What is Disaster Resilience?

The capacity of an individual or community to “bounce back” from a disaster or other hazardous event.
Beyond economic and demographic, a variety of factors have been theorized.
The two most interaction-based factors are **least** theoretically and methodologically developed.
The two most interaction-based factors are least theoretically and methodologically developed.

“The aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition” (Bourdieu 1985: 248).
The two most interaction-based factors are least theoretically and methodologically developed.

“The shared belief that a group can effectively meet environmental demands and improve their lives through concerted effort” (Benight 2004: 402).
Mixed Method Case Studies: Dixie and Leon Counties, Florida
Research Methods

Individual level:
- Surveys of residents
  - N = 65 in Dixie
  - N = 73 in Leon
  - Response rate of 27%
- Interviews
  - N = 9 in Dixie
  - N = 16 in Leon

Community level:
- Interviews with organizational representatives
  - N = 5 in Dixie
  - N = 23 in Leon
How do individuals understand their informal social capital for disaster situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Relationship (parent, sibling, friend, neighbor, etc.)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Location (City, State)</th>
<th>Help they could provide (check all that apply)</th>
<th>Have they helped you in past hurricanes?</th>
<th>Have you helped them in past hurricanes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Non-financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal disaster social networks are limited in size.
Financial disaster social networks are smaller than nonfinancial networks.
Family is prevalent in individuals’ disaster networks.
Formal social capital is limited, and many would not rely on it for disaster assistance.
How do residents and organizational representatives perceive the collective efficacy of their communities to “come together” for disaster resilience?
Collective Efficacy

Social Cohesion Index, Mean 2.62
- Can be trusted
- Don’t get along
- Willing to help neighbors
- Close-knit neighborhood
- Don’t share similar values

Community Index, Mean 3.24
- A safe place
- People can have an impact on community
- Will get worse in next 5 years
- People would not cooperate
- I would like to move

Disaster Collective Efficacy, Mean 3.27
- Community would distribute resources effectively following a disaster
- People in my community will work well with each other during disaster recovery
- Organizations and individuals are ready to respond to the community’s needs following a disaster
- Supporting those in greatest need after a disaster would be a priority for my community
- Community could work toward common recovery goals

Correlation: 0.74

Correlation: 0.61

Correlation: 0.62
Collective Efficacy

Interviewees gave several reasons to believe in high levels of disaster collective efficacy in their communities.

1. **Organizational** – Emergency response organizations are assumed to be effective and foster collective action.
2. **Cultural story** – Small, Southern towns have friendly people.
3. **Neighborly** – Neighbors and neighborhoods are supportive.
4. **Place attachment and education** – Promote individual involvement in collective action.
5. **Volunteerism and civic participation** – Indicate willingness for disaster collective action.
“People are more than willing to serve. But you’ve got to be organized, and you have to show that you have a strong foundation and that when you come in you’re prepared to receive them, they feel good about their service, it’s mission-driven.... That is more long-term sustainability and long-term success.” – Volunteer Services, Leon County
1. Social capital, both informal and formal, are distinct from collective efficacy.

2. Informal social capital relies on family ties, which are not captured in common social capital measures.

3. Measures of disaster social capital must include the resource.

4. Disaster collective efficacy perceptions rely on assumptions about disaster organizational response.
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## Survey Respondents Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dixie (n =75)</th>
<th>Leon (n =63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-30,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-45,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000-60,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 and above</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons with High School Degree or Higher</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons with Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Has a Disability</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Alone</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black/African American Alone</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>