The Role of Social Networks in Disaster Response

19 FEBRUARY 2025

Niklas Klingel



1. Introduction: Social Networks as Disaster Lifelines

Disasters reveal structural weaknesses in social, economic, and political systems, often overwhelming conventional emergency services and institutional responses. In these circumstances, social networks – comprising personal relationships and digital platforms – act as vital conduits for information sharing, resource coordination, and emotional support (Aldrich, 2012). Social networks are uniquely positioned to combine horizontal communication (peer-to-peer exchanges) with vertical coordination (links

between institutions and communities). This capacity allows for rapid, grassroots mobilization while complementing official disaster responses. Understanding the structure and dynamics of these networks, especially through Social Network Analysis (SNA), provides valuable insights into how to strengthen them for future crises.

2. Historical Foundations: The Evolution of Social Networks in Crises

2.1 Pre-Digital Networks: Community Resilience Through Social Capital

Before the digital era, informal social networks were central to disaster survival and recovery. For instance, during the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, displaced families relied on kinship ties to migrate together and pool resources (Putnam, 2000). Similarly, during the 1995 Kobe earthquake in Japan, neighbors collaborated on rescue operations and supported one another while waiting for institutional aid (Aldrich, 2012). These networks operated on reciprocity and trust, fundamental components of social capital.

Social capital is particularly effective in low-resource settings, as demonstrated by mutual aid societies in early 20th-century urban communities that provided disaster insurance and support. Such networks illustrate the enduring power of localized human connections in crises (Granovetter, 1973).

2.2 The Digital Revolution: Expanding the Reach of Networks

The digital age has transformed social networks, enabling instantaneous communication and collaboration on an unprecedented scale. Platforms such as Twitter, WhatsApp, and Facebook have redefined disaster response by providing real-time information and facilitating large-scale coordination (Reuter & Kaufhold, 2018). During the 2010 Haiti earthquake, for example, the Ushahidi platform combined SMS and social media to create live crisis maps, helping responders allocate resources effectively (Meier, 2015). Similarly, in the 2011 Arab Spring, activists used social media to organize protests and disseminate updates, demonstrating the capacity of digital networks to empower communities under pressure (Starbird & Palen, 2012).

3. Social Network Analysis: A Theoretical and Practical Tool

Social Network Analysis (SNA) provides a framework to study the connections and flow of information within social networks. By examining nodes (individuals or organizations), ties (relationships), and metrics like centrality, SNA reveals patterns of influence, resource flow, and vulnerabilities in communication systems (Wasserman & Faust, 1994).

Key concepts in SNA

For instance, during Hurricane Sandy in 2012, researchers used SNA to map Twitter activity and found that a few key accounts, including those of government agencies and NGOs, played a disproportionate role in disseminating critical updates (Hughes & Palen, 2012). Such insights can inform future disaster planning and response strategies.

4. Real-World Impacts of Social Networks in Disasters

4.1 Information Dissemination: Speed and Reach

Social networks excel in rapidly disseminating life-saving information. During the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami, Twitter became a key platform for real-time updates, enabling affected populations to make informed decisions about evacuation and safety (Palen et al., 2007). Similarly, during the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, SMS alerts reached remote communities, though infrastructural limitations posed significant challenges (Haddow et al., 2017). Many cell phone towers were overwhelmed by the surge in communication, resulting in network congestion and delayed message delivery. Despite these setbacks, the use of SMS and emerging mobile technologies demonstrated the potential for reaching even isolated populations in disaster scenarios.

4.2 Community Mobilization: Filling Institutional Gaps

Social networks empower communities to self-organize and take action when official responses are delayed or inadequate. Following the 2017 Mexico City earthquake, residents used Facebook and WhatsApp to coordinate rescue operations, distribute supplies, and offer temporary housing to those in need (Kietzmann et al., 2011). These grassroots efforts often complement institutional responses, showcasing the synergy between formal and informal systems.

4.3 Bridging Local and Global Responses

Digital platforms connect local actors with global audiences, amplifying their voices and mobilizing resources. During the 2015 Nepal earthquake, the #PrayForNepal campaign on Twitter and Instagram attracted international attention, facilitating fundraising and volunteer mobilization (Reuter & Kaufhold, 2018). This highlights the potential of social networks to bridge local needs with global capacities.

5. Challenges and Limitations of Social Networks in Crises

5.1 Misinformation: Navigating the Risks

The rapid flow of information in social networks can also spread false or misleading content. During the COVID-19 pandemic, misinformation about

vaccines and treatments proliferated on platforms like WhatsApp, undermining public trust in health measures (Vosoughi et al., 2018). Addressing this requires stronger content moderation, fact-checking initiatives, and digital literacy campaigns.

5.2 The Digital Divide: Unequal Access to Networks

Not all populations have equal access to digital tools, exacerbating vulnerabilities during disasters. Rural communities, low-income households, and older adults are often left out of critical communication loops (Norris, 2001). Bridging this digital divide demands investments in infrastructure, affordable technology, and inclusive policies.

5.3 Trust and Legitimacy: Establishing Credible Sources

In crises, trust in information sources is crucial. Social networks often feature a mix of verified and unverified actors, making it difficult to discern reliable information. Research shows that people are more likely to trust local, familiar sources, emphasizing the importance of empowering community-based communication channels (Starbird & Palen, 2012).

6. Conclusion: Strengthening Networks for Resilient Futures

Social networks, whether offline or online, are indispensable tools in disaster response. They facilitate information sharing, enable resource coordination, and enhance community resilience. By using Social Network Analysis, we can identify key actors, address vulnerabilities, and optimize these networks for future crises.

However, challenges such as misinformation, the digital divide, and trust deficits must be addressed to unlock the full potential of social networks. Investments in digital infrastructure, public education, and the promotion of trusted communication channels are critical steps toward building equitable and resilient systems. As disasters increase in frequency and complexity, leveraging the power of social networks is no longer optional —it is essential. By fostering stronger connections and empowering communities, we can create a future where collective resilience becomes our greatest strength.

References

Aldrich, D. P. (2012). Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery. University of Chicago Press.

Bruns, A., & Burgess, J. (2012). Crisis communication on Twitter: Analyzing #qldfloods. Australian Journal of Emergency Management, 27(1), 37–45.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78(6), 1360–1380. https://doi.org/10.1086/225469

Haddow, G. D., Bullock, J. A., & Coppola, D. P. (2017). Introduction to emergency management. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Heverin, T., & Zach, L. (2012). Use of microblogging for collective sense-making during violent crises: A study of three campus shootings. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 63(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21685

Hossain, L., & Kuti, M. (2010). Disaster response preparedness coordination through social networks. Disasters, 34(3), 755–775. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2010.01169.x

Hughes, A. L., & Palen, L. (2012). Twitter adoption and use in mass convergence and emergency events. International Journal of Emergency Management, 8(3), 248–274. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEM.2012.051007

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. Business Horizons, 54(3), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005

Margetts, H., John, P., Hale, S., & Yasseri, T. (2015). Political turbulence: How social media shape collective action. Princeton University Press.

Meier, P. (2015). Digital humanitarians: How big data is changing the face of humanitarian response. CRC Press.

Munoz, C., & Pathak, R. D. (2014). Online social media applications for government transparency and its impact on trust: The Chilean case. Government Information Quarterly, 31(3), 505–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.02.002

Norris, P. (2001). Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide. Cambridge University Press.

Palen, L., Vieweg, S., Liu, S. B., & Hughes, A. L. (2007). Crisis informatics: Studying crisis in a networked world. Social Science Computer Review, 27(4), 467–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439308318517

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. Simon & Schuster.

Reuter, C., & Kaufhold, M. A. (2018). Fifteen years of social media in emergencies: A retrospective review and future directions for crisis informatics. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 26(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12196

Shirky, C. (2011). Cognitive surplus: How technology makes consumers into collaborators. Penguin Press.

Shklovski, I., Palen, L., & Sutton, J. (2008). Finding community through ICT during disaster events. Proceedings of the ACM 2008 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 127–136. https://doi.org/10.1145/1460563.1460578

Starbird, K., & Palen, L. (2012). (How) will the revolution be retweeted? Information diffusion and the 2011 Egyptian uprising. Proceedings of the ACM 2012 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/2145204.2145212

Stieglitz, S., Mirbabaie, M., & Milde, M. (2018). Social positions and collective sensemaking in crisis communication networks. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 26(1), 4–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12197

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. Science, 359(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). Social network analysis: Methods and applications. Cambridge University Press.

DOI 10.69790/epis-rep-cpe-1/72481