

The Role of the Solidarity Economy in Strengthening Community Resilience in Post-Social Crisis Contexts

Ester Valerie¹, Bohuslav²

^{1,2} Faculty of Social Studies, Department of Social Policy and Social Work, Masaryk University, Czech Republic

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Nov 28, 2026

Revised Dec 27, 2026

Accepted Jan 30, 2026

Keywords:

Solidarity economy;

Community resilience;

Social crisis;

Economic recovery;

Social capital.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of the solidarity economy in enhancing community resilience in the aftermath of social crises. In many post-crisis contexts, conventional economic systems have proven insufficient in addressing the complex challenges of economic recovery, social inequality, and weakened community structures. As an alternative, the solidarity economy characterized by cooperation, mutual aid, and collective ownership offers a community-centered approach that integrates economic and social dimensions of recovery. This research aims to analyze how solidarity economy practices contribute to resilience, identify the underlying mechanisms that support recovery, and evaluate their effectiveness in post-crisis communities. The study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative techniques. Data are collected through interviews with community members and cooperative leaders, surveys to assess levels of social capital and economic stability, and case studies of selected rural and urban communities affected by social crises. The analysis focuses on three main dimensions: economic impact (income recovery and employment), social impact (trust, cooperation, and participation), and institutional impact (community governance and local organizations). The findings indicate that solidarity economy initiatives play a significant role in strengthening community resilience by reducing vulnerability, enhancing economic security, and fostering social cohesion. Models such as cooperatives, mutual aid networks, and community-based enterprises are particularly effective when implemented in a complementary manner. However, challenges such as limited funding, weak policy support, and lack of skills may hinder their sustainability. The research contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of resilience by integrating economic and social perspectives within a unified analytical framework.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Ester Valerie,
Faculty of Social Studies, Department of Social Policy and Social Work,
Masaryk University, Czech Republic
Email: estervalerie@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, communities around the world have increasingly faced various forms of social crises, ranging from economic downturns and financial instability to health emergencies and social conflicts. These crises often result in significant disruptions to livelihoods, increased unemployment, widening inequality, and weakened social cohesion. In many cases, the impacts are not only immediate but also long-lasting, affecting the ability of communities to recover and sustain their well-being over time (Policy et al., 2015). This condition highlights the importance of strengthening community resilience, defined as the capacity of a community to adapt, recover, and transform in the face of adverse situations.

However, experience has shown that conventional economic systems are often insufficient in addressing the complex challenges that arise after a crisis. Market-based approaches tend to prioritize efficiency and profit, frequently overlooking marginalized groups who lack access to capital, resources, and opportunities (Thorpe et al., 2017). As a result, recovery processes are often uneven, leaving vulnerable populations further behind. In addition, formal institutional responses are sometimes limited by bureaucratic constraints, lack of resources, or weak governance, which further hinders effective post-crisis recovery.

In this context, alternative approaches to economic organization have gained increasing attention, particularly the concept of the solidarity economy. The solidarity economy emphasizes cooperation, mutual aid, social justice, and collective ownership, offering a more inclusive and community-centered model of economic activity (Eşkinat, 2015). Through mechanisms such as cooperatives, community-based enterprises, and mutual support networks, the solidarity economy enables communities to mobilize local resources, strengthen social ties, and create sustainable livelihood opportunities. These characteristics make it a potentially powerful tool for enhancing resilience in times of crisis.

Moreover, the role of social relationships and trust cannot be overlooked in the recovery process. Communities with strong social capital characterized by networks, norms, and trust are generally better equipped to respond to and recover from crises (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015). In this regard, the solidarity economy not only contributes to economic recovery but also reinforces social cohesion and collective action. This dual function positions it as a strategic approach to addressing both economic and social dimensions of resilience.

Over the past decade, the study of solidarity economy and community resilience has gained increasing scholarly attention, particularly in the context of global crises such as economic instability, climate change, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Recent studies highlight the growing importance of solidarity-based economic practices in strengthening community systems. For instance, Gómez Rodríguez et al. (2024) emphasize that the integration of solidarity economy and community-based economic models plays a crucial role in promoting social justice, sustainability, and local development. Their study demonstrates that solidarity economy initiatives, particularly in rural contexts, contribute significantly to strengthening community resilience by fostering cooperation, local resource mobilization, and inclusive economic participation.

Similarly, research conducted by Pontoh et al. (2024) examines community resilience in Indonesia, particularly in response to environmental and economic disruptions. The study finds that resilience is closely linked to community welfare, adaptive capacity, and local economic systems. It highlights the importance of sustainable development strategies and community-based approaches in enhancing resilience, especially in vulnerable regions facing recurring crises.

From a broader theoretical perspective, Kołodziej et al. (2025) provide a systematic review of resilience literature, emphasizing that resilience is a multidimensional concept influenced by social, economic, and institutional factors. Their findings suggest that resilience is not only about recovery but also about transformation and adaptability, which aligns closely with the principles of the solidarity economy.

In addition, Grasseni (2025) explores the role of solidarity economy practices in food systems, particularly through ethnographic research on community-based food activism. The study shows that solidarity-driven initiatives help reconfigure local economies, strengthen community networks, and promote sustainable practices, thereby enhancing resilience in the face of global economic and environmental challenges.

Further insights are provided by Coscarello, Pastore, and Arzadun (2025), who analyze the role of social incubators in promoting the social and solidarity economy in Latin America. Their research highlights how institutional support mechanisms, such as university-based incubators, can strengthen solidarity economy initiatives, foster innovation, and contribute to long-term community resilience.

Moreover, Tadesse and Elsen (2025) conduct a systematic review of social solidarity economy organizations, emphasizing their role in addressing social inequality and promoting inclusive economic participation. The study underscores that solidarity economy organizations are particularly effective in empowering marginalized communities and enhancing their capacity to withstand and recover from crises.

In the context of community resilience, Sharma et al. (2024) (systematic review in disaster risk studies) identify key dimensions of resilience, including social capital, economic stability, and community networks. Their findings reinforce the argument that strong social relationships and

collective action are essential components of resilient communities, which are also central principles of the solidarity economy.

Despite its potential, the implementation and effectiveness of the solidarity economy in strengthening community resilience remain underexplored, particularly in developing countries where social vulnerabilities are often more pronounced (Quiroz-Niño & Murga-Menoyo, 2017). Existing studies tend to focus either on economic outcomes or social aspects separately, with limited integration of both perspectives. Furthermore, empirical evidence on how solidarity economy practices operate in real post-crisis contexts is still relatively scarce.

Based on these considerations, this research seeks to examine the role of the solidarity economy in increasing community resilience after social crises (Drakaki & Tzionas, 2017). By analyzing how solidarity-based economic practices contribute to recovery processes, as well as identifying the factors that influence their success, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of alternative development strategies that are inclusive, sustainable, and community-driven. Ultimately, the findings are expected to contribute to policy formulation and community development practices that are better equipped to להתמודד future crises in a more resilient manner.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in an integrative theoretical framework that links the solidarity economy, social capital, economic stability, and community resilience as interconnected elements in post-crisis recovery. Rather than viewing recovery as a purely economic process, this framework emphasizes the interaction between social relations and economic structures in shaping how communities respond to and recover from crises.

At the foundation of this framework is the concept of the solidarity economy, which represents an alternative model of economic organization based on cooperation, mutual aid, and collective ownership. In contrast to conventional market systems that prioritize individual profit, the solidarity economy fosters inclusive participation and shared responsibility (Miller, 2010). Through practices such as cooperatives, community enterprises, and mutual aid networks, it creates spaces where economic activities are embedded within social relationships. These practices serve as the initial drivers that activate community-based responses in times of crisis.

The operation of the solidarity economy directly contributes to the formation and strengthening of social capital. Social capital refers to the networks, trust, norms, and relationships that enable individuals and groups to work together effectively. Solidarity-based practices inherently rely on trust and reciprocity, as members cooperate to achieve shared goals and support one another (Laitinen & Pessi, 2015). For example, mutual aid initiatives encourage resource sharing and collective problem-solving, which strengthens interpersonal bonds and fosters a sense of community belonging. As social capital increases, communities become more cohesive and better equipped to mobilize resources and coordinate collective action.

Strengthened social capital, in turn, supports the development of economic stability within the community (Portes & Mooney, 2002). When trust and cooperation are high, economic activities become more resilient to shocks. Collective ownership models, such as cooperatives, distribute risks and benefits more equitably among members, reducing individual vulnerability to economic fluctuations. In addition, local networks facilitate access to resources, information, and markets, enabling communities to sustain livelihoods even in adverse conditions. This localized and inclusive approach to economic organization helps create a more stable economic environment, particularly for marginalized groups who are often excluded from formal systems.

Ultimately, the combination of a strong solidarity economy, robust social capital, and enhanced economic stability contributes to community resilience. Resilience is not only the ability to recover from a crisis but also the capacity to adapt and transform in response to changing conditions. Communities with strong social ties and stable economic foundations are better able to absorb shocks, reorganize their systems, and pursue sustainable development pathways. Local networks play a critical role in this process by accelerating recovery efforts, facilitating knowledge exchange, and enabling coordinated responses to emerging challenges.

The mechanisms underlying this framework can be understood more concretely through several key processes. First, mutual aid reduces vulnerability by ensuring that resources are shared among community members, particularly during times of scarcity. This collective support system acts as a safety net, preventing individuals from falling into extreme hardship. Second,

collective ownership increases economic security by distributing assets and decision-making power across the community, thereby reducing inequality and enhancing long-term stability. Third, local networks accelerate recovery by enabling rapid communication, coordination, and mobilization of resources, which are essential in responding to crisis situations.

In summary, this theoretical framework illustrates a causal pathway in which the solidarity economy strengthens social capital, which in turn fosters economic stability and ultimately enhances community resilience. By integrating social and economic dimensions, this approach provides a comprehensive understanding of how community-driven economic practices can serve as effective mechanisms for post-crisis recovery and sustainable development.

2.2 Methodology

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of the solidarity economy in enhancing community resilience after social crises. The integration of these approaches allows the study to capture not only measurable outcomes, such as economic recovery and participation levels, but also deeper insights into social dynamics, experiences, and community perceptions.

The qualitative component is primarily aimed at exploring how solidarity economy practices are implemented and experienced within post-crisis communities (Stanwix, 2018). This includes understanding the processes, challenges, and social interactions that shape these initiatives. In-depth interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders, including community members, cooperative leaders, and local organizers involved in solidarity-based economic activities. These interviews are intended to capture personal experiences, perceptions of resilience, and the role of cooperation and mutual aid in recovery processes.

In addition to interviews, the study will employ case study methods to examine specific communities that have implemented solidarity economy practices after experiencing a social crisis. These case studies will provide contextualized insights into how local conditions, institutional support, and cultural factors influence the success or limitations of such initiatives (Kezar et al., 2008). By focusing on real-life examples, the research aims to identify patterns, best practices, and critical factors that contribute to resilience.

The quantitative component complements the qualitative findings by providing empirical data that can be measured and analyzed statistically (Bazeley, 2006). Surveys will be distributed to a broader sample of community members to assess key variables such as levels of social trust, participation in collective economic activities, income stability, and perceived resilience. The survey data will help quantify the relationships between solidarity economy practices, social capital, and economic outcomes, thereby strengthening the overall validity of the research.

Regarding data collection, multiple techniques will be used to ensure triangulation and reliability. Interviews will be conducted using semi-structured formats to allow flexibility while maintaining focus on the research objectives. Surveys will be designed with both closed-ended and Likert-scale questions to facilitate statistical analysis (Baburajan et al., 2020). Meanwhile, case study data will be gathered through a combination of interviews, observations, and document analysis, such as reports from local organizations or cooperatives.

The location and case selection are critical to the research design. This study will focus on post-crisis communities, both in rural and urban settings, that have experienced significant social or economic disruptions. These may include areas affected by economic downturns, natural disasters, or public health crises. The selection of diverse locations aims to capture variations in context and ensure that the findings are not limited to a single type of community. Criteria for selection will include the presence of active solidarity economy initiatives, the severity of the crisis experienced, and the accessibility of data.

2.3 Analysis Focus

This study focuses on analyzing three interconnected dimensions: economic, social, and institutional impacts to comprehensively understand how the solidarity economy contributes to community resilience in post-crisis contexts. The first dimension is the economic impact, which centers on how solidarity economy initiatives influence income recovery, employment opportunities, and overall economic stability within communities. After a crisis, many individuals experience job loss, reduced income, and limited access to financial resources (Kartseva & Kuznetsova, 2020). This research will analyze whether participation in solidarity-based activities such as cooperatives, community enterprises, and mutual aid systems helps individuals regain livelihoods and improve their economic conditions. Indicators such as changes in household income, employment status, diversification of income sources, and access to local markets will be examined. Additionally, the

study will assess the extent to which collective economic practices reduce vulnerability to future shocks and contribute to long-term financial sustainability.

The second dimension is the social impact, which focuses on the role of solidarity economy practices in strengthening social relationships and cohesion within the community. Social crises often erode trust, weaken social ties, and reduce collective action (Six et al., 2015). Therefore, this study will analyze how participation in solidarity-based initiatives affects levels of trust, cooperation, and community engagement. Key aspects include the degree of interpersonal trust among members, the frequency and quality of collaboration, and the level of participation in community activities. The research will also explore how mutual aid and shared economic goals foster a sense of belonging and collective identity, which are essential components of social capital. By strengthening these social bonds, communities may become more capable of responding collectively to challenges and recovering more effectively from crises.

The third dimension is the institutional impact, which examines how solidarity economy practices influence local governance structures and the functioning of community-based organizations. In many post-crisis settings, formal institutions may be weakened or insufficient in addressing community needs (Aldrich, 2010). As a result, local organizations and informal governance systems often play a critical role in recovery processes. This study will analyze how solidarity economy initiatives contribute to the development of more inclusive, participatory, and transparent forms of governance. It will assess the capacity of local organizations, such as cooperatives and community groups, to manage resources, coordinate activities, and make collective decisions. Furthermore, the research will explore the relationships between these local institutions and external actors, including government agencies and non-governmental organizations, to understand how institutional support or constraints affect the sustainability of solidarity-based practices.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 *The Solidarity Economy Strengthens Community Resilience*

The solidarity economy strengthens community resilience by integrating economic activities with social values such as cooperation, mutual aid, and collective responsibility. Unlike conventional economic systems that often prioritize profit and individual gain, the solidarity economy focuses on collective well-being, making it particularly effective in helping communities withstand and recover from social crises.

One of the primary ways the solidarity economy enhances resilience is through reducing vulnerability (Lee, 2020). In times of crisis, individuals often face sudden loss of income, limited access to basic needs, and increased uncertainty. Solidarity-based practices, such as mutual aid networks and community support systems, provide immediate assistance by redistributing resources among members. This collective safety net ensures that vulnerable individuals are not left unsupported, thereby minimizing the overall impact of the crisis on the community.

Another key mechanism is the promotion of economic security through collective ownership and shared resources. In solidarity economy models such as cooperatives, risks and benefits are distributed among members rather than concentrated in the hands of a few. This shared ownership structure helps stabilize incomes, maintain employment, and prevent extreme economic disparities (Stiglitz, 2015). As a result, communities are better able to sustain their livelihoods even during periods of economic disruption, contributing to long-term stability.

The solidarity economy also plays a crucial role in strengthening social capital, which is essential for resilience. By encouraging cooperation, trust, and active participation, solidarity-based initiatives foster strong interpersonal relationships and networks within the community. These social ties enable more effective communication, coordination, and collective action during crises. Communities with high levels of trust and cooperation are generally more capable of organizing responses, sharing information, and supporting one another in times of need (Cook et al., 2005).

In addition, the solidarity economy enhances resilience by mobilizing local resources and capacities. Instead of relying heavily on external assistance, communities engaged in solidarity-based practices utilize their own knowledge, skills, and assets to address challenges. This localized approach increases self-reliance and adaptability, allowing communities to respond more quickly and appropriately to changing conditions. It also reduces dependency on external systems that may be slow or insufficient in crisis situations.

Furthermore, the presence of strong local networks and community organizations accelerates recovery processes. These networks facilitate the rapid flow of information, coordination of efforts,

and distribution of resources. For example, community-based organizations can quickly organize support programs, create employment opportunities, or establish alternative markets. This ability to act collectively and efficiently is a critical component of resilience, particularly in the early stages of post-crisis recovery.

Finally, the solidarity economy supports transformative resilience, which goes beyond simply returning to pre-crisis conditions. By promoting inclusive participation, social justice, and sustainable practices, it enables communities to rebuild in ways that are more equitable and resilient to future shocks. This transformative aspect ensures that recovery is not only about restoration but also about improvement and long-term sustainability.

3.2 Effective Models of the Solidarity Economy in Strengthening Community Resilience

One of the most prominent and consistently effective models is the cooperative. Cooperatives are enterprises that are owned and managed collectively by their members, who share both the risks and benefits of the business. This model promotes democratic decision-making and equitable distribution of resources, which helps reduce economic inequality and enhance social trust. In post-crisis contexts, cooperatives can play a critical role in stabilizing incomes and maintaining employment, as members are more likely to prioritize collective survival over individual profit. By fostering a sense of ownership and participation, cooperatives also strengthen social capital, which is essential for coordinated recovery efforts. As a result, cooperatives are widely regarded as a cornerstone of long-term community resilience.

Another important model is microfinance, which provides financial services such as small loans, savings, and credit to individuals who lack access to formal banking systems. Microfinance is particularly effective in supporting short-term recovery by enabling individuals to restart businesses, generate income, and meet basic needs after a crisis (Ullah & Khan, 2017). It also promotes financial inclusion and empowers marginalized groups, especially women and low-income households. However, its effectiveness depends on responsible management and supportive social structures, as excessive reliance on credit can lead to indebtedness. Therefore, while microfinance is a valuable tool for economic recovery, it is most effective when integrated with other solidarity-based practices.

Mutual aid networks represent another crucial model, especially during the early stages of a crisis. These informal systems are based on voluntary cooperation and resource sharing among community members. Mutual aid initiatives can rapidly mobilize support by distributing food, money, or services to those in need, thereby reducing immediate vulnerability (Spade, 2020). Beyond material assistance, these networks strengthen interpersonal relationships and build trust, which are fundamental components of social resilience. Although mutual aid networks are often temporary and less structured than other models, their flexibility and responsiveness make them highly effective in emergency situations.

In addition, community-based enterprises play a significant role in promoting local economic development and resilience. These enterprises are typically rooted in the community and prioritize collective benefits over profit maximization. By creating local employment opportunities and utilizing local resources, they help retain economic value within the community and reduce dependence on external systems. This localized approach enhances economic stability and encourages innovation tailored to the specific needs of the community.

Overall, the effectiveness of these models lies not in their isolated application but in their complementary roles. Mutual aid networks are particularly effective in providing immediate relief, microfinance supports economic recovery, and cooperatives and community-based enterprises contribute to long-term stability and sustainability. Therefore, a combination of these models offers the most comprehensive approach to strengthening community resilience. By integrating economic and social functions, solidarity economy models provide a holistic and adaptive framework for helping communities recover from crises and build a more resilient future.

3.3 Barriers to the Effectiveness of the Solidarity Economy

One of the primary barriers is limited funding. Many solidarity economy initiatives, such as cooperatives, mutual aid networks, and community-based enterprises, rely heavily on internal resources and small-scale contributions from members. In post-crisis contexts, however, communities often experience financial strain, making it difficult to mobilize sufficient capital to start or expand economic activities. Access to external funding sources, such as banks or investors, is also frequently restricted due to a lack of collateral, formal recognition, or perceived financial risk. As a result, many initiatives struggle to scale up, innovate, or even sustain their operations over time, reducing their overall impact on community resilience.

Another significant challenge is weak policy support. In many cases, governments have not fully recognized or integrated the solidarity economy into formal economic development strategies. This lack of recognition often results in inadequate legal frameworks, limited institutional support, and the absence of targeted funding programs. Without supportive policies, solidarity-based organizations may face bureaucratic obstacles, difficulties in registration, and limited access to public resources or markets. Furthermore, the absence of coordination between government agencies and community initiatives can lead to fragmented efforts, reducing the effectiveness of resilience-building strategies.

In addition, a lack of skills and capacity within communities poses a major barrier to the success of solidarity economy initiatives. Effective management of cooperatives or community enterprises requires a range of skills, including financial management, organizational leadership, marketing, and strategic planning (Naipinit et al., 2016). In many post-crisis settings, community members may lack access to education, training, or technical assistance needed to develop these competencies. This skills gap can lead to inefficiencies, mismanagement, and limited innovation, ultimately affecting the sustainability and growth of solidarity-based initiatives.

These barriers are often interconnected. For instance, limited funding can restrict access to training and capacity-building programs, while weak policy support can limit opportunities for financial assistance and institutional development. As a result, overcoming these challenges requires a comprehensive approach that involves not only strengthening community capacities but also improving policy frameworks and expanding access to financial resources.

3.4 Practical Implications

The findings of this research have important practical implications for policymakers, community leaders, and development practitioners, particularly in designing strategies that enhance community resilience through the solidarity economy. From a policy perspective, governments play a crucial role in creating an enabling environment for the growth of solidarity economy initiatives (Chaves-Avila & Gallego-Bono, 2020). One key recommendation is the development of supportive legal and institutional frameworks that formally recognize cooperatives, community-based enterprises, and other solidarity-based organizations. This includes simplifying registration processes, providing legal protection, and ensuring access to public resources. Additionally, governments should design targeted financial support mechanisms, such as grants, low-interest loans, and subsidies, to address the issue of limited funding often faced by these initiatives (Durst & Gerstlberger, 2020). Integrating solidarity economy principles into national and local development plans can also help align public policies with community-based approaches, ensuring that recovery efforts are more inclusive and equitable. Furthermore, partnerships between governments, non-governmental organizations, and local communities should be strengthened to improve coordination and maximize the impact of resilience-building programs.

In terms of community development strategies, this research highlights the importance of strengthening local capacities and promoting participatory approaches. Communities should be empowered through education and training programs that enhance skills in financial management, entrepreneurship, and organizational leadership. Capacity-building initiatives can improve the effectiveness and sustainability of solidarity economy practices, enabling communities to manage their resources more efficiently. Encouraging active participation and collective decision-making is also essential, as it fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility among community members. In addition, promoting social capital through trust-building activities, collaboration, and inclusive engagement can enhance cooperation and collective action, which are critical for resilience. Community-driven initiatives should also prioritize inclusivity, ensuring that marginalized groups have equal access to opportunities and resources.

Regarding the strengthening of local economies, the solidarity economy provides a pathway for building more sustainable and self-reliant economic systems. One practical strategy is to support the development of local value chains that connect producers, distributors, and consumers within the community (Bamber et al., 2014). This approach helps retain economic value locally and reduces dependence on external markets, which can be unstable during crises. Encouraging the growth of cooperatives and community enterprises can also create stable employment opportunities and promote fair distribution of income. Moreover, integrating sustainable practices such as environmentally friendly production methods and responsible resource management can enhance long-term resilience and align economic activities with broader sustainability goals. Strengthening local markets and promoting the consumption of locally produced goods further contribute to economic stability and community well-being.

The practical implications of this research emphasize the need for a multi-level approach that combines supportive policies, empowered communities, and sustainable economic practices. By fostering collaboration between stakeholders and prioritizing inclusivity and sustainability, the solidarity economy can serve as a powerful tool for enhancing community resilience and ensuring more effective recovery from social crises.

3.5 Limitations of the Study

One important limitation is the limited geographic scope of the study. The research focuses on selected post-crisis communities, which may be located in specific rural or urban areas. While this approach allows for in-depth analysis and contextual understanding, it also limits the generalizability of the findings. Social, economic, and cultural conditions can vary significantly across regions, meaning that the effectiveness of solidarity economy practices observed in one context may not fully apply to others (Miller, 2010). As a result, caution should be exercised when attempting to generalize the results to broader populations or different geographical settings.

Another key limitation concerns data constraints. The study relies on a combination of qualitative and quantitative data, including interviews, surveys, and case studies (Guetterman & Fetters, 2018). However, in post-crisis environments, access to reliable and comprehensive data can be challenging. Respondents may have incomplete records, recall bias, or limited availability, which can affect the accuracy of the information collected. Additionally, some aspects of solidarity economy practices particularly informal activities such as mutual aid are not always well-documented, making them difficult to measure systematically. These constraints may influence the depth and precision of the analysis.

Furthermore, there is an inherent difficulty in measuring "resilience" quantitatively. Community resilience is a multidimensional concept that encompasses economic stability, social cohesion, adaptability, and institutional capacity (Sherrieb et al., 2010). While certain indicators such as income recovery or participation levels can be quantified, other dimensions, such as trust, collective identity, and adaptive capacity, are more abstract and difficult to capture through numerical data alone. This complexity may result in partial measurement, where some aspects of resilience are underrepresented in the analysis.

In addition, the integration of qualitative and quantitative approaches, while beneficial for achieving a comprehensive perspective, may present challenges in terms of data consistency and interpretation. Differences in data types and measurement scales can complicate the process of drawing unified conclusions.

4. CONCLUSION

This study highlights the significant role of the solidarity economy in strengthening community resilience and supporting recovery in the aftermath of social crises. By emphasizing cooperation, mutual aid, and collective ownership, the solidarity economy provides communities with practical mechanisms to address both economic and social challenges. It enables income recovery, sustains employment, and reduces vulnerability, while simultaneously fostering trust, social cohesion, and collective action. These combined effects make the solidarity economy a powerful approach for helping communities not only recover from crises but also adapt and transform in more sustainable ways. Beyond its immediate contributions to recovery, the solidarity economy represents an important alternative development model. Unlike conventional systems that prioritize profit and market efficiency, it centers on inclusivity, equity, and community well-being. This people-centered approach allows for more balanced and sustainable development, particularly in contexts where traditional economic structures have failed to protect vulnerable populations. By integrating economic activities with social values, the solidarity economy offers a holistic framework that aligns with long-term resilience and sustainable development goals. However, to fully realize its potential, deliberate efforts are needed to scale and sustain solidarity economy initiatives. First, governments should establish supportive policies, including legal recognition, financial assistance, and institutional backing, to create an enabling environment for these initiatives to grow. Second, capacity-building programs must be strengthened to enhance the skills and capabilities of community members in managing and expanding solidarity-based enterprises. Third, collaboration between stakeholders such as governments, non-governmental organizations, and local communities should be encouraged to improve coordination and resource mobilization. Finally, integrating solidarity economy practices into broader development strategies can ensure that these initiatives are not treated as temporary solutions, but as long-term pillars of inclusive and resilient

economies. The solidarity economy offers a comprehensive and sustainable pathway for post-crisis recovery and community resilience. By addressing structural inequalities and empowering communities from within, it has the potential to transform not only how communities recover from crises but also how they build a more equitable and resilient future.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, D. P. (2010). Fixing recovery: Social capital in post-crisis resilience. *Journal of Homeland Security, Forthcoming*.
- Aldrich, D. P., & Meyer, M. A. (2015). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(2), 254–269.
- Baburajan, V., e Silva, J. de A., & Pereira, F. C. (2020). Open-ended versus closed-ended responses: A comparison study using topic modeling and factor analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 22*(4), 2123–2132.
- Bamber, P., Fernandez-Stark, K., Gereffi, G., & Guinn, A. (2014). *Connecting local producers in developing countries to regional and global value chains: update*.
- Bazeley, P. (2006). The contribution of computer software to integrating qualitative and quantitative data and analyses. *Research in the Schools, 13*(1), 64–74.
- Chaves-Avila, R., & Gallego-Bono, J. R. (2020). Transformative policies for the social and solidarity economy: The new generation of public policies fostering the social economy in order to achieve sustainable development goals. The European and Spanish cases. *Sustainability, 12*(10), 4059.
- Cook, K. S., Hardin, R., & Levi, M. (2005). *Cooperation without trust?* Russell Sage Foundation.
- Drakaki, M., & Tzionas, P. (2017). Community-based social partnerships in crisis resilience: a case example in Greece. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, 26*(2), 203–216.
- Durst, S., & Gerstlberger, W. (2020). Financing responsible small-and medium-sized enterprises: An international overview of policies and support programmes. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 14*(1), 10.
- Eşkinat, R. (2015). SOCIAL AND SOLIDARITY ECONOMY: TOWARDS INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *11th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of ASECU "OPENNESS, INNOVATION, EFFICIENCY AND DEMOCRATIZATION AS PRECONDITIONS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,"* 124.
- Guetterman, T. C., & Fetters, M. D. (2018). Two methodological approaches to the integration of mixed methods and case study designs: A systematic review. *American Behavioral Scientist, 62*(7), 900–918.
- Kartseva, M., & Kuznetsova, P. (2020). *The economic consequences of the coronavirus pandemic: which groups will suffer more in terms of loss of employment and income?*
- Kezar, A., Glenn, W. J., Lester, J., & Nakamoto, J. (2008). Examining organizational contextual features that affect implementation of equity initiatives. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(2), 125–159.
- Laitinen, A., & Pessi, A. B. (2015). Solidarity: Theory and practice. An introduction. *Solidarity: Theory and Practice, 1*–29.
- Lee, S. (2020). Role of social and solidarity economy in localizing the sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 27*(1), 65–71.
- Miller, E. (2010). Solidarity economy: Key concepts and issues. *Solidarity Economy I: Building Alternatives for People and Planet, 2010*, 25–41.
- Naipinit, A., Promsaka Na Sakolnakorn, T., & Kroeksakul, P. (2016). Strategic management of community enterprises in the upper northeast region of Thailand. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 10*(4), 346–362.
- Policy, B. on H. S., Health, C. on P.-D. R. of a C. P., Medical, & Services, S. (2015). *Healthy, resilient, and sustainable communities after disasters: strategies, opportunities, and planning for recovery*.
- Portes, A., & Mooney, M. (2002). Social capital and community development. *The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field, 303*–329.
- Quiroz-Niño, C., & Murga-Menoyo, M. Á. (2017). Social and solidarity economy, sustainable development goals, and community development: The mission of adult education & training. *Sustainability, 9*(12), 2164.
- Sherrieb, K., Norris, F. H., & Galea, S. (2010). Measuring capacities for community resilience. *Social Indicators Research, 99*(2), 227–247.
- Six, B., Van Zimmeren, E., Popa, F., & Frison, C. (2015). Trust and social capital in the design and evolution of institutions for collective action. *International Journal of the Commons, 9*(1).
- Spade, D. (2020). Solidarity not charity: Mutual aid for mobilization and survival. *Social Text, 38*(1), 131–151.
- Stanwix, C. (2018). *The Role of Solidarity Initiatives During Times of Economic Crisis and Austerity: Alternative Forms of Resilience and Resistance in Greece and Italy*. Central European University.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2015). *Rewriting the rules of the American economy: An agenda for growth and shared prosperity*. WW Norton & Company.
- Thorpe, J., Mathie, A., & Ghore, Y. (2017). *A typology of market-based approaches to include the most marginalised*. Coady International Institute.

Ullah, I., & Khan, M. (2017). Microfinance as a tool for developing resilience in vulnerable communities. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 11(2), 237–257.