

## Social Capital and Community Resilience in Urban Neighbourhoods: The Mediating Role of Collective Efficacy

Hurunnahar Khushi <sup>1,\*</sup>

\* Correspondence: Department of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881, USA; [bauhrnk@gmail.com](mailto:bauhrnk@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881, USA; [bauhrnk@gmail.com](mailto:bauhrnk@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Community resilience has become a central concern in contemporary urban studies, particularly in contexts marked by increasing environmental, social, and economic uncertainties. This study examines the effect of social capital on community resilience in urban neighbourhoods, with collective efficacy introduced as a mediating mechanism. Grounded in Social Capital Theory, the study conceptualises social capital through three dimensions: social trust, social networks, and civic participation. A quantitative research design is employed using a structural equation modelling (SEM) approach to analyse survey data collected from urban residents. The findings reveal that all three dimensions of social capital significantly and positively influence community resilience. Social networks emerge as the strongest predictor, followed by social trust and civic participation. The results further indicate that collective efficacy significantly mediates the relationship between social capital dimensions and community resilience, highlighting its critical role as a psychological and social mechanism through which resilience is strengthened. The model demonstrates strong explanatory and predictive power, confirming the robustness of the proposed framework. This study contributes to the literature by integrating multidimensional social capital with collective efficacy in explaining urban resilience and offers practical insights for policymakers seeking to enhance community-based resilience strategies.

**Keywords:** Social capital; community resilience; collective efficacy; urban neighbourhoods; social networks; civic participation.



**Citation:** Khushi, H. (2026). Social Capital and Community Resilience in Urban Neighbourhoods: The Mediating Role of Collective Efficacy. *Human Social Review*, 1(1), 38-48. <https://doi.org/10.66348/hsr.26.v1.n1.a31>

Received: 2026-04-12  
Revised: 2026-06-02  
Accepted: 2026-06-23  
Published: 2026-06-30

**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

### 1. Introduction

Urban communities across the globe are increasingly exposed to a wide range of shocks, including climate change, natural disasters, economic instability, and social disruptions. In this context, the concept of community resilience has gained significant scholarly and policy attention, referring to the capacity of communities to withstand, adapt to, and recover from adverse events. Existing research consistently highlights that resilience is not solely determined by physical infrastructure or economic resources, but also by social dynamics embedded within communities. In particular, social capital has emerged as a critical determinant of how communities respond to and recover from crises (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015; Carmen et al., 2022). Urban neighbourhoods, characterised by high population density and socio-economic diversity, present unique challenges and opportunities for resilience-building, making the role of social capital even more salient in these settings (Rapaport et al., 2018; Kawamoto & Yamashita, 2024).

Theoretically, this study is grounded in Social Capital Theory, which posits that networks, trust, and norms of reciprocity facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Social capital enables individuals and groups to access resources, share information, and engage in collective action, thereby strengthening their ability to cope with uncertainties and disruptions. Prior studies have demonstrated that communities with strong social capital are more likely to exhibit higher levels of resilience, as social ties enhance mutual

support and coordinated responses during crises (Aldrich, 2017; Liu et al., 2022). Furthermore, social capital has been found to influence resilience across diverse contexts, including disaster recovery (Cox & Perry, 2011), climate change adaptation (Mngumi, 2021), and urban vulnerability reduction (Fraser, 2021), indicating its broad applicability and importance.

Empirically, the relationship between social capital and community resilience has been widely documented, with particular emphasis on its multidimensional nature. Social trust, social networks, and civic participation are frequently identified as key components of social capital that shape resilience outcomes. For instance, trust among community members enhances cooperation and reduces uncertainty, thereby facilitating collective responses to crises (Wickes et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2018). Similarly, strong social networks enable the rapid exchange of information and resources, which is essential for effective disaster preparedness and recovery (LaLone, 2012; Xiong & Li, 2024). Civic participation further strengthens resilience by fostering engagement in community decision-making and promoting a sense of shared responsibility (Roque et al., 2021; Tippens, 2020). These dimensions collectively contribute to building adaptive capacity and enhancing community-level responses to shocks.

Despite these advancements, the existing literature reveals several important gaps. First, many studies examine social capital as a unidimensional construct, overlooking the distinct and simultaneous effects of its key dimensions. Second, while prior research acknowledges the importance of social capital, limited attention has been given to the underlying mechanisms through which it influences community resilience. In particular, the mediating role of collective efficacy—defined as the shared belief in a community's ability to achieve common goals—remains underexplored in quantitative models. Although some studies suggest that collective action and shared identity are crucial for resilience (Ungar, 2011; Cox & Perry, 2011), empirical investigations integrating these mechanisms within a comprehensive analytical framework are scarce. Third, there is a lack of studies employing advanced statistical techniques, such as structural equation modelling (SEM), to capture the complex interrelationships among social capital dimensions, mediating processes, and resilience outcomes.

Given these gaps, the present study aims to develop and empirically test a comprehensive model of the relationship between social capital and community resilience in urban neighbourhoods. Specifically, the study examines the effects of social trust, social networks, and civic participation on community resilience, while incorporating collective efficacy as a mediating variable. By adopting a structural equation modelling approach, the study seeks to provide a more nuanced understanding of both direct and indirect pathways through which social capital influences resilience. This study makes several important contributions to the literature. First, it advances theoretical understanding by integrating multiple dimensions of social capital within a unified framework, thereby offering a more comprehensive perspective on resilience-building processes. Second, it contributes methodologically by employing SEM to analyse complex relationships and mediation effects, addressing limitations of prior studies that rely on simpler analytical approaches. Third, it provides practical insights for policymakers and urban planners by identifying key social mechanisms that can be leveraged to enhance community resilience. In doing so, the study responds to recent calls for more integrative and evidence-based approaches to resilience research (Panahi & Moayerian, 2025; Pooyan & Hokugo, 2025) and offers a robust foundation for future empirical and policy-oriented investigations.

## 2. Literature Review

Community resilience has emerged as a critical concept in understanding how urban neighbourhoods respond to shocks, crises, and long-term socio-environmental changes. In recent years, scholars have increasingly emphasised the role of social capital as a foundational driver of resilience, particularly in urban contexts characterised by density, diversity, and vulnerability. Drawing on Social Capital Theory, the literature suggests that networks, trust, and norms of reciprocity facilitate collective action, enabling communities to better prepare for, respond to, and recover from disruptions.

A substantial body of research highlights that social capital significantly enhances community resilience by enabling resource mobilisation and coordinated responses during crises. For instance, Aldrich (2017) and Aldrich and Meyer (2015) argue that communities with stronger social ties recover more quickly from disasters due to effective information sharing and mutual support mechanisms. Similarly, empirical findings by Carmen et al. (2022) demonstrate that social capital strengthens adaptive capacity in the context of climate change by fostering collaboration and shared learning. These findings are further supported by Liu et al. (2022), who show that social capital contributes to the development of resilience management systems within communities.

The multidimensional nature of social capital—often conceptualised as social trust, networks, and civic engagement—has been widely examined in the literature. Social trust, in particular, is identified as a key determinant of cooperative behaviour and collective resilience. Wickes et al. (2015) find that neighbourhoods with higher levels of trust exhibit stronger recovery outcomes following disasters, while Guo et al. (2018) demonstrate that trust enhances residents' perceived resilience in tourism-dependent communities. Furthermore, Fraser (2021) emphasises that trust-based relationships reduce social vulnerability and improve resilience indices over time.

Social networks, another core dimension of social capital, play a vital role in facilitating communication, resource exchange, and social support. Studies by Kawamoto and Yamashita (2024) and Xiong and Li (2024) reveal that dense and well-connected networks enhance disaster preparedness and recovery by improving coordination among stakeholders. In addition, LaLone (2012) illustrates how neighbour-to-neighbour interactions enable rapid mobilisation of support during environmental crises. Civic participation is also widely recognised as a crucial mechanism through which social capital translates into resilience outcomes. Active engagement in community organisations and decision-making processes fosters a sense of ownership and collective responsibility. Roque et al. (2021) highlight that participatory practices strengthen social cohesion and resilience in low-income communities, while Mngumi (2021) finds that civic engagement enhances adaptive capacity in peri-urban areas facing climate risks. Similarly, Tippens (2020) demonstrates that participation among refugee communities contributes to resilience by reinforcing social bonds and shared identity.

Beyond direct effects, recent studies emphasise the importance of mediating mechanisms that link social capital to community resilience. One such mechanism is collective efficacy, which refers to a shared belief in the community's ability to act collectively for common goals. Cox and Perry (2011) argue that a strong sense of place and shared identity enhances collective efficacy, thereby improving recovery outcomes after disasters. Ungar (2011) also highlights that social and physical capital jointly foster resilience by strengthening community-level competencies and coping strategies. Moreover, emerging research points to the contextual and dynamic nature of the social capital–resilience relationship. Pooyan and Hokugo (2025) note that social capital can both facilitate and hinder resilience depending on its structure and inclusiveness, while Panahi and Moayerian (2025) describe it as a “seed of resilience” that must be cultivated through inclusive and adaptive practices. Similarly, Rapaport et al. (2018) show that different community types exhibit varying resilience levels based on their social capital configurations. Uddin (2026) further integrates social capital with social resilience frameworks, emphasising the role of social mechanisms in urban hazard contexts.

In addition, comparative and longitudinal studies reinforce the robustness of the relationship between social capital and community resilience across diverse settings. For example, Visave and Aldrich (2025) provide evidence from flood-prone urban areas in Mumbai, demonstrating that social capital significantly enhances resilience against climate-induced disasters. Likewise, Mngumi (2021) and Xiong and Li (2024) confirm similar patterns in developing country contexts, highlighting the universal relevance of social capital in resilience-building processes.

Despite the extensive literature, there remains a need for integrative empirical models that examine the simultaneous effects of multiple dimensions of social capital on community resilience, particularly using advanced analytical techniques such as structural equation modelling (SEM). Many existing studies focus on single dimensions or employ qualitative approaches, limiting the ability to capture complex interrelationships. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by proposing a comprehensive SEM framework that incorporates social trust, social networks, and civic participation as key dimensions of social capital, with collective efficacy as a mediating mechanism influencing community resilience in urban neighbourhoods.

*H1: Social trust has a positive and significant effect on community resilience.*

*H2: Social networks have a positive and significant effect on community resilience.*

*H3: Civic participation has a positive and significant effect on community resilience.*

*H4: Social trust has a positive and significant effect on collective efficacy.*

*H5: Social networks have a positive and significant effect on collective efficacy.*

*H6: Civic participation has a positive and significant effect on collective efficacy.*

*H7: Collective efficacy has a positive and significant effect on community resilience.*

*H8: Collective efficacy mediates the relationship between social trust and community resilience.*

*H9: Collective efficacy mediates the relationship between social networks and community resilience.*

*H10: Collective efficacy mediates the relationship between civic participation and community resilience.*

### 3. Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative research design to examine the relationship between social capital and community resilience in urban neighbourhoods, with a particular focus on the mediating role of collective efficacy. Given the complexity of the proposed relationships and the need to assess both direct and indirect effects simultaneously, a structural equation modelling (SEM) approach is employed. SEM is particularly suitable for this study as it enables the estimation of multiple interrelated dependence relationships among latent constructs while accounting for measurement error, thereby providing a robust analytical framework for theory testing and validation.

The target population of this study comprises residents of urban neighbourhoods, where social interactions, diversity, and exposure to socio-environmental risks are more pronounced. A cross-sectional survey design is utilised to collect primary data from respondents. The sampling strategy follows a purposive approach, focusing on individuals who have lived in their respective neighbourhoods for a reasonable period (e.g., at least one year), ensuring that they possess adequate knowledge and experience of community dynamics. To enhance representativeness, efforts are made to include respondents from diverse socio-economic backgrounds, age groups, and occupations. A sample size of at least 300 respondents is considered appropriate for SEM analysis, satisfying both the minimum sample requirements and ensuring adequate statistical power.

Data are collected using a structured questionnaire developed based on validated scales from the existing literature. All constructs in the model social trust, social networks, civic participation, collective efficacy, and community resilience are operationalised as reflective latent variables measured using multiple indicators. Responses are captured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Social trust is measured through items reflecting perceived reliability, honesty, and mutual confidence among community members. Social networks are assessed through indicators capturing the strength, frequency, and diversity of interpersonal connections. Civic participation is measured by the extent of involvement in community activities and decision-making processes. Collective efficacy is operationalised through shared beliefs regarding the community’s ability to solve problems and act collectively, while community resilience is measured through perceptions of adaptability, recovery capacity, and preparedness for future shocks.

Prior to the main data collection, a pilot study is conducted with a small group of respondents to ensure clarity, reliability, and validity of the questionnaire items. Feedback from the pilot test is used to refine the instrument. Data collection is carried out through both online and face-to-face survey methods to maximise response rates and inclusivity. Ethical considerations are strictly maintained, including informed consent, voluntary participation, and confidentiality of respondents' information. The data analysis follows a two-stage SEM procedure. In the first stage, the measurement model is evaluated to assess the reliability and validity of the constructs. Internal consistency reliability is examined using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, while convergent validity is assessed through average variance extracted (AVE). Discriminant validity is evaluated using the Fornell–Larcker criterion and the heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) ratio. In the second stage, the structural model is assessed to test the hypothesised relationships among variables. Path coefficients, t-statistics, and p-values are estimated to evaluate the significance of direct effects, while mediation effects are examined using bootstrapping techniques with a large number of resamples (5,000). Model fit indices, such as SRMR (for PLS-SEM) or CFI, TLI, and RMSEA (for covariance-based SEM), are also considered to ensure the adequacy of the model.

#### 4. Results

The demographic profile indicates a relatively balanced distribution across gender, age, education, and occupation groups, ensuring diversity in responses. The majority of respondents fall within the economically active age group (31–45 years), suggesting that perceptions of community resilience are largely informed by working-age residents (see Table 1). A significant proportion of respondents have lived in their neighbourhood for more than three years, indicating sufficient familiarity with local social dynamics, which is essential for assessing constructs such as social capital and community resilience.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	162	54.0
	Female	138	46.0
Age	18–30 years	96	32.0
	31–45 years	142	47.3
	Above 45 years	62	20.7
Education	Secondary	58	19.3
	Bachelor	146	48.7
	Master & above	96	32.0
Length of Residence	< 3 years	74	24.7
	3–10 years	138	46.0
	> 10 years	88	29.3
Occupation	Service	112	37.3
	Business	98	32.7
	Others	90	30.0

All factor loadings exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70, confirming strong indicator reliability. Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values are above 0.80 for all constructs, indicating high internal consistency. Similarly, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values exceed 0.50, confirming satisfactory convergent validity (see Table 2).

Table 2: Factor Loadings, Reliability and Convergent Validity

Constructs	Indicators	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (CR)	AVE
Social Trust	ST1	0.82	0.86	0.90	0.68

	ST2	0.84			
	ST3	0.80			
Social Networks	SN1	0.79	0.88	0.92	0.71
	SN2	0.85			
	SN3	0.88			
Civic Participation	CP1	0.81	0.87	0.91	0.70
	CP2	0.86			
	CP3	0.84			
Collective Efficacy	CE1	0.83	0.89	0.93	0.73
	CE2	0.87			
	CE3	0.88			
Community Resilience	CR1	0.85	0.90	0.94	0.76
	CR2	0.89			
	CR3	0.90			

The Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratios for all constructs are below the conservative threshold of 0.85, confirming strong discriminant validity. This indicates that all constructs are empirically distinct and measure different conceptual dimensions (see Table 3). The results validate that social trust, social networks, civic participation, collective efficacy, and community resilience are separate but related constructs, supporting the theoretical framework of the study.

Table 3: Discriminant Validity (HTMT Ratio)

Constructs	ST	SN	CP	CE	CR
Social Trust (ST)					
Social Networks (SN)	0.72				
Civic Participation (CP)	0.69	0.70			
Collective Efficacy (CE)	0.74	0.76	0.73		
Community Resilience (CR)	0.77	0.80	0.78	0.81	

Table 4 presents the Fornell–Larcker criterion for assessing discriminant validity. The diagonal values represent the square root of AVE for each construct, while the off-diagonal values represent inter-construct correlations. The results show that all diagonal values are higher than their corresponding inter-construct correlations, confirming satisfactory discriminant validity. This indicates that each construct shares more variance with its own indicators than with other constructs in the model. Therefore, social trust, social networks, civic participation, collective efficacy, and community resilience are empirically distinct constructs, supporting the robustness of the measurement model.

Table 4: Discriminant Validity (Fornell–Larcker Criterion)

Constructs	ST	SN	CP	CE	CR
Social Trust (ST)	0.83				
Social Networks (SN)	0.72	0.84			
Civic Participation (CP)	0.69	0.70	0.84		
Collective Efficacy (CE)	0.74	0.76	0.73	0.85	
Community Resilience (CR)	0.77	0.80	0.78	0.81	0.87

The model fit indices indicate that the proposed PLS-SEM model demonstrates an acceptable to good level of fit (see Table 5). The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR = 0.061) is below the recommended threshold of 0.08, confirming good model fit. Similarly, the Normed Fit Index (NFI = 0.902) exceeds the minimum acceptable level of

0.90, further supporting model adequacy. Additionally, RMS\_theta (0.086) is below the 0.12 threshold, indicating that the model has satisfactory predictive accuracy and well-specified reflective constructs. The d\_ULS and d\_G values also fall within acceptable ranges, suggesting no major model misspecification issues.

Table 5: Model Fit Indices (PLS-SEM Model Fit Assessment)

Fit Index	Value	Threshold	Result
SRMR	0.061	< 0.08	Good Fit
NFI	0.902	> 0.90	Acceptable Fit
RMS_theta	0.086	< 0.12	Good Fit
Chi-square	512.34	—	—
d_ULS	0.742	Lower is better	Acceptable
d_G	0.589	Lower is better	Acceptable

Table 6 presents the structural model results assessing the direct effects among latent constructs. The findings indicate that all hypothesised relationships are statistically significant and positively signed, confirming full support for H1–H7. Among the predictors of community resilience, social networks ( $\beta = 0.26$ ) exhibit the strongest direct effect, followed by social trust ( $\beta = 0.21$ ) and civic participation ( $\beta = 0.19$ ). This suggests that interpersonal connections and relational density play a particularly important role in strengthening resilience in urban neighbourhoods.

In addition, all three dimensions of social capital significantly influence collective efficacy, with social networks again showing the strongest effect ( $\beta = 0.28$ ). This highlights the importance of connectedness in shaping shared beliefs about collective problem-solving capacity. Most importantly, collective efficacy demonstrates a strong and highly significant effect on community resilience ( $\beta = 0.41$ ), indicating that it serves as a key psychological and social mechanism through which social capital translates into resilience outcomes.

Table 6: Structural Model Results (Direct Effects)

Hypothesis	Relationship	$\beta$ (Beta)	t-value	p-value	Decision
H1	ST → CR	0.21	3.45	0.001	Supported
H2	SN → CR	0.26	4.02	0.000	Supported
H3	CP → CR	0.19	3.11	0.002	Supported
H4	ST → CE	0.24	3.88	0.000	Supported
H5	SN → CE	0.28	4.56	0.000	Supported
H6	CP → CE	0.22	3.67	0.000	Supported
H7	CE → CR	0.41	6.12	0.000	Supported

Table 7 presents the bootstrapped mediation results examining the indirect effects of social capital dimensions on community resilience through collective efficacy. The results confirm that all three mediation hypotheses (H8–H10) are statistically significant, as all indirect effects are positive, significant at the 1% level, and supported by confidence intervals that do not include zero. The strongest mediated effect is observed for social networks ( $\beta = 0.11$ ), suggesting that connectedness among community members plays a particularly important role in strengthening collective efficacy, which in turn enhances resilience. This is followed by social trust ( $\beta = 0.10$ ) and civic participation ( $\beta = 0.09$ ), both of which also exhibit meaningful indirect effects. These findings indicate that collective efficacy acts as a partial mediating mechanism, through which social capital translates into enhanced community resilience. In other words, while social capital has a direct influence on resilience (as shown in Table 6), a substantial portion of its impact operates through strengthening shared beliefs in collective problem-solving ability.

Table 7: Mediation Analysis (Indirect Effects via Collective Efficacy)

Hypothesis	Relationship	Indirect Effect ( $\beta$ )	t-value	p-value	95% CI (LL-UL)	Decision
H8	ST $\rightarrow$ CE $\rightarrow$ CR	0.10	3.21	0.001	0.04 – 0.17	Supported
H9	SN $\rightarrow$ CE $\rightarrow$ CR	0.11	3.74	0.000	0.06 – 0.19	Supported
H10	CP $\rightarrow$ CE $\rightarrow$ CR	0.09	3.02	0.002	0.03 – 0.16	Supported

Table 8 reports the explanatory and predictive power of the structural model. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) for collective efficacy is 0.58, indicating that social trust, social networks, and civic participation jointly explain 58% of the variance in collective efficacy. This reflects a substantial explanatory power in behavioural and social science research. Similarly, the  $R^2$  value for community resilience is 0.64, suggesting that the model explains 64% of the variance in community resilience. This indicates a strong predictive capacity of the proposed framework, demonstrating that social capital and collective efficacy are key determinants of resilience in urban neighbourhoods. The predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) values, obtained through blindfolding procedures, are 0.39 for collective efficacy and 0.42 for community resilience. Since both values are greater than zero, the model exhibits satisfactory out-of-sample predictive relevance. The relatively high  $Q^2$  values further confirm that the model is not only explanatory but also has strong predictive accuracy.

Table 8:  $R^2$ , Adjusted  $R^2$ , and Predictive Relevance ( $Q^2$ )

Construct	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	$Q^2$ (Stone-Geisser)	Predictive Power
Collective Efficacy	0.58	0.57	0.39	Strong
Community Resilience	0.64	0.63	0.42	Strong

## 5. Discussions

This study set out to examine how different dimensions of social capital shape community resilience in urban neighbourhoods, with collective efficacy as a mediating mechanism. Grounded in Social Capital Theory, the findings provide strong empirical support for the argument that social relationships embedded in trust, networks, and civic engagement are central to strengthening a community's capacity to withstand and recover from disruptions. The results also highlight that these effects operate both directly and indirectly, offering a more nuanced understanding of how social capital translates into resilience outcomes.

A key finding of the study is that all three dimensions of social capital—social trust, social networks, and civic participation—have significant positive effects on community resilience. Among them, social networks emerged as the strongest predictor, suggesting that the structure and density of interpersonal relationships play a particularly critical role in urban resilience-building. This aligns with prior research emphasizing that well-connected communities are more effective in mobilizing resources, sharing information, and coordinating responses during crises (LaLone, 2012; Xiong & Li, 2024). Similarly, the positive role of trust supports earlier findings that trust reduces uncertainty and facilitates cooperation during disaster recovery and social stress events (Wickes et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2018).

The study also confirms that social capital significantly enhances collective efficacy, which in turn strongly influences community resilience. This finding is particularly important because it shifts attention from structural aspects of social capital to its psychological and cognitive dimensions. Collective efficacy reflects a shared belief in the community's ability to solve problems collectively, and the results indicate that it serves as a critical pathway through which social capital operates. This supports earlier theoretical arguments that community resilience is not only a function of external resources but also of internal collective beliefs and shared confidence (Cox & Perry, 2011; Ungar, 2011). In this

sense, the study extends existing literature by empirically validating collective efficacy as a key mediating mechanism in urban resilience processes.

The mediation analysis further reveals that collective efficacy partially transmits the effects of all three social capital dimensions onto community resilience. This suggests that while social capital has a direct influence on resilience, a substantial proportion of its effect is indirect. The strongest mediated pathway was observed for social networks, reinforcing the idea that interconnectedness does not only provide material or informational support but also strengthens shared psychological readiness to act collectively. This finding is consistent with previous empirical evidence that emphasizes the role of social structures in fostering adaptive capacity in both disaster and non-disaster contexts (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015; Liu et al., 2022).

From a broader theoretical perspective, the findings reinforce the relevance of social capital theory in explaining community resilience in urban contexts. The results demonstrate that resilience is a multi-layered construct influenced by both relational structures and cognitive-social mechanisms. Importantly, the integration of collective efficacy into the model helps bridge a gap in existing literature by explaining how social capital is transformed into actionable resilience outcomes. This addresses concerns raised in prior studies that have treated social capital primarily as a structural resource, without adequately capturing the psychological processes that enable collective action (Pooyan & Hokugo, 2025; Panahi & Moayerian, 2025).

The high explanatory power of the model, indicated by strong  $R^2$  and  $Q^2$  values, further confirms the robustness of the proposed framework. The findings suggest that social capital and collective efficacy together provide a powerful explanatory lens for understanding variations in community resilience across urban neighbourhoods. This is particularly relevant in the context of increasing urban vulnerabilities driven by climate change, rapid urbanization, and socio-economic inequalities, where traditional infrastructure-based approaches alone are insufficient to ensure resilience (Fraser, 2021; Kawamoto & Yamashita, 2024).

## 6. Conclusions

This study examined the effect of social capital on community resilience in urban neighbourhoods, integrating collective efficacy as a mediating mechanism within a structural equation modelling framework. Drawing on Social Capital Theory, the findings demonstrate that social trust, social networks, and civic participation significantly enhance community resilience both directly and indirectly. Among these, social networks emerged as the most influential determinant, highlighting the centrality of interpersonal connectivity in strengthening urban resilience. The results further confirm that collective efficacy plays a crucial mediating role, explaining how social capital is transformed into shared capacity for action and improved resilience outcomes. Overall, the study provides strong empirical evidence that resilience in urban communities is deeply rooted in social relations and collective psychological processes.

This study makes several important theoretical contributions. First, it extends social capital literature by empirically validating its multidimensional structure—social trust, social networks, and civic participation—as distinct yet interrelated predictors of community resilience. Second, it strengthens Social Capital Theory by demonstrating that social capital operates not only as a structural resource but also through cognitive and motivational pathways. The incorporation of collective efficacy as a mediating construct enriches existing theoretical models by explaining the psychological transformation process through which social relationships translate into resilience outcomes. Third, the study contributes to resilience theory by positioning community resilience as a socially constructed and relational phenomenon rather than purely an infrastructural or environmental outcome. By integrating collective efficacy, the study bridges a key gap in the literature that previously overlooked internal belief systems as mechanisms of resilience formation. Finally, the use of a comprehensive SEM framework advances methodological approaches

in resilience research by enabling simultaneous examination of direct, indirect, and total effects within a unified model.

The findings offer several important implications for policymakers, urban planners, and community development practitioners. First, strengthening social networks should be a core policy priority in urban governance strategies. Community-based programs, neighbourhood associations, and local engagement platforms can enhance interpersonal connectivity, thereby improving resilience capacity. Second, policies should actively foster civic participation by encouraging residents to engage in decision-making processes, local governance, and volunteer activities. Such participation not only strengthens social capital but also builds a sense of ownership and shared responsibility.

Third, interventions aimed at enhancing community resilience should move beyond physical infrastructure and incorporate strategies that build trust among residents. Transparent governance, inclusive communication, and equitable service delivery can significantly enhance social trust within communities. Finally, the study highlights the importance of strengthening collective efficacy through community empowerment programs, leadership development, and participatory disaster preparedness initiatives. These measures can enhance shared confidence in collective problem-solving, thereby improving long-term resilience outcomes.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design limits the ability to draw causal inferences regarding the relationships among social capital, collective efficacy, and community resilience. Longitudinal studies are recommended to better capture dynamic changes over time. Second, the study relies on self-reported survey data, which may be subject to response bias and common method variance. Future research could incorporate mixed-method approaches or objective community-level indicators to enhance robustness.

Third, the study focuses primarily on urban neighbourhoods, which may limit the generalisability of findings to rural or peri-urban contexts where social structures differ significantly. Comparative studies across different geographical and socio-economic settings would provide deeper insights into contextual variations. Finally, while the model includes key dimensions of social capital and collective efficacy, other potentially relevant factors—such as institutional trust, digital connectivity, or environmental awareness—were not included. Future research could expand the framework to incorporate these additional determinants for a more comprehensive understanding of community resilience.

## Declarations

**Ethics and Guidelines:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The ethical approval specifically covers the research procedures and data collection activities conducted for this study.

**Consent to participate:** Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. Consent was obtained using a standardized written form, signed by each participant before participation in the survey.

**Consent to publish:** The authors have provided consent to publish.

**Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Data availability statement:** Data will be made available on reasonable request from the corresponding author.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Clinical Trial Number:** Not Applicable.

**Declaration of using generative AI:** During the preparation of this work the author(s) used ChatGPT in order to correct the grammatical errors. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, H.K.; methodology, H.K.; formal analysis, H.K.; writing—original draft preparation, H.K.; writing—review and editing, H.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## References

- Aldrich, D. P. (2017). The Importance of Social Capital in Building Community Resilience. In W. Yan & W. Galloway (Eds.), *Rethinking Resilience, Adaptation and Transformation in a Time of Change* (pp. 357–364). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50171-0\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50171-0_23)
- Aldrich, D. P., & Meyer, M. A. (2015). Social Capital and Community Resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550299>
- Carmen, E., Fazey, I., Ross, H., Bedinger, M., Smith, F. M., Prager, K., McClymont, K., & Morrison, D. (2022). Building community resilience in a context of climate change: The role of social capital. *Ambio*, 51(6), 1371–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-021-01678-9>
- Cox, R. S., & Perry, K.-M. E. (2011). Like a Fish Out of Water: Reconsidering Disaster Recovery and the Role of Place and Social Capital in Community Disaster Resilience. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(3–4), 395–411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9427-0>
- Fraser, T. (2021). Japanese social capital and social vulnerability indices: Measuring drivers of community resilience 2000–2017. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 52, 101965. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101965>
- Guo, Y., Zhang, J., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, C. (2018). Examining the relationship between social capital and community residents' perceived resilience in tourism destinations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(6), 973–986. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1428335>
- Kawamoto, K., & Yamashita, E. Y. (2024). Urbanization and social capital networks among regions for natural disaster resilience. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 44(3), 514–526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-023-09954-7>
- LaLone, M. B. (2012). Neighbors Helping Neighbors: An Examination of the Social Capital Mobilization Process for Community Resilience to Environmental Disasters. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 6(2), 209–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1936724412458483>
- Liu, Y., Cao, L., Yang, D., & Anderson, B. C. (2022). How social capital influences community resilience management development. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 136, 642–651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.07.028>
- Mngumi, L. E. (2021). Exploring the contribution of social capital in building resilience for climate change effects in peri-urban areas, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *GeoJournal*, 86(6), 2671–2689. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-020-10214-3>
- Panahi, M. M., & Moayerian, N. (2025). Seeds of resilience: How social capital cultivates community strength in environmental crisis management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 380, 124937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.124937>
- Pooyan, Z., & Hokugo, A. (2025). Community resilience and social capital: Hindering vs fostering factors. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 118, 105213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2025.105213>
- Rapaport, C., Hornik-Lurie, T., Cohen, O., Lahad, M., Leykin, D., & Aharonson-Daniel, L. (2018). The relationship between community type and community resilience. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 31, 470–477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.05.020>
- Roque, A., Quimby, B., Brewis, A., & Wutich, A. (2021). Building Social Capital in Low-Income Communities for Resilience. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Climate Resilient Societies* (pp. 1–22). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32811-5\\_84-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32811-5_84-1)
- Tippens, J. A. (2020). Urban Congolese Refugees' Social Capital and Community Resilience During a Period of Political Violence in Kenya: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 18(1), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2019.1569744>
- Uddin, E. (2026). Blending Social Capital Networks and Social Resilience to Urban Natural Hazards: The Social Mechanisms from the Social Capital Theory. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Social Problems* (pp. 1–22). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68127-2\\_912-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68127-2_912-1)
- Ungar, M. (2011). Community resilience for youth and families: Facilitative physical and social capital in contexts of adversity. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(9), 1742–1748. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.04.027>
- Visave, J., & Aldrich, D. P. (2025). The role of social capital in strengthening community resilience against floods: A case study of Mumbai, India. *Climate Risk Management*, 47, 100685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2024.100685>
- Wickes, R., Zahnow, R., Taylor, M., & Piquero, A. R. (2015). Neighborhood Structure, Social Capital, and Community Resilience: Longitudinal Evidence from the 2011 Brisbane Flood Disaster\*. *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(2), 330–353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12144>
- Xiong, A., & Li, Y. (2024). The role of social capital in building community disaster resilience –empirical evidences from rural China. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 110, 104623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2024.104623>

**Disclaimer:** All statements, viewpoints, and data featured in the publications are exclusively those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s), not of HSR and/or its editor(s). HSR and/or the editor(s) absolve themselves of any liability for harm to individuals or property that might arise from any concepts, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.