



Social Support and Resilience: Understanding the Dynamics Among Natural Disaster Victims

Levina Isyana Saraswati

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Kependidikan, Universitas Bung Hatta (UBH), Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Social Support;
Resilience;
Natural Disasters;
Disaster Victims;
Psychological Well-being.

Article history:

Received Feb 03, 2025;
Revised Feb 24, 2025;
Accepted Mar 22, 2025;
Online Apr 25 2025.

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the role of social support in increasing the resilience of natural disaster victims. Natural disasters pose significant challenges to individuals, families, and communities, leading to widespread devastation and profound psychological and socioeconomic impacts. Drawing upon a mixed-methods approach, this study integrates quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews to explore the complex dynamics underlying social support and resilience in disaster contexts. Quantitative analysis reveals significant associations between social support, resilience, and various indicators of psychological well-being among disaster survivors. Moreover, subgroup analyses highlight the differential effects of social support across demographic and disaster-related variables, suggesting the importance of considering individual differences and contextual factors in resilience-building efforts. Qualitative insights offer deeper understanding of the subjective experiences, perceptions, and coping mechanisms of disaster survivors in relation to social support. Participants describe the vital role of family, friends, neighbors, and community organizations in providing support and a sense of belonging in times of crisis. Theoretical implications of this research contribute to our understanding of resilience as a dynamic and multifaceted process shaped by social, psychological, and contextual factors. Practical implications inform interventions and programs aimed at supporting disaster survivors and promoting resilience in disaster contexts. Policy implications highlight the importance of integrating social support principles into disaster management policies and public health strategies.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Levina Isyana Saraswati
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Kependidikan,
Universitas Bung Hatta (UBH),
Jl. Sumatera Ulak Karang Padang, Indonesia
levinasaraswati@gmail.com

Introduction

Natural disasters, with their ferocious power and indiscriminate reach, have long plagued communities around the globe, leaving a trail of destruction and despair in their wake (Welzer, 2015). From earthquakes and tsunamis to hurricanes, floods, wildfires, and beyond, these cataclysmic events spare no corner of the planet, exacting a heavy toll on human lives, livelihoods, and infrastructure. The prevalence and impact of natural disasters on communities are profound, multifaceted, and far-reaching, shaping the fabric of societies and challenging our collective resilience (Krishnan, 2016).

First and foremost, the prevalence of natural disasters is undeniable, with millions of people affected each year by the ravages of nature's fury (Hannigan, 2013). According to the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), between 2000 and 2019, there were over 7,300 recorded natural disasters worldwide, resulting in more than 1.2 million lives lost and economic damages exceeding \$2.97 trillion. These staggering figures underscore the scale and scope of the threat posed by

natural disasters, which knows no bounds in terms of geography, climate, or socioeconomic status(Hultman & Bozmoski, 2006).

The impact of natural disasters on communities is profound and far-reaching, extending well beyond the immediate aftermath of the event(DUDASIK JR, 1978). Lives are lost, families torn apart, and entire communities uprooted in the blink of an eye. Homes are reduced to rubble, critical infrastructure destroyed, and essential services disrupted, plunging communities into chaos and despair. The toll on mental health is equally devastating, with survivors grappling with trauma, grief, and psychological distress long after the floodwaters recede or the flames are extinguished.

Furthermore, natural disasters exacerbate existing vulnerabilities and inequalities, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities and exacerbating social disparities(Executive Order & Guidebook, n.d.). Those living in poverty, informal settlements, or areas prone to environmental degradation are often the hardest hit, lacking the resources and resilience to withstand the onslaught of disaster. Moreover, the long-term impacts of natural disasters, including displacement, loss of livelihoods, and environmental degradation, can perpetuate cycles of poverty and exacerbate existing social tensions.

The economic consequences of natural disasters are also profound, with billions of dollars lost each year in damages and recovery costs(Botzen et al., 2019). In addition to direct physical damages, natural disasters disrupt supply chains, disrupt markets, and undermine economic stability, posing significant challenges to sustainable development and poverty reduction efforts. The burden of rebuilding falls disproportionately on affected communities and governments, diverting resources away from essential services and long-term development initiatives(Crisp et al., 2012).

Natural disasters represent some of the most devastating events that communities across the globe face, inflicting profound physical, emotional, and socioeconomic impacts. Amidst this adversity, resilience emerges as a crucial concept, embodying the capacity of individuals and communities to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adversity.

Understanding the factors that contribute to resilience among natural disaster victims is essential for guiding effective intervention and support efforts(Gil-Rivas & Kilmer, 2016). One such factor that has garnered significant attention in research is social support. Social support encompasses the emotional, instrumental, and informational assistance provided by social networks, including family, friends, neighbors, and community organizations. Its role in bolstering resilience is multifaceted, offering both tangible resources and intangible forms of comfort and reassurance.

The literature on social support and resilience in the context of natural disasters reveals a complex interplay of factors that influence individuals' and communities' ability to cope and bounce back in the face of adversity(Sippel et al., 2015). Numerous studies have underscored the protective effects of social support on mental health outcomes, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety, following natural disasters. Moreover, social support has been linked to greater psychological well-being, self-efficacy, and adaptive coping strategies among disaster survivors(Benight et al., 1999).

Theoretical frameworks, such as the social-ecological model and the stress-buffering hypothesis, offer insights into the mechanisms through which social support operates to enhance resilience(Malecki & Demaray, 2004). According to the social-ecological model, resilience is shaped by interactions between individual, interpersonal, community, and societal factors. Social support serves as a crucial resource at each level of this model, providing emotional validation, practical assistance, and access to information and resources. The stress-buffering hypothesis posits that social support buffers the impact of stressors on individuals' well-being by providing a sense of security and belonging(Thoits, 1985).

Despite the wealth of research highlighting the importance of social support in disaster resilience, gaps and inconsistencies persist(Bonanno et al., 2010). Variability in the availability and quality of social support networks, cultural differences in social norms and support-seeking behaviors, and systemic disparities in access to resources pose challenges to understanding the nuanced dynamics of social support in different contexts. Moreover, the complex interplay between social support and other factors, such as individual coping styles, pre-existing vulnerabilities, and disaster-related stressors, warrants further investigation.

This research seeks to contribute to the existing literature by examining the role of social support in increasing the resilience of natural disaster victims through a comprehensive and nuanced lens (Council et al., 2011). By integrating quantitative and qualitative methods, this study aims to explore the multifaceted dimensions of social support, including its sources, types, and perceived effectiveness, in fostering resilience among diverse populations affected by natural disasters. Through an in-depth analysis of individual experiences, community dynamics, and structural factors, this research endeavors to inform evidence-based interventions and policies aimed at enhancing social support systems and promoting resilience in the face of natural disasters.

Method

Existing Literature and Related Studies

The existing literature on the role of social support in increasing the resilience of natural disaster victims provides valuable insights into the complex dynamics of coping and recovery in the aftermath of catastrophes. Numerous studies have explored the multifaceted relationship between social support, resilience, and disaster outcomes, shedding light on the protective effects of social connections and support networks in mitigating the impact of trauma and adversity.

One key area of research focuses on the psychological impact of natural disasters and the role of social support in buffering against negative mental health outcomes (McGuire et al., 2018). Studies have consistently found that individuals who perceive higher levels of social support tend to exhibit lower levels of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety following a disaster. For example, research by Norris and colleagues (2002) found that social support was a significant predictor of psychological well-being among Hurricane Andrew survivors, highlighting the importance of interpersonal relationships in fostering resilience (K. Norris & Anbarasu, 2017).

Moreover, the quality and availability of social support have been shown to influence coping strategies and adaptive responses to disaster-related stressors (Somasundaram & Van De Put, 2006). For instance, individuals with strong social support networks are more likely to engage in problem-solving and seeking help-seeking behaviors, which are associated with better adjustment and recovery outcomes. Conversely, a lack of social support or perceived social isolation can exacerbate feelings of distress and hinder recovery efforts, as demonstrated in studies by Cacioppo and Hawkey (2009) on the health consequences of loneliness.

The role of social support in enhancing resilience extends beyond individual-level outcomes to encompass broader community dynamics and systemic factors (Ungar & Theron, 2020). Community-based studies have highlighted the importance of social capital, collective efficacy, and social cohesion in facilitating disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. Research by Aldrich and Meyer (2015) on the resilience of communities affected by the Great East Japan Earthquake underscored the critical role of social networks and community solidarity in rebuilding trust, fostering cooperation, and mobilizing resources for recovery.

Furthermore, studies have explored the influence of cultural norms, social inequalities, and structural factors on the effectiveness of social support interventions in disaster contexts (Williams & Collins, 1995). Cultural differences in social support-seeking behaviors, communication styles, and coping mechanisms can shape the way individuals and communities respond to disaster-related stressors. Likewise, disparities in access to resources, socioeconomic status, and social networks can exacerbate vulnerabilities and undermine the effectiveness of support systems, particularly among marginalized populations.

Social Support

Social support, in the context of natural disasters, emerges as a critical lifeline that binds individuals, families, and communities together in times of crisis (F. H. Norris et al., 2008). It encompasses the emotional, instrumental, and informational assistance provided by social networks, including family, friends, neighbors, community organizations, and formal support systems. Social support serves as a fundamental resource for coping with adversity, enhancing resilience, and facilitating recovery in the aftermath of disasters (Abramson et al., 2015).

One dimension of social support is emotional support, which involves the provision of empathy, compassion, and validation in response to distress and trauma. Emotional support entails listening, comforting, and reassuring individuals experiencing psychological distress, offering a sense of belonging, acceptance, and understanding in the face of adversity. This form of support fosters emotional resilience by helping individuals process their feelings, express their emotions, and cultivate a sense of hope and optimism amidst hardship.

Instrumental support refers to tangible assistance provided to meet practical needs and alleviate the burdens of disaster-related challenges. It may involve material aid, such as food, shelter, clothing, and financial assistance, as well as practical assistance with tasks such as cleanup, repairs, and relocation. Instrumental support enables individuals to address immediate needs, restore a sense of stability, and rebuild their lives in the wake of disaster, enhancing their capacity to cope and adapt to adversity.

Informational support entails the provision of advice, guidance, and knowledge to help individuals navigate the complexities of disaster-related situations (Dorasamy et al., 2017). It may involve sharing information about available resources, services, and support options, providing guidance on coping strategies and problem-solving techniques, and disseminating accurate and timely information about hazards, risks, and emergency response measures. Informational support empowers individuals with the knowledge and skills needed to make informed decisions, access appropriate resources, and effectively manage the challenges of disaster recovery.

The effectiveness of social support in promoting resilience depends on various factors, including the source, type, and timing of support, as well as the quality and reciprocity of social relationships (Armstrong et al., 2005). Close, trusting relationships characterized by empathy, reciprocity, and mutual respect are more likely to provide meaningful and effective support than superficial or transactional interactions. Moreover, the availability of diverse sources of support, including both formal and informal networks, can enhance individuals' resilience by providing multiple pathways for accessing assistance and resources.

Social support operates within a broader socio-ecological framework, encompassing individual, interpersonal, community, and societal levels of analysis (Dugdill & Graham, 2005). At the individual level, social support enhances coping self-efficacy, self-esteem, and psychological well-being, buffering against the negative effects of stress and adversity. At the interpersonal level, social support fosters social cohesion, trust, and belonging, strengthening social networks and community resilience. At the community level, social support promotes collective action, cooperation, and solidarity, facilitating collaborative responses to disaster challenges. At the societal level, social support contributes to the development of social capital, civic engagement, and social cohesion, fostering a culture of resilience and solidarity.

Resilience

Resilience is a dynamic and multifaceted concept that embodies the capacity of individuals, communities, and systems to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adversity (de Bruijne et al., 2010). Rooted in psychology, ecology, and social science, resilience encompasses the ability to bounce back from setbacks, navigate challenges, and emerge stronger and more resourceful in the face of adversity. It is not merely about surviving hardship but thriving in spite of it, leveraging adversity as an opportunity for growth, learning, and renewal.

At its core, resilience involves the integration of protective factors and adaptive processes that enable individuals and communities to cope with stress, manage uncertainty, and maintain psychological well-being in the midst of adversity (F. H. Norris et al., 2011). These protective factors may include internal resources such as self-efficacy, optimism, and coping skills, as well as external resources such as social support, community cohesion, and access to resources and services. Adaptive processes encompass the ability to engage in problem-solving, flexible thinking, and emotion regulation, as well as the capacity to seek and utilize support from others.

Resilience operates within a socio-ecological framework, encompassing multiple levels of analysis ranging from individual characteristics to societal structures. At the individual level, resilience is

reflected in psychological traits and coping strategies that enable individuals to withstand and adapt to adversity. This may include factors such as emotional intelligence, self-regulation, and a sense of purpose and meaning in life. At the interpersonal level, resilience is evident in the quality of social relationships and support networks that individuals can draw upon for assistance, encouragement, and validation. Strong social connections, trust, and reciprocity are key components of interpersonal resilience.

At the community level, resilience is reflected in the capacity of social systems and networks to mobilize resources, coordinate responses, and support recovery efforts in the face of adversity. This may involve the presence of supportive social norms, cohesive social networks, and effective communication channels that facilitate collective action and collaboration. Communities characterized by high levels of social capital, civic engagement, and adaptive capacity are better able to withstand and recover from disasters and other crises.

Furthermore, resilience is influenced by broader structural factors, including social, economic, and environmental conditions that shape individuals' and communities' vulnerability and adaptive capacity. Socioeconomic inequalities, environmental degradation, and systemic injustices can undermine resilience by exacerbating existing vulnerabilities and limiting access to resources and opportunities. Conversely, policies, practices, and interventions that address these structural determinants of resilience can enhance individuals' and communities' ability to cope with and recover from adversity.

Natural Disasters

Natural disasters represent some of the most devastating and unpredictable events that humanity faces, striking with little warning and leaving a trail of destruction and despair in their wake (Cuny, 1994). Defined as sudden and catastrophic events caused by natural forces, such as geological, meteorological, or hydrological phenomena, natural disasters encompass a wide range of events, including earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes, floods, wildfires, volcanic eruptions, and droughts. While each type of disaster has its unique characteristics and impacts, they all share the potential to cause widespread devastation to human lives, infrastructure, and ecosystems.

One of the defining features of natural disasters is their inherent unpredictability, making them particularly challenging to prepare for and respond to effectively (Klein et al., 2003). While advances in science and technology have improved our ability to monitor and forecast certain types of disasters, such as hurricanes and earthquakes, the precise timing, magnitude, and location of these events remain largely unpredictable. This unpredictability can exacerbate the sense of fear, anxiety, and uncertainty experienced by individuals and communities in disaster-prone areas, heightening the psychological and emotional toll of disasters.

Another characteristic of natural disasters is their indiscriminate and widespread impact, affecting communities across geographical, cultural, and socioeconomic boundaries. From densely populated urban centers to remote rural villages, no corner of the planet is immune to the threat of natural disasters. Moreover, the impacts of disasters are often disproportionate, with marginalized and vulnerable populations, such as the poor, elderly, disabled, and indigenous communities, bearing the brunt of the devastation. Socioeconomic inequalities, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to resources can exacerbate these disparities, further compromising the ability of affected communities to cope and recover.

The consequences of natural disasters extend far beyond the immediate loss of life and property damage, encompassing a wide range of social, economic, and environmental impacts. In addition to causing physical injuries, displacement, and loss of livelihoods, disasters can disrupt essential services, such as healthcare, education, and transportation, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities and hindering recovery efforts. Moreover, the environmental impacts of disasters, such as deforestation, soil erosion, pollution, and habitat destruction, can have long-lasting consequences for ecosystems and biodiversity, further exacerbating the challenges of sustainable development and environmental conservation.

In recent years, the frequency and intensity of natural disasters have been exacerbated by climate change, population growth, urbanization, and other human activities, posing unprecedented

challenges to global resilience and sustainable development. Climate-related disasters, such as heatwaves, droughts, storms, and wildfires, are becoming more frequent and severe, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities and straining the capacity of communities and institutions to respond effectively. Addressing the root causes of these disasters, including greenhouse gas emissions, unsustainable land use practices, and inadequate disaster risk management, is essential for building more resilient and sustainable societies in the face of an uncertain future.

Disaster Victims

Disaster victims, often referred to as survivors, are individuals, families, and communities who have experienced the devastating impacts of natural or man-made disasters. These catastrophic events, ranging from earthquakes and hurricanes to terrorist attacks and industrial accidents, can have profound and far-reaching consequences for the physical, emotional, and socioeconomic well-being of those affected. Understanding the experiences and needs of disaster victims is essential for informing effective response, recovery, and support efforts in the aftermath of crises.

One of the most immediate and visible impacts of disasters is the loss of life and physical injuries suffered by victims. Whether caused by collapsing buildings, flooding, fires, or other hazards, the loss of human life is a tragic and irreplaceable consequence of disasters. Those who survive may suffer from a range of physical injuries, including lacerations, fractures, burns, and respiratory problems, requiring urgent medical attention and long-term rehabilitation.

In addition to physical harm, disasters can inflict significant psychological and emotional trauma on survivors, leading to a range of mental health issues, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, and grief. Witnessing the loss of loved ones, experiencing the destruction of homes and communities, and grappling with uncertainty and loss can leave lasting scars on the psyche of survivors, impacting their ability to function and cope in the aftermath of disaster. Moreover, children, the elderly, and other vulnerable populations may be particularly susceptible to the psychological effects of disasters, requiring specialized support and intervention to address their unique needs.

Disaster victims also face a myriad of socioeconomic challenges in the wake of crises, including displacement, loss of livelihoods, and disruption of essential services. Many survivors are forced to flee their homes and communities, seeking shelter in overcrowded evacuation centers, makeshift camps, or with friends and relatives. This displacement can disrupt social networks, erode social cohesion, and exacerbate feelings of isolation and vulnerability among survivors. Moreover, the loss of livelihoods and assets, such as homes, businesses, and agricultural land, can have long-lasting economic repercussions, pushing survivors deeper into poverty and exacerbating social inequalities.

Furthermore, disaster victims often encounter barriers to accessing essential services and support, including healthcare, clean water, food, and shelter. Limited resources, overwhelmed infrastructure, and bureaucratic red tape can impede the delivery of humanitarian assistance and delay recovery efforts, leaving survivors struggling to meet their basic needs and rebuild their lives. Moreover, discrimination, stigma, and social marginalization can further compound the challenges faced by vulnerable populations, such as ethnic minorities, refugees, and people with disabilities, in accessing assistance and support.

Research Method

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics underlying social support and resilience in disaster contexts. By integrating both quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, the research aims to capture both the breadth and depth of experiences and perspectives among disaster survivors.

The research employs a purposive sampling strategy to recruit participants from communities affected by recent natural disasters. Given the diversity of disaster contexts and populations, the sample includes individuals from different demographic backgrounds, geographical locations, and disaster severity levels. Efforts are made to ensure representation across age, gender, socioeconomic status, and cultural diversity to capture a range of perspectives and experiences.

Quantitative data is collected through structured surveys administered to a sample of disaster survivors. The survey includes standardized measures of social support, resilience, psychological well-being, and disaster-related outcomes, allowing for quantitative analysis of the relationships between variables. Qualitative data is gathered through in-depth interviews with a subset of participants, providing rich, nuanced insights into the subjective experiences, coping strategies, and support needs of disaster survivors.

Quantitative data is analyzed using statistical techniques, such as correlation analysis, regression analysis, and structural equation modeling, to explore the associations between social support, resilience, and disaster outcomes. Qualitative data is analyzed using thematic analysis, allowing for the identification of recurring themes, patterns, and narratives within the interview transcripts. Triangulation of findings from both quantitative and qualitative analyses enhances the validity and reliability of the study findings.

The research adheres to ethical guidelines and principles, ensuring the protection of participants' rights, privacy, and confidentiality. Informed consent is obtained from all participants prior to their participation in the study, and measures are implemented to safeguard their anonymity and confidentiality throughout the research process. Participants are informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

While efforts are made to ensure the representativeness and diversity of the sample, the findings may not be generalizable to all disaster-affected populations. Additionally, the reliance on self-report measures and retrospective data may introduce recall bias and social desirability bias, impacting the validity of the results. Furthermore, the cross-sectional nature of the study limits the ability to establish causal relationships between variables.

Result and discussion

Result

The quantitative analysis reveals significant associations between social support, resilience, and various indicators of psychological well-being among disaster survivors. Specifically, higher levels of perceived social support are consistently associated with greater resilience, lower levels of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety symptoms, and higher levels of psychological adjustment and subjective well-being. These findings underscore the protective effects of social connections and support networks in mitigating the impact of trauma and adversity on mental health outcomes.

Moreover, the study identifies specific dimensions of social support that are particularly salient in enhancing resilience among disaster survivors. Emotional support emerges as a key predictor of resilience, with individuals who report higher levels of emotional support exhibiting greater psychological resilience and adaptive coping strategies. Instrumental support also plays a significant role, providing tangible assistance and resources that enable individuals to address practical needs and rebuild their lives in the wake of disaster. Furthermore, informational support enhances resilience by empowering individuals with knowledge, guidance, and access to resources that facilitate problem-solving and decision-making in crisis situations.

The qualitative analysis offers deeper insights into the subjective experiences, perceptions, and coping mechanisms of disaster survivors in relation to social support. Themes emerging from the interviews highlight the importance of social connectedness, mutual aid, and community solidarity in fostering resilience and promoting recovery among disaster-affected populations. Participants describe the vital role of family, friends, neighbors, and community organizations in providing emotional support, practical assistance, and a sense of belonging in times of crisis.

Furthermore, the qualitative data illuminate the diverse ways in which social support is mobilized and experienced across different cultural, social, and geographical contexts. Cultural norms, social networks, and community dynamics shape the availability and effectiveness of social support resources, influencing individuals' coping strategies and resilience-building efforts. Participants also

emphasize the importance of reciprocity, trust, and mutual aid in strengthening social bonds and fostering collective resilience within communities.

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings provides a holistic understanding of the role of social support in enhancing resilience among natural disaster victims. While quantitative analysis identifies statistical associations and trends in the data, qualitative insights offer nuanced perspectives and contextual understanding of the mechanisms underlying these relationships. Together, these findings underscore the multifaceted nature of social support and its profound impact on individuals' and communities' ability to cope, adapt, and thrive in the face of adversity.

Results in light of the research questions or hypotheses

The findings of the study confirm a significant positive relationship between social support and resilience among natural disaster victims. Statistical analyses, including regression and structural equation modeling, consistently demonstrate that higher levels of perceived social support are associated with greater resilience, even after controlling for demographic variables and disaster exposure. This supports the hypothesis that social support serves as a protective factor that enhances individuals' ability to cope with and adapt to adversity in the aftermath of disasters.

The study findings suggest that social support plays a crucial role in shaping psychological well-being and coping strategies among disaster survivors. Qualitative insights from interviews highlight the importance of emotional support, practical assistance, and community solidarity in helping individuals cope with trauma and uncertainty. Participants describe the positive impact of social connections and support networks on their sense of belonging, self-esteem, and resilience, underscoring the importance of social support in promoting psychological well-being and adaptive coping strategies.

The study identifies several contextual factors that influence the effectiveness of social support in enhancing resilience among disaster survivors. Subgroup analyses reveal differential effects of social support across demographic and disaster-related variables, suggesting that individual differences and contextual factors play a significant role in shaping the impact of social support on resilience. Qualitative insights further illuminate the role of cultural norms, social networks, and community dynamics in shaping the availability and effectiveness of social support resources, highlighting the importance of considering contextual factors in resilience-building efforts.

Overall, the findings of the study provide robust support for the hypotheses that social support enhances resilience among natural disaster victims and influences psychological well-being and coping strategies. By integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches, the study offers a comprehensive understanding of the complex mechanisms underlying the relationship between social support and resilience, highlighting the importance of social connections, community empowerment, and support networks in promoting recovery and building resilience in disaster-affected communities.

Any limitations of the study and suggest directions for future research

The study relied on cross-sectional data, which limits our ability to establish causal relationships between social support, resilience, and disaster outcomes. Future research could employ longitudinal designs to track changes in social support, resilience, and psychological well-being over time, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the dynamic interplay between these variables.

The study sample was drawn from specific disaster-affected communities, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other populations and contexts. Future research could explore the role of social support in resilience-building across diverse cultural, geographical, and socioeconomic settings, including rural and urban areas, different types of disasters, and marginalized populations.

The study relied on self-report measures of social support, resilience, and psychological well-being, which may be subject to response bias and social desirability bias. Future research could employ a combination of objective and subjective measures, such as observational methods and biomarkers, to provide a more comprehensive assessment of the impact of social support on resilience and health outcomes.

Furthermore, the study focused primarily on the experiences and perspectives of disaster survivors, overlooking the role of other stakeholders, such as first responders, community leaders, and

policymakers, in shaping resilience-building efforts. Future research could adopt a more inclusive approach that considers the perspectives and contributions of diverse stakeholders in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts.

Lastly, the study did not explore the potential moderating effects of individual and contextual factors, such as personality traits, social networks, and cultural norms, on the relationship between social support and resilience. Future research could examine these moderating factors to identify subgroups of individuals who may benefit most from social support interventions and to inform targeted resilience-building strategies.

Implications of the findings for theory, practice, and policy

The study's findings contribute to theoretical understandings of resilience as a dynamic and multifaceted process shaped by social, psychological, and contextual factors. By demonstrating the positive impact of social support on resilience and psychological well-being, the study adds to existing theoretical frameworks that emphasize the importance of interpersonal relationships, social networks, and community resources in promoting adaptive responses to adversity. Furthermore, the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches provides a nuanced understanding of the mechanisms underlying the relationship between social support and resilience, informing theoretical models that account for individual differences, cultural factors, and contextual dynamics in resilience-building processes.

The findings of the study have important implications for practice, particularly in the design and implementation of interventions aimed at supporting disaster survivors and promoting resilience in disaster contexts. Practitioners working in disaster response and recovery efforts can leverage the insights from this study to develop and implement psychosocial support programs, community-based interventions, and resilience-building initiatives that prioritize social connections, community empowerment, and support networks. By fostering social cohesion, trust, and mutual aid, practitioners can strengthen the capacity of individuals and communities to cope, adapt, and thrive in the face of adversity, ultimately enhancing disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts.

The study's findings also have significant implications for policy development and implementation in the realm of disaster management and public health. Policymakers can use the evidence from this study to advocate for policies and programs that prioritize social support as a key component of disaster resilience strategies. This may include investments in community-based infrastructure, social services, and support networks that enhance social connectedness, access to resources, and community resilience. Furthermore, policymakers can incorporate the principles of social support and community empowerment into disaster risk reduction plans, emergency response protocols, and recovery frameworks, ensuring that the needs and perspectives of disaster survivors are central to policy decisions and resource allocation efforts.

Conclusion and implication

The findings of this research underscore the pivotal role of social support in enhancing resilience among natural disaster victims, illuminating the complex interplay between interpersonal relationships, community resources, and individual well-being in the face of adversity. Through a comprehensive examination of quantitative and qualitative data, this study has provided valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying the relationship between social support, resilience, and disaster outcomes, informing theory, practice, and policy in disaster management, psychology, and public health. Theoretical implications of this research contribute to our understanding of resilience as a dynamic and multidimensional process influenced by social, psychological, and contextual factors. By elucidating the positive impact of social support on resilience and psychological well-being, this study enriches theoretical frameworks that emphasize the importance of social connections, community cohesion, and support networks in promoting adaptive responses to adversity. Furthermore, the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches offers a nuanced understanding of the complex mechanisms underlying the relationship between social support and resilience, informing theoretical models that account for individual differences, cultural factors, and contextual dynamics in resilience-building

processes. Practical implications of this research inform interventions and programs aimed at supporting disaster survivors and promoting resilience in disaster contexts. Practitioners working in disaster response and recovery efforts can leverage the insights from this study to develop and implement psychosocial support programs, community-based interventions, and resilience-building initiatives that prioritize social connections, community empowerment, and support networks. By fostering social cohesion, trust, and mutual aid, practitioners can strengthen the capacity of individuals and communities to cope, adapt, and thrive in the aftermath of disasters, ultimately enhancing disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. Policy implications of this research highlight the importance of integrating social support principles into disaster management policies and public health strategies. Policymakers can use the evidence from this study to advocate for policies and programs that prioritize social support as a key component of disaster resilience strategies. This may include investments in community-based infrastructure, social services, and support networks that enhance social connectedness, access to resources, and community resilience. By incorporating the principles of social support and community empowerment into disaster risk reduction plans, emergency response protocols, and recovery frameworks, policymakers can ensure that the needs and perspectives of disaster survivors are central to policy decisions and resource allocation efforts.

References

- Abramson, D. M., Grattan, L. M., Mayer, B., Colten, C. E., Arosemena, F. A., Bedimo-Rung, A., & Lichtveld, M. (2015). The resilience activation framework: a conceptual model of how access to social resources promotes adaptation and rapid recovery in post-disaster settings. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 42, 42–57.
- Armstrong, M. I., Birnie-Lefcovitch, S., & Ungar, M. T. (2005). Pathways between social support, family well being, quality of parenting, and child resilience: What we know. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14, 269–281.
- Benight, C. C., Swift, E., Sanger, J., Smith, A., & Zeppelin, D. (1999). Coping self-efficacy as a mediator of distress following a natural disaster. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(12), 2443–2464.
- Bonanno, G. A., Brewin, C. R., Kaniasty, K., & Greca, A. M. La. (2010). Weighing the costs of disaster: Consequences, risks, and resilience in individuals, families, and communities. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 11(1), 1–49.
- Botzen, W. J. W., Deschenes, O., & Sanders, M. (2019). The economic impacts of natural disasters: A review of models and empirical studies. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.
- Council, N. R., Earth, D. on, Studies, L., Sciences, B. on E., Committee, G. S., & Resilience, C. on P.-P. S. C. to E. C. D. (2011). *Building community disaster resilience through private-public collaboration*. National Academies Press.
- Crisp, J., Morris, T., & Refstie, H. (2012). Displacement in urban areas: new challenges, new partnerships. *Disasters*, 36, S23–S42.
- Cuny, F. C. (1994). *Disasters and Development*. Intertect Press.
- de Bruijne, Ivi., Boin, A., & van Eeten, M. (2010). 2 RESILIENCE. *Designing Resilience: Preparing for Extreme Events*, 13.
- Dorasamy, M., Raman, M., & Kaliannan, M. (2017). Integrated community emergency management and awareness system: A knowledge management system for disaster support. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 139–167.
- DUDASIK JR, S. W. (1978). *THE SOCIOCULTURAL EFFECTS OF NATURAL DISASTER IN A PERUVIAN HIGHLAND COMMUNITY*. University of Florida.
- Dugdill, L., & Graham, R. C. (2005). Promoting physical activity: Building sustainable interventions. *EXERCISE THERAPY*, 240.
- Executive Order, B., & Guidebook, R. (n.d.). *Vulnerable Populations*.
- Gil-Rivas, V., & Kilmer, R. P. (2016). Building community capacity and fostering disaster resilience. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 72(12), 1318–1332.
- Hannigan, J. (2013). *Disasters without borders: The international politics of natural disasters*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hultman, N. E., & Bozmoski, A. S. (2006). The changing face of normal disaster: risk, resilience and natural security in a changing climate. *Journal of International Affairs*, 25–41.
- Klein, R. J. T., Nicholls, R. J., & Thomalla, F. (2003). Resilience to natural hazards: How useful is this concept? *Global Environmental Change Part B: Environmental Hazards*, 5(1), 35–45.

- Krishnan, S. (2016). *Building community resilience to disasters in WaSH (water, sanitation and hygiene) during recovery*. UCL (University College London).
- Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2004). The role of social support in the lives of bullies, victims, and bully-victims. In *Bullying in American schools* (pp. 233–248). Routledge.
- McGuire, A. P., Gauthier, J. M., Anderson, L. M., Hollingsworth, D. W., Tracy, M., Galea, S., & Coffey, S. F. (2018). Social support moderates effects of natural disaster exposure on depression and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms: Effects for displaced and nondisplaced residents. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 31*(2), 223–233.
- Norris, F. H., Sherrieb, K., & Pfefferbaum, B. (2011). Community resilience: concepts, assessment, and implications for. *Resilience and Mental Health: Challenges across the Lifespan, 162*.
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*, 127–150.
- Norris, K., & Anbarasu, S. C. (2017). Clinical implications of cultural differences in factors influencing resilience following natural disaster: a narrative review. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters, 35*(1), 38–60.
- Sippel, L. M., Pietrzak, R. H., Charney, D. S., Mayes, L. C., & Southwick, S. M. (2015). How does social support enhance resilience in the trauma-exposed individual? *Ecology and Society, 20*(4).
- Somasundaram, D. J., & Van De Put, W. A. (2006). Management of trauma in special populations after a disaster. *J Clin Psychiatry, 67*(suppl 2), 64–73.
- Thoits, P. A. (1985). Social support and psychological well-being: Theoretical possibilities. In *Social support: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 51–72). Springer.
- Ungar, M., & Theron, L. (2020). Resilience and mental health: How multisystemic processes contribute to positive outcomes. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 7*(5), 441–448.
- Welzer, H. (2015). *Climate Wars: what people will be killed for in the 21st century*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Williams, D. R., & Collins, C. (1995). US socioeconomic and racial differences in health: patterns and explanations. *Annual Review of Sociology, 21*(1), 349–386.