

THE CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE IN COMMUNITY AND ENGINEERED SYSTEMS - A CROSS SECTORAL FEEDING OF IDEAS

Timothy L.J. Ferris

Defence and Systems Institute, University of South Australia,
Mawson Lakes, South Australia, Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines some recent work in organising the metaphor of “resilience” in application to engineered systems. This work provides an approach to the identification of threat types and magnitudes and the acceptable or desired outcomes to instances of the threats which can be used for specification of engineered system. The paper then explores the usage of the word family “resilience” in *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, a sector journal published by the Australian government. It is found that “resilience” is used as a metaphor, which is often described, in various ways, but not tightly defined. It is concluded that the emergency management sector would benefit from exploring the broadening and application of the engineering concepts to the less crisp issues related to the impact of threats on distributed community systems, so that appropriate disaster resilience development responses are made.

Keywords: Resilience; Emergency management; Engineered systems

INTRODUCTION

The idea of resilience is one which has grown in recent years in both engineering and community sectors. Is the recognition that all systems may be subjected to unfortunate events which will cause some kind of disruption or damage so that the system is no longer able to perform in the manner which was able to perform prior to the disruptive event the effect of the disruption is, immediately that the system cannot function as it had prior to the disruptive event and that some work is required in order to restore the system to a state in which it is capable of providing the functionality that it had prior to the disruption. The idea of resilience concerns the ability of systems, with appropriate inputs of work and tangible resources, to be restored in a reasonable time to an appropriate condition following a disruptive event.

Disruptive events which may impact systems can come from a variety of sources. The sources may be one of the following:

- weather related events, such as storms, floods or drought;
- natural disasters, such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides, fires or tsunamis;
- human activity of a malicious kind, such as arson, criminal or terrorist activity;

Concept of Resilience

- human activity of a nonmalicious kind, such as accidents caused by negligence, errors of judgement, miss recognition of the true situation or misunderstanding between people;
- failure of physical assets, such as equipment failure preventing service, damage caused to assets or by any other disruptive event and these failures could be caused by either design vulnerabilities of the assets to the particular events may encounter or by inadequate maintenance leading to vulnerabilities being developed by systems.

The summarising description of possible causes of disruption in the points above is merely a summary, and complex relationships between possibilities do exist. For example, the manifestation of a particular kind of disruptive event, such as a fire, could be caused by any of a variety of factors, including a storm, a malicious act by a person or an accident. Whilst the physical damage caused by the fire may be the same regardless of cause of the fire the reaction of the people who are victims of the fire is likely to be very different depending on the cause of the fire. Further, the opportunity of the victims to receive restorative assistance through methods such as insurance or broader-based community assistance, whether government or private supported, may be significantly impacted by the cause of the problem. The response of the people will reflect both the physical impact of the events upon them and the psychological impact associated with the nature of the cause and the extent to which individuals feel that they are sharing their experience with a broader community. In addition, the impact of a disruptive event depends in part on availability of assistance for victims, and so therefore will depend to some extent on the magnitude of the disruptive event compared with the resource base from which assistance could be drawn.

DEFINITIONS OF RESILIENCE

The common English definition of “resilience” is “the act of rebounding or springing back” (*Concise* 1976). This definition relates to materials which return to their original shape after deformation. This definition conveys a rhetorical sense that a system which is resilient is able to return to something reasonably approximating its original state. However it gives us no indication of any method by which that restoration could occur or any basis for measuring or otherwise judging the success of the restorative activity.

The inadequacy of the common English concept of resilience for use in any technical application, whether in relation to engineered systems or communities, is clear to all practitioners in both engineering and community support roles. The inadequacy of the common English usage of "resilience" is that the common usage does not enable the clear communication of what kind of outcome would be considered reasonable in the context of the particular system of interest and the particular threats being considered. The specificity of the idea of resilience to both the threats encountered and the results that would be considered acceptable is a necessary consequence of the great range of possible disruptive events, each of which would impact on the system in a different way based on the nature of the threat, the magnitude of the threat and the details of the system upon which it is impacting.

Concept of Resilience

In ecosystem scholarship resilience has been defined as: “the capacity of an ecosystem to tolerate disturbance without collapsing into a qualitatively different state that is controlled by a different set of processes” (Resilience Alliance 2010). This definition is predicated on a view that systems can occupy any of a number of metastable states, with the possibility that the system can be transitioned from one to another as a result of certain input events. The idea of resilience of the system is that it is capable of returning to its original metastable state after being affected by some threat. Should the threat exceed the resilience capacity of the system the outcome would be that the system ends up in a new metastable state and cannot be restored to the original state.

Engineered systems are created through the process of design, in which the designers commence with a need for a solution to some experienced inadequacy of the current capabilities of engineered systems. The process of design leads to the creation of a system which has a designed configuration of elements of both designed and preconfigured kinds. That is, the designed system includes technological, natural and human elements, all of which are arranged, by design, in order to provide a solution to the need for which they have been developed. The technical of the elements of the system are designed to have properties which enable desirable characteristics to be achieved, and enable prediction and management of their response to various kinds of import, including a variety of threats. The natural and human elements of the system are not so controllable by the designer. The result is that the anticipation of the impact of threats on engineered systems is a complex and demanding task which can only provide information about a range of potential outcomes and cannot provide a deterministic description of the outcome that would be experienced in any particular case. In relation to the resilience of engineered systems the International Council on Systems Engineering (INCOSE) Resilient Systems Working Group has, similarly to other definitions of resilience associated with engineered systems, defined resilience as “the capability of a system with specific characteristics before, during and after a disruption to absorb the disruption, recover to an acceptable level of performance, and sustain that level for an acceptable period of time” (INCOSE 2010).

This definition introduces the notions of a timeline of response to a threat and the recovery of an acceptable level of performance. This definition certainly permits a system that is classified as resilient to suffer significant impairment, such that it is not suitable for its original purpose.

In the broader field of civil infrastructures, which refers to the assets developed by the society to support the community lifestyle The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP) has defined disaster resilience as “the capability to prevent, protect against or mitigate any significant threat or event, including terrorist attacks, and to expeditiously respond, recover and reconstitute critical assets, operations and services with minimum damage to public health and safety, the economy, and national security” (TISP 2010). This definition emphasises the ability of the system to achieve helpful recovery within a reasonable time and the idea of minimising deleterious consequential impacts of the threat and system response.

Concept of Resilience

Again, from an engineering background, Haimes defines resilience as “the ability of the system to withstand a major disruption within acceptable degradation parameters and to recover within an acceptable time and composite costs and risks” (Haimes 2009). This definition includes the same primary elements contained in the INCOSE definition above, and clearly highlights that the amount of degradation of the engineered system that is considered acceptable is a matter of specification.

All of the definitions presented above are challenged by the fact that their authors are attempting to encapsulate the concept of resilience in a single sentence. In order for a single sentence to be passed with a reasonable level of complexity so that it is understood by most people it is necessary to summarize salient features of a complex concepts such as resilience rather than to completely identify and describe them. The effect of this fact of communication is that single sentence type definitions of resilience provide an attractive rhetorical expression of the idea but do not frame the idea of resilience in a manner which enables judgments such as what outcomes, or intermediate responses, would be considered acceptable in relation to a system suffering from a certain kind of threat.

What is needed to specify the resilience characteristics required of an engineered system is to identify a set of possible threat types and magnitudes and the acceptable outcome, see Table 1. The system design team must identify a range of relevant threat types, where the types depend on the nature of the system. For example, a large-scale infrastructure system would include threat types related to various types of natural disaster, accidental and deliberate human activity. For each of the threat types various magnitudes of threat could be identified. In order to make the specification problem tractable it is necessary to aggregate subtle variations of threat type into groups and to aggregate magnitudes for each threat into meaningful categories which would distinguish different kinds of response desired from the system.

Table 1. Specification of the system responses to various types and magnitude of threat.

Threat	Magnitude₁	Magnitude₂	⋮	Magnitude_m
Type₁	Response ₁₁	Response ₁₂		Response _{1m}
Type₂	Response ₂₁	Response ₂₂		Response _{2m}
...				
Type_n	Response _{n1}	Response _{n1}		Response _{nm}

For each magnitude of each threat it may be appropriate to specify a different response. For example, for small magnitude threats it may be appropriate to expect that the system would survive intact, with, perhaps only, some minor temporary disruption to supply service.

Concept of Resilience

In contrast for a large magnitude threat it may be considered appropriate to allow that the system will experience a substantial failure, or even be destroyed. The judgment of appropriate responses of the system depends on case specific issues including the cost of preventive design work and the impact of any actual failure.

In table 1 the cells containing the responses are matrix in which a description of the response desired from the system to stated. The responses used in the specification can be guided by a set of resilience classes identified in other work of this author, working with colleagues.(Jackson, Ferris, and Cook submitted). The resilience classes for engineered systems are presented in table 2. The system outcomes described in these classes range from the relatively minor inconvenience of avoiding a threat or suffering an immediate impact within the design specification of the system, in class 1, through various stages of increasing severity and inconvenience through to total loss of the system, in different circumstances, in classes 3b and 4. The descriptions of the classes are reasonably broad, to enable inclusiveness of all anticipated possibilities in a reasonable number of categories, seven, but a sufficiently detailed to assist the process of specification of a particular instantiation of the class description which is relevant to the situation of the particular system under development.

Table 2. Resilience classes for engineered systems (Jackson, Ferris, and Cook submitted).

Resilience class	Description of resilience class
1a	The ability of a system to retain, or recover to, full service delivery following an encounter with a threat by performing evasive action.
1b	The ability of a system to retain, or recover to, full service delivery following an encounter with a threat as a result of absorbing or resisting the threat.
2a	The ability of a system that has suffered partial impairment following a threat encounter to be restored to full service delivery through repair work that entails system shut down.
2b	The ability of a system that has suffered partial impairment following a threat encounter to be restored to full service delivery through repair work that can be undertaken while the system is providing partial service delivery.
3a	The ability of a system to perform with partial loss of delivered service level for a reasonable time following a threat encounter and subsequently provides an alternative level of service provision followed by later restoration of full service.
3b	The ability of a system to perform with partial loss of delivered service level for a reasonable time following a threat encounter and subsequently provides an alternative level of service provision followed by later retirement of the system.
4	The ability of a system to perform an orderly shut-down following a threat encounter that has resulted in damage sufficiently severe as to provide no prospect of repair and restoration to service.

The strength of describing the resilience of the system in terms of the classes and subclasses described in table 2 is that this provides a conveniently small arrangement of categories which describe the intended outcomes in a generic manner to enable specific

Concept of Resilience

specification of a particular system and to communicate with stakeholders what the system is designed to do under particular threat scenario conditions.

“RESILIENCE” IN *AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT*

The *Australian Journal of Emergency Management (AJEM)* is published by the Attorney general’s Department of the Australian government. As such it is designed as a multi-purpose publication which contains refereed research, various official statements, and news reports related to the emergency management field that are of archival relevance. Much of the subject matter is directly related to Australia, so most articles of all types address an Australian originated issue, although there are some articles, usually by international authors, which address issues originating elsewhere. In most cases of articles addressing international issues it would appear that the editors judge the article to have some instructive value to the Australian emergency management community. The refereed research is usually reported in a manner which is instructive to practitioners, and definitely in language which is easily read by people with no specific education in emergency management.

Method used in the study

All items published in *AJEM* between volume 10, number 1, Autumn 1995 and volume 27, number 2, June 2012, were word searched for the appearance of any of the words in the “resilient” group by using electronic search for the character string “resilien”. The uses of words were identified and classified in order to provide insight into the understandings of the concept of “resilience” evidenced by the authors. The understandings of the authors in context were sought in the word study, without presupposition that there was an overarching single definition of resilience which they were all using. It was important to this study to allow authors to speak with their own voices and to have different definitions of resilience, which were what was sought through the study, rather than to try to impose a common definition, since the purpose was to explore the variety of meanings used.

The usages of “resilience” include a variety of types:

- A meaningful word in a context where the author is building meaning using the meaning of “resilience” as a contributing element.
- A name of a concept in which the word “resilience” is used as part of naming something with a commonly accepted compound word name.
- A proper name of some entity.
- Incidental uses including in the name of entities with which an author is affiliated, in the bibliographic details of sources referenced, in book reviews which do not expand concepts, and as part of notices and news item briefs.

Concept of Resilience

Complex uses of “resilience”

Cottrell provides a developed discussion of factors relating to resilience, including the idea of vulnerability and the community dimension of resilience (Cottrell 2011). This discussion evidences the complexity of the notion of resilience and the means to achieve it and to identify its presence or absence. The difficulty with understanding and grasping the idea of “resilience” is that it is, according to Rogers, a metaphor, and therefore not intended as a word providing direct communication (Rogers 2011). The problem with frequent use of a word which is itself a metaphor is that in its metaphoric character it connotes many things to many people, and in these case, sounds like an unspecified desirable good and is therefore likely to become a means of miscommunication. Koob discusses the need for a glossary which would include “resilience” as a tool to provide unified definitions of terms across the emergency management sector, indicating the absence of a clear definition (Koob 1997-98).

Resilience is increased by loss minimisation actions during a disaster, accelerating return to normal life, which indicates that the idea of resilience concerns the capacity to re-establish normal life following an event (Finnis et al. 2004).

Idea of vulnerability and resilience

The two ideas of vulnerability and resilience are used as a hendyadic antonymous pair, sometimes arranged slightly differently. The idea conveyed is that vulnerability, that is the susceptibility to bad things happening because of some weakness or failing, is an antonym of resilience, which in some way refers to the ability to prevent the initial bad event occurring or to enable recovery from its effects, although the connection with vulnerability places the emphasis on the prevention rather than the recovery (Buckle 1998-99; Dovers and Norton 1999; Buckle, Mars, and Smale 2000; King and MacGregor 2000; "A strategic research agenda for emergency management" 2001; "Announcement Resilience and vulnerability assessment" 2001; Buckle and Hill 1995; Manock 1997; Coghlan 1998; Handmer and Dovers 2008; Buckle 2002; King 2002; Buckle, Marsh, and Smale 2003; Morrissey and Reser 2003; Handmer 2003; Dovers 2004; McDougall 2003; Buckle 1995).

Idea of community resilience

A common usage in *AJEM* is “community resilience”. This concept conveys that whatever it is that resilience refers to is something which comes into existence in the context of a community and therefore involves the relationships of the people providing mutual assistance. This concept is conveyed by (Lahey 2011b; Nicholls 2012; Taylor et al. 2012; "Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management communique Auckland, 11 November 2011" 2012; Biggs 2012; Carter 2012; Eburn and Dovers 2012; "Profile: Dr Margot McCarthy Australia's new National Security Adviser" 2012; Johnston et al. 2011; Thomas et al. 2011; Frandsen, Paton, and Sakariassen 2011; Webber and Jones 2011; Sturzenegger and Hayes 2011; Lapsley 2011; "AEMI Master class report facilitating community-led recovery" 2011; Crawley 2011; Lahey 2011a; Childs, Carlisle, and Hastings 2001; Rodrigue 2001; Pearse, Johnston, and Becker 2001;

Concept of Resilience

Wajs-Chaczko 2008; Tolhurst, Shields, and Chong 2008; Crompton and McAneney 2008; Sullivan 2008; Koob 1996; Wapling 1996; Tarrant 1997-98; Young 1998; Indian 2007; Lewis 2008; Proudley 2008; Goodman and Gawen 2008; Walia 2008; Fallahi 2008; Eburn 2008; Beckenham and Nicholls 2004; Coles and Buckle 2004; King and Gurtner 2005; "In profile: Bruce Esplin" 2005; Floyd 2005; Ruddock 2006; Childs 2006; Lewis 2006; Saunders et al. 2007; Maguire and Hagan 2007; Bushnell and Cottrell 2007; Meo and Ziebro 2002; Handmer 2002; McLachlan 2003; Gabriel 2003; Hocke and O'Brien 2003; Prestipino 2004; Britton 2002; Dufty 2012).

Uses of “resilience” in papers – “resilience from” or “resilient to”

A common construct in the use of the word resilience is “resilience from” or “resilient to”. This usage appears in many papers with the implication that resilience concerns the entity, either specific assets or the community which may be subjected to the threat of some kind of disaster, having the strength to withstand the impact of the threat and return to normal life soon. Examples of this usage, which do not have additional explanation of how this resilience is achieved or a detailed statement of the author’s intent with respect to is are found in (Eggleston and Koob 2004; Shaw, Gupta, and Sarma 2003; Yeo 2003; AusAID 2002; "Reports Mainstreaming disaster risk management: a development for the Pacific small island developing states" 2007; Dufty 2008; Henderson and Ginger 2008; Lambley and Cordery 1997; Arthur, Schofield, and Cechet 2008; Paton, Johnston, Smith, et al. 2001; Enarson and Fordham 2001; Goodyear 2000; Dore and Etkin 2000; McEntire 2000; Chambers 2011; Rothery 2005).

A similar concept is conveyed in (Sullivan 2003a) in the discussion of the idea of inherent resilience to threat. The idea of resilience involving a variety of levels of capacity in the community as the outcome of resistance to the threat is conveyed (Paton, Smith, and Johnston 2005).

Resilience used in a general sense

A large number of the usages of “resilience” appear to be in constructs which suggest that it is used in a general English language sense, to indicate some kind of strength to deal with adversity, with the connotation of being a desirable good in its own right (Aryal and Dobson 2011; Posetti and Lo 2012; Lahey 2012; "Disaster mapper' designed to help build student resilience" 2012; "Before the storm" 2012; Thornton 2012; Taylor 2001; Kay 2011; Taylor et al. 2011; "Ministerial council for police and emergency management communique Canberra, 26 November 2010" 2011; Cooper 2011; McRae and Sharples 2011; Dufty 2011; Sheehan 2011; Lambley 1998; Powell 1998; Salter 1998-99; Kouzmin and Korac-Kakabadse 1999; McEntire 1999; Bayman et al. 2000; Lunn 2000; Rossi 2000; McGee and Young 2001; Paton, Johnston, Bebbington, et al. 2001; Paton, Johnston, Smith, et al. 2001; Twigg and Steiner 2001; "Communique" 2008a; Pearce 2008; Salter 1995, 1995/96; Granot 1996; May 1997; Buckle, Brown, and Dickinson 1998; Berry and King 1998; Holgate and Di Pietro 2007; Esplin 2007; Paton et al. 2008; Wells and Edwards 2004; Gurtner 2004; Eyre 2004; Goodin and O'Neill 2005; Webster 2006; Watson 2006; King, Goudie, and Dominey-Howes 2006; Nicholls 2006; Haynes 2006; Handmer and Choong 2006; Pearce 2007; Brown 2007; Arnold 2002; Juratowitch,

Concept of Resilience

Daly, and Smith 2002; Taylor 2003). This usage extends with some authors who present the idea that resilience exists in a form which can be referred to meaningfully with the quantitative notion of “more”, and similar qualifying terms (Sullivan 2003b; “Communique” 2008b; Handmer and Hillman 2004; Keys 2006; Silberbauer 2003; Abrahams 2004; Yates and Anderson-Berry 2004; Briceno 2004; Laurence 2004; Mearns 2004; Paul 1998-99).

Uses of “resilience” in proper names of entities

There are several organisations which include resilience in the organisation name. In this case the word “resilient” appears in the text as part of a compound word proper noun and does not indicate any usage of the concept of resilience by the author.

There were two uses of “London Resilience”, an organisation with the charge of making London more resilient. There were two uses of “Resilient New Zealand”, referring to an organisation. There was one reference to “Community Safety and Resilience”, referring to a concept as a named entity. Twenty sources used “National Strategy for Disaster Resilience”, in reference to an Australian national policy document. Two authors used “Natural Disaster Resilience Program”. One reference used “Resilient Organisations” as the name of a research funding scheme.

Uses of “resilience” in book notices and reviews

Eight book reviews and notices are classified here as incidental uses of the word “resilience” because they are very short items and contain a mix of content from the author of the book and the author of the notice or review, thereby making it difficult to discern the intended meaning of the word.

Uses of “resilience” in general notices

In its function as an organ of the Attorney General’s Department *AJEM* contains a number of notices of a general kind, some of which contain the word “resilience”. The inclusion of the word “resilience” in a brief notice is not analysed since there is, usually, insufficient context to use to infer meaning. There were 12 notices in the journal containing “resilience”.

Uses of “resilience” in Conference Notices

In its function as an organ of the Attorney General’s Department *AJEM* contains a number of notices of relevant conferences. Many of these notices use the word “resilience” as a topic describing the material to be presented or the possible topics of papers in a call for papers. This type of usage of “resilience” does not convey depth of meaning, and so is not discussed in detail, but the appearance of this usage over time does provide an historical view of the usage of “resilience” as a term of interest in the community. The total number of these references was 11.

Concept of Resilience

Uses of “resilience” in reference lists only

Fifteen authors refer to a source which includes the word “resilience” in the citation, but do not use the word “resilience” in the text of their own contribution.

Uses of “resilience” in author affiliations only

Six articles used the word “resilience” only in naming the entity to which an author was affiliated.

CONCLUSIONS

The discussion of the usage of “resilience” in the two communities, in engineering and in the emergency management community, reflects a fundamentally different usage. The engineering community has only recently shifted usage from a general metaphorical form to a form which enables or guides specific action. This is exemplified in the very recent work described in the first part of this paper showing how the idea of resilience can be transformed into tools which would guide engineered system developers to explore and tease out the ideas that they have with respect to guiding the specification of the proposed engineered system. The essence of this approach is that useful guidance in relation to design of an engineered system requires identification of the potential threats and specification of acceptable, reasonable or desirable outcomes in the event that such a threat actually appears and affects the system. The engineering perspective is that the system designed and developed is a significant asset, intended to last for a reasonably long service life, and that it is difficult to change after construction. The fact that it is difficult to change the system demands that it be made right during development.

The engineered system includes both the equipment items which could be shipped from a developer/supplier to the user and the designed aspects of the situation of deployment, such as the organisational design required to effectively use the engineered system. The asset and the surrounding elements which enable it to be useful constitute the system which is designed, and also the system which is subjected to a variety of threats, and which must appropriately, as defined by the system specification, respond to those threats.

The usage of “resilience” in the emergency management community is still, clearly, in the metaphorical stage, as stated by Rogers (2011). This provides a danger of miscommunication as authors may have one intent and readers may interpret a different meaning. The effect of such a fuzziness of communication is that there is serious risk that action taken around the concept of resilience will be inadequate, with either conflicting overlaps or absences of action, leading to outcomes evidencing less adequate resilience than for which anyone would hope.

The usage of “resilience” in *AJEM* evidences a number of threads, most of which are not major items of contribution, but are part of the facts leading to this conclusion. But there are some major contributions:

Concept of Resilience

- Resilience is a property of a community, that is, the whole life situation including the people and their relationships and the assets they have available are the source of whatever resilience may be present.
- Resilience is concerned with the restoration of the community as closely as possible to its former state of life, including relationships and economic activity, and all the community things necessary to enable that state of life, after the impact of a threat.
- One of the uses of “resilience” concerned the toughening of the community system to withstand the impact of certain threats. This usage parallels the engineering Class 1 response of a system to a threat. This is achievable for threats of up to some magnitude and of defined types, but is impractical for all threats of all magnitudes.
- Since community systems include engineered assets, the engineering application of the resilience metaphor in the specification of acceptable outcomes for a matrix of threat types and magnitudes will inform the design of the assets, through specification.

By combining recent work in the application of the metaphor of “resilience” in engineering to enable tangible responses to what is otherwise a grand rhetorical metaphor with the concerns of the emergency management sector it should be possible to improve community preparedness for threats of diverse kinds, leading to a safer and better life for the community and its members. The path to combination of the perspectives is to develop methods of identifying relevant threat types and magnitudes to guide the design of community development, and the distribution of assistive assets to address needs created by threat events, in order enable planned levels and timetables of recovery from the threats to be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, Jonathan. 2004. "Conference report reflections on the safer and sustainable communities 2003 disaster conference." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (1):34-44.
- "AEMI Master class report facilitating community-led recovery." 2011. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):62-64.
- "Announcement Resilience and vulnerability assessment." 2001. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (2):13.
- Arnold, Margaret. 2002. "Development for disaster reduction-the role of the World Bank." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (4):34-36.
- Arthur, Craig, Anthony Schofield, and Bob Cechet. 2008. "Assessing the impacts of tropical cyclones." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):14-20.
- Aryal, Kamal, and Olivia Dobson. 2011. "A case study from the National Disaster Management institute in the Republic of Korea." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (4):34-42.
- AusAID. 2002. "Australian aid: making a difference in times of disaster." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 17 (2):4-9,55-57.

Concept of Resilience

- Bayman, R, R Burton, D D'Cruz, F Gebhard, J Humphries, J Kenny, K King, J Matijas-Kekez, C Mavor, G Searle, E Talikowski, D Vicary, and M Wettinger. 2000. "Operation safe haven - disaster recovery management with the Kosovar refugees at Leeuwin Barracks, Western Australia." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (1):40-42.
- Beckenham, Annabel, and Susan Nicholls. 2004. "Government communication strategies for community recovery following the ACT bushfires, January 2003." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (4):67-75.
- "Before the storm." 2012. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):66-67.
- Berry, Linda, and David King. 1998. "Tropical cyclone awareness and education issues for far north Queensland school students Storm watchers - a cyclone awareness education package for upper primary school children." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (3):25-30.
- Biggs, Ruth. 2012. "Paying for disaster recovery: Australia's NDRRA and the United States' NFIP." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):26-30.
- Briceno, Silvano. 2004. "Global challenges in disaster reduction." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (1):3-5.
- Britton, Neil R. 2002. "A new emergency management for the new millenium?" *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (4):44-54.
- Brown, Naomi. 2007. "Foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (2):2.
- Buckle, Philip. 1995. "A framework for assessing vulnerability." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 10 (1):11-15.
- — —. 1998-99. "Re-defining community and vulnerability in the context of emergency management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (4):21-26.
- — —. 2002. "Managing community vulnerability in a wide area disaster." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (4):13-18.
- Buckle, Philip, Jan Brown, and Michael Dickinson. 1998. "Supporting the entire person A comprehensive approach to supporting people affected by emergencies and disasters." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (2):35-38.
- Buckle, Philip, and John Hill. 1995. "Community based management of social disruption following disasters." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 10 (3):31-38.
- Buckle, Philip, Graham Mars, and Syd Smale. 2000. "New approaches to assessing vulnerability and resilience." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (2):8-14.
- Buckle, Philip, Graham Marsh, and Sydney Smale. 2003. "Reframing risk, hazards, disasters, and daily life: A report of research into local appreciation of risks and threats." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):81-87.
- Bushnell, Sally, and Alison Cottrell. 2007. "Increasing community resilience to bushfire-implications from a north Queensland community case study." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (2):3-9.
- Carter, Rachel Anne. 2012. "Flood risk, insurance and emergency management in Australia." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):20-25.

Concept of Resilience

- Chambers, David A. 2011. "Policing and climate change." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (3):52-59.
- Childs, IrAPHNE R W, Ralph D Carlisle, and Peter A Hastings. 2001. "The Brisbane-Gladstone transport corridor: identification of risk and vulnerability for the bulk transport of dangerous goods." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (4):54-57.
- Childs, Merilyn. 2006. "Counting women in the Australian fire services." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (2):29-34.
- Coghlan, Andrew. 1998. "Recovery management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (2):1.
- Coles, Eve, and Philip Buckle. 2004. "Developing community resilience as a foundation for effective disaster recovery." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (4):6-15.
- "Communique." 2008a. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):3.
- "Communique." 2008b. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2).
- The concise Oxford dictionary of current English based on the Oxford English dictionary and its supplements*. 1976. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, Dianne. 2011. "Workshop report: AEMI workshop: international experts talk resilience." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):4-5.
- Cottrell, Alison. 2011. "Engaged and resilient communities: AEMI workshop 17-19 May 2011." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (4):9-13.
- Crawley, Heather. 2011. "Engaged and resilient communities: An overview of workshop rationale and structure." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (4):7-8.
- Crompton, Ryan, and John McAneney. 2008. "The cost of natural disasters in Australia: the case for disaster risk reduction." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):43-46.
- "Disaster mapper' designed to help build student resilience." 2012. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):8.
- Dore, Mohammed, and David Etkin. 2000. "The importance of measuring the social costs of natural disasters at a time of climate change." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (3):46-51.
- Dovers, Stephen. 2004. "Sustainability and disaster management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (1):21-25.
- Dovers, Stephen, and Tony Norton. 1999. "'Ecological emergencies' and resource and environmental management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 14 (3):2-5.
- Dufty, Neil. 2008. "A new approach to community flood education." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2):4-8.
- — —. 2011. "Engagement or education?" *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (3):35-39.
- — —. 2012. "Using social media to build community disaster resilience." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):40-45.
- Eburn, Michael. 2008. "Litigation for failure to warn of natural hazards and community resilience." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2):9-13.

Concept of Resilience

- Eburn, Michael, and Stephen Dovers. 2012. "Mainstreaming fire and emergency management across legal and policy sectors." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):14-19.
- Eggleston, Graeme, and Peter Koob. 2004. "The role of local government in agricultural emergencies." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (3):29-31.
- Enarson, Elaine, and Maureen Fordham. 2001. "Lines that divide, ties that bind: race, class, and gender in women's flood recovery in the US and UK." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (4):43-52.
- Esplin, Bruce. 2007. "Foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (4):2.
- Eyre, Anne. 2004. "Psychosocial aspects of recovery: practical implications for disaster managers." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (4):23-27.
- Fallahi, Alireza. 2008. "An interdisciplinary analytical study on the risk preparedness of Bam and its cultural landscape, a world heritage property in danger in Iran." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2):21-30.
- Finnis, Kristen, Sarah Standring, David Johnston, and Kevin Ronan. 2004. "Children's understanding of natural hazards in Christchurch, New Zealand." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (2):11-20.
- Floyd, Peter. 2005. "Notion of customer service." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (4):27-30.
- Frandsen, Mai, Douglas Paton, and Kerry Sakariassen. 2011. "Fostering community bushfire preparedness through engagement and empowerment." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):23-30.
- Gabriel, Paul. 2003. "The development of municipal emergency management planning in Victoria, Australia." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):74-80.
- Goodin, Laura, and Peter O'Neill. 2005. "Orange on the scene: the SES media officer program." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (1):46-52.
- Goodman, Helen, and John Gawen. 2008. "Glimpses of 'community' through the lens of a small fire event." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (1):30-36.
- Goodyear, Earl James. 2000. "Disaster mitigation: challenges to raise the capacity of at-risk populations in coping with natural, social and economic disasters." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (3):25-30.
- Granot, Hayim. 1996. "Using small incidents to prepare for the big one." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 11 (1):22-24.
- Gurtner, Yetta. 2004. "After the Bali bombing - the long road to recovery." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (4):56-65.
- Haimes, Yacov Y. 2009. "On the Definition of Resilience in Systems." *Risk Analysis* no. 29 (43):498-501.
- Handmer, John. 2002. "Flood warning reviews in North America and Europe: statements and silence." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 17 (3):17-24.
- . 2003. "We are all vulnerable." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (3):55-60.

Concept of Resilience

- Handmer, John, and Wei Choong. 2006. "Disaster resilience through local economic activity in Phuket." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (4):8-15.
- Handmer, John, and Stephen Dovers. 2008. "Policy development and design for fire and emergency management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (1):21-29.
- Handmer, John, and Marnie Hillman. 2004. "Economic and financial recovery from disaster." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (4):44-50.
- Haynes, Katherine. 2006. "Volcanic island in crisis: investigating environmental uncertainty and the complexities it brings." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (4):21-28.
- Henderson, David, and John Ginger. 2008. "Role of building codes and construction standards in windstorm disaster mitigation." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2):40-46.
- Hocke, Irene, and Arthur O'Brien. 2003. "Strengthening the capacity of remote indigenous communities through emergency management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):62-70.
- Holgate, Alina, and Maria Di Pietro. 2007. "Coming down off the high: firefighters experience of readjustment following deployment." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (4):34-38.
- "In profile: Bruce Esplin." 2005. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (3):43-45.
- INCOSE. 2010. *Resilient Systems Working Group (RSWG)*. Resilient Systems Working Group (RSWG) 2010 [cited October 17, 2010 2010]. Available from <http://www.incose.org/practice/techactivities/wg/rswg/>.
- Indian, Jenny. 2007. "The use of local knowledge in the Australian high country during the 2003 bushfires." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (4):27-33.
- Jackson, Scott, Timothy L J Ferris, and Stephen C Cook. submitted. "Defining resilience for engineered systems."
- Johnston, David, Ruth Tarrant, Karlene Tipler, Maureen Coomer, Sandy Pedersen, and Ruth Garside. 2011. "Preparing schools for future earthquakes in New Zealand: lessons from an evaluation of a Wellington school exercise." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):24-30.
- Juratowitch, Dawn, K L Daly, and N J Smith. 2002. "Reduction of stress and trauma in the delivery of disaster recovery services: the users decide-an exploratory study of the effects of delivering disaster recovery services." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 17 (1):50-54.
- Kay, Robert. 2011. "Opinion: preparing worldviews for uncertainty." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):63-65.
- Keys, Chas Watson, Kellie. 2006. "The evolution of floodplain risk management and real-time flood management planning in New South Wales." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (1):3-8.
- King, David. 2002. "Post disaster surveys: experience and methodology." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 17 (3):39-47.

Concept of Resilience

- King, David, Douglas Goudie, and Dale Dominey-Howes. 2006. "Cyclone knowledge and household preparation - some insights from Cyclone Larry." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (3):52-59.
- King, David, and Yetta Gurtner. 2005. "After the wave: a wake up warning for Australian coastal locations." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (1):4-9.
- King, David, and Colin MacGregor. 2000. "Using social indicators to measure community vulnerability to natural hazards." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (3):52-57.
- Koob, Peter. 1996. "The context of emergency management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 11 (2):1-4.
- — —. 1997-98. "Developing the Australian emergency management glossary." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 12 (4):40-41.
- Kouzmin, Alexander, and Nada Korac-Kakabadse. 1999. "From efficiency to risk sensitivity: reconstructing management capabilities after economic rationalism." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 14 (1):8-19.
- Lahey, Kate. 2011a. "A day in the life of the emergency sector." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (4):14-17.
- — —. 2011b. "Mid-west Gasgoyne region resilience - the silver lining to WA monsoon low." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (4):24-27.
- — —. 2012. "Australia's maritime disaster training no longer oceans away." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):10-15.
- Lambley, Des. 1998. "Cerebrally risking it." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (3):5,10.
- Lambley, Des, and Ian Cordery. 1997. "The effects of catastrophic flooding at Nyngan and some implications for emergency management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 12 (2):5-9.
- Lapsley, Craig. 2011. "Opinion: fire services commissioner for Victoria." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):15-16.
- Laurence, Jo. 2004. "Notes from the field." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (2):31-32.
- Lewis, Chris. 2006. "Risk management and prevention strategies." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (3):47-51.
- — —. 2008. "Are house fires changing?" *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (1):44-48.
- Lunn, John. 2000. "How long is too long at the sharp end? Critical incident staffing: prevention is better than cure." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (2):48-52.
- Maguire, Brigit, and Patrick Hagan. 2007. "Disasters and communities: understanding social resilience." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (2):16-20.
- Manock, Ian. 1997. "The Tasmanian lifelines project." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 12 (1):11-15.
- May, Peter J. 1997. "Addressing natural hazards: challenges and lessons for public policy." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 11 (4):30-37.

Concept of Resilience

- McDougall, Allan. 2003. "National earthquake conference in Adelaide." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (1):48-52.
- McEntire, David A. 1999. "Redundancy as requirement: lessons from the 1997-98 Peruvian El Nino disasters." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 14 (1):15-17.
- — —. 2000. "Sustainability or invulnerable development? Proposals for the current shift in paradigms." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (1):58-61.
- McGee, Rod, and Lynn Young. 2001. "Tasman bridge disaster: 25th anniversary memorial service." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (4):10-14.
- McLachlan, Eddie. 2003. "Seagulls on the airstrip: indigenous perspectives on cyclone vulnerability awareness and mitigation strategies for remote communities in the Gulf of Carpentaria." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (1):4-12.
- McRae, Rick, and Jason Sharples. 2011. "A conceptual framework for assessing the risk posed by extreme bushfires." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):47-53.
- Mearns, Alan. 2004. "Pacific prepares for the second world conference on disaster reduction." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (3):104.
- Meo, Mark, and Becky Ziebro. 2002. "Natural hazards mitigation in Tulsa: the role of strategy policy innovation and social learning." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 17 (1):42-43.
- "Ministerial council for police and emergency management communique Canberra, 26 November 2010." 2011. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):6-7.
- Morrissey, Shirley A, and Joseph P Reser. 2003. "Evaluating the effectiveness of psychological preparedness advice in community cyclone preparedness materials." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):46-61.
- Nicholls, Susan. 2006. "Disaster memorials as government communication." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (4):36-43.
- — —. 2012. "The resilient community and communication practice." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):46-51.
- Paton, Douglas, Bruce F Houghton, Chris E Gregg, Duane A Gill, Liesel A Ritchie, David McIvor, Penny Larin, Steven Meinhold, J Horan, and David M Johnston. 2008. "Managing tsunami risk in coastal communities: Identifying predictors of preparedness." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (1):4-9.
- Paton, Douglas, David M Johnston, Mark S Bebbington, Chin-Diew Lai, and Bruce F Houghton. 2001. "Direct and vicarious experience of volcanic hazards: implications for risk perception and adjustment adoption." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (4):58-63.
- Paton, Douglas, David Johnston, Leigh Smith, and Marian Millar. 2001. "Responding to hazard effects: promoting resilience and adjustment adoption." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (1):47-52.

Concept of Resilience

- Paton, Douglas, Leigh Smith, and David Johnston. 2005. "When good intentions turn bad: promoting natural hazard preparedness." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (1):25-30.
- Paul, Sarah. 1998-99. "UK emergency planning - the integrated approach." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (4):47-49.
- Pearce, Tony. 2007. "Foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (1):2.
- — —. 2008. "AJEM foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):2.
- Pearse, Lisa, David Johnston, and Julia Becker. 2001. "Managing natural hazards in the Hawke's Bay, New Zealand." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (3):37-39.
- Posetti, Julie, and Ping Lo. 2012. "The twitterisation of ABC's emergency and disaster communication." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):34-39.
- Powell, Susan. 1998. "Back to basics - holding on to the game plan when the rules and the players keep changing." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (3):11-13.
- Prestipino, David. 2004. "Meeting the natural disasters challenge." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (2):8-10.
- "Profile: Dr Margot McCarthy Australia's new National Security Adviser." 2012. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):4.
- Proudley, Mae. 2008. "Fire, families and decisions." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (1):37-43.
- "Reports Mainstreaming disaster risk management: a development for the Pacific small island developing states." 2007. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (3):40-45.
- Resilience Alliance. *Resilience*. Resilience Alliance 2010 [cited October 17, 2010]. Available from www.resalliance.org/576.php.
- Rodrigue, Christine M. 2001. "Impact of internet media in risk debates: the controversies over Cassini-Huygens mission and the Anaheim Hills, California, landslide." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (1):53-61.
- Rogers, Peter. 2011. "Development of resilient Australia: enhancing the PPRR approach with anticipation, assessment and registration of risks." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):54-58.
- Rossi, Ino. 2000. "Post-disaster reconstruction and economic development: A methodology for the utilisation of public information data." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (2):2-7.
- Rothery, Mike. 2005. "Critical infrastructure protection and the role of emergency services." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 20 (2):45-50.
- Ruddock, Philip. 2006. "Foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (1):2.
- Salter, John. 1995. "Disasters as manifestations of vulnerability." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 10 (1):9-10.
- — —. 1995/96. "Towards a better disaster management methodology." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 10 (4):8-16.

Concept of Resilience

- — —. 1998-99. "Public safety risk management: assessing the latest national guidelines." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (4):50-53.
- Saunders, Wendy, Jane Forsyth, David Johnston, and Julia Becker. 2007. "Strengthening linkages between land-use planning and emergency management in New Zealand." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 22 (1):36-43.
- Shaw, Rajib, Manu Gupta, and Anshu Sarma. 2003. "Community recovery and its sustainability: Lessons from Gujarat earthquake of India." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):28-33.
- Sheehan, Tony. 2011. "Foreword." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (3):2.
- Silberbauer, George. 2003. "Structural and personal social processes in disaster." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (3):29-36.
- "Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management communique Auckland, 11 November 2011." 2012. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):3-5.
- "A strategic research agenda for emergency management." 2001. *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 15 (4):63.
- Sturzenegger, Lisa, and Terry Hayes. 2011. "Post black saturday: development of a bushfire safety system." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):54-59.
- Sullivan, Karl. 2008. "Policy implications of future increases in extreme weather events due to climate change." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):37-42.
- Sullivan, Mark. 2003a. "Communities and their experience of emergencies." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (1):19-26.
- — —. 2003b. "Integrated recovery management: A new way of looking at a delicate process." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (2):4-27.
- Tarrant, Michael. 1997-98. "Risk communication in the context of emergency management: planning 'with' rather than 'for' communities." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 12 (4):20-21.
- Taylor, A J W. 2001. "Conflict over causation of catastrophe." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (3):15-17.
- Taylor, A J W (Tony). 2003. "Bringing 'complex terrorism' and 'corporate malfeasance' into a classification schema for disasters." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (1):27-34.
- Taylor, Mel, Wendy Joun, Barbara Griffin, David Hill, Robert Chisari, Beryl Hesketh, and Beverley Raphael. 2011. "The public and a radiological or nuclear emergency event: threat perception, preparedness, and anticipated response." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):31-39.
- Taylor, Mel, Garrett Wells, Gwyneth Howell, and Beverley Raphael. 2012. "The role of social media as psychological first aid as a support to community resilience building." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (1):20-26.
- Thomas, Melanie, David King, Diane U Keogh, Armando Apan, and Shahbaz Mushtaq. 2011. "Resilience to climate change impacts: a review of flood mitigation policy in Queensland, Australia." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (1):8-17.

Concept of Resilience

- Thornton, Richard. 2012. "This special legal edition of the Australian Journal of Emergency Management in context." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 27 (2):5-6.
- TISP. 2010. Regional Disaster Resilience Guide. The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP).
- Tolhurst, Kevin, Brett Shields, and Derek Chong. 2008. "Phoenix: development and application of a bushfire management tool." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (4):42-54.
- Twigg, John, and Diane Steiner. 2001. "Missed opportunities: NGOs and the United Nations International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 16 (3):5-14.
- Wajs-Chaczko, Emil. 2008. "Gen Y and emergency management: How do we engage generation Y in the emergency management sector?" *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (3):58-61.
- Walia, Ajinder. 2008. "Community based disaster preparedness: Need for a standardized training module." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 23 (2):68-73.
- Wapling, Dennis. 1996. "October 1993 floods - impact on Benalla and the district: A local government perspective." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 11 (2):27-32.
- Watson, Kellie. 2006. "Building community self sufficiency for fire safety." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (1):43-46.
- Webber, Ruth, and Kate Jones. 2011. "After the bushfires: surviving and volunteering." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 26 (2):33-38.
- Webster, Margery. 2006. "Notes from the field." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 21 (1):56-58.
- Wells, Dick, and Alan Edwards. 2004. "Securing our food supply." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (3):17-19.
- Yates, Loti, and Linda Anderson-Berry. 2004. "The societal and environmental impacts of Cyclone Zoe and the effectiveness of the tropical cyclone warning systems in Tikopia and Anuta Solomon Islands December 26-29, 2002." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 19 (1):16-20.
- Yeo, Stephen. 2003. "Effects of disclosure of flood-liability on residential property values." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 18 (1):35-44.
- Young, Elspeth. 1998. "Dealing with hazards and disasters: risk perception and community participation in management." *The Australian journal of emergency management* no. 13 (2):14-16.