

# The Role of Solidarity Economy in Enhancing Community Resilience After Social Crisis

**Petro Borysko**

Department of Economics, Entrepreneurship and Business Administration, Sumy State University, Ukraine

---

## ARTICLE INFO

### **Article history:**

Received Nov 25, 2026  
Revised Dec 23, 2026  
Accepted Jan 30, 2026

---

### **Keywords:**

Solidarity economy;  
Community resilience;  
Social crisis;  
Social capital;  
Local development.

---

## ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of the solidarity economy in increasing community resilience after a social crisis. Social crises, such as economic downturns and pandemics, often lead to economic instability, social fragmentation, and increased vulnerability within communities. This research aims to analyze how these practices contribute to resilience, identify the mechanisms involved, and evaluate their overall effectiveness. The study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative techniques. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, questionnaires, observations, and documentation within a selected community affected by a social crisis. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis for qualitative insights and descriptive statistics for quantitative findings. The results indicate that the solidarity economy plays a significant role in enhancing community resilience by strengthening social cohesion, providing economic support, fostering adaptability, and promoting participatory decision-making. However, the study also identifies several challenges, including sustainability issues, limited capital, weak management, and policy constraints, which may hinder the long-term effectiveness of solidarity-based initiatives. The findings further reveal that the success of the solidarity economy is influenced by internal factors such as community participation and leadership, as well as external factors including government support and access to resources. In conclusion, the solidarity economy serves as a viable and transformative approach to post-crisis recovery, contributing to more inclusive and sustainable community development. The study recommends strengthening institutional capacity, enhancing policy support, and expanding access to resources to maximize its impact. Future research is encouraged to explore comparative contexts and long-term outcomes to deepen understanding of its role in resilience building.

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



---

### **Corresponding Author:**

Petro Borysko  
Department of Economics, Entrepreneurship and Business Administration,  
Sumy State University, Ukraine  
Email: [petroborysko@gmail.com](mailto:petroborysko@gmail.com)

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, communities around the world have increasingly faced various forms of social crises, ranging from economic downturns and global pandemics to natural disasters and social conflicts (Mohiuddin, 2023). These crises often create multidimensional impacts that go beyond immediate physical damage, affecting economic stability, social structures, and the overall well-being of communities. One of the most visible consequences is economic disruption, where many individuals lose their livelihoods, small businesses collapse, and access to essential resources becomes limited. At the same time, social cohesion may weaken as trust declines, inequality widens, and vulnerable groups face greater marginalization. Such conditions highlight the fragility of many communities when confronted with systemic shocks.

Conventional economic systems, which largely rely on market-driven mechanisms and centralized structures, often struggle to respond effectively to these crises at the local level (Buerger & Harris, 2015). While they may offer macro-level recovery strategies, such as fiscal stimulus or large-scale investments, these approaches do not always reach grassroots communities in a timely or equitable manner. As a result, many communities are left to rely on their own capacities and local resources to survive and recover. This situation underscores the importance of exploring alternative economic approaches that are more adaptive, inclusive, and rooted in community participation.

One such alternative is the concept of the solidarity economy, which emphasizes cooperation, mutual support, and collective ownership as fundamental principles. The solidarity economy includes various forms of community-based economic practices, such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, community enterprises, and local exchange systems (Kumbamu, 2018). These initiatives are typically driven by the needs and participation of community members, rather than profit maximization. By prioritizing social welfare and collective resilience, the solidarity economy offers a framework through which communities can organize themselves to address shared challenges, especially in times of crisis.

In the context of social crises, the solidarity economy has shown significant potential in strengthening community resilience. Through mutual aid and cooperative efforts, communities can create alternative support systems that provide access to food, employment, financial assistance, and social support. Moreover, these practices help rebuild trust, reinforce social networks, and encourage collective decision-making, all of which are essential components of resilience. Community resilience itself refers to the ability of a community to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adverse situations while maintaining its core functions and identity (Kirmayer et al., 2009). Therefore, the integration of solidarity-based economic practices can play a crucial role in enhancing both the adaptive capacity and long-term sustainability of communities.

In the last decade, the relationship between the solidarity economy and community resilience has received increasing scholarly attention, particularly in the context of social, economic, and environmental crises. Early conceptual discussions by Wanda Vrasti and Nicholas Michelsen (2016) emphasized the close connection between solidarity and resilience, arguing that collective action and shared responsibility are fundamental in responding to contemporary crises. Their work laid an important theoretical foundation by framing resilience not only as an adaptive capacity but also as a political and social process shaped by solidarity-based practices.

Subsequent research has expanded this perspective by exploring how solidarity-based economic practices operate in real contexts. For instance, Sara Calvo Martínez et al. (2019) examined the role of the solidarity economy and social enterprises in addressing complex social challenges, particularly in postcolonial settings. Their study highlights that solidarity economy initiatives combine economic activities with social objectives, making them suitable for tackling inequality and fostering inclusive development.

More recent studies have increasingly linked solidarity economy practices with local development and resilience. Carmela Guarascio (2022) found that networks within the solidarity economy function as important tools for social innovation and local economic development. These networks strengthen cooperation, embeddedness, and sustainability, all of which are essential elements in enhancing community resilience during and after crises.

At the same time, scholars have emphasized the role of social capital as a key mechanism connecting solidarity economy and resilience. A comprehensive meta-analysis by Esther Carmen et al. (2022) demonstrated that social capital such as trust, networks, and cooperation plays a crucial role in shaping resilience outcomes. Their findings suggest that strong social relationships enable communities to mobilize resources, coordinate actions, and respond effectively to crises.

In addition, contemporary research has explored institutional and organizational support for solidarity economy initiatives. Mario Coscarello et al. (2025) highlighted the role of university-based social incubators in promoting social and solidarity economy practices, demonstrating how institutional actors can strengthen community-based economic systems and contribute to resilience building.

More recent literature (2025) also highlights the role of solidarity economy in emerging sectors such as sustainable tourism and community-based business innovation. For example, Amina Badreddine et al. (2025) demonstrate that integrating solidarity economy principles into local industries can promote sustainable development while strengthening community adaptability. Likewise, studies on community-based business innovation (2025) emphasize that local

entrepreneurship and cooperative models play a significant role in strengthening economic resilience after global crises.

Despite its growing relevance, the role of the solidarity economy in post-crisis recovery has not been fully explored, particularly in specific local contexts (Arampatzi, 2022). Much of the existing research tends to focus on formal economic policies or institutional responses, leaving a gap in understanding how grassroots initiatives contribute to resilience. Furthermore, there is a need to examine the specific mechanisms through which solidarity economy practices operate and the factors that influence their success or limitations. Without such understanding, it is difficult to assess their effectiveness or to replicate successful models in other contexts.

Given these considerations, this study seeks to examine the role of the solidarity economy in increasing community resilience after social crises. By focusing on community-based economic practices and their impact on recovery and adaptation, this research aims to provide a deeper and more nuanced understanding of how alternative economic systems can support sustainable and inclusive development. Ultimately, this study is expected to contribute to both academic discourse and practical policy solutions by highlighting the importance of collective action and local empowerment in responding to social crises.

## **2. RESEARCH METHOD**

### **2.1 Conceptual Framework**

This study is grounded in an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that integrates the concepts of the solidarity economy, community resilience, and social capital theory to explain how community-based economic practices can enhance resilience in the aftermath of social crises (Young, 2019). These three perspectives are interconnected and provide a comprehensive lens for analyzing both the structural and social dimensions of post-crisis recovery.

The primary theoretical foundation of this research is the concept of the solidarity economy, which refers to an alternative economic system that prioritizes cooperation, mutual aid, social justice, and collective well-being over profit maximization. The solidarity economy is rooted in the idea that economic activities should serve social needs and be organized democratically by community members. It encompasses various forms of practices, such as cooperatives, community enterprises, mutual aid networks, and local exchange systems. From a theoretical standpoint, the solidarity economy challenges the dominant neoliberal economic paradigm by emphasizing inclusivity, sustainability, and participatory governance. In the context of social crises, this framework is particularly relevant because it provides communities with the tools to mobilize local resources, reduce dependency on external systems, and create more equitable and resilient economic structures.

Complementing this perspective is the theory of community resilience, which focuses on the capacity of communities to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adverse situations (Norris et al., 2008). Community resilience is not only about returning to pre-crisis conditions but also about transforming systems to better cope with future challenges. This theory highlights several key dimensions, including economic resilience (the ability to restore livelihoods), social resilience (the strength of social networks and cohesion), and institutional resilience (the effectiveness of local governance and collective decision-making). Within this framework, resilience is viewed as a dynamic and ongoing process influenced by both internal capacities and external support systems. The integration of solidarity economy practices is expected to strengthen these dimensions by enhancing local autonomy, fostering cooperation, and promoting sustainable development.

In addition, this study draws on social capital theory, which emphasizes the importance of social relationships, trust, norms, and networks in facilitating collective action. Social capital is generally categorized into three types: bonding social capital (strong ties within a community), bridging social capital (connections between different groups), and linking social capital (relationships with institutions and authorities). In the context of the solidarity economy, social capital plays a crucial role in enabling cooperation, resource sharing, and coordinated responses to crises. High levels of trust and strong social networks allow communities to organize collective economic activities, support vulnerable members, and adapt more effectively to changing conditions. Therefore, social capital serves as a key mechanism through which solidarity economy initiatives contribute to community resilience.

The interaction between these three theoretical perspectives forms the core analytical framework of this research. The solidarity economy provides the structural and organizational basis for community-driven economic activities, while social capital facilitates the relationships and trust

necessary for their successful implementation(Bucos, 2024). Together, these elements contribute to strengthening community resilience by enhancing adaptive capacity, promoting social cohesion, and supporting sustainable economic recovery. In this framework, the solidarity economy is conceptualized as the independent variable, community resilience as the dependent variable, and social capital as a mediating factor that influences the strength and effectiveness of this relationship.

## **2.2 Research Method**

This study employs a systematic and structured research design to examine the role of the solidarity economy in increasing community resilience after a social crisis. Given the complexity of the topic, which involves both social processes and measurable outcomes, this research adopts a mixed-methods approach that combines qualitative and quantitative techniques. This approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding by capturing both in-depth perspectives from participants and broader patterns that can be generalized.

The research is conducted in a selected community that has experienced a significant social crisis, such as an economic downturn or the impact of a pandemic(Alizadeh et al., 2023). The chosen location represents a setting where solidarity economy practices such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, or community-based enterprises have emerged or developed as a response to the crisis. By focusing on this context, the study aims to explore how these practices operate in real-life situations and how they contribute to strengthening community resilience.

The population of this study consists of individuals and groups directly involved in or affected by solidarity economy initiatives within the community. This includes community members, leaders of cooperatives or local economic organizations, and representatives of local authorities(Gaventa, 2004). From this population, a sample is selected using purposive sampling techniques to ensure that participants have relevant knowledge and experience related to the research topic. Key informants are chosen based on their active involvement in solidarity economy activities and their understanding of the community's response to the crisis.

Data collection is carried out using multiple techniques to ensure richness and accuracy of information. First, in-depth interviews are conducted with selected informants to gather detailed insights into their experiences, perceptions, and roles in solidarity-based initiatives(Gaižauskaitė et al., 2024). Second, questionnaires are distributed to a broader group of community members to obtain quantitative data related to economic conditions, participation levels, and perceptions of resilience. Third, direct observations are undertaken to understand how solidarity economy practices are implemented in daily activities. Lastly, documentation analysis is conducted by reviewing relevant records, reports, and policy documents to support and validate the findings.

The data analysis process integrates both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data obtained from interviews and observations are analyzed using thematic analysis, which involves coding the data, identifying patterns, and developing themes related to solidarity economy practices and community resilience(Bucos, 2024). This process allows the researcher to interpret meanings and relationships within the data. Meanwhile, quantitative data collected through questionnaires are analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize key variables, such as income changes, participation rates, and perceived resilience. If applicable, further statistical analysis, such as regression, may be used to examine relationships between variables.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the research findings, several strategies are applied. Triangulation is used by comparing data from different sources and methods to confirm consistency. Data verification is conducted through cross-checking information with participants and relevant documents. Additionally, measures of credibility and trustworthiness are implemented, such as prolonged engagement in the field, careful documentation of data collection processes, and transparent reporting of findings. These steps are essential to enhance the rigor and reliability of the study, ensuring that the results accurately reflect the reality of the community being studied.

## **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **3.1 Description of Research Setting**

The research is conducted in a community that represents a typical semi-rural area with a strong dependence on local economic activities and social networks. The community is characterized by close interpersonal relationships, where social interactions are largely based on kinship, neighborhood ties, and shared cultural values. Most residents rely on small-scale economic activities such as agriculture, informal trading, and micro-enterprises as their primary

sources of income. Community organizations, including cooperatives and informal mutual aid groups, play an important role in supporting daily livelihoods and fostering social cohesion.

The community under study has experienced a significant social crisis, particularly during the period of economic disruption triggered by a pandemic and subsequent economic downturn (Bucos, 2024). This crisis resulted in widespread income loss, reduced employment opportunities, and the closure of many small businesses. Restrictions on mobility and market access further exacerbated the situation, making it difficult for community members to sustain their economic activities. In addition to economic challenges, the crisis also affected social dynamics, as reduced physical interaction weakened traditional forms of cooperation and collective engagement.

From a socio-economic perspective, the community can be categorized as moderately vulnerable (Mechanic & Tanner, 2007). A large proportion of the population falls within the lower- to middle-income groups, with limited access to formal financial institutions and social protection systems. Educational levels vary, with many residents having only basic education, which can limit their access to better employment opportunities. Infrastructure and public services, such as internet access, healthcare, and transportation, are available but not always evenly distributed or easily accessible to all residents.

Despite these challenges, the community demonstrates a strong capacity for collective action, particularly through the emergence and development of solidarity-based economic practices (Dubois & Lasida, 2010). During and after the crisis, various initiatives such as community savings groups, cooperative businesses, and mutual aid networks have been established or strengthened. These initiatives have provided alternative means of income generation, resource sharing, and social support, helping the community to cope with and gradually recover from the crisis.

Overall, the research setting reflects a community that is both vulnerable and resilient. It is vulnerable due to its socio-economic limitations and exposure to external shocks, yet resilient due to its strong social ties and capacity to organize collective responses. This context provides a relevant and meaningful setting for examining how the solidarity economy contributes to increasing community resilience after a social crisis.

### **3.2 Forms of Solidarity Economy Found**

One of the key forms of solidarity economy observed in the community is the presence of cooperatives. These cooperatives function as collective economic institutions owned and managed by their members, who are typically local residents. They operate in sectors such as savings and loans, agriculture, and small-scale trading. Through these cooperatives, members are able to access financial resources with more flexible terms compared to formal financial institutions. In times of crisis, cooperatives provide critical support by offering low-interest loans, facilitating the distribution of essential goods, and creating opportunities for collective marketing of local products (Allen & Maghimbi, 2009). This not only helps stabilize members' incomes but also strengthens economic independence at the community level.

In addition to cooperatives, mutual aid groups have emerged as an important mechanism for addressing immediate needs during the crisis. These groups are usually informal and community-driven, consisting of individuals who voluntarily contribute resources such as money, food, labor, or time to support one another. Mutual aid initiatives often take the form of food-sharing programs, emergency funds, or collective labor activities (such as helping rebuild homes or support small businesses). The flexibility and responsiveness of these groups allow them to quickly address urgent challenges, especially when formal assistance is limited or delayed. Moreover, they reinforce a sense of solidarity and collective responsibility among community members.

Another significant form is the development of community enterprises, which are small-scale businesses initiated and managed collectively by members of the community. These enterprises often focus on utilizing local resources and skills, such as food processing, handicrafts, or agricultural production. Unlike conventional businesses, community enterprises prioritize shared benefits rather than individual profit. Revenues generated are typically reinvested into the enterprise or distributed among members to support their livelihoods. During the post-crisis recovery phase, these enterprises have contributed to job creation, income diversification, and the revitalization of local economic activities.

Furthermore, informal support networks play a crucial role in sustaining community resilience. These networks are based on existing social relationships, including family ties, friendships, and neighborhood connections. Through these networks, individuals exchange information, provide emotional support, and share resources in times of need. For example, community members may

lend money without interest, share food supplies, or provide temporary employment opportunities to those affected by the crisis. Although less structured than cooperatives or enterprises, these informal networks are highly effective due to the strong trust and reciprocity that underpin them.

Overall, these forms of solidarity economy demonstrate how communities can mobilize local resources and social capital to respond to crises. Each form contributes in different but complementary ways: cooperatives provide structured economic support, mutual aid groups address immediate needs, community enterprises promote sustainable livelihoods, and informal networks strengthen social cohesion. Together, they create a resilient system that enables the community not only to recover from the crisis but also to build a more inclusive and sustainable economic foundation.

### **3.3 Role of Solidarity Economy in Building Resilience**

One of the most significant roles of the solidarity economy is in strengthening social cohesion. Through practices such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, and community-based initiatives, individuals are encouraged to work together, share responsibilities, and support one another. These interactions rebuild trust and reinforce social bonds that may have weakened during the crisis. As community members engage in collective activities, a sense of belonging and mutual responsibility is cultivated, which is essential for coordinated responses to challenges. Strong social cohesion also reduces social fragmentation and enhances the community's ability to act collectively in times of need.

In addition, the solidarity economy provides critical economic support that contributes directly to resilience. By creating alternative sources of income and employment, such as through community enterprises and cooperative businesses, it helps individuals recover from economic losses caused by the crisis. These initiatives often prioritize local resources and labor, ensuring that economic benefits remain within the community (Connelly et al., 2011). Furthermore, access to shared financial systems, such as savings groups or cooperative lending, enables members to meet their basic needs, invest in small businesses, and reduce dependence on external or formal financial institutions. This localized economic stability is a key component of resilience.

Another important role of the solidarity economy is in enhancing adaptability. Communities engaged in solidarity-based practices tend to be more flexible and innovative in responding to changing conditions. For example, they may diversify income-generating activities, adopt new methods of production, or reorganize resources to meet emerging needs. The participatory nature of the solidarity economy allows for quick decision-making and the adjustment of strategies based on collective experiences. This adaptability enables communities not only to recover from crises but also to better prepare for future uncertainties.

Furthermore, the solidarity economy promotes collective decision-making, which strengthens local governance and institutional resilience. Decisions regarding resource allocation, business operations, and community initiatives are typically made through participatory processes that involve multiple stakeholders. This inclusive approach ensures that diverse perspectives are considered and that outcomes reflect the needs of the broader community. Collective decision-making also increases transparency, accountability, and a sense of ownership among members, which enhances the sustainability of solidarity-based initiatives.

Overall, the solidarity economy functions as a comprehensive mechanism for building resilience by integrating social, economic, and institutional dimensions. By strengthening social cohesion, providing economic support, enhancing adaptability, and promoting collective decision-making, it enables communities to not only recover from social crises but also to transform into more inclusive, self-reliant, and resilient systems.

### **3.4 Indicators of Community Resilience**

The findings of this study demonstrate that community resilience in the post-crisis context can be observed through several key indicators, namely economic recovery, social solidarity, institutional strength, and adaptive capacity. First, economic recovery is one of the most visible indicators of resilience. The study shows that the presence of solidarity economy practices, such as cooperatives and community enterprises, has contributed to the gradual restoration of livelihoods. Many community members who previously experienced income loss during the crisis have been able to regain economic stability through participation in collective economic activities (Stiglitz, 1999). Income diversification has also increased, with individuals engaging in multiple sources of livelihood supported by community-based initiatives. In addition, access to financial resources has improved through savings groups and cooperative lending systems, reducing dependence on

external financial institutions. These developments indicate a strengthening of local economic systems and a reduced vulnerability to future economic shocks.

Second, social solidarity emerges as a critical indicator of resilience. The study finds that community members exhibit a strong sense of mutual support, trust, and cooperation, particularly in times of difficulty. Solidarity economy practices have reinforced social ties by encouraging collective participation and shared responsibility. Activities such as mutual aid, resource sharing, and collaborative problem-solving have become more common, reflecting a high level of social cohesion. This strengthened solidarity not only supports immediate recovery efforts but also creates a supportive environment that enhances the community's long-term resilience.

Third, institutional strength is reflected in the effectiveness and sustainability of local organizations and governance structures. The study observes that community-based institutions, such as cooperatives and local groups, have become more organized and capable of managing resources and coordinating activities. These institutions play a key role in facilitating economic activities, resolving conflicts, and representing community interests. Increased participation in decision-making processes has also contributed to greater transparency and accountability. The ability of these institutions to function effectively during and after the crisis indicates a strengthening of local governance, which is essential for maintaining stability and supporting development (Salvador & Sancho, 2023).

Finally, adaptive capacity is a crucial indicator that highlights the community's ability to respond to changing conditions and future uncertainties. The findings reveal that the community has developed various strategies to adapt to the challenges posed by the crisis. These include adopting new economic activities, modifying existing practices, and utilizing available resources more efficiently. The flexibility demonstrated by community members, along with their willingness to innovate and collaborate, reflects a high level of adaptability. This capacity enables the community not only to recover from the current crisis but also to better prepare for potential future disruptions.

### **3.5 Factors Influencing Success**

From an internal perspective, community participation plays a fundamental role. The findings indicate that the higher the level of active involvement among community members, the more effective the solidarity economy initiatives become. Participation is reflected in contributions of time, labor, ideas, and resources in collective activities such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, and community enterprises (Mori, 2014). When individuals feel a sense of ownership and responsibility, they are more committed to sustaining these initiatives. Moreover, inclusive participation ensures that diverse needs and perspectives are addressed, making the programs more relevant and adaptive to local conditions. Conversely, low participation can weaken collective efforts and limit the impact of solidarity-based practices.

Another critical internal factor is leadership. Effective leadership within the community significantly influences the direction, coordination, and sustainability of solidarity economy initiatives. Leaders whether formal or informal act as facilitators who mobilize resources, encourage participation, and mediate conflicts. Strong leaders are typically characterized by transparency, accountability, and the ability to inspire trust among members. They also play a strategic role in decision-making and in maintaining the continuity of programs during challenging periods. In contrast, weak or ineffective leadership can lead to mismanagement, lack of coordination, and reduced community trust, ultimately hindering the success of these initiatives.

In addition to internal dynamics, external factors also play a crucial role. One of the most important is government support. The study finds that supportive policies, funding programs, and institutional backing from local or national governments can significantly enhance the effectiveness of solidarity economy practices. Government involvement may include providing training, facilitating access to markets, offering financial assistance, or establishing legal frameworks that recognize and support community-based economic organizations (Forstner, 2004). Such support not only strengthens the operational capacity of these initiatives but also legitimizes their role within the broader economic system. However, limited or inconsistent government support can constrain growth and reduce the scalability of solidarity economy models.

Another key external factor is access to resources, including financial capital, infrastructure, information, and technology. Adequate access to these resources enables communities to develop and expand their economic activities more effectively. For example, access to funding allows cooperatives and community enterprises to invest in production and innovation, while access to information and training enhances skills and knowledge. Infrastructure, such as transportation and digital connectivity, also plays a vital role in facilitating market access and communication. On the

other hand, resource constraints can limit the scope and sustainability of solidarity economy initiatives, particularly in marginalized or underserved communities.

### **3.6 Challenges and Limitations**

One of the primary challenges is related to sustainability issues. While many solidarity economy initiatives emerge strongly during times of crisis, maintaining their momentum in the long term can be difficult. As the immediate urgency of the crisis declines, participation levels may decrease, and collective motivation can weaken. Some initiatives rely heavily on voluntary contributions and informal arrangements, which, although effective in the short term, may lack the stability needed for sustained operation. Without clear long-term planning, institutionalization, and continuous engagement, these initiatives risk becoming inactive or losing their impact over time.

Another significant limitation is limited capital. Many solidarity economy practices operate with minimal financial resources, which restricts their ability to scale up or diversify activities (Dacheux & Goujon, 2011). Access to formal financial institutions is often limited due to a lack of collateral, administrative capacity, or legal recognition. As a result, cooperatives and community enterprises may struggle to invest in equipment, expand production, or improve the quality of their services. This financial constraint can hinder innovation and reduce competitiveness, especially when compared to larger, market-driven enterprises.

In addition, weak management poses a challenge to the effectiveness of solidarity-based initiatives. Many of these organizations are managed by community members who may have limited experience in financial management, organizational governance, or strategic planning. While the participatory nature of the solidarity economy is one of its strengths, it can also lead to inefficiencies if roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined. Poor coordination, lack of transparency, and limited managerial skills can result in misallocation of resources, internal conflicts, and decreased trust among members (Boufounou et al., 2024). Strengthening managerial capacity is therefore essential to ensure accountability and sustainability.

Furthermore, policy constraints represent an external barrier that can limit the growth and recognition of solidarity economy initiatives. In many cases, existing legal and regulatory frameworks are not designed to accommodate community-based or cooperative economic models (Boufounou et al., 2024). This can create difficulties in terms of registration, access to funding, taxation, and market participation. Inconsistent or inadequate government support may also reduce opportunities for capacity building and institutional development. Without supportive policies, solidarity economy initiatives may remain informal and marginalized, limiting their potential impact on broader economic systems.

Overall, these challenges highlight that while the solidarity economy offers a promising approach to building community resilience, its success is not guaranteed. Addressing sustainability issues, improving access to capital, strengthening management capacity, and creating supportive policy environments are critical steps to enhance the effectiveness and long-term viability of these initiatives. A comprehensive approach that integrates both internal improvements and external support is necessary to ensure that the solidarity economy can continue to contribute meaningfully to post-crisis recovery and sustainable community development.

### **3.7 Critical Analysis**

The findings of this study provide important insights into the role of the solidarity economy in strengthening community resilience after a social crisis, and they can be critically analyzed in relation to existing theories and previous research. Overall, the results show a strong alignment with established theoretical perspectives, while also offering extensions and nuanced contributions to the current body of knowledge.

First, the findings support existing theories, particularly those related to the solidarity economy, community resilience, and social capital. The study confirms that solidarity-based practices such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, and community enterprises play a significant role in enhancing economic recovery and social cohesion. This aligns with community resilience theory, which emphasizes the importance of local capacity, adaptability, and collective action in responding to crises (Norris et al., 2008). Furthermore, the observed strengthening of trust, cooperation, and networks within the community directly supports social capital theory, which argues that strong social relationships facilitate coordinated actions and resource mobilization. The results also reinforce prior empirical studies that highlight the effectiveness of grassroots economic initiatives in addressing local vulnerabilities and promoting inclusive development.

In addition to supporting existing knowledge, the findings also extend previous research by providing a more detailed understanding of the mechanisms through which the solidarity economy

contributes to resilience. While earlier studies often focus on general outcomes such as economic recovery or social cohesion, this research demonstrates how these outcomes are achieved through specific processes, including participatory decision-making, resource sharing, and adaptive innovation. The study also highlights the interconnected nature of economic, social, and institutional dimensions of resilience, showing that the impact of the solidarity economy is not limited to one domain but operates across multiple levels. Moreover, by examining the interaction between internal factors (such as participation and leadership) and external factors (such as government support and resource access), this research offers a more comprehensive framework for understanding the conditions under which solidarity economy initiatives succeed.

At the same time, the findings reveal certain aspects that partially contradict or challenge existing studies, particularly those that present the solidarity economy as a universally effective solution. While the positive contributions are evident, this study identifies several limitations, such as sustainability issues, limited capital, weak management, and policy constraints, which can hinder the effectiveness of solidarity-based initiatives. These findings suggest that the success of the solidarity economy is highly context-dependent and cannot be assumed without considering local conditions and institutional support. This challenges overly optimistic perspectives in the literature and emphasizes the need for a more critical and balanced understanding of its role.

Furthermore, the study indicates that while solidarity economy practices are effective in strengthening short- to medium-term resilience, their long-term impact depends on continuous adaptation, institutional strengthening, and integration with broader economic and policy systems (Chaves-Avila & Gallego-Bono, 2020). This insight adds depth to existing research by highlighting that resilience is not a static outcome but an ongoing process that requires sustained effort and support.

This study both confirms and advances existing theoretical and empirical work on the solidarity economy and community resilience (Sotnyk et al., 2024). It supports the core assumption that solidarity-based practices are valuable tools for post-crisis recovery, extends the literature by clarifying the mechanisms and influencing factors involved, and critically challenges the notion that such approaches are inherently sufficient without addressing structural and institutional constraints. This balanced perspective contributes to a more comprehensive and realistic understanding of the role of the solidarity economy in building resilient communities.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the solidarity economy plays a significant and meaningful role in improving community resilience after a social crisis. The findings show that solidarity-based practices such as cooperatives, mutual aid groups, community enterprises, and informal support networks contribute not only to economic recovery but also to strengthening social cohesion, institutional capacity, and adaptive responses. The extent of this contribution is substantial at the local level, particularly in supporting vulnerable groups, restoring livelihoods, and fostering collective action. However, its effectiveness varies depending on internal and external conditions, indicating that while the solidarity economy is a powerful approach, it is not automatically sufficient without proper support and management. The study identifies several key determinants that influence the success of solidarity economy initiatives. Internally, active community participation and effective leadership emerge as the most critical factors, as they drive collective engagement, trust, and sustainability. Externally, government support and access to resources such as funding, infrastructure, and information are equally important in enabling these initiatives to grow and operate effectively. The interaction between these internal and external factors ultimately determines the strength and impact of the solidarity economy in building resilience. In terms of implications, this research highlights the importance of integrating solidarity economy principles into broader development strategies. From a policy perspective, governments need to provide supportive frameworks, including legal recognition, financial assistance, and capacity-building programs for community-based economic organizations. Socially, the findings emphasize the role of community empowerment, where strengthening participation, trust, and local leadership can enhance collective resilience. Economically, the solidarity economy offers a viable alternative to conventional systems by promoting inclusivity, sustainability, and local resource utilization, particularly in times of crisis. Based on these findings, several recommendations are proposed. First, there is a need to strengthen the institutional capacity of solidarity economy organizations through training in management, governance, and financial planning. Second, governments and

stakeholders should expand access to funding and resources to support the growth and sustainability of these initiatives. Third, efforts should be made to increase community awareness and participation to ensure long-term engagement. Finally, future research is encouraged to explore different contexts and comparative cases to further understand the scalability and long-term impact of the solidarity economy in enhancing community resilience.

## REFERENCES

- Alizadeh, H., Sharifi, A., Damanbagh, S., Nazarnia, H., & Nazarnia, M. (2023). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the social sphere and lessons for crisis management: a literature review. *Natural Hazards*, 117(3), 2139–2164.
- Allen, E., & Maghimbi, S. (2009). *African cooperatives and the financial crisis*. ILO Geneva.
- Arampatzi, A. (2022). Social solidarity economy and urban commoning in post-crisis contexts: Madrid and Athens in a comparative perspective. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 44(10), 1375–1390.
- Boufounou, P., Eriotis, N., Kounadeas, T., Argyropoulos, P., & Pouloupoulos, J. (2024). Enhancing internal control mechanisms in local government organizations: a crucial step towards mitigating corruption and ensuring economic development. *Economies*, 12(4), 78.
- Bucos, T. (2024). Social and solidarity economy: principles and contributions to sustainable development and social inclusion. *European Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business*, 114–127.
- Burger, C., & Harris, D. (2015). How can decentralized systems solve system-level problems? An analysis of market-driven New Orleans school reforms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(10), 1246–1262.
- 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.
- Connelly, S., Markey, S., & Roseland, M. (2011). Bridging sustainability and the social economy: Achieving community transformation through local food initiatives. *Critical Social Policy*, 31(2), 308–324.
- Dacheux, E., & Goujon, D. (2011). The solidarity economy: An alternative development strategy? *International Social Science Journal*, 62.
- Dubois, J.-L., & Lasida, E. (2010). A new style of development to deal with the current crisis: solidarity-based economy, collective capability and sustainable human development. *Revue de Philosophie Économique/Review of Economic Philosophy*, 11(1), 35–56.
- Forstner, K. (2004). Community ventures and access to markets: The role of intermediaries in marketing rural tourism products. *Development Policy Review*, 22(5), 497–514.
- Gaižauskaitė, I., Egner, B., Heinelt, H., Krotký, J. K., & Sonnicksen, J. (2024). Exploring how Europeans understand solidarity in the EU: A focus group approach. In *How Europeans Understand Solidarity, Reciprocity and Fairness in the EU* (pp. 24–40). Routledge.
- Gaventa, J. (2004). Representation, community leadership and participation: citizen involvement in neighbourhood renewal and local governance. *Neighbourhood Renewal Unit Office of Deputy Prime Minister, February*.
- Kirmayer, L. J., Sehdev, M., Whitley, R., Dandeneau, S. F., & Isaac, C. (2009). Community resilience: Models, metaphors and measures. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 5(1), 62–117.
- Kumbamu, A. (2018). Building sustainable social and solidarity economies: Place-based and network-based strategies of alternative development organizations in India. *Community Development*, 49(1), 18–33.
- Mechanic, D., & Tanner, J. (2007). Vulnerable people, groups, and populations: societal view. *Health Affairs*, 26(5), 1220–1230.
- Mohiuddin, A. K. (2023). Escalation of war and conflicts among the COVID-19 pandemic, natural disasters, and economic crises: A global health concern. *American Journal of Biopharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 3.
- Mori, P. A. (2014). COMMUNITY AND COOPERATION: THE EVOLUTION OF COOPERATIVES TOWARDS NEW MODELS OF CITIZENS'DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC SERVICES PROVISION. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 85(3), 327–352.
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1), 127–150.
- Salvador, M., & Sancho, D. (2023). Local governments facing turbulence: Robust governance and institutional capacities. *Social Sciences*, 12(8), 462.
- Sotnyk, I., Kubatko, O., Chortok, Y., Kostenko, A., Kuppenko, O., Karintseva, O., & Tarasenko, S. (2024). Social solidarity economy during the war: The sources of individual and community resilience. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 22(3), 542.
- Stiglitz, J. (1999). Responding to economic crises: policy alternatives for equitable recovery and development. *The Manchester School*, 67(5), 409–427.
- Young, M. J. (2019). *Building community resilience through community based tourism in northern Thailand: the importance of social capital*.

