



Low vs high levels of social cohesion as weaknesses or strengths in disaster situations

Attitudes oscillated between a perceived weakness due to low social cohesion in areas with a high fluctuation of people, including but not limited to a high flow of tourists and expatriates, and a perceived strength of tightly knit neighbourhoods with strong social cohesion. Whereas, initially, many participants argued with general stereotypes, i.e. urban anonymity in multi-storey apartment blocks vs strong community sense in rural villages, the discussions also revealed more pointed aspects, in particular related to the strengths and weaknesses of multicultural neighbourhoods.

Applicable to:

Stakeholders: [Social networks](#), [Ethnicity](#), [Open-mindedness](#)

Disaster Phases: [Preparedness](#), [Response](#), [Recovery](#)

Hazards: [Natural hazards](#), [Man-made non-intentional hazards or emergency situations](#), [Man-made intentional hazards](#)

Recommendations:

- [Foster social connectedness and the development of a strong sense of community, as these encourage citizens to help each other in disaster situations](#)

Source

[Deliverable D5.4 "Report on citizens' reactions and opinions: Citizen Summit 2 \(Malta\)" \(page 20\)](#)

This file was generated automatically on: 12.02.2019.

Low vs high levels of social cohesion as weaknesses or strengths in disaster situations

<https://culturalmap.carismand.eu/a/5-4-25-low-vs-high-levels-of-social-cohesion-as-weaknesses-or-strengths-in-disaster-situations>