No One Stands Alone - Partnerships for Community Resilience

Maria Drakaki (✉ mdrakaki@ihu.gr)

International Hellenic University: Diethnes Panepistemio tes Ellados <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9322-7324>

Gyöngyi Kovács

Hanken School of Economics - Vaasa Campus: Hanken Svenska handelshogskolan - Vasa

Panagiotis Tzionas

International Hellenic University: Diethnes Panepistemio tes Ellados

Research Article

Keywords: Community-based social partnership , Community-based approach , Logistics , Community resilience , Financial crisis , Disaster management , Local capacity

Posted Date: January 25th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1226053/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Organisations included in social partnerships jointly address the gaps in their society and community. Community-based social partnerships are based on the principles of self-organisation, yet logistically, this can bring many challenges. This study therefore focuses on the logistical aspects of a community-based social partnership in Greece, and the contribution of this partnership to community resilience. The role of community-based logistical activities in building community resilience has been studied. An in-depth qualitative study of a particular community-based social partnership was conducted, with interviews across all partner organisations and secondary data from publicly available documents. Logistical activities are performed mainly by the membership base of various non-governmental organisations in a manner of self-organised “collective action”. Interestingly, community resilience refers to a capacity for collective action, hence organising logistical activities in this fashion ultimately contributes to community resilience.

1 Introduction

The self-reliance of communities has frequently been emphasised from various directions: Disaster management (DM) stresses how communities are “on their own” for the first hours and days after a disaster has occurred, before international aid can at all arrive. Even more, self-reliant communities can be actively involved in operational planning, policy and practice of all DM phases (Gaillard 2010). At the same time, humanitarian and development aid has moved towards localisation and local capacity building, while facilitating trade and growth. Local communities increasingly participate to different degrees in all phases of a disaster cycle including preparedness, response and recovery/reconstruction (Pardasani 2006; Gaillard 2010; Rogers et al. 2016; Matopoulos et al. 2014). Community engagement in DM also relates to community resilience (UNISDR 2009).

Community resilience has been identified as the potential for individuals to collaborate with key organisations by acting on the local level. Ideally, power and responsibility for action should pass to citizens, yet there is no single model of sustainable collaboration and community engagement in building community resilience (Rogers et al. 2016). A high degree of community participation leads to community empowerment and a high degree of citizen control (Arnstein 1969). Community participation and community partnerships can be considered as community capabilities towards building effective disaster prevention and disaster resilient communities (Chou and Wu 2014).

In the context of disaster risk reduction (DRR), there is a wide discussion on the impact of the different degrees of community participation and the “power” relationships between a community and the government (Burnside-Lawry and Carvalho 2015). Yet, community engagement contributes to community empowerment, therefore the interactions involved in the activities between stakeholders to build disaster resilience should encourage a participatory approach. Such approaches contribute to social learning, explore shared interests, joint problem solving, relationship building and can be reflected in modified policies (Burnside-Lawry and Carvalho 2015).

Community resilience has become the holy grail of both DM and development aid, and how better to create resilient communities than developing the idea of self-reliance (Shuman 2013)? Resilience is a concept that allows researchers to bridge between adaptation and resistance (Alexander 2013). Community resilience is influenced by the social and economic networks, whereas it depends on the quality of the relationships developed between public and private sectors (Stewart et al. 2009). Moreover, it can lead to positive adaptation by using stakeholders' resources (Norris et al. 2008). Among the community resources, social capital and social competence are social adaptive capacities (capabilities) that can lead to community empowerment through collective action and decision making. Capabilities also refer to the resources and assets that local communities own, including local knowledge, skills, technologies and solidarity networks (Gaillard and Mercer 2013).

Importantly, effective disaster response requires the involvement of local people with logistical expertise to coordinate needs assessment and information sharing among stakeholders (Perry 2007). Yet, it is less clear how logistics, itself a dynamic capability (Kovács et al. 2012), contributes to community resilience. Logistics is a dynamic capability of all relevant stakeholders (Kovács et al. 2012). Therefore, it has the potential to contribute to positive adaptation in a dynamic environment and community resilience building. According to Jahre et al. (2016), neither extant academic literature nor humanitarian practice distinguishes between the logistical and other efforts of a community. However, local communities do also contribute themselves to logistics (Perry 2007; Sheppard et al. 2013). Therefore, this paper focuses on the logistical activities of a local community during a crisis and examines its role in building community resilience.

In order to do so, a study has been conducted on the endeavours of a particular community-based social partnership (CBSP) in Greece in the midst of a financial crisis, a consequence of the 2008-2009 Global Financial Crisis. While financial crises are less typical in DM as well as humanitarian logistics (HL) research, at its height, the Greek financial crisis had escalated into a humanitarian crisis, with almost 2 million people depending on local aid distribution in 2012. Interestingly, however, much of this aid was self-organised by the Greek community. The community endeavour in this study has been investigated earlier in Drakaki and Tzionas (2017), who also defined a CBSP as "a grass-root, self-organised, social network that involves combinations of public, private and civic sectors, with members engaging in voluntary, mutually beneficial, innovative relationships at national level, sensitising individuals to participate in actions, in order to jointly respond to a shared risk or crisis" (p. 206).

This paper is structured as follows: The next section revisits community-based approaches in relation to (humanitarian) logistics, resulting in the presentation of a conceptual framework. After this, the research methods are presented, before turning to discussion and findings of the study itself. The paper ends with conclusions and suggests avenues for further research.

2 Literature Review

Communities are at the core of DM and HL; yet more often than not, the way they are treated are as passive aid recipients. As Kunz and Reiner (2012) point out, “community” is one of the most commonly used terms in HL literature, yet interestingly, communities are referred to as the setting or recipient, i.e. a socio-cultural situational factor, rather than a resource. At the same time, DM models acknowledge that any community is at its own in the immediate aftermath of a disaster, and the first responders are the community itself (Gaillard and Mercer 2013). Also, people affected by a disaster typically turn to their family and social network first for help; and social networks are equally important in raising interest and even volunteers in disaster relief (Stewart et al. 2014). Overall, while disasters are defined as events that exceed the capacity of a community, this is not to say that communities could not also self-organise and at least in part address the vulnerabilities and contribute to the alleviation of suffering. From the perspective of the social system, disasters are linked to latent social vulnerabilities (Quarantelli 2005; Perry 2007), whereas crises pose threats to core values and life sustaining functions (Rosenthal et al. 2001). Social vulnerabilities including uneven power distribution within the society are brought to surface when disasters strike. Therefore, DRR should focus on development, in order to address the root causes of social vulnerabilities, including power, access and choice (Wisner et al. 2004; Gaillard 2010). Accordingly, communities may take actions that will address social vulnerabilities and result in social transformation in order to build community and disaster resilience (Gaillard 2010; Weichselgartner and Kelman 2015). Generally, the discussion evolves around the link between local capacity-building, resilience, and the contribution of social capital to both of these (Bernier and Meinzen-Dick 2014).

In fact, both DM and HL research posits that by building local capacity, aid recipient communities would gain in resilience, and require less to no aid the next time they face a similar disaster. This consideration has led to an emphasis on local procurement (Matopoulos et al. 2014), and beneficiaries as decision-makers (Kovács et al. 2010). Yet HL research on local manufacturing, local business, local procurement, and local logistical efforts overall is scant (Kunz and Reiner 2012; Jahre et al. 2016). Also when it comes to depicting the HL network, communities are overlooked. Rather, HL focuses on partnerships across non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and aid agencies such as clusters and communities of practice (Kovács and Spens 2010), and alliances, partnerships and other engagements between aid agencies or NGOs with other types of organisations such as the military (Heaslip et al. 2015), logistics service providers (Tomasini and van Wassenhove 2009), and implementing partners (IPs) (Kovács 2014).

Yet also HL research has advocated for community-based approaches, not only to build local capacity and increase community resilience, but also to increase the local acceptance of decisions made in an aid programme, and return the decision-making power to beneficiaries themselves (Kovács et al. 2010). Whilst humanitarian efforts are centred on the needs of beneficiaries, the degree to which beneficiaries and communities partake in decision-making varies greatly. At one end of the spectrum, aid can be completely organised in a top-down fashion by agencies and governments (such as the agency-centric efforts described in Holguín-Veras et al. 2012), on the other, communities can also completely self-organise aid on a grass-root basis. There are many options in between, from communities partaking in decisions in governmental-steered programmes, to collaborative aid networks (CANs) that are integrated with the local social networks (Holguín-Veras et al. 2012), to beneficiaries being included in decision-

making committees or even as suppliers of materials and workforce in various programmes (Matopoulos et al. 2014). But while there is even a stream of literature that has been defined as “community-based operations research”, that claims HL to be among its domains and that focuses on problems that are community-specific (Johnson and Smilowitz 2011), it still focuses on HL models that solve community-specific problems but not necessarily on models that are driven by the community itself.

Focusing on the community as the driver of a humanitarian response, Drakaki and Tzionas (2017) have drawn upon social partnership literature when defining a community-based social partnership (CBSP), widening the scope of the traditional social partnership focus from labour market agreements to other societal endeavours. There is though more than just a common societal goal that defines a CBSP. According to Putnam (2000), *social capital* facilitates co-ordination and co-operation among community members on issues of shared concern. Social capital contributes to community resilience (Norris et al. 2008; Stewart et al. 2009; Bernier and Meinzen-Dick 2014; Weichselgartner and Kelman 2015; Cutter 2016). Yet while social capital is necessary, it is not sufficient for local development (Khrishna 2001). According to Krishna (2001), agency, as to say, some *catalyst* to urge individuals and organisations to act, is required to convert social capital to development benefits. Apart from a shared social network, a shared risk and/or crisis seems to be a catalyst for individuals’ sensitisation, and mobilisation (participation) in the CBSPs (Comfort 1999; Drakaki and Tzionas 2017). When social capital is pre-existent and potentially strong, it facilitates the formation, and self-organisation of CBSPs. For the presented CBSP, the shared risk is the loss of community’s social cohesion, through poverty, caused and aggravated by the financial crisis.

CBSPs consist in essence of a *network* of organisations and individuals. These collaborative efforts involving public, private and non-profit sectors, emerge when complex problems arise, such as disasters, to cope with issues outside the scope of a single organisation (Kamensky and Burlin 2004). *Self-organisation* is another important characteristic of CBSPs. Resilient communities exhibit self-organisation characteristics (UNISDR 2009; Norris et al. 2008) by using social networks (Holguín-Veras et al. 2012; Comfort et al. 2010; Comfort 1999; Kapucu et al. 2010; Kapucu 2005). The CANs Holguín-Veras et al. (2012) described were integrated with pre-existing social networks, such as religious congregations that came with their own social network, logistical system, and also physical space that could be used as HLSCM facilities such as collection and sorting points, warehouses, distribution points etc. Comfort et al. (2010), using the concept of complex adaptive systems as a theoretical framework, further argued that resilient communities use a self-organised and mobilised collective response system to act coherently, in response to risk or danger. Furthermore, volunteers are more likely to engage with disaster relief to a community if they have linkages to them through their social networks (Stewart et al. 2014). Self-organisation brings further challenges with it, primarily in the area of logistics, and assigning volunteers for various logistical activities (Falasca and Zobel 2012). Fig. 1 summarises these characteristics and presents a conceptual framework of a CBSP.

To summarise these characteristics, CBSPs mobilise individuals and organisations from the public, civic and private sectors towards a common societal goal. Social capital is of importance in the formation of

the network of individuals and organisations as in the mobilisation of volunteers. Through people, CBSPs also mobilise, i.e. collect and distribute, material resources. The common societal goal may be more short-term, such as the provision of aid to an affected population, but through the formation and the operation, including logistics operation, of the CBSP it further contributes to social cohesion, and ultimately, to community resilience.

3 Research Methodology

This paper investigates the logistical challenges and logistics contribution of CBSPs in community resilience by using a case example of a CBSP in Greece, named “All together, we can”. Considering the complexity of a crisis environment, the case study investigated in this paper aims to contribute in enriching the existing knowledge on the research area.

At its height, the Greek financial crisis had escalated into a humanitarian crisis, with almost 2 million people depending on local aid distribution in 2012. By 2013, the UN Human Development Index placed Greece as No.27, slipping down 9 places below its No.18 place back in 2008. While the slip has not been this drastic since, there is no recovery yet in sight, the 2019 index ranks Greece No.32. “All together, we can”, was established in response to this crisis, to collect and distribute aid to those affected.

The CBSP in the focus of this study was initiated by the private company Radio & Telecommunications Enterprises S.A (SKAI) in 2010. It called on the community to contribute in their own way to the well-being of the community, and resulted in a myriad of local organisations and people contributing to the community. While one can debate whether a media company-initiated effort is indeed a “community”-based one, it is the resultant partnership that is of essence to this study. A description of the first three years of the CBSP can be found in Drakaki and Tzionas (2017); this paper, however, turns to a more in-depth analysis of its logistical challenges.

The study itself was designed as follows: First, the members of the CBSP were mapped out to identify relevant respondents. Respondents were thus identified from private companies as well as NGOs. Interviews were conducted with participants representing different departments of each organisation, such as marketing and NGO directors, NGO representatives and private sector employees including logistics staff, in order to have a complete picture at the operational as well as technical levels. Two interview guides were used: A general one to all participants, and a more specific one for warehouse employees.

Both formal and informal interviews were conducted with various members of the CBSP, either face to face or over the phone. Data collection was implemented between October 2013 and November 2014. The process included 11 semi-structured and informal interviews plus 5 feedback documents from 6 private companies and 2 NGOs. Most of the semi-structured interviews took between 60 and 90 minutes. In addition, secondary data was collected for data triangulation from the partnership’s website, social accounting reports of the participants, and media news reports. Further written communication was exchanged to cross-verify collected information.

For the purposes of data analysis, interview topics were categorised at different themes/levels. The first theme covered general information on the structure of the partnership to validate the published action outcomes in the partnership's website and to gather more information on the logistical activities. The second theme included questions on operations and processes, such as staff responsibilities, material flow (from determining the needs/demand to organising the funding and the distribution). The third theme included questions on social capital and focused on relationships, such as how the relationship was established, how partners met and developed trust with each other (trust mechanisms), how they controlled that the agreements were held (control mechanisms), and relationship-building properties. The fourth theme included questions on how the community was involved, such as a list of human, material/physical, and organisational resources, with topics ranging from employment to the involvement of community members as decision-makers, suppliers of labour and materials. The fifth theme included more questions on social capital, such as shared interests among partners, what constitutes the "returns" in the relationship, trust and solidarity.

As the focus in this study is on the contribution of logistical activities in community resilience, the related information has been used for the analysis. Thus, only those activities that included the collection and distribution of items (food, medicine, clothing, school supplies) were included in this analysis. The author that was not involved in data collection contributed in this part in order to ensure reliability and transparency. Objectivity was optimised by following the resource division of local resources as in Matopoulos et al. (2014).

4 Findings

The aftermath of this financial crisis in Greece has led to a vast proportion of a population becoming aid recipients. The government rolled back the social welfare system due to the austerity measures. However, social solidarity and civic engagement increased considerably in response to the crisis (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014; Kantzara 2014; Simiti 2015). Accordingly, during the crisis many agencies provided social support and welfare services to people in need including local authorities, the Church of Greece, NGOs, companies, mass media companies, informal social networks as well as citizens. Informal social networks including among others, cooperatives, social pharmacies, social groceries and social medical centers, differentiate from formal organisations such as NGOs by not registering in courts (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014). Both public participation and informal volunteerism increased as the crisis evolved. Several municipalities set up a department of solidarity which often cooperated with other agencies to provide welfare services. Simiti (2015) pointed out that a novel element of both formal and informal initiatives that had emerged in response to the crisis was that they often transcended the binary divisions between formality and informality. Kantzara (2014) argued that solidarity in Greece during the crisis sustained social ties whereas simultaneously it helped so that social relations changed from bottom-up. Sotiropoulos (2014) claimed that the welfare services, provided by civil society in response to the crisis, contributed to the stabilisation of the government and therefore made democracy work (Putnam 1993). In this context, some NGOs became critical of the impact of their welfare services, wondering whether they were letting the government off the hook (Simiti 2015). Self-organisation was shown by both NGOs and

informal social networks (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014). NGOs reorganised to cover rising social needs, expanding their services in the area of social welfare and integrating volunteers in their labour force (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014; Simiti 2015). Moreover, informal social networks considered their beneficiaries as active participants in the solidarity actions (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014).

4.1 The structure of the CBSP

In an effort to cope with the effects of the crisis, SKAI, itself a broadcaster, launched a national media campaign in 2009, addressing the audience through its media outlets (radio, TV, web stations and print) in available trailer time to contribute as they can, so that services and goods could be delivered to people who really need it. Public response was growing and therefore, in 2010, the initiative became a partnership called “All together, we can”. A dedicated website was created and voluntary actions were offered in various sectors. As stated in May 2010, *“the financial crisis has penetrated through all levels of the society. It becomes obvious daily; that it is a matter that concerns all of us, and that we, all together, should react to it... We will go through this difficult period all together...”* (“All together, we can” 2013).

In other words, SKAI initiated a campaign to collect items from the public, and to distribute them to people in need. While SKAI was involved in co-ordinating the resulting efforts, it was not alone in doing so:

“The media campaign increased public awareness of the action and helped in raising public awareness of the company’s activities. It has sensitised many more citizens and private companies to join the actions and offer goods. Individual. .. contribution is large and touching.” (Deputy director of corporate communications)

Apart from donors, which apart from the general public included e.g. 2,000 supermarkets for food donations, other organisations and individuals joined in to co-ordinate the efforts and to collect and distribute the items (Fig. 2).

By 2010, IPs came from public, private and civic sectors, to promote actions in sectors such as nutrition, health and education. By using the community’s collective action, the aim was to keep society’s social cohesion intact, as illustrated by the following quote:

“.. . to reinforce social cohesion, better access to information, enhanced reputation and credibility, citizen sensitisation, boost in donations, employees’ voluntary participation in social actions” (SKAI’s deputy director of corporate communications)

From a critical perspective, a private sector company initiated the CBSP. SKAI advocated for a partnership that would enhance social cohesion, in response to the crisis, and therefore sustain social ties. It could be argued that the CBSP aimed to maintain rather than question the status quo (Weichselgartner and Kelman 2015). Yet activities such as welfare services, otherwise provided by the state, have political implications, because they expose weaknesses of the political system (Kantzara 2014) and therefore,

increase community risk awareness. The CBSP also collaborated in the logistics with informal social networks, namely social groceries, social pharmacies and social medical centers (free clinics), that were both providers of social support and expressions of public dissatisfaction (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014).

In terms of power sharing in the partnership, the specific responsibilities of SKAI were: (i) to bring key IPs together for each action type, and (ii) to implement the media campaign to promote the actions of the partnership. Decision making in the CBSP was decentralised. Some of the actions were initiated and implemented by NGOs, such as the medical services to children in need. As acknowledged by an NGO representative, participation in the CBSP increased the publicity of their actions and the number of beneficiaries:

Through the partnership more beneficiaries accessed NGO's services (increased publicity through the media campaign)

Regarding the provision of welfare services to Greek citizens, an NGO Director argued that social capital (social cohesion and inclusion) formed the basis of their policy:

"The NGO's policy is based on social cohesion and inclusion, through the provision of ... services to all people in need. The target beneficiaries before the crisis used to be socially excluded community groups... but after the crisis...the majority of the beneficiaries are Greek citizens outside of the target groups" (NGO Director)

The participation of NGOs in the CBSP further supported bottom-up approaches by promoting equality and the empowerment of beneficiaries. As stated by an NGO representative:

NGO's key policies are based on no discrimination – equity principles, voluntary work, and community capacity building through empowerment of beneficiaries. Empowerment of beneficiaries is built by following policies based on no discrimination, equity for all community members and voluntary work Drakaki and Tzionas (2017) argued that interactions and relationship building in planning and implementation of the actions facilitated development of social adaptive capacities. Changes in social relations were acknowledged by interacting IPs, such as trust development. The emerged interactions between IPs from different societal sectors and citizens and the variety of activities can enable changes of social relations (Kantzara 2014), as well as social learning (Burnside-Lawry and Carvalho 2015).

4.2 Needs assessment

Needs assessment is a complex exercise of determining who is vulnerable yet not capable to support themselves (Kovács and Spens 2007). Based on this, needs can be matched with supply, and deliveries can be organised. Needs assessment was done by programme coordinators in cooperation with the collaborating IPs, public sector services, institutions, organisations and municipalities. It was a complex process, and a dynamic one, as needs evolved and increased over time:

“There is a large increase in needs. The beneficiaries in the past used to be mostly immigrants. But currently the majority of the beneficiaries are Greek citizens, either people who have lost their jobs or low income citizens.” (NGO representative)

The CBSP responded to increasing demands from Dioceses of Greece, various institutions and organisations, social services departments of municipalities. Additionally, the Ministry of Education provided lists of students in need and the Ministry of Health provided lists of uninsured people:

“Social services departments of various municipalities in the areas of Athens and Thessaloniki provide catalogues of uninsured citizens, where each catalogue represents a different location area.” (NGO director)

Figure 3 shows the partners responsible for the needs assessment and the beneficiaries of the main actions.

In the early stage of the CBSP, SKAI created a database of people in need, accessed by anyone wishing to provide help. People in need could themselves provide their data (name, address, employment status, family members, needs) to either SKAI or other collaborating radio stations and thereby register in the database. This community-based approach of needs assessment ensures beneficiary participation and empowerment (Pardasani 2006; Matopoulos et al. 2014).

4.3 Collection and distribution

Logistically, these endeavours differed from one another significantly. Their numbers and locations of collection and distribution points, their contributors and beneficiaries, as well as the frequency of collection and distribution differed. Thus, the mobilisation of individuals, organisations, companies, among others, and resources in order to deliver services and goods to people in need was a prerequisite for the operational success of the CBSP's actions. For example, 2,000 supermarkets contributed to the food collection continuously across Greece, while e.g. school supplies were collected from the general public three times a year through specific calls to drop-off points in cities. Most collections were rather regular:

“Our audiences are the ones who contribute at large both in the food and medicine collection actions. This can be explained due to the regularity of our medicine actions which occur on a weekly basis, and the food collection is a static point of gathering where individuals can donate on a daily basis” (SKAI representative)

The collection of medicine from the public was organised with regional medical associations (also for their quality assurance) across 70 municipalities. Volunteer doctors collected the medicine, part of which was distributed to social medical centers run by volunteer doctors and social pharmacies for the uninsured citizens in Athens and border cities. The Ministry of Health stated in relation to this that

“The crisis we live requires solutions that would seem unorthodox in the past. Private sector has undertaken initiatives for the collection of medicine to help people in need. In this framework the state wants to contribute to the initiative taken by the Athens Medical Association and Apostoli...” (Ministry of Health).

Thus in the end, even public resources such as the Ministry of Health were mobilised. Their contribution was to provide free health services (health vouchers). Therefore, the measures taken by the government as a result of the interactions with the CBSP can be considered as an indication of social learning (Burnside-Lawry and Carvalho 2015).

Not only the regular actions but also the one-offs, e.g. the collection of items for the 2014 floods in the Balkans, posited quite a logistical challenge:

“But the actions that tend to shock us in respect of participants and donations to the cause are the actions that are dedicated to sensitive, desperate call for help – such as when we collected basic necessary goods. .. for the people that suffered the severe floods in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia & Herzegovina. Such organised actions tend to bring a large public outpour of participations, e.g. for the specific event we were collecting at 5 different locations around Athens. .. One specific location required 7 large trucks in order to pick up all the donations people gave on the specific day and hours of the one-day-only action event. We assume that this incredible number of participants is due to the sensibility of its cause. Even if Greece is going through a financial crisis, individuals will give what they can in their own way” (SKAI marketing department employee)

Food, medicine, and non-food items were collected from the community, and deliveries were scheduled according to the specificities of the items and their demand. Much attention was paid to the quality of collected items; which could otherwise be a main problem in material convergence especially in light of in-kind donations (Kunz et al. 2017).

“Expiration date control is done for food and medicine products. Quality product control takes place with frequent subsequent controls.” (NGO logistics staff)

Each logistics plan of action was decided on the basis of the corresponding programme. Logistics planning was done by programme co-ordinators in co-operation with programme IPs. Logistics assessment was linked with the operational organisation of the programmes. Interestingly, however, logistical activities of collection, but also of materials handling, warehousing, transportation and distribution were all carried out by various members of the community itself.

Volunteers did the collection, sorting and materials handling, churches served as warehouses, trucks were provided by private companies, and anything from social supermarkets to municipal buildings were used as points of distribution:

“Using the five social groceries, goods are distributed as packages of “love” to large unit families, low income families, students and soup kitchens. They are also distributed to various foundations and

charity institutions. Medicine is distributed in co-operation with the Athens Medical Association from the social pharmacies.” (NGO logistics staff)

Figure 4 shows the partners involved in the logistics decision making of the main actions.

The overall logistical assessment of the CBSP is summarised in Table 1.

5 Analysis

Operationally, the CBSP can be characterised as an event network operating in a crisis. For the CBSP, resources and individuals are dynamically mobilised and self-organised to contribute to community resilience. An analogy can be made to the event nature of humanitarian supply chains or networks operating in turbulent environments which leads to a transformation of resources and skills to dynamic capabilities (Kovács et al. 2012).

Table 1

Logistics assessment of the CBSP

Assessment	Description	Type/Actors
Infrastructure	Nodes activated nationwide depending on the action	
Human resources (HR)	Collection of in-kind donations	<p>Faith-based volunteers for collection of medicine, including in churches;</p> <p>Private companies' volunteer employees, including for collection of in-kind donations for children in need,</p> <p>NGO or church employees and volunteers for collection of food in supermarkets,</p> <p>Volunteers of social networks</p>
	Warehousing	NGO employees and volunteers
	Transportation of in-kind donations	<p>Volunteer private companies,</p> <p>Military for transportation in border areas,</p> <p>NGO employees</p>
	Distribution of in-kind donations	<p>Organisations/institutions for distribution of in-kind donations for children in need</p> <p>NGOs for food and medicine distribution</p>
Locations	Collection points of in-kind donations	<p>Churches</p> <p>Municipal buildings,</p> <p>Supermarkets,</p> <p>Open squares</p>
Warehousing	Central warehouse -operated by an NGO	Apostoli
	Local warehouses	<p>Free clinics,</p> <p>Social pharmacies,</p> <p>Social groceries,</p> <p>Medical Association of Athens (main offices),</p> <p>Churches,</p> <p>Municipal buildings</p>
Transportation	Trucks - provided by volunteer private companies or owned by NGOs	Such as 3E, Apostoli
	Mobile medical unit	

Distribution	Points of distribution	Free clinics, Social pharmacies, Social groceries, Churches, Various organisations, Schools, “Social Mission” offices, Social departments of municipalities
Mobilisation	Media campaign	Radio, TV, web stations, and print of SKAI
	Coordination	An IP for each programme/action
	Self-organisation (depending on the programme/action, in order to achieve programme goals)	By collaboration between different departments of IPs, Municipalities, Government, Volunteer organisations and Private companies,
Accountability	Action assessment reports	Mainly on partnership’s website
Data covers the period 1/2010-7/2014; *Since September 2013		

The success of any community resilience initiative depends on the availability of resources. Table 2 analyses the resources of the CBSP as suggested by Matopoulos et al. (2014), i.e. in terms of access to beneficiaries, cost efficiency, continuity, balancing the local economy, knowledge of local authorities, community participation, ownership of the decision and aid effectiveness. The community impact shown in Table 2 has been measured in terms of the information extracted from the data (mainly interviews) concerning intangible aspects such as trust mechanisms or relationship building as well as measured outcomes such as number of medicinal products collected in a certain time period.

Physical resources included local material and infrastructure (see also Table 1). Local churches and municipal buildings were collection points, and informal social structures (social groceries, social pharmacies, social medical centers) were part of the distribution channels. Local material included food collected at local supermarkets for the action of food collection. Thus, cost efficiency as well as balancing the local economy can be identified as contributors to a positive community impact (Matopoulos et al. 2014).

Human resources include the volunteers registering their own services at the CBSP’s website, volunteers in the partnership actions, such as doctors in the action of medical services to children in need; church

employees, faith-based church members which provided voluntary work for the churches being points of actions collection and doctors for the receiving, sorting, quality control, warehousing and distribution of medicine donations; journalists and reporters of SKAI for the media campaign; private company employees, who contributed in the logistics of the actions. For instance, the logistics for the collection of goods for children in need (Fig. 2 and Table 1) were collaboratively done by volunteers from NBG, municipalities' social services, orphanage institutions and large-unit families unions. It should be noted, that certain volunteers were beneficiaries themselves, such as volunteers from orphanage institutions and large-unit families unions. Collaboration is enhanced among volunteers of networks with strong social/religious connections (Holguín-Veras et al. 2012). Based on survey results, many volunteers were unemployed citizens that felt empowered by participating in the various solidarity actions (Sotiropoulos and Bourikos 2014). However, IPs acknowledged that the large number of volunteers was a challenge, mainly due to volunteer training. Human resources training is a key element in HL (Kovács et al. 2012).

In the HL context, the partnership exhibits an agility dimension (Oloruntoba and Gray 2006), as the actions/events take place at a national level and many resources (such as faith-based volunteers or NGO members) constitute a dormant resource (Kovács and Tatham 2009; Matopoulos et al. 2014) mobilised when needed. Moreover, information technology, warehouse and logistics employees, marketing and communication departments co-ordinators and local logistics service providers included staff/paid personnel that contributed to the human resources.

Table 2

Resources provided by the CBSP and partnership's community impact

Type of resource	Description	Community Impact
Physical	<p>Use of local material, local infrastructure:</p> <p>Depending on the action (including medicine, medical supplies and equipment; mobile medical unit, transportation vehicles, warehouse, municipal buildings, churches, social pharmacies; social groceries)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reinforcement of social cohesion ● Access to beneficiaries ● Provision of services and in-kind donations to meet beneficiary needs ● Community competence building ● Community capacity building ● Trust (between partners in individual actions and between partners and beneficiaries)
Human	<p>Local volunteers (including doctors, administrative personnel, journalists, reporters, personnel for receiving, sorting or transporting in-kind donations);</p> <p>Local staff/paid personnel (including information technology, warehouse and logistics employees),</p> <p>Marketing and communication departments coordinators;</p> <p>Local logistics service providers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Community social capital building/ Relationship building ● Mobilisation of individuals ● Volunteerism ● Cost efficiency ● Continuity ● Balancing the local economy ● Knowledge of local authorities ● Ownership of the decision ● Community participation ● Aid effectiveness ● Example outcomes in terms of collected goods:
Organisational	<p>Local IPs</p> <p>National media campaign</p> <p>Local decision making</p> <p>Relationship building/ co-ordination, collaboration for aid delivery</p> <p>Information and communication</p>	<p>2012: 3,226,600 daily meals – close to the year distributed meals by Apostoli</p> <p>16/6/2012-1/7/2013: 491,000 medicinal products</p>

Depending on the action: local procurement;
warehousing; transportation; distribution

Accountability, transparency of the actions; action
assessment reports

Organisational resources included local IPs. Thus, community participation and knowledge of local authorities contribute to positive community impact. For instance, the social services department of the relevant municipality cooperated with Doctors of the World Greece to suggest the location for each action and the associated list of beneficiaries. Social groceries and social pharmacies operated in spaces offered for free by the municipalities. The local chapters of Red Cross in Athens and Thessaloniki assisted with transportation and temporary warehousing of collected goods for the flood-stricken countries of Serbia and Bosnia Herzegovina, in 2014. Local organisational resources such as local chapters and IPs in humanitarian aid contribute to the continuity of aid programs and the development of community resilience (Oloruntoba and Gray 2006; Matopoulos et al. 2014).

Procurement was not integral resource in all actions. For instance, the food and medicine collection actions relied on donors as suppliers of material. The national media campaign was generally acknowledged to contribute to the mobilisation of individuals and resources, and a boost in donations (Drakaki and Tzionas 2017).

Community impact includes community competence, trust and social capital building (Drakaki and Tzionas 2017). Trust between collaborating IPs was either pre-existent or developed through the actions. The authors argued that social interactions and relationship building enabled by the actions, contributed to development of social adaptive capacities (resources), i.e. social capital and community competence building and therefore community resilience building (Norris et al. 2008). Relationship building is a key element of logistics (Kovács et al. 2012; Jahre et al. 2016). Community competence, defined as the place attributes that promote health and well-being, is an indicator/form of community resilience (Cutter 2008). Collective action in the logistical activities enabled social capital and community competence and therefore, community resilience building (Norris et al. 2008). Importantly, the impact on the community is not only one in terms of the aid being received, but further impacts can be traced in light of reinforcing the social cohesion of the community, and in building local capacity – which are also the aims of community resilience.

6 Conclusions

This paper has investigated the logistical aspects of a community-based social partnership in Greece, and the contribution of this partnership's logistical activities to community resilience. Based on the logistics performance, a conceptual model has been developed, linking the partnership with self-organisation, social capital building, and community resilience. The community impact of physical, human and organisational resources follows the resource division of local resources introduced by

Matopoulos et al. (2014). The CBSP's actions have mobilised resources and individuals to participate in self-organised logistical activities in order to reinforce social cohesion. Various CBSP's actions mobilised public resources including local authorities and ministries to contribute in the logistics. They even triggered further solidarity/policy measures by various ministries, and therefore, may have contributed to social learning. Social changes show the capacity of a community to adapt and bounce forward. An agility dimension has been shown as dormant resources are mobilised on an event/action need basis at a national level.

Community impact also includes social resources such as community competence and social capital, both enabled by collective action in the logistical activities. Relationship building between IPs facilitated social capital building and contributed to the planning and implementation of the CBSP's logistical activities. Stakeholder engagement and interactions enabled self-organised collective action for the logistics implementation and contributed to community capacity building.

Furthermore, the media campaign of the CBSP has been identified as a communicative strategy that encouraged public engagement and advocated for the social risk dimensions, such as the loss of social cohesion (Drakaki and Tzionas 2017). Many volunteers contributed in the implementation of the logistical activities, yet, decision making was mainly done by the various IPs. The partnership's social welfare services contributed to exposing the weaknesses of the system. Moreover, in some logistical activities volunteers were both beneficiaries and active participants. Furthermore, the partnership collaborated with informal social networks that also exposed the weaknesses of the political system in the social welfare. A shift of responsibilities between public, civil and private sectors has been acknowledged in the CBSP (Drakaki et al. 2017). Future research could focus on issues of governance and the relationship between community resilience and transformation of governance. Therrien et al. (2020) have identified the lack of institutional factors in the literature of (urban) resilience.

The role of community-based logistical activities in building community resilience has been studied. The study complements existing knowledge on the contribution of community-based logistical activities to community resilience. It was conducted during the aftermaths of the Greek financial crisis, and the context may impact significantly on the findings. The focus of this study is on the Greek population. Later refugee movements have not been included in this study.

Future research could investigate the evolvement of the partnership in terms of its contribution to community capacity building, especially since 2015, in the context of both the financial crisis and the refugee flows. Furthermore, future research could focus on the analysis of informal social networks as well as similar international CBSPs in order to formulate policy responses for community resilience.

Declarations

Funding

No funding was received for conducting this study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. "All together, we can" (2013) "All together, we can". Available at: <https://www.oloimaziboroume.gr/>. Accessed 16 October 2013
2. Alexander DE (2013) Resilience and disaster risk reduction: an etymological journey. *Nat Hazard Earth Sys* 13: 2707–2716
3. Arnstein SR (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *J Am I Planners* 35(4): 216–224
4. Bernier Q, Meinzen-Dick R (2014) Resilience and Social Capital (Vol. 4). *Intl Food Policy Res Inst*
5. Burnside-Lawry J, Carvalho L (2015) Building local level engagement in disaster risk reduction: a Portugese case study. *Disaster Prev Manag* 24: 80–99
6. Chou J-S, Wu J-H (2014) Success factors of enhanced disaster resilience in urban community. *Nat Hazards* 74:661–686
7. Comfort LK (1999) *Shared Risk: Complex Systems in Seismic Response*. Pergamon Press, New York
8. Comfort LK, Boin A, Demchak CC (2010) *Designing Resilience: Preparing for extreme events*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh
9. Cutter SL, Barnes L, Berry M, Burton C, Evans E, Tate E, Webb J (2008) A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Glob Environ Chang* 18(4): 598–606
10. Cutter SL (2016) The landscape of disaster resilience indicators in the USA. *Nat Hazards* 80: 741–758
11. Drakaki M, Tzionas P (2017) Community-based social partnerships in crisis resilience: a case example in Greece. *Disaster Prev Manag* 26(2): 203-216
12. Falasca M, Zobel C (2012) An optimization model for volunteer assignments in humanitarian organizations. *Socio-Econ Plan Sci* 46: 250-260
13. Gaillard JC (2010) Vulnerability, capacity and resilience: perspectives for climate and development policy. *J Int Dev* 22(2): 218-232
14. Gaillard JC, Mercer J (2013) From knowledge to action: Bridging gaps in disaster risk reduction. *Prog Hum Geogr* 37(1): 93-114
15. Heaslip G, Kovács G, Haavisto I (2015) Supply chain innovation: Lessons from humanitarian supply chains. In: Stentoft J, Paulraj A, Vastag G (eds) *Research in the Decision Sciences for Global Supply Chain Network Innovations*. Pearson Press, pp. 9-26
16. Holguín-Veras J, Jaller M, Wachtendorf T (2012) Comparative performance of alternative humanitarian logistic structures after the Port-au-Prince earthquake: ACEs, PIEs, and CANs. *Transp Res A* 46: 1623–1640

17. Jahre M, Pazirandeh A, Wassenhove LV (2016) Defining logistics preparedness: A framework and research agenda. *J Humanit Logist Supply Chain Manag* 6(3): 372-398
18. Johnson MP, Smilowitz K (2011) Community-Based Operations Research. In: Johnson (ed) *Community-Based Operations Research: Decision Modeling for Local Impact and Diverse Populations*. Springer, pp. 37-65
19. Kamensky J, Burlin T (eds) (2004) *Collaboration using partnerships and networks*. Rowman & Littlefield, New York
20. Kantzara V (2014) Solidarity in times of Crisis: Emergent Practices and Potential for Paradigmatic Change. *Notes from Greece. Studi Sociol* 3: 261-280
21. Kapucu N (2005) Interorganizational coordination in dynamic context: networks in emergency response management. *Connect* 26(2): 33–48
22. Kapucu N, Arslan T, Collins ML (2010) Catastrophic Disasters : Toward a Network-Centered Approach. *Admin Soc* 42: 222-247
23. Kovács G, Spens KM (2007) Humanitarian logistics in disaster relief operations. *Int J Phys Distr Log* 37(2): 99–114
24. Kovács G, Tatham P (2009) Responding to disruptions in the supply network – from dormant to action. *J Bus Logist* 30(2): 506–528
25. Kovács G, Spens KM (2010) Knowledge sharing in relief supply chains. *Int J Netw Virtual Organ* 7(2/3): 222-239
26. Kovács G, Matopoulos A, Hayes O (2010) A community-based approach to supply chain design. *Int J Logist Res App* 13(5): 411-422
27. Kovács G, Tatham P, Larson, PD (2012) What skills are needed to be a humanitarian logistician?. *J Bus Logist* 33(3): 245–258
28. Kovács G (2014) Where next? The future of humanitarian logistics. In: Tatham P, Christopher M (eds) *Humanitarian Logistics: Meeting the Challenge of Preparing for and Responding to Disasters*, 2nd edn. Kogan Page, London, pp.275-286
29. Krishna A (2001) Moving from the stock of social capital to the flow of benefits: the role of agency. *World Dev* 29(6): 925-943
30. Kunz N, Reiner G (2012) A meta-analysis of humanitarian logistics research. *J Humanit Logist Supply Chain Manag* 2(2): 116-147
31. Kunz N, Van Wassenhove L, Besiou M, Hambye C, Kovács G (2017) Relevance of humanitarian logistics research: Best practices and way forward. *Int J Oper Prod Man* 37(11): 1585-1599
32. Matopoulos A, Kovács G, Hayes O (2014) Examining the use of local resources and procurement practices in humanitarian supply chains: an empirical examination of large scale house reconstruction projects. *Decision Sci* 45(4): 621-646
33. Norris FH, Stevens SP, Pfefferbaum B, Wyche KF, Pfefferbaum RL (2008) Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *Am J Commun Psychol*

41(1/2): 127-150

34. Oloruntoba R, Gray R (2006) Humanitarian aid: An agile supply chain. *Supply Chain Manag* 11(2): 115–120
35. Pardasani M (2006) Tsunami reconstruction and redevelopment in the Maldives: A case study of community participation and social action. *Disaster Prev Manag* 15(1): 79-91
36. Perry M (2007) Natural disaster management planning : A study of logistics managers responding to the tsunami. *Int J Phys Distr Log* 37(5): 409-433
37. Putnam RD (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
38. Putnam RD (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon and Schuster, New York
39. Quarantelli EL (2005) A social science research agenda for the disasters of the 21st century: theoretical, methodological and empirical issues and their professional implementation. In: Perry RW, Quarantelli EL (eds). *What is a disaster?*, pp. 325–396, Xlibris, Bloomington
40. Rogers P, Burnside-Lawry J, Dragisic J, Mills C (2016) Collaboration and communication. *Disaster Prev Manag* 25(1): 75 – 90
41. Rosenthal U, Boin A, Comfort LK (eds) (2001) *Managing Crises, Threats, Dilemmas, Opportunities*. C. C. Thomas, Springfield
42. Sheppard A, Tatham P, Fisher R, Gapp R (2013) Humanitarian Logistics: enhancing the engagement of local populations. *J Humanit Logist Supply Chain Manag* 3(1): 22–36
43. Shuman, M (2013) *Going Local: Creating Self-Reliant Communities in a Global Age*. Routledge, New York
44. Simiti M (2015) 'Social Need' or 'Choice'? Greek Civil Society during the Economic Crisis". Greece Paper No.95. Hellenic Observatory Papers on Greece and Southeast Europe
45. Sotiropoulos D (2014) Civil Society in Greece in the Wake of the Economic Crisis. Research Paper. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung & ELIAMEP, Athens
46. Sotiropoulos DA, Bourikos D (2014) Economic Crisis, Social Solidarity and the Voluntary Sector in Greece. *J Power Polit Gov* 2(2): 33-53
47. Stewart GT, Kolluru R, Smith M (2009) Leveraging public-private partnerships to improve community resilience in times of disaster. *Int J Phys Distr Log* 39(5): 343– 364
48. Stewart K, Glanville JL, Bennett DA (2014) Exploring spatiotemporal and social network factors in community response to a major flood disaster. *Prof Geogr* 66(3): 421-435
49. Therrien M-C, Usher S, Matyas D (2020) Enabling strategies and impeding factors to urban resilience implementation: A scoping review. *J Conting Crisis Man* 28(1): 83–102
50. Tomasini RM, van Wassenhove LN (2009) From preparedness to partnerships: case study research on humanitarian logistics. *Int Trans Oper Res* 16(5): 549-559

51. United Nations Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) (2009) UNISDR terminology on disaster risk reduction. UNISDR, Geneva
52. Weichselgartner J, Kelman I (2015) Geographies of resilience: Challenges and opportunities of a descriptive concept. Prog Hum Geogr 39(3): 249–267
53. Wisner B, Blaikie P, Cannon T, Davis I (2004) At Risk: Natural Hazards, People’s Vulnerability and Disasters. Routledge, London

Figures

Figure 1

A conceptual framework of a CBSP

Figure 2

Structure and programmes of the “All together, we can” CBSP. Data covers the period 1/2010-7/2014

Type of actions	Decision makers in the needs assessment	Beneficiaries
Food collection	Apostoli in Athens, Regional Dioceses in other cities Ministry of Education	Poor citizens served in the soup kitchens, large unit families, low income families, low income students
Medicine collection	Athens and regional Medical Associations	Uninsured or marginalised citizens
Medical services to children in need	Doctors of the World Greece Social services departments of various municipalities in Athens and Thessaloniki	Uninsured or marginalised citizens of the specific locations of the municipalities. Citizens from other city locations were accepted by the NGO during the actions
Collection of goods for children in need	NBG and SKAI	Children of low-income large-unit families, children of non-profit welfare organisations and children in the social services departments of municipalities

Figure 3

Partners involved in the needs assessment and beneficiaries of main actions

Type of actions	Decision makers for the collection and warehousing	Decision makers for the transportation and distribution
Food collection	Collection: 2,000 supermarkets Warehousing: Apostoli in Athens and Regional Dioceses in other cities	Transportation: Apostoli in Athens and Regional Dioceses in other cities Distribution: Apostoli in Athens, social groceries in other cities
	Collection: Athens and regional medical Association - volunteer doctors	Transportation: Apostoli in Athens

Figure 4

The partners involved in the decision making in the collection, warehousing, transportation and distribution of the main actions