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**INTRODUCTION... BASIC CONCEPTS MARKS A TENDENCY:**

- **Resilience** affects all the ways a person responds to adversity and/or risky environments. This can be a stage or a domain, if it integrates salient skills and abilities, or it can be an adaptation process in which an individual accumulates protective factors that modify how they respond to risk factors over time (Jain & Cohen, 2013) and provides a strengthened mental state, higher maturity, emotional stability, and resistance to endure what comes next (Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990).

- **Poverty** is considered as synonymous with “low income”, with the understanding that limited financial resources limit one’s ability to: a) meet basic needs and b) have access to resources (e.g., education, health services) to improve one’s quality of life (e.g., self-confidence, self-assurance in undertakings and life satisfaction in the psychological realm). It has social disadvantages. But, as **urban poverty** is a manifestation of such inequalities in order the unequal distribution among subpopulations.

- **Poverty and psychological wellbeing** can affect each other via adaptation processes. Those who live in poverty are socially disadvantaged due to disparities in resource allocation (principally physical, services, employment and health) within societies (Purandare, 2013). The lack of resources and living in high-risk circumstances ends up taking a toll and generating unexpected and inappropriate responses to stressors (Edlynn et al., 2008; Hansen-Nord et al., 2016).
PURPOSE OF THIS REVIEW...IF...THESE...THEN THERE ISN’T RESILIENCE CAPACITY TO RESPONSE TO UP

- (i) economic disadvantage to understand how people respond from their income limited condition to improvement options

- (ii) life-skill disadvantage in terms of distinguishing resources used to face poverty and what other aspects are non-responsive

- (iii) social disadvantage by disparity in the range of social resources and their response by perceiving themselves victims of such circumstances
1. Which are the risk factors that limit and increase vulnerability and which are those resilient responses that ease development and psychological functioning in those who live in UP?

2. Which is the combination among resilient factors which to give them (families and individuals) the possibility to escape of urban poverty in turn they can express psychological functioning and a good social adaptation?
Flow diagram: phases of the systematic reviewed about UP and resilience:

**Method:**

- The keywords were based on the terms resilience, UP and their derivatives.
- The connectors used respond to the Boolean search system and were established by two algorithms the same in English and Spanish for EBSCO and Web of Science.

- **Identification**
  - Identified documents in search engines (n= 422)
  - Discarded elements for foreign subjects or repeated (n = 94)
- **Revision**
  - Revised abstracts (n= 370)
  - Excluded Abstracts (N= 272)
- **Eligibility**
  - Complete articles revised for eligibility (N = 98)
  - Complete articles excluded by not expressing an UP context, for methodological quality, no measure of resilience or do not add to the theme of study (N=71),
- **Inclusion**
  - Articles with qualitative data (N = 7)
  - Articles with quantitative data (N = 20)

*Note: Original work of the authors following the 4 phase flow diagram proposed by Liberati et al., (2009).*
Figure 2. Frequency distribution of the articles reviewed by year of publication.

Note: Authors’ original work.

Figure 3. Frequency distribution of journal themes

Table 1. Articles retrieved on UP and resilience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region being studied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-saharan Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country income levels</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1^ The article total by region and country income are not mutually exclusive. 2^ The percentage corresponds to the number of articles from the final pool of 27 articles. 3^ According to the World Bank’s classification.
GLOBAL SUMMARY…JUST IS AN EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Region (sample)</th>
<th>Kind of Study (Design)</th>
<th>Risk Factors (RF), Adverse Antecedents (AD) or Protection Factors (PF)</th>
<th>Perspective of Study or recommendation to study</th>
<th>Type of response to UP: (I) Individual, (F) Familial, and/or (C) Communal</th>
<th>Protective Factors as indicators of adaptation and psychological strengthening: ( \downarrow \text{RF} \uparrow \text{PF} = (R) \text{Resilience or (In) intervention}\Rightarrow\text{Resilience}</th>
<th>The family as mediator role of resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony (2008)</td>
<td>United States (n=157 adolescents 6-8 grade, public school, M=15 years)</td>
<td>Quantitative Cross-Sectional (Correlations, Clusters and Linear Regression)</td>
<td>(AD) Disorder conditions and violence in poor neighborhood, (PF) Social and positive behavior</td>
<td>Multi-level or Sistemic</td>
<td>(I) Self-esteem, coping skills. (F) Social and family support, community cohesion, parental supervision and consistent discipline. (C) Community cohesion.</td>
<td>( (R) \uparrow \text{Self-esteem}, \uparrow \text{spiritual development}, \uparrow \text{problem solving and communication at home}, \uparrow \text{school achievements.} )</td>
<td>( \uparrow \text{Social and family support, community cohesion, parental supervision and consistent discipline.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley et al. (2005)</td>
<td>United States (n=134 Afroamerican Women, 18-64 years)</td>
<td>Quantitative Cross-sectional (Descriptive Analysis, Pearson’s correlation and linear regression)</td>
<td>(AD) disorder symptoms for post-traumatic disorder (PTSD) due to: sexual abuse, slapped, kicked, pushed, drowned, pierced, forced sex; threatened by weapon, (RF) Symptoms of PTSD</td>
<td>Family Level</td>
<td>(I) Self-esteem as an element that provides security. (F) In situations of great adversity, the social support network favors. (C) Social support network and positive religious beliefs.</td>
<td>( \downarrow \text{In a condition is post-traumatic stress only the social network can facilitate} \uparrow \text{the psychological strengthening=} (R) )</td>
<td>( \uparrow \text{In situations of great adversity,} \uparrow \text{the social support network is indispensable.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camfield (2012)</td>
<td>Ethiopia (n=395 Adolescents, 11-15 years)</td>
<td>Qualitative (case study)</td>
<td>(PF) Social adaptation, psycho-emotional skills and social networks</td>
<td>Social resilience generated from observations multi-level or systemically</td>
<td>(I) Subjective well-being and individual competences. (C) Social resilience generated by communities made through social support networks</td>
<td>( (R) \uparrow \text{social network,} \uparrow \text{social resilience,} \uparrow \text{academic performance} )</td>
<td>( \uparrow \text{Self-efficacy, parent-child relation and coping strategies} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Relational circularity that exists between the individual and an UP environment.

5. A stressed person lowers its response capability towards adversity in UP and by consequence becomes a reinforcing agent of it.

Or enhances response capability: there is a resilient escape.

The person is resilient, adapts easily and overcomes stress.
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FOUR CATEGORIES OF RELATIONSHIPS HAVE EMERGED:

- (i) a habituation* relationship characterized by a low consciousness of the poverty condition
- (ii) high consciousness and high management of opportunities
- (iii) a conscious relationship in relation to involvement and social engagement
- (iv) conscious relationship motivated by a third party
Demographic characteristics: age, subpopulation, social condition, receiving help from government or public school's students.
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