



---

Undergraduate Honors Theses

---

2024-06-25

## Trust in Information, Preparation, and Resource Adequacy in Coastal Louisiana

Elizabeth Long-Meek

Michael R. Cope  
*Brigham Young University*

Scott Sanders  
*Brigham Young University*

Carol Ward  
*Brigham Young University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/studentpub\\_uht](https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/studentpub_uht)

---

### BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Long-Meek, Elizabeth; Cope, Michael R.; Sanders, Scott; and Ward, Carol, "Trust in Information, Preparation, and Resource Adequacy in Coastal Louisiana" (2024). *Undergraduate Honors Theses*. 402.  
[https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/studentpub\\_uht/402](https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/studentpub_uht/402)

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

# Trust in Information, Preparation, and Resource Adequacy in Coastal Louisiana

## Introduction

Natural disasters are an unpredictable phenomenon, affecting individuals in every country and time of life. While the severity of these disasters depends on one's geographical location, it is nearly inevitable that, at some point in their lives, most people will encounter a natural disaster. As natural disasters continue to increase in frequency and severity, especially along the southern coast of the United States, individuals and communities in rural parishes on the Louisiana coast are increasingly impacted.

Given that preparation for natural disasters is crucial to avoid or minimize the negative effects of natural disasters on individuals and communities and increase community resilience (Bonanno et al. 2010, Cutter 2017, Vamvakas, Tsiropoulou, and Papavassiliou 2019), several aid agencies have recently pushed initiatives to help individuals and communities better prepare for disasters. However, the task of increasing an individual's perceptions of their own and their communities' preparations for disasters is affected by several different factors, including the trust that individuals have in their local and federal governments as well as other aid agencies when receiving information about impending acute or chronic hazards.

This exploratory research is building off of a previous paper done by Cope et al. 2018 from a dataset collected in two coastal Louisiana areas: Plaquemines and Lafourche. These parishes have been faced with frequent disaster situations, such as being impacted by several hurricanes, the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, and other significant chronic threats tied to climate change. As such, the people in these communities are prompted to think about their own preparation for disasters that threaten their lives, community, and property. This study aims to examine the correlations between a person's willingness to trust various government and social entities and their perceptions of their own preparedness for and access to resources in the event of a disaster.

## **Literature Review**

### **Hazards, Disasters, and Vulnerability**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency defines a disaster as an occurrence that has resulted in property damage, deaths, and/or injuries to a community. Quarantelli conceptualizes disasters as the processes that happen when a community's routines are significantly disrupted and must be altered in order to respond to the crisis as opposed to a single event (Quarantelli 2000; Smith and Wenger 2007).

Disasters typically strike swiftly, but it can take years to recover from them financially, mentally, and physically (Bonanno et al. 2010; Chou et al. 2004) and the disasters often affect communities differently due to characteristics of that community (Arnold 2002; Welle and Birkmann 2015; Abrahamson and Raine 2009). Natural disasters that damage the water resources and sanitation facilities can contaminate the usable water (Reddy, Singh, and Anbumozhi 2016), the food supply chains are susceptible to disruptions due to disasters (Cutter 2017), and infrastructure damage due to disasters means that supplies and power can be hard to access and may take several days to arrive (FEMA). Unfortunately, studies have shown that “those who are most likely to be harmed during a disaster may be the least prepared” (Eisenman et al. 2009) due to a variety of reasons, including concerns about the financial cost (Johar et al. 2022; Gallagher, Hartley, and Rohlin 2023) or perceived increases in discrimination (Spialek et al. 2021).

Although many picture large, sudden disasters when thinking of emergencies, even more devastating can be the long-term effects of chronic hazards caused by climate change or other disasters. This is a particularly looming threat in the case of the Louisiana coastal communities in our survey, as salt water intrusion (Department of Energy and Natural Resources n.d), the loss of over 25% of coastal wetlands between 1932 and 2016 (Couvillion et al., 2017), and overall sea level rise (Loh et al. 2023) have major impacts on the daily lives and livelihoods of many residents in the coastal communities.

### **Preparation and Resilience**

Preparation, specifically disaster preparation, is complex and ever-changing in response to social, ecological, and emergency contexts (Levac, Toal-Sullivan, and O'Sullivan 2012) and overall changing conditions (Perry and Lindell 2003). Resilience, often emphasized as the goal

of preparation, is defined by the Committee on Increasing National Resilience to Hazards and Disasters as “the ability to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse events” (2012) and emphasizes the successful adaptation to the disruptions to the routines of a community (Aldrich and Meyer 2015) and therefore, by definition, is an essential component in mitigating the negative impact of natural disasters.

Preparation for disasters or other hazards can take several forms; preparation can be physical, mental, emotional, or financial in focus. All elements of preparation are important, although aspects of physical preparation such as food storage or having an evacuation plan are often focused on by government agencies. Mental and emotional resilience to disasters is one aspect of hazard mitigation, as people’s physical and mental health can be improved with a heightened sense of self-efficacy and belief that a disaster can be managed (Gowen et al. 2015; Fekete, Hufschmidt, and Kruse 2014). Financial preparation for disasters can decrease short- and long-term stress related to losses from a disaster (Selenko and Batinic 2011). Preparedness is important to reducing vulnerability and often enhances community resilience to hazards concurrently (Bolton et al. 2014; Hutton 2009; Levac et al. 2012).

### **Individual Trust in Larger Entities**

To find and process all the information necessary to be individually prepared for hazards that may be threatening a community requires significant mental effort, and so many turn to various agencies to obtain information (Southwell et al. 2022, Basolo et al. 2009). This is especially true in cases of chronic disasters such as those related to climate change (Cologna and Siegrist 2020). However, this process of dispersing information about an acute or chronic hazard requires an individual to have at least a semblance of trust in the agencies they are receiving information from, and some studies suggest that individual trust may have a large influence in how we pay attention to and process communication during disasters (Wachinger et al 2013; Morgan et al. 2002; Paton 2008; Siegrist and Árvai 2020).

One common definition of trust used in academic literature is trust as a psychological state based on positive expectations of the behavior of another (Rousseau et al. 1998). Another complementary definition of trust is put forth by Ulrich Beck, as he argues that we trust our communities and systems to mitigate risks that we cannot mitigate by ourselves (1986). Current literature follows these themes by noting that people trust government or other aid agencies

because we cannot manage information or hazards on our own (Comfort, Mosse, and Znati 2009), exhibiting a form of social trust that is reflected in perceptions of community preparedness (Liu and Mehta 2021; Goidel et al. 2020). Quarantelli argues that resilience in a situation like a hurricane requires that individuals and organizations have the ability to receive trusted information from a central source such as the government or news organizations (2002). However, it should also be noted that some studies have found that people become less dependent on information from institutions and authorities when they deal with more frequent disasters (Paton 2008).

Studies found that in general, political trust was strongest with government actors they interacted with most often and that people often relied on local officials and friends before, during, and after a disaster (Torres, Alsharif, and Tobin 2018). Mismanagement of information, disaster responses, or disaster resources decreases people's trust in government agencies and other organizations, especially in the case of human-caused disasters (Flagg 2017; Siegrist and Árvai 2020). Recreancy, used to describe an institutions or group that should have but failed to fulfill their expected roles (Freudenburg 1993), is a key aspect in the loss of trust from individuals and communities in organizations in the wake of a disaster (Gordon 2012) and agencies attempting to increase community resiliency must be aware of the corrosive aspects of public perceptions of recreancy. In the coastal Louisiana area, this is a particular problem due to increased perceptions of government and company recreancy following Hurricane Katrina and the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. However, it is important that the government and other organizations work to regain public trust following disasters given they have suggested that there is a positive link between trust in government and disaster preparedness (Choi and Wehde 2020; Longstaff and Yang 2008; Paton 2008). It is also argued that those with a higher trust in government are more likely to adopt preparedness measures that will increase individual and community resilience (Bonfanti et al. 2024).

## **Perceptions of Risk**

It is well documented within studies that risk perceptions have an important effect on people's behavior. Familiarity with a hazard, such as a direct experience with severe weather or climate-related phenomena or being evacuated due to a previous disaster, increases people's likelihood to perceive higher risks from climate change and support implementing policies to

mitigate risks (Spence, Poortinga, and Pidgeon 2012; Tanner and Árvai 2018). Familiarity and the availability of information about it also affects the individual's decisions to adopt protective measures (Paton 2008).

Perceptions of risk also affect how people receive communications about the hazards (Morgan et al. 2002). People are more likely to adopt measures that increase resilience to risks as recommended by various entities if they trust them (Paton 2008). Communication from organizations about risks or hazards are often focused on one-way communication aimed at informing the public about the hazard, risks, and mitigation and prevention measures (Höppner et al. 2012) but that information transmitted does not matter if those receiving it do not trust the information or organization enough to act upon it (Wachinger et al 2013). Trust has been shown to be significant in increasing individual's actions upon risk information from the government (Wachinger et al 2013; Gough 2000; Han et al. 2017). Trust in their local community, such as friends and relatives, is especially likely to increase perception and awareness of risks especially when dealing with histories of mistrust towards government (Paton 2007; Haynes, Barclay, and Pidgeon 2008).

## **Research expectations**

Based on the current themes in the literature, we expect that in disaster prone communities the more trust an individual has in an official source of information about disasters, the more prepared they will be. We also expect that there will be higher levels of trust in local governments and organizations than federal or state governments due to proximity and consistent contact with the communities. We do not predict that there will be an increase in perceived access to resources due to trust in the governments and organizations listed.

## **Methods:**

### **Study Setting:**

The geographic target area for this study consists of two coastal Louisiana parishes in the southeastern portion of the state: Plaquemines and Lafourche. As of the time of data collection (October 2013 - January 2014), the area had experienced several significant disasters in the prior decade, including Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, Hurricane Gustav in 2008, Hurricane Isaac in 2012, and the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010. The area also faces extremely

serious and chronic environmental and ecological hazards in the form of gradual-onset threats to the local community such as coastal erosion, sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, fisheries depletion, and environmental pollution.

The communities surveyed in this study are at a particularly high risk of disruption to their communities in the form of disasters, whether acute or chronic. Within the context of a community that is well-used to the threats posed by disasters to their lives, livelihood, and homes, it is important to understand how information regarding those threats will be received by those who live there.

### **Sample selection**

This paper draws on multi-mode survey data collected by the Louisiana State University Public Policy Research Lab between October 2013 and January 2014. A random sample of household addresses was obtained from the U.S. Postal Service's computerized Delivery Sequence File. This file contains nearly all known addresses in the parishes of Plaquemines and Lafourche, the population of interest (target sample size was  $n = 1200$ ). Of the 10,000 records randomly selected for potential inclusion in the study, initial contact was attempted with 5300 addresses following standard mail data collection methods (e.g., Dillman et al. 2009) with residents receiving a cover letter, paper copy of the survey, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. The letter also provided a link to an online version of the survey for respondents that preferred that mode of survey completion. After waiting roughly 1 month for mail and internet responses, follow-up telephone interviewing commenced for those who had not completed a questionnaire.

Eventually, phone records were expanded to include the remainder of the ten thousand addresses selected for potential inclusion in the study ( $n = 4700$ ), from which respondents were randomly drawn until the target sample size was reached, a process that ultimately yielded 1209 completed surveys. Due to missing values among surveyed households that showed no distinct pattern, deletion of such cases resulted in a total sample size of 928 used for the analysis presented here. The overall response rate for the survey was 9.5%, and the completed surveys were 61% mail surveys, 33% phone surveys, and 6% online surveys. This response rate is consistent with those currently achieved by major survey research organizations (Curtin et al. 2005; Pew Research Center 2012). The data was then weighted by age and sex on the basis of

the distributions of these groups in our sample versus the sample from corresponding areas in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2008–2012 American Community Survey.

## **Measures**

### *Perceptions of threat, preparedness, and resource adequacy*

Replicating the dependent variables in Cope et al. 's (2018) study from this same dataset, the dependent variables measure people's perceptions of preparedness and resource adequacy for coping with environmental hazards along the Gulf Coast. Survey respondents were provided a list of potential environmental threats of which they were asked to mark if they believed they faced and (if so) which threat they perceived as being the most serious. Including the identification of the type of threat the respondents felt was most important in a survey is suggested by other research (Vamvakas, Tsiropoulou, and Papavassiliou 2019). The options provided were sea level rise, coastal erosion, salt water intrusion, seasonal flooding, declines in fishing harvests, wind damage from hurricanes, storm surges from hurricanes, and environmental pollution.

To gain insight into perceived preparedness and resource adequacy, respondents were asked: "Speaking now only of the most serious threat, do you think your household is prepared to successfully deal with that threat?" and "Do you think your household has appropriate resources to deal with it if that threat happens or continues?" Respondents could choose between options of "yes," "no," or "don't know." The responses to both were then coded with a binary outcome, with 1 meaning yes.

### *Measures of Trust*

As opposed to the focus of the paper by Cope et al (2018) from which the rest of this study is replicated, measures were instead emphasized regarding the respondent's trust in various levels of government and other organizations. Respondents were asked the following questions:

"Do you trust the information regarding the most serious threat facing your community from:

1. The Federal Government?
2. State Representatives (such as the governor and state agencies)?



3. Local politicians (such as the mayor or town council)?
4. Neighbors and friends?
5. Scientists and extension agents from LSU?"

Respondents could choose “yes”, “no”, or “don’t know”. Each of these outcomes was coded as 1 = yes.

#### *Other forms of social capital*

As in Cope et al. (2018), an additional measure to capture dimensions of social capital were controlled for as a measure of community associations, or the . The measure of community associations is a summative index with a max score of 8 calculated by the addition of 1 per reported participation in the following groups: adult sports club or league, a youth organization, a parents association, activities at a church or other place of worship other than attending services, a neighborhood association, a charity or social welfare organization, a professional or business association, and other clubs or societies. This measure of community association is supported by the literature on community attachment (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Cope et al. 2013; Carpino and Hystad 2011).

A measure of generalized trust was also constructed from questions asking respondents how much they trusted the following groups: people in their neighborhood, the people they work with, the people at their church or place of worship, the people who work in the stores where they shop, and the police in their community. The generalized trust variable was developed by combining the respondent’s answers from each of those five questions, with responses of “trust them a lot” or “trust them some” coded as 1 and all other responses coded as 0.

Respondents were also asked what percentage of adults they knew by name in their local community, how long they had lived in the current community (calculated as a proportion of their life by dividing their reported length of residence by reported age), and whether they owned their current home (1 = yes) as these measures are backed by the literature as a way to capture a person’s access to or investments in social capital (Putnam 2000; Akbar, Hartono, and Aritenang 2023; Grinstein-Weiss et al. 2013; Yamamura 2011; Whitham 2012).

#### *Control variables*

Control variables for this study include the respondent's employment status (1 = currently employed) household annual income (measured in dollars), respondent's level of education (measured in years), race (1 = white), age of respondent measured in years, household size (no. of people), number of children (aged 17 or younger) currently living in the household, respondent's marital status (1 = married), and respondent's sex (1 = male). These controls are generally suggested

We also controlled for the involvement of a member of the respondent's households employed in the oil industry (1 = yes) or fishing industry (1 = yes). We included these controls due to literature suggesting the importance of these controls for research on resilience and vulnerability to disasters given the added vulnerability attached to employment opportunities that are dependent on natural resources that could be disrupted by disasters or other hazards (e.g., Cope et al. 2013; Parks et al. 2017).

Due to variation within the questions given to respondents based on the type of survey the household chose to complete, Michael Cope created a standard regression based imputation that was used to impute missing data for respondents income and sex. The OLS regression equation Cope used to generate predicted values for annual household income was  $Income = b_0 + male(\bar{x}) + age(\bar{x}) + educational\ attainment(\bar{x}) + race(\bar{x}) + household\ size(\bar{x})$ . As data was also missing on sex among respondents to our mail survey, Cope's team coded sex using the respondent's name, of which a panel of three project team members coded each respondent as male or female. Responses from each panel member were then cross checked for consistency and compared to a logistic regression model predicting respondent's sex which is:  $Sex = age(\bar{x}) + race(\bar{x})$ .

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Preparedness Measures		
Prepared to successfully deal with most serious threat? (yes=1)	57.35%	
Appropriate resources to deal with it if that threat happens or continues? (yes=1)	55.07%	
Trust Measures		
Trust in information from the Federal Government (yes=1)	24.18%	
Trust in information from the State Government (yes=1)	50.00%	
Trust in information from the local Government (yes=1)	57.84%	
Trust in information from friends (yes=1)	73.37%	
Trust in information from LSU (yes=1)	68.79%	
Other forms of social capital		
Community Associations	2.317	1.908
General Trust	4.340	1.434
Number of adults known by name	35.954	29.828
Length of residence (proportion)	.705	.321
Home ownership (yes=1)	96.73%	
Control Variables		
Work in the oil industry (yes = 1)	55.39%	
Work in fishing industry (yes = 1)	27.78%	
Employed (yes = 1)	49.35%	
Income	\$ 61,245.92	\$ 31,277.52
Education (0–18)	13.211	3.695
White	90.85%	
Age	57.828	14.022
Household Size	2.611	1.804
Number of Children	.407	.835
Married	71.41%	
Male	56.86%	

Percentages are presented for categorical variables. N = 612

## Modeling strategy

Logistic regression models are specified to establish the relationships between our primary conceptual variables — measures of trust in the information regarding a serious threat

given out by government and local agencies — and perceived preparedness and perceived resource adequacy. We present odds ratios to interpret point estimates and predicted probabilities based on varying levels of the trust measures.

## Results:

While just over half of the sample responded that they are prepared to successfully deal with the most serious threat and have appropriate resources to deal with it if that threat happens or continues, there is more variation in the percentage of the respondents that trust in the levels of the government and other information sources. Regarding the most serious threat faced by their communities, respondents reported trusting in information about that threat from friends most often (73.37%), followed by trust in information from LSU (68.79%). In line with expectations from the literature, the level of government that people trusted information from most was local government (57.84%) such as the mayor or town council. Just under a quarter (24.18%) trusted information about a disaster from the federal government.

Model 1 in Table 2 presents results from a logistic regression model predicting perceived preparation for environmental hazards under conditions isolating trust measures (yes = 1). The results indicate that a unit increase in trust in information from the federal government is associated with a 201.7% increase in the odds of perceived preparation ( $p < .000$ ) when isolated, and a 184% increase in the odds of perceived preparation in the full model (Model 2). According to Model 1 in Table 2 Unit increases in trust in information from the local government and from friends were also significant ( $p < .000$ ) and are associated with, respectively, a 94% increase and a 140.1% increase in the odds of perceived preparation. However, in Model 2 of Table 2, trust in information from the local government is no longer significant. Along with trust in the federal government, in the full model trust in information from friends ( $p < .000$ ), LSU ( $p < .000$ ), and the state government ( $p < .002$ ) are important in the odds of perceived preparation. Model 2 also shows that general trust, home ownership, and employment are somewhat significant and are associated with increased perceived preparedness while education level is very significant ( $p < .001$ ) and is associated with a decreased occurrence of perceived preparedness.

Table 2. Logistic regression models predicting perceived household preparedness for coping with environmental threats

Trust Measures	Odds Ratio	Model 1 95% CI		Odds Ratio	Model 2 95% CI	
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper

Trust in information from the Federal Government	3.017***	2.171	4.193	2.840***	1.768	4.562
Trust in information from the State Government	0.755	0.538	1.059	0.455**	0.276	0.748
Trust in information from the local Government	1.940***	1.409	2.673	1.490	0.906	2.449
Trust in information from friends	2.401***	1.796	3.210	2.182***	1.401	3.397
Trust in information from LSU	1.105	0.831	1.469	2.258***	1.465	3.480
Other forms of social capital						
Community Associations				0.999	0.901	1.109
General Trust				1.151*	1.006	1.316
Number of adults known by name				1.002	0.995	1.008
Length of residence (proportion)				0.781	0.442	1.382
Home ownership (yes=1)				3.835*	1.341	10.964
Control Variables						
Work in the oil industry (yes = 1)				0.692	0.468	1.022
Work in fishing industry (yes = 1)				0.818	0.529	1.265
Employed (yes = 1)				1.530*	1.039	2.251
Income				1.000	1.000	1.001
Education (0–18)				0.898***	0.843	0.956
White				0.974	0.497	1.912
Age				1.011	0.998	1.024
Household Size				0.962	0.829	1.118
Number of Children				0.972	0.761	1.241
Married				1.152	0.751	1.768
Male				1.001	0.692	1.448

N = 928. \*p ≤ 05; \*\*p ≤ 01; \*\*\*p ≤ 001

Table 3 presents results from a replicated logistic regression model predicting perceived resource adequacy for dealing with environmental hazards (that respondents identified as most important) if yes = 1. Model 1 in Table 3 presents results from a model predicting perceived resource adequacy under conditions isolating trust measures. As with the model for the associations between trust and perceived preparedness, results presented for the associations between trust and perceived resource adequacy show that a unit increase in trust in information from the federal government is associated with a 184.6% increase in the odds of perceived resource adequacy ( $p < .000$ ) when isolated. Model 1 in Table 3 also notes that unit increases in trust in information from the local government and from friends were also significant ( $p < .000$ ) and are

associated with, respectively, a 130.4% increase and a 118.9% increase in the odds of perceived resource adequacy, while the effects of trust in information from the state government and LSU are not statistically significant.

Table 3. Logistic regression models predicting resource adequacy for coping with environmental threats

Trust Measures	Model 1: Perceived preparedness 95% CI			Model 2: Perceived preparedness 95% CI		
	Odds Ratio	Lower	Upper	Odds Ratio	Lower	Upper
Trust in information from the Federal Government	2.846***	2.042	3.967	2.794***	1.734	4.450
Trust in information from the State Government	0.886	0.631	1.243	0.703	0.428	1.154
Trust in information from the local Government	2.304***	1.672	3.175	1.486	0.906	2.437
Trust in information from friends	2.189***	1.634	2.932	2.383***	1.529	3.714
Trust in information from LSU	1.037	0.779	1.381	1.886**	1.229	2.896
Other forms of social capital						
Community Associations				0.988	0.891	1.097
General Trust				1.059	0.927	1.209
Number of adults known by name				0.998	0.992	1.005
Length of residence (proportion)				0.893	0.503	1.586761
Home ownership (yes=1)				2.651	0.887	7.924
Control Variables						
Work in the oil industry (yes = 1)				0.858	0.581	1.267
Work in fishing industry (yes = 1)				1.257	0.810	1.950
Employed (yes = 1)				1.496	1.038	2.156
Income				1.000**	1.000	1.000
Education (0–18)				1.015	0.955	1.079
White				1.364	0.692	2.689
Age				1.012	0.999	1.025
Household Size				0.963	0.834	1.112
Number of Children				0.848	0.665	1.081
Married				1.512	0.988	2.313
Male				0.934	0.645	1.352

N = 612. \*p ≤ 05; \*\*p ≤ 001; \*\*\*p ≤ 001

In the full logistic regression model presented in Model 2 of Table 3, trust in information from the federal government, friends, and LSU are all statistically significant ( $p < .000$ ,  $p < .000$  and  $p < .004$ ) and are associated with a 179.4%, 138.3%, and 88.6% increase in the odds of perceived resource adequacy. This follows the same pattern as the results presented in Table 2 (Model 2) for the association between trust and perceived preparation. Unlike the model for perceived preparedness, this model suggests that income is statistically significant in association to a person's perceived resource adequacy.

## **Discussion and Conclusions**

Replicating Cope et al. (2018), this study aimed to examine the correlations between a person's willingness to trust various government and social entities and their perceptions of their own preparedness for and resources adequacy in the event of a disaster. We found that trust in information from the federal government and trust in information from neighbors and friends is associated with an increase in odds of both perceived preparedness and perceived resource adequacy in the face of a hazard or disaster in both the isolated and full models. Model 2 in both Table 2 and Table 3 also suggest that in the full model trust in information from LSU is also significant and increases the odds of both perceived preparedness and perceived resource adequacy. In contrast to expectations from the literature (Torres, Alsharif, and Tobin 2018) which suggested that people were more likely to trust information from the local government, trust in the information about a disaster from local government officials was not significant in association with perceived preparedness and perceived resource adequacy. Model 2 (Table 2) found that trust in information from the State government is significant and associated with an increase in the odds of perceived preparation, but Model 2 (Table 3) did not show this significance in association between trust in the State government and perceived resource adequacy. Efforts intended to build resilience in communities should consider the source of information regarding disasters or hazards, as differences in the amount of trust community members express in federal, state, and local governments as well as friends as LSU are associated with differences in their perceived preparedness and resource adequacy.

However, it must be recognized that the analysis of respondent's preparedness and resource adequacy relies on their reported, subjective perceptions of disaster preparedness and resource adequacy, rather than objective measures of preparatory steps or resources available to

the respondent. This is especially important given literature that warns that respondents are likely to overestimate their ability to cope with a disaster (Levac et al. 2012, p. 727). Future research should be conducted to look at associations between demonstrated measures of preparation and resources and measures of trust in information from various sources to see if the associations demonstrated here continue.

As disasters continue to increase in frequency and severity, communities like those in coastal Louisiana will continue to face increased vulnerability to their lives and livelihood. We contend that when addressing resilience in communities often associated with disaster, it is important to consider the trust that individuals and communities have in the sources from which they receive information about the disaster.

## **Citations:**

- Akbar, Ryan Aldiansyah, Djoni Hartono, and Adiwan Fahlan Aritenang. 2023. "The Effects of Homeownership on Social Capital." *Journal of Regional and City Planning* 34(1):101–21. doi: 10.5614/jpwk.2023.34.1.6.
- Aldrich, Daniel P., and Michelle A. Meyer. 2022. "Community Level Social Capital and Resilience1." Pp. 201–13 in *Routledge Handbook of Environmental Hazards and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Basolo, Victoria, Laura J. Steinberg, Raymond J. Burby, Joyce Levine, Ana Maria Cruz, and Chihyen Huang. 2009. "The Effects of Confidence in Government and Information on Perceived and Actual Preparedness for Disasters." *Environment and Behavior* 41(3):338–64. doi: 10.1177/0013916508317222.



- Baustian, Melissa M., Bingqing Liu, Leland C. Moss, Alyssa Dausman, and James W. Pahl. 2023. "Climate Change Mitigation Potential of Louisiana's Coastal Area: Current Estimates and Future Projections." *Ecological Applications: A Publication of the Ecological Society of America* 33(4). doi: 10.1002/eap.2847.
- Bonanno, George A., Chris R. Brewin, Krzysztof Kaniasty, and Annette M. La Greca. 2010. "Weighing the Costs of Disaster: Consequences, Risks, and Resilience in Individuals, Families, and Communities." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest: A Journal of the American Psychological Society* 11(1):1–49. doi: 10.1177/1529100610387086.
- Bonfanti, Rubinia Celeste, Benedetta Oberti, Elisa Ravazzoli, Anna Rinaldi, Stefano Ruggieri, and Adriano Schimmenti. 2023. "The Role of Trust in Disaster Risk Reduction: A Critical Review." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 21(1):29. doi: 10.3390/ijerph21010029.
- Carpiano, Richard M., and Perry W. Hystad. 2011. "'Sense of Community Belonging' in Health Surveys: What Social Capital Is It Measuring?" *Health & Place* 17(2):606–17. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.12.018.
- Choi, Junghwa, and Wesley Wehde. 2020. "Trust in Emergency Management Authorities and Individual Emergency Preparedness for Tornadoes." *Risk Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 11(1):12–34. doi: 10.1002/rhc3.12185.
- Cologna, Viktoria, and Michael Siegrist. 2020. "The Role of Trust for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Behaviour: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 69(101428):101428. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101428.
- Comfort, Louise K., Daniel Mosse and Taieb Znati. 2009. "Managing Risk in Real Time: Integrating Information Technology into Disaster Risk Reduction and Response." *Commonwealth* 15(1):27-45.
- Committee on Increasing National Resilience to Hazards and Disasters, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, Policy and Global Affairs, and National Academies. 2012. *Disaster Resilience: A National Imperative*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Cutter, Susan L. 2017. "The Perilous Nature of Food Supplies: Natural Hazards, Social Vulnerability, and Disaster Resilience." *Environment* 59(1):4–15. doi: 10.1080/00139157.2017.1252603.
- De Haen, Hartwig, and Günter Hemrich. 2007. "The Economics of Natural Disasters: Implications and Challenges for Food Security: The Economics of Natural Disasters." *Agricultural Economics (Amsterdam, Netherlands)* 37(s1):31–45. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-0862.2007.00233.x.
- Department of Energy and Natural Resources. n.d. "Water-Wise in BR: WHAT IS SALTWATER INTRUSION?" Louisiana.gov. Retrieved May 29, 2024 (<https://www.dnr.louisiana.gov/index.cfm/page/1277>).
- Fekete, Alexander, Gabriele Hufschmidt, and Sylvia Kruse. 2014. "Benefits and Challenges of Resilience and Vulnerability for Disaster Risk Management." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* 5(1):3–20. doi: 10.1007/s13753-014-0008-3.
- Flagg, Julia A. 2017. "The Social Consequences of a Natural/Technological Disaster: Evidence from Louisiana and Mississippi." *Local Environment* 22(3):306–20. doi: 10.1080/13549839.2016.1195801.
- Gallagher, Justin, Daniel Hartley, and Shawn Rohlin. 2023. "Weathering an Unexpected Financial Shock: The Role of Federal Disaster Assistance on Household Finance and

- Business Survival.” *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 10(2):525–67. doi: 10.1086/721654.
- Goidel, Kirby, Jennifer A. Horney, Paul M. Kellstedt, Emily Sullivan, and Stephanie E. V. Brown. 2020. “Perceptions of Disaster Resilience in Four Texas Coastal Communities.” Pp. 121–40 in *Local Disaster Management*. Routledge.
- Gordon, Jason. 2012. “Perceptions of Recreancy in the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill : A Study of Two Mississippi Coastal Communities.”
- Gough, J. (2000). Perceptions of risk from natural hazards in two remote New Zealand communities. *The Australasian journal of disaster and trauma studies*, 2(1), 1-15.
- Grinstein-Weiss, M., Y. H. Yeo, K. R. Manturuk, M. R. Despard, K. A. Holub, J. K. P. Greeson, and R. G. Quercia. 2013. “Social Capital and Homeownership in Low- to Moderate-Income Neighborhoods.” *Social Work Research* 37(1):37–53. doi: 10.1093/swr/svs035.
- Han, Ziqiang, Xiaoli Lu, Elisa I. Hörhager, and Jubo Yan. 2017. “The Effects of Trust in Government on Earthquake Survivors’ Risk Perception and Preparedness in China.” *Natural Hazards (Dordrecht, Netherlands)* 86(1):437–52. doi: 10.1007/s11069-016-2699-9.
- Haynes, Katharine, Jenni Barclay, and Nick Pidgeon. 2008. “The Issue of Trust and Its Influence on Risk Communication during a Volcanic Crisis.” *Bulletin of Volcanology* 70(5):605–21. doi: 10.1007/s00445-007-0156-z.
- Höppner, Corina, Rebecca Whittle, Michael Bründl, and Matthias Buchecker. 2012. “Linking Social Capacities and Risk Communication in Europe: A Gap between Theory and Practice?” *Natural Hazards (Dordrecht, Netherlands)* 64(2):1753–78. doi: 10.1007/s11069-012-0356-5.
- Humann, Michael, Craig Collie, Kayte Bright, Janne Thomsen, and Phil Crook. 2022. “Public Engagement during Full-scale Exercises: Dimensions of Trust and Community Resilience.” *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 30(3):317–26. doi: 10.1111/1468-5973.12388.
- Johar, Meliyanni, David W. Johnston, Michael A. Shields, Peter Siminski, and Olena Stavrutova. 2022. “The Economic Impacts of Direct Natural Disaster Exposure.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 196:26–39. doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2022.01.023.
- Kapucu, Naim, and Sana Khosa. 2013. “Disaster Resiliency and Culture of Preparedness for University and College Campuses.” *Administration & Society* 45(1):3–37. doi: 10.1177/0095399712471626.
- Levac, Joëlle, Darene Toal-Sullivan, and Tracey L. O’Sullivan. 2012. “Household Emergency Preparedness: A Literature Review.” *Journal of Community Health* 37(3):725–33. doi: 10.1007/s10900-011-9488-x.
- Liu, Brooke F., and Amisha M. Mehta. 2021. “From the Periphery and toward a Centralized Model for Trust in Government Risk and Disaster Communication.” *Journal of Risk Research* 24(7):853–69. doi: 10.1080/13669877.2020.1773516.
- Loh, P. M., Y. A. Twumasi, Z. H. Ning, M. Anokye, J. Oppong, R. Armah, C. Y. Apraku, and J. B. Namwamba. 2023. “Analyzing the Impact of Sea Level Rise on Coastal Flooding and Shoreline Changes along the Coast of Louisiana Using Remote Sensory Imagery.” *ISPRS - International Archives of the Photogrammetry Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences XLVIII-M-3–2023*:139–45. doi: 10.5194/isprs-archives-xlvi-m-3-2023-139-2023.

- Longstaff, P. H., and Sung-Un Yang. 2008. "Communication Management and Trust: Their Role in Building Resilience to 'Surprises' Such as Natural Disasters, Pandemic Flu, and Terrorism." *Ecology and Society: A Journal of Integrative Science for Resilience and Sustainability* 13(1). doi: 10.5751/es-02232-130103.
- Miller, Demond Shondell. 2016. "Public Trust in the Aftermath of Natural and Na-Technological Disasters: Hurricane Katrina and the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Incident." *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 36(5/6):410–31. doi: 10.1108/ijssp-02-2015-0030.
- Morgan, M. G., Fischhoff, B., Bostrom, A., & Atman, C. J. (2002). *Risk communication: A mental model approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Paton, Douglas. 2019. "Disaster Risk Reduction: Psychological Perspectives on Preparedness." *Australian Journal of Psychology* 71(4):327–41. doi: 10.1111/ajpy.12237.
- Paton, Douglas, Bruce Parkes, Michele Daly, and Leigh Smith. 2008. "Fighting the Flu: Developing Sustained Community Resilience and Preparedness." *Health Promotion Practice* 9(4\_suppl):45S-53S. doi: 10.1177/1524839908319088.
- Paton, Douglas. 2007. "Preparing for Natural Hazards: The Role of Community Trust." *Disaster Prevention and Management* 16(3):370–79. doi: 10.1108/09653560710758323.
- Paton, Douglas. 2008. "Risk Communication and Natural Hazard Mitigation: How Trust Influences Its Effectiveness." *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues* 8(1/2):2. doi: 10.1504/ijgenvi.2008.017256.
- Perry, Ronald W., and Michael K. Lindell. 2003. "Preparedness for Emergency Response: Guidelines for the Emergency Planning Process." *Disasters* 27(4):336–50. doi: 10.1111/j.0361-3666.2003.00237.x.
- Quarantelli, E. L. 1997. "Problematical Aspects of the Information/ Communication Revolution for Disaster Planning and Research: Ten Non-technical Issues and Questions." *Disaster Prevention and Management* 6(2):94–106. doi: 10.1108/09653569710164053.
- Quarantelli, E. L. 2001. "Statistical and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Disasters." *Disaster Prevention and Management* 10(5):325–38. doi: 10.1108/09653560110416175.
- Quarantelli, E. L. 2002. "The Role of the Mass Communication System in Natural and Technological Disasters and Possible Extrapolation to Terrorism Situations." *Risk Management* 4(4):7–21. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.rm.8240130.
- Rousseau, Denise M., Sim B. Sitkin, Ronald S. Burt, and Colin Camerer. 1998. "Not so Different after All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust." *Academy of Management Review* 23(3):393–404. doi: 10.5465/amr.1998.926617.
- Selenko, Eva, and Bernad Batinic. 2011. "Beyond Debt. A Moderator Analysis of the Relationship between Perceived Financial Strain and Mental Health." *Social Science & Medicine* (1982) 73(12):1725–32. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.09.022.
- Siegrist, Michael, and Joseph Árvai. 2020. "Risk Perception: Reflections on 40 Years of Research." *Risk Analysis: An Official Publication of the Society for Risk Analysis* 40(S1):2191–2206. doi: 10.1111/risa.13599.
- Southwell, Brian, Deanna Corin, Montana Eck, Angela Hessenius, Leslie Li, Audrey Magnuson, Joanna Parkman, Rebecca Sauer, Callie Turner, and Shane Stansbury. 2021. "Dimensions of Trust and Information Seeking on Natural Disasters, Hazards, and Extreme Weather in North Carolina (USA)."
- Spialek, Matthew L., J. Brian Houston, Haejung Shin, Katherine Okker-Edging, and Valeria Pierola Suzuki. 2021. "Individual Disaster Communication in the Latinx Community

- after Hurricane Harvey: The Role of Disaster Exposure, Perceived Discrimination Stress, and Social Trust.” *Communication Monographs* 88(3):330–49. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2020.1851038.
- Straub, Adam M. 2021. “‘Natural Disasters Don’t Kill People, Governments Kill People:’ Hurricane Maria, Puerto Rico—Recreancy, and ‘Risk Society.’” *Natural Hazards* (Dordrecht, Netherlands) 105(2):1603–21. doi: 10.1007/s11069-020-04368-z.
- Torres, Hannah R., Kamal A. Alsharif, and Graham A. Tobin. 2018. “Perspectives on Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Hazardous Environments: Insights from Broward County, Florida.” *Weather, Climate, and Society* 10(2):361–72. doi: 10.1175/wcas-d-17-0094.1.
- Wachinger, Gisela, Ortwin Renn, Chloe Begg, and Christian Kuhlicke. 2013. “The Risk Perception Paradox—Implications for Governance and Communication of Natural Hazards.” *Risk Analysis: An Official Publication of the Society for Risk Analysis* 33(6):1049–65. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01942.x.
- Whitham, Monica M. 2012. “Community Connections: Social Capital and Community Success1: Social Capital and Community Success.” *Sociological Forum* (Randolph, N.J.) 27(2):441–57. doi: 10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01325.x.
- Yamamura, Eiji. 2011. “How Do Neighbors Influence Investment in Social Capital? Homeownership and Length of Residence.” *International Advances in Economic Research* 17(4):451–64. doi: 10.1007/s11294-011-9318-z.