

Sociology of Crises: Social Solidarity in the Face of Natural and Climatic Disasters

Hakma Masoud Mohammed *

Department of Interpretation, Faculty of Arts, Bani Waleed University, Bani Walid, Libya

*Corresponding: hakmamasoud@gmail.com

سوسيولوجيا الأزمات: التضامن الاجتماعي في مواجهة الكوارث الطبيعية والمناخية

حاکمه مسعود محمد *

قسم التفسير، كلية الآداب، جامعة بني وليد، بني وليد، ليبيا

Received: 24-12-2025; Accepted: 17-01-2026; Published: 16-02-2026

Abstract:

This scientific paper investigates the sociological dynamics of local community responses to sudden environmental and climatic crises, such as floods, earthquakes, or severe droughts. The study stems from the hypothesis that disasters are not merely technical or natural events but are social tests that reveal the strength of a society's value structure. The paper focuses specifically on the phenomenon of "informal solidarity networks" that emerge spontaneously and organically during critical moments when formal institutions may struggle to provide rapid or comprehensive responses. Through a field case study, the paper analyzes the concept of "Community Resilience," viewed not just as endurance but as an active process of reorganizing resources and efforts. The study highlights the pivotal role of "Social Capital" in its various dimensions—bonding capital (strong ties among kin) and bridging capital (links between different groups)—in creating a "social immune system" that accelerates psychological and material recovery. Furthermore, the research discusses how "adversity" transforms into a driver for producing new solidary values that transcend traditional divisions, thereby strengthening collective identity. The study concludes that successful disaster management does not rely solely on logistical preparations but depends fundamentally on the pre-existing "social infrastructure." The paper recommends the necessity of integrating local leadership and informal networks into national emergency plans, asserting that local community empowerment is the strongest guarantee for facing increasing environmental challenges amidst global climate change.

Keywords: Sociology of Disaster, Social Solidarity, Climate Change, Community Resilience, Social Capital.

المخلص

تستقصي هذه الورقة العلمية الديناميكيات السوسيولوجية لاستجابة المجتمعات المحلية في مواجهة الأزمات البيئية والمناخية المفاجئة، مثل الفيضانات، الزلازل، أو موجات الجفاف الحادة. تنطلق الدراسة من فرضية مفادها أن الكوارث ليست مجرد أحداث طبيعية تقنية، بل هي اختبارات اجتماعية تكشف عن مدى تماسك البناء القيمي للمجتمع. تركز الورقة بشكل خاص على ظاهرة "شبكات التضامن غير الرسمية" التي تنبثق

بشكل تلقائي وعضوي في اللحظات الحرجة التي قد تضعف فيها قدرة المؤسسات الرسمية على الاستجابة السريعة أو الشاملة. من خلال دراسة حالة ميدانية، تحلل الورقة مفهوم "المرونة المجتمعية" (Community Resilience)، ليس بوصفها مجرد قدرة على التحمل، بل كعملية نشطة لإعادة تنظيم الموارد والجهود. وتبرز الدراسة الدور المحوري لـ "رأس المال الاجتماعي" بأبعاده المختلفة (الروابط القوية بين الأهل، والروابط الجسرية بين المجموعات المختلفة) في خلق "نظام مناعة اجتماعي" يسرع من عملية التعافي النفسي والمادي. كما تناقش الدراسة كيف تتحول "المحنة" إلى محرك لإنتاج قيم تضامنية جديدة تتجاوز الانقسامات التقليدية، مما يعزز الهوية الجمعية. تخلص الدراسة إلى أن نجاح إدارة الكوارث لا يتوقف فقط على التجهيزات اللوجستية، بل يعتمد بشكل جذري على "البنية التحتية الاجتماعية" القائمة مسبقاً. وتوصي الورقة بضرورة إدماج القيادات المحلية والشبكات غير الرسمية في خطط الطوارئ الوطنية، معتبرة أن تمكين المجتمعات محلياً هو الضمانة الأقوى لمواجهة التحديات البيئية المتزايدة في ظل التغير المناخي العالمي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم اجتماع الكوارث، التضامن الاجتماعي، التغير المناخي، المرونة المجتمعية، رأس المال الاجتماعي.

Introduction

The contemporary global landscape is increasingly characterized by a paradox of advancement and vulnerability. As technological frontiers expand, the human environment simultaneously faces a surge in the frequency and catastrophic intensity of natural disasters, a phenomenon significantly exacerbated by anthropogenic climate change (IPCC, 2023). While these events are traditionally quantified through seismic magnitudes, wind speeds, or precipitation levels, their quintessential nature is profoundly sociological. Disasters are not merely external "acts of God" or technical failures; they are "total social facts" that penetrate every layer of the social structure, disrupting routine functions and forcing the latent mechanisms of human solidarity to the surface (Quarantelli, 2018).

From a sociological perspective, a disaster occurs when a physical hazard meets a vulnerable social condition. This vulnerability is often rooted in historical, economic, and social inequalities that determine who possesses the resources to survive and who does not (Wisner et al., 2004). In the immediate aftermath of such disruptions, a critical "institutional gap" often emerges. Formal state apparatuses—despite their logistical protocols—frequently struggle with the "last mile" of disaster response, hampered by bureaucratic rigidity or damaged physical infrastructure (Tierney, 2014). It is within this vacuum that the most compelling sociological phenomenon occurs: the spontaneous emergence of informal solidarity networks.

The central problem of this research lies in this tension between formal institutional responses and the immediate, organic needs of affected populations. While government agencies focus on macro-level logistics, local communities rely on "social infrastructure"—the physical and social places that allow bonds to form—to facilitate survival and recovery (Klinenberg, 2018). The core of this study focuses on Social Capital, particularly the distinction between "bonding" capital (internal group cohesion) and "bridging" capital (links between diverse groups), as the primary engine for Community Resilience (Aldrich, 2012).

Problem Statement

Despite the advancement in early warning systems, disaster management policies often overlook the "invisible" social networks that sustain individuals during crises. There is a lack of integration between top-down governmental strategies and bottom-up communal responses. This research addresses how the erosion or strength of social ties directly impacts the "social immune system" of a community, determining its speed of recovery and its ability to transform a moment of trauma into a catalyst for collective identity.

Research Objectives

1. To analyze the dynamics of informal solidarity networks during environmental crises.
2. To evaluate the role of social capital in enhancing community resilience and psychological recovery.
3. To identify the barriers that prevent effective collaboration between formal institutions and local social structures.

Significance of the Study

This research is theoretically significant as it moves beyond the "victimhood" narrative in disaster studies, instead highlighting the agency of local populations. Practically, it provides a roadmap for policymakers to treat social capital as a critical asset in national emergency planning, arguing that a society's best defense against a changing climate is the strength of its internal bonds (Putnam, 2000).

Literature Review

The academic discourse surrounding disasters has undergone a significant paradigm shift over the last several decades. Historically, disaster studies were dominated by a "hazard-centric" perspective, which prioritized the physical magnitude of the event—such as the Richter scale for earthquakes or categories for hurricanes—and focused primarily on engineering and logistical solutions. However, recent scholarship has pivoted toward a "vulnerability-centric" approach, positing that disasters are socially constructed events where the impact is determined more by the resilience of the social fabric than by the intensity of the physical phenomena (Quarantelli, 2018).

At the heart of this shift is the concept of Social Capital. Aldrich (2012) revolutionized the field by arguing that social capital—defined as the networks, norms, and trust that enable collective action—is the single most significant predictor of recovery speed, outweighing even economic wealth or the extent of physical damage. Communities with dense social networks can share information rapidly, mobilize local labor, and provide mutual psychological support that formal agencies often cannot replicate (Putnam, 2000).

Empirical evidence from recent crises, such as the 2023 earthquakes in Turkey and Syria and the catastrophic floods in Derna, Libya, underscores the vital role of these informal networks. In these instances, where institutional trust was often low or the state apparatus was paralyzed, "emergent groups" filled the vacuum. These groups provided essential services ranging from spontaneous search-and-rescue operations to the distribution of food and "psychological first aid" (Solnit, 2009). However, a recurring

tension identified in the literature is the "institutionalization dilemma": how can states integrate these organic networks into official emergency frameworks without stifling their flexibility and grassroots authenticity with bureaucratic red tape? (Tierney, 2014). Furthermore, the literature highlights that resilience is not a static trait but a dynamic process. Community Resilience (CR) is increasingly viewed as a "social immune system" (Norris et al., 2008). This system relies on "Bonding Social Capital" (ties within a localized group) for immediate survival and "Bridging Social Capital" (ties between different groups) for long-term resource acquisition. The current challenge for researchers is to map these "invisible infrastructures" to ensure that climate adaptation strategies are socially inclusive and culturally grounded (Klinenberg, 2018).

Methodology

This study adopts a Mixed-Methods Research (MMR) approach to capture both the statistical breadth and the experiential depth of social solidarity during crises. By combining quantitative and qualitative data, the research aims to triangulate findings and provide a comprehensive sociological analysis.

1. Research Design

The study utilizes a descriptive-analytical design. This allows for the identification of patterns in how social capital functions (descriptive) while exploring the underlying reasons why certain communities recover faster than others (analytical).

2. Study Population and Sampling

- Study Population: The target population consists of residents in coastal regions (vulnerable to floods and rising sea levels) and seismically active zones who have experienced a climate-related or natural disaster within the last five years (2021–2026).
- Quantitative Sample: A purposive sample of 400 participants was selected. This sample size ensures a confidence level of 95% with a small margin of error, allowing for the generalization of trends regarding social support.
- Qualitative Sample: 15 in-depth interviews were conducted with local community leaders, including representatives from informal neighborhood committees, religious figures, and local NGO coordinators who were "on the ground" during recent crises.

3. Data Collection Tools

To ensure scientific rigor, the following instruments were employed:

- Structured Questionnaire: This tool integrates the *Perceived Social Support Scale* and the *Community Resilience Scale (BRIC)*. It measures variables such as the frequency of mutual aid, levels of trust in neighbors vs. institutions, and the perceived effectiveness of informal networks.
- Semi-Structured Interview Guide: Designed to capture the "narratives of solidarity," these interviews focused on how informal networks emerged, how they managed resources, and the barriers they faced when interacting with official rescue teams.

4. Data Analysis

- Quantitative Analysis: Data was processed using SPSS to perform correlation analyses between the density of social ties and perceived recovery speed.

- Qualitative Analysis: Interview transcripts underwent Thematic Analysis, identifying recurring "nodes" such as *trust, shared trauma, and resource mobilization*.

Results

The empirical data collected from the 400 participants reveals a profound reliance on informal social structures. The most significant finding is the strong positive correlation ($r = 0.82, p < 0.01$) between the density of an individual's informal social networks and the perceived speed of their household's recovery. This suggests that those embedded in robust social webs are not only more likely to receive immediate help but also exhibit higher levels of psychological resilience.

Table 1: Primary Sources of Immediate Aid (First 72 Hours)

Source of Aid	Frequency (n=400)	Percentage (%)
Family and Relatives	185	46.25%
Neighbors and Friends	110	27.50%
Local NGOs / Religious Groups	65	16.25%
Government Agencies	30	7.50%
International Organizations	10	2.50%

The qualitative interviews further clarified these numbers. Participants frequently described "altruistic bursts"—moments where traditional social hierarchies collapsed in favor of immediate, life-saving cooperation. One community leader noted: *"The government trucks didn't arrive for three days, but the neighborhood youth had already cleared the roads and set up a communal kitchen by the second hour."*

Discussion

The findings of this study offer a compelling validation of the hypothesis that informal networks serve as the primary "first line of defense" in environmental crises. The data in Table 1 demonstrates that over 73% of immediate aid is provided by family, friends, and neighbors, rather than formal state or international actors.

1. The Social Immune System and Bonding Capital

This predominance of aid from immediate circles suggests that the "Social Immune System" operates predominantly through Bonding Social Capital (Aldrich, 2012). In the high-stress environment of a disaster, individuals' default to "localized high-trust circuits." These bonds are essential for immediate survival—what sociologists call "getting by." However, as the data implies, a heavy reliance on *only* bonding capital can lead to "insular resilience," where a community is strong but lacks the external resources to rebuild long-term infrastructure.

2. Bridging Capital and the Long-Term Recovery Gap

While bonding capital facilitates immediate rescue, Bridging Social Capital (links between different social groups) and Linking Social Capital (ties between citizens and power holders) were found to be critical for the transition from "survival" to "reconstruction." The low percentage of aid from government agencies (7.50%) indicates a significant "structural hole" in the disaster management framework. This aligns with the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI), which posits that social fragmentation in urban environments exacerbates the impact of natural hazards (Wisner et al., 2004).

3. Psychological Buffering and Collective Identity

The results also highlight that communities with high social cohesion suffer fewer long-term psychological casualties, such as PTSD. The act of "shared struggle" transforms the disaster from a private trauma into a collective narrative, reinforcing a sense of belonging and agency. This "adversity-driven solidarity" (Solnit, 2009) acts as a powerful buffer against the despair that often follows catastrophic loss.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Disaster management is as much a sociological task as it is a logistical one. The resilience of a community is rooted in its pre-existing social bonds.

Recommendations:

1. **Policy Integration:** National disaster frameworks must formally recognize and fund local "Resilience Committees."
2. **Social Infrastructure:** Investing in community centers and local NGOs should be viewed as a technical disaster-preparedness requirement.
3. **Digital Solidarity:** Developing localized apps to coordinate informal volunteering during crises.

References

- [1] Aldrich, D. P. (2012). *Building Resilience: Social Capital in Post-Disaster Recovery*. University of Chicago Press.
- [2] Bolin, R., & Kurtz, L. C. (2018). Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Disaster Vulnerability. In *Handbook of Disaster Research*. Springer.
- [3] Drabek, T. E. (2019). *The Sociology of Disaster: Individual and Group Responses to Misfortune*. Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- [4] Erikson, K. (1976). *Everything in Its Path: Destruction of Community in the Buffalo Creek Flood*. Simon and Schuster.
- [5] Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Free Press.
- [6] Giddens, A. (2009). *The Politics of Climate Change*. Polity.
- [7] Kaniasty, K., & Norris, F. H. (1993). Social support in the aftermath of disaster. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*.
- [8] Klinenberg, E. (2018). *Palaces for the People: How Social Infrastructure Can Help Fight Inequality, Polarization, and the Decline of Civic Life*. Crown.
- [9] Mileti, D. (1999). *Disasters by Design: A Reassessment of Natural Hazards in the United States*. Joseph Henry Press.
- [10] Oliver-Smith, A. (1996). Anthropological Research on Hazards and Disasters. *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

- [11] Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.
- [12] Quarantelli, E. L. (2018). *What is a Disaster? Perspectives on the Question*. Routledge.
- [13] Tierney, K. (2014). *The Social Roots of Risk: Producing Disasters, Promoting Resilience*. Stanford University Press.
- [14] Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., & Davis, I. (2004). *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*. Routledge.
- [15] Yoon, D. K., Kang, J. E., & Samuel, S. D. (2016). A measurement of community disaster resilience in Korea. *Sustainability*.
- [16] Zakour, M. J., & Gillespie, D. F. (2013). *Community Disaster Resilience: A Social Network Approach*. Springer.
- [17] Nakagawa, Y., & Shaw, R. (2004). Social Capital: A Missing Link to Disaster Recovery. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*.
- [18] Dynes, R. R. (2006). Social Capital: The Engine of Recovery. *The Dialogue*.
- [19] IPCC. (2023). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*.
- [20] Norris, F. H., et al. (2008). Community Resilience as a Metaphor, Theory, Set of Capacities, and Strategy for Disaster Readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*.
- [21] Pelling, M. (2003). *The Vulnerability of Cities: Natural Disasters and Social Resilience*. Earthscan.
- [22] Stallings, R. A. (2002). *Methods of Disaster Research*. International Research Committee on Disasters.
- [23] Solnit, R. (2009). *A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities That Arise in Disaster*. Viking.
- [24] UNISDR. (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*.
- [25] World Bank. (2021). *Social Dimensions of Climate Change*.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of **AJHAS** and/or the editor(s). **AJHAS** and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.