Fostering community socio-educational resilience in pandemic times: Its concept, characteristics and prospects

Edgar Iglesias*, Moises Esteban-Guitart, Carolina Puyaltó and Carme Montserrat

Institute of Educational Research, University of Girona, Girona, Spain

One area of research that has important implications for preventing school failure is concerned with "resilient students," or those children and youth learners who succeed in school despite the presence of adverse circumstances. However, this concept supposes a reductionist vision of the phenomenon of educational resilience by considering the individual as an object of intervention, as well as assuming deficits and limitations to it: its socioeconomic, cultural and linguistic condition. In contrast, we understand resilience as an available resource that transcends the individual and is integrated within a given territory, region or city. The aim of this paper is therefore to propose the incorporation of a new term in the available literature, namely, "community socio-educational resilience (CSER)," inspired in the term "community resilience." To this end, the new term is defined, characterized and illustrated from an experience carried out during lockdown due to COVID-19. By "CSER" we mean the engagement of different social, cultural and educational agents in the design and implementation of creative and transformative educational practices that challenge such adversity and uncertain circumstances as those deriving from the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., home confinement, remote teaching). Five fundamental dimensions of the construct are proposed and suggestions for educational practice are discussed.

KEYWORDS

educational resilience, community resilience, community socio-educational resilience, community funds of knowledge and identity, pandemic

Introduction

The recent COVID-19 pandemic has challenged social, educational and health systems. Specifically, in the field of education, tensions have been identified between a conventional teaching-learning system and new digital practices of communication, exchange and learning (Schleicher, 2020; Tejedor et al., 2020). It has also evidenced ongoing challenges in terms of existing educational inequalities, and the dissimilar

conditions in which schools address schooling (Van Lancker and Parolin, 2020; Bonal and González, 2021) and the training needs of their teachers (Dussel, 2020), among other issues (Huck and Zhang, 2021). However, it has also provided an opportunity to consolidate, develop and implement processes of educational transformation and renewal (Esteban-Guitart et al., 2020; Iglesias et al., 2020; González-Patiño and Esteban-Guitart, 2021), as well as review the very foundations of the meaning and purpose of school as an institution (Lingard and Keddie, 2013; Gardner and Stephens-Pisecco, 2019; Tarabini, 2020). Different responses have been proposed to address the new circumstances and challenges arising from situations of confinement and non-presence, for example. Specifically, the main aim of this theoretical article is to propose, for the first time in the literature, the notion of "CSER," drawing on the construct "community resilience" (Norris et al., 2008; Magis, 2010; Sharifi, 2016). After defining the notion, we posit five dimensions of analysis, taking illustrative examples from the educational experience "Petits Joves Actius" (English: Small Active Young People) implemented in Palau d'Anglesola (Lleida, Catalonia, Spain) during the strict lockdown period of the third semester of the 2019–2020 school year. We conclude with a number of considerations regarding the proposed construct, particularly in relation to the processes of educational transformation and elements that facilitate and promote actions based on CSER.

What is meant by resilience?

The concept of resilience has a long tradition in different fields, including the environmental, social and education sciences (Bhamra et al., 2011; Ghimbulut and Opre, 2013), and specific spheres such as psychological coping in the face of adversity, urban studies, rural sociology, natural disaster management and terrorism and security (Koliou et al., 2018). Taking a strict interpretation of the concept of resilience, two main lines of research and conceptualization can be identified.

On the one hand, psychologically based positions linked to the health sciences, which define resilience as an individual-personal process associated with certain personality traits that underlie coping with adversity. Also noted is the ability of the individual as a factor that demonstrates psychological health in the face of difficult situations, as well as the ability to recover from certain crises (Khanlou and Wray, 2014; Zolkoski and Bulloch, 2021). On the other hand, there are more systemic and contextual approaches, which focus on a collective, group or territory. These would include the notion of community resilience, defined by Magis (2010) as: "The existence, development and involvement of community resources by members of a given territory to deal with adverse environmental situations characterized by change and uncertainty" (p. 401).

More specifically in the field of education, the concept of resilience has been used to analyze explanatory factors underlying the so-called "resilient student," i.e., those students who achieve good results and school-academic performance despite adverse conditions at the socioeconomic level (Waxan et al., 2003; Downey, 2008; Gardner and Stephens-Pisecco, 2019; Van Geel and Mazzucato, 2020).

Community socio-educational resilience: A mesogenetic approach to education

Taking the construct of community resilience as a reference, this article proposes to expand the unit of analysis to consider different social, educational and community agents as the focus of what we call here "Community Socio-Educational Resilience" (CSER). Thus, we define CSER as: The involvement of different social, cultural and educational agents in the design and implementation of creative-transformational educational responses to situations of adversity, uncertainty.

Consequently, the CSER construct implies going beyond the notion of "resilient student" (Downey, 2008; Van Geel and Mazzucato, 2020). In addition to the deficit bias that is assumed in this definition—students characterized by certain limitations or deficits—the focus is above all on the individual. In contrast, by adopting a systemic and ecological perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Gifre and Esteban-Guitart, 2012; Esteban-Guitart et al., 2018), we propose instigating action at the mesogenetic level, linking it to the establishment of educational continuity between two or more contexts of life and activity, which might be the school, family, any local public service, or educational, social, cultural, organizations etc.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) understood mesosystem as "a set of interrelations between two or more settings in which the developing person becomes an active participant" (p. 209), recognizing the influence of other social structures, whether formal or informal, which, despite not containing the developing person, have an impact on the immediate contexts of their life, i.e., the notion of "exosystem" (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). In a series of hypotheses, the author proposed that learners benefit through participation in different contexts or sociocultural practices, especially when establishing relationships and learning with other "more mature or experienced" people (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 212, Hypothesis 29). A further hypothesis was that in different learning contexts, whether formal or informal, there are relationships based on collaboration and shared work, which involve mutual trust and goal consensus. Psychological development and learning therefore benefit "as a function of the number of supportive links existing between that setting and other settings (such as home and family)" [27] (p. 215, Hypothesis 35). Thus, links are promoted between different social, educational and

community agents that must "encourage the growth of mutual trust, positive orientation, goal consensus between settings and an evolving balance of power" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 214, Hypothesis 34). In sum: "The developmental potential of a setting is increased as a function of the number of supportive links existing between that setting and other settings (such as home and family). Thus, the least favorable condition for development is one in which supplementary links are either non-supportive or completely absent—when the mesosystem is weakly linked" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 215, Hypothesis 35).

The above hypotheses allow us to suggest a mesosgenetic approach to understand, and promote, resilience. In respect of this, a recent review of the literature shows the benefits of adopting a multi-systemic model to explain and promote resilience (Bryan et al., 2020). By way of example, the ability of one system, such as the school, to successfully cope with change and stress is shown to improve as other systems align with one another and act together. Although many different interventions have been proposed in this regard, the only ones to have been implemented are school and family-based resilience programs (Twum-Antwi et al., 2020).

In line with the literature on community resilience, we propose broadening the focus of analysis to incorporate, in addition to the school and families, other community agents, services and resources that promote processes of educational transformation in alliance with one another. It is in this sense that we characterize CSER as work shared between different social, cultural, educational and community agents. This alliance is articulated with the aim of identifying needs, and designing and implementing educational responses to address adversity and uncertainty. In fact, "community supports" have been identified as a protective factor and generator of resilience in children and young people (Zolkoski and Bulloch, 2021). That being said, for the most part, after-school program supervisors, coaches, community center workers, clergy, mental health workers, and neighborhood associations have not been considered as coordinated joint integrated protective and facilitating factors, but rather as individual actions distributed throughout the community (Zolkoski and Bulloch, 2021).

Given all of the above, our proposed notion of CSER has a dual purpose. Firstly, to recognize the specific role played by different actors, resources, social and community institutions in promoting educational resilience. And secondly, in light of the need to create alliances between these actors through joint and collaborative work, and to co-design educational responses capable of addressing situations of change and uncertainty.

Dimensions of community socio-educational resilience

With the joint aim of characterizing and analyzing the processes involved in community educational resilience, we propose the following five mechanisms, factors or dimensions: (a) orientation, social support and personalization; (b) the identification and use of existing knowledge, resources and strengths (community funds of knowledge and identity); (c) collective action and participatory culture; (d) governance, and (e) communication and information. We discuss each of them briefly below:

Firstly, by "orientation, social support and personalization" we refer to a broad and heterogeneous set of strategies, resources and actions that aim to promote learning with meaning and personal value based on acknowledging the voices of learners and involving them (Coll et al., 2020). This dimension entails recognizing and encouraging the agency processes undertaken by learners, who actively participate, in whole or in part, in the teaching-learning processes and phases (for example, joint establishment of aims, joint design of pedagogical activities, joint evaluation, etc.), as well as social, collective and cooperative situations involving pedagogical-educational support.

Secondly, the notion of "community funds of knowledge and identity" (Esteban-Guitart et al., 2022) invites us to conceive physical and virtual spaces and people in a given territory or urban or rural context as depositories of resources, knowledge and strengths that are identified and used in educational action. By way of example, this would be the case of a family that possesses advanced technological knowledge and makes that knowledge available to other families to learn how to manage resources or software. Specifically, funds of knowledge refer to: "culturally developed and historically accumulated bodies of knowledge and skills essential to the functioning and wellbeing of the family or individual" (Moll, 1997, p. 47). Based on this conceptualization, the notion of "community funds of knowledge and identity" is suggested as: "culturally developed educational opportunities, historically accumulated and socially distributed and mediated for the functioning, wellbeing, singularization and development of a certain region" (Esteban-Guitart et al., 2022, p. 237). Even more specifically, what is proposed in relation to the notion of community funds of knowledge and identity is the transfer of this positive orientation to the community sphere, understanding it as central to assets, resources, services and educational opportunities that can be identified and used pedagogically. The model posited by Norris et al. (2008) established access to and use of mutual support and aid networks as a mechanism linked to community resilience. Coming under the notion of social capital and following (Castiglione et al., 2008, p. 5), it is an element that can impact different spheres, including the educational and social, facilitating social cohesion, community support and social wellbeing. Thus, the notion of community funds of knowledge and identity invites us to consider not only the relations existing between collaboration and social care, but also a given community's resources, knowledge and strengths.

Thirdly, by "collective action and participatory culture" we refer to the already highlighted public character underlying the

notion of community educational resilience. In other words, it is understood to be the result of a process that articulates different social, educational and community agents, who work together to respond to a situation of uncertainty, novelty and change. Specifically, the concept of "participatory culture" (Jenkins, 2009) involves recognizing social and digital media as platforms for the shared creation of artistic, social, cultural and educational productions and performances. Instead of conceiving digital media as mere artifacts for distribution, they are conceived as open practices *via* which content and experiences circulate, leading the public to shape, create, share, re-frame and actively re-mix this content and these experiences, rather than consume pre-constructed messages. Thus, people are seen not as isolated individuals but as active agents within broader communities and social networks. According to Norris et al. (2008) community competence includes joint and creative work carried out to resolve and address the situation of change and uncertainty.

Fourth, the dimension of governance refers to the forms of relationship, interaction, articulation and production of collective responses, in our case to social and educational needs, which involve not only public institutions, but also all private actors and civil society as a whole (Daly, 2003). The governance paradigm aims to overcome some of the main limitations of representative systems and build networks of deliberation that favor full citizen participation in societies profoundly transformed by globalization. From this perspective, responses in dynamic, complex and diverse societies require that actors who were not previously consulted and civil society in general be incorporated as key actors (Stoker, 2021). In processes of collective action and management, relationships of power, recognition and legitimation are produced between the actors, each of whom has the capacity to add value in the diagnosis, design and implementation of responses to collective needs. In the case of service provision, it is equally important to encourage user involvement. From this perspective, relationships between actors are horizontal, without being based exclusively on the criterion of hierarchy, and nourished by the knowledge and experience of all to obtain comprehensive, plural and polyhedral responses that favor a more precise network approach to social complexity based on creation and collective intelligence. Within this dimension, we therefore find interesting issues such as leadership, forms and structures of coordination between actors, the promotion of participation, power relations, and forms of communication and interaction between actors, as well as the inclusion mechanisms for all individual and collective agents. All of this stems from a dynamic of collective responsibilities that exceeds individual and individualistic logics (Kooiman, 2003).

Finally, processes of "communication and information" are linked to the processes of dissemination and exchange of content and actions, as well as the channels associated with them, and may be physical and/or virtual. Related to the concept of "community resilience," Norris et al. (2008)

referred to communication and information processes as the creation of shared meanings and understandings, as well as the generation of opportunities for people to articulate their needs, visions and attitudes, disseminating experience and situation in a transparent and rigorous manner. In respect of this, the review of the literature conducted by Sharifi (2016) identified the dimension of communication and information as the availability of information and confidence in the public channels used. For example, the instrument validated by Pfefferbaum et al. (2015) operationalizes this dimension with items such as: "My community keeps people informed about relevant issues through television, radio, newspapers, internet, mobile, etc."; "If a disaster occurs, my community provides information about it" or "People in my community trust the public-official channels of information and communication" (p. 186).

Taken as a whole, these five dimensions allow us, at the same time, to characterize the concept of community socio-educational resilience, as well as to analyze certain social and educational experience at a community level. The exercise that we propose below relates to the "petits joves actius" experience.

"Petitsjovesactius.com": An illustrative example

In order to illustrate the notion of community educational resilience during pandemic times, we present the experience of "Petits Joves Actius" (Catalan for "Small Active Young People") held in the town of Palau d'Anglesola (Lleida, Catalonia, Spain) during the strict lockdown period, which involved the closure of schools and home confinement in the third semester of the 2019–2020 school year due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This experience was based on the creation of a website[1] that offered a series of challenges and educational activities scheduled in weekly blocks and aimed at each of the 2-year cycles of infant and primary education in Catalonia (boys and girls aged from 3 to 12 years old). The initiative was conceived voluntarily by four local young people—a preschool teacher, a primary school teacher and two pedagogues—with the aim of offering support to students, their families and teaching staff in light of the sudden closure of schools. It originated from the local educational organization "Voluntariat de Palau—Petits Joves Actius" (English: "Palau Volunteers—Small Active Young People") and had the collaboration of the staff at Arnau Berenguer school, its family association, the Town Council and various entities and agents in the territory. Thus, "Petits Joves Actius" was founded as a space that offers pupils focused educational support through community action and participatory culture, the mobilization of the strengths

---

1 https://www.petitsjovesactius.org

and resources of the community itself and communication between the different participants. Specifically, the experience was implemented by three volunteers from the organization "Voluntariat de Palau—Petits Joves Actius," as well as 12 teachers of the Arnau Berenguer School, and different people from the town, including local artists.

Below we provide a specific analysis of the extent to which this initiative integrated the five dimensions briefly described above and thus represented an example of community socio-educational resilience. First of all, we will refer to "Orientation, social support and personalization." One of the main characteristics that was valued about this experience was that it was based on the needs of the people to whom the initiative was addressed. To this end, volunteers from the organization "Voluntariat de Palau—Petits Joves Actius" administered a survey to children and their families to identify their interests and needs. By way of example, one of the identified needs was having strategies to work on family cohabitation. Similarly, the needs of the teachers and the school were also explored, although it was agreed that the initiative would represent a playful-educational space aimed at exchange to facilitate learning, and not an academic space that would lead families to take on the role of the school. As for the proposed activities, it should be noted that they were scheduled in weekly blocks, which facilitated their follow-up, while making them suitably flexible to cater to the pupils' own pace and levels of autonomy. Execution of the activities was equally flexible and based on the children's needs. For example, over 9 weeks the activities included in the infants' cycle incorporated academic crafts or language tasks, as well as playful games such as "the roulette of emotions": to perform as a family. Another element worth highlighting was the support offered to both pupils and their families by volunteers and educators. Specifically, this was made available through the use of a chat on the website, which allowed users to resolve doubts, make suggestions, etc.

Referring to "Community funds of knowledge and identity," these were based on sharing the strengths, knowledge and experience available to the community itself. In this regard, the space provided by the analyzed experience allowed different agents of the community to offer all kinds of resources and activities. Thus, entities such as the swimming club or the women's association proposed initiatives and offered activities on the web platform. In addition, the Town Council facilitated spaces to promote links between the different social and educational agents, organizing spaces for meetings and joint work. In addition, it should also be noted that this initiative welcomed all profiles and skills among its volunteer participants: those who contributed ideas, those who provided content and practical activities, and community agents, who turned this experience into an educational initiative very much connected with its own context. By way of example, the school cook suggested different recipes and activities to pupils and their families. Indeed, the webpage

created can be considered itself as a community funds of knowledge and identity by providing knowledges, skills, experiences, and personal/social identifications embedded in this particular digital space.

Thirdly, we will refer to "Collective action and participatory culture." This initiative would not have been viable without the collective work and participatory culture of all volunteers and community actors working on it. In fact, "Petits Joves Actius" was based on a network of pupils, families, school, public administration, entities, services, etc., in which everyone had the opportunity to contribute and share based on their own interests, needs and strengths and from different educational spheres, whether formal, non-formal or informal. This collaboration was also possible thanks to the resources and digital media provided by the web platform itself (Drive or Chat), but also other applications such as Instagram (@petitsjovesactius)—on which participants could share visual and multimedia content—or WhatsApp. All this made it easier for the volunteers, teachers, pupils and families to create content to share on the website and social media. For example, through the "Talent Show" activity, pupils recorded and demonstrated different skills, competences and activities from their homes.[2]

Fourthly, in relation to governance, this initiative is put into practice through the articulation of a horizontal leadership in which power relations are not an obstacle to its realization. In fact, despite the fact that the initiative was developed by the young people who initially led the proposal, other agents soon joined in, especially the school and the town council. In this sense, recognition is awarded to teachers, for example, as well as different social and community actors participating in important egalitarian roles. Furthermore, a participation system is encouraged that is characterized by a dynamic in which all agents are and feel responsible for the functions assigned to them. This derives from the use of social communication networks (WhatsApp, Instagram), which, in addition to disseminating content, allow for its creation and the development of the project itself. A further aspect to highlight is that governance of this initiative reveals the articulation of logics of interdependence among actors, which, through a deliberative approach, reinforces collective participation practices. Although the project, that is, the website with the proposal of educational activities, was first initiated by the four girls who devised the project, the participation of the Arnau Berenguer School is key, along with the support of the town council, which provides a web domain. In fact, a group of volunteers was ultimately formed comprising 15 people, basically teachers from the school, which was complemented by the occasional participation of other agents and entities from the local area. In addition, this type of governance, which we could characterize as open and flexible, is consistent with the principle of inclusion, since it welcomes and recognizes the educational functions of actors who are sometimes not recognized as such. For example,

---

2 https://www.petitsjovesactius.org/talent-show

the recipes that were shared by the school cook every Friday were legitimized and recognized as an educational activity, as were other proposals by entities in the local area, such as the association of friends of the "Camí de Sant Jaume" ("Way of Saint James" in English), which proposed a route map to acknowledge different places in the town, and work related to aspects of the natural environment.

Finally, we will refer to "Communication and information." The dissemination and exchange of content and activities was one of the main features of this initiative, and occurred through various channels. On the one hand, the website (see text footnote 1), which represented the main meeting and connection space between the different participants. And on the other, the Google Drive and WhatsApp groups that were organized according to the specific educational levels and fields, and allowed access to specific content. Also, there was the Instagram channel (@petitsjovesactius), which became a space to disseminate and share various different artistic, social and cultural activities, such as cooking or crafts, for example, with more than 500 followers and 70 posts. In addition, videos and photographs made by the students themselves were also disseminated, sharing their talents or the result obtained from doing the activities proposed on the website. The role played by the community entities and agents was also highlighted in this space through recognition and gratitude for their efforts.

Challenges and opportunities of community socio-educational resilience

The main aim of this theoretical article has been to propose the notion of "community socio-educational resilience." To this end, a definition based on the notion of "community resilience" has been suggested (Magis, 2010), which seeks, as stated above, to question the restricted notion of "educational resilience" (Van Geel and Mazzucato, 2020). Thus, we have proposed five dimensions of analysis, and presented an educational experience to illustrate these dimensions.

The situation resulting from the pandemic—especially during periods of lockdown, when boys and girls could not attend school—has highlighted both the inequality of educational opportunities and the particularly negative impact of the pandemic on children in contexts of vulnerability. At the same time, however, resilient educational practices have emerged in response to emerging needs, driven by a collective and participatory approach and involving processes of co-creation and educational innovation. From the perspective of community socio-educational resilience, these practices, which likely comprise more than those documented here, have transcended the walls of the school institution to seek partnerships and optimize resources for individuals, groups and organizations within communities. A key factor in this is that

the search for community alliances has broadened the focus of education, as it takes place beyond regulated spaces, with other actors, times and methods (Esteban-Guitart et al., 2018; Iglesias et al., 2020).

In the case described in this text, a playful-educational space for exchange has been presented that facilitated learning, avoiding turning families or other people in the nucleus of cohabitation into "home teachers," eroding family relationships or leaving children to their own devices. It is not just a question of method or didactics, but also of the very conception of what, where and when; to open the door to educational renewal and rethinking the role of school in contemporary societies (Lingard and Keddie, 2013; Gardner and Stephens-Pisecco, 2019; Iglesias et al., 2020; Tarabini, 2020).

One relevant aspect regarding the dimension of analysis focusing on orientation, social support and personalization is that it recognizes the active participation of pupils regardless of their particular physical, intellectual, linguistic, economical and sociocultural condition, origin and background. In doing so, it is necessary to pay attention to students and families situation in terms of gender, social class or cultural origin. Identifying their particular needs, interests and circumstances is crucial for optimal social support and orientation. Indeed, to us resilience is promoted when issues of diversity and inclusion are addressed explicitly, not only in this dimension but also in the other ones as a cross-cutting issues. However, is specifically relevant in this dimension to guarantee that educational activity is relevant and accessible for all. Moreover, resilience is encouraged when learners have had the opportunity to show adults that, as stated in Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations, 1989), the issue of the pandemic also affects them, their family or nucleus of cohabitation and their environment—whether these are regulated or non-formal educational spaces—and who have the right to be heard and to play a central role in teaching-learning processes.

This example has also illustrated that the school has looked outside its own walls to the potential of people, resources and organizations in its environment. Also, the school has been concerned about the role the aforementioned elements might play in educational performance; that is, action framed within the dimension of analysis focused on community funds of knowledge and identity. It should be noted that joint projects have already begun in some territories, while in others the pandemic has acted as a trigger and catalyst to pave the way for the use of support networks, thus increasing the social and cultural capital of community actors.

From the perspective of governance, the analyzed example illustrates that the articulation of a collective and broad response facilitates involvement by a set of actors outside public institutions. This perspective is consistent with that stated by Daly (2003) and is aligned with a deliberative logic and broad participation *via* the involvement of actors who are often not taken into account (Stoker, 2021). This type of open,

flexible and inclusive governance facilitates the recognition of educational functions that are not always recognized, establishing a framework of action that allows for a vision of collective responsibility above the individual (Kooiman, 2003). In addition, the logics of interdependence between actors are fundamental since they foster new learning during the course of the practice itself, more precise approaches and the legitimation of a somewhat horizontal way of operating.

In addition, from the perspective of the dimension of analysis focused on collective action and participatory culture, alliances with other actors in the community favors the joint creation of educational projects and actions. In respect of this, the learning that pupils can gain from their participation in initiatives of this nature and the connections they weave with the community act as firm enhancers of resilience.

Although both dimensions (i.e., collective action-participatory culture and governance) can refers to the promotion of people participation, it seems to us being useful to distinguish between them. Collective action and participatory culture, an opposed to consumer culture, refers to individuals as contributors or producers (prosumers). Indeed, the concept is most often applied to the production, creation, remixing, generating, and disseminating collaboratively news, ideas, experiences, and creative works by Internet. Illustrated in the case of the "Petits Joves Actius" in the webpage and Instagram channel created. Therefore, participatory culture refers to forms of expression and engagement in public action and discourse mediated by digital devices and spaces. Rather, governance invites us to consider who is promoting the activity? who is leading? What kind the power relationships exists among participants? In our example, the young members of the civic association suggested the actuation that was supported by the city council and the school first, participating other social agents second.

Furthermore, the example analyzed allows us to consider communication and information processes as comprising a key piece in the processes of community resilience found in contemporary societies. The intention to provide accompaniment and mutual support in the educational process or to create a community project cannot be fulfilled if reliable and accessible information channels are not made available to all people, both in terms of accessibility and understanding. Technology can make this easier, but it also causes gaps and misinformation. Having information and, above all, relying on its content and the channel used is in itself a challenge for the twenty-first century.

To end, we will highlight some implications for educational practice, which also constitute instruments required for promoting community socio-educational resilience processes:

1. Alliances that bring together social, educational and community actors, following the concept of educational ecosystem posited by Mueller and Toutain (2015), where

the different agents inside and outside the school constitute an organization with different types and levels of collaboration and which, far from being a static organization, evolve according to the socio-political and cultural context. In this ecosystem, the characteristics of the interactions between the different agents will also be decisive in fostering a collaborative network (also virtual), thus promoting the social capital existing between them (Agranoff and McGuire, 2003). These interactions must be based on mutual trust and interdependence in order to promote cross-cutting work and overcome organizational limitations. As a limitation, it should be noted that although social capital can be measured, the diverse indicators used are not always sufficiently developed, and their application is limited (Castiglione et al., 2008, p. 6).

2. Governance and operational processes, explaining the role, experience and functions of each agent, in line with Díaz-Gibson et al. (2013) regarding the importance of promoting community alliances to respond to people's real needs; for these to be collaborative they must include both strategic planning and an evaluation process that ensures their sustainability and efficiency. Achieving this can be complex, due to both individual attitudes and aspects of governance with models that do not highlight common goals. Examples of roles being explained include the works by Gardner and Stephens-Pisecco (2019) and Downey (2008), which investigated the role of educators in promoting student resilience, and Waxan et al. (2003) and Lundy and McEvoy (2012), which delved deeper and discussed how to make the school resilient and achieve teacher involvement.

3. Channels of direct participation for the school population, as it constitutes the main object of the educational intervention. This approach based on children's rights (United Nations, 1989) focuses not only on providing safe, inclusive and engaging opportunities for pupils to express their opinions, but also on deliberate strategies to encourage them to form opinions. The guide for professionals working with children [Council of Europe [COE], 2020] highlights the idea that participation is important not only as a right and a general principle, but also because it brings important benefits to children and young people and communities, including: making improvements in their lives, their school and in policy; greater protection; capacity building; contributions to the communities in which they live; and greater responsibility.

4. Processes aimed at identifying their interests, needs and learning experiences, as well as incorporating them within the joint design processes of the educational action. Regarding the concept of personalizing education, Esteban-Guitart et al. (2020) emphasized the idea that all pedagogical action should revolve around (i) elements that are truly meaningful to learners (needs, motivations,

people, contexts), and (ii) that attention is paid to their identity and how they project it (objectives, beliefs, spaces). This requires connecting the learning experience with the context, i.e., the individual with the community level.

We believe that future research is needed not only to document community socio-educational resilience practices, but also to examine their educational and social impact and contribution.

Author contributions

ME-G and EI: conceptualization. CP: methodology and resources. CM, ME-G, and EI: writing—review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Acknowledgments

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

Agranoff, R., and McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative Public Managment; new Strategies for Local Governments*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bhamra, R., Dani, S., and Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions. *Int. J. Prod. Res.* 49, 5375–5393. doi: 10.1080/00207543.2011.563826

Bonal, X., and González, S. (2021). Educación formal e informal en confinamiento: Una creciente desigualdad de oportunidades de aprendizaje. *Rev. Sociol. Educ.* 14, 44–62. doi: 10.7203/RASE.14.1.18954

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *Am. Psychol.* 32, 513–531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology Of Human Development: Experiments By Nature And Design*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bryan, J., Williams, J. M., and Griffin, D. (2020). Fostering educational resilience and opportunities in urban schools through equity-focused school-family-community partnerships. *Prof. Sch. Couns.* 23. doi: 10.1177/2156759X19899179

Castiglione, D., Van Deth, J. W., and Wolleb, G. (eds) (2008). *The Handbook Of Social Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coll, C., Esteban-Guitart, M., and Iglesias, E. (2020). *Aprendizaje con Sentido y Valor Personal. Experiencias, Recursos y Estrategias de Personalización Educativa. Editorial Graó*. São Paulo: Editorial Graó.

Council of Europe [COE] (2020). *Listen - Act - Change. Council of Europe Handbook on Children's Participation for Professionals Working for and With Children*. Strasbourg: COE.

Daly, M. (2003). Governance and social policy. *J. Soc. Work* 32, 113–128. doi: 10.1017/S0047279402006840

Díaz-Gibson, J., Civís, M., and Longás, J. (2013). La gobernanza de redes socioeducativas: Claves para una gestión exitosa. *Rev. Teor. Educ.* 25, 213–230.

Downey, J. A. (2008). Recommendations for fostering educational resilience in the classroom. *Prev. Sch. Fail.* 53, 56–64. doi: 10.3200/PSFL.53.1.56-64

Dussel, I. (2020). La formación docente y los desafíos de la pandemia. *Rev. Cient. EFI-DGES.* 6, 11–25.

Esteban-Guitart, M., Coll, C., and Penuel, W. (2018). Learning across settings and time in the Digital Age. *Digit. Educ. Rev.* 33, 1–16. doi: 10.1344/der.2018.33.%25p

Esteban-Guitart, M., González-Patiño, J., Iglesias, E., and González-Ceballos, I. (2020). La personalización educativa en tiempos de cambio e innovación educativa. Un ejemplo ilustrativo. *Aula Abierta* 49, 395–402. doi: 10.17811/rifie.49.4.2020.395-402

Esteban-Guitart, M., Iglesias, E., Lalueza, J. L., and Palma, M. (2022). Lo común y lo público en las prácticas de enseñanza desde la perspectiva de los fondos comunitarios de conocimiento e identidad. *Rev. Educ.* 395, 237–262. doi: 10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2022-395-518

Gardner, R. L., and Stephens-Pisecco, T. L. (2019). Fostering childhood resilience: A call to educators. *Prev. Sch. Fail.* 63, 195–202. doi: 10.1080/1045988X.2018.1561408

Ghimbulut, O., and Opre, A. (2013). Assessing resilience using mixed methods: Youth resilience measure. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* 78, 310–314. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.301

Gifre, M., and Esteban-Guitart, M. (2012). Consideraciones educativas de la perspectiva ecológica de Urie Bronfenbrenner. *Contextos Educativos Rev. Educ.* 15, 79–92.

González-Patiño, J., and Esteban-Guitart, M. (2021). La transformación hacia experiencias expandidas en educación superior: Curso UAMskills de identidad digital. *RED Rev. Educ. Distancia* 65, 1–24. doi: 10.6017/red.433881

Huck, C., and Zhang, J. (2021). Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on K-12 Education: A systematic literature review. *Educ. Res. Dev. J.* 24, 53–84.

Iglesias, E., González-Patiño, J., Lalueza, J. L., and Esteban-Guitart, M. (2020). Manifiesto en tiempos de pandemia: Por una educación crítica, intergeneracional,

sostenible y comunitaria. *Rev. Int. Educ. Para Justicia Soc.* 9, 181–198. doi: 10.15366/riejs2020.9.3.010

Jenkins, H. (2009). *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. Chicago: MacArthur Foundation.

Khanlou, N., and Wray, R. A. (2014). Whole Community Approach toward Child and Youth Resilience Promotion: A Review of Resilience Literature. *Int. J. Ment. Health Adict.* 12, 64–79. doi: 10.1007/s11469-013-9470-1

Koliou, M., van de Lindt, J. W., McAllister, T. P., Ellingwood, B. R., Dillard, M., and Cutler, H. (2018). State of the research in community resilience: Progress and challenges. *Sustain. Resilient Infrastruct.* 5, 131–151. doi: 10.1080/23789689.2017.1418547

Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage.

Lingard, B., and Keddie, A. (2013). Redistribution, recognition and representation: Working against pedagogies of indifference. *Pedagogy Cult. Soc.* 21, 427–447.

Lundy, L., and McEvoy, L. (2012). Children's rights and research processes: Assisting children to (in)formed views. *Childhood* 19, 129–144.

Magis, K. (2010). Community resilience: An indicator of social sustainability. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* 23, 401–416. doi: 10.1080/08941920903305674

Moll, L. (1997). "Vygotsky, la educación y la cultura en acción," in *Hacía un Currículum Cultural. La Vigencia de Vygotski en la Educación*, ed. A. Álvarez (Madrid: Fundación Infancia y Aprendizaje), 39–53.

Mueller, S., and Toutain, O. (2015). *The outward looking school and its ecosystem*. Paris: OECD.

Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., and Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 41, 127–150. doi: 10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6

Pfefferbaum, R. L., Pfeffebbaum, B., Nitiema, P., Houston, J. B., and Van Horn, R. L. (2015). Assessing community resilience: An application of the expanded

CART survey instrument with affiliated volunteer responders. *Am. Behav. Sci.* 59, 181–199. doi: 10.1177/0002764214550295

Schleicher, A. (2020). *The Impact of Covid-19 on Education: Insights from Education at a Glance*. Paris: OECD.

Sharifi, A. (2016). A critical review of selected tools for assessing community resilience. *Ecol. Indic.* 69, 629–647. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.05.023

Stoker, G. (2021). Was local governance such a good idea? A global comparative perspective. *Public Adm.* 89, 15–31. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01900.x

Tarabini, A. (2020). ¿Para qué sirve la escuela? Reflexiones sociológicas en tiempos de pandemia global. *Rev. Sociol. Educ.* 13, 145–155. doi: 10.7203/RASE.13.2.17135

Tejedor, S., Cervi, L., Tusa, F., and Parola, A. (2020). Educación en tiempos de pandemia: Reflexiones de alumnos y profesores sobre la enseñanza virtual uniersitaria en España, Italia y Ecuador. *Rev. Lat. Comun. Soc.* 78, 1–21. doi: 10.4185/RLCS-2020-1466

Twum-Antwi, A., Jefferies, P., and Ungar, M. (2020). Promoting child and youth resilience by strengthening home and school environments: A literature review. *Int. J. Sch. Educ. Psychol.* 8, 78–89. doi: 10.1080/21683603.2019.1660284

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Van Geel, J., and Mazzucato, V. (2020). Building educational resilience through transnational mobility trajectories: Young people between Ghana and the Netherlands. *Young* 29, 119–136. doi: 10.1177/1103308820940184

Van Lancker, W., and Parolin, Z. (2020). COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A social crisis in the making. *Lancet Public Health* 5:e243–e244. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0

Waxan, H. C., Gray, J. P., and Padrón, Y. N. (2003). *Review Of Research On Educational Resilience*. San Francisco: Center For Research on Education.

Zolkoski, S. M., and Bulloch, L. M. (2021). Resilience in children and yotuh: A review. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* 34, 2295–2303. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.08.009