

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Social Cohesion and Covid-19: an integrative review

Paul Ware^{1*}

¹Department of Social and Community Health, School of Population Health, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

* Corresponding author

Email: paul.ware@auckland.ac.nz

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background**

28 Nations of considerable wealth and sophisticated healthcare infrastructures have seen high rates of
29 illness and death from Covid-19. Others with limited economic means and less developed healthcare
30 infrastructures have achieved much lower burdens. In order to build a full understanding, an
31 appraisal of the contribution of social relationships is necessary. Social cohesion represents a
32 promising conceptual tool.

33 **Objective**

34 The aim was to examine scholarship on social cohesion during the Covid-19 pandemic: specifically –
35 the constructions of social cohesion deployed, how it was measured, and the effects of and on social
36 cohesion reported.

37 **Methods**

38 The Pubmed, Scopus and JSTOR databases were searched for relevant journal articles and grey
39 literature. 66 studies met the inclusion criteria. Data were extracted and analysed from these using
40 spreadsheet software.

41 **Results**

42 Several constructions of social cohesion were found. These concerned interpersonal relationships;
43 sameness and difference; collective action; perceptions/emotions of group members; structures and
44 institutions of governance; local or cultural specificity; and hybrid/multidimensional models. Social
45 cohesion was reported as influential on health outcomes, health behaviours, and resilience and
46 emotional wellbeing; but also that there was some potential for it to drive undesirable outcomes.

47 Scholarship reported increases or decreases in quantitative measures of social cohesion, a
48 temporary ‘rally round the flag’ effect early in the pandemic, the variable impacts of policy on
49 cohesion, and changing interpersonal relationships due to pandemic conditions. There are numerous
50 issues with the literature that reflect the well-documented limitations of popular versions of the
51 social cohesion concept.

52 **Conclusions**

53 Social cohesion has been used to express a range of different aspects of relationships during the
54 pandemic. It is said to promote better health outcomes, more engagement with positive health
55 behaviours, and greater resilience and emotional wellbeing. The literature presents a range of ways
56 in which it has been altered by the pandemic conditions.

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68 Introduction

69 The Covid-19 pandemic has offered a challenge to those seeking to understand the operation of
70 social relationships and patterns of health and illness. Throughout what is likely the first truly global
71 pandemic in the information age, humans have had access to real-time data from across the globe.
72 What we have seen has frequently surprised us. For example, the 2019 Global Health Security Index
73 positioned the USA and UK in the top two positions in the league table of pandemic preparedness¹,
74 yet these nations have experienced among the highest rates of illness and death from Covid-19 on
75 the planet². The same report placed Aotearoa-New Zealand (Aotearoa-NZ) and Singapore much
76 lower in the rankings, but these nations have managed to limit their burdens of this kind².

77 Analyses have sought to explain geographic patterns in populations' Covid-19 outcomes using,
78 among other independent variables, features of physical geography³, previous experiences of
79 infectious disease outbreaks⁴, the ethnic composition of populations⁵ and even leaders' gender⁶.
80 Although some of these may make important and valid points, none tell the whole story. An
81 understanding of such patterning is not complete without looking to social determinants. After all, it
82 is physical, in-person interaction between humans that allows the virus to spread. In most cases, a
83 nation's ability to slow or stop the spread of the virus has depended on collective action from the
84 large majority of its population. More fundamentally, the ability of a government to enact policy for
85 protection of public health in the face of Covid-19 is contingent on there being political
86 infrastructure to permit it and, following this, the likelihood that the policy will be adhered to at the
87 population level. At every juncture, the progress of the disease is contingent on social relationships.

88 One useful tool for the examination of social relationships is the social cohesion concept.
89 Comprehensive accounts of social cohesion have already recently been written⁷⁻⁹; however, a brief
90 summary of its history here may provide context to the current discussion. Its inception into
91 academic inquiry is usually attributed to Durkheim¹⁰, who sought to understand what brings and

92 holds societies together, and occasionally Tönnies¹¹. Contributions from Le Bon¹², Lewin and the field
93 theorists¹³, Parsons¹⁴ and Lockwood¹⁵, are frequently acknowledged in the literature. In the 1980s
94 social capital arose adjacent to social cohesion in the works of Bourdieu¹⁶ and Coleman¹⁷ and looked
95 more directly at the nature and operation of interpersonal relationships; Putnam¹⁸⁻²⁰ later developed
96 his own distinct version. Beginning in the late 1980s, policy scholars and authors took social cohesion
97 for their own and infused it with a range of normative goals for societal development and
98 constructed it in a manner amenable to quantitative measurement. Research institutions in the EU²¹⁻
99 ²⁴, Australia^{25, 26}, the UK²⁷, Canada²⁸⁻³⁰, and at the World Bank³¹ have all used it as a vehicle toward
100 their own contextually-grounded political aims and analysis. Despite the diversity across
101 constructions of social cohesion through history, disciplinary grounding and politics, it remains, most
102 basically, a tool for the analysis of social relationships and collective sociality.

103 Given this theoretical lineage of social cohesion and its drawing attention to, among other things,
104 collective action³²; political or civic engagement^{18, 19}; inequality³³; relationships across population(s),
105 state and social institutions^{15, 16}; ethnic and cultural difference^{34, 35}; trust³⁶; and resilience to
106 hardships or shocks³⁷, it appears to offer promise in the quest to understand how social relationships
107 have contributed to different nations' experiences of Covid-19. This work is an initial step in such a
108 line of inquiry. Beyond this specific topic, and as the direct impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic
109 diminish in magnitude, the accumulation and persistence of further wicked problems –
110 environmental degradation and climate change, poverty and inequality, recurring financial-economic
111 crises etc. – the imperative for understanding collective behaviours becomes ever more salient.
112 Social cohesion is a concept that might be of use to humans' endeavours therein.

113 In preparation for an analysis using social cohesion to understand the operation of social
114 relationships within and upon the Covid-19 pandemic, a review of what others have contributed is
115 necessary. Reported here is the process and results of an integrative review on this topic. The
116 integrative method was chosen for its capacity to draw together a range of methodologies³⁸. It was

117 of special interest to investigate the different constructions of social cohesion deployed, how they
118 were measured, and the effects of and on social cohesion being claimed.

119 **Methods**

120 **Search Strategy**

121 A computerised search strategy was conducted on the PubMed, Scopus and JSTOR databases on
122 10/10/22. Owing to the newness of the topic, keywords used to search for relevant literature were
123 kept simple and broad to maximise results:


124 “social cohesion” AND “coronavirus” OR “Covid”

125 Searches were limited to journal articles and grey literature published since 2020 to exclude those
126 previous to the period of interest. For the PubMed search, the search parameters were set at title
127 and/or abstract. For the Scopus search this was widened to also include keywords, and for the JSTOR
128 search to include the whole text as initial title/abstract searches alone yielded limited results.

129 From an initial return of 453 results, 56 were reviewed. A further ten articles / reports were included
130 from the reference lists, bringing the total number of papers to 66. Inclusion criteria were:

- 131 1. Social cohesion forms a central component of the analysis
- 132 2. Discussion on Covid-19 outcomes or social cohesion in the context of the pandemic
- 133 3. Full text available through the associated database
- 134 4. Full text available in English language

135 The selection / exclusion process is shown in *Figure 1*.



136

137

Fig. 1: Selection / exclusion process

138 Data Extraction

139 All 66 studies were accessed electronically. In each case PDF files were downloaded from the
140 database on which they were found. Data were extracted using Whittemore and Knaffl's³⁸ method.
141 This consists of data reduction and coding; display; comparison; and the drawing of conclusions. A
142 coding matrix was developed using the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet software (*appendix 1*). During
143 initial coding the literature was arranged by methodology and discipline. Following this, through an
144 inductive process, it was organised by further categories becoming salient during a second pass.
145 These included the nature of the work (empirical, analytical or theoretical), the unit(s) of analysis,
146 the objects of focus, the construction of social cohesion being deployed, and the outcomes being

147 described. A third pass over the literature informed by this was then conducted, which yielded the
148 thematic structure described in the following section. The extraction focused in particular on the
149 manner in which social cohesion was conceptualised, the components and/or indicators thereof
150 proposed and the argument being presented regarding its operation during the pandemic.

151 **Results**

152 **Study Features**

153 Sixteen of the pieces of work involved an analysis of two or more nations³⁹⁻⁵⁴; twelve were based in
154 the United Kingdom^{27, 55-65}; seven in the United States of America⁶⁶⁻⁷²; four each in Germany⁷³⁻⁷⁶,
155 Australia⁷⁷⁻⁸⁰ and Aotearoa-NZ⁸¹⁻⁸⁴; two each in Iran^{85, 86} and South Africa^{87, 88}; and one each in
156 Indonesia⁸⁹, Spain⁹⁰, China⁹¹, Canada⁹², Argentina⁹³, Peru⁹⁴, Denmark⁹⁵, Italy⁹⁶, Kenya⁹⁷, Poland⁹⁸,
157 Romania⁹⁹ and Japan¹⁰⁰. The remaining three works were not attached to a specific location¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰³.
158 Fifteen of the papers offered analytical commentaries alone^{27, 39-46, 52, 53, 66, 81, 85, 89} and eight of the
159 papers theoretical commentaries alone^{54, 72, 84, 88, 96, 101-103}. Forty of the papers focused their reporting
160 on the collection and/or analysis of empirical data. Twenty-two of these used only quantitative
161 data^{47, 48, 51, 56, 58, 65, 67, 69-71, 73, 75, 78, 80, 82, 91, 92, 95, 97-100}, thirteen of these used only qualitative data^{49, 50, 55,}
162 ^{63, 64, 68, 77, 79, 83, 86, 87, 90, 94} and five of these used a combination of the two^{59-62, 93}. Three papers
163 combined theoretical and quantitative analysis^{57, 74, 76}.
164 Twenty-eight of the papers' primary focus was the interplay between pandemic conditions and
165 social cohesion in their location(s) of interest^{27, 40, 41, 46, 48, 54, 58-61, 63, 65, 68, 73, 75, 76, 79, 81, 83-85, 87, 88, 90, 95, 98, 101,}
166 ¹⁰². Seven of the papers used social cohesion as an independent variable in seeking to explain
167 patterns of health outcomes from Covid-19 between groups^{39, 47, 51, 56, 69, 70, 72}. A further seven papers
168 offered discussion on the role of institutions of governance in maintaining social cohesion in relation
169 to the pandemic^{42-44, 52, 53, 66, 97}. Eight papers investigated the effects of social cohesion on the
170 practicing of recommended health behaviours or adherence to restrictive public health

171 interventions^{49, 50, 55, 57, 71, 80, 86, 100}. Six papers looked into emotional and mental wellbeing in relation
172 to social cohesion during the pandemic^{67, 78, 82, 91, 92, 96}. Eight papers presented an analysis of the
173 responsibility of social cohesion for community resilience to the hardships brought by the
174 pandemic^{45, 74, 77, 89, 93, 94, 99, 103}. Two papers discussed the effects that the performance of voluntary
175 work during the pandemic had on social cohesion^{62, 64}.

176 **Different Models of Social Cohesion**

177 A range of constructions of social cohesion were presented by the literature. These may be sensibly
178 organised as clusters of concepts and/or objects of attention which are used to represent social
179 cohesion one way or another. These clusters commonly describe the same or similar sets of
180 behaviours or situations using different terminology. Seven are proposed here: one relating to social
181 networks and interpersonal relationships; a second concerning the effects of sameness and
182 difference; a third presenting social cohesion as groups' collective action or their members' choosing
183 to act toward the overall benefit of the group; a fourth constructing the concept as a product of the
184 perceptions or emotions of group members; and a fifth concerning the operation of structures and
185 institutions of governance. The sixth category is a small one which contains those suggesting locally
186 and culturally specific expressions of social cohesion, and the seventh consists of accounts
187 presenting large hybrid and multidimensional models containing conceptual representatives of all or
188 most of the other clusters.

189 **1. Interpersonal relationships**

190 Those accounts constructing social cohesion broadly as a product of active interpersonal
191 relationships included those focusing on the provision of social support^{41, 55, 65, 68, 71, 77, 83, 90, 94},
192 interpersonal reciprocity^{69, 100}, the sharing of information across social networks^{55, 77, 100}, the number
193 of social connections or interactions maintained by an individual^{48, 56, 58, 61-63, 65, 72, 74, 89, 93}, the quality
194 of social connections available to an individual^{41, 45, 48, 58, 62, 63, 71, 78, 85, 89, 90, 92, 101} and the relative

195 operation of close relationships such as those between family members and less involved
196 relationships such as those between friends and acquaintances^{48, 61-63, 70}. Those operating in this
197 general area frequently referred to a close relationship between social capital and social cohesion^{47,}
198 ^{55, 63, 69, 70, 75, 82, 90, 98, 100}, some using these terms interchangeably^{93, 94}, or presenting a model of
199 cohesion which more closely resembles what might be considered social capital, usually in
200 Putnam's^{18, 19} tradition^{48, 56-58, 64, 67, 69, 71-73, 77, 78, 85, 89, 91, 92, 101}.

201 **2. Sameness and difference**

202 Where sameness and difference were important to constructions of social cohesion, the axes
203 thereof offered included ethnic groupings^{60, 65, 77, 78, 83}, shared identity^{27, 60, 61, 80, 97, 102}, norms^{91, 102},
204 values^{49, 76, 92} and behavioural conformity or contagion^{50, 55, 76, 77}. For example, Lalot et al.⁶⁵, drawing
205 on Bottoni¹⁰⁴, present and measure frequency of contact with those of different ethnicity as an
206 indication of greater social cohesion in a society. However, some operationalise ethnic difference in
207 the opposite manner: Morgan et al.⁸³ use a model with roots in scholarship from the Canadian Social
208 Cohesion Network^{28, 29} in which the presupposition that ethnic difference presents a challenge for
209 social cohesion is implicit. On a smaller scale, Healey et al.⁷⁷ indicate the importance for social
210 cohesion of having those of similar culture and experience within reach.

211 **3. Working together or acting for the good of the collective**

212 Accounts which emphasised group members' working together or their choice to act for the good of
213 the collective expressed these behaviours in reference to collective action^{39, 42, 43, 52, 55, 65, 66, 79, 80, 87, 99},
214 co-operation^{42, 76, 90, 97, 98}, collaboration^{53, 88}, limited conflicts of interest⁴⁵, the pursuit of a shared
215 goal⁴⁹, enactment of social or civic responsibility^{27, 47, 50, 55, 87}, a latent orientation to the common
216 good^{66, 75, 86}, mutual aid^{45, 85}, altruism^{66, 78} and solidarity^{45, 46, 49, 50, 66, 91, 103}. In this respect, Garber and
217 Vinetz⁶⁶ consider the tension between adjacent processes of individualised identity and low trust in

218 public officials, and the importance of cohesion as collective buy-in for public health interventions
219 such as mask wearing.

220 **4. Social cohesion as a subjective phenomenon**

221 Some accounts presented social cohesion as the sum of individuals' appraisals of the group or
222 population of which they were a member. Orientations measured included feelings of togetherness
223 or unity^{27, 50, 60, 76, 79}; trust in hypothetical others from the same nation^{47, 61, 63, 73-75, 80, 90}, or those in
224 one's neighbourhood or community^{39, 47, 56, 58, 60, 61, 67, 69, 74, 75, 78, 80, 85, 86, 90-92, 101}; trust in others to follow
225 public health advice and/or adhere to formal restrictions^{59-61, 76}; trust or confidence in public officials,
226 politicians or political institutions^{39, 47, 60-63, 65, 66, 74, 76, 80, 87, 90, 93, 95, 97}; or, simply, perceived cohesion^{58, 86}.
227 For example, Collischon and Patzina⁷³ place trust of 'unknown others' at the centre of social
228 cohesion and find geographically patterned negative association with Covid-19 incidence, an effect
229 mostly driven by women in their sample, hypothesising that this may be driven by the suspicion that
230 others' neglect to follow public health advice.

231 **5. The operation of institutions and structures of governance**

232 Some accounts of social cohesion situated it at the structural level. Such accounts included those
233 that related social cohesion to the effectiveness of democracy in a nation⁵¹; the integrity of the
234 social contract⁴⁴; within-nation inequality^{43, 44, 47}; governments' action to uphold human rights^{95, 103};
235 the strength of state institutions^{49, 53}; coherence and integration of institutions, state tiers or other
236 structural elements (Lockwood's¹⁵ 'system integration')^{54, 86, 97}; a state's tactics and success in
237 relation to internal conflict management and maintenance of order¹⁰³; and effective leadership^{43, 53},
238 ¹⁰². Razavi et al.⁴⁴ conducted an analysis using such a version of social cohesion, suggesting that pre-
239 pandemic declines thereof in European nations was temporarily arrested by governments'
240 instituting welfare policies to ameliorate the economic disruption of stay-at-home orders.

241

242 **6. Locally or culturally specific arrangements of cohesion**

243 A small number of commentators suggested that there are distinct and locally specific arrangements
244 of social cohesion. Schröder et al.⁷⁶ described a latent network of connections across local
245 populations as a ‘milieu’ from which specific forms of cohesion arise in relation to the arrangements
246 of culture and socioeconomics within. Villalonga-Olives et al.⁹⁰ gave an account of the culturally
247 bound manners of relating in the Mediterranean region and Spain. Garber and Vinetz⁶⁶ noted the
248 culturally specific forms of resistance and their place in questions of social cohesion more broadly
249 that lead to patterns of rejection of restrictive public health measures⁶⁶. Miao⁹¹ made comment on
250 the specific cultural-historical tendency of Chinese peoples to act for communal benefit, this
251 implying a distinct operation of social cohesion in their population of interest. Saghin⁹⁹ found that
252 the localised tension between a burgeoning culture of individualism and the hangover from
253 communist collectivism was instrumental to social cohesion contributing to Romanians’ resilience
254 during the early pandemic. Metz⁸⁸ discussed the African ethic of *Ubuntu* (an expression of collective
255 orientation), how this creates a locally specific form of social cohesion, and how those existing
256 within this social environment might negotiate the demands of distancing during the pandemic.

257 **7. Hybrid and multidimensional models**

258 There was widespread (but not ubiquitous) recognition in the literature that social cohesion is
259 usually understood as a complex and multidimensional model. After acknowledging this fact, most
260 works included in this review proceeded to focus on, analyse and/or measure one specific concept
261 or cluster. However, some authors sought to deploy a broad focus facilitated by a systematically
262 integrated collection of concepts. Among these, some referenced pre-existing theoretical models
263 assembled by other authors^{65, 83}, some detailed the construction of their own theoretical models for
264 the specific purpose of the work being reported^{27, 76, 103}, and others used different combinations of
265 conceptual categories to represent social cohesion, using a range of justifications for their choices,
266 but stopping short of building these into a free-standing structure^{49, 80, 97, 103}. Of the two works in the

267 first group, one⁶⁵ used Bottoni's¹⁰⁴ model, which incorporates appraisal of interpersonal
268 relationships, collective action and the operation of the state. The other⁸³ used a model initially
269 constructed by the Canadian Social Cohesion Network²⁹ then later developed and given Aotearoa-
270 Aotearoa-NZ specificity by Spoonley et al.¹⁰⁵. This model appraises sameness / difference, collective
271 action and the operation of the state. Of those in the second group, one²⁷ offered a model
272 constructed from concepts relating to sameness and difference, collective action or working for the
273 good of the collective, and subjective processes. Another⁷⁶ following the construction of a novel
274 theoretical model, sought to represent social cohesion in the context of the pandemic in Germany in
275 relation to subjective appraisals of togetherness and the operation of structures of governance. The
276 third¹⁰³ situated social cohesion as a component of a much larger model of resilience during crises. In
277 this model, social cohesion was constructed using concepts relating to interpersonal relationships,
278 subjective appraisals, collective action and the operation of the state. The remainder offered
279 combinations of subjective appraisals, collective action and the operation of the state⁹⁷; subjective
280 appraisals, interpersonal relationships and the operation of the state⁷⁴; collective action, sameness
281 and difference and the operation of the state⁴⁹; and sameness, subjective appraisals and collective
282 action⁸⁰.

283 **Units of analysis**

284 There were a range of different units of analysis across the papers reviewed, largely contingent on
285 the manner in which social cohesion was constructed or measured by each. Most commonly,
286 characteristics of collections of individuals were observed in order to describe populations at the
287 local geographic level^{45, 56-58, 61, 64-67, 69, 71, 72, 77, 78, 82, 85, 86, 89, 91-93, 96, 99, 100}. However communities of
288 sameness^{94, 101}; regions within nations⁷⁰; entire national populations^{40, 88, 95, 97, 98}; and nation states
289 themselves^{39, 42-44, 46, 47, 49-53} were also used as the units of analysis. National populations were often
290 divided along demographic axes in order to analyse specific groups: occupational⁶², age^{41, 83},
291 gender⁷³, or a combination of these axes of difference⁸¹. Some – often the qualitative work and that

292 coming from researchers in psychological fields – focused on individuals^{48, 55, 63, 68, 74, 79, 103}. Finally, a
293 number of works used some combination of the above units of analyses: individuals and social
294 groups^{87, 90, 102}; neighbourhood and social groups⁷⁶; communities of sameness and social groups⁵⁴;
295 neighbourhoods and nations⁸⁰; neighbourhoods, regions and nations^{27, 75}; individuals,
296 neighbourhoods, regions and nations⁵⁹; and individuals, social groups, communities of sameness and
297 regions⁶⁰.

298 **The different effects of social cohesion**

299 **1. Health outcomes**

300 Those works presenting social cohesion as a determinant of health most commonly held it to be
301 producing comparatively positive population health outcomes from Covid-19. Such reporting
302 included the negative association of social cohesion or social capital with the likelihood of death^{51, 70};
303 or the spread of infections of Covid-19 in groups and populations^{69, 72}; or antibody response to
304 vaccination⁵⁶; or, in the case of some analytical and theoretical work, a less precisely defined and
305 more general ‘health outcomes’³⁹. For example, Gallagher et al.⁵⁶ used a 5-item questionnaire to
306 measure frequency of contact with neighbours; and perceptions of neighbourhood trustworthiness,
307 willingness to help, similarity and friendship; and vaccination-related blood antibody concentration
308 among 676 people from the UK, finding a positive association between their measure of social
309 cohesion and blood antibody concentration.

310 Some works sought to isolate the effect of different components or variables within their model of
311 social cohesion on health outcomes from Covid-19^{47, 69, 70} and/or different effects of the same
312 components on different populations⁶⁹. For example, Elgar et al.⁴⁷ drew on existing data from
313 surveys across 84 countries which used a Putnam-inspired construct measuring trust in other
314 people, membership of community groups, civic activity and confidence in the state, to investigate a
315 hypothesised association between social cohesion / capital and Covid-19 deaths in the early days of

316 the pandemic. They reported that while mortality was positively associated with interpersonal trust
317 and group affiliations, it was negatively associated with civic engagement and confidence in the
318 state. Ransome et al.⁶⁹ measured feelings of belongingness, trust in neighbours, perceptions of
319 neighbours' willingness to help, civic and social participation and collective engagement across a
320 selection of neighbourhoods in Philadelphia, looking for any associations with rates of Covid-19
321 diagnosis. They found that social cohesion operated differently in different places: neighbourhoods
322 predominantly occupied by African Americans found some of their indicators of choice to be
323 associated with higher rates of diagnosis, whilst those in which African Americans were the minority
324 saw the same indicators associated with lower rates.

325 **2. Information for, and practice of, health behaviours for the prevention** 326 **of Covid-19**

327 A number of works described the effects of their chosen construction of social cohesion on the
328 promotion of health behaviours intended to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2. These included
329 commentary on those behaviours made compulsory by legislation and access to or transmission of
330 information around them. This body of work includes notable contributions from those who
331 deployed qualitative methods to explore in detail the motivators and barriers for practicing
332 recommended and required public health behaviours^{49, 50, 55, 86}. Each of these introduced social
333 cohesion at the latter stages of their analyses to draw together a collection of influences on opinions
334 and behaviours into a single explanation. In keeping with the qualitative approach, these presented
335 a more complex arrangement of forces than the one-dimensional scales or binaries commonly
336 expressed by quantitative work. For example, Zimmerman et al.⁵⁰ used social cohesion to explain
337 those behaviours informed by feelings of togetherness, commonality, empathy and compassion;
338 linking this to the spread of uptake of health promoting behaviours across a group. They noted that
339 these can encourage closer adherence to public health guidelines through care for the collective,

340 while at the same time may cause people to deviate from guidelines and regulations when doing so
341 is perceived to benefit another or others who may be in need.

342 Others produced quantitative analyses using self-report surveys to capture the practice of specific
343 sets of Covid-19 related health behaviours^{71, 80, 93}. For example, Cheng and Lo⁷¹ surveyed older adults
344 from the USA on the number of preventative behaviours from a given list in which they engaged and
345 a 3-item Likert scale measuring neighbourhood social cohesion. They reported a positive association
346 between the two. Cardenás et al.⁸⁰ surveyed a large sample of Australians to investigate whether
347 engaging in physical distancing and hand hygiene behaviours were susceptible to socio-political
348 determinants. They used a model of social cohesion incorporating social identification, confidence in
349 government and social relations captured by a 14-item tool. They reported a complex set of findings
350 in which their measures relating to social cohesion are spread across being positively associated with
351 these health behaviours, negatively associated with them, evidencing no apparent relationship, or
352 associated with one and not the other.

353 The place of social cohesion in the distribution, provision and accessing of good quality health-
354 related information has also been of interest to scholars^{55, 77, 100}. Burton et al.'s⁵⁵ and Healey's⁷⁷
355 interview research presented the sharing of health information as a form of social support and this,
356 in turn, as a component of social cohesion. Machida et al.¹⁰⁰ suggested that the offering and uptake
357 of health information between groups bound by ethnic and cultural sameness may be an
358 explanation for the positive relationship they found between social cohesion and rates of
359 vaccination.

360 Some authors engaged in commentary on relationships between social cohesion and whether or not
361 people choose to become vaccinated against Covid-19^{57, 100}. For example, Machida et al.¹⁰⁰ in a cross-
362 sectional study in Japan, found social capital (in their Putnam-derived construction containing social
363 cohesion) to be associated with both previous vaccination and intent to receive a booster vaccine.

364

365 **3. Social cohesion promoting resilience and emotional wellbeing**

366 The effects of social cohesion on resilience and/or mental and emotional wellbeing have seen
367 significant attention in the literature. These works commonly noted the heightened states of stress
368 and anxiety brought about by the pandemic and the isolating effects of the physical distancing
369 measures that were employed to prevent transmission of Covid-19. There are those who referred to
370 the resilience of groups in this respect, proposing that their chosen model of social cohesion is
371 supportive of this^{45, 77, 89, 93, 94, 99}. For example, Rela et al.⁸⁹ offered an analysis of the action of a
372 Putnam-influenced fusion of social cohesion and social capital in Indonesia. An argument is
373 presented for social cohesion as a determinant of a community resilience, defined as the capacity of
374 a group to cope with changing environments while continuing to improve the living conditions of its
375 members. Garcia-Rabines et al.⁹⁴ and Healey et al.⁷⁷ both argued that within-group cohesion in
376 marginalised communities (trans women and ethnic minorities respectively) can act as a source of
377 resilience in times of crisis in the forms of practical and moral social support. Group resilience is also,
378 by some, explicitly held as important for groups' protection against psychosocial distress and clinical
379 versions of this^{74, 93}. Most commonly, however, the various constructions of social cohesion at the
380 group level are offered as a resource for individuals' protection from poor mental health outcomes^{67,}
381 ^{78, 82, 91, 92, 96, 103}. For example, Best et al. ⁹² surveyed 1,381 Canadians on perceptions of social
382 cohesion in their neighbourhoods and levels of panic, depression, emotional stability and worry,
383 alongside a range of other variables. They found that the pandemic and the restrictive responses to
384 it were responsible for heightened distress, but that their social cohesion indicators were
385 unequivocally negatively associated with all measures thereof. O'Donnell⁷⁸ reported, on the basis of
386 longitudinal research with Australian informants, that neighbourhood-level social cohesion was
387 associated with lower levels of depression during periods of high infection rates and restrictions on
388 social activity; but that there was no effect on anxiety and loneliness.

389

390 **4. Disunity, fragmentation and the negative effects of social cohesion**

391 Some authors offered commentary on the opposites of social cohesion, or its less desirable effects. A
392 number of works presented social cohesion and division as antithetical and presented broad
393 commentaries on the operation of the latter^{27, 43, 54, 60, 61}. For example, Bisiada⁵⁴, in a theoretical
394 discussion of social life in Germany and Spain over the course of the pandemic countered the
395 argument that social divisions have been primarily ideological in nature and presented another, that
396 socioeconomics have been the major axis. Abrams et al.^{60, 61} presented data to show that the United
397 Kingdom's experiences of the pandemic have been marked by increasing perceptions of unity at the
398 local level but of disunity at the national level. Other works considered the manners in which social
399 cohesion as it is constructed may produce undesirable outcomes. These include social cohesion or
400 elements of it as a driver of increased infection or death rates. Ransome et al.⁶⁹, using data collected
401 from across the USA, and Thomas et al.⁷², in a San Francisco based simulation, suggested that social
402 cohesion viewed as collective engagement or frequency of interpersonal connection respectively
403 may offer a mechanism by which increases in social cohesion may explain ethnic differences in
404 infection rates. Brief commentary was also made by Hangel et al.⁴⁹, Zimmermann et al.⁵⁰ and
405 Schneiders et al.⁶³ on the manner in which demands made by commitments to the cohesion of a
406 larger social group might come to negatively impact the wellbeing of those in one's close circle. One
407 example of this is in the demands for physical distancing in order to stop the population-level spread
408 of SARS-CoV-2 meaning that some family members suffer isolation.

409 Some works presented commentaries suggesting that social cohesion may operate to produce in-
410 group versus out-group orientations or sharpen existing ones in populations in the pandemic
411 environment and explored some of the implications^{42, 81, 83, 90, 95}. Comment was made on group
412 constructions that pre-existed the pandemic and their boundaries and operation in its context:
413 age⁸³, ethnicity⁸³, gender⁴², and neighbours versus 'outsiders'⁹⁰. Others suggested that new groups
414 have formed in response to the pandemic and the requirements of the public health response^{81, 95}.

415 Ergler⁸¹ offered an analysis of the procession of groups that have become marked as outsiders as a
416 result of the Aotearoa-NZ pandemic response which included political efforts to generate a national
417 unity in opposition to the virus. Schuessler⁹⁵ measured the extent to which compulsory vaccination
418 policy in Denmark brought into being group boundaries which exclude those resisting vaccination
419 from some aspects of social life.

420 **Changing social cohesion during the pandemic**

421 **1. 'Increasing' and 'decreasing' cohesion during the pandemic**

422 Some commentators suggested that the pandemic conditions facilitated increases in social cohesion
423 in the manner they constructed it, that is, the quantitative measure(s) on which the appraisal is built.
424 These suggestions were based on observations of increases in the provision of social support^{68, 79, 83};
425 the fruitful interaction between pandemic conditions and previous policy efforts to bolster social
426 cohesion at the local level⁶⁵; and perceptions of increases in local unity and solidarity^{27, 60, 61}. For
427 example, Morgan et al.⁸³, conducted in-depth interviews with older people following the first wave
428 of the pandemic in Aotearoa-NZ and found participants feeling a greater sense of belonging in their
429 communities due to the help they received from family and friends during a difficult time, this being
430 experienced in different manners by different ethnic and age groups. Some (including some of the
431 same authors) also painted the opposite picture: the pandemic environment bringing about a
432 reduction in social cohesion. Such evidence presented includes declining trust: in others from the
433 population under investigation⁶⁵, and in politicians and political institutions^{60, 61}. Perceptions of
434 declining national unity are also referenced in this respect^{27, 60, 61}. Others, as covered above,
435 reference the action of policy responses to the pandemic to create division^{74, 81, 95}; and the occasional
436 failure of national policy approaches to cater to and include all groups⁸³. Also raised in this respect is
437 the sometimes polarising effects of pandemic politics and public health responses and the interplay

438 thereof with social cohesion, adherence to public health measures and population health
439 outcomes^{51, 54, 95, 98}.

440 **2. ‘Rally round the flag’ and its diminishing returns**

441 An observation that is made frequently across the literature, especially in works that have engaged
442 in longitudinal research or ongoing analysis, is that there was a moment of increased cohesion in the
443 early stages of the pandemic which gave way to a return to form – or worse – toward the end of
444 2020. This was characterised by the British Academy²⁷ as a “rally round the flag” effect. This effect
445 has been described occurring in relation to a range of different constructions of social cohesion and
446 their indicators: interpersonal interaction, social support and feelings of togetherness^{27, 68, 87}; trust in
447 ‘most people’⁷³, those in one’s neighbourhood⁵⁹ and government^{27, 60, 93}; political polarisation⁹⁸;
448 feelings of national and local unity^{27, 59-61}; and collaboration between nations⁴⁶. The British
449 Academy’s²⁷ UK-based narrative suggested pre-existing division and declining cohesion in the years
450 before the pandemic, followed by a ‘coming together’ during the first wave, in which people were
451 brought to trust each other more, have increased perceptions of local and national unity, identify
452 more closely with their communities and offer both emotional and practical support to others. The
453 authors suggested that this moment had come to an end by September 2020 at which point almost
454 all indicators returned to pre-pandemic levels. Perceptions of local unity in some cases remained
455 higher, and trust in government declined to still lower levels, the latter effect being most
456 pronounced in socioeconomically deprived communities and ‘key’ workers such as those employed
457 in front-line social care, who were concentrated in these lower socioeconomic strata, and who
458 experienced the greatest exposure to risk of contracting the virus.

459 **3. The effects of policy**

460 A smaller body of work looked into the effects of policy on social cohesion in pandemic conditions.
461 There have been those already mentioned who held vaccination policies⁹⁵ and a framing of collective

462 action against the virus⁸¹ as responsible for driving division. Others pointed to the greater levels of
463 social cohesion experienced by nations who focused policy towards fostering it in their pandemic
464 response – including those emphasising solidarity and agency⁴²; “we-ness”, that is, feelings of
465 unity⁴³; and the swift roll-out of generous social protections⁴⁴. Contrary to this, Strupat⁹⁷, in an
466 analysis of the Kenyan response, considered that the burden placed on the nation by the pandemic
467 was too great for the welfare approach overseen by the government to have any real effect. A
468 further set of commentaries, all from the early stages of the pandemic, offered analyses and advice
469 for policy authors toward prioritising social cohesion in the pandemic response^{45, 52, 53, 66}.

470 **4. Changing interpersonal relationships**

471 A significant thread in the literature, involving those constructions of social cohesion where
472 interpersonal relationships are at the centre, is analysis of how changes in relationships brought
473 about by the pandemic have affected social cohesion. Such accounts include the suggestions that
474 frequency of contact and quality of relationships with people from outside the family circle have
475 diminished^{48, 58, 60, 61, 75, 85}; and that bonding with those in one’s close environment has
476 strengthened^{48, 59-61, 63, 83}. Other interesting observations on the changing nature of interpersonal
477 relationships includes their becoming politically polarised and/or depolarised over time^{63, 98}; and the
478 manners in which the requirements of remaining physically distant can function in cultures of
479 communal sociality^{40, 88}.

480 A common suggestion is that the conditions of the pandemic have produced a fundamental
481 reformation of the manners and practices by which social relationships are enacted – and therefore
482 a change in a cohesion which is reliant on these. These range from, most simply, the observation
483 that the novel social conditions of the pandemic may bring new conditions for the construction of
484 personal identity, group identity and thus group interactions¹⁰², that the extent of disruption to
485 established practices has required a conscious and intentional reformation of relationships⁶³, to the
486 idea that times of crisis bring the requirement for specific sets of practices of interaction^{76, 78, 94}.

487 More specific observations include those on details of the large-scale shift of interaction to remote
488 communication technologies^{68, 79}; the use of outdoor singing as a communal negotiation of grief and
489 solidarity^{96, 101}; and signing up to volunteer programmes as an expression of commitment to the
490 collective and a means of engaging in meaningful interpersonal interaction^{62, 64, 75}. There are
491 numerous commentaries dealing with the changing practices of interaction of different groups,
492 including the changing construction of oldness in relation to older people's increased vulnerability
493 during the pandemic and how this has affected inter-generational relations^{41, 79, 83}; the 'closing ranks'
494 of trans people in expectation of heightened oppression⁹⁴; increasing victimisation experienced by
495 ethnic minorities⁶⁰; the increase in disconnection and isolation felt by key workers⁶²; and the
496 disproportionate decline in quality and frequency of social relations felt by socioeconomically
497 marginalised peoples^{27, 43, 44, 54} and those of lower formal education levels⁷⁵.

498 Of particular interest due to their novel nature are the accounts that identify the intersection
499 between local culture and pandemic environment to create conditions of possibility for new
500 practices of interaction. Schröder et al.⁷⁶, upon their aforementioned theoretical model in which
501 cohesion arises in a space of latency from an underlying milieu of social relations, noted that in
502 Germany these practices took different forms in different geo-cultural regions. These authors held
503 the distribution of socioeconomic resources and values to be of special importance. Villalonga-Olives
504 et al.⁹⁰ described a 'bounded solidarity' on the island of Menorca in which there was an increase in
505 solidarity and support in the communities of the island but a tension between mistrust of outsiders
506 as potential carriers of disease and the reliance of the same outsiders to bring in capital to maintain
507 islanders' financial wellbeing.

508 **Critique**

509 The literature on social cohesion and the Covid-19 pandemic contains weaknesses. A large
510 proportion of these limitations are a function of the already well-documented issues with the social
511 cohesion concept. The broad diversity of definitions and constructions of social cohesion have long

512 been the subject of discussion and appear to be no closer to a resolution^{7, 8, 106}. In respect of the
513 literature under analysis here, this means that there is such a spread of versions of social cohesion in
514 circulation that its explanatory power is weakened and it is difficult to make stable comparisons
515 across the body of knowledge. In general, Bernard's³³ well-quoted observation remains apt: social
516 cohesion is a "quasi-concept", amenable to the imprinting of any political-ideological or discipline-
517 bound framework within which those using it are working. The presence of such diversity within
518 social cohesion and its value-laden nature necessitates explicit theoretical engagement and clear
519 justification of choice for the version of the concept being deployed. With some notable exceptions
520 (e.g.^{76, 83}), this work is not – beyond an acknowledgement of diversity – undertaken with detailed
521 attention in the literature reviewed here. As such, social cohesion does not carry as much
522 explanatory strength in analyses of the conditions of the pandemic as it might: a model built without
523 full attention to theoretical foundations leaves its conclusions open to concomitant critique.

524 In this body of literature, social cohesion is, as mentioned, situated among a group of concepts
525 clustered around a set of behaviours, orientations and situations. Social cohesion is frequently not
526 precisely defined or distinguished from those concepts adjacent to it. This is especially true in
527 respect of social capital where the two are often treated as synonymous (e.g.^{77, 89}) or where social
528 capital is used as a proxy for social cohesion without a detailed justification (e.g.^{93, 57}). There is also
529 frequent unacknowledged definitional imprecision across social cohesion and 'solidarity' (e.g.^{49, 66}),
530 engagement with democratic processes (e.g.⁵¹), the social contract (e.g.^{44, 73}) and activity in the civic
531 space (e.g.^{99, 100}). Where these concepts are not defined and differentiated with care and clarity,
532 analyses become unclear as to the networks of cause and effect being invoked and, again,
533 explanatory power is impeded.

534 It is possible that a large portion of the imprecision across social cohesion, social capital and civic
535 engagement is a consequence of the reliance on Putnam's^{18, 19} framework. This model, nominally of
536 social capital, incorporates several diverse elements. It situates social cohesion in part as a product

537 of interpersonal connections and individuals' access to resources (finance, support etc.); a notion
538 present in other constructions of social capital^{16, 17}. It also, however, measures political and civic
539 engagement and uses whole groups as the units of analysis – practices which might sit more
540 comfortably under the social cohesion banner. This may invite conflation of these concepts. The
541 frequent use of Putnam's framework also means that the body of knowledge focusing on social
542 cohesion during the pandemic is heavily skewed toward a cluster of constructions of social cohesion
543 kept inside its boundaries: at the local/neighbourhood level, contingent on its specific set of
544 indicators and its knowledge produced by quantitative inquiry. One common consequence of this is
545 a self-fulfilling deficit-orientation by which social cohesion is held to be reliant on face-to-face
546 interpersonal interaction and trust, is measured quantitatively with models designed for normal
547 conditions in the context of stay-at-home and physical distancing requirements, and it is inevitably
548 concluded that there are problems for social cohesion as a result.

549 An over-reliance on quantitative models is accompanied by an over-reliance on old established
550 measures of social cohesion from self-report survey data to impede the quality of knowledge in the
551 area. Although the complexity and local specificity of social relationships and the unprecedented
552 nature of the pandemic environment are well recognised, the measurement of social cohesion using,
553 for example, Likert scales with five or fewer items – sometimes one alone – is common and is
554 unlikely to be sufficient to describe the complexity of the relationships across groups and the
555 populations under scrutiny in novel circumstances. One such frequently deployed tool is
556 Sampson's¹⁰⁷ scale. This was devised in 1997 to measure disorder and collective efficacy in the
557 suburbs of Chicago and measures a number of perceptions of the neighbourhood on a 5-item Likert
558 scale. Also common practice is to ask a single question on perceptions of other's trustworthiness.
559 Aside from the potential problems with validity in the novel pandemic context, the problems with
560 making firm conclusions on self-report data of this kind are well-documented (e.g.¹⁰⁸). Even when
561 cultural specificity and the newness of the pandemic environment is explicitly acknowledged, the

562 complexity and diversity of social relations are recognised, and the ongoing issues with the social
563 cohesion concept engaged with, some still fall back on such limited manners of measurement⁷⁶.

564 At the other end of the spectrum, there are some models which appear to be so large and all-
565 encompassing that social cohesion becomes the basic determinant of almost all psycho-social life
566 and culture. For example, Godara et al.'s¹⁰³ construction includes social connections (capital),
567 interaction, inclusion, civic engagement, identity, social structures, norms and values, loyalty,
568 solidarity, human rights, trust, conflict management, equality and order; across micro, meso and
569 macro levels; involves both structures and groups of various sizes; and includes vertical and
570 horizontal relationships. Scholarship of this kind creates a version of social cohesion that becomes
571 overly mechanistic, un-attentive to local difference; while at the same time too large to make work
572 within the limits of the capacities of knowledge-production apparatus. Its broadness also, again,
573 weakens its explanatory power, such that Schröder et al.⁷⁶ warn that the concept is in danger of
574 becoming an “empty signifier”. There may be a sweet spot between reductionism, expansionism and
575 the particular that few in this body of knowledge have managed to achieve, though there are some
576 notable examples, predominantly using qualitative or mixed-methods (e.g.^{27, 60, 83, 90}).

577 Two further problems with the literature reviewed here are also noted by commentators on the
578 social cohesion literature more generally. The first, in relation to the quantitative work, and
579 described previously by Janmaat¹⁰⁹ and Green and Janmaat¹¹⁰, is that the indicators contained within
580 commonly deployed constructions of cohesion frequently do not co-vary (e.g.⁸⁰). This calls into
581 question the validity of the construction of a concept which aims to provide a single coherent
582 explanation – or independent variable – for social life. The second is that there is some ethical
583 concern with works^{69, 72} that apply closed-ended quantitative approaches to identify ways in which
584 social cohesion may be driving higher rates of sickness and death from Covid-19 in marginalised
585 populations and minorities. As has been pointed out elsewhere¹¹¹, this comes with the danger of
586 blaming the victims of structural violence for its effects.

587 A final comment here relates to the quality of data regarding Covid-19 outcomes. Such was the
588 speed at which the pandemic achieved great size, the data collection infrastructures were
589 overwhelmed, and the quality of data describing its effects are not currently of a quality most would
590 hope to have. This means that commentaries on effects on population health outcomes, especially
591 those relying on quantitative data, should be treated with caution until better data is produced. This
592 effect is most prominent in those commentaries undertaken early in the pandemic when the quality
593 of data was at its worst. Furthermore, a number of those accounts authored in the early stages of
594 the pandemic may have produced different conclusions if they were undertaken with a longer
595 period of experience, evidence and context from which to draw.

596 **Discussion and Conclusions**

597 Social factors have undoubtedly influenced the course and experiences of the Covid-19 pandemic.
598 One important set of social factors is relationships – within and across societies. Social cohesion is a
599 concept which might provide a useful tool in analysing and understanding the way relationships
600 have operated and changed in the context of the pandemic. There is a body of literature which has
601 made use of social cohesion and related concepts in this way. These use a range of constructions of
602 social cohesion. This review categorised them into the following broad groups:

- 603 1. Those considering it a product of interpersonal relationships
- 604 2. Those claiming a reliance on sameness
- 605 3. Social cohesion as collective action and/or acting for the benefit of the collective
- 606 4. The accumulation of individual subjective perceptions or emotions relating to togetherness
- 607 5. The operation of structures of governance
- 608 6. Locally and/or culturally specific arrangements
- 609 7. Hybrid models

610 Some commentary centres on the effects of social cohesion on other objects or processes of interest
611 and some on social cohesion itself during the pandemic. Of the former group, the following broad
612 themes are present:

- 613 1. Cohesive groups or societies are generally said to see lower burdens of ill-health during the
614 pandemic, depending on how social cohesion is constructed and the population under study.
- 615 2. Cohesive groups or societies are generally said to engage in better health-related practices
616 in the context of Covid-19, though there are some tensions identified between the
617 requirements of the larger collective and smaller groups.
- 618 3. Social cohesion is said to be a resource for resilience, emotional wellbeing and protection
619 against clinically diagnosable mental states during the pandemic.
- 620 4. There are indications of an emergence of novel social groupings in relation to the demands
621 of the pandemic and related policy and evidence of in-group / out-group dynamics.

622 Of the latter group, the following themes are present:

- 623 1. Changes to social cohesion claimed during the pandemic depend on the way it is constructed
624 and the group(s) under investigation. Changes are distributed and experienced unequally.
- 625 2. There was a 'rally round the flag' moment early in the pandemic where many populations
626 exhibited higher social cohesion by many different appraisals. This gave way to a return to
627 type – or worse – toward the end of 2020.
- 628 3. Government policy prior to and during the pandemic has been of real importance to the
629 operation of social cohesion ongoing.
- 630 4. There have been significant and fundamental changes to the practices around interpersonal
631 relationships. These changes have not been distributed equally across populations.

632 Problems identified in the literature by and large reflect the wider and well-documented issues with
633 the social cohesion concept and the diversity of forms it takes^{33, 35, 106}. This makes comparison across
634 the literature and the development of coherent thematic structures somewhat problematic. There is

635 an over-reliance on long-established quantitative tools of measurement which are likely not entirely
636 appropriate for such a new and complex situation. One of the major issues in this respect is the
637 reduction of a complex and diverse arrangement of culturally-bound relationships to a limited
638 number of closed-ended quantitative measures. There is a need for more detailed and in-depth
639 theoretical and qualitative work and a focus on population groups of different sizes.

640 Much of what has been reported on here aligns with previous relevant scholarship on social
641 cohesion. Interrelationships between social cohesion and health have been studied extensively,
642 usually suggesting a positive association and a health promoting effect (e.g.^{36, 112}). The importance of
643 social cohesion in preparing for and responding to times of difficulty effectively has also been the
644 topic of extensive scholarship, including violent conflict¹¹³, significant social change¹¹⁴, natural
645 disasters^{115, 116} and pandemics^{117, 118}. Moreover, the transmission of social cohesion to individual
646 psychological and emotional resilience against distress is well studied (e.g.¹¹⁹) The situation-specific
647 forms of bonding, collective action and support in response to moments of increased need (the
648 “rally round the flag” effect²⁷) has also been studied previously under the banner of social cohesion
649 (e.g. ‘emergent social cohesion’¹²⁰), such that scholars early in the Covid-19 pandemic engaged in
650 hurried efforts to set out how this effect might be promoted and harnessed¹²¹.

651 However, some new knowledge has been produced by this literature. Obviously, some of this is in
652 relation to Covid-19 itself which is, of course, itself new; but there has also been novel insight and
653 development of existing ideas on how social cohesion may be conceptualised, its operation and
654 important considerations therein. A good portion of the more notable insights are raised by
655 qualitative work, which is well-represented in the body of work reviewed here and which is
656 uncharacteristic of social cohesion scholarship in general. One of the more significant directions
657 taken up by the literature dealing with social cohesion and the Covid-19 pandemic is the
658 acknowledgement of a diversity of potentialities for social cohesion. These included the new
659 arrangements of identities, group membership, relationships and manners of interaction demanded

660 by the pandemic environment and policy responses^{63, 64, 73, 102}. Positions maintaining that distinct
661 locally and culturally bound arrangements of cohesion exist were also forwarded, taking up Green
662 and Janmaat's¹¹⁰ until now somewhat neglected invitation^{76, 90, 99}. Commentaries also extended the
663 understanding of the temporal nature of certain expressions of cohesion^{27, 44, 60}.

664 Another area of interest where significant new ground was broken was the place of information and
665 communication technology in the functioning of social relationships and therefore social cohesion,
666 an area identified as neglected by Bayliss et al.⁹ in their 2019 review. Commentaries highlighted the
667 importance of communications technology (and, of course, having possession of it and necessary
668 skills to make use of it) for maintaining relationships over distance and therefore for the
669 strengthening of cohesion^{68, 83}; and thus by implication calling into question the usefulness of
670 constructions of the concept which rely on face-to-face interaction. Also, importantly, scholarship
671 drew attention to the technologically mediated processes of in/out group formation and political
672 polarisation^{54, 95, 98}.

673 This review has several limitations. Firstly, although as broad a net as possible was cast intentionally,
674 the knowledge being produced is bounded by the limits of the search terms deployed. There are, for
675 example, relevant literatures dealing with social capital (and not mentioning cohesion), *communitas*,
676 'tight and loose' cultures and more that are not captured by the singular focus on social cohesion.
677 Secondly, there are likely relevant works which were not held by any of the three libraries searched
678 here and which have thus been omitted. Thirdly, as has been suggested in the findings section,
679 during the period from which literature was obtained the situation and knowledge on it developed –
680 and in many cases misunderstandings and errors were corrected – at great pace. This means that
681 those published earlier in the pandemic did not have the benefit of the developments, context,
682 corrections and hindsight that those published later did. This means that the knowledge being
683 produced here is, at least in part, also subject to this issue. Fourthly, related to the third, data quality
684 relating to Covid-19 (especially on morbidity and mortality and, again, especially from early in the

685 pandemic) is still not of the standard one would wish to have to make robust claims. Finally, the
686 great diversity of forms and manners in which social cohesion has been conceptualised, constructed
687 and measured means that it is frequently difficult and problematic to make broad and sweeping
688 statements on the body of literature. Indeed, as is common across social cohesion literatures, much
689 of the scholarship uses similar nomenclature but is commenting upon and measuring a surprisingly
690 diverse range of phenomena, experiences and subjectivities.

691 **Future Directions**

692 Based on the above review and critique, there are a number of areas where future research may be
693 focused to improve the body of knowledge. Firstly, there is a need for more engagement with theory
694 within the social cohesion concept to sharpen it and make it more useful to understand the Covid-19
695 pandemic. There are some promising beginnings offered by those such as Schröder et al.⁷⁶ which can
696 be developed and put to use in developing the social cohesion concept itself, its components and
697 ways of measurement that may aid a more complete understanding of the social world and its
698 relationship with health. This will aid in ending an over-reliance on the more limited measures
699 discussed. Following this, there is a need for more qualitative research in order to generate new
700 knowledge on the way social cohesion may be understood and may operate in the context of Covid-
701 19. Existing works such as that from Morgan et al.⁸³ are an indication of the usefulness of detailed
702 and in-depth qualitative work for understanding the unprecedented social conditions and
703 relationships operating during the pandemic, and for the opportunity to develop the quantitative
704 frameworks toward greater depth of understanding. Work in both of these arenas will assist both in
705 improving the social cohesion concept and the social cohesion scholarship on the Covid-19 pandemic
706 in relation to cultural specificity. The importance of this line of inquiry has been noted by Green and
707 Janmaat¹¹⁰ for social cohesion generally and by Schröder et al.⁷⁶ on the specific topic dealt with in
708 this review, but work of this nature remains thin on the ground.

709 The literature in this body of work so far contains an over-representation of analyses conducted at
710 the neighbourhood level. More work is needed to understand the operation of societies at the
711 national level – the ongoing work conducted by Abrams and colleagues⁵⁹⁻⁶² in the UK offer a good
712 example of the value of such scholarship. There is also room for more analysis at the small-group
713 level: only two works in the literature reviewed here attended to this^{48, 65}. The operation of
714 information and communication technology in respect of social cohesion also represents a promising
715 avenue for future research offered by the work reviewed.

716

717 **Acknowledgements**

718 Thanks are due to Drs. Peter Adams, Bruce Cohen and Peter Saxton for feedback, advice and editing
719 of drafts

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727 References

- 728 1. Cameron E, Nuzzo JB, Bell J. GHS Index. John Hopkins, Bloomberg School of Public Health;
729 2019.
- 730 2. Roser M, Ortez-Ospina E. Coronavirus Pandemic: OurWorldinData; 2022 [cited 2023 03/02].
731 Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus#explore-the-global-situation>
- 732 3. Gupta A, Banerjee S, Das S. Significance of geographical factors to the COVID-19 outbreak in
733 India. *Modeling Earth Systems and Environment*. 2020;6(4):2645-53.
- 734 4. Chua AQ, Al Knawy B, Grant B, Legido-Quigley H, Lee W-C, Leung GM, et al. How the lessons
735 of previous epidemics helped successful countries fight covid-19. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n486.
- 736 5. Whittimore PB. COVID-19 fatalities, latitude, sunlight, and vitamin D. *American Journal of*
737 *Infection Control*. 2020;48(9):1042-4.
- 738 6. Garikipati S, Kambhampati U. Leading the Fight Against the Pandemic: Does Gender Really
739 Matter? *Feminist Economics*. 2021;27(1-2):401-18.
- 740 7. Fonseca X, Lukosch S, Brazier F. Social cohesion revisited: a new definition and how to
741 characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*. 2019;32(2):231-53.
- 742 8. Schiefer D, van der Noll J. The Essentials of Social Cohesion: A Literature Review. *Social*
743 *Indicators Research*. 2017;132(2):579-603.
- 744 9. Bayliss I, Beider H, Hardy M. Cohesive Societies Literature Review. 2019.
- 745 10. Durkheim E. *Suicide, A Study in Sociology*. London: Routledge; 1996 [1897].
- 746 11. Tönnies F. *Community and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001
747 [1887].
- 748 12. Le Bon G. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York: MacMillan; 1896.
- 749 13. Lewin K. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper; 1951.
- 750 14. Parsons T. *The Social System*. London, UK: Routledge; 2013 [1951].
- 751 15. Lockwood D. Social Integration and System Integration. In: Zollschan G, editor. *Social*
752 *Change: Explorations, Diagnoses and Conjectures*. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1964.
- 753 16. Bourdieu P. The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson J, editor. *Handbook of theory and research*
754 *for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press; 1986.
- 755 17. Coleman JS. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*.
756 1988;94:S95-S120.
- 757 18. Putnam R, Leonardi R, Nanetti R. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*.
758 Chichester, West Sussex: Princepton University Press; 1993.
- 759 19. Putnam R. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York:
760 Simon and Schuster; 2000.
- 761 20. Putnam R. 'E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century – the
762 2006 Johan Skytte
- 763 Prize Lecture'. *Scandinavian Political Studies*. 2007;30(2):137-74.
- 764 21. Council of Europe. *Revised Strategy for Social Cohesion*. Strasbourg: European Committee
765 for Social Cohesion; 2004.
- 766 22. European Commission. *Investing in Europe's future: Fifth report on economic, social and*
767 *territorial cohesion*. Brussels: European Commission; 2010.
- 768 23. European Commission. *Report from the commission to the european parliament, the*
769 *council, the european economic and social committee and the committee of the regions* Brussels:
770 European Commission; 2013.
- 771 24. European Commission. *Cohesion in Europe towards 2050: Eighth report on economic,*
772 *social and territorial cohesion*. Brussels: European Commission; 2022.
- 773 25. Markus A. *mapping social cohesion*. Victoria, Australia: The Scanlon Institute; 2013.
- 774 26. Markus A. *Mapping Social Cohesion: Launching the National Social Cohesion Index,*
775 *Incorporating the Scanlon Monash Index*. The Scanlon Institute; 2021.

- 776 27. Academy B. THE COVID DECADE Understanding the long-term societal impacts of COVID-19.
777 London: The British Academy; 2021.
- 778 28. Jenson J. Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research. Ottawa: Canadian Policy
779 Research Networks; 1998.
- 780 29. Beauvais C, Jenson J. Social Cohesion: Updating the State of the Research. Ottawa: Canadian
781 Policy Research Network; 2002.
- 782 30. Jenson J. Defining and Measuring Social Cohesion. Vol. 1. London: Commonwealth
783 Secretariat; 2010.
- 784 31. Ritzen J, Easterly W, Woolcock M. On "Good" Politicians and "Bad" Policies: Social Cohesion,
785 Institutions and Growth. The World Bank Office of the Vice President Development Policy and
786 Development Research Group Macroeconomics and Growth; 2000.
- 787 32. Stanley D. What Do We Know about Social Cohesion: The Research Perspective of the
788 Federal Government's Social Cohesion Research Network. The Canadian Journal of Sociology /
789 Cahiers canadiens de sociologie. 2003;28:5-17.
- 790 33. Bernard P. La Cohesion Sociale: critique dialectique d'un quasi-concept. Lien sociale et
791 politiques. 1999;41:47-59.
- 792 34. Larsen C. The Rise and Fall of Social Cohesion: The Construction and Deconstruction of Social
793 Trust in the US, Sweden and Denmark. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013.
- 794 35. Cheong PH, Edwards R, Goulbourne H, Solomos J. Immigration, social cohesion and social
795 capital: A critical review. Critical Social Policy. 2007;27(1):24-49.
- 796 36. Kawachi I, Berkman L. Social Cohesion, Social Capital, and Health. In: Kawachi I, Berkman L,
797 editors. Social Epidemiology. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014. p. 174-90.
- 798 37. Rolfe R. Social Cohesion and Community Resilience: A Multi-Disciplinary Review of Literature
799 for Rural Health Research. Nova Scotia, Canada: The Rural Centre for Atlantic Canada; 2006.
- 800 38. Whitemore R, Knafk K. The integrative review: updated methodology. Journal of advanced
801 nursing. 2005;52(5):546-53.
- 802 39. Dayrit MM, Mendoza RU. Social cohesion vs COVID-19. International Journal of Health
803 Governance. 2020;25(3):191-203.
- 804 40. Elcheroth G, Drury J. Collective resilience in times of crisis: Lessons from the literature for
805 socially effective responses to the pandemic. The British journal of social psychology.
806 2020;59(3):703-13.
- 807 41. Ellerich-Groppe N, Pfaller L, Schweda M. Young for old-old for young? Ethical perspectives
808 on intergenerational solidarity and responsibility in public discourses on COVID-19. European journal
809 of ageing. 2021;18(2):159-71.
- 810 42. Lima de Miranda K, Snower DJ. The societal responses to COVID-19: Evidence from the G7
811 countries. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.
812 2022;119(25):e2117155119.
- 813 43. Muldoon OT, Liu JH, McHugh C. The Political Psychology of COVID-19. Political psychology.
814 2021;42(5):715-28.
- 815 44. Razavi S, Behrendt C, Bierbaum M, Orton I, Tessier L. Reinvigorating the social contract and
816 strengthening social cohesion: Social protection responses to COVID-19. International Social Security
817 Review. 2020;73(3):55-80.
- 818 45. Sadeghmoghadam L, Khakhki MK, Saadati N. Can social cohesion improve the resilience of
819 individuals and health providers during the COVID-19 quarantine? Evidence Based Care Journal.
820 2020;10(3):64-5.
- 821 46. Akin Ocak P, Erhan Ç. A Litmus Test for the EU's Longest Year: Solidarity Principle and
822 Challenges by COVID-19 in 2020. Uluslararası İlişkiler / International Relations. 2021;18(71):21-43.
- 823 47. Elgar FJ, Stefaniak A, Wohl MJA. The trouble with trust: Time-series analysis of social capital,
824 income inequality, and COVID-19 deaths in 84 countries. Social science & medicine (1982).
825 2020;263:113365.

- 826 48. Nahkur O, Kutsar D. The change in children's subjective relational social cohesion with family
827 and friends during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multinational analysis. *Frontiers in sociology*.
828 2022;7:974543.
- 829 49. Hangel N, Schönweitz F, McLennan S, Fiske A, Zimmermann BM, Buyx A. Solidaristic behavior
830 and its limits: A qualitative study about German and Swiss residents' behaviors towards public health
831 measures during COVID-19 lockdown in April 2020. *SSM Qualitative research in health*.
832 2022;2:100051.
- 833 50. Zimmermann BM, Fiske A, McLennan S, Sierawska A, Hangel N, Buyx A. Motivations and
834 Limits for COVID-19 Policy Compliance in Germany and Switzerland. *International journal of health
835 policy and management*. 2021.
- 836 51. Rose SM, Pattera M, Isaac C, Bell J, Stucke A, Hagens A, et al. Analysing COVID-19 outcomes
837 in the context of the 2019 Global Health Security (GHS) Index. *BMJ Global Health*.
838 2021;6(12):e007581.
- 839 52. World Health Organization. Overview of public health and social measures in the context of
840 COVID-19 Interim guidance. World Health Organization; 2020.
- 841 53. Chan EYY, Gobat N, Dubois C, Bedson J, de Almeida JR. Bottom-up citizen engagement for
842 health emergency and disaster risk management: directions since COVID-19. *The Lancet*.
843 2021;398(10296):194-6.
- 844 54. Bisiada M. Discourse and Social Cohesion in and After the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Media and
845 Communication*. 2022;10(2):204-13.
- 846 55. Burton A, McKinlay A, Dawes J, Roberts A, Fynn W, May T, et al. Understanding Barriers and
847 Facilitators to Compliance with UK Social Distancing Guidelines during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A
848 Qualitative Interview Study. *Behaviour Change*. 2022.
- 849 56. Gallagher S, Howard S, Muldoon O, Whittaker AC. Social cohesion and loneliness are
850 associated with the antibody response to COVID-19 vaccination. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*.
851 2022;103:179-85.
- 852 57. Bécares L, Shaw RJ, Katikireddi SV, Irizar P, Amele S, Kapadia D, et al. Racism as the
853 fundamental cause of ethnic inequities in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: A theoretical framework and
854 empirical exploration using the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *SSM - Population Health*. 2022;19.
- 855 58. Borkowska M, Laurence J. Coming together or coming apart? Changes in social cohesion
856 during the Covid-19 pandemic in England. *European Societies*. 2021;23(S1):S618-S36.
- 857 59. Abrams D, Lalot F. Community, Connection and Cohesion During COVID-19: Beyond Us and
858 Them Report. 2021.
- 859 60. Abrams D, Lalot F, Broadwood J, Hayon K, Dixon A. Beyond Us and Them - Societal Cohesion
860 in Britain Through Eighteen Months of COVID-19. 2021.
- 861 61. Abrams D, Lalot F, Broadwood J, Platts-Dunn I. Beyond Us and Them Perception of Covid-19
862 and Social Cohesion. 2020.
- 863 62. Abrams D, Lalot F, Broadwood J, Platts-Dunn I. All in it, but not necessarily together:
864 Divergent experiences of keyworker and volunteer responders to the Covid-19 pandemic. 2020.
- 865 63. Schneiders ML, Mackworth-Young CRS, Cheah PY. Between division and connection: a
866 qualitative study of the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on social relationships in the United
867 Kingdom. *Wellcome open research*. 2022;7:6.
- 868 64. Gardner M, Webber DJ, Parry G, Bradley P. COVID-19: How community businesses in
869 England struggled to respond to their communities' needs. *Local Economy*. 2021;36(6):524-40.
- 870 65. Lalot F, Abrams D, Broadwood J, Davies Hayon K, Platts-Dunn I. The social cohesion
871 investment: Communities that invested in integration programmes are showing greater social
872 cohesion in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of community & applied social psychology*.
873 2022;32(3):536-54.
- 874 66. Garber L, Vinetz JM. Transmission-Blocking Preventive Measures for Infectious Diseases:
875 Altruism, Solidarity, and the Common Good. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*.
876 2021;104(5):1609-10.

- 877 67. Robinette JW, Bostean G, Glynn LM, Douglas JA, Jenkins BN, Gruenewald TL, et al. Perceived
878 neighborhood cohesion buffers COVID-19 impacts on mental health in a United States sample. *Social*
879 *Science and Medicine*. 2021;285.
- 880 68. Perez-Brumer A, Balasa R, Doshi A, Brogdon J, Doan T, Oldenburg CE. COVID-19 Related
881 Shifts in Social Interaction, Connection, and Cohesion Impact Psychosocial Health: Longitudinal
882 Qualitative Findings from COVID-19 Treatment Trial Engaged Participants. *International journal of*
883 *environmental research and public health*. 2022;19(16).
- 884 69. Ransome Y, Ojikutu BO, Buchanan M, Johnston D, Kawachi I. Neighborhood Social Cohesion
885 and Inequalities in COVID-19 Diagnosis Rates by Area-Level Black/African American Racial
886 Composition. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*.
887 2021;98(2):222-32.
- 888 70. Fraser T, Aldrich DP, Page-Tan C. Bowling alone or distancing together? The role of social
889 capital in excess death rates from COVID19. *Social science & medicine (1982)*. 2021;284:114241.
- 890 71. Cheng TC, Lo CC. Older Adults' Preventive Behaviors During COVID-19 Outbreak: Application
891 of Multiple Disadvantage Model. *Journal of prevention (2022)*. 2022;43(4):499-511.
- 892 72. Thomas LJ, Huang P, Yin F, Xu J, Almquist ZW, Hipp JR, et al. Geographical patterns of social
893 cohesion drive disparities in early COVID infection hazard. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
894 *Sciences of the United States of America*. 2022;119(12):e2121675119.
- 895 73. Collischon M, Patzina A. COVID-19 and Gender Differences in Social Trust: Causal Evidence
896 from the First Wave of the Pandemic. *Socius : sociological research for a dynamic world*.
897 2022;8:23780231221117910.
- 898 74. Silveira S, Hecht M, Matthaeus H, Adli M, Voelkle MC, Singer T. Coping with the COVID-19
899 Pandemic: Perceived Changes in Psychological Vulnerability, Resilience and Social Cohesion before,
900 during and after Lockdown. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.
901 2022;19(6).
- 902 75. Burrmann U, Mutz M, Sielschott S, Braun S. Social Capital Trends in Germany in the Face of
903 the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Research Note. *Frontiers in Political Science*. 2022;4.
- 904 76. Schröder T, Speer A, Sachweh P, Groh-Samberg O. Trust and compliance: Milieu-specific
905 differences in social cohesion during the COVID-19 pandemic in Germany. *Frontiers in sociology*.
906 2022;7.
- 907 77. Healey SJR, Ghafournia N, Massey PD, Andrich K, Harrison J, Taylor K, et al. Factors
908 contributing to the sharing of COVID-19 health information amongst refugee communities in a
909 regional area of Australia: a qualitative study. *BMC public health*. 2022;22(1):1434.
- 910 78. O'Donnell J, Cárdenas D, Orazani N, Evans A, Reynolds KJ. The longitudinal effect of COVID-
911 19 infections and lockdown on mental health and the protective effect of neighbourhood social
912 relations. *Social science & medicine (1982)*. 2022;297:114821.
- 913 79. Campbell N, Thompson SC, Tynan A, Townsin L, Booker LA, Argus G. Silver Linings Reported
914 by Australians Experiencing Public Health Restrictions during the First Phase of the COVID-19
915 Pandemic: A Qualitative Report. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.
916 2021;18(21).
- 917 80. Cárdenas D, Orazani N, Stevens M, Cruwys T, Platow M, Zekulin M, et al. United We Stand,
918 Divided We Fall: Sociopolitical Predictors of Physical Distancing and Hand Hygiene During the COVID-
919 19 Pandemic. *Political psychology*. 2021;42(5):845-61.
- 920 81. Ergler C, Huish R, Georgeou N, Simons J, Eyles O, Li Y, et al. COVID-19 stigma in New Zealand:
921 Are we really a 'team' of five million? *New Zealand Geographer*. 2021;77(3):174-9.
- 922 82. Lay-Yee R, Campbell D, Milne B. Social attitudes and activities associated with loneliness:
923 Findings from a New Zealand national survey of the adult population. *Health & social care in the*
924 *community*. 2022;30(3):1120-32.
- 925 83. Morgan T, Koh A, Black S, Fanueli E, Moeke-Maxwell T, Xu J, et al. How socially cohesive was
926 New Zealand's first lockdown period from the perspective of culturally diverse older New
927 Zealanders? *Kotuitui*. 2022;17(4):518-37.

- 928 84. Lewis N, Morgan J. Trouble with social cohesion: The geographies and politics of COVID-19 in
929 Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*. 2021;77(3):170-3.
- 930 85. Shokri A, Moradi G, Bolbanabad AM, Moradpour F, Younesi F, Ebrazeh A. Has COVID-19
931 Affected the Social Cohesion? *Iranian journal of public health*. 2022;51(2):476-8.
- 932 86. Ahmadi S, Jorjoran Shushtari Z, Shirazikhah M, Biglarian A, Irandoost SF, Paykani T, et al.
933 Social Determinants of Adherence to COVID-19 Preventive Guidelines in Iran: A Qualitative Study.
934 *Inquiry : a journal of medical care organization, provision and financing*. 2022;59:469580221084185.
- 935 87. Cloete A, North A, Ramlagan S, Schmidt T, Makola L, Chikovore J, et al. "... It is like it has
936 come up and stole our lives from us" The first 21 days: A rapid qualitative assessment of how
937 different sectors of society experienced the COVID-19 lockdown in South Africa. *Social sciences &*
938 *humanities open*. 2021;4(1):100167.
- 939 88. Metz T. What does an African ethic of social cohesion entail for social distancing? *Developing*
940 *world bioethics*. 2021;21(1):7-16.
- 941 89. Rela IZ, Ramli Z, Firihiu MZ, Widayati W, Awang AH, Nasaruddin N. COVID-19 Risk
942 Management and Stakeholder Action Strategies: Conceptual Frameworks for Community Resilience
943 in the Context of Indonesia. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.
944 2022;19(15).
- 945 90. Villalonga-Olives E, Kawachi I, Hernández-Aguado I. Social Capital during the First Wave of
946 the COVID-19 Outbreak: The Case of the Island of Menorca. *International journal of environmental*
947 *research and public health*. 2021;18(23).
- 948 91. Miao J, Zeng D, Shi Z. Can neighborhoods protect residents from mental distress during the
949 COVID-19 pandemic? Evidence from Wuhan. *Chinese Sociological Review*. 2021;53(1):1-26.
- 950 92. Best LA, Law MA, Roach S, Wilbiks JMP. The psychological impact of COVID-19 in Canada:
951 Effects of social isolation during the initial response. *Canadian Psychology*. 2021;62(1):143-54.
- 952 93. Carter ED, Cordero ML. Salir Adelante: Social capital and resilience during the Covid-19
953 pandemic in Argentina. *Health Place*. 2022;x77:102870.
- 954 94. Garcia-Rabines D, Bencich B. Community-Based Resistance Strategies among a Group of
955 Trans Women in Lima, Peru during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of homosexuality*.
956 2021;68(4):663-72.
- 957 95. Schuessler J, Dinesen PT, Østergaard SD, Sønderskov KM. Public support for unequal
958 treatment of unvaccinated citizens: Evidence from Denmark. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2022;305.
- 959 96. Corvo E, De Caro W. COVID-19 and spontaneous singing to decrease loneliness, improve
960 cohesion, and mental well-being: An Italian experience. *Psychological trauma : theory, research,*
961 *practice and policy*. 2020;12(S1):S247-s8.
- 962 97. Strupat C. Social Protection and Social Cohesion in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic:
963 Evidence from Kenya. *The European journal of development research*. 2022;34(3):1320-57.
- 964 98. Jarynowski A, Semenov A, Wójta-Kempa M, Belik V. Social Cohesion During the Stay-at-
965 Home Phase of the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Polish-Speaking Twitter. 2021. p. 361-
966 70.
- 967 99. Saghin D, Lupchian MM, Luceș D. Social Cohesion and Community Resilience during the
968 COVID-19 Pandemic in Northern Romania. *International journal of environmental research and*
969 *public health*. 2022;19(8).
- 970 100. Machida M, Kikuchi H, Kojima T, Nakamura I, Saito R, Nakaya T, et al. Individual-level social
971 capital and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Japan: a cross-sectional study. *Human vaccines &*
972 *immunotherapeutics*. 2022:1-7.
- 973 101. Chiu R. Functions of Music Making Under Lockdown: A Trans-Historical Perspective Across
974 Two Pandemics. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2020;11:616499.
- 975 102. Abrams D, Lalot F, Hogg MA. Intergroup and intragroup dimensions of COVID-19: A social
976 identity perspective on social fragmentation and unity. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*.
977 2021;24(2):201-9.

- 978 103. Godara M, Silveira S, Matthäus H, Singer T. The Wither or Thrive Model of Resilience: an
979 Integrative Framework of Dynamic Vulnerability and Resilience in the Face of Repeated Stressors
980 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Adversity and resilience science*. 2022;1-22.
- 981 104. Bottoni G. A Multilevel Measurement Model of Social Cohesion. *Social Indicators Research*.
982 2018;136(3):835-57.
- 983 105. Spoonley P, Peace R, Butcher A, O'Neill D. Social cohesion: A policy and indicator framework
984 for assessing immigrant and host outcomes. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*. 2005;24(1):85-
985 110.
- 986 106. Chan J, To H-P, Chan E. Reconsidering Social Cohesion: Developing a Definition and Analytical
987 Framework for Empirical Research. *Social Indicators Research*. 2006;75(2):273-302.
- 988 107. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study
989 of collective efficacy. *Science (New York, NY)*. 1997;277(5328):918-24.
- 990 108. Brenner PS, DeLamater J. Lies, Damned Lies, and Survey Self-Reports? Identity as a Cause of
991 Measurement Bias. *Social psychology quarterly*. 2016;79(4):333-54.
- 992 109. Janmaat JG. Social Cohesion as a Real-life Phenomenon: Assessing the Explanatory Power of
993 the Universalist and Particularist Perspectives. *Social Indicators Research*. 2011;100(1):61-83.
- 994 110. Green A, Janmaat J. *Regimes of Social Cohesion: Societies and the Crisis of Globalisation*.
995 Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan; 2011.
- 996 111. Dobbernack J. *The Politics of Social Cohesion in Germany, France and the United Kingdom*.
997 Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series. Uberoi V, Meer N, Modood T, editors.
998 Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan; 2014.
- 999 112. Wilkinson R. Income inequality, social cohesion, and health: clarifying the theory—a reply to
1000 Muntaner and Lynch. In: *The Political Economy of Social Inequalities*. Routledge; 1999. p. 347-65.
- 1001 113. Gilligan MJ, Pasquale BJ, Samii C. Civil War and Social Cohesion: Lab-in-the-Field Evidence
1002 from Nepal. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2014;58(3):604-19.
- 1003 114. OECD. *Perspectives on Global Development 2012: Social Cohesion in a Shifting World*. Paris:
1004 OECD Development Centre; 2011.
- 1005 115. Townshend I, Awosoga O, Kulig J, Fan H. Social cohesion and resilience across communities
1006 that have experienced a disaster. *Natural Hazards*. 2015;76(2):913-38.
- 1007 116. Ludin SM, Rohaizat M, Arbon P. The association between social cohesion and community
1008 disaster resilience: A cross-sectional study. *Health & social care in the community*. 2019;27(3):621-
1009 31.
- 1010 117. Perrin PC, McCabe OL, Everly GS, Links JM. Preparing for an Influenza Pandemic: Mental
1011 Health Considerations. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*. 2009;24(3):223-30.
- 1012 118. Forsythe S. Infectious diseases: historical lessons for the age of AIDS. *AIDS analysis Africa*.
1013 1999;10(3):12-4.
- 1014 119. Williams AJ, Maguire K, Morrissey K, Taylor T, Wyatt K. Social cohesion, mental wellbeing
1015 and health-related quality of life among a cohort of social housing residents in Cornwall: a cross
1016 sectional study. *BMC public health*. 2020;20(1):985.
- 1017 120. Fan C, Jiang Y, Mostafavi A. Emergent social cohesion for coping with community disruptions
1018 in disasters. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*. 2020;17(164):20190778.
- 1019 121. Jewett RL, Mah SM, Howell N, Larsen MM. Social Cohesion and Community Resilience During
1020 COVID-19 and Pandemics: A Rapid Scoping Review to Inform the United Nations Research Roadmap
1021 for COVID-19 Recovery. *International journal of health services : planning, administration,*
1022 *evaluation*. 2021;51(3):325-36.

1023