

1 Post-disaster recovery and sociocultural change: rethinking social capital development for the new
2 social fabric

3 **KW: Recovery, social capital, Montserrat, volcano, cohesion, disaster**

4

5 **Abstract**

6 The post-disaster period is critical for reducing vulnerability and building resilience. Social capital
7 plays an important role in generating and maintaining risk reducing behaviour and a rich evidence
8 base demonstrating its contribution to the recovery process exists. Yet, so far little distinction has
9 been made between the different types of social capital, despite important variations of outcomes.
10 To address this gap, this article examines the evolving roles of specific forms of social capital on the
11 long-term post-disaster recovery process. We explore the disaster recovery process on the active
12 volcanic island of Montserrat in the Caribbean, marked by rapid and intense post-disaster
13 demographic change following the beginning of the eruption in 1995. We explore the challenges of
14 the shift from a relatively homogenous to a relatively diverse population for building a resilient society.
15 Our investigation illustrates the complexity of the recovery process and the coexistence of conflicting
16 objectives which, if poorly managed, can create new forms of vulnerability and impede the
17 sustainability of the development process. We argue that not all forms of social capital development
18 are beneficial for the long-term recovery process. In a diversifying society, bonding social capital may
19 have perverse effect while bridging and linking social capital may be key for building social cohesion,
20 a key contributor to sustainable development. We argue that measures for re-development should be
21 sensitive to the long-term effects of different forms of social capital, in particular their consequences
22 for building social cohesion, a key contributor to sustainable recovery in a dynamically changing
23 society.

24

25 **1. Introduction**

26 Post-disaster periods give rise to major short-term and long-term challenges for affected
27 communities. In addition to facing emergency response' needs, recovery measures have direct and
28 indirect impacts on the long-term development trajectory of an affected society. Yet, the complexity
29 of the long-term recovery processes and the multiplicity of its dimensions remains relatively
30 underexplored.

31 A growing number of studies have shown that social capital is a key driver of sustainable recovery
32 [1], [2]. It can prevent marginalisation of some social groups [2]–[4], support preparedness to disaster
33 and risk awareness [1], [5]–[7], or even support trust between social groups and decision-makers [8]–
34 [10]. Yet, social capital can also have a perverse effect on long-term recovery by reinforcing
35 inequalities [11]–[14] or by encouraging harmful behaviours [12], [13], [15], [16]. There is therefore a
36 need for a more careful attention on the paradoxical effects of social capital for long-term recovery.
37 A distinction between different forms of social capital, namely bonding, bridging and linking, enables
38 a better understanding of their evolving roles and influences through different stages of the post-
39 disaster recovery process. This study is one of relatively few to explore the role of specific forms of
40 social capital for supporting sustainable post-disaster recovery. Here we aim to provide more

41 understanding of the obstacles to reducing vulnerability, building resilience and lessening the risk of
42 recurrence in future.

43 Using an ethnographic approach, we analyse the case of Montserrat, a Caribbean British Overseas
44 Territory, severely affected by volcanic eruptions from 1995 to 2010¹. One of the main long term
45 impacts of the disaster is the rapid demographic change due to high levels of both emigration, with
46 the departure of affected people, and the immigration of workers from neighbour countries. Here, we
47 explore the challenges of the shift from a relatively homogenous to a relatively diverse population for
48 building a resilient and sustainable society. The paper illustrates the complexity of the post-disaster
49 recovery process and the coexistence of conflicting objectives which, if not well managed, can create
50 new forms of vulnerability and hence impede the sustainability of the development process. We argue
51 that measures for re-development should be sensitive to the effects of different forms of social capital,
52 in particular their consequences for building social cohesion, a key contributor to sustainable
53 development, in a dynamically changing society.

54 After briefly reviewing relevant research literature on disaster, recovery processes and social
55 capital to establish the basis for our analysis, we describe the empirical case study focus for the paper,
56 and outline the methodology employed in the research. We then explore the role of different forms
57 of social capital through the post-disaster period and their implications for the long-term recovery
58 process and resilience building. We conclude by highlighting the importance of promoting a shift from
59 bonding to bridging social capital in a diversifying society in order to build resilience.

60

61 **2. Disaster, post-disaster recovery and social capital**

62 **2.1. Recovery**

63 Post-disaster recovery is discussed mainly in terms of response, rehabilitation, restoration and
64 reconstruction but rarely are the long-term dynamics considered. Recently, the focus of disasters
65 research has been at decadal-scale post-disaster recovery and directed towards vulnerability
66 reduction [17]. The post-disaster decision-making process is challenged by the consequences of the
67 disaster and the loss of resources. Yet, it plays a crucial role in determining the long-term recovery
68 trajectory of affected communities. It is an opportune time for learning from past events in order to
69 create a more resilient society [18]–[20]. The Hyogo Framework for Action for 2005-2015 and the
70 Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction for 2015-2030 have institutionalized this in the principle
71 of “Build-Back-Better” [19]. It distinguishes the recovery process from the idea of a “return to normal”,
72 i.e. to the conditions existing before the disaster, to a need for change and improvement in order to
73 reduce the impact of drivers of vulnerability to natural hazards. Hence, it recognizes the need to
74 include preparedness measures within the recovery period, instead of considering them as separate
75 stages of the disaster cycle.

76 While building-back-better and learning from experience is ideal, it remains challenging to
77 understand the post-disaster recovery process and the recipe for its sustainability. Indeed, the
78 recovery process encompasses multiple dimensions, e.g. physical, environmental, social,
79 psychological or demographic, each proceeding at a different pace and interacting with the others, in
80 ways that might facilitate or impede them [21]–[23]. It is critical to understand these interactions in

¹ As of May 2019, the eruption is still officially ongoing although activity at the volcano remains low.

81 order to implement sustainable practices, reduce vulnerability and build resilience. The sustainability
82 of the process is strongly linked with the concept of resilience [24]–[27], which is seen as “the intrinsic
83 capacity of a system, community or society predisposed to a shock or stress to adapt and survive by
84 changing its non-essential attributes and rebuilding itself” [25]. It presupposes a learning process that
85 prevents reproducing pre-disaster status-quo [28] [29], although policy-makers and affected people
86 commonly attempt to recreate the resources lost during the disaster and the environment with which
87 they were familiar. Recovery processes build on pre-existing social structures, culture and values, in
88 order to create a more resilient and sustainable future. They can, in turn, reproduce existing social
89 inequalities or, inadvertently, create new sources of vulnerability to disaster [30].

90 We argue that there are learning processes taking place at different levels in the recovery
91 process, implemented through policy and practices, that contribute to determine how adaptive or
92 maladaptive is society’s transformation, and hence the sustainability of the implemented change [26],
93 [31], [32]. Although there has been much research on the best approaches to reduce the risk of
94 disaster and address vulnerabilities, there are relatively few studies of the challenges of implementing
95 measures for DRR in a post-disaster period, a period of transition marked by multiple disruptions to
96 society.

97 **2.2. Social capital, disaster and recovery**

98 **2.2.1. What is social capital?**

99 The concept of social capital has been used increasingly in recent years to explain differences in
100 economic, social and political development [8], [33]. While this concept has initially been developed
101 and understood by the sociologists Bourdieu and Coleman as a private good, beneficial at the
102 individual or small group level [34], disasters and post-disaster development research tends to be
103 informed by the collective perspective of Robert Putnam. His concept focuses on the *collective*
104 outcomes of connectedness between people and the structural effects of social capital on community
105 or national development. He describes social capital as, “the features of social organizations, such as
106 networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit” [35]. He
107 elaborates on this, noting how these, “intangible resources of community, shared values and trust
108 upon which we draw in daily life [...] can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated
109 actions” [35].

110 The understanding and measurement of social capital are made difficult by the different contexts
111 to which the concept is applied and the purposes to which it is put [15]. However, a distinction can be
112 drawn between bridging, bonding and linking social capital [8], which in turn is related to the
113 heterogeneity or homogeneity of groups [3], [15]. Bonding social capital refers to social ties that link
114 people together with others who are primarily like them in some key respect (e.g. community, race,
115 religion). It often characterizes homogenous groups [2]. Bridging social capital refers to social ties that
116 link people across social differences and divides [36]. Linking social capital refers to ties with people
117 with access to power [37]. This third type introduces a more hierarchical dimension, although in many
118 cases it can overlap significantly with bridging networks.

119 Despite its analytical limits [38], [39], such a distinction is critical since the different forms of social
120 capital contribute differently to adaptation [40], development and social cohesion [39], [41]. Putnam
121 argues that bonding social capital, “is good for undergirding specific reciprocity and mobilizing
122 solidarity” [8]. It reinforces conformity and solidarity but can be, as a consequence, exclusive to the

123 others, those who do not share this conformity [39]. Importantly, research demonstrates that
124 homogenous communities often display stronger bonding social capital than heterogeneous ones, but
125 less bridging and linking social capital [3], [42]. Putnam also maintains that bridging social capital is
126 inclusive and enables, “linkage to external assets [and] information diffusion” [8]. Correspondingly,
127 research has demonstrated that in heterogeneous populations bridging social capital has greater
128 value, because it enables exposure to, exchanges and development of ideas and values, and hence
129 enhances social cohesion [3], [15], [43].

130

131 **2.2.2. Social capital, disasters, and recovery**

132 The importance of social capital and social cohesion for development and resilience is now widely
133 acknowledged [1], [2], [6]. As disasters are intimately linked to daily life and development processes
134 [24], social capital plays a critical role in reducing the risk of disaster [2], [5], [6], [44], [45] and for post-
135 disaster recovery [46], [47]. Murphy [6] also claims that the value of social capital as a lens through
136 which disasters can be analysed is in, “its emphasis on the role of community members as active
137 agents rather than passive victims”. In a review of the literature, Meyer [1] shows that social capital
138 has a positive impact on mitigation and adaptation strategies. Reflecting on post-disaster context,
139 Aldrich [44] argues that social capital is, “the strongest and most robust predictor of population
140 recovery after catastrophe”. Pelling and High [40] suggest that the growing interest in social capital
141 enables us to better understand the role played by social attributes, in particular social networks and
142 norms, in the production of adaptive capacity and adaptive actions to environmental change, a view
143 echoed in other studies [48]. Because of the importance of social change [2], [49], [50] and social
144 capital in the recovery process, several authors have called for a re-orientation of recovery
145 programmes, from the established approach focused mainly on physical infrastructure to programmes
146 that target forms of social infrastructure, like social capital [2], [17], [41], [51].

147 Social capital can facilitate access to a variety of resources, including information, social support,
148 and financial aid [2]–[4], that can prevent the marginalization of individuals or communities, support
149 their awareness of risks and level of preparedness, and hence reduce their level of vulnerability to
150 disaster. Trust, a critical element of social capital, is particularly critical for facilitation, coordination,
151 cooperation and communication [8]–[10], [14] before, during and after a disaster. It also contributes
152 to shaping collective and individual actions [40], [44], [52], and to encouraging the participation of the
153 different stakeholders in decision-making [8]. Research shows that trust, inclusion and participation
154 in decision-making have been major factors in successful community-level preparedness, mitigation
155 and adaptation [1], [40]. Moreover, numerous studies have shown that bonding, bridging and linking
156 social capital are complementary during and after crises, playing different roles [2]. For example,
157 research has found that a high level of bridging social capital is generally associated with a higher level
158 of preparedness [1], [5]–[7] and better access to information and supplies during the recovery process
159 [3]. Linking social capital is particularly valuable as it provides access to power structures and
160 institutions [3], [43]. During the post-disaster period, affected individuals and communities tend to
161 rely primarily in their bonding social capital, in particular their family members, for immediate support,
162 mainly through the supply of provisions [2], [49]. Studies have demonstrated that strong bonding
163 social capital increases the likelihood of collective action for recovery [2], [14], [46], [53], [54] and can
164 reduce the reliance on external support and aid. Hsueh [47] also emphasized the complementary role
165 of the three forms of capital after a typhoon, and the higher support rates and recovery satisfaction
166 among the people who had higher bridging and linking network, compared to those relying exclusively

167 on their bonding network. Yet, the nature of the social fabric is not specified, hence it makes the
168 generalisation of those results to another case study difficult.

169
170 The availability of these different forms of social capital also evolves over time, and is context
171 dependent. Islam & Walkerden [55] found that immediately after extreme weather events,
172 communities in Bangladesh relied heavily on both their bonding and bridging social capital. As time
173 elapsed, however, they found that only bonding networks continued to be active, while bridging
174 relationships tended to weaken because of poverty, conflict or competition over access to resources
175 or external support. The same analysis was made by Masud-All-Kamal & Monirul Assan [56] a few
176 years later, still in Bangladesh, as they highlighted that linking social capital eventually was used for
177 the benefit of a few only. Although other research has found that the role of bridging social capital
178 grows over time after disaster [1], [3], [4], there is evidence that bonding networks, because of their
179 exclusivity, can tend to prevent the development of bridging social networks [11]–[13].

180
181 The existing studies focus on the use of social capital. There is a need to analyse how the later can
182 be adjusted and transform to promote sustainable recovery. The negative externalities of social capital
183 must be considered as they can alter the recovery process and resilience building [12]–[14].
184 Recognizing the perverse effects of social capital is essential in order to adapt policies and
185 development projects during the post-disaster period [12], [13]. Research has highlighted two major
186 downsides of bonding social capital in particular. First, when a group is linked by strong ties that lead
187 to the exclusion of outsiders, it can reinforce social and economic inequalities [11]–[14]. In their study
188 of the recovery process following Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, Aldrich and Crook [57] show that
189 strong local networks benefited only some sections of society. While they provided resources for a
190 fast and efficient recovery for a large part of the society, they also tended to exclude those who were
191 ‘outsiders’ to those social networks, and hence it encouraged resistance against certain recovery
192 needs. A high level of bonding social capital can also increase the incidence of risky behaviours due to
193 individuals following or helping other members of the community [1], [58]. These studies emphasize
194 the paradoxical roles of social capital within the recovery processes, and hence the need to better
195 contextualise the process, both in terms of social fabric and recovery needs and objectives for short
196 and long-term. Here, we argue that different forms of social capital should be strategically thought
197 and developed, informed by these studies, in order to promote sustainable capital.

198

199 **3. Study area**

200 This research was conducted on the island of Montserrat, a small British Overseas Territory
201 located in the Caribbean that was severely affected by volcanic eruptions from 1995 to 2010. The first
202 eruption occurred only six years after Hurricane Hugo had devastated about 90% of the country’s
203 infrastructure. The Soufrière Hills Volcano, located in the South of the island, became active after more
204 than 300 years of dormancy. In 1997, the southern two-thirds of the island was evacuated and remains
205 an uninhabited exclusion zone (Figure 1). Pyroclastic flows and lahars destroyed the capital city,
206 Plymouth, and most of the major infrastructure. Although the last significant activity occurred in 2010,
207 the volcano is still active, with continued uncertainty regarding the level of risk [59].



208

209 *Figure 1: Position of Montserrat in the Lesser Antilles island arc [60]*

210 The disaster gave rise to transformative social changes. In 1998, three years after the
 211 beginning of the crisis, three-quarters of the population of about 10,300 emigrated to the UK or to
 212 neighbouring Caribbean countries. This was largely in response to relocation schemes set up by the
 213 British government. The rest of the population, reduced at its lowest point to only 2,400 inhabitants,
 214 and including dislocated families, had to relocate to the underdeveloped North of the country. The
 215 Montserratian government decided, in 1998, to attract immigrants from other Caribbean countries to
 216 encourage demographic growth, support rebuilding and compensate for the loss of skilled workers.
 217 From 2002, the population started to increase again thanks to immigration, stabilizing between 4,000
 218 and 5,000. Reliable data are not available but it is estimated by Montserratian officials that as much
 219 as half of the current population is composed of immigrants, mainly from Guyana, Jamaica and the
 220 Dominican Republic. As a result, the population profile is considerably changed, from the relatively
 221 homogenous society that existed before the disaster, composed of only 19% non-Montserratians², to
 222 the very diverse society of today. It is because of this process of rapid, disaster-induced social change
 223 and its consequences for post-disaster recovery that Montserrat was chosen as the empirical focus
 224 for this study. The aim of the research was to examine how the different forms of social capital
 225 contributes to the sustainability of post-disaster recovery.

226 It may be objected that Montserrat, given the prolonged nature of the volcanic eruption and
 227 the relative scale of displacement and subsequent depopulation, represents an extreme case. The
 228 rationale for choosing it is as a focus for this study is that it more starkly highlights processes that need
 229 to be understood and enable lessons to be learned that may be relevant to more typical situations

² Data provided by the Department of Statistics of the Government of Montserrat in 2016

230 [61]. Montserrat shares common characteristics with small island developing states that are
 231 vulnerable to volcanic or other natural hazards. Without claiming that the specificities of the situation
 232 in Montserrat can be generalised, we can, nonetheless, learn from its experience and glean insights
 233 about the role of social capital in processes of post-disaster recovery that may be transferred to other
 234 settings. They will have particular relevance for other places with a relatively homogenous population
 235 that face rapid demographic change after a disaster.

236

237 4. Methods

238 The researcher (Monteil) spent a total of nine months on Montserrat, in April 2015, January-
 239 May 2016 and January-March 2017, and used a variety of qualitative data collection methods to study
 240 post-disaster recovery processes, including ethnographic observation with detailed field notes; both
 241 semi-structured and informal interviews; and focus group discussions. Multiple methods were used
 242 to triangulate the data, adjust to the sensitivity of the subject, and to capture both the said and non-
 243 said within society. In total 130 interviews as indicated in Table 1.

	<i>Institutions/groups</i>	<i>Total number of interviews</i>	<i>Formal interviews (number)</i>	<i>Informal interviews (number)</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Age range (estimation)</i>
1	Government officers (British and Montserratian government) from different departments	21	21		9	12	30-60
2	Risk management/ monitoring institutions (Disaster Management Coordination Agency, Montserrat Volcano Observatory, Red Cross)	10	10		5	5	30-60
3	Social/Health/Educational institutions (like social services, schools, churches)	16	16		12	4	30-65
4	Business people	5	5		2	3	25-55
5	Montserratians	20	8	12	7	13	20-75
6	Guyanese	14	8	6	8	6	15-65
7	Jamaicans	14	6	8	6	8	20-65
8	Dominicans from Dominican Republic ³	12	7	5	5	7	45-70
9	Other nationalities	18	3	15	4	14	30-60
	Total	130	84	46	58	72	

244 *Table 1: Interviews conducted between 2014 and 2018 in Montserrat - (The members of risk management, social/health*
 245 *institutions and business people (categories 2, 3, 4) were both Montserratians and non-Montserratians).*

246 Despite repeated efforts, it was not possible to convene a focus group of immigrants from the
 247 Dominican Republic. Observation was mainly focusing on the type and level of interactions between
 248 social groups, of participation to various sorts of activities organised by NGOs, government, schools
 249 or communities themselves. It was also focusing on people’s reactions to development programs and
 250 policy changes. All data, including notes and audio records, were transcribed, and then coded in NVivo
 251 for triangulation and analysis. The process of coding evolved throughout the analysis, corresponding
 252 overall to the three stages defined by Charmaz [62] as the initial coding, the focused coding and the

³ The latter are referred to in this article as Dominicans but should not be confused with people originating on the Caribbean island of Dominica, of whom there are also a number living on Montserrat.

253 theoretical coding. Data were analysed with guidance and constant comparison with the conceptual
254 framework developed earlier. It is important to acknowledge the practical difficulties encountered
255 during the data collection process and how they may have influenced the results. Data collection
256 methods had to be adapted after entering the field because of the sensitivity of the topics tackled in
257 this study, which often made it impossible to make audio-recordings or even taking notes during most
258 interviews. The consequent reliance on the researcher’s memory when making notes after the event
259 may have led to some inaccuracies or inadvertent omissions. Moreover, it was challenging for the
260 researcher as a young white woman to gain access to some individuals or groups within the different
261 communities in order to conduct interviews or group discussions. The researcher made efforts to
262 minimise any impact that these practical challenges might have on the dependability of the study by
263 triangulating data from each interview with those collected from other data sources.

264

265 **5. Results and discussion**

266 Analysis of the post-disaster recovery processes in Montserrat highlights the complex role of social
267 capital. In this section, we first review briefly the adverse effects of the disaster on social links and
268 social cohesion on the island. We then examine how efforts to re-establish a sense of cultural
269 normality and economic stability for the remaining Montserratian population, which have perverse
270 implications for both social cohesion and disaster risk reduction, come into conflict with long-term
271 sustainability goals. Finally, we examine efforts to create and reinforce forms of social capital that
272 contribute to social cohesion.

273 **5.1. Disruption of social links during the volcanic crisis**

274 The eruption of the Soufriere Hills Volcano in 1995 was followed by several episodes of intense
275 activity, the most recent in 2010. It prompted the evacuation of the capital city, Plymouth, and
276 surrounding villages, that were partly destroyed in 1997 by pyroclastic flows [63]. The evacuations of
277 the Southern and Eastern parts of the Island led to significant disturbance of Montserrat’s physical
278 and social environment [64]–[66]. The displacement of most of the population, first within the country
279 and then, for 75% of Montserratians, off the island, led to a breakdown of the social fabric, both at
280 household level and at community level [67]. New interviews revealed that some families remain
281 separated twenty years after the beginning of the crisis. The break-up of communities also led to a
282 transformation of social practices, in particular relating to social care for children and the elderly, and
283 to a persistent sense of loss and of nostalgia for the old neighborhoods and communities. About this
284 rapid transformation, a policy-maker said during an interview in May 2016:

285

286 *“Our sense of what is being a Montserratian is lost, [...] all those kinds of things that are deeply*
287 *embedded in the culture. People [...] have anxiety because those things are being lost and also*
288 *they have anxiety because young people are leaving [...] so there is this feeling that for some*
289 *people they really don't want to come to turn to the fact that it's a completely new Montserrat.”*

290

291 The rapid immigration of other nationalities and ethnicities since the beginning of the crisis has for
292 many Montserratians compounded this acute sense of disruption and loss. That immigrant groups
293 have come to constitute, in just two decades, about half of the total population has ramifications for
294 the development trajectory of the country, for power relations between social groups, and for cultural

295 practices. This dramatic influx of ‘foreigners’, economically and politically necessary in the absence of
296 a return by large numbers of the Montserratians who left the country during the volcanic crisis, is
297 experienced by many who remained as bringing an additional unwanted transformation to their
298 society. The presence of these new immigrants consequently has become the focus of critical public
299 comment, which often reveals the fears of ordinary Montserratians and their rejection of these
300 groups. During interviews and informal conversations, Montserratians frequently emphasized the
301 differences between native Montserratians and the three main immigrant groups and expressed
302 disquiet or anger at the changes that have accompanied the arrival of these new residents.
303 Immigration was encouraged to address the shortage of workers that resulted from the mass exodus
304 from the island during the volcanic crisis. Inevitably this has led to increased competition in some
305 sectors of the labor market, as the incomers, in the way of economic migrants worldwide, are often
306 more ready to accept working conditions and levels of pay that are not attractive to Montserratians.
307 Immigration is also blamed by some for a perceived increase in crime and for a loss of traditional
308 values. This is fervently expressed in a contribution by a Montserratian, in February 2016, to a public
309 discussion on Facebook:

310 *“After [immigrants] finish doing what they came to Montserrat to do, I say send them*
311 *back home to Jamaica or wherever they came from. Soon they will start making*
312 *children and start telling us, THE NATIVES, how to live in our own island. We don’t need*
313 *other people from other countries coming here and dictate to us. Soon they will [bring]*
314 *their criminals elements with them.”*

315 The post-disaster period hence began with an important disruption of the pre-existing social capital.
316 Bonding social networks have been broken down first by the quick and large emigration of the
317 previously homogenous social group. This has been rapidly intensified by the immigration of foreign
318 labour, strategically attracted as a recovery strategy, and thus with the transformation of the society
319 as a heterogeneous group.

320 **5.2. Recovery process challenged by contradictory priorities**

321 The multitude of needs and objectives during the post-disaster period make conflicts,
322 compromise and trade-offs inevitable. The psychological dimension of recovery plays an important
323 role, especially in a small society like Montserrat, where decision-makers and citizens are closely
324 connected. A large part of the decision-making therefore aims to reinforce the sense of stability and
325 safety of the Montserratian social group, despite the long-term implications it may have. That
326 proceeds mainly by multiple efforts to restore – or recreate - the society as it used to be; that is
327 homogenous and centred around the Montserratian social group, which has the largely unintended
328 consequence of preventing the integration of non-Montserratians groups. It emphasizes in particular
329 the objective of restoring a strong bonding social capital.

330 Hence, although there is a persisting need for demographic and economic growth, decision-
331 makers have made it explicit that it should be addressed by encouraging the return of the
332 Montserratian diaspora. Yet, return of diaspora has been proved relatively difficult, mainly because of
333 lack of jobs and housing, and remains slow according to Montserratian officials. Institutional
334 measures, such as immigration control through enforcement of work permit regulations, the
335 tightening of visa renewal procedures and naturalisation process to achieve British citizenship, aim to
336 coax potential returnees back by making it challenging for immigrants to work and stay in Montserrat.
337 Moreover, despite the demand for highly qualified and skilled workers, amplified by the emigration of

338 Montserratians during the volcanic crisis (Halcrow Group Limited, 2012; Sword-Daniels et al., 2014),
339 informal measures attempt to restrict access to certain jobs, in particular governmental jobs, to
340 Montserratians. The national newspaper states on its page for job advert:

341 *“All employers are reminded of Section 4.8 of the Work Permit Policy which requires*
342 *that ‘Every job being offered to a non-belonger must have first been advertised*
343 *extensively in the media in order to give local persons a fair opportunity to apply’. Proof*
344 *of such advertisement must be submitted to the Labour Department when making*
345 *application for Work Permits” [68].*

346 Interviews with both Montserratians and non-Montserratians have shown that the term ‘local
347 persons’ is often understood as a person of Montserratian origin. It leads to a widely spread and
348 unquestioned belief that priority for employment must be given to Montserratians, while the article
349 79 of the Labour Code [69] states that no discrimination should occur. In practice, this divides the job
350 market by nationality of origin and effectively restricts access to employment in the public sector to
351 the Montserratian community. The post-disaster recovery process is fraught with conflicting
352 objectives in a context of social fabric transformation. On the one hand, the need to restore stability
353 and sense of ‘normality’ is demonstrated by efforts at national scales to reinforce bonding social
354 capital among the remaining Montserratian social group. On the other hand, the objectives of
355 economic, physical and demographic recovery require a better consideration of the diversification of
356 the society through the development of bringing and linking social networks.

357 **5.3. Shaping cultural identity as strengthening Montserratian bonding capital**

358 During the volcanic crisis, in the face of catastrophic disruption, a strong sense of collective
359 identity and shared adversity helped those Montserratians who remained on the island to endure,
360 adapt and begin the process of recovery. The post-disaster period, however, has been marked by the
361 question of what it means to be Montserratian, a question regularly discussed publicly in media and
362 often a subject of great interest both for those who remained and those who left the country. Shaping
363 cultural identity with the aim of restoring a sense of Montserratian society “as it used to be”, a notion
364 often asserted by native residents, has been an important response to the rapid post-disaster socio-
365 cultural changes.

366 Montserratian identity is expressed publicly in specific practices, which are celebrated and asserted
367 during national cultural events, such as the Christmas or St Patrick’s Day festivals. These practices
368 contribute to the symbolic construction of a Montserratian sense of community, citing cultural
369 references that bring the included group together and distinguish it from others [70]. They also
370 emphasize values that are seen as distinctly Montserratian, such as the sense of hospitality and the
371 quietness, but are felt to be endangered by immigration. A Montserratian academic explains:

372 *“The essence of Montserratness is captured in maroons, [...] calypsos, steelbands,*
373 *masquerades and string bands. It is also manifested in dressing in one’s ‘Saturday and*
374 *Sunday best’, the ‘strangers’ paradise’ hospitality, ‘the-morning-neighbour-morning’*
375 *greeting, the communal joys and sorrows and an exciting ‘Montserrat English’ (dialect).*
376 *There is no Montserratness without these Irish legacy: the Shamrock, the Lady and the*
377 *Harp, St Patrick’s Day, goat water, surnames such as Allen, Bramble, Dyer, O’Brien,*
378 *O’Garro, Riley and Tuitt.” [71].*

379 This construction of Montserratian culture emphasizes elements drawn from a specific representation
380 of the pre-disaster society. Although this can be seen as the expression of a desire to emphasize
381 cultural continuity after the collective trauma of the disaster and the subsequent social changes, it
382 also arises from a conscious questioning of what constitutes the Montserratian identity, something
383 that was not such a focus of concern during the pre-disaster period when this identity was not felt to
384 be threatened and hence was not questioned. One consequence of this has been a greater emphasis
385 on Montserratian cultural practices and a stronger assertion of a specific identity than was the case
386 prior to 1995. This is not, however, viewed as an unmitigated good by all of the island's residents.
387 Three community workers, Montserratian and non-Montserratian, from different organizations who
388 were interviewed expressed regret that cultural events emphasize very little of the post-disaster
389 characteristics. For instance, while several events celebrate the villages that were abandoned during
390 the volcanic eruptions as part of the national heritage, some of the interviewed community workers,
391 of different origins (including a Montserratian) regret that there is no equivalent for the new villages.
392 One community worker explained that the exclusive focus on abandoned villages prevents the
393 development of social cohesion and of pride in the newly built neighbourhoods. This was echoed
394 during a focus group with a group of Guyanese women, who explained that they do not like the period
395 of the St Patrick's festival because its cultural exclusivity reminds them that they do not belong in this
396 culture.

397 Hence, while the reinforcement of Montserratian cultural identity strengthens the bonding capital of
398 the Montserratian community, weakened by two decades of rapid demographic transformation, it
399 simultaneously obstructs the creation of closer connections between different social groups and the
400 cultivation of bridging social capital. It therefore excludes non-native Montserratians, who represent
401 about half of the population and who play a critical role in the economic and physical development of
402 the island, from the process of collective identity construction that is so important to social cohesion.

403 **5.4. Promoting social cohesion to promote sustainable recovery**

404 The post-disaster recovery period is critical for sustainable development in the sense that it aims
405 to promote changes that support a fully functioning society that is less vulnerable to natural hazards.
406 Learning from disaster involves, among other things, paying greater attention to factors of
407 vulnerability. Strong bridging and linking social capital are critical for social cohesion [3], [15], [43],
408 and hence to resilience and vulnerability reduction, two major aspects of the recovery process [1], [2],
409 [6]. In order to assess the sustainability of the recovery process among this heterogeneous and
410 changing society, we analysed the type and impact of initiatives that have gradually emerged during
411 the post-disaster process and that aim to promote social cohesion and hence encouraging sustainable
412 recovery. They are mainly grassroots initiatives that have been developed as a reaction to the
413 emerging challenges associated with the cultural diversification of the population. They are initiatives
414 conducted by government, disaster risk reduction organizations and those involved in welfare
415 (including churches and schools). Our analysis shows that they are mainly dedicated to the promotion
416 of some specific aspects of social capital, in particular the creation of shared representations and
417 meanings between social groups, and less focused on the creation of network of access between social
418 groups of different origins and trust building [72].

419 Because of the increasing diversity of both teachers and pupils, secondary school teachers who were
420 interviewed highlighted the need for events that foster cultural understanding. One teacher
421 explained:

422 *We had a cultural presentation [...]. We actually featured the culture of all other*
423 *territories, so they were able to share and everybody appreciate each other's culture.*
424 *And that was really essential for the unity of the school. [...] We have a number of*
425 *students from Santo Domingo, Spanish speaking [...]. And the students accepted what*
426 *they did, and actually surprisingly [...] they were very welcoming. (Interview in*
427 *January 2016)*

428 Such initiatives aim to promote some aspects of bridging social capital including sense of trust,
429 respect, and sense of identity that links social and cultural groups. However, this kind of initiative
430 remains relatively rare, and limited mainly to a few spaces where interactions between social groups
431 are critical, such as school and church.

432 Similarly, sporadic initiatives have aimed to address language barriers faced by two of the
433 immigrant communities. Teachers pointed to the importance of language classes. Spanish-speaking
434 students are offered English classes to support them in their academic studies, and hence in their
435 social integration. However, Spanish classes are also offered to all students. A teacher explained
436 during an interview that with the increase of the Dominican population, English-speakers also had to
437 make an effort to communicate with these newcomers. Similar initiatives have begun to address the
438 language needs of adult immigrants. Bi-lingual leaders in the Haitian and Dominican communities
439 explained that they translate official documents into, respectively, French Creole and Spanish, to
440 enable their community members to manage official administrative tasks. A member of the Dominican
441 community also voluntarily organises English classes on her free time, although this is insufficient to
442 address the needs of the whole Dominican community. A similar project has been established by a
443 pastor for the Haitian community. At the time of this study, however, there was no translated
444 information being offered by government for key services such as health and welfare.

445 All of the grassroots initiatives described above have emerged from the realisation that with the
446 increasing diversity of the population, there is a need for better integration. The same observation has
447 been made by members of the organisations in charge of disaster management and hazards
448 monitoring. During interviews, they emphasized that language and lack of cohesion were a major issue
449 for the efficiency of their work. A scientist working at the Montserrat Volcano Observatory (MVO) in
450 2016 pointed out that he had little knowledge of what constituted effectiveness of MVO's
451 communication activities, in particular because he was not sure that immigrant groups use the same
452 media information sources as Montserratians. The Montserrat Disaster Management Coordination
453 Agency (DMCA), facing the same issues, has taken the initiative to translate information pamphlets
454 into several languages. Nevertheless, members of the agency's staff also indicated their uncertainty
455 about the effectiveness of these measures because of the assumed inadequacy of pamphlets generally
456 as a communication tool. Despite these efforts, it therefore seems reasonable to infer that differential
457 access to information continues to be a barrier to communication and awareness raising for disaster
458 risk reduction that is effective across all social groups.

459 At the time of the study, measures for promoting social cohesion were mainly focused on
460 facilitating communication. Apart from the school initiative described above, we have not identified
461 major measures promoting trust between social groups, a critical element of bridging social capital
462 [8]–[10]. The Red Cross is the only organisation that explicitly aims to reinforce bridging and linking
463 social capital through its programs while playing a major role in poverty alleviation and disaster risk
464 reduction on the island. Several immigrants explained during interviews that volunteering with the

465 Red Cross was a way of becoming integrated into the life of the island and to connect to powerful
466 actors. This is reflected in the composition of the Red Cross's volunteer team, which includes many
467 newcomers. Yet, the small number of Montserratians actively involved in the organisation limits its
468 capacity to build strong links between migrants and non-migrant groups. The organisation also plays
469 a critical role in giving a legitimate and effective voice to facilitate exchanges with policy-makers, and
470 hence build linking social capital, crucial for effective recovery process [3], [43].

471 The development of both bridging and linking social capital require supporting measures to be
472 taken at a national level in order to make structural transformations. Although, as we saw earlier,
473 there are no major national initiatives as a consequence of the existing pressure to restore a form of
474 'normality' that reflects the pre-disaster society, there were indications of an increasing awareness of
475 the need to foster bridging social capital. Political campaigning during the 2017 by-elections saw calls
476 for the integration of immigrants. A party political speech broadcast by the opposition 'Movement for
477 Change and Prosperity' (MCAP) party during their campaign couched this in terms of social justice:

478 *"We need a new kind of politics, a politics of inclusion. Instead of creating divisions we*
479 *should be breaking down barriers. Everybody on this island deserves to be treated*
480 *equally. Do we really think Montserrat is going to progress if we disenfranchise half*
481 *the population? [...] We want a Government of the people, by the people, and for the*
482 *people."* (Radio broadcast by the opposition MCAP party, January 2017)

483 He argues here that the development of linking social capital could be used consecutively for
484 supporting the reinforcement of bridging social capital between the different social groups.

485 The sustainability of the recovery process is still endangered by the lack of major government
486 initiatives for promoting social cohesion. Yet, there is growing public acknowledgement among the
487 island's politicians, similar to what has driven the grassroots initiatives, that social segregation
488 adversely affects the functioning of society and may be harmful to the Montserrat's long-term
489 development.

490

491 **6. Conclusion: bonding social capital as an obstacle to sustainable recovery in a diverse society**

492 Among the effects of disaster, social disruption can have significant long-term impacts. In extreme
493 cases, such as that of Montserrat, this extends to the transformation of the socio-demographic
494 structure of the society, from a homogenous to a heterogeneous one. These changes in turn may
495 influence or even determine the trajectory of post-disaster recovery. During this critical period, re-
496 thinking the role of social capital is critical. It can either promote social cohesion, thereby contributing
497 to reducing vulnerability, or it can create the conditions for future disaster. However, this study
498 highlights that the conflicting goals of the post-disaster recovery period, in particular the need to
499 support the psychological and social recovery of affected social groups, as well as economic and other
500 constraints on policy intervention, can prevent the development of new or altered forms of social
501 capital in order to adapt to changed post-disaster conditions. The transformation of the social
502 structure requires adjustment of the type of social capital, in this case to develop bridging and linking
503 social capital, in order to promote social cohesion, a key factor of a sustainable recovery process.

504

505 Yet, in the case of Montserrat, the need for stability and a sense of normality encourages the
506 reinforcement, in both formal and informal ways, of the bonding social capital that helped the

507 population get through the crisis period. Although this supports the recovery process to some extent,
508 it also damages the social cohesion within the newly diverse society by obstructing the development
509 of bridging and linking social capital between the different social groups. There have been *ad hoc*
510 grassroots measures aiming to promote bridging and linking social capital, but there remains a major
511 need for more coordinated measures to support the transformation of social capital in a way that
512 promotes social cohesion. In the absence of that, in a context of significant demographic
513 transformation, the resulting recovery trajectory may contribute to maintaining immigrant groups in
514 a situation of relative marginalization, which in turn is a root driver of vulnerability to disaster [24], an
515 obstacle to sustainable recovery process.

516
517 More broadly, this study contributes to better understanding of the complexity and specificities of the
518 different forms of social capital in any affected community or society. While the importance of social
519 capital for post-disaster recovery is now widely acknowledged, studies often lack more detailed
520 characterisation and contextualisation, and hence may fail to adequately assess the sustainability of
521 the recovery process. This study highlights the need to distinguish the different forms of social capital
522 and their effects, both intended and unintended, in order to adapt them to the long-term needs of
523 post-disaster recovery, and to better evaluate and coordinate measures taken to promote social
524 cohesion. It emphasizes how different forms of social capital may be strategically thought and
525 developed as a tool for a sustainable recovery.

526
527
528 Acknowledgments:
529 We express our gratitude to NERC (NE/L002585/1) and the University of East Anglia for supporting
530 and funding this research.

531

532 References

- 533 [1] M. A. Meyer, "Social Capital in Disaster Research," in *Handbook of Disaster Research*, H.
534 Rodriguez, E. Quarantelli, and R. Dynes, Eds. New York: Springer, 2018, pp. 263–286.
- 535 [2] D. P. Aldrich and M. A. Meyer, "Social Capital and Community Resilience," *Am. Behav. Sci.*,
536 vol. 59, no. October, pp. 254–269, 2014.
- 537 [3] R. L. Hawkins and K. Maurer, "Bonding, Bridging and Linking: How Social Capital Operated in
538 New Orleans Following Hurricane Katrina," *Br. J. Soc. Work*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1777–1793,
539 2010.
- 540 [4] J. R. Elliott, T. J. Haney, and P. Sams-Abiodun, "Limits To Social Capital: Comparing Network
541 Assistance in Two New Orleans Neighborhoods Devastated by Hurricane Katrina," *Sociol. Q.*,
542 vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 624–648, 2010.
- 543 [5] E. Chamlee-Wright and V. H. Storr, "Social capital as collective narratives and post-disaster
544 community recovery," *Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 59, pp. 266–282, 2011.
- 545 [6] B. L. Murphy, "Locating social capital in resilient community-level emergency management,"
546 *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 297–315, 2007.
- 547 [7] E. L. Tompkins, "Planning for climate change in small islands: Insights from national hurricane
548 preparedness in the Cayman Islands," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 139–149,
549 2005.
- 550 [8] R. D. Putnam, *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. Simon &
551 Schuster, 2000.
- 552 [9] R. Forrest and A. Kearns, "Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood," *Urban*

- 553 *Stud.*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 2125–2143, 2001.
- 554 [10] S. Myeong and H. Seo, “Which type of social capital matters for building trust in government?
555 Looking for a new type of social capital in the governance era,” *Sustainability*, vol. 8, no. 322,
556 pp. 1–15, 2016.
- 557 [11] J. Field, *Social Capital*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- 558 [12] A. Portes and P. Landolt, “The downside of social capital,” *Am. Prospect*, no. 26, pp. 16–22,
559 1996.
- 560 [13] K. P. Adhikari and P. Goldey, “Social Capital and its ‘Downside’: The Impact on Sustainability
561 of Induced Community-Based Organizations in Nepal,” *World Dev.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 184–
562 194, 2010.
- 563 [14] D. P. Aldrich, “The externalities of strong social capital: Post-tsunami recovery in Southeast
564 India,” *J. Civ. Soc.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 81–99, 2011.
- 565 [15] D. Narayan and M. F. Cassidy, “A Dimensional Approach to Measuring Social Capital:
566 Development and Validation of a Social Capital Inventory,” *Curr. Sociol.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 59–
567 102, 2001.
- 568 [16] M. O. Caughy, P. J. O’Campo, and C. Muntaner, “When being alone might be better:
569 neighborhood poverty, social capital, and child mental health,” *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 57, no. 2,
570 pp. 227–237, Jul. 2003.
- 571 [17] O. Aijazi, “Social repair and structural inequity: implications for disaster recovery practice,”
572 *Int. J. Disaster Resil. Built Environ.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 454–467, 2015.
- 573 [18] A. Oliver-Smith, “Post-Disaster Housing Reconstruction and Social Inequality : A Challenge to
574 Policy and Practice,” *Disasters*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1990.
- 575 [19] S. L. Becker and D. E. Reusser, “Disasters as opportunities for social change: Using the multi-
576 level perspective to consider the barriers to disaster-related transitions,” *Int. J. Disaster Risk
577 Reduct.*, vol. 18, pp. 75–88, 2016.
- 578 [20] C. B. Rubin, “Long Term Recovery from Disasters – The Neglected Component of Emergency
579 Management,” *J. Homel. Secur. Emerg. Manag.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 19, 2009.
- 580 [21] W. Medd *et al.*, “The flood recovery gap: A real-time study of local recovery following the
581 floods of June 2007 in Hull, North East England,” *J. Flood Risk Manag.*, vol. 8, pp. 315–328,
582 2015.
- 583 [22] D. J. Alesch, L. A. Arendt, and J. N. Holly, *Managing for long-term community recovery in the
584 aftermath of disaster*. Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute, 2009.
- 585 [23] R. B. Olshansky, L. D. Hopkins, and L. A. Johnson, “Disaster and Recovery: Processes
586 Compressed in Time,” *Nat. Hazards Rev.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 173–178, 2012.
- 587 [24] B. Wisner, P. Blaikie, T. Cannon, and I. Davis, *At Risk - Second Edition Natural hazards,
588 people’s vulnerability and disasters*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- 589 [25] S. B. Manyena, “The concept of resilience revisited,” *Disasters*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 433–451,
590 2006.
- 591 [26] R. Djalante, C. Holley, F. Thomalla, and M. Carnegie, “Pathways for adaptive and integrated
592 disaster resilience,” *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 2105–2135, Jul. 2013.
- 593 [27] A. Klinke and O. Renn, “Adaptive and integrative governance on risk and uncertainty,” *J. Risk
594 Res.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 273–292, Mar. 2012.
- 595 [28] R. J. T. Klein, R. J. Nicholls, and F. Thomalla, “Resilience to natural hazards: How useful is this
596 concept?,” *Environ. Hazards*, vol. 5, no. 2003, pp. 35–45, 2003.
- 597 [29] J. Birkmann *et al.*, “Extreme events and disasters: A window of opportunity for change?
598 Analysis of organizational, institutional and political changes, formal and informal responses
599 after mega-disasters,” *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 55, pp. 637–655, 2010.
- 600 [30] D. J. Alesch, “Complex urban systems and extreme events: toward a theory of disaster
601 recovery,” in *Paper presented at 1st International Conference on Urban Disaster Reduction*,
602 2005.
- 603 [31] L. Lebel, T. Grothmann, and B. Siebenhüner, “The role of social learning in adaptiveness:

- 604 insights from water management," *Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law Econ.*, vol. 10, no. 4,
605 pp. 333–353, Oct. 2010.
- 606 [32] M. Pelling, *Adaptation to Climate Change. From Resilience to Transformation*. London:
607 Routledge, 2011.
- 608 [33] J. S. Coleman, *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard
609 University Press, 1990.
- 610 [34] P. Bourdieu, "The forms of capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of*
611 *Education*, Greenwood., Westport, 1986, pp. 241–258.
- 612 [35] R. D. Putnam, "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life," *Am. Prospect*, vol.
613 13, pp. 35–42, 1993.
- 614 [36] J. Scott and P. J. Carrington, *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*. London: SAGE
615 Publications Ltd, 2011.
- 616 [37] E. L. Tompkins, L.-A. Hurlston, and W. Poortinga, "Disaster Resilience: Fear, Friends and
617 Foreignness as Determinants of Risk Mitigating Behaviour in Small Islands," Leeds, UK, 18,
618 2009.
- 619 [38] M. Leonard, "Bonding and bridging social capital: Reflections from Belfast," *Sociology*, vol. 38,
620 no. 5, pp. 927–944, 2004.
- 621 [39] N. Macnab, G. Thomas, and I. Grosvenor, "Connected Communities. The changing nature of
622 'connectivity' within and between communities," Birmingham.
- 623 [40] M. Pelling and C. High, "Understanding adaptation: What can social capital offer assessments
624 of adaptive capacity?," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 308–319, 2005.
- 625 [41] D. P. Aldrich, "Fixing Recovery: Social Capital in Post-Crisis Resilience," *J. Homel. Secur.*, vol. 5,
626 no. 3, pp. 1–16, 2010.
- 627 [42] D. L. Costa and M. E. Kahn, "Understanding the American Decline in Social Capital, 1952-
628 1998," *Kyklos*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 17–46, 2003.
- 629 [43] S. Szreter, "The state of social capital: Bringing back in power, politics, and history," *Theory*
630 *Soc.*, vol. 31, pp. 573–621, 2002.
- 631 [44] D. P. Aldrich, "The power of people: Social capital's role in recovery from the 1995 Kobe
632 earthquake," *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 595–611, 2011.
- 633 [45] E. L. Quarantelli, "A Social Science Research Agenda For The Disasters Of the 21st Century:
634 Theoretical, Methodological And Empirical Issues And Their Professional Implementation," in
635 *What is a disaster: New answers to old questions*, R. W. Perry and E. L. Quarantelli, Eds.
636 Philadelphia: Xlibris Corp., 2005, pp. 325–396.
- 637 [46] Y. Nakagawa and R. Shaw, "Social Capital: A Missing Link to Disaster Recovery," *Int. J. Mass*
638 *Emergencies Disasters*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 5–34, 2004.
- 639 [47] H.-Y. Hsueh, "The role of household social capital in post-disaster recovery: An empirical
640 study in Japan," *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, vol. 39, p. 101199, Oct. 2019.
- 641 [48] W. N. Adger, N. Brooks, G. Bentham, and M. Agnew, *New indicators of vulnerability and*
642 *adaptive capacity*. Norwich, UK: Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, 2004.
- 643 [49] R. L. Hawkins and K. Maurer, "'You fix my community, you have fixed my life': The disruption
644 and rebuilding of ontological security in New Orleans," *Disasters*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 143–159,
645 2011.
- 646 [50] E. Chamlee-Wright, "The power of narrative in post-disaster entrepreneurial response," *Rev.*
647 *Austrian Econ.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 467–472, 2017.
- 648 [51] K. A. Cagney, D. Sterrett, J. Benz, and T. Tompson, "Social resources and community resilience
649 in the wake of Superstorm Sandy," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, pp. 1–17, 2016.
- 650 [52] M. Woolcock, "Social Capital in Theory and Practice: Reducing Poverty in Building
651 partnerships between States, Markets and Civil Society," in *Social Capital and Poverty*
652 *Reduction. Which role for the civil society organizations and the state?*, UNESCO, Ed. Paris,
653 2002, pp. 20–44.
- 654 [53] E. Chamlee-Wright, *The Cultural and Political Economy of Recovery: Social Learning in a Post*

655 *Disaster Environment*. London: Routledge, 2010.

656 [54] N. Adger, "Social Capital, Collective Action, and Adaptation to Climate Change," *Econ. Geogr.*,
657 vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 387–404, Feb. 2009.

658 [55] R. Islam and G. Walkerden, "How bonding and bridging networks contribute to disaster
659 resilience and recovery on the Bangladeshi coast," *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, vol. 10, pp.
660 281–291, 2014.

661 [56] M. Masud-All-Kamal and S. M. Monirul Hassan, "The link between social capital and disaster
662 recovery: evidence from coastal communities in Bangladesh," *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 93, no. 3, pp.
663 1547–1564, Sep. 2018.

664 [57] D. P. Aldrich and K. Crook, "Strong civil society as a double-edged sword: Siting trailers in
665 post-Katrina New Orleans," *Polit. Res. Q.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 378–389, 2008.

666 [58] C. MacDougall, L. Gibbs, and R. Clark, "Community-based preparedness programmes and the
667 2009 Australian bushfires: policy implications derived from applying theory," *Disasters*, vol.
668 38, no. 2, pp. 249–266, Apr. 2014.

669 [59] SAC, "Assessment of the Hazards and Risks Associated with the Soufriere Hills Volcano,
670 Montserrat - 18th Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee on Montserrat. Part II: Full
671 Report," Montserrat, 2013.

672 [60] E. Wilkinson, "Disaster risk governance in volcanic areas – A concept note from Work Package
673 4 of the Strengthening Resilience in Volcanic areas (STREVA) programme," London, 2013.

674 [61] M. Q. Patton, "Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis," *Health Serv. Res.*,
675 vol. 34, no. 5 Pt 2, pp. 1189–208, Dec. 1999.

676 [62] K. Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*.
677 London: Sage Publications, 2006.

678 [63] A. Hicks and R. Few, "Trajectories of social vulnerability during the Soufrière Hills volcanic
679 crisis," *J. App.*, vol. 4, no. 20, p. 15, 2015.

680 [64] E. Clay *et al.*, "An Evaluation of HMG's Response to the Montserrat Volcanic Emergency -
681 Volume I," *Dep. Int. Dev.*, vol. I, no. December, p. 105, 1999.

682 [65] A. K. Possekkel, *Living with the Unexpected: Linking Disaster Recovery to Sustainable
683 Development in Montserrat*. Berlin; New-York: Springer, 1999.

684 [66] V. Sword-Daniels *et al.*, "Consequences of long-term volcanic activity for essential services in
685 Montserrat: challenges, adaptations and resilience," in *The eruption of Soufriere Hills
686 Volcano, Montserrat, from 2000 to 2010*, vol. 39, G. Wadge, R. E. A. Robertson, and B. Voight,
687 Eds. London: Geological Society, 2014, pp. 471–488.

688 [67] Halcrow Group Limited, *Final Report - Montserrat Survey of Living Conditions, 2009. Volume
689 1. Main report*. Montserrat: Government of Montserrat and the Caribbean Development
690 Bank, 2012.

691 [68] The Montserrat Reporter, "Job Vacancies in Montserrat," *The Montserrat Reporter*. [Online].
692 Available: <http://www.montserratreporter.org/jobs.htm>. [Accessed: 26-Jan-2017].

693 [69] G. of Montserrat, "Montserrat Labour Code 2012," Montserrat, 2012.

694 [70] A. P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, The Open U. London, 1985.

695 [71] G. Shotte, "Montserratness and Sustainable Development: Some Post-1995 Reflections," in
696 *Montserrat Country Conference, University of West Indies, 13-13 November 2008*, 2008, pp.
697 1–12.

698 [72] J. Nahapiet and S. Ghoshal, "Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational
699 Advantage," *Acad. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 242–266, Apr. 1998.

700

701

702

703

704

705

