Chapter 5

Strengthening Social Cohesion in the Context of Resilience Building in Small States With Reference to Commonwealth Small States

Dr Godfrey St Bernard

5.1 Introduction

Small states face elevated vulnerability risks, which have been attributed principally to exposure to adverse economic shocks and susceptibility to natural disasters and climate change. However, exposure to a range of social forces is just as critical. Social forces originate from social systems such as regulatory systems, familial systems, communications systems, systems impacting human capital accumulation, systems impacting the accumulation of wealth, legal systems, and systems impacting culture and values. All of these systems act independently and collectively to produce outcomes with both positive and negative consequences, but, to the extent that the latter outstrips the former, negative social forces evolve to increase vulnerability risks that are socially determined.

In the context of small states, this chapter recognises that each is exposed to differential vulnerability risks, whether economic, social, environmental or some combination of all three forms. Moreover, the chapter also recognises that such risks are likely to be increased if mechanisms focusing upon building resilience are not implemented. The study that forms the basis of this chapter is predicated on the fact that notions of vulnerability cannot be overlooked in the development discourse, as is the case when one considers assessments of development in the context of frameworks such as the Human Development Index (HDI), which is devoid of such considerations. In addressing notions of vulnerability in small states, Briguglio et al. (2006) emphasised the importance of gauging and understanding resilience levels in such states.

This chapter specifically addresses these issues from the standpoint of the social aspects of resilience. Resilience building, including social cohesion, is instrumental in facilitating social development initiatives in small states. Accordingly, pushes towards social development hinge upon the pursuit of policies that foster social cohesion and, by extension, social resilience building. Building resilience is deemed to be an antidote to vulnerability risks that have their origins in the breakdown of societies in small states, due principally to their inability to withstand the negative effects of domestic and international shocks. Such shocks are not always sudden, but can be gradual. Vulnerability that is due to the inability to respond to stimuli that have evolved through gradual processes of change has not been regularly articulated in many of the discourses that give primacy to external shocks (which are often sudden). This is principally because of the omission of the social forces that

are manifest in processes of social change, which often occurs at a slower pace than change predicated on economic and environmental forces.

The estimation of key parameters describing population characteristics pertaining to attributes of individuals, and collectivities of individuals such as households, institutions and nations as entities, permits the generation of indicators that are indicative of material well-being and access to opportunities among such populations. Social development, in the context of the aforementioned units, hinges upon gauging social aspects of resilience that encapsulate social cohesion. Thus, beyond permitting observations that reflect improvements in status and condition for any given unit of analysis, other observations strive to reflect reductions in inequalities across different subgroups and reinforce pushes towards a more just exposure to conditions and opportunities through reductions in inequities.

This chapter is primarily focused upon combating the inherent vulnerability exposure of small states, through strengthening the social aspects of resilience and advocating policies that could feature meaningfully in achieving that goal. To this end, the chapter seeks to identify the social aspects of resilience building. Such aspects are connected to domains of policy interest that collectively permit the derivation of appropriate policy agendas, and hence the identification of relevant variables and suitable indicators that capture the social aspects of resilience. Using a set of proposed population clusters that reflect the medium-term socio-demographic characteristics and dynamics of 31 Commonwealth small states, the author determines and recommends different policy agendas.

5.2 Contextualising small states

Small states are deemed to have high levels of vulnerability due to their physical land area, small population size, inability to diversify national production and geographic location, with some states either being landlocked or dispersed across vast oceans. Many small states are islands of various sizes, while others are nation states, also of various sizes, located within continental domains – principally in Africa, Asia and the Americas.

In its assessment of vulnerability, the Commonwealth Secretariat (1985) defined small states as having population sizes of around one million or less. Principally because of increases in population size with the passage of time, revised population size thresholds have been established, increasing from 1 million to 1.5 million. It has been noted that population size has been seen a principal criterion for labelling a state as a small state, insofar as there is evidence consistent with a high correlation between population size, physical land area and the size of the economy (Commonwealth Secretariat 1997).

Small population size, small land area and challenges emanating as a result of topographic and maritime characteristics mix and combine in complex ways to place limitations on the capacity of many small states to produce and consume goods and services in accordance with market forces that are efficient, competitive and capable of sustaining the well-being of individuals and institutions. For small states, such

outcomes exacerbate the vulnerability risks they face. Further, such outcomes not only reinforce the urgent requirement of building resilience as a means of preventing the ills that are likely to accrue from innate characteristics of small states; they also promote favourable response mechanisms that fortify individuals and institutions against stimuli that have exposed their vulnerability and, at the same time, facilitate building capabilities and capacities that reduce response times for recovery after being exposed.

Size and geography are identified as two major challenges that intensify vulnerability risks. Size manifests itself in terms of vulnerability to economic shocks; for example, income vulnerability, limited capacity to produce and consume, and difficulty accessing external capital. On the other hand, geography manifests itself in terms of reinforcing limited competitiveness and susceptibility to natural disasters and climate change. In this context, the complexity of vulnerability as a phenomenon of interest is showcased, especially with respect to its multifaceted nature. This is more than a combination of the main effects of vulnerabilities, classified as economic, social and environmental; it also arising from their respective interactions. For each class of vulnerability, each small state is exposed to differential levels of degradation and destruction due to exposure to harmful forces that pose threats to the status quo, rendering individuals and institutions incapable of counteracting such threats. To this end, efforts towards building resilience have to focus upon individuals and institutions, introducing a dynamic model inasmuch as individuals shape institutions over and beyond innate institutional characteristics that build resilience within institutions. At the same time, individuals are shaped and moulded by institutions over and beyond their own set of individual characteristics, which evolve independent of institutions.

Sutton and Payne (1993) cite five characteristics of small states. These are openness, insularity/enclaveness, resilience, weakness and dependence. They see these characteristics and their diverse manifestations as having both positive and negative effects in the evolution of states. These are latent characteristics that are fairly common to all small states, exposing them to high vulnerability risks irrespective of land area, population size and income. The Commonwealth Secretariat (1997) recognises these five characteristics as being critical and has elaborated on their respective impacts, whether in the context of intensifying or limiting vulnerability exposure in small states.

With respect to openness, for example, the Commonwealth Secretariat (1997) makes reference to negative consequences such as those fostering foreign cultural penetration, the erosion of cultural/value systems and a propensity to migrate. In terms of positive consequences, the Commonwealth Secretariat (1997) notes that openness may actually arouse entrepreneurial and competitive interests. With respect to insularity and enclaveness, the Commonwealth Secretariat (1997) reinforces notions of remoteness, and susceptibility to the effects of natural disasters and climate change. Remoteness is deemed to be synonymous with extraordinary economic and administrative costs, which intensify the burden of sustaining livelihoods. It is also deemed important in connecting its citizens to space and reinforcing attitudes that are resistant to co-operative ventures. On the positive side, insularity is considered

central to the pleasant ambience that enables tourism industries to thrive and present viable opportunities to the residents in small island states.

Notwithstanding the high vulnerability risks that feature in small states, the Commonwealth Secretariat (1997) acknowledges the fact that many of these states are also characterised by high levels of political stability, with fewer exhibiting high levels of human capability, as gauged through the Human Development Index. These observations are indicative of the high levels of social cohesion that may already be characteristic of many of these small states, and augur well for their high levels of resilience – these in turn consistent with evidence from the vulnerability–resilience framework (Briguglio et al. 2006). As a characteristic of small states, 'weakness' is a function of the inability of such states to wield power and authority on a global stage. In fact, power and authority in such settings are most likely to be attained through integration movements that are, in some senses, inimical to the insular tendencies of these states. Finally, the notion of dependence is linked to weakness and is reflected in small states' reliance on arrangements such as preferential treatment for exports, overseas development assistance, and employment opportunities through labour migration and injections into their domestic economies through remittances. However, Chand (2006) argues that international labour migration may in fact contribute towards building resilience in microstates.

5.3 Reconciling vulnerability and social resilience

5.3.1 Contextualising vulnerability and sustainable development

According to St Bernard (2007), 'the evolution of development studies has been characterised by increasing interest in the vulnerability status of social entities whether they assume the form of individuals, groups of individuals, communities, regions or nations'. In his work on social vulnerability, St Bernard (2007) emphasised the importance of understanding social sustainability insofar as he deemed social vulnerability to be the converse of social sustainability – a concept that has featured in the work of Lele (1991), Chambers and Conway (1991) and Barbier (1987). In essence all social systems, whether they be nation states, regions, communities or households, are exposed to a gross vulnerability which is the sum total of all vulnerability risks in the absence of any resilience capabilities. However, understanding and measuring vulnerability hinge upon determining levels of net vulnerability, after taking into account resilience capabilities that are partially influenced by cohesive mechanisms and – in the case of social systems – those mechanism that are tantamount to social cohesion.

Social sustainability is a function of resilience that encapsulates social cohesion, but there has to be a focus on the capacity to sustain social systems across time, and especially inter-generationally, introducing a dynamic dimension to an analytical framework that embraces future sensibilities. In dealing with social sustainability, Lele (1991) focuses upon the ability of a social entity to sustain the social basis of human life. Chambers and Conway (1991, 25) define a livelihood as 'a means of living and the capabilities, assets and activities required for it'. They define social sustainability

as 'the ability of a human unit (individual, household or family) to cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, to adapt to and exploit changes in its physical, social and economic environment, and to maintain and enhance capabilities for future generations' (Chambers and Conway 1991, 26). Barbier (1987), on the other hand, notes that social sustainability is an implicit dimension in gauging sustainable economic development and argues that strategies to promote such development should be 'consistent with social values and institutions, and encourage "grassroots" participation in the development process' (Barbier 1987, 109).

Understanding and measuring vulnerability has become a significant goal in the development literature, because pushes towards the attainment of sustainable development have been handicapped by inherent shortcomings in gauging vulnerability. Sustainable development encompasses different dimensions reflecting economic, political, environmental, social and cultural domains. It thrives on notions of development as sustainable insofar as they are economically viable, politically feasible, environmentally responsible and socially and culturally acceptable. Likewise vulnerability, whether gross or net, is conceived in accordance with similar domains. Thus, the determination of net vulnerability hinges upon resilience and cohesion as attributes that can be understood and measured in accordance with similar domains. Having established relationships between sustainable development, vulnerability, resilience and cohesion, and having identified their disparate domains, the complexity of such relationships becomes manifest as both main and interaction effects have to be entertained in the quest to understand and measure.

This study focuses specifically on the sociocultural dimensions, leaving the economic, environmental and political dimensions as matters to be pursued by specialists in those respective fields. The study focuses on small states as holistic systems, to the extent that vulnerability risks can be assessed in the context of the magnitude of the disintegration within such systems due to domestic and international shocks that are sudden or gradual changes. Gradual changes associated with human beings, as individuals or as collectivities, and with institutions are manifest in attitudes, expectations, roles, relationships, responses and behaviour, and are associated with anomie and outcomes such as acculturation[1] and enculturation.[2] Sudden changes are likely to be the result of external forces that can be economic, as in the case of a crash in financial markets; environmental, as in the case of episodes such as hurricanes, catastrophic earthquakes and volcanic eruptions; and social, as in the case of industrial unrest and political instability. Gradual changes, in contrast, may be due to economic forces associated with routine inflationary processes; and cultural forces, as in the case of changing norms and value systems that precipitate anomie in societies or the impact of the media and ICT on acculturation or enculturation.

A similar representation of vulnerability is evident in Moser (1996). She reckons that the threats that increase vulnerability exposure, whether in the context of individuals, households or communities, can be ecological, economic, social and political; and in each category, classified as sudden shocks, whether long term or seasonal. Moser (1996) reinforces notions of resilience by making reference to vulnerability as a function – not only of the threats to resisting, but also of the threats to recovering

in response to the negative effects associated with the different categories of threats. She notes that in the establishment of any index of vulnerability there ought to be focus upon the extent to which intrinsic assets render individuals, households and communities incapable of resisting or recovering from the threats associated with sudden shocks, whether long term or seasonal.

5.3.2 The essence of resilience

This chapter is specifically directed towards building aspects of social resilience to counteract inherent vulnerability exposure, referred to as gross vulnerability in an earlier section of this paper. The social aspects of resilience can be deemed to be the social development component of the resilience factor that is represented in the vulnerability–resilience framework articulated by Briguglio et al. (2006). The resilience factor is a function of the impact of policy measures that have resulted in economic stability, market flexibility, social development and good governance. Briguglio et al. (2006) make reference to inherent economic vulnerability, which is a function of trade openness, export concentration and dependence on strategic imports. While the resilience factor is indicative of a small state's coping ability due to policy-induced measures that enable it to withstand external shocks, inherent economic vulnerability is indicative of overall economic vulnerability exposure to external shocks. In essence, inherent economic vulnerability is viewed as adding to vulnerability risks while the resilience factor reduces such risks. At any given point in time, actual vulnerability risk is the net effect of overall vulnerability exposure and the resilience factor.

The vulnerability–resilience framework permits the classification of states into four clusters: a best-case scenario (low inherent economic vulnerability and high resilience), a worst-case scenario (high inherent economic vulnerability and low resilience), self-made states (high inherent economic vulnerability and high resilience) and prodigal-son states (low inherent economic vulnerability and low resilience). The ultimate aim in building resilience is to enable the worst-case states to join the ranks of the self-made states and to prevent self-made states from slipping into being worst-case states. Alternatively, resilience efforts also assist states classified as prodigal sons in becoming best-case states and prevent best-case states from slipping into the ranks of prodigal-son states.

Of 29 Commonwealth small states, Table 5.1 shows that 17 have been classified as self-made states, 10 as borderline worst-case states and 2 as prodigal-son states, in accordance with the vulnerability–resilience framework established by Briguglio et al. (2006). Altogether, 14 states need to adopt policy-induced measures that would strengthen their capabilities towards being much more effective in withstanding external shocks. The remaining 17 states have to sustain intervention measures that will enable them to continue strengthening resilience capabilities in the future, rather than becoming complacent, weakening such capabilities and increasing vulnerability risks.

The social aspects of resilience are not only about more favourable characteristics associated with the attributes of individuals, households, communities, nations

Table 5.1 Commonwealth small states by population cluster according to vulnerability–resilience framework

Classification	Worst-case states	Self-made states	Prodigal-son states
High growth-momentum populations	Kiribati Solomon Islands Papua New Guinea Maldives	Belize Vanuatu	Namibia
Quasi-stationary ageing populations	St Vincent and the Grenadines Guyana Seychelles	St Lucia St Kitts and Nevis Barbados Brunei Darussalem Cyprus Malta Mauritius Samoa Tonga	_
Moderate growth-momentum populations	_	Antigua and Barbuda The Bahamas Fiji	_
Ageing populations with high potential for declining size	Jamaica Grenada	Trinidad and Tobago Dominica	_
Moderate growth in high-mortality populations	Lesotho	Botswana	Swaziland

and regions. They are also about more favourable characteristics associated with institutional entities that are shaped by individuals, households, communities, nations and regions, and that are impacted by the lived experience of individuals, households, communities, nations and regions; hence the social aspects of resilience are also about interactions between units, lived experiences of the units and institutional entities. Conceptually, the latter approximates a dynamic process with interdependent temporal connections that are difficult if not impossible to model statistically. Nonetheless, enhanced levels of resilience are critical insofar as they fulfil the role of softening the adverse impact of sudden shocks, or for that matter any other set of factors that are otherwise likely to precipitate vulnerability risks.

Moser (1996) provides a platform for operationalising the social aspects of resilience, claiming that vulnerability is linked to asset ownership – so that a greater proliferation of favourable assets is associated with lower vulnerability risks. She identifies these assets as human capital, productive assets, household relations and social capital. She also makes reference to the intra-household factors including gender-based differentials in household decision-making, their potential contribution to strengthening resilience and their impact on inherent vulnerability exposure within households. This is relevant in the context of social cohesion, which

is in fact culturally determined for different ways across households, communities, nations and regions.

In some household settings, the persistence of traditional gender relations is likely to be due to a collective consciousness that contributes to sustaining order, harmony and happiness for its members. A similar set of outcomes is also likely to prevail in some household settings characterised by a persistence of egalitarian gender-relations, due to members embracing a collective consciousness. Such outcomes may reinforce levels of happiness among members in such settings, a happiness that is deemed to be individual-specific and critical in the thrust towards sustaining social networks that impact manifestations of social cohesion in a positive way. These ideas are consistent with the thought processes informed by the works of Dwyer and Bruce (1988), Haddad and Kanbur (1989), Sen (1990) and the World Bank (1993).

In the context of geographic regions within any given member state, differences in the manifestation of social cohesion as a result of cultural differences reinforce the importance of examining whether similar differences persist in each of the geographic regions. In member states where the differences are similar, pushes toward the attainment of social cohesion are not likely to be as challenging as in member states where there is variation in the manifestation of cultural differences from one geographic region to another. Thus, it is important to examine patterns of variation predicated on culture within each geographical region within member states, as a prerequisite for making decisions about implementing intervention measures to build resilience on the basis of a collective consciousness. Failure to pursue such a strategy may result in the implementation of intervention measures that might not build social cohesion in geographic regions where the consciousness of the population is not consistent with that which prevails for the member state as a whole.

5.3.3 Social cohesion: an imperative for building resilience

Berger-Schmitt (2000, 28) states that 'although social cohesion represents a societal quality it affects the individual quality of life because the elements of social cohesion are perceived and experienced by members of the society'. Social cohesion is therefore integral to promoting a more favourable quality of life for individuals by first of all contributing towards building their resilience capabilities. Berger-Schmitt (2000) cites two principal goals that are associated with notions of attaining greater levels of social cohesion. The first hinges upon reducing disparities, inequalities and social exclusion. These can be operationalised in the context of analytical frameworks that demonstrate the thrust towards greater equality and greater equity pertaining to accessing conditions and opportunities. The second hinges upon strengthening social relations, interactions and ties between individuals, between networks, and between networks and individuals, with all such relationships contributing to facilitate individuals' attitudes and behaviours about sustaining group membership.

While the first deals with social cohesion in the context of pushes towards overcoming disparities, inequalities and exclusion across social groups, the second deals with social cohesion from the standpoint of social capital formation, whether in formal or informal settings. Thus, social capital formation can be investigated further on the basis of data that reflect public participation of individuals in formal and informal organisations, and their identification with specific social networks – for example, family, co-workers and friends – with respect to winning approval and building trust. Altogether, social cohesion is based on a number of aspects that reflect 'strength of social relations, shared values and communities of interpretation, feelings of a common identity and a sense of belonging to the same community, trust among societal members, as well as the extent of inequality and disparities (Wooley 1998; Jenson 1998b, as cited in Berger-Schmitt 2000, 3).

These thoughts are consistent with ideas articulated by Springer (2006) and reinforce the notion that social cohesion thrives on the attainment of levels of homogeneity with regard to the human condition and access to opportunities that elevate the status of humankind. It becomes manifest when such homogeneity transcends different social groups, enhancing greater material well-being, attaining greater levels of equality and promoting options that facilitate greater equity and justice. The OECD (2011) in its report entitled *Perspectives on Global Development 2012: Social Cohesion in a Shifting World* makes reference to three different dimensions of social cohesion: social inclusion, social capital and social mobility. Additionally, the OECD (2011) notes that social cohesion is critical to long-term economic development and that the persistence of social inequalities, exclusion and 'voicelessness' are inimical to sustainable processes. Some of the policy domains for which recommendations have been proffered by OECD (2011) include fiscal tax design, employment, social protection, civic participation, education, gender and migration.

Friedkin (2004) acknowledges the complex nature of social cohesion as a concept, noting that the vast literature has spawned numerous definitions that are difficult to reconcile. Friedkin (2004) cites several studies (Bollen and Hoyle 1990; Drescher et al. 1985; Evans and Jarvis 1980; Hagstrom and Selvin 1965; Mudrack 1989; Piper et al. 1983) and notes that analyses of social cohesion have characterised it as a multidimensional concept or as a latent construct. He states that social cohesion is characterised by a set of processes that involve reciprocal connections between attributes at the individual and group levels and recognises that such processes pose tremendous challenges for statistical analysis. According to Friedkin (2004, 410), 'groups are cohesive when group-level conditions are producing positive membership attitudes and behaviours and when group members' interpersonal interactions are operating to maintain these group-level conditions'. In examining membership attitudes and behaviours that are indicative of social cohesion, Friedkin (2004) makes reference to different individual-level indicators that permit inferences about different aspects of individuals' attraction or attachment to groups.

In order to better explain the processes involved in shaping individuals' attitudes and behaviour in the context of their pushes towards sustaining group membership, Friedkin (2004) alludes to three critical challenges. First, there is a need to embrace appropriate theoretical frameworks explaining group membership attitudes and behaviours, and provide descriptive accounts of the distribution of group members' attitudes and behaviours pertaining to 'belongingness' in their groups. Second, there must be a link between social processes in different networks and the attitudes and behaviours of individuals towards their respective social groups. Third, there ought to be a systemic connection between the different networks and the dynamics of group conditions that influences the perception of members about their tenure within groups. Collectively, overcoming these three challenges is deemed to be critical in operationalising the formation of social capital as a dimension of social cohesion.

In evaluating efforts toward the attainment of social cohesion based upon reducing inequalities and inequities, analytical frameworks operate on three levels. The first recognises individuals as being naturally segregated on the basis of attributes such as geographic location, ethnicity, sex, age, religion, nativity, disability status and wealth status, to name a few. These are considered to be first-level variables and thus deemed to be exogenous. As human characteristics vary across each of these attributes, natural and cultural differences persist in much the same way across time and may harbour instinctive differences that are real, virtually impossible to erase, and not amenable to the smallest prospect of compromise. In societies where such tendencies persist, there is ethnic and religious segregation, and this is even more pronounced when the basis of segregation is predicated upon interactions between two or more of these attributes. In such societies, there could be little or no room for social cohesion, as is the case in countries where racial and religious tensions have brought strife and anarchy to the fore and have heightened vulnerability risks to a maximum.

Notwithstanding such natural and sometimes cultural differences, some level of social cohesion can still be attained in spite of the natural and cultural diversity of some societies. This is because policy prescriptions target second-level attributes that are the outcome variables used to determine variations in resilience capacities and capabilities. These attributes are linked to performance measures related to education; economic activity; health; knowledge, attitudes and practice in the context of HIV/AIDS; fertility outcomes; public participation; wealth accumulation; the use of ICT; social protection; and public order and public safety. For any given performance measure pertaining to a second-level attribute, the closer the observed measures are in spite of variation in the characteristics of the first-level attributes, the greater the push towards social cohesion predicated on the notion of reductions in inequality of condition or access to opportunity across naturally or culturally diverse sets of individuals.

By way of illustration, suppose 35 per cent of the population of Small State A had access to health insurance coverage in 1990, with respective proportions among poor and non-poor persons being 6 per cent and 45 per cent. In 2010, the corresponding proportions increased to 45 per cent, 20 per cent and 55 per cent. Not only has there

been greater access to opportunity with respect to health insurance coverage over the 20-year period, there has also been a push toward greater equality with regard to opportunities for accessing health insurance coverage (a second-level attribute) across two social groups reflecting differences in wealth status (a first-level attribute). In essence, intervention measures may have been associated with such an outcome during the intervening years, removing some of the barriers that permit exclusion between the two groups. Beyond assessing the thrust towards greater equality, one can also assess pushes towards greater equity by computing concentration ratios such as Gini Indexes.

The third set of attributes are tantamount to control variables that are used to determine whether observed patterns of relationships between first-level and second-level variables persist or vary dependent on differences that are characteristic of the third level attribute. In the previous illustration, a control variable might be municipal area. Assuming that there are four disparate municipal areas in Small State A, a highly desirable outcome will be the recurrence in each of the four municipal areas of a pattern that is consistent with that which had occurred for Small State A prior to taking municipal area into account. In other words, one can conclude that, in each of the municipal areas, intervention measures can be associated with the observation of greater equality across the 20-year period.

In sum, this analytical framework is built upon a temporal analysis of outcomes on key performance measures that constitute mechanisms towards gauging improvements in material well-being within social groups, and greater equality across social groups, through the use of rates, proportions, ratios and summary measures such as means and medians. Ultimately, temporal analyses of Gini Indexes and Concentration Ratios permit further assessments of pushes towards greater equity.

5.4 Measuring social aspects of resilience

5.4.1 Determining policy domains to inform social aspects of resilience

Adequate coverage of the social aspects of resilience constitutes the full extent of capabilities assigned to societies as social systems. Such coverage contributes towards fortifying units such as individuals, households, communities, municipal areas, nations and regional blocs to the extent that vulnerability risks due to exposure to domestic or external forces are reduced. Implicitly, input data that throw light on the social aspects of resilience should be collected targeting attributes that pertain to the character of individuals and institutions and be indicative of variable outcomes that can be classified as being more favourable or less favourable. Institutional entities such as the public sector, the private sector, non-governmental organisations, community-based organisations, faith-based organisations and international organisations, together with individuals, are the principal agents of action with respect to the delivery of intervention measures that are established in accordance with policy agendas. Moreover, formal and informal networks mix and combine with individuals and institutions to influence the efficacy of service delivery to empower individuals, institutions and social systems and build resilience.

The individual constitutes the lowest level of data collection for the purpose of developing indicators that make it potentially possible to obtain indicators at higher levels of analysis. Moreover, data collection at the lowest level is important in developing analytical frameworks that hinge upon the ability to establish control using non-experimental data. The latter is critically important at the stage of policy prescription, insofar as policy agendas that appear to be feasible at a higher level may not necessarily be feasible in dealing with the needs of units such as individuals and other potential beneficiaries at lower levels. For example, the collection of data pertaining to different but related characteristics in each of the geographical regions within any given member state will not inform policy prescriptions targeting individuals and households in such a member state. However, the collection of data pertaining to a representative sample of individuals in households will permit further analyses that inform policy prescriptions targeting households and geographic regions within such member states.

Goodwin (2003) identifies five kinds[3] of capital deemed critical to sustainable economic production: financial, natural, produced, human and social capital. Though social development hinges upon all forms of capital, it more directly relies upon capital that is classified as financial, human and social, which collectively consume natural capital and, in addition to consuming produced capital, also produce it.

Social aspects of resilience therefore focus on those attributes that relate to financial, human and social forms of capital. Building and strengthening the social aspects of resilience focus upon establishing policy prescriptions and charting policy agendas consistent with such aspects. For example, agendas associated with wealth creation relate to strengthening social aspects of resilience impacting financial capital, while agendas associated with exposure to education, access to healthcare, and knowledge, attitudes and practices in the context of HIV/AIDS relate specifically to strengthening social aspects of resilience impacting human capital. Exposure to education is also contingent upon being healthy, which is a function of adequate food security coverage and access to healthcare, and both exposure to education and access to healthcare impact an individual's engagement in economic activity, with all three domains impacting the accumulation of wealth. Other related domains such as the use of ICT, social protection and fertility are associated with all of the aforementioned. Policy agendas impacting social protection also impact social aspects of resilience pertaining to public order and public safety.

Social capital contributes to social development and strengthening the social aspects of resilience through strengthening social cohesion. To this end, policy agendas dealing with public participation are necessary, and at the same time have to be supported by other policy agendas with associated targets tantamount to reductions in inequalities, inequities and exclusion. Such agendas can be advocated in each of the aforementioned domains and complement those akin to social cohesion that strengthen social aspects such as trust, shared values, belongingness and solidarity in the context of public participation. Whether in the context of financial, human or social capital, the social aspects of resilience are to be captured at the level of the individual to permit the generation of observations at the individual level. Although

reference has been made to data collection with regard to units representing institutional organs, methodological limitations preclude such data collection. With respect to Commonwealth small states, ten domains are proposed and will inform the derivation of indicators that permit efforts to gauge the strengthening of resilience-building capabilities among individuals as the primary beneficiaries.

5.4.2 Determining variables reflecting the social aspects of resilience

Having proposed ten policy domains that will inform prospective policy agendas for building social aspects of resilience in Commonwealth small states, Table 5.2 lists a number of variables that can be observed among individuals in accordance with relevant indicators. A small number of variables have been listed to reflect observations that can be easily obtained and considered to be valid for the purposes of evaluating outcome. Additionally, the listed variables can be observed directly in keeping with standard operationalisation procedures used in routine national sample surveys. For each of the listed variables, potential data sources, target populations and control variables can be determined. Apart from obtaining appropriate estimates for specific parameters of interest in gauging social aspects of resilience for each Commonwealth small state, further estimates can also be obtained to reflect differences in parameter estimates across different sub-populations of interest.

Table 5.3 shows that the ten policy domains rely on data from nine different sources. The reliance on data is variable dependent on the source. Living standards measurement surveys (LSMS) can potentially be used to collect the requisite data within each of the policy domains. Labour force surveys (LFS) only permit the collection of data pertaining to economic activity and ought to be one of the more routine data collection exercises of national statistical offices. The multiple indicator cluster survey (MICS) is spearheaded by UNICEF and permits data collection pertaining to knowledge, attitudes and practices with respect to HIV/AIDS; fertility; and access to healthcare. Several Commonwealth small states have conducted MICS under the auspices of UNICEF. Insofar as the MICS strives to facilitate institutional strengthening in such states, prospects are good for building capabilities to continue collecting such data nationally, provided that the political and technical will remain alive.

Fewer domains rely on data collected from other sources such as decennial population census-taking, sexual and reproductive health surveys (SRHS), national victimisation surveys (NVS), national literacy surveys (NLS) and administrative data sources such as the police and the International Telecommunications Union (ITU). Nonetheless, NVS, NLS and SRHS are critical in enhancing prospects for collecting valid data pertaining to crime victimisation rates, literacy, and sexual and reproductive health (including HIV/AIDS and fertility outcomes). In many small states, constraints predicated upon the availability of financial constraints and innate technical capabilities inhibit prospects for such surveys to be considered despite their importance. It should be noted, however, that these surveys are not expected to be annual, but rather can be rotated biennially and each repeated every five years as a means of achieving some measure of efficiency. Decennial census-taking and administrative data from the police and the ITU constitute routine data collection

Table 5.2 Principal dependent variables by policy domain

Policy domain	Principal dependent variable
Exposure to education	Adult literacy
	Early childhood care and education
	Successful completion of secondary education
	Successful completion of tertiary education
Access to health treatment	Access to health insurance coverage
	Visit to health institution
	Visit to medical doctor
	Exposure to stressors
	Postnatal care of infants
	Child health
	Child nutrition
HIV/AIDS	Knowledge of HIV/AIDS prevention
	Attitudes toward discrimination
	Risky sex behaviour
Female fertility[4]	Children ever born alive
	Ideal family size
Public order/public safety	Victim of violent crime
	Victim of intra-familial violence
	Use of dangerous substances (including alcohol and tobacco)
Accumulation of wealth	Entrepreneurial starts
	Business failure
	Access to credit
	Income/expenditure
	Poverty status
ICT	Internet usage
	Television viewing
	Listening to radio
Economic activity	Unemployed status
	Participation in the labour force
	Self-employment status
	Employed in agriculture
	Employed in unskilled labour
	Employed in skilled labour
	Employed in professional work
	Employed in decent work
Public participation	Civic engagement
	Civic participation
	Political participation
	Political voice
Social protection	Receipt of benefits – education, medical, unemployment, housing, meals
	Receipt of pension
	Receipt of remittances
	Receipt of counselling services – medical and/or social problems

Table 5.3 Locating data collection sources

Domains	LSMS	LFS	MICS	SRHS	NVS	NLS	Pop Cen	Police	ITU
Education	X					X	X		
Healthcare	X		X						
Economic activity		X							
Wealth accumulation	X								
Social protection	X								
Public participation	X								
HIV/AIDS			X	X					
ICT	X								X
Fertility	X		X	X			X		
Public order/safety					X			X	

Note: LSMS - Living Standards Measurement Surveys, LFS - Labour Force Surveys, MICS - Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, SRHS - Sexual and Reproductive Health Surveys, NVS - National Victimization Surveys, NLS - National Literacy Surveys, Pop. Cen - Population Census, ITU - International Telecommunications Union

exercises that facilitate the need for data for variables pertaining to education, violent crime and ICT.

5.5 Shaping policy agendas: some preliminary considerations

Population size and age composition have implications for the thrust of future policy interventions and for building resilience. The ability of a country to respond to shocks is dependent on the process of ageing, the extent to which youth populations will continue to grow, the extent to which elderly populations and their share in overall populations will continue to grow, and whether or not overall population sizes would continue to grow or decline. Therefore, a review of population projections is a critical prerequisite for determining the prospects of future population sizes and dynamics based on current knowledge of key demographic components of population change and assumptions about their prospective changes. This is pursued in the context of 31 small states that are members of the Commonwealth and pivotal to this study, and provides heuristic insights about prospective policy prescriptions. These policy prescriptions based on changes in prospective age compositions of populations are classified in accordance with five different trajectories of population growth. Such trajectories are consistent with five population clusters that are to be presented for the purposes of this study.

The terminal year of the population projections is 2050. This is consistent with a projection horizon that is sufficiently long to permit reliable assessments of trajectories pertaining to prospective attributes of the populations of Commonwealth member states, in particular, population size and age composition. These changes have implications for the thrust of future policy interventions and their implications for building resilience dependent population dynamics that impact demographic ageing and population size. In essence, future domains for policy interventions are likely to

be similar within each of the five population clusters, bearing in mind differences that will be unique to specific member states.

It is also worth noting that past and current levels of fertility, mortality and migration inform assumptions about prospective changes in levels of fertility, mortality and migration. These in turn have implications for shaping policy prescriptions, which ought to be designed to attain desirable outcomes with respect to trends pertaining to each of the three components of population change. This study is predicated on the notion that these components – together with their implications for changes in population size, population growth rates and the age composition of populations – do influence in large measure the direct and indirect policies that should be directed towards building resilience. Such policies are realised through the implementation of formalised programmes with performance objectives that are operationalised in terms of key indicators reflecting the social aspects of resilience at the level of individuals.

5.6 Towards policy agendas: small states in the Commonwealth

5.6.1 A population perspective

Insofar as this study deals with attainment of social cohesion as a means of building resilience, the basic unit of analysis ought to be individual members of the populations of Commonwealth small states. Moreover, the philosophical outlook underlying the formulation of policy prescriptions in this study hinges upon a preventive model that recognises changing population dynamics as critical levers for implementing preventive measures that modify evolutionary processes in ways that will prevent the recurrence of past undesirable outcomes and foster the onset of outcomes that are deemed to be more desirable, thus constituting improvements – for example, greater resilience – compared with the past. In essence, the preventive model ought to elevate desired characteristics of human existence through prevention mechanisms that reduce prospects of the recurrence of less desirable characteristics of human existence.

It is therefore imperative that population projections provide heuristic insights about future population dynamics. Such dynamics should inform the focus, formulation and implementation strategies of policies and their corresponding intervention measures, which ought to be directed differentially to the same set of individuals with the passage of time. The latter is due principally as responses to changes in individuals' life stage attitudes, roles, expectations, responses, challenges, conditions and opportunities. These correspond to notions of period and cohort effects, which are often overlooked in the policy discourse but critical in the articulation of the preventive model.

In dealing with different human characteristics that are manifestations of attributes reflecting social aspects of resilience, the focus is primarily on period outcomes. Such outcomes are based on the life experiences and actions of specific cohorts of actors and impact exposure to vulnerability risks, whether individually in determining their own destiny or collectively to determine the destiny of institutions and nations.

Interestingly, the preventive model draws on future sensibilities about period outcomes pertaining to human characteristics that are manifestations of different social aspects of resilience at different time points/periods in the future. However, the beneficiaries of such outcomes will undoubtedly be emergent cohorts of players, who will have come of age to continue shaping development process in a manner that will continue reducing vulnerability risks based upon the attainment of stronger resilience capabilities.

5.6.2 Determining the population clusters

Drawing on demographic data, especially demographic projections, Commonwealth member states have been classified according to five population clusters. The projections are obtained from the databases of the United Nations Population Prospects – 2012 Revision, and are consistent with the medium assumptions for the member states under review. Data summarising ageing dynamics and the socio-economic characteristics of Commonwealth member states are also presented as a means of contextualising the discussions.

Of the 53 Commonwealth member states, this study identifies 31 as small states. The majority of these states have population sizes below 1.5 million. However, for those states that have larger population sizes, their land area or income attributes render them exposed to similar vagaries to those with population sizes below 1.5 million. The 31 member states have also been classified according to five population clusters, which have been determined on the basis of projected population growth trajectories and implications for age composition in projected populations. The typology reflecting the population clusters identified to classify member states is as follows:

- high growth-momentum populations;
- moderate growth-momentum populations;
- moderate growth in high-mortality populations;
- ageing populations with high potential for declining size; and
- quasi-stationary ageing populations.

Table 5.4 shows that the member states are drawn from five major regions, namely Africa (six member states); Asia (two member states); Europe (two member states); Latin America and the Caribbean (twelve member states); and the Pacific (nine member states).

Twenty-five (25) of the 31 member states have populations that are less than 1.5 million, which poses a number of challenges linked to the attainment of critical masses and the disadvantages of being unable to capitalise on economies of scale. The remaining six (6) member states – Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho and Swaziland – have population sizes in excess of 1.5 million each, but are characterised by a number of challenges that epitomise states exposed to high inherent vulnerability exposure in the face of compromised resilience levels. In essence, these states are plagued with at least one of the following challenges:

Table 5.4 Commonwealth small states by region and population cluster

Classification	Africa	Asia	Europe	Latin America and the Caribbean	Pacific	All states
Moderate growth-momentum populations	–	–	–	2	1	3
Quasi-stationary ageing populations	2	1	2	5	3	13
High growth-momentum populations	1	1	–	1	5	8
Ageing populations with high potential for declining size	–	–	–	4	–	4
Moderate growth in high-mortality populations	3	–	–	–	–	3
Total	**6**	**2**	**2**	**12**	**9**	**31**

- dependence on a narrow range of exports;
- high transportation costs due to insularity and remoteness;
- dependence on strategic imports such as food and fuel;
- susceptibility to natural disasters;
- decline in global trade and investment;
- lack of readily available infrastructure for investors and trade partners; and/or
- limited capacity to harness growth opportunities.

The above traits reflect facets of economic and environmental vulnerabilities that result in high inherent vulnerability exposure in each of the seven member states.

5.6.3 Characteristic features and policy agendas of the population clusters

The five population clusters constitute a platform for gauging prospective changes with respect to critical demographic and socio-economic attributes that are integral to initiatives for attaining greater levels of social cohesion and, especially, strengthening social attributes of resilience. From the standpoint of population dynamics, ageing dynamics and socioeconomic character, each of the five population clusters reflects clear and unique trajectories for informing policy agendas to positively impact the attainment of social cohesion and, by extension, stronger resilience capabilities. Table 5.5 provides a classification of the member states according to the five population clusters.

Table 5.5 Commonwealth small states by population cluster

Classification	Country examples
Moderate growth-momentum populations	Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Fiji Islands
Quasi-stationary ageing populations	Barbados, Guyana, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu, Cyprus, Malta, Mauritius, Seychelles, Brunei Darussalam
High growth-momentum populations	Belize, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Maldives, Namibia
Ageing populations with high potential for declining size	Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago
Moderate growth in high-mortality populations	Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland

High growth-momentum populations

This cluster consists of member states from four of the five regions: Latin America and the Caribbean, the Pacific, Africa and Asia. For all of the member states, gross disparities are evident with regard to the size of their respective land areas, especially when one considers the kind of variation across Nauru, Maldives, Belize, Papua New Guinea and Namibia. The vast majority of the member states have very small populations of fewer than one million persons, exceptions being Papua New Guinea and Namibia. Though small, these populations have exhibited phenomenal increases in their sizes and are highly likely to sustain similar upward trends, with no prospect of declining population size by 2050. The large population size and phenomenal growth trajectories that are characteristic of Papua New Guinea ring alarm bells.

Within this cluster, the most favourable mortality experiences for populations have been evident in Belize, the only Caribbean member state; Vanuatu in the Pacific; and Maldives in Asia. Mortality experiences are less favourable in the four remaining Pacific member states – Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Nauru and Solomon Islands – and in an African member state – Namibia. All of the member states have high fertility levels that are well above the replacement fertility level and are thus fuelling population growth. Despite evidence of ageing, which has become a near-universal phenomenon, the populations in all of these member states are inherently young and highly likely to be much the same way by 2025 and beyond.

Generally speaking, all of the member states can be classified as low-income states. Moreover, there appear to be noteworthy inequities in the distribution of income, especially in Namibia. With respect to internet use, all of the member states, with the exception of Nauru, are characterised by low internet use; this outcome is most striking in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands.

The common denominator in this cluster of member states is the extraordinary rate of population growth and persistent increase in their population sizes, and that they will continue to have predominantly young populations. Targeting the overwhelmingly large populations of children, youth and young adults is a key

strategy in setting social policy agendas that are geared towards strengthening social attributes of resilience in the future. Such populations are the engines that will sustain and build these economies and societies over the next half of a century. To this end, policy prescription and formulation should include four principal domains: exposure to quality education; access to healthcare; fertility reduction; and enhanced economic activity, including access to decent work.

Moderate growth-momentum populations

This cluster consists of three member states from two regions: Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Pacific. The three member states – Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas and Fiji Islands – have population sizes and physical land areas that are quite variable. In each of the three member states, populations are characterised by mortality experiences that are favourable. This is especially true for females in Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas and Fiji. Males, however, have less favourable experiences than females in the three member states, this being mostly so in the case of Fiji. Except for Fiji, the remaining member states have fertility levels that are at or below replacement level. Migration is the engine of moderate growth momentum in The Bahamas and Antigua and Barbuda. Ageing populations abound in each of the three member states, with the pace of ageing being slowest in Fiji. There is noteworthy variation in income levels across the three member states. There also appears to be growing internet use in each of the three member states and closure of the gap of internet use among the member states.

The populations of this cluster of member states have an in-built growth momentum that is fuelled by positive migration flows in the cases of Antigua and Barbuda and The Bahamas. Had their population fortunes been left solely to fertility and mortality dynamics, the three member states would experience much slower growth or would be threatened by declining population sizes in later decades. Given current trajectories, however, the latter does not appear to be likely by 2050. Rather, all of the populations are expected to increase by a magnitude of 1.3 between 2013 and 2050. In accordance with the vulnerability–resilience framework (Briguglio 2014), the three member states are classified as 'self-made' states having high inherent vulnerability exposure and high resilience. This suggests that they have had a fairly satisfactory track record with regard to building resilience in traditional domains such as education, healthcare and social protection.

Notwithstanding such achievements, novel areas for policy intervention may include the promotion of opportunities for greater public participation for youth and the elderly, and mechanisms that build social cohesion given the diverse character of populations such as those in Antigua and Barbuda and The Bahamas where differences may persist between the conditions, opportunities and experiences of migrant and native sub-populations. Reconciling such differences through policies designed to achieve greater equality and equity in policy domains, such as in the accumulation of wealth and economic activity including access to decent work, is a worthy goal for the member states in this cluster. Dealing with the threat of xenophobia in such settings is also a worthy venture to help foster social cohesion.

The promotion of greater public participation ensures that the rights and desires of young persons continue to be represented in an emergent world where they may eventually be outnumbered. In this cluster, the indicators are that greater longevity will swell the ranks of the elderly, who need to be reassured of their rights and freedom in accordance with pushes towards greater social cohesion that thrives on greater equality and greater equity prevailing irrespective of age. To this end, the elderly need to be empowered through the promotion of greater public participation.

Moderate growth in high-mortality populations

This cluster consists of three member states from the African continent: Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. The three member states have population sizes that are similar, ranging between one million and three million. All of the three populations are characterised by less favourable mortality experiences as a result of high child mortality and unusually high adult mortality, both due to HIV/AIDS. Fertility is also high, being well above replacement and fuelling population growth in the face of losses due to high mortality. Though youthful, the populations contain relatively large proportions of elderly persons due to the relatively high mortality in younger adult life.

There is substantial variation in income levels, with Botswana having higher income levels than in Lesotho or Swaziland. In Swaziland, there is evidence of gross inequity surrounding the distribution of income. There are also gross disparities in physical land area, with Botswana covering a much larger land area than Lesotho or Swaziland. Both Swaziland and Lesotho are landlocked – a factor which adds to their high inherent economic vulnerability exposure. Each of the three member states has a low prevalence of internet use.

The common denominator in this cluster of member states is the extraordinary rate of population growth and persistent increase in their population sizes, and that they will continue to have predominantly young populations. Not surprisingly, targeting for the purpose of setting policy agendas will have similar consequences as in the case of the 'high growth-momentum populations', with the overwhelmingly large populations of children, youth and young adults being central to setting social policy agendas that are geared towards strengthening resilience capabilities in the future. For the same reasons as indicated earlier, policy prescription and formulation should include four principal domains: exposure to quality education; access to healthcare; fertility reduction; and enhanced economic activity, including access to decent work.

A second factor influencing intervention measures to be adopted is the high adult mortality due to HIV/AIDS. This hinges upon the establishment of policy prescriptions with goals seeking to reduce incidence rates for HIV, modify sexual practices, increase knowledge about HIV/AIDS and reduce discriminatory behaviour. Intervention measures associated with such policy prescriptions should target the overwhelmingly large number of adolescents and youth in the populations of the three member states in this cluster. In addressing the different goals, intervention measures should recognise differences in outcomes that prevail across domains predicated upon geographic location, wealth status and age, and hence the need to reduce inequalities

and inequities as means toward achieving greater social cohesion, while at the same time achieving more favourable outcomes for the respective populations being targeted.

In this cluster, there is evidence of aged populations, insofar as more than 7 per cent of national populations are observed to be aged 65 years or older. In Botswana, this proportion is as high as 11 per cent and points to the significance of policy prescriptions targeting access to healthcare, social protection and the promotion of greater public participation.

Ageing populations with high potential for declining size

This cluster best characterises the experience of the populations in four Caribbean member states: Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. The two smaller states have population sizes that do not exceed 110,000 and are less likely to do so in the future. The two larger states – Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago – have population sizes exceeding two million and one million respectively. There are also disparities in physical land area, with Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago being substantially larger than Dominica and Grenada. Population change dynamics suggest that the sizes of these two populations will peak and begin to decline in the face of population ageing.

In all four member states, the populations are characterised by favourable mortality experiences, despite observations pointing to less favourable experiences among male populations in Trinidad and Tobago. All of the member states have low fertility levels, which are either at or below replacement level and retarding population growth. Moreover, they have all been characterised by population losses due to net migration. In all four states there is clear evidence of population ageing, resulting in markedly greater concentrations of older persons in their respective populations with the passage of time.

There are disparities in income levels across the four member states with Trinidad and Tobago having a notably higher income level than each of the other member states. In Jamaica, however, the available evidence is consistent with noteworthy inequities in the distribution of income. Internet use is more prevalent in Dominica and Trinidad and Tobago than it is in Grenada and Jamaica.

For the four member states within this cluster, population sizes are highly likely to decline well before 2050. These member states have fertility levels at or below the replacement level, are ageing rapidly and have been characterised by net losses due to migration. Additionally, the age structure of populations in these member states is changing rapidly – to the extent that persons 65 years or older will account for an increasingly larger share of the population, while persons under 15 years will account for an increasingly smaller share. Policy agendas targeting children and youth on one hand, and the elderly on the other, are critical options for these four member states. For children and youth, policies should set goals that focus on greater exposure to education at all levels; greater access to healthcare; greater food security awareness and coverage; greater levels of social protection, particularly in the context of living in

dangerous circumstances; and greater public participation. For young adults, policies should set goals focusing on greater wealth accumulation; greater participation in economic activity; greater public participation; and greater mechanisms for social protection. For the elderly, policy agendas should be directed towards greater public participation, greater social protection and greater access to healthcare.

Whether in the context of geographic region, gender, wealth status, disability status, nativity, ethnicity or other socio-economic background characteristics, policy agendas should also set goals to achieve greater equality and equity regarding the allocation of the abovementioned human needs. Through these means, policy agendas assist in satisfying the overarching goal of strengthening resilience through the attainment of greater social cohesion. Such sensibilities also prevail when one reflects upon observed trends of marked reductions in fertility at national levels, despite little or no reduction among women in lower-wealth status groups.

This is evident in member states such as Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, where reductions in the number of live births annually are expected during the next three decades in response to declining fertility levels. It also implies that increasingly larger proportions of children and youth are likely to be living in household settings where wealth status is compromised and this could impact negatively on their access to conditions and opportunities that can enhance their life chances. This has deleterious implications for these children and youth in the context of their transition to adulthood, their worthwhile engagement in society and the economy, and the overall competitiveness of these member states over the next three decades. For these member states, the public sector and other critical organs of civil society therefore have obligations to ensure the well-being of these youth populations, through fulfilling the mandates set by policy prescriptions designed to permit greater equality and equity with respect to exposure to quality education at all levels, social protection, access to healthcare and greater food security coverage catering to the needs of young children in lower-wealth status groups.

Quasi-stationary ageing populations

This is the largest cluster, consisting of 13 member states from all of the five regions. Most of the member states have small population sizes not exceeding 500,000, exceptions being Guyana, Cyprus and Mauritius. Population sizes have increased very slowly and, if they have not peaked, are likely to peak before beginning to decline at a slow pace. In essence, these population sizes will stay fairly static for a sustained period. For all of the states, there are gross disparities in physical land area when one compares Tuvalu, Cyprus and Guyana.

For females, favourable mortality experiences are generally evident for member states except for Guyana and Tuvalu, where less favourable mortality experiences are characteristic of females. In Seychelles, less favourable experiences were noted among males. With the exception of Guyana, the small states from Africa, Asia, Europe and the Caribbean have near replacement or below replacement fertility levels. In contrast, the three small states from the Pacific – Tonga, Samoa and Tuvalu –

have high fertility levels. All of the states in this cluster have ageing populations, although Guyana and the states in the Pacific region will continue to have very young populations.

Across the member states, there is substantial variability in income levels, the highest being in Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Malta and Seychelles. In Seychelles, the relevant data are indicative of noteworthy inequities in the distribution of income. Lowest-income levels persist among Pacific member states, while Caribbean member states are between the two extremes. Internet use is variable within and across the regions, with consistently higher use being evident in the two European member states (Malta and Cyprus), in Barbados and St Kitts and Nevis in the Caribbean, and in Brunei Darussalam. In contrast, low use is evident in the three member states from the Pacific region (Tonga, Samoa and Tuvalu) and the two African member states (Mauritius and Seychelles).

The sizes of the populations for this cluster of member states are relatively small and exhibit small growth for two principal reasons. For member states such as Barbados, Malta, Cyprus and Brunei Darussalam, gains from net migration have facilitated modest population growth, notwithstanding the fact that they are all characterised by below replacement fertility. For Guyana, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Seychelles, fertility levels are sustained above replacement level and fuel modest population growth – due to high net loss as a result of migration in the case of Guyana and population size dynamics in the cases of Seychelles and the three Pacific member states. For St Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, St Vincent and the Grenadines, and Mauritius, fertility levels are at or below the replacement level to the extent that population sizes are likely to stabilise and eventually decline as ageing processes gain momentum.

This cluster contains three sets of member states that should engage policy agendas consistent with other aforementioned clusters. Member states such as Barbados, Malta, Cyprus and Brunei Darussalam should embrace policy agendas consistent with moderate growth-momentum populations. In contrast, Guyana, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Seychelles should embrace policy agendas consistent with high growth-momentum populations. The third set of member states, consisting of St Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, St Vincent and the Grenadines, and Mauritius, should embrace policy agendas consistent with ageing populations with high potential for decline.

5.7 Summarising policy agendas and goals

For the different population clusters, a host of prescriptions have been forthcoming with respect to policy agendas targeting specific sub-populations predicated upon a preventive model for promoting social development (see Appendix 5.2). The delivery of intervention measures associated with specific policy agendas is likely to be the responsibility of a host of stakeholder groups including the public sector, the private sector, non-government organisations, community-based organisations, faith-based organisations and international organisations, each channelling their efforts through a host of social institutions including the family, the education system, communication systems, regulatory systems, legal systems, systems for resource

allocation, and cultural and value systems to reach beneficiaries at the individual level. Of course, the impact of their interventions is a function of the robustness and innate resilience that shape the character of stakeholders and social institutions, provided that the will, the appropriate resources and the technology are also all available to create the desired impact on beneficiaries.

As far as possible, techniques akin to process evaluation provide bases for undertaking feasible intervention strategies, and, to the extent that such intervention strategies are pursued in accordance with appropriate standards for monitoring outcomes and evaluating impact, the desired impact can become manifest among beneficiaries. Advancing social development through strengthening social aspects of resilience also impacts stakeholder groups and social institutions positively, insofar as the beneficiaries are also the primary actors among stakeholders and within social institutions. Within the various population clusters, beneficiaries in the respective member states are drawn from children, youth, young adults and the elderly in the main. Some are also classified according to their nativity status, wealth status, sex, geographic region or other background socio-economic characteristic in order to further advance efforts to strengthen resilience capabilities through the attainment of greater social cohesion.

With respect to domains pertaining to education, healthcare and economic activity, goals should be established to ensure that national-level magnitudes are indicative of more favourable conditions, experiences, opportunities, responses and orientations, among other desired characteristics of key national attributes. In addition, within the context of outcomes at sub-national levels or at the level of sub-populations, there should be evidence of the attainment of greater equality and greater equity with regard to the allocation of conditions, experiences, opportunities, responses and orientations, among other desired characteristics due to designated intervention measures.

From the standpoint of children's well-being, health, education and nutrition are critical factors influencing variations in status. In fact, children's educational characteristics are often predicated upon their health and nutrition, both of which are functions of background characteristics such as the wealth status of their households. The attainment of more favourable educational characteristics is positively associated with human attributes in later stages of their lives. These attributes include orientations towards public participation, internet usage, economic activity and the accumulation of wealth. In contrast, sub-populations of women with less favourable educational characteristics are more likely to have higher lifetime fertility and a greater reliance on social protection to cover the human needs of their children. In member states that have losses due to net migration, remittances become a critical means through which social protection can fill the void created by the inability of other stakeholder groups to compensate for the absence of material resources to meet the needs of children living in difficult circumstances.

For adolescents, youth and young adults, a different configuration of policy options prevails, with policy agendas specifically targeting HIV/AIDS as a domain of interest for intervention. Though this was specifically featured in the context of 'moderate growth in high-mortality populations', it may have some relevance in the context

of country-specific requirements of member states belonging to the remaining four clusters. In such cases, intervention measures should seek to positively modify attitudes and behaviours that precipitate risky sexual behaviours among adolescents, youth and young adults. Moreover, pushes towards expanding awareness of and knowledge about HIV/AIDS and promoting more positive attitudes that would reduce discriminatory behaviour are also deemed to be appropriate intervention measures.

Youth and young adults also stand to benefit from exposure to intervention measures designed to increase exposure to adult literacy programmes and proportions of youth completing secondary and tertiary schooling. These intervention measures are also connected to increased participation in economic activity and prospects for the accumulation of wealth, albeit dynamic processes with change becoming manifest with the passage of time. For youth and young adults, satisfying the need for social protection also has implications for reinforcing conformity and preventing youth and young adults from following deviant careers.[5] To this end, it is clear that policy agendas associated with social protection are also connected to those associated with public order and public safety. Policy agendas linked to increasing public participation among youth and young adults are warranted, especially among member states in clusters where youth populations are becoming less predominant as a result of population dynamics. Such agendas are especially important in such settings to ensure that youth voices prevail to represent the rights and interests of youth and young adults in the face of declining proportions and numbers in populations.

Population ageing is a universal phenomenon, notwithstanding the fact that the pace is much faster in some member states than in others. Such a phenomenon reinforces the significance of policy agendas targeting growing elderly populations and declining youth populations. Having addressed policy agendas needed for youth populations, policy agendas that cater to the needs of growing elderly populations should also be identified. Such agendas target policy domains such as health, wealth accumulation, social protection and public participation. Much of societies' wealth lies in the wisdom and experiences of elder citizens, who possess institutional and lifelong knowledge that ought to be transmitted inter-generationally. The onus therefore is upon stakeholders to preserve the health and longevity of life of such citizens, as their knowledge and experience are critical to resilience-building initiatives targeting prospective generations.

Social protection, whether through the provision of national health insurance coverage, social insurance coverage or even remittances from children and other relatives abroad, can fill a void providing elderly citizens with access to quality health services or enabling them to meet their nutritional needs. Social protection of the elderly is also tied to monitoring their wealth status as a means towards levelling playing fields as much as possible through a reliance on intervention measures status designed to promote greater equality and equity in the allocation of wealth. Policy agendas targeting public participation among the elderly not only give them a voice to showcase their interests and safeguard their rights, but also present them with

opportunities to contribute towards building resilience among children or youth through their engagement in voluntary services and inter-generational exchanges that are philanthropic in nature.

The moderate growth-momentum populations constitute a cluster of member states that have experienced population growth fuelled by gains through net migration. In such countries, it has been suggested that strengthening resilience capabilities can be achieved through strategies that intensify levels of social cohesion – for example, reducing inequalities and inequities that otherwise prevail dependent upon the nativity status of the populations in those member states. In some instances, natives have more favourable experiences, but there may also be instances when it is immigrants who have more favourable experiences. These differences have to be managed through iterative processes of monitoring and pursuing intervention measures to facilitate greater equality and equity across nativity status. This is especially warranted when there is evidence of more favourable outcomes with the passage of time, irrespective of nativity status, particularly in the context of policy domains such as wealth accumulation, economic activity, education, health and social protection.

5.8 Concluding remarks

This study that forms the basis of this chapter is one of a number of other studies focusing on the resilience side of the coin. It is primarily focused on critically assessing the nature and scope of the social aspects of resilience building, as a means of facilitating the social development component of resilience. Other parallel studies have also been undertaken with similar aims in the context of building resilience capabilities associated with environmental management, good governance and economic aspects.

This chapter has provided a systematic framework for identifying the social aspects of resilience building. It has drawn on different forms of capital in order to pinpoint policy domains for the social aspects, each of which has numerous dimensions as reflected in the variables that have been identified. The social aspects are critical insofar as they provide a basis for shaping policy agendas geared towards stimulating social development through strengthening resilience and increasing levels of social cohesion. The chapter establishes five population clusters, which classify Commonwealth small states according to key demographic and socio-economic characteristics that inform prospective sets of cluster-specific policy agendas. The shaping of the policy agendas has been informed by a preventive model, which embraces future sensibilities as critical to problem solving that is predicated on the principles of systematic evaluation and, as such, is data driven.

Systematic evaluation hinges upon an appreciation of the theoretical connections between intervention measures and variation in outcomes associated with any given social aspect of resilience. It thrives upon evidence-informed policy formulation objectives with realistic performance targets, and implementation strategies that

adhere to appropriate monitoring standards. Additionally, the availability of valid data and presence technical skills, which would permit temporal analyses of the critical substantive issues, are important inputs that have to be considered given the insights that are to be gleaned from the study. Notwithstanding these requirements, there appear to be obvious gaps that have to be overcome. Rather than point to the gaps, the rest of the chapter will focus on the inputs that are deemed critical to overcome the gaps.

First, there is a need to review the list of proposed variables and indicators to ensure that routine sample surveys and other administrative data collection apparatus continue to produce the requisite data that are needed to permit efforts to track variation in social attributes. Moreover, there is a need to promote, encourage and facilitate training that would greatly contribute to the development of expertise in high-end statistical analysis and technical analyses akin to monitoring and evaluation. This could be a daunting challenge in small states, due to the lack of a critical mass.

Policy analysts and development specialists often articulate views about action to improve the circumstances of humankind. In so doing, they are frequently oblivious to the robust statistical requirements that are essential for contesting such views, largely as a result of their ignorance of statistical processes and, in particular, the intricacies of statistical analysis. In general, many policy analysts and development specialists overlook the technical requirements that inform inevitable methodological and statistical challenges, which have to be entertained and sustained in order to effectively fulfil the production of statistics that serve the needs of development programmes. On the other end, there are also official statisticians who lack an appreciation for sociological theory, development theory and research design issues. Thus, there is a need to ensure that official statisticians develop greater awareness and higher levels of competence in such areas to ensure that sufficiently valid data are produced.

Finally, many small states are beset with serious financial constraints, which result in little or no priority being given to sustaining statistical data collection and formal research activities. This chapter outlines a set of initiatives that can be realised only if greater priority is given to both activities.

Notes

1 Acculturation as a process of socialization into a new culture (Spencer, 1985:105). It can also be described as the outcome of intergroup contact in which the minority group adopts the culture of the dominant group (Brinkerhoff and White (1991:257).

2 Enculturation as a "process by which a society's culture is transmitted from one generation to the next" Haviland (1974:330)

3 According to Goodwin (2003,1), 'Financial capital facilitates economic production, though it is not itself productive, referring to a system of ownership or control of physical capital. Natural capital is made up of the resources and ecosystem services of the natural world. Produced capital consists of physical assets generated by applying human productive activities to natural capital and capable of providing a flow of goods or services. Human capital refers to the productive capacities of an individual, both inherited and acquired through education and training. Social capital, the most controversial and hardest to measure, consists of a stock of trust, mutual understanding, shared values and socially held knowledge.'

4 Lifetime reproductive experience of women.
5 Refers to careers that place them at greater risk of confrontation with law enforcement officials.

References

Barbier, EB (1987), 'The concept of sustainable economic development', *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 14 No. 2, 101–10.

Berger-Schmitt, R (2000), 'Social cohesion as an aspect of the quality of societies: concept and measurement', EuReporting Working Paper No. 14, Centre for Survey Research and Methodology, Mannheim.

Bollen, KA and RH Hoyle (1990), 'Perceived cohesion: a conceptual and empirical examination', *Social Forces*, Vol. 69, 479–504.

Briguglio, L, G Cordina, N Farrugia and S Vella (2006), 'Conceptualizing and measuring economic resilience', in Briguglio, L, G Cordina and E Kisanga (Eds.), *Building the Economic Resilience of Small States*, Islands and Small States Institute, Malta and Commonwealth Secretariat, London, England, 265–88.

Briguglio, L, G Cordina, N Farrugia and S Vella (2009), 'Economic vulnerability and resilience: Concepts and measurements', *Oxford Development Studies*, Vol. 37 (3), 229–247.

Brinkerhoff, DB and LK White (1991) *Sociology* – Third Edition, West Publishing Company.

Chambers, R and GR Conway (1991), 'Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century', IDS Discussion Paper 296.

Chand, S (2006), 'Developing resilience through labour mobility in micro-states', in Briguglio, L, G Cordina and E Kisanga (Eds.), *Building the Economic Resilience of Small States*, Islands and Small States Institute, Malta and Commonwealth Secretariat, London, England, 59–76.

Commonwealth Secretariat (1997), *A Future for Small States: Overcoming Vulnerability*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Commonwealth Secretariat (1985), *Vulnerability: Small States in the Global Society*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Drescher, S, G Burlingame and A Fuhriman (1985), 'Cohesion: an odyssey in empirical understanding', *Small Group Behaviour*, Vol. 16, 3–30.

Dwyer, D and J Bruce (Eds.), (1988), *A Home Divided: Women and Income in the Third World*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Evans, NJ and PA Jarvis (1980), 'Group cohesion: a review and re-evaluation', *Small Group Behaviour*, Vol. 11, 359–70.

Friedkin, NE (2004), 'Social cohesion', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 30, 409–25.

Goodwin, NR (2003), 'Five kinds of capital: useful concepts for sustainable development', *Global Development and Environment Institute*, Working Paper No. 03–07.

Haddad, L and R Kanbur (1989), 'How serious is the neglect of intra-household inequality?', Policy Research Working Paper 296, World Bank Research Advisory Staff, Washington, DC.

Hagstrom, WO and HC Selvin (1965), 'Two dimensions of cohesiveness in small groups', *Sociometry*, Vol. 28, 30–43.

Haviland, and A William (1974) *Anthropology* – 5th Edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Jenson, J (1998b), 'Mapping social cohesion: the state of Canadian research', Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) Study No. F/03, Ottawa, available at: www.cccg.umontreal.ca/pdf/CPRN/CPRN_F03.pdf (accessed 7 August 2014).

Lele, SM (1991), 'Sustainable development: a critical review', *World Development*, Vol. 19 No. 6, 607–21.

Moser, CO (1996), *Confronting Crisis: A Comparative Study of Household Responses to Poverty and Vulnerability in Four Poor Urban Communities*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Mudrack, PE (1989), 'Defining group cohesiveness: a legacy of confusion', *Small Group Behaviour*, Vol. 20, 37–49.

OECD (2011) *Perspectives on Global Development 2012: Social Cohesion in a Shifting World*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Piper, W, M Marrache, R Lacroix, A Richardson and B Jones (1983), 'Cohesion as a basic bond in groups', *Human Relations*, Vol. 36, 93–108.

Sen, A (1990), 'Gender and co-operative conflicts', in Tinker, I (Ed.), *Persistent Inequalities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Spencer, M (1985), *Foundations of Modern Sociology,* Canadian Fourth Edition, Prentice Hall, Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.

Springer, C (2006), 'Economic resilience and social cohesion: the case of small island states in the Eastern Caribbean', in Briguglio, L, G Cordina and E Kisanga (Eds.), *Building the Economic Resilience of Small States*, Islands and Small States Institute, Malta and Commonwealth Secretariat, London, England, 196–211.

St Bernard, G (2007), 'Measuring social vulnerability in Caribbean states', paper presented at 8th SALISES Annual Conference: Crisis, Chaos and Change – Caribbean Development Challenges in the 21st Century.

St Bernard, G (2003), 'Towards the construction of a social vulnerability index: theoretical and methodological considerations', paper submitted for publication in the *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.

Sutton, PK and A Payne (1993) 'Lilliput Under Threat: The Security Problems of Small Island and Enclave Developing States', *Political Studies,* Vol. 41, 579–93.

Woolley, F (1998), 'Social cohesion and voluntary activity: making connections', Centre for the Study of Living Standards (CSLS) Conference: *The State of Living Standards and the Quality of Life*, 30–31 October, Ottawa.

World Bank (1993), 'Paradigm postponed: gender and economic adjustment in sub-Saharan Africa', Technical Note, Africa Technical Department, Human Resources and Poverty Division, Washington, DC.