Article

2025 3rd International Conference on the Sociology of the Global Economy, Education, Arts and Humanities (GEEAH 2025)

Soft Resilience in Urban Governance

Zhijiang Lu [1,*] and Hongbo Yu [2]

[1] School of International Affairs and Public Administration, Ocean University of China, Qingdao, 10423, China
[2] School of Marxism, Northeastern University, Shenyang, 10145, China
* Correspondence: Zhijiang Lu, School of International Affairs and Public Administration, Ocean University of China, Qingdao, 10423, China

Abstract: From the perspective of public administration, this paper reconstructs the "soft resilience" framework within urban resilience theory, breaking away from the traditional focus on physical infrastructure. It highlights the critical role of social, cultural, and institutional factors in enhancing urban adaptability. Through interdisciplinary integration, this paper introduces complexity theory, multi-dimensional value balancing in policy-making, and adaptive management models, systematically exploring flexible policy adjustments and feedback mechanisms in dynamic environments. It reveals the coordinating and driving role of public administration in building urban resilience. "Soft resilience" is conceptualized as a dynamic adaptation process aimed at continuous learning, feedback, and optimization to strengthen cities' capacities to confront globalization, climate change, and social uncertainties. By constructing participatory mechanisms, fostering cross-sector collaboration, and strengthening social capital, public administration emerges not merely as a crisis manager but as a fundamental driver of institutional transformation and urban resilience.

Keywords: urban resilience; public administration perspective; soft resilience

1. Introduction

The rapid acceleration of globalization and urbanization has intensified the complexity and vulnerability of urban environments. Increasing environmental uncertainties and socio-economic risks have made urban resilience a critical area of focus for urban planning and public administration. This paper aims to introduce a new conceptual framework — "soft resilience" — which extends traditional notions of resilience beyond physical infrastructure to include social, cultural, and institutional dimensions.

Originally, the concept of urban resilience was deeply rooted in ecological studies, where it primarily described the capacity of ecosystems to absorb disturbances and maintain essential functions despite external shocks or stresses. Early ecological resilience theory emphasized an ecosystem's ability to persist, adapt, and reorganize in the face of environmental changes, such as natural disasters, climatic shifts, or human interventions [1]. This biological foundation provided a useful framework for understanding how complex systems respond to uncertainty and disruption.

As urban environments grew increasingly complex, scholars and practitioners began to extend the resilience concept beyond the ecological domain. Over time, urban resilience evolved to encompass the broader socio-economic, political, and technological dimensions of city systems. In this expanded view, cities are understood not just as physical

Received: 05 April 2025
Revised: 12 April 2025
Accepted: 22 April 2025
Published: 29 May 2025

infrastructures, but as dynamic social-ecological-technical networks that require multifaceted forms of resilience to thrive under conditions of risk, volatility, and change.

Traditionally, approaches to urban resilience were dominated by what is termed "hard resilience" strategies. These strategies focus on strengthening the physical robustness of cities through measures such as constructing flood defenses, earthquake-resistant buildings, redundant infrastructure systems, and technological safeguards. The emphasis was placed on engineering solutions and material fortifications to minimize physical vulnerabilities and ensure the rapid restoration of urban functions after a disruptive event [2].

However, contemporary urban challenges — including climate change, social fragmentation, economic instability, and governance crises — reveal the limitations of hard resilience alone. Physical defenses, while necessary, are insufficient to address the complex, systemic, and often unpredictable risks cities now face [3]. Consequently, there is an increasing recognition of the need to cultivate "soft resilience" — the less tangible but equally critical capacities that enable urban societies to adapt, transform, and thrive amidst adversity.

Soft resilience emphasizes non-physical attributes such as community engagement and empowerment, the preservation and reinforcement of cultural identity, policy flexibility and innovation, participatory governance, social trust, and the ability of institutions to learn and evolve. These soft dimensions of resilience contribute to strengthening the social fabric and enhancing adaptive governance mechanisms that are crucial for long-term urban sustainability. By fostering inclusive social networks, responsive policy-making, and cultural continuity, cities enhance their capacity not only to withstand shocks but also to regenerate and transform in response to ongoing pressures.

In sum, the shift from an exclusive focus on hard resilience to an integrated understanding that values soft resilience represents a critical evolution in urban resilience theory. It reflects the growing appreciation that resilience is as much about people, institutions, and cultural systems as it is about physical structures [4].

From a public administration perspective, "soft resilience" emphasizes enhancing urban adaptability through non-material resources. Policies that encourage social capital development, civic participation, and cross-sector collaboration are critical. Public administrators play a central role in orchestrating these efforts, not only responding to crises but proactively shaping the adaptive capacities of cities.

This research synthesizes insights from ecology, sociology, and governance studies to propose a holistic view of urban resilience. By integrating complexity theory and adaptive management approaches, it provides a framework that better addresses the dynamic, multi-scalar challenges facing modern cities. "Soft resilience" thus emerges as essential for sustainable urban development, ensuring that cities can navigate the intertwined crises of globalization, climate change, and social instability.

2. Urban Resilience under the Public Administration Perspective

2.1. Multidimensional Exploration of Urban Resilience

Urban resilience originally stems from the Latin term resilio, meaning "to rebound". Initially linked to material science, the concept migrated into ecology to describe ecosystems' ability to maintain function amidst external disturbances. Urban resilience has since evolved into a multidimensional concept encompassing social, economic, technological, and environmental systems [5].

Ecological studies initially laid the theoretical foundation for the concept of resilience, emphasizing the importance of system stability, adaptability, and the capacity to recover from disturbances. Early ecological research was primarily concerned with understanding how natural systems, such as forests, wetlands, or coral reefs, could maintain their essential functions and structures despite environmental shocks like storms, fires, or human-induced disruptions. Stability was understood not as a static state but as the ability to

absorb change while preserving core characteristics; adaptability referred to adjusting internal processes in response to external pressures.

Building upon these insights, social-ecological research emerged to bridge the gap between natural and human systems. Scholars recognized that ecosystems are inextricably linked to human activities, governance structures, and socio-economic processes. This interdisciplinary approach expanded the discussion of resilience to include how human communities interact with, shape, and depend upon ecological systems [6]. Key themes such as collective action, institutional robustness, adaptive governance, and socio-economic equity became integral to understanding resilience. Human agency, cultural factors, and political dynamics were acknowledged as crucial variables that influence a system's capacity to adapt and transform under conditions of stress.

In the era of globalization and rapid urbanization, the resilience discourse has become even more urgent and complex. Modern cities are deeply embedded in global networks of finance, trade, information, and migration, rendering them simultaneously powerful and vulnerable. They face a growing array of diverse and interconnected risks that transcend traditional boundaries. Climate change poses existential threats through rising sea levels, extreme weather events, and resource scarcity. Pandemics, such as COVID-19, have exposed the fragility of global health systems and urban infrastructures. Social unrest, driven by inequality, political polarization, and cultural tensions, further challenges the stability and cohesion of urban societies [7].

These multifaceted risks demonstrate that resilience strategies based solely on physical robustness — such as building stronger levees, reinforcing infrastructure, or enhancing technological redundancies — are no longer sufficient. Contemporary urban resilience must also incorporate social, economic, institutional, and cultural dimensions. It requires flexible governance mechanisms, inclusive decision-making processes, diversified economies, strong social networks, and a proactive capacity for learning and adaptation. Only by embracing a holistic approach that integrates both hard and soft aspects of resilience can cities hope to navigate the uncertainties and complexities of the 21st century.

Public administration adds a crucial layer by emphasizing institutional flexibility, participatory governance, and cultural cohesion. From this viewpoint, resilience is not just about surviving shocks but thriving through dynamic adaptation and system evolution.

2.2. The Role of Public Administration in Urban Resilience

Public administration plays a transformative role in reshaping the understanding and practice of urban resilience by advocating for holistic, system-wide thinking. Traditionally, resilience in urban contexts was often framed through a technical and infrastructural lens, emphasizing physical assets such as transportation networks, utility grids, and building fortifications [8]. While these components remain vital, public administration scholars and practitioners argue that an exclusive focus on technical resilience overlooks the deeper, systemic dimensions that determine a city's true capacity to withstand and adapt to complex challenges.

From a public administration perspective, cities are not merely agglomerations of physical structures; they are intricate social organisms composed of diverse populations, institutional arrangements, cultural traditions, and political dynamics. Thus, resilience must be understood as an emergent property of these interconnected systems. Public administration theory emphasizes that governance frameworks — ranging from formal government agencies to informal community organizations — are critical mediators of resilience. The ways in which policies are formulated, decisions are made, and resources are allocated directly influence a city's ability to anticipate risks, respond effectively to crises, and recover in a sustainable manner [9].

Moreover, public administration highlights the importance of social structures and civic engagement as fundamental pillars of urban resilience. Strong social networks, pub-

lic trust, inclusive governance, and participatory decision-making processes create a reservoir of social capital that can be mobilized during times of crisis [10]. Cultural systems, too, are recognized as crucial, as they shape collective identities, shared values, and community narratives that foster solidarity and continuity amidst disruption.

By integrating social, cultural, political, and institutional dimensions into resilience strategies, public administration advocates a more comprehensive and dynamic model of urban resilience. This approach recognizes that resilience is not solely built through engineering feats or technological innovation, but through adaptive governance, collaborative leadership, community empowerment, and the nurturing of a civic culture that values flexibility, learning, and collective action. In doing so, it broadens the scope of resilience planning, ensuring that cities are better equipped not only to endure shocks but to evolve and thrive in the face of uncertainty [11].

Key functions of public administration include:

1) Policy innovation: Designing adaptive policies that evolve with shifting risks.
2) Cross-sector collaboration: Bridging governmental departments, private sectors, and communities.
3) Civic engagement: Mobilizing community participation to strengthen social trust and cooperative capacities.

The emphasis shifts from reinforcing physical defenses to building societal and institutional flexibility. Public administrators thus become architects of adaptive urban systems, facilitating dynamic learning, collaboration, and inclusive governance to reinforce cities' long-term resilience.

3. Building the "Soft Resilience" Framework

3.1. Complexity and System Dynamics in Urban Resilience

Modern cities operate as complex adaptive systems where social, economic, environmental, and political elements interact dynamically. Traditional resilience strategies focusing on physical infrastructure are insufficient in addressing the intertwined, evolving risks cities face today.

Complexity theory offers a vital conceptual framework for rethinking urban resilience in the contemporary era. It suggests that cities, as complex adaptive systems, must develop capabilities not merely to withstand external shocks but also to adapt, transform, and evolve in response to changing conditions. In complexity theory, systems are characterized by non-linearity, emergent behaviors, dynamic interactions among components, and sensitivity to initial conditions. Applied to urban contexts, this perspective implies that cities are not static entities but constantly evolving networks of people, institutions, infrastructures, and environments [12].

Under this view, resilience is not a matter of returning to a pre-existing equilibrium after disturbance — a notion tied to more traditional, engineering-based conceptions — but rather the ability to learn from disturbances, reorganize internal structures, and develop new trajectories that enhance long-term sustainability. Therefore, a city's resilience must be framed not simply as resistance to disruption, but as an ongoing process of adaptation, transformation, and innovation.

Implementing this complexity-informed approach demands a resilience framework that prioritizes flexibility, continuous learning, and systemic feedback mechanisms across multiple layers of governance and society. Flexibility allows institutions, policies, and communities to adjust strategies dynamically as new information and conditions arise, rather than rigidly adhering to pre-established plans [13]. Learning processes — both institutional and societal — enable the identification of vulnerabilities, the diffusion of best practices, and the fostering of innovation in problem-solving. Systemic feedback, gathered through monitoring, evaluation, and participatory engagement, ensures that governance systems remain sensitive to emerging risks and community needs, thus preventing maladaptive path dependencies.

Moreover, complexity theory underscores the necessity of multi-level, polycentric governance. Cities must coordinate resilience-building efforts not only at the municipal level but also across regional, national, and even global scales. At the same time, local communities, civil society organizations, and grassroots networks must be empowered as co-producers of resilience, recognizing that adaptive capacity is distributed throughout society rather than centralized in formal institutions alone [14].

By integrating principles from complexity theory, urban resilience frameworks can move beyond simplistic, linear models and embrace a more nuanced, dynamic understanding of how cities survive and thrive amid uncertainty. This perspective ultimately supports the development of urban systems that are not only robust but also profoundly adaptive, capable of transforming themselves in the face of continual change [15].

Public administration plays a vital role by fostering adaptive governance structures capable of dynamic response. Policymakers must move beyond linear, rigid planning toward strategies that recognize interdependencies and anticipate emergent risks through systemic analysis and continuous adjustment.

3.2. Policy-Making: Balancing Multiple Values

Urban resilience construction requires careful balancing of diverse, sometimes conflicting, values — economic growth, social equity, environmental protection, and cultural sustainability. Policy-making under a public administration lens must mediate among these objectives rather than privileging short-term economic or political gains.

Key aspects include:

1) Inclusive governance: Ensuring marginalized voices contribute to resilience planning.
2) Flexibility and responsiveness: Policies must adapt as social and environmental conditions evolve.
3) Long-term vision: Resilience strategies must prioritize sustainability over immediate outputs.

Public administrators must act as mediators among stakeholders, orchestrating policies that enhance resilience without sacrificing environmental integrity, social justice, or cultural vitality.

3.3. From Crisis Management to Comprehensive Resilience Strategies

Historically, urban resilience was equated with emergency response and crisis management. Today, resilience encompasses proactive, systemic planning that integrates social capital development, cultural sustainability, and environmental stewardship.

Modern resilience strategies involve:

1) Risk anticipation: Identifying vulnerabilities before they escalate.
2) Capacity building: Empowering communities to self-organize and recover.
3) Adaptive learning: Continuously revising policies based on new data and feedback.

Public administration ensures that resilience planning shifts from reactive responses to proactive, holistic frameworks encompassing everyday governance and long-term sustainability.

3.4. Holistic Risk Assessment and Dynamic Feedback

Effective urban resilience frameworks require comprehensive, multi-scalar risk assessment systems covering infrastructure, governance structures, social networks, economic vitality, and ecological health.

Dynamic feedback mechanisms are crucial:

1) Continuous monitoring: Real-time tracking of social, environmental, and economic indicators.
2) Iterative adaptation: Policies must evolve in response to emerging challenges and lessons learned.
3) Stakeholder engagement: Feedback loops must include diverse community voices to ensure equity and inclusivity.

Public administration must establish adaptive feedback systems that promote resilience not as a static goal but as an evolving, iterative process.

3.5. A Comprehensive Framework of "Soft Resilience"

"Soft resilience" integrates:

1) Complexity and dynamic systems thinking
2) Multi-value balancing in policy-making
3) Transition from crisis management to systemic adaptability
4) Ongoing risk evaluation and learning

At its core, "soft resilience" positions cities as living systems whose resilience depends on the strength of their social fabrics, cultural coherence, governance adaptability, and institutional learning capacities.

Public administration acts as the central node coordinating across sectors, nurturing social capital, encouraging innovation, and maintaining flexibility in governance structures. Through this, cities become not merely survivors of crises but agile, thriving ecosystems capable of continual adaptation.

4. Future Directions for Urban Resilience Research from the Perspective of Soft Resilience

4.1. Interdisciplinary Integration and Theoretical Expansion

The evolution of urban resilience research increasingly demands interdisciplinary integration. Political science, sociology, urban planning, environmental science, and public administration must collaborate to address complex urban challenges.

Through cross-disciplinary synthesis, resilience research now captures:

1) Political dynamics: How governance structures and power distributions shape resilience.
2) Social capital: The role of trust, networks, and community organization in fostering adaptability.
3) Environmental sustainability: The interplay between urban development and ecological limits.
4) Cultural vitality: How collective identities and values reinforce resilience.

Public administration emerges as a crucial integrator, linking insights from various disciplines into coherent, adaptable urban strategies.

4.2. Governance Complexity and Institutional Flexibility

Future resilience research must foreground the complexities of governance systems. Power distribution among stakeholders — government agencies, businesses, communities — profoundly affects how cities respond to crises and pursue long-term adaptability.

Key governance priorities include:

1) Decentralization: Empowering local actors to increase responsiveness.
2) Adaptive institutions: Designing governance structures capable of continuous learning and adjustment.
3) Collaborative frameworks: Facilitating cooperation across governmental and societal sectors.

Institutional flexibility, supported by dynamic policy processes and inclusive decision-making, will be critical for enhancing cities' soft resilience capacities.

4.3. Policy-Driven and Participatory Resilience Building

Resilience must be actively constructed through participatory, policy-driven processes rather than assumed as an automatic outcome of infrastructure investments. This requires:

1) Public engagement: Building participatory governance mechanisms to involve citizens in resilience planning.
2) Social empowerment: Strengthening marginalized communities' voices and resources.
3) Dynamic policy design: Creating policies that evolve with emerging risks and community feedback.

Public administration's role transcends mere policy implementation; it becomes a catalyst for mobilizing social capital, nurturing civic trust, and embedding resilience into everyday governance practices.

4.4. Adaptive Management Models for Resilient Cities

Adaptive management offers a dynamic framework for urban resilience, emphasizing:

1) Continuous monitoring and feedback: Integrating real-time data into governance responses.
2) Experimental governance: Testing and adjusting policies based on outcomes and environmental shifts.
3) Knowledge integration: Drawing from diverse sources — scientific, community-based, traditional knowledge — to inform policy-making.

By applying adaptive management, cities can better navigate the uncertainties of climate change, economic volatility, and social transformation.

5. Conclusion

The "soft resilience" framework marks a paradigm shift from rigid, infrastructure-focused resilience to dynamic, system-wide adaptability. Public administration is no longer a passive manager of emergencies but an active architect of resilient urban futures, driving institutional innovation, policy flexibility, and social cohesion.

By embracing complexity, balancing diverse societal values, fostering inclusive governance, and promoting adaptive management, cities can transform resilience from a static goal into a living, evolving process.

In an era of globalization, climate uncertainty, and social flux, "soft resilience" offers a vital pathway for ensuring cities not only survive but thrive.

References

1. N. Frantzeskaki, "Bringing transition management to cities: Building skills for transformative urban governance," *Sustain.*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 650, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14020650.
2. N. Bautista-Puig, J. Benayas, J. Manana-Rodríguez, M. Suárez, and E. Sanz-Casado, "The role of urban resilience in research and its contribution to sustainability," *Cities*, vol. 126, p. 103715, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2022.103715.
3. G. Yang, P. Zhang, F. Yu, and X. Zhu, "A review on resilient cities research from the perspective of territorial spatial planning: a bibliometric analysis," *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, vol. 11, p. 1300764, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fevo.2023.1300764.
4. B. Wei, T. Yuchun, M. Tingting, et al., "Review on resilience management of urban infrastructure systems," *J. Saf. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 14–28, 2021, doi: 10.16265/j.cnki.issn1003-3033.2021.06.003.
5. X. You, Y. Sun, and J. Liu, "Evolution and analysis of urban resilience and its influencing factors: a case study of Jiangsu Province, China," *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 113, no. 3, pp. 1751–1782, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11069-022-05368-x.
6. R. Gallotti, P. Sacco, and M. De Domenico, "Complex urban systems: challenges and integrated solutions for the sustainability and resilience of cities," *Complexity*, vol. 2021, no. 1, p. 1782354, 2021, doi: 10.1155/2021/1782354.
7. C. Cartalis, "Toward resilient cities–a review of definitions, challenges and prospects," *Adv. Build. Energy Res.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 259–266, 2014, doi: 10.1080/17512549.2014.890533.
8. J. Yang, P. Zheng, and Z. Chai, "Responding to extreme weather with innovative urban social governance mechanisms driven by complex adaptive systems theory: The 7.20 Zhengzhou flood," preprint, 2023, doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-3386865/v1.

9. D. Olsson, "From technocracy to democracy: Ways to promote democratic engagement for just climate change adaptation and resilience building," *Sustain.*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 1433, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14031433.
10. S. Nazif, M. M. M. Khoie, and S. Eslamian, "Urban disaster management and resilience," in *Handb. Disast. Risk Reduct. Resil.*, Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2021, pp. 157–185. ISBN: 9783030612771.
11. J. Hu, M. Yang, and Y. Zhen, "A review of resilience assessment and recovery strategies of urban rail transit networks," *Sustain.*, vol. 16, no. 15, p. 6390, 2024, doi: 10.3390/su16156390.
12. T. McDaniels, "Four decades of transformation in decision analytic practice for societal risk management," *Risk Anal.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 491–502, 2021, doi: 10.1111/risa.13332.
13. A. Abdillah, I. Widianingsih, R. A. Buchari, and H. Nurasa, "Resilience-based governance: A public administration perspective and resilience agenda," *Public Organ. Rev.*, pp. 1–21, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s11115-025-00834-z.
14. E. R. Tangsgaard, "Risk management in public service delivery: multi-dimensional scale development and validation," *Int. Public Manag. J.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1005–1026, 2022, doi: 10.1080/10967494.2021.2004270.
15. X. Lu and Z. Han, "Emergency management in China: towards a comprehensive model?," *J. Risk Res.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1425–1442, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13669877.2018.1476901.