developing countries. In spite of the SDGs topicality, it remains unclear how they can assist in solving current and future problems of sustainable development. The authors probe into SDGs potentials (each of 17), namely how they are used to overcome existing challenges of sustainable development.

H. Kopnina (Kopnina, 2016) studies the ecological resilience. The ecological disorder is caused by structural and capitalistic features. According to the researcher, the irresilience panacea is the social-economic development. New emphasis of social-economic aims is conditioned by the SDGs system. The SDGs achievement is hardly going to raise the social equality and economic prosperity. On the contrary, there will be unstable manufacturing and consumption, constant economic and demographic growth as the initial causes of ecological problems. The destructive irresilience trends may be overcome via proper ethical approaches to environment. That can effectively eradicate main disadvantages of sustainable development. The latter is usually anthropocentric, which complicates the proper detection of irresilience source.

Simultaneously, H. Kopnina (Kopnina, 2020) underlines the relevance of education aspects in carrying out the SDGs. Subsequently, the programs “Education for Sustainable Development” and “Education for the Sustainable Development Goals” were adopted. While most educational institutions are ready for accepting the SDGs, there is a question if education for sustainable development is appropriate as enlightenment for future. The author offers to reconsider the sustainable development paradoxes via some alternative education mechanisms based on global ethics, ecopedagogics, ecocentric study, education for sustainable development, human rights.

I. Saiz and K. Donald (Saiz, Donald, 2017) assess strong and weak features of the SDGs in terms of human right observance. Political vulnerability of this aim and its realization prospects are revealed. The authors explain how norms, standards and tools in the human right sphere may assist in accomplishing such a task. Also, they define how mechanisms of human right monitoring can track the progress and authority accountability.

T. Eskelinen (Eskelinen, 2021) estimates the SDGs political sense in UN or national acts. In this respect, utopia and management are represented as ideal and analytical tools for the quality content analysis of the SDGs. Such an approach is especially efficient in assessing the international development policy since it is characterized by excessive utopianism and management expediency. The approach shows the humanity idea as the single subject on the way to common prosperity. On the other hand, the SDGs are restricted by the appeal to modern management, international order and economic development.

D. Gasper (Gasper, 2019) stresses the two-aspect mechanism of the SDGs formation – the procedural and organizational-managerial ones. The author studies their influence on establishing the SDGs implementation system. Here, government, business and civil institutes play an important role. The main actors deal with the triad “aims – tasks – indexes”. This system relates to different prospects of global management via the SDGs.

A. Morrison-Saunders et al. (Morrison-Saunders et al., 2020) examine the potential of influence assessment (IA) as the main tool in carrying out the SDGs. The latter are intended for achieving broader results than their IA for the given moment. However, there is a great convergence between the IA and the SDGs, which is researched through the main estimating resilience dimensions: comprehensiveness, strategy and integrity. The “updated IA” can be applied as a key means to reach the SDGs. The IA should become more comprehensive and integrated to make the whole SDGs set and their connections researched deeper.



As we see, the sustainable development issue concerns all sectors of public life: economics, poverty elimination, environment protection, human right observance, etc. Besides, there are other directions of the SDGs implementation: gender equality (Hollida et al., 2019; Gammage et al., 2019; Hennebry et al., 2019; Koehler, 2016; Azcona, Bhatt, 2020); education (Wade, 2002; Ross, 2015; Shulla et al., 2020; Holdsworth, Thomas, 2021; Carrapatoso, 2021; Laksov, 2021); social processes (Endo, Ikeda, 2022; Boess et al., 2021; Matović, Obradović, 2022; Dusík, Bond, 2022; Al-Qudah et al., 2022) etc.

A peculiar attention should be paid to publications about security within sustainable development. There are three levels of security analysis: the global, national and local ones (Harwell, 2012; Orji, 2012; Dimitrova, Petrova, 2011; Buttanri, 2017; Egwalusor, 2020).

Another relevant direction is the social resilience investigation within the UN Sustainable Development Goals (Metaxas, Psarropoulou, 2021; Constantinescu, Frone, 2018; Constantinescu, 2014; Pisano, 2012; Barria et al., 2019; Borie et al., 2019; Cretney, 2014; Elmqvist et al., 2019; Yamagata, Sharifi, 2018; Lebid, Nazarov, Shevchenko, 2021; Lebid, Medvid, Nazarov, 2022).

Today, it is also important to correlate the UN SDGs with principles of national resilience. The concept of resilience was initially applied in ecology, critical infrastructure and natural sciences. Holling C. (Holling, 1973) regarded resilience as the system ability to absorb changes and keep functioning properly. The notion of social resilience was defined by N. Adger (Adger, 2000): the community ability to resist outer impacts of social infrastructure. The social resilience analysis aims at understanding mechanisms of system adaptation to current, sudden or unknown challenges. Many researchers defined social resilience as the ability to absorb changes, to resist instability (Kates, Clark, 1996; Streets, Glantz, 2000).

According to Adger N. et al. (Adger, 2005), resilience is measured as the violation value that the system can withstand with a stable functionality. From the social-ecological perspective, resilience is treated as the system ability to absorb violations and restructure in case of changes for keeping the same components, functions, identity and feedbacks (Folke, 2006). In terms of sustainable development studies, the resilience definition was also supplemented with the system ability to train and adapt (Berkes et al., 2003).

Therefore, resilience is regarded as “a border object” between natural and social sciences (Star, 2010). One of fundamental resilience ideas consisted in the fact that environment problems cannot be separated from the social context (O’Brien et al., 2009). That was a critical response to the conservative resilience definition (Pelling, Manuel-Navarrete, 2011).

Lately, resilience supporters have updated their conception via the added notion of transformation or transformability. The system is believed to have several potential stable states or gravity basins. Together, they form “the stability landscape” (Gallopín, 2006).

All definitions of social resilience concern social subjects (persons, organizations, communities) and their abilities to resist, absorb, overcome and adapt to different ecological and social threats. As many researchers note, the initial point for empirical studies of social resilience is the questions “Resilience to what?” and “What is the threat or risk that we examine?” (O’Brist et al., 2010).

Examples of social resilience reflect a wide range of threats (Cinner et al., 2009). Most other studies focus on certain stress factors arranged into three categories.

The first research category deals with natural hazards and cataclysms (Rockstrom, 2004; Pearce, 2010; Braun, Abheuer, 2011; Cashman, 2011; Haase, 2011; Lopez-Marrero, Tschakert, 2011; Frazier et al., 2010; Howe, 2011; Adger, 2005; Klocker, 2011; Biggs et al., 2012; Harte et al., 2009; McGee, 2011).

The second research category is dedicated to long-term management of natural resources and environmental changeability. Applied research concerns issues of mangrove forest transformation (Adger, 2000; Marshall et al., 2009), desertification (Bradley, Grainger, 2004), water deterioration (Gooch et al., 2012), etc.

The third research category concerns different social shifts and development problems. Here, topics are policies and institutional changes of social resilience (Thomas, Twyman, 2005; Marshall, 2007; Nazarov, Shevchenko, 2021), migration (Adger et al., 2002; Porter et al., 2008), local economic transformations (Bouzarovski et al., 2011; Evans, 2008), tourism (Adams, 2010), infrastructure development (Perz et al., 2010), crisis and indefiniteness (Schwarz et al., 2011), health risks (Leipert, Reuter, 2005; Hoy et al., 2008).

#### 4. Results

In 2015, 193 UN members approved the plan of achieving common future welfare. For the next 15 years, these efforts aim at eliminating beggary, inequality, injustice and environment problems. The fundamental act “The 2030 Agenda” and 17 Sustainable Development Goals (with respective 169 tasks) outline the world that humanity aspires to. New SDGs are all-inclusive: business, civil society and other stakeholders unite. The SDGs implementation requires the highest efforts from everybody.

Ukraine participates as well. To provide public sustainable development, common welfare and constitutional observance, many documents were adopted for enhancing national resilience in digital, security, financial, social and other branches. Therefore, the 2030 Ukrainian Sustainable Development Goals are guidelines in drafting new forecasts, programs, acts to keep the economic, social and ecological balance within the Ukrainian sustainable development (Ukaz..., 2019).

In Ukraine, the national 2030 SDGs are defined in four directions: fair social development; permanent economic growth and employment; efficient management; ecological balance and resilience improvement (SDG's: Ukraine, 2017).

Sustainable development (the third millennium ideal) is regarded as a harmonious conception of current needs and resources for future generations. It should replace all other development conceptions, in particular the extensive one. However, sustainable development does not mean a constant improvement. Here, it is better to say about a comprehensive balanced development.

The SDGs are established by the UN Sustainable Development Committee for each country separately. It is the Committee who builds the global strategy of sustainable development and analyzes resources of different states to define volume of tasks for accomplishment. The Committee cooperates with each state separately in their sustainable development support.

The sustainable development conception is based on five principles (valid for any country):

- 1) The humanity can reach sustainable development if there is a balance between needs of current and future generations;
- 2) Restrictions on use of natural resources are relative. They depend on planet self-recovery and mining safety;
- 3) Sustainable development is impossible if basic needs of all people are not satisfied. Poverty is one of the main reasons for ecologic disasters.
- 4) Excessive use of material resources must match the economic planet possibilities.
- 5) Population increase must match the Earth ecosystem potential.

The UN Sustainable Development Goals are improving factors for the Millennium Development Goals. Among other priorities, they include new global spheres: climatic changes, economic inequality, innovations, proper consumption, peace and justice, etc.

In response to the adopted UN Sustainable Development Goals and as their supporter, Ukraine arranged own national tasks by needs and interests. Such a Ukrainian SDGs work is based on some international acts: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1992), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992), the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Rio Declaration..., 1992), the United Nations Millennium Declaration (UN Millennium Declaration, 2000), etc.

The national documents discuss social resilience, peace, public security, conflict and post-conflict settlement (SDG's: Ukraine, 2017: 115). They deal with resilience of socially vulnerable communities (SDG's: Ukraine, 2017: 128). Also, they improve the food industry and agriculture to raise resilience, production, ecosystem safety, soil quality and climate adaptation (SDG's: Ukraine, 2017: 149).

As mentioned above, the SDGs are elaborated via resilience on the global, national and local levels.

In research publications, the notion of resilience is applied in several contexts. Ecology defines resilience as the ecosystem extent to absorb changes and keep functioning (Mayunga, 2007: 2). It can be also treated as a set of abilities to function positively and adjust after disorder or successful adaptation to stress, hostility or other challenges (Sonn, Fisher, 1998: 3). Resilience enhancement is a long-term process of establishing better relations between political and social subjects.

In contrast to common expectations, the notion of force means that preventive measures do not produce a full effect. Subsequently, it focuses on restriction of any public containment. Resilience and resistance are different notions. Resistance is regarded as the system ability to cope with immediate stress consequences and return to normal functioning within similar conditions (Maru, 2010). In the changing medium, resistance may cause a stable system disorder. On the contrary, resilience is more than strength and pain endurance. It deals with inner latent forces and

resources for coping efficiently with a long crisis. Resilience is the highest adaptation and flexibility (Ganor, Ben-Lavy, 2003: 106).

The resilience interest started rising exponentially after the 9/11 terrorism event in the USA and natural or industrial disasters. Today, the conception concerns the worldwide crises: COVID-19, wars, etc.

Today, there are clearer approaches to the notion of resilience. For example, the UN terminological glossary defines resilience as the system, community or society ability to absorb outer impacts and recover its basic structure and functions quickly. It also deals with the system adaptation and flexibility within great transformation and outer influence.

Resilient communities are successful. They can ensure welfare of its members (individuals and groups) to regain a high social development after overcoming difficulties. Many experts recognize social resilience as an inherent part of national security and public unity during inner or outer conflicts (caused by political changes). Such a conception is similar to the notion of community resilience. Most of these studies concern social resilience as well.

Usually, specialists apply interdisciplinary approaches to treating social resilience on the level of separate communities. Wilson (2012) involves the intersectoral analysis of natural and social sciences to explain social resilience. Within environmental sciences, his ideas are based on the social-ecological subfield. For social sciences, he engages the decision, transit and social capital theories. The notion of community resilience is conceptualized between economic, social and ecological capitals. That correlates the community resilience with global indexes of strong and weak social capitals. Via them, a wide range of issues is established for determining the community resilience levels.

Social resilience is an integral component of national resilience. It is defined as the country ability to unite in case of outer and inner conflicts caused by political changes or riots (Jackson, Ferris, 2012). This conception is similar to the community resilience. Most of these studies concern social resilience as well.

Sonn C. and Fisher A. (Sonn, Fisher, 1998: 15) argued that humans can belong to several communities simultaneously. However, they remain “implanted” in the initial community that ensures values, norms, history, myths and heritage.

Ganor M. and Ben-Lavy Y. (Ganor, Ben-Lavy, 2003) singled out six main components of community resilience:

- 1) Discussion of situation, threats, risks and support;
- 2) Local cooperation and responsibility rather than outer aid expectancy;
- 3) Unity via empathy and mutual assistance;
- 4) Self-reliant crisis resistance;
- 5) Leadership (especially, on the lowest level);
- 6) Better welfare belief.

Keck M. and Sakdapolrak P. (Keck, Sakdapolrak, 2013) regard social resilience as a triple ability: challenge overcoming, empirical adaptation and institutional transformation.

Norris F. et al. (Norris et al., 2008) established four interrelated resources that social resilience is based on:

- 1) Economic development (resource diversity and their fair distribution; just risk; sensitivity to danger);
- 2) Social capital (resource obtained from social relations – social support in case of need, unity of formal and informal links, their attachment to place);
- 3) Community competence (skills of solving problems and cooperation, or the social collective efficiency). That depends on critical reflection, contribution readiness, group conflict settlement, collective decision making;
- 4) Information and communication (reliable sources for effective data transfer in management).

Ukrainian UNDP researchers pay a deep attention to psychological and social-cultural aspects of resilience progress (Dumky ta pohliady naseleennia, 2021). Its significance consists not only in the fact that national and social resilience is connected with life conditions, border media. In spite of historical ties and neighborhood upon Russia, many displaced people from combat zones and hostile propaganda, the Ukrainian population keeps improving democratic institutes and its national identity. That is a relevant component in understanding social resilience.

Regardless of the absent single definition of social resilience and its elements among

Ukrainian scientists, there is a great interest in studying adjacent issues. In particular, experts research identification mechanisms on the national and local levels. They are significant to recognize social resilience since unity presupposes identity (Tkachuk, Natalenko, 2020: 52-53).

A range of studies adjacent to social resilience focus on correlation between the local, regional and national identities. Domination of the regional identity over the national one is described in the paper “The Ukrainian Z Generation: Values and Guidelines”, which was supported by the New Europe Center and the Friedrich Ebert Fund. The same conclusion was made by specialists of the Horshenin Institute in their all-Ukrainian poll “Ukrainian Society and European Values”. The research was conducted in cooperation with the Ukrainian and Belarusian Offices of the Friedrich Ebert Fund (Ukrainske suspilstvo, 2017).

Besides, social capital is also investigated in the resilience sphere. Mutual trust between community residents is a set of constructive personal ties between individuals and groups. Such ties are the most valuable community resources to resist challenges and accomplish tasks – industrial, living and social. Constructiveness or destructiveness of these ties depend on common trust among society and community members. Subsequently, it affects their unity and solidarity (Koulman, 2001).

The positive social capital implies constructive ties. Its size is measured by width and diversity of these ties. The wider they are, the more reliable mutual assistance and community resilience become, which is based on trust. If there is a lack of sincere and altruistic trust, human relationships get suspicious and hostile. The latter is the negative social capital. Consequently, poverty and crime are rampant in the community (Fukuizama, 2008).

Within fast development of modern technologies, the today’s reality changes traditional ideas of threats. They are usually caused by natural, technological, social and military reasons. New conflicts and crises require understanding how they emerge. That should be done via complex analysis and risk assessment for the most important state and society branches – economics, power, mass media, cybernetics, ecology, food, healthcare, education, culture.

Based on Ukrainian interests and international experience, the multi-level national resilience will promote state, regional and local abilities to prevent threats and recover quickly.

Such a system must provide a proper coordination of state and local authorities, strict distribution of their duties, anti-crisis planning. The national resilience introduction requires legislative settlement of its functioning. For this purpose, Ukraine has adopted corresponding acts: “The Conception of Ensuring National Resilience” (Kontseptsiia..., 2021), “The Strategy of Ukrainian National Security” (Stratehiia..., 2020), “The Strategy of Digital Security” (Stratehiia..., 2021), etc.

According to the purpose of our research conducted in March-June 2021 for local communities of some Ukrainian oblasts (Sotsialna stiikist..., 2021), we can hypothesize that social resilience is signified and determined by 3 of 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals:

- 1) Goal 3. Strong Health: healthy life and welfare for people of any age;
- 2) Goal 11. Stable Development of Cities and Communities: openness, safety, vitality and ecologic resilience of human settlements;
- 3) Goal 16. Peace and Justice: open, peaceful and resilient society; unrestricted access to justice; new accountable and efficient institutions (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 2015).

Like other UN members, Ukraine joined the global process of ensuring sustainable development. During 2016-2017, there was a wide-scale SDGs adaptation within the Ukrainian context. For Ukraine, the 2030 national strategic framework was conducted on the all-inclusive basis. Each global goal was reconsidered according to national development peculiarities. That resulted in the national SDGs system, which consists of the national development tasks with respective indexes.

**Table 1.** Monitoring of the SDGs indexes in Ukraine. Goal 3 (SDG’s: Ukraine, 2020: 18-25)

Goal 3. Strong Health					
Index	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
3.1.1. Maternal mortality per 100,000 newborns	15.1	12.6	9.1	12.5	14.9
3.2.1. Children’s mortality (under 5 years of age) per 1,000 newborns	9.3	8.8	8.9	8.3	8.2
3.3.1. HIV rate per 100,000 residents	37.0	37.0	40.6	40.8	42.6



3.3.2. Active tuberculosis rate per 100,000 residents	55.9	54.7	51.9	50.5	60.1
3.5.1. Death probability among males (20-64 years of age)	0.38943	0.38364	0.37535	0.38675	0.38088
3.5.2. Death probability among females (20-64 years of age)	0.15514	0.15208	0.14696	0.15010	0.14536

Recently, the Ukrainian and worldwide spread of COVID-19 brought new challenges. That significantly affected the social resilience parameters on the global, national, regional and local levels ([Coronavirus Worldwide Graphs, 2022](#)).

**Table 2.** Monitoring of the SDGs indexes in Ukraine. Goal 11 ([SDG's: Ukraine, 2020: 62-64](#))

<b>Goal 11. Stable Development of Cities and Communities</b>					
<b>Index</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
11.2.1. Regions that have approved and implement some public local development strategies, %	88	100	100	100	100
11.2.1. Regions that have approved and implement some public local development strategies and their plans, %	64	96	100	–	–
11.4.1. Introduction and modernization of local automated warning systems, %	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.1	0.1
11.5.1. Stationary pollution emissions, % till 2015	100.0	107.7	90.5	87.8	86.1
11.5.2. Cities where the average annual pollution emissions exceed the average monthly ones	34	34	34	35	36
11.6.1. Realization of local development strategies for better economic growth, employment, tourism, recreation, culture and manufacturing. Number of tourism employees	54,421	55,413	58,588	62,585	–

Another indexing parameter of social resilience is Goal 16 – Peace and Justice.

**Table 3.** Monitoring of the SDGs indexes in Ukraine. Goal 16 ([SDG's, 2020: 73-88](#))

<b>Goal 16. Peace and Justice</b>					
<b>Index</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
16.1.2. Crime victims per 100,000 people	965.12	1044.08	882.92	817.92	720.23
16.3.2. Applicants for free law help	38,303	219,981	393,228	400,478	404,030
16.7.1. Ukrainian position in the Global Competitiveness Report Ranking according to the subindex "State and public institutions"	130	129	118	110	104

In this sphere, Task 16.9 matters. It enhances social resilience, peace and public security, conflict and post-conflict settlement. Here, the Social Unity and Reconciliation Index is measured via several indicators:

- 1) Social unity and participation;
- 2) Tolerance and public responsibility;
- 3) Psychological-social adaptability;
- 4) Migration fall;
- 5) Readiness for dialogue;
- 6) Civil behavior;
- 7) Relationships between government and security;
- 8) Relationships between groups;
- 9) Political security ([SDG's; 2020: 86-88](#)).

Therefore, Ukrainian tasks should be singled out to ensure sustainable development (according to resilience parameters determined by Goals 3, 11 and 16):

- 1) Further healthcare reforming, disease prevention, healthy environment;
- 2) Epidemy containment and free access to safe medical services;
- 3) Adoption and realization of the State Regional Development Strategy via stimulating the local potential use;
- 4) Proper smart specialization in coordinating regional development strategies;
- 5) Stronger ties between strategic, spatial and budgetary planning;
- 6) Eliminated barriers between cities and communities;
- 7) Higher rights of local communities;
- 8) Mediation institute legalization (SDG's, 2020).

Index values of Goals 3, 11 and 16 make it possible to conclude that Ukraine tends to raising resilience and efficient systemic mechanisms of sustainable development (SDG's; 2017: 26-29, 84-87, 114-117).

## 5. Conclusion

Ukraine is devoted to Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Since 2015, Ukraine has started reforming social and economic relationships to enhance the democratic order. The Sustainable Development Goals are integrated into the state politics on the all-inclusive basis. As of 2019, Ukraine has generally succeeded in 15 of 17 SDGs.

In case of COVID-19 risks, Ukrainian important tasks are: healthcare reforms; authority coordination and professionalization; manufacturing recovery; social assistance reforms; digitalized administration services; modernized approaches to distance learning, etc.

The SDGs became "Ukrainian shifting drivers". They reconsidered the national growth conceptions. Having joined the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Ukraine changed techniques of strategic planning and defined priorities of social-economic development.

For further studies, we should pay attention to the social resilience conception where the whole society responds collectively to different threats. To clarify the social resilience criteria, Ukraine has adopted a range of strategic documents to arrange resilience priorities in the Ukrainian reality.

Social resilience is signified and determined by 3 of 17 SDGs: Goal 3 – Strong Health; Goal 11 – Stable Development of Cities and Communities; Goal 16 – Peace and Justice. Thus, the enhanced social resilience will promote Ukraine's succeeding in the SDGs implementation. At the same time, the state policy focus on the SDGs accomplishment will increase the social resilience performance.

## References

- Adams, 2010 – Adams, A. (2010). Planning for cruise ship resilience: an approach to managing cruise ship impacts in Haines, Alaska. *Coastal Management*. 38(6): 654-664
- Adger, 2000 – Adger, N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*. 24(3): 347-364.
- Adger et al., 2005 – Adger, N., Hughes, T., Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Rockström, J. (2005). Social-ecological resilience to coastal disasters. *Science*. 309(5737): 1036-1039.
- Adger et al., 2002 – Adger, N., Kelly, P., Winkels, A., Huy, I., Locke, C. (2002). Migration, remittances, livelihood trajectories, and social resilience. *Ambio*. 31(4): 358-366.
- Al-Qudah et al., 2022 – Al-Qudah, A., Al-Okaily, M., Alqudah, H. (2022). The relationship between social entrepreneurship and sustainable development from economic growth perspective: 15 'RCEP' countries. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*. 12(1): 44-61.
- Azcona, Bhatt, 2020 – Azcona, G., Bhatt, A. (2020). Inequality, gender, and sustainable development: measuring feminist progress. *Gender & Development*. 28(2): 337-355.
- Barria et al., 2019 – Barria, P., Cruzat, M. L., Cienfuegos, R., J. Escauriaza, G.C., Bonilla, C., Moris, R., Ledezma, C., Guerra, M., Rodriguez, R., Torres, A. (2019). From multi-risk evaluation to resilience planning: the case of central Chilean coastal cities. *Water*. 11(3).
- Berkes et al., 2003 – Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C. (2003). Navigating social-ecological systems. Building resilience for complexity and change. *Cambridge*.
- Bexell, Jönsson, 2017 – Bexell, M., Jönsson, K. (2017). Responsibility and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. *Forum for Development Studies*. 44(1): 13-29.
- Biggs, Hall, Stoeckl, 2012 – Biggs, D., Hall, C., Stoeckl, N. (2012): The resilience of formal and informal tourism enterprises to disasters: reef tourism in Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 20(5): 645-665.

- Boess et al., 2021 – Boess, E.R., Lyhne, I., Davila, J.G., Jantzen, E., Kjellerup, U., Kørnøv, L. (2021). Using Sustainable Development Goals to develop EIA scoping practices: The case of Denmark. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. 39(6): 463-477.
- Borie et al., 2019 – Borie, M., Ziervogel, G., Taylor, F.E., Millington, J.D.A., Sitas, R., Pelling, M. (2019). Mapping (for) resilience across city scales: an opportunity to open-up conversations for more inclusive resilience policy? *Environmental Science and Policy*. 99: 1-9.
- Bouzarovski et al., 2011 – Bouzarovski, S., Salukvadze, J., Gentile, M. (2011). A socially resilient urban transition? The contested land-scapes of apartment building extensions in two post-communist cities. *Urban Studies*. 48(13): 2689-2714.
- Bradley, Grainger, 2004 – Bradley, D., Grainger, A. (2004). Social resilience as a controlling influence on desertification in Senegal. *Land Degradation and Development*. 15(5): 451-470.
- Braun, Aßheuer, 2011 – Braun, B., Aßheuer, T. (2011). Floods in megacity environments: vulnerability and coping strategies of slum dwellers in Dhaka/Bangladesh. *Natural Hazards*. 58(2): 771-787.
- Buttanri, 2017 – Buttanri, E. (2017). Sustainable development and security – the global agenda and its reflections in the OSCE. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.osce.org/magazine/306696>
- Camacho, 2015 – Camacho, L. (2015). Sustainable Development Goals: kinds, connections and expectations. *Journal of Global Ethics*. 11(1): 18-23.
- Carpenter, Walker, Anderies, 2001 – Bel N.Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J., Bel N. (2001). From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what? *Ecosystems*. 4: 765-781.
- Carrapatoso, 2021 – Carrapatoso, A. (2021). Education for Sustainable Development and Action-Oriented Learning at Higher Education Institutions: Reflections on a Trans-Disciplinary Teaching Project. *Journal of Political Science Education*. 17(1): 12-22.
- Cashman, 2011 – Cashman, A. (2011). Case study of institutional and social responses to flooding: reforming for resilience? *Journal of Flood Risk Management*. 4(1): 33-41.
- Chapman, 2017 – Chapman, A. (2017). Evaluating the health-related targets in the Sustainable Development Goals from a human rights perspective *The International Journal of Human Rights*. 21(8): 1098-1113.
- Cinner, Auentes, Kandria Mahazo, 2009 – Cinner, J., Auentes, M., Kandria Mahazo, H. (2009). Exploring social resilience in Madagascar's marine protected areas // *Ecology and Society*. 2009, Vol. 14, Is. 1
- Constantinescu, 2014 – Constantinescu, A. (2014). Hypostases of resilience for sustainable development, *The Second World Congress on Resilience from Person to Society*. E-book. Timisoara.
- Constantinescu, Frone, 2018 – Constantinescu, A., Frone, S. (2018). the concept of resilience from a sustainable development perspective. *Annals of the «Constantin Brâncuși» University of Târgu Jiu*. Economy Series, Special Issue. Pp. 168-174.
- Coronavirus Worldwide Graphs, 2020 – Coronavirus Worldwide Graphs. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/worldwide-graphs/#countries-cases>
- Cretney, 2014 – Cretney, R. (2014). Resilience for whom? Emerging critical geographies of socio-ecological resilience. *Geography Compass*. 9: 627-640.
- Dimitrova, Petrova, 2011 – Dimitrova, S., Petrova, E. (2011). Sustainable Development and National Security *Review of General Management*. 13(1): 44-54.
- Dusík, Bond, 2022 – Dusík, J., Bond, A. (2022). Environmental assessments and sustainable finance frameworks: will the EU Taxonomy change the mindset over the contribution of EIA to sustainable development? *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. Published online: 18 Jan.
- Egwalusor, 2020 – Egwalusor, R. (2020). Achieving Sustainable National Security and Development in Nigeria Through French Language. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research*. 8(1): 55-60.
- Elmqvist et al., 2019 – Elmqvist, T., Andersson, E., Frantzeskaki, N., McPhearson, T., Olsson, P., Gaffney, O., Takeuchi, K., Folke, C. (2019). Sustainability and resilience for transformation in the urban century. *Nature Sustainability*. 2: 267-273.
- Endo, Ikeda, 2022 – Endo, K., Ikeda, S. (2022). How can developing countries achieve sustainable development: implications from the inclusive wealth index of ASEAN countries. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*. 29(1): 50-59.
- Eskelinen, 2021 – Eskelinen, T. (2021). Interpreting the Sustainable Development Goals through the Perspectives of Utopia and Governance. *Forum for Development Studies*. 48(2): 179-197.

Evans, 2008 – Evans, G. (2008). Transformation from «Carbon Valley» to a «Post-Carbon Society» in a climate change hot spot: the coalfields of the Hunter Valley, New South Wales, Australia. *Ecology and Society*. 13(1).

Filho et al., 2019 – Filho, W., Tripathi, S., Guerra, J., Giné-Garriga, R., Orlovic Louren, V., Willats, J. (2019). Using the sustainable development goals towards a better understanding of sustainability challenges. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*. 26(2): 179-190.

Folke, 2006 – Folke, C. (2006). Resilience. The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analysis. *Global Environmental Change*. 16(3): 253-267.

Frazier et al., 2010 – Frazier, T., Wood, N., Yarnal, B. (2010). Stakeholder perspectives on land-use strategies for adapting to climate-change-enhanced coastal hazards: Sarasota, Florida. *Applied Geography*. 30(4): 506-517

Fukuda-Parr, 2016 – Fukuda-Parr, S. (2016). From the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals: shifts in purpose, concept, and politics of global goal setting for development. *Gender & Development*. 24(1): 43-52.

Fukuizama, 2008 – Fukuizama, F. (2008). Sotsialnyi kapital [Social capital]. *Nezalezhnyi kulturolohichnyi chasopys «I»*. 53. [in Russian]

Gallopín, 2006 – Gallopín, G. (2006). Linkages between vulnerability, resilience, and adaptive capacity *Global Environmental Change*. 16(3): 293-303.

Gamage, Stevanovic, 2019 – Gamage, S., Stevanovic, N. (2019). Gender, migration and care deficits: what role for the sustainable development goals? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 45(14): 2600-2620.

Ganor, Ben-Lavy, 2003 – Ganor, M., Ben-Lavy, Y. (2003). «Community resilience: Lessons derived from Gilo under fire». *Journal of Jewish Communal*. 79: 105-108.

Gasper, 2019 – Gasper, D. (2019). The road to the Sustainable Development Goals: building global alliances and norms *Journal of Global Ethics*. 15(2): 118-137.

Gooch et al., 2012 – Gooch, M., Butler, J., Cullen-Unsworth, L., Rigano, D., Manning, C. (2012). Community-derived indicator domains for social resilience to water quality decline in a Great Barrier Reef catchment, Australia. *Society and Natural Resources*. 25(5): 421-439.

Haase, 2011 – Haase, D. (2011). Participatory modelling of vulnerability and adaptive capacity in flood risk management. *Natural Hazards*.

Harte et al., 2009 – Harte, E., Childs, I., Hastings, P. (2009). Imizamo Yethu: a case study of community resilience to fire hazard in an informal settlement Cape Town, South Africa. *Geographical Research*. 47(2): 142-154.

Harwell, 2012 – Harwell, J. (2012). The impacts of national security and sustainable development: a comparative study of shared protected areas. Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, 233 p.

Hennebry et al., 2019 – Hennebry, J., Hari, K., Piper, N. (2019). Not without them: realising the sustainable development goals for women migrant workers. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 45(14): 2621-2637.

Holdsworth, Thomas, 2021 – Holdsworth, S., Thomas, I. (2021). Competencies or capabilities in the Australian higher education landscape and its implications for the development and delivery of sustainability education. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 40(7): 1466-1481.

Hollida et al., 2019 – Hollida, J., Hennebry, J., Gamage, S. (2019). Achieving the sustainable development goals: surfacing the role for a gender analytic of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 45(14): 2551-2565

Holling, 1973 – Holling, C. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 4: 1-23.

Horne et al., 2020 – Horne, R., Correia, J., Badland, H., Alderton, A., Higgs, C. (2020). From Ballarat to Bangkok: how can cross-sectoral partnerships around the Sustainable Development Goals accelerate urban liveability? *Cities & Health*. 4(2): 199-205.

Howe, 2011 – Howe, P. (2011). Hurricane preparedness as anticipatory adaptation: a case study of community businesses. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy Dimensions*. 21(2): 711-720.

Hoy et al., 2008 – Hoy, D., Southavilay, K., Chanlivong, N., Phimpachanh, C., Douangphachanh, V., Toole, M. (2008). Building capacity and community resilience to HIV: a project designed, implemented, and evaluated by young Lao people. *Global Public Health*. 3(1): 47-61.



- Jackson, Ferris, 2012 – Jackson, S., Ferris, T. (2012). Infrastructure resilience: past, present, and future, *George Mason University Magazine*, P. 1-4
- Kates, Clark, 1996 – Kates, R., Clark, W. (1996). Environmental surprise. Expecting the unexpected. *Environment*. 38(2): 6-18.
- Keck, Sakdapolrak, 2013 – Keck, M., Sakdapolrak, P. (2013). What is social resilience? Lessons learned and way forward. *Erdkunde*. 67(1): 5-19.
- Klocker et al., 2011– Klocker, R., Calgaro, E., Thomalla, F. (2011). Governing resilience building in Thailand's tourism-dependent coastal communities: conceptualising stakeholder agency in social-ecological system. *Global Environmental Change*. 21(2): 481-491.
- Koehler, 2016 – Koehler, G. (2016). Tapping the Sustainable Development Goals for progressive gender equity and equality policy? *Gender & Development*. 24(1): 53-68.
- Kontsepsiia..., 2021 – Kontsepsiia zabezpechennia natsionalnoi systemy stiikosti vid 27 veresnia 2021 roku №479/2021. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/4792021-40181>
- Kopnina, 2016 – Kopnina, H. (2016). The victims of unsustainability: a challenge to sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*. 23(2): 113-121.
- Kopnina, 2020 – Kopnina, H. (2020). Education for the future? Critical evaluation of education for sustainable development goals. *The Journal of Environmental Education*. 51(4): 280-291.
- Koulman, 2001 – Koulman, Dzh. (2001). Kapital sotsial'nyi i chelovecheskii [Social and human capital]. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*. 3: 122-139. [in Russian]
- Laksov, 2021– Laksov, K.B. (2021). In partnership with heads of department for sustainable educational development. *International journal for academic development*. Ahead-of-print. P. 1-13.
- Lebid et al., 2021 – Lebid, A., Nazarov, M., Shevchenko, N. (2021). Information Resilience and Information Security as Indicators of the Level of Development of Information and Media Literacy // *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 6(2): 354-363.
- Lebid et al., 2022 – Lebid, A., Medvid, O., Nazarov, M. (2022). Information Security of UN Sustainable Development Goals Implementation. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 7(2): 487-498
- Leipert, Reuter, 2005 – Leipert, B., Reuter, L. (2005). Developing resilience: how women maintain their health in northern geographically isolated settings. *Qualitative Health Research*. 15(1): 49-65.
- Lewin, 2019 – Lewin, K. (2019). The Sustainable Development Goals for Education: Commonwealth Perspectives and Opportunities. *The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*. 108(4): 367-382.
- Lopez-Marrero, Tschakert, 2011 – Lopez-Marrero, T., Tschakert, P. (2011). From theory to practice: building more resilient communities in floodprone areas. *Environment and Urbanization*. 23(1): 229-249.
- Marshall, Marshall, 2007 – Marshall, N., Marshall, P. (2007). Conceptualizing and operationalizing social resilience within commercial fisheries in northern Australia. *Ecology and Society*. 12(1).
- Marshall et al., 2009 – Marshall, N., Marshall, P., Abdulla, A. (2009). Using social resilience and resource dependency to increase the effectiveness of marine conservation initiatives in Salum, Egypt. *Environmental Planning and Management*. 52(7): 901-918.
- Maru, 2010 – Maru, Y. (2010). Resilient regions: clarity of concepts and challenges to systemic measurement. Socio-economics and the Environment in Discussion (SEED) Working Paper Series 2010-04. *CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems*. Pp. 1-37.
- Matović, Obradović, 2022 – Matović, S., Obradović, S.L. (2022). Assessing socio-economic vulnerability aiming for sustainable development in Serbia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*. 29(1): 27-38.
- Mayunga, 2007 – Mayunga, J. (2007). Understanding and applying the concept of community disaster resilience: A capital-based approach. *Summer Academy for Social Vulnerability and Resilience Building*. Pp. 1-16.
- McGee, 2011 – McGee, T. (2011). Public engagement in neighbourhood level wildfire mitigation and preparedness: case studies from Canada, the US and Australia. *Environmental Management*. 92(10): 2524-2532.
- Metaxas, Psarropoulou, 2021 – Metaxas, T.; Psarropoulou, S. (2021). Sustainable

Development and Resilience: A Combined Analysis of the Cities of Rotterdam and Thessaloniki. *Urban Sci.* Vol. 5, Is. 78

**Morrison-Saunders, 2020** – Morrison-Saunders, A., Sánchez, L., Retief, F., Sinclair, J., Doelle, M., Jones, M. (2020). Gearing up impact assessment as a vehicle for achieving the UN sustainable development goals. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal.* 38(2): 113-117.

**Norris et al., 2008** – Norris, F., Stevens, S., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K., Pfefferbaum, R. (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.

**O'Brien et al., 2009** – O'Brien, K., Hayward, B., Berkes, F. (2009). Rethinking social contracts: building resilience in a changing climate. *In: Ecology and Society.* 14(2).

**OBrist, Pfeiffer, Henley, 2010** – 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.

**Orji, 2012** – Orji, K. (2012). National Security and Sustainable Development in Nigeria: Challenges from the Niger Delta. *African Research Review.* 6(1): 198-211.

**Pearce, Willis, Wadham, Binks, 2010** – Pearce, M., Willis, E., Wadham, B., Binks, B. (2010). Attitudes to drought in outback communities in South Australia. *Geographical Research.* 48(4): 359-369.

**Pelling, Manuel-Navarrete, 2011** – Pelling, M., Manuel-Navarrete, D. (2011). From resilience to transformation: the adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers. *Ecology and Society.* 16(2).

**Perz et al., 2010** – Perz, S., Cabrera, I., Carvalho, I., Castillo, J., Barnes, G. (2010). Global economic integration and local community resilience: road paving and rural demographic change in the southwestern Amazon. *Rural Sociology.* 75(2): 300-325.

**Pisano, 2012** – Pisano, U. (2012). Resilience and Sustainable Development: Theory of resilience, systems thinking and adaptive governance. *European Sustainable Development Network.* ESDN Quarterly Report N°26. 50 p.

**Pogge, Sengupta, 2015** – Pogge, T., Sengupta, M. (2015). The Sustainable Development Goals: a plan for building a better world? *Journal of Global Ethics.* 11(1): 56-64.

**Pogge, Sengupta, 2016** – Pogge, T., Sengupta, M. (2016). Assessing the sustainable development goals from a human rights perspective. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy.* 32(2): 83-97.

**Porter et al., 2008** – Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Kyei, P., Adjalo, M., Rapoo, G., Kilpatrick, K. (2008). Linkages between livelihood opportunities and refugee-host relations: learning from the experiences of Liberian camp-based refugees in Ghana. *Journal of Refugee Studies.* 21(2): 230-252.

**Rio Declaration..., 1992** – Rio Declaration on environment and development, 1992. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A\\_CONF.151\\_26\\_Vol.I\\_Declaration.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_CONF.151_26_Vol.I_Declaration.pdf)

**Rockstrom, 2004** – Rockstrom, J. (2004). Making the best of climatic variability: options for upgrading rainfed farming in water scarce regions. *Water Science and Technology.* 49(7): 151-156.

**Ross, 2015** – Ross, H. (2015). Negotiating managerialism: professional recognition and teachers of sustainable development education. *Environmental Education Research.* 21(3): 403-416.

**Saiz, Donald, 2017** – Saiz, I., Donald, K. (2017) Tackling inequality through the Sustainable Development Goals: human rights in practice. *The International Journal of Human Rights.* 21(8): 1029-1049.

**Schwarz et al., 2011** – Schwarz, A., Bene, C., Bennett, G., Boso, D., Hilly, Z., Paul, C., Posala, R., Sibiti, S., Andrew, N. (2011). Vulnerability and resilience of remote rural communities to shocks and global changes: empirical analysis from Solomon Islands. *Global Environmental Change.* 21(3): 1128-1140.

**SDGs-Ukraine, 2019** – SDGs-Ukraine. SDG8: Decent Work and Economic Growth. Monitoring report. Kyiv, 2019. 36 p.

**Shulla et al., 2020** – Shulla, K., Filho, W., Lardjane, S., Sommer, J., Borgemeister, C. (2020). Sustainable development education in the context of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology.* 27(5): 458-468.

**Sonn, Fisher, 1998** – Sonn, C., Fisher, A. (1998). Sense of Community: Community Resilient Responses to Oppression and Change. *Journal of Community Psychology.* 26(5): 1-32.

**Sotsialna stiikist..., 2021** – Sotsialna stiikist terytorialnykh hromad v umovakh pandemii COVID-19 [Social statistics of territorial communities in the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic]. Analychnyi zvit. Sumy: SumDU, 2021. 53 p.

**Star, 2010** – *Star, S.* (2010). This is not a boundary object: reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 35(5): 601-617.

**Stratehiia..., 2021** – Stratehiia informatsiinoi bezpeky vid 28 hrudnia 2021 roku №685/2021. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/6852021-41069>

**Stratehiia..., 2022** – Stratehiia natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy vid 14 veresnia 2020 roku №392/2020. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3922020-35037>

**Streets, Glantz, 2000** – *Streets, D., Glantz, M.* (2000). Exploring the concept of climate surprise. *Global Environmental Change*. 10: 97-107.

**Sustainable, 2019** – Sustainable Development Goals for the Children of Ukraine. National report. Kyiv, 2019. 27 p.

**Convention, 1992** – The Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>

**Thomas, Twyman, 2005** – *Thomas, D., Twyman, C.* (2005). Equity and justice in climate change adaptation amongst natural-resource-dependent societies. *Global Environmental Change*. 15(2): 115-124.

**Tkachuk, Natalenko, 2020** – *Tkachuk, A.F., Natalenko, N.V.* (2020). Mistseva identychnist [Local identity]. Dlia terytorialnykh hromad i ne tilky. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo «Iuston», 97 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Transforming..., 2015** – Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015.

**SDG's: Ukraine, 2017** – Tsili staloho rozvytku: Ukraina. Natsionalna dopovid [Goals of sustainable development: Ukraine. National report.]. Kyiv: Ministerstvo ekonomichnoho rozvytku i torhivli Ukrainy, 2017. 174 p. [in Ukrainian]

**SDG's: Ukraine, 2020a** – Tsili staloho rozvytku-Ukraina. Dobrovilnyi natsionalnyi ohliad [Goals of sustainable development-Ukraine. Voluntary national review]. Kyiv: Departament stratehichnoho planuvannia ta makroekonomichnoho prohnouzuvannia, 2020. 116 p. [in Ukrainian]

**SDG's: Ukraine, 2020b** – Tsili staloho rozvytku-Ukraina: 2020. Monitorynhovyi zvit [Sustainable development goals-Ukraine: 2020. Monitoring report]. Kyiv: Derzhavna sluzhba statystyky Ukrainy, 2020. 90 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Ukaz..., 2019** – Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 30.09.2019 r «Pro Tsili staloho rozvytku Ukrainy na period do 2030 roku». [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/722/2019#Text>

**UN Framework, 1992** – United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://unfccc.int/files/essential\\_background/background\\_publications\\_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf](https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf)

**UN Millennium, 2000** – United Nations Millennium Declaration, 2000. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/55/2>

**Wade, 2002** – *Wade, R.* (2002). Sustainable development education and Curriculum 2000. *Planet*. 8(1): 4-7.

**Wilson, 2012** – *Wilson, G.* (2012). Community Resilience and Environmental Transitions Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 240 p.

**Wynn, Jones, 2021** – *Wynn, M., Jones, P.* (2021). Industry approaches to the Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*. 79(10): 1-15.

**Yamagata, Sharifi, 2018** – *Yamagata, Y., Sharifi, A.* (2018). Resilience-Oriented Urban Planning Theoretical and Empirical Insights. Springer, Cham. Pp. 3-27.