
Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

Nirmal Chongbang 

Tribhuvan University (TU) Nepal

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Nirmal Chongbang, E-mail: nirech2005@gmail.com

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8164>

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ABSTRACT

Volume:

Issue:

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6743925

KEYWORDS

Disaster, vulnerability, social protection, social support, resilience.

Disasters have a multiplicity of effects on vulnerable populations, including women, children, and individuals with disabilities. This study attempts to explain the disaster management initiatives of Nepal especially in the highly earthquake affected communities of Gandaki province. It tries to ascertain the major local and social support practice with regard to disaster management in the disaster affected area. While testing the hypothesis that local social support increases the bounce-back capacity of disaster-affected households more than external support, An online (google) based survey was distributed to potential frontline workers and non-state representatives based on their project lead area. Respondents were randomly divided into two groups (local support and external support) and asked for supporting practices when a disaster occurs at a local level. Responses were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive and inferential analysis. The results demonstrated that local level support was superior to external support during disaster response. Study results suggested local household, neighborhood, and community level support was quick, applicable, and easier to adopt compared to external supporters. Based on the study, further development intervention should center on capacity strengthening of local households, neighbourhoods, community-based organizations, and local states rather than expecting external support.

1. Introduction

Local social support practices, particularly in low-income, marginalized, and targeted communities, can help to mitigate existing shocks and stresses. The local social support practices and social capital can be explained as social protection. It can reduce the existing and future risk in targeted communities. Local social support practices can be implemented from formal and informal modes which can be enforced formally through a legal frame and informally from differ programmatic package. It can guarantee individual access to economic or social support, whereas informal safety nets provide the likelihood of support to individuals to ensure they recover from shock and stress due to disaster or unfavorable situations. In the background setting, studies had explained that social support practices and disaster risk are separate phenomena. Paitoonpong et al. (2008) and their colleagues discussed existing social protection, its benefits, and potential future applications. Brown et al. (2018) have explained the disaster scenario, somehow trying to raise a voice to link it with social protection and future sensitive actions.

There were 460 incidents recorded in Gandaki province in the previous year (Incident (bipadportal.gov.np, 2020), but they could not be responded to quickly by the state and development partners due to remoteness, a lack of structural response mechanisms, and a lack of local readiness. Hence, this study attempts to explain the disaster management initiatives of Nepal especially in the highly earthquake affected communities of Gandaki province. This study will try to ascertain what are the major local and social support, how affected people assume the state role in provision of social support governance in terms of disaster response mechanisms, and why affected people not getting prompt support

in the disaster affected area? What are the underlying factors making disturbance to recovery action, and what link with social protection initiatives or provision from development partners and local authorities' major gaps in previous studies?

Local social support practices refer to the support which individuals can get from the government and public program which can support them generate assets such as employment, cash transfer to subsidies basic needs aftermath of any disaster. The study has tried to highlight major local supporting practices and how they have been contributing to capacity building in local communities and aid in recovery aftermath of any disaster. The study has assumed the local level of support from neighbors, community-based organizations, non-state actors, and state actors has facilitated scaled up the response capacity of disaster-affected communities.

Paitoonpong, et al. (2008) compare that social support practices have emerged more prominently since the financial crisis of South Asia. The authors claim that issues relating to social support practices especially the use and meaning of the social support practices term is still considerable confusing among scholars and national, and international organizations. The authors further outlined the different definitions of the term—particularly as it was used during the Asian Financial Crisis—and attempt to clarify its meaning and proper use. They explained that social protection began with structural adjustment programs related to the lending program, which is directly related to poverty alleviation, during the Asian Financial Crises.

Disaster bring about socio-economic losses and have higher impact on the poor and vulnerable due to their lower coping and preparedness capacities. Disaster losses can be reduced through better physical and socio-economic preparedness. Concern stakeholders can contribute to scaling up the capacity (response capacity) of poor and targeted communities through future forecasting, responding to existing shock stresses, changing socio-economic-ecological behavior patterns, and advocacy on local governance capacity of targeted communities. The local and social support practices can contribute to social and economic recovery aftermath of disaster strikes and provide the chance for the affected community to bounce back to a better condition as social protection from public and private engagement. Brown et al. (2018) explains how the natural disaster give rise to lose and damage and may affect subjective expectations about the prevalence and severity of future disasters. These expectations about the occurrence and severity of future disasters. These expectations might then in turn shape individuals' investment behaviors, potentially affecting their incomes in following years. As part of emerging literature on endogenous preferences, economists have begun studying the consequences that exposure to natural disasters has on risk attitudes, perceptions, and behavior. They explain further, that people in low-income countries are 12 times more likely to die from natural disasters and are similarly more likely to suffer serious economic consequences of disasters, even though high and low-income countries do not differ significantly either in terms of the number of disasters experienced in terms of the number of people affected.

When disaster occurs in any communities, it has huge negative consequence on environments and affect human society socio-economically. previous studies were based on disaster risk reduction, social protection, and social support practices separately, but a systematic study on community-driven disaster risk reduction and preparation through social support practices or social protection is still lacking.

This paper will try to find how the anticipated and well-practiced social protection or social support practices provision will deduct community risk aftermath of a disaster, and find out how humanitarian organization and the local authority has been engaged in social support practices in the targeted community in response and recovery intervention. This study will explore how social support mechanism has been inline in organizational and local authority policies, plan, and activities that support a risk reduction model in disaster-affected communities in the study area.

Literature Review

The social support theory originally begins with Cullen's in 1994 through the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. (Thoits, 1995 as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler, 2018). Cullen, Wright, and Chamlin (1999) as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler (2018) have elaborated on this concept by describing social support as the process of conveying human, cultural, material, and social capital between individuals or larger social units (communities, states) and their members.

In the beginning, Cullen argued that the notion of social support is threaded through many theories of crime and delinquency. Cullen distinguished between macro-level and interpersonal-level effects of social support, enhancing how the supportive initiatives had made formative relationships. Social support is commonly identified based on social resources and it made a difference when people supported to each-others in crises. Social support can be facilitated by a

Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

transformation of human, cultural, material, and social capital. Which can be interlinked with individuals and can be based on larger societal units with their dependent members.

Social support theory can be utilized in existing social assets within of community, which could be used as a social safety net while community members are in crisis. During the disaster preparedness, response, and recovery; the local social support can be utilized as a coping tool for disaster shocks and stress in the community. In communities' people can support each-other based on their available assets, exchange kind/cash and support their neighbors through their assets like food, medicine, cash, and kind during disaster response.

Over the last decades, local social support has become a crucial term in the development field, including government and even community development perspectives. Several governments, development partners, and local agencies have been working on enhancing local social support through different forms of intervention. Consider, for example, policies, programs, strategies, and intervention measures that seek to safeguard, lower risk, speed-up recovery from various shocks and stressors, particularly in poor, vulnerable, and targeted groups.

Asquith et al. (2001) claim the East Asia was hit by a major financial crisis in 1997, which resulted in negative growth in Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand, reversing decades of gains in poverty reduction. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) and other foreign financial institutions responded by providing emergency loans to protect social sector spending and expand safety nets. During this time, ADB's support for social protection increased from 1% to 12% of total financing, prompting the bank to embark on a three-year process to draught its first Social Protection Strategy (p.19). Srawooth at. al. (2008) explains the issues of social support practices have emerged more prominently since the financial crises. She explains further in social support practices as considerable Asian financial crises. Explained further; the safety net analogy is drawn from high-wire walkers who can be protected while they fall. The social support practices can be defined as social protection which can facilitate on emphasis private and public support mechanisms to the needful and vulnerable community, while the disaster strikes.

Many studies show the current implementation of local and social support practices during the disaster in the most affected countries provides learn lessons from countries that had not previously considered implementing local support and social protection programs until the COVID-19 crisis. The local support and social protection practices, policy guidelines, and intervention modalities should be focused on risk reduction in the current scenario and centered on future risk reduction. It showed that the local support and social support practices should become a key policy tool, especially in low-income communities and vulnerable households for instance; social recovery and support packages during the crises and aftermath of the pandemic.

The local, and social support practices can be executed for multi-purposes and should be more flexible and adaptable tools that the policymakers could use to enhance community resilience capacity to cope with various future shocks and stresses of communities. Azize et al. (2020) discuss the social protection programs, and local supporting practices have become a key tool for policymakers. Writers raised about the social protection programs executed to achieve multiple objectives such as fighting poverty and hunger and increasing the resilience of the poor and vulnerable groups towards various shocks. Recently, the rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, many countries started to implement social protection programs, and social support practices contributed into eliminate the negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis and enhancing community resilience. Edward (2011) compares the case of why social support and safety nets are important tools for managing the risk of natural hazards. The use of safety nets is advocated both ex-ante (pre), to prevent and mitigate the impact of natural disasters, and ex-post (post), to cope with the impacts of natural shocks. Firstly, these papers explore the implications of contextual factors to be considered in the design of an effective safety net system to respond to the needs generated by natural disasters.

It is difficult to define because every local and social support practice can be regarded as an anticipatory action that could reduce current and future risks to vulnerable communities' socioeconomic recovery. It is hard to define the link between local support practices and community resilience capacity, especially in disaster management. Longhurst et. al (2020) explains major two dominant frameworks guiding work in this area. First, the framework of Adaptive Social Supportive Protection (ASP) considers how links between disaster risk management, climate change adaptation (CCA), and social protection can reduce the impact of shocks and stressors on peoples' livelihoods and build resilience. Longhurst compare further with the concept of Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) provides a framework and typology for thinking through the different ways in which climate vulnerability assessment (CVA), long term crises management, and social protection (SP) can be linked through the categories of horizontal and vertical expansion, piggybacking, alignment, and design takes. In this paper, the author raised the debate about linking Climate Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) and Social Protection (SP) as part of the wider and long-running discussion about ways to link relief and development. A core problem

with this long debate has been that it tends to assume that stronger linkages are both right and achievable amongst different parties, assuming the right concept and technical solutions can be devised. But if this is the case, then the literature largely fails to explain why it has been so difficult to make happen in practice and tends to omit the

fundamental differences in principle, approach, and ways of working that have made linkages difficult among disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and linkage with local and social protection.

A core problem with this long debate has been the gap between local and social support practices, social protection, and disaster risk management. The disaster-affected community can be resilient when the anticipated action for risk reduction was being used as a disaster management tool. But in this case, the large-scale literature has failed to explain how local and social support initiatives and social support packages have been operated as disaster anticipation tools, or risk reduction tools in the study area.

Local-social support initiatives and social protection define an anticipative action that can contribute to future risk reduction and facilitate bounce back better capacity to the disaster-affected community. In her research of the interrelationship of social protection in Sri Lanka on disaster management via programs and policies, Wickramasinghe (2013) examines the substantial impact of the catastrophe on poor and affluent families. She claims that the frequency and severity of natural catastrophes in Sri Lanka have increased dramatically during the previous several decades. Natural catastrophes have resulted in personal, physical, financial, and environmental losses, as well as significant economic repercussions in Sri Lanka. She went on to say that the impact of natural catastrophes is not uniform throughout diverse groups of society. As a result, she sought to evaluate the level of protection offered by Sri Lanka's current social protection system and social support practices against natural disasters through the present study and identify any gaps in this assessment, and then offer appropriate recommendations to enhance the system moving forward. She went on to note that Sri Lanka's current social assistance and protection programs fall short of protecting those who are vulnerable to natural catastrophes. The current social protection programs have a very limited reach, and the system is unable to adequately address the needs of those who are catastrophe susceptible. The most striking aspect of the disaster risk management system is that it prioritizes rapid aid over helping families become less vulnerable to disasters.

In the background discussion, studies on how policymakers in countries establish and implement local and social protection policies are discussed. In the current circumstances, local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), development partners, and the local government attempt to address social protection and establish social assistance activities as a minimal service to the constrained community. As a result, it is critical to develop local social assistance initiatives and social protection measures to improve crisis management. Policymakers should consider how they can improve their future forecasting capacity, adapt to existing changes, cope with existing shocks and stresses, and take transformative action to strengthen local and social support practices in the community when developing disaster resilience plans and policies.

Community-based disaster risk reduction and preparation planning are still out of tune with local and social support practices, as well as disaster-response policies and strategies. Existing social support strategies and social protection programs are conspicuously silent when it comes to disaster preparedness and response. The present policy and planning process have gaps in bouncing back greater capability of communities in the targeted region with the help of local-social support and protection policies. Micro-level social protection and community bridging with social capital appear to be in short supply. The findings of this study can help to determine how local-social support practices and social protection systems can help to establish resilient communities in disaster-affected areas. Specifically, how development partners, INGOs, and local non-governmental organizations have allocated their humanitarian efforts.

Methodology

The research design is based on descriptive and explanatory. The study describes the local-social support, engaged in capacity building in the community aftermath of a disaster, how it has supported the bounce-back capacity of the community, and what could be more intensive engagement could scale up the capacities of disaster-affected communities. The research article attempts to determine how local, societal, and humanitarian activity affects response and recovery.

Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

The study has tested objectives by examining the relationships among variables. Methodology explores the relation between existing local and social support practices, social protection policies, plans, and practices in affected communities, and the supporting role of community organizations, development partners, and local authorities. The study has explored the subjectivist understanding of cause and effect between social support practices, humanitarian initiatives, state support, and building resilience status of the disaster-affected household. This research employed both qualitative and quantitative data. Primary data has been analyzed based on the cause and effect of local-social support practices and their impact on building the resilience capacity of the community.

Secondary information has been explained based on existing local-social support practices in the study area. Descriptive interpretations have been applied to data analysis, it could be contextual on practices of local-social support initiative and their overcome capacities.

Convenience sampling was used due to the limited researcher in the field. Most of the data collectors were from Gorkha and the Tanahun district of Gandaki province. Most of the informants were affected by the earthquake in 2015. Respondents were selected from disaster-affected communities. Close-ended questions were formulated and shared with local data collectors via a google form. 22 households and 19 organization representatives responded to the questionnaire from two districts of Gandaki province. Secondary data was collected from the government's official *Bipad portal*. The historical database was compiled and analyzed based on disaster trend analysis in Gandaki and the primary source of disaster in this province. Responses were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive and inferential statistics.

Discussion and findings

While finalizing the content from the available data, organize in coding, especially coded into, 'social support initiatives', 'state support', 'non-state support', and 'bounce-back capacity'. After completion of coding, generated themes from the codes. All available information is generated into common themes based on previous codes and started writing.

Descriptive discussion (Disaster affected communities)

Local and social support in disaster management initiatives:

Mean	1.7045
Standard Error	0.1513
Median	1.5
Mode	1.5
Standard Deviation	0.7097
Sample Variance	0.5037
Kurtosis	0.5704
Skewness	-0.4292
Range	3
Minimum	0
Maximum	3
Sum	37.5
Count	22
Largest(1)	3
Smallest(1)	0
Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.3146

Source of data?

The average of respondents received local support from their neighbors, community-based organizations, and support for making temporary shelter, received food and temporary shelter, but received a lower budget for the construction of their new shelter from the external supporting agency, received external support to construct their new shelter with an average of a 50% loan, and could not get any financial support from local financial institutions. The local support from neighbors, on construction support to temporary shelter building, new shelter making support, and ward authority supported families

is strong in the study region, however they build their new shelter with a 50% loan and no financial help from local financial institutions.

Result (Mean) reveals the average of respondents has received the local support from their neighbors, community-based organization, and support for making temporary shelter, received food and temporary shelter, but they received a lower budget for the construction of new shelter from the external supporting agency, received external support to construct their new shelter

with an average of 50% loan, and could not get any financial support from local financial institutions. Result (mode) reflects the local support from the neighbors support, on construction support to temporary shelter making, new shelter making support, and ward authority supported households are high in the study area, but they build their new shelter in 50% loan, and could not get any financial support from local financial institutions. The 'minimum' value shows there is no any respondents, who has does not receive the first response from the state, received temporary shelter construction support, did not get enough budget for the construction of a new shelter, and were limited to their new shelter in subsidy only. That shows most of the respondents were received extensive support from their neighbors, local state and external humanitarian agencies on disaster response. The 'maximum' value shows the respondents who received the first response from the state and neighbors, received temporary shelter construction support, get enough budget for the construction of a new shelter, and were not limit their new shelter construction only to the subsidy.

Due to weak infrastructure, lower preparedness, and the least social support practices in the study area, only 72.72% were have affected by the earthquake, 9.10% were affected by a flood, and 18.18% were affected by a landslide (<http://bipadportal.gov.np/>). All respondents reported they have traditional house structures (non-RCC structures). Even though they are not well informed about a low-cost retrofitting technology, and not have access to technical support for retrofitting in their existing houses before of earthquake. The respondent said they had not reached early warning for flood and landslide, and they didn't know about the heavy rainfall information. Weather forecasting information is being collect from radio Nepal, but they are not received information as sincere and active listeners.

Respondent shared his short story about when disaster struck in the community; they only expected response and relief from state and non-state actors. Usually, the local state responds at the beginning, and non-state actors play the aftermath for a week if the disaster has been highly impacted. Around 50% of the respondent reported that their neighbors did immediate support, 36.36% of respondents have shared their local community had responded aftermath of the disaster, 9.14% has shared the rural/municipal body response, and only 4.50% has said the NGO had responded to the aftermath of disaster strikes in communities. During the focus group discussion (FGD), respondents said the household or near neighborhood should be more capacitated in disaster response. The household members and neighbors are the first responders in disaster management and need to strengthen their capacity as neighbors and local community members as first responders. FGD participants have added remarks on; due to remoteness, lack of communication, and lack of prompt response team of the municipality they are not able to receive disaster response services immediately.

The major local-social support practices:

All respondents reported they received support from their neighbors, community-based organizations, local state agencies, and humanitarian organizations. 54.54% of respondents reported receiving food and medicine; 22.72% reported receiving non-food items; 9.09% reported receiving another item; and 13.65% reported receiving temporary shelter support from outside helping hands. During the FGD, respondents have shared they received immediate external support from their neighbors, who are the first responders to disasters in local communities. They have added that even neighbours are heavily engaged in response, relief, and reconstruction. The crucial local experiences in disaster management are: supporting temporary shelter, exchanging locally available food items, interest-free loans, receiving temporary shelter, receiving short-term shelter, and receiving food and non-food items.

Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

72% of respondents have already built their new house, 18.18% are still in temporary shelters, and 9.82% of respondents are not ready to share their current status. During the reconstruction of the house, the disaster-affected people received support from the ward/local state authorities; some received support from their neighbors, and some received support from their relatives. 86.36% of respondents said they received support, and 13.64% said they did not receive any support. Having remoteness, lower available working age groups in the community, no registration as a disaster-affected household by the reconstruction authority, and land issues are the main causes of not receiving state support in the reconstruction of the home

Among the disaster-affected households, 68.18% of respondents revealed that they received local and social subsidies for their children re-join schools; received subsidies on health support schemes; and received agriculture support on livelihood support. But 31.82% of respondents revealed that they did not receive any subsidy for education. Unavailability of identity cards, lack of citizen cards, and age cards affect receiving these subsidies. Having received these subsidies, most of the respondents have experience of better coping capacity in the aftermath of a disaster. 45.45% of respondents said they received subsidies from the ward and municipal authorities, 18.18% received support from INGO/NGO, 22.72% received support from other agencies, and 13.65% of respondents do not know who provided subsidies to them. Due to high response priority to disaster-affected people, addressing points to poor and vulnerable, and high priority to the targeted population based on social protection, the disaster affected people received these subsidies immediately. Every municipal body has its own social development wing, and these wing have addressed poor, vulnerable, disadvantaged, and socially excluded group members' protection and promotion issues.

During the FGD, respondents revealed that they got financial support when they built their temporary or permanent shelter in the community. Some respondents have received financial support from community-based financial organisations like agriculture and mothers' groups, and some have received it from saving and credit groups. 27.27% of respondents said they received financial support from community-based organizations. And 4.54% said they received financial support from a government-based social organization. 54.54% did not receive any support. 13.65% said they do not have any idea whether they received support or not. Based on formal membership, most respondents are eligible to receive assets and financial support from their group. They save regularly on a monthly or time interval basis in their local group, and they do support their members who are in crisis through the mobilization of their contingency fund.

Construction of houses and disaster management is not a piece of cake. It is a multi-stakeholder system with multiple accountability systems. Among the respondents, the disaster-affected home owners requested more than 50% of the loan from local financial institutions. Due to limited grant mechanisms from state authorities, inadequate financial resources impact building houses. 22.72% of respondents said they received financial support. 4.54% of respondents said they received financial grants from NGO/INGO projects; 68.18% of respondents said they reconstructed their house based on a 50% loan, and 4.54% said they constructed their home on a 100% loan. To make our findings more reliable and valid from objectivist thoughts, research carry out multiple regression to explain how the local support, social grant, social support initiation, and subsidy facilitate a objectivist interpretation on the disaster management initiatives. Which can be elucidated as below;

4.2 Contributing factors to capacitated of local communities into bounce back better (Inferential discussion)

ANOVA					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	2	3.8636	1.9318	2.7319	4.3841
Residual	19	1.3435	7.0712		
Total	21	3.8636			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	6.6613	3.0319	2.1970	0.0406	3.1544	1.3007	3.1544	1.3007
State and non-state actor support on shelter construction	1	2.2248	4.4947	1.0084	1	1	1	1
Public/local support or subsidy on education, health facility and agriculture	1	1.3731	7.2823	1.0517	1	1	1	1

F statistics are significant for the entire regression. At a (alpha) = 0.005, this regression is seems statistically significant because 'P-value is < 0.05. All two T values are statistically significant because their corresponding P-value is < 0.05. Therefore, all two X1 (State and non-state actor support on shelter construction), and X2 (Public/local support or subsidy on education, health facility, and agriculture), are individually in the prediction of Y (Bounce back capacity of families in disaster management). Prediction equation= $Y=b_0+(b_1*x_1) + (b_2*x_2)$, $Y=6.66+(1*1)+(1*1)$. Therefore $Y= 8.66$, that's why significantly the State and non-state actors support shelter construction and public/local support or subsidy on education, health facility, and agriculture practices scale up every household recovery capacity by 8.66 level in each disaster management initiative. It could directly add value to bounce back the capacity of each household in every disaster management initiative.

The interpersonal-level support, humanitarian support, and state institution initiatives can make a difference in scaling up and enhancing disaster management initiatives. Previously, social support is commonly identified based on social resources, and it made a difference when people supported to each-others in crises. But through this paper, we can claim collective approaches among neighbors, community-based organizations, humanitarian agencies, and states can make joint differences and scale-up response capacity of the most vulnerable and targeted communities. Local-social support can make a difference in the transformation of human, cultural, material, and social capital. It should interlink with individuals and societal supporting units to enhance the response capacity of dependent members.

Social support theory shows that existing social assets within of community could be used as a social safety net while community members are in crisis. During the disaster preparedness, response, and recovery, the local social support can be utilized as a coping tool for disaster shocks and stress in the community. Community members can support to each-other based on their available assets, exchange kind/cash, and support their neighbors through their assets like food, medicine, cash, and kind during disaster response. The collective action of a community can makes a difference in the response capacity of a household and get a multiplayer impact on disaster response.

A systematic study on community-level social work disaster risk reduction and preparedness planning was still lacking, and few local governments and development partners practised social protection policy and disaster response planning. Bonding, bridging, and social support activities are crucial social capital during disaster response (Chongbang, N. 2021). The role of social protection action can be enhanced through people's capabilities of using their connections and resources, which could be positive social capital as a survival mechanism for vulnerable communities. Rapeli (2017) compares how the practice of Finnish social work preparedness to develop future interventions and the use of social capital in disasters. The results show that micro-level social work and bonding social capital emphasized capacity in disaster management. Bridging and linking social support initiatives into disaster-related structures should be developed, and social capital should be

Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

strengthened before and after disasters. She added that the concept of social capital is used to represent valuable social networks between individuals, groups, or organizations, which take the forms of bonding, bridging, and linking. Mainly, the Finnish intervention shows how local-social capital bridges individual action and social structures. Thus, it is crucial to social work practice in disaster risk management.

The social support initiative and social protection scheme should be interlinked as bonding, bridging, and linking with disaster preparedness and response. It can facilitate the bounce back and better capacity of disaster-affected communities. The micro-level social support actions must be linked with social capital in the community and interlinked with the local authority budget and plan to contribute to disaster management. Local level disaster risk reduction and management authorities can facilitate bridging with local support, social capital, and social protection at a local level.

Disaster can be defined itself naturally, or man-made. The state authority policies, development partners' intermediate and immediate support, and community preparedness can reduce its impact when a disaster occurs. Sharma (2003) explained the Indian disaster management initiative related to the massive loss of life and property. The author describes social and economic disruptions caused by increasing frequencies and severity of natural disasters. This context draws disaster management as a crucial issue to take attention of various stakeholders in the community to introspect how prepared. Chemmencheri (2016) discusses the rights-based approach to social protection, which is variously viewed as a right of every citizen, a tool of poverty alleviation, or a recovery shield from market fluctuation or degradation due to disaster strike. raised various social protection practices in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka with their comprehensiveness and implementation challenges. The author elaborated on the rights-based approach to social protection when disaster strikes in communities.

Local and social support initiatives and social protection policy interventions can envision disaster management tools based on the forecast and post-response capacity of state authorities and development organizations. Cash support, kind support, saving-capacity, livelihood support, response, rescue, and long-term livelihood support are vital local-social support examples in communities. Vathana et al. (2013) explain the natural disaster scenario in Cambodia by comparing the consequences of flood and drought. The paper presents the impact of disasters on household welfare and the linkage impact of social support interventions by communities and the state. This study strongly emphasized the formulation of policy design on social protection interventions to emphasize ex-ante (forecast) instruments rather than the ex-post (post) response to natural disasters as focusing on emergency assistance and relief. Witvorapong et al. (2015) examine the relationships between social participation and disaster risk reduction actions of the 2021 Indian Tsunami. The authors investigate communication participation, early warning system receipt, and application on daily behaviour in disaster risk reduction. These community engagements make sense in minimizing disaster damage and life savings. Local practices of disaster mitigation measures, improving forecasting and warning systems, community resilience practices, and local promotional awareness of potential disaster risks are major contributing factors to risk reduction measures to reduce life and livelihood damages. Individual protective measures, social support, and collective actions are tools of community engagement to reduce disaster risk. Cash transfer programmes provide poor and vulnerable households with direct assistance in promoting their livelihoods. The ex-ante cash transfer program can play a vital role in encouraging vulnerable households to invest in business rather than spending on food. The microfinance schemes can also support preparedness actions and boost targeted household capacity when a disaster occurs.

Common protective measures range from storing emergency food and water supplies, preparing a household emergency plan, and attending a first-aid course to purchasing insurance against natural disasters. Emergency preparedness allows households to carry out appropriate responses if and when a disaster strikes and strengthens their capabilities to cope with the aftermath. Finally, they found that engagement in community-based activities increases disaster preparedness and the intention to move away from disaster-risk areas, suggesting that promoting social participation may generate a positive externality in reducing vulnerability and disaster risk.

Households and the community themselves contribute to their bounce-back capacity through collective action in the community. Druzca (2017) describes the political dimensions of social protection reforms in post-conflict Nepal. This study examines vertical versus horizontal party structures and the political economy of support for different political institutions and how these relate to social protection. The authors describe the attitude of members of the major Nepalese political parties toward social protection and analyse the proposals on social protection within party manifestos. It discusses the role of social protection in democratisation and its limitations towards constructing a democratic welfare state. Chogbang (2021) reveals the community's existing resilience capacity-based practices on Gorkha earthquake resilience practices. According to the author, community-based organisations, state agencies, and their collective engagement can make a

difference when disasters occur or when they rebuild their shelters. According to Chongbang, the neighbourhood, community-based organizations, and local authorities can make a difference in resilience-building through collective engagement.

The community itself can practice local and social support initiatives through collective action, such as common interest groups, formulating social capital, and use it while disasters occur. Local support practices can enhance the social support framework and protection network when a disaster occurs. It should be framed and mobilized in a broad sense through policies and program formulation by local authorities. It can provide access to essential social services to the vulnerable community and facilitate bounce-back capacity in the aftermath of crises. Through the enhancement of local and social support, we can make social protection through the practices and advocacy into policy formulation for better disaster management in the future.

Conclusion

This paper envisioned how well-practiced local support and social support practices contribute to reducing community risk. This study explored how local-social support mechanisms escalate the risk reduction model in disaster management initiatives. Based on local and social support initiatives, disaster management can be more effective, efficient, and affordable in the local community. While people respond to disasters from the directly affected community based on their local resources, it could be easy to respond. Disaster management may become easier in the future as local and national support begins with the community, the use of their savings for local-social support, and the response of trained locals. The holistic disaster management mechanism should be enacted by local authorities through the formulation of local social policies which will ensure social support initiatives and social protection as civil rights.

Funding: Please add: "This research received no external funding" or "This research was funded by NAME OF FUNDER, grant number XXX" and "The APC was funded by XXX".

Acknowledgments: In this section you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

Conflicts of Interest: Declare conflicts of interest or state "The authors declare no conflict of interest."

References:

- Abdoul-Azize, H. T., & El Gamil, R. (2020). Social Protection as a Key Tool in Crisis Management: Learnt Lessons from the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Global Social Welfare*. doi:10.1007/s40609-020-00190-4
- Asquith, J. B. et. al. (2001). Asian Development Bank : Social Protection Strategy 2001. Asian Development Bank. retrieve in Nov 2020 from <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/evaluation-document/35994/files/ses-socialprotection.pdf>
- Brown, P., Daigneault, A. J., Tjernström, E., & Zou, W. (2018). Natural disasters, social protection, and risk perceptions. *World Development*, 104, 310–325. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.12.002

Local and Social Support Practices in Disaster Management Initiatives in Nepal

- Chemmencheri, S. R. (2016). Social Protection as a Human Right in South Asia. *Human Development*, SAGE Publications, 10(2), 236–252. doi:DOI: 10.1177/0973703016671844
- Chongbang, N. (2021, June 18). Building Community Resilience: A Study of Gorkha Reconstruction Initiatives. *Molung Educational Frontier*, 11. doi:https://doi.org/10.3126/mef.v11i0.37849
- Druzca, K. (2017). The politics behind social protection in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 1–25. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/2057891117734652
- Edward, C. (2011). Natural Disasters : What is the Role for Social Safety Nets?. *Social Safety Nets Primer Notes*; No. 32. World Bank, Washington, DC. © World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11686> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO. Retrieved on 11 Dec 2020 from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11686>
- Longhurst, D. et. al. (2020). LINKING SOCIAL PROTECTION AND HUMANITARIAN CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE. *Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)*, German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO). Retrieved on 12 Jan 2022 from <https://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/publications/linking-social-protection-and-humanitarian-cash-and-voucher-assistance>
- Rapeli, M. (2017). Social capital in social work disaster preparedness plans: The case of Finland. *International Social Work*, 002087281769564. doi:10.1177/0020872817695643
- Sharma, V. K. (2003). Disaster Management - Approach and Emerging Strategies in India. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 7(1), 135–144. doi:10.1177/097226290300700112
- Srawooth, P., Shigeuki, A. & Nipon, P. (2008). The meaning of “social safety nets”. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 467–473. doi:doi:10.1016/j.asieco.2008.09.01
- VATHANA, S., OUM, S., KAN, P. & CHERVIER, C. (2013). Impact of Disasters and Role of Social Protection in Natural Disaster Risk Management in Cambodia. Retrieved on Dec 2021 from <https://www.eria.org/ERIA-DP-2013-10.pdf>
- Wickramasinghe, K. (2013). Role of Social Protection in Disaster Management in Sri Lanka. *Sri Lanka journal of social sciences*, 35/36(1 & 2). doi:DOI: 10.4038/sljss.v35i1-2.7297
- Witvorapong, N., Muttarak, R., & Pothisiri, W. (2015). Social Participation and Disaster Risk Reduction Behaviors in Tsunami Prone Areas. *PLOS ONE*, 10(7), e0130862. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130862