www.aiwest-dr.org

PROCEEDINGS

Annual International Workshop and Expo on Sumatra Tsunami Disaster & Recovery

AIWEST-DR 2009

Banda Aceh, Indonesia - November 23 - 25, 2009

tsunami and disaster mitigation research center
syiah kuala university
www.tdmrc.org

www.aiwest-dr.org

PROCEEDINGS

Annual International Workshop and Expo on Sumatra Tsunami Disaster & Recovery

AIWEST-DR 2009

Banda Aceh, Indonesia - November 23 - 25, 2009

tsunami and disaster mitigation research center
syiah kuala university
www.tdmrc.org

Preface

Distinguished guests and workshop participants,

It is truly a great pleasure for us to welcome you to Banda Aceh on the occasion of the 4th Annual International Workshop and Expo on Sumatra Tsunami Disaster and Recovery, an event to commemorate the tragic 2004 Sumatra Tsunami that has affected many communities around the Indian Ocean.

Over the past five years following the aftermath of the tsunami disaster, considerable collaborative recovery efforts have been initiated and successes have been realized. Today, as reflected in the underlying objective of the workshop, it is timely for us to take a retrospective look to what has been achieved, what has been learnt and what has been changed so far. And based on that, to oversee to what we should do next.

It is hoped that this workshop will stimulate further efforts that result in better disaster management strategies and will yield initiatives toward sustaining the learning and knowledge sharing processes, integrating the international lessons, and providing a sound platform for a sustainable international collaboration in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), with a particular reference to tsunami-related issues, all of which will hopefully help establish disaster-resilient communities.

I am also happy to report that more than 75 technical papers from 15 countries are to be presented at this year workshop. In addition, various important and interesting issues related to post 2004 tsunami recovery, will be discussed in four panel session.

On behalf of the Tsunami and Disaster Mitigation Research Center, Syiah Kuala University, I would like to express our sincere appreciation to the Government of Aceh, Multi Donor Trust Funds (MDTF), and UNDP, for the support and good cooperation afforded to us leading to the proper organization of this workshop. Special thanks is also extended to our fellow national and international counterparts for their collaborations and continued support in this effort.

Please enjoy and have a fruitful workshop!

Thank you.

Dr. Khairul Munadi
Organizing Committee
Chairman

List of Content

Geotechnical and Hydrodynamical Modelling

Disaster Preparedness & Education

Disaster Medicine & Nursing/ Mental Health

Environmental Management

Geohazard/ Risk Analysis/ Database Development

Community Participation in Post-Disaster Redevelopment

Ichsan
Public Policy Program, University of Arkansas
119 Ozark Hall, 1 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA
Malikussaleh University
Jln. Tgk. Chik Ditiro No. 26, Lhokseumawe, Indonesia
E-mail: iichsan@uark.edu

Abstract-This paper describes the significance of community members' involvement in post-disaster redevelopment. The purpose of this study is to show that the participatory approach is a realistic and effective tool in dealing with the post-disaster relief process. This study finds that the involvement of the affected people and communities in disaster relief is instrumental to any long-term plans for sustainable recovery change. Their involvement has vital position in building the capacity of communities, meeting the need of communities, and maintaining the continuum of development. Furthermore, their engagement, particularly in needs assessment, contributes to reducing disaster vulnerability and increasing resilience.

Keywords: Disasters, emergency management, community participation, redevelopment efforts.

I. INTRODUCTION

The 2004 Aceh tsunami, the series of 2005 disasters, including Hurricanes' Katrina and Rita, the Pakistan earthquake, and the Central America floods, and other recent disasters, have again demonstrated the devastating impacts of natural disasters on human beings, environment, infrastructure, settlements, and public facilities. This should lead nations around the globe to think seriously how to prepare for and cope with disasters in a more effective manner.

During times of crisis characterized by a large negative deviation from the normal state of affairs, including in a situation of natural disaster, policy makers are expected to take measures that have a high positive impact in responding the crisis [1]. The demand for appropriate decisions is as important as that for quick action. In this case, policy makers should not overlook the involvement of various stakeholders in the recovery process. Besides the central role of government hierarchies, emergency response also necessarily involves nongovernmental actors, such as community members, non governmental organizations (NGOs), private companies, and professional groups [2, 3].

With respect to the involvement of community members in post-disaster reconstruction, research shows that the involvement of the affected people and communities is instrumental to any long-term plans for sustainable recovery change. Their involvement in reconstruction efforts has vital position in building the capacity of communities, meeting the need of communities, and maintaining the continuum of development [2, 3, 4]. Given that, participatory approach should be an important tool to be considered by policy makers to achieve the overall success of post-disaster redevelopment.

The successful practices of the approach in various social entities need to be analyzed so that they can be adopted in various environments with some adjustments and modifications by considering such aspects as culture, politics and economy of related communities where the approach is implemented.

This paper will specifically examine the significance of community members' involvement in post-disaster redevelopment. It will begin with the overview of community participation in the context of democratic systems and the importance, challenges, and extent of participation. It will then discuss how community participation relates to emergency management and collective efforts in rebuilding process. This paper will end with the analysis of nature and advantages of the participatory process in post-disaster relief.

II. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN DEMOCRATIC SYSTEMS

In democratic systems, it is widely accepted that citizens have determinant power in dealing with many aspects of their lives. Democracy, in general, requires that the government be in some way selected by, guided by, and accountable to the public. This simple statement, though, implies direct democracy, which does not, in fact, exist in anything but the smallest settings. What exists, in reality, is various forms of representative democracy, a factor which is complicated for the ordinary citizens, by the fact that there are multiple layers of general purpose governments, plus many forms of "special districts," all of which are supposed, in democratic systems, to at least be guided by and accountable to the public. Some democratic theorists view the democratic system as a mechanism for representing citizen interests as well as developing an informed citizenry consistent with the educative functions of democracy [5]. This so called "participatory democracy" is considered pivotal to development of citizens.

Added to the complications of representation and multiple levels and forms of government is the fact that, even in representative systems, the control individual citizens can, or should, have over government is limited by factors of numbers and widely varying levels of attentiveness and even knowledge [6]. Hence, typically "pluralism" exists. Pluralism is a system in which there is a whole plethora of groups and organizations –now often referred to as "interest groups"— intervening between the grassroots of individual citizens and their various "governments" [7, 8]. This plethora of

intervening groups and organizations is a large portion of what is now commonly referred to as "civil society," something that is being promoted aggressively by U.S, European, United Nations, etc. organizations in their approach to the currently "emerging nations" in their efforts to promote their vision of democracy.

In fact, the "franchise," the right to participate in government by voting, also varies considerably, and has changed over time. Mostly, various mechanisms have emerged to extend the franchise to a broader range of citizens. One very significant, and somewhat unique, mechanism for expanding the franchise is "administrative participation." This is the engagement of the public via "public involvement" by administrative agencies, often on a program-by-program basis, and very frequently directly engaging grassroots citizens. This is done in the form of such things as hearings, public meetings, organization of advisory committees, each focusing upon specific public agencies and/or programs [9, 10].

One of the things that is evident from this is that, in democratic systems, there is a wide range of flexibility in the manner in which citizens may participate, which allows for a considerable amount of what can best be called "ad hoc" participation [11]. Ad hoc participation may take a number of forms: committees, ombudsmen, citizen research and information offices, volunteer programs, and fund-raising efforts.

Starting with David Lilienthal's writings [12], Philip Selznick's "TVA and the Grass Roots," [13] and the voluminous literature on the "Maximum Feasible Participation" feature of the U.S. war on poverty of the 1960s, and even the literature on community development, there is a very large literature on administrative participation, or what is often simply referred to "public involvement." In the U.S., there are, for instance, detailed guidelines and manuals for "public involvement" in agency decision-making produced by various government agencies, like the Department of Transportation [14]. Voth and Bonner have summarized some of the major features, functions, and dilemmas of administrative participation [10].

III. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT: THE IMPORTANCE, CHALLENGES AND EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

A. The Importance and Challenges of Community Participation

In participatory development literature, community participation is often considered to have the same meaning as "community involvement," "popular participation," "self-help," and "self reliance." [15]. In many ways, community participation has been widely accepted as a tool for analyzing and addressing social problems in a sustainable way [16]. Even though scholars agree that community participation is a determinant factor in development, they still have disagreement about its definition. Various social, economic, educational, and other conditions within communities impact community participation. The varying degrees and types of involvement in development activities also contribute to the difficulty of defining community participation [15].

In simple terms, community participation in development can be defined as "the involvement of the community members in development project" [15]. The involvement can include a series of activities: assessment of the situation, definition of the problems, setting of priorities, making decisions, planning of action programs to overcome the problems, sharing responsibility in project implementation, and evaluating and modifying the project. Some scholars contend citizen participation connotes active involvement in which the citizen engages [10, 17]. Voth and Bonner define citizen participation as "voluntary activities undertaken by persons in their roles as ordinary citizens, or amateurs, to influence public decisions or the act of public officials" [10]. In this regard, the action that citizens take aims to express their views to those in charge. By putting aside disagreement about the degrees and types of community's involvement, it can be concluded that community participation refers to a situation in which society members take part in the development process.

Community participation in development can benefit both communities and the government. First, community participation mobilizes the resources of citizenry (money, material, knowledge, skills, and leadership) which contributes to complementing the lack of government resources. Second, community participation creates a possibility for decisions to be based on the community's needs and priorities. Third, community participation ensures community's knowledge, creativity, and skills are recognized and used that in turn results in the enhancement of community's capacity building. Fourth, community participation builds up the self enabling and cooperative spirit of the community. Fifth, community participation ensures a greater acceptance and appreciation of development programs. This may result in better care and maintenance. Sixth, community participation can function to reduce conflict by airing conflictual issues openly and attempting to resolve them [10, 18].

According to Hoff and Steinberg [19], the willingness and readiness of both the government and communities affect community participation in policymaking process. On the one hand, government bureaucrats and agencies should have the political will and skills to stimulate and broaden the participatory process. On the other hand, community members should have the will and ability to participate in the process or learn over time the benefits of such participation. Referring to Cobb and Ross' "low cost strategies" concept, the unwillingness of government relates to an attempt to preserve its power and promoted its own self-interest. The use of the strategies also leads government not to utilize a lot of resources, such as funds, time, and people [20].

Despite its significant benefits in the abstract, public participation in development poses certain challenges for community decision makers. According to Cogan, Sharpe, and Hertzberg, citizen participation in development will naturally vary for different activities and governmental levels [21]. In terms of activities, due to technical capability issues, citizen participation is most effective in the stages of goal formulation

and policy definition and tends to be limited in other stages. In this case, the planners' roles in those other stages will be much more dominant. Cogan et al. also consider that citizen participation in development cover a broad scope, i.e. goal setting, policy identification and analysis, policy making, administrative rulemaking, program operations, and evaluation. With regard to governmental levels, citizens tend to get involved at the local level decisions because they are close to their concerns which are readily understood. On the other hand, issues at the state and regional levels tend to be more abstract and removed from their daily routine.

Moreover, Cogan et al. [21] argue that the constraints of community participation should also be considered in light of the nature of community participation itself: on one hand, public involvement is often a requirement for government; on the other, it is optional for citizens. Cogan et al. contend, even though community members tend to be reluctant to participate in the development process, it does not mean that they have no motivation to be involved. As a matter of fact, they have various motivations. They choose to participate probably because they expect a satisfying experience and hope to be able to make a difference. With regard to a well-planned program, the expectations of community members and the government are similar.

Meanwhile, Snel contends that there are three primary constraints on community participation [22]. First, it is likely that community participation is considered an unfair distribution of work among members of community. Some community members probably feel that they are asked to take on extra work tasks that do not provide them with appropriate financial, social, or other incentives. Second, the usual positions of people tend to be individualistic. Dealing with this, it is difficult to involve people with affairs that are not directly related to their lives and interests. Third, community members perhaps consider that the development project is government's responsibility, therefore government's efforts to involve them in the project is a form of exploitation.

Based on this review of the literature, it can be concluded that constraints on community participation in policymaking come from both the government and the community. The roles of these groups and their cooperation determine the success of community participation in the policymaking process. More successful community participation requires the political will and the skills of government bureaucrats and government agencies to stimulate the participatory process, as well as the awareness and abilities of community members to participate in the process.

Specifically, to deal with the technical capability constraints that, in the worst case, lead communities not to be able to get involved in policymaking, the constituent participation model formulated by Johnson [23] can be adopted. Through this model, community members can be represented by officials or leaders who are familiar with the issues the community is dealing with. This model requires elected community representatives so that community's aspirations and needs can be properly channeled in the policymaking process.

B. The Extent of Community Participation

Arnstein's "ladder of citizen participation" offers an analytic framework for categorizing community involvement in development. She argues that citizen participation has hierarchical levels. The highest level of participation is the so-called citizen power which is defined as "the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future" [24]. The lowest level is non participation in which citizens have no chance to get involved in planning or conducting programs.

In a way, despite using the American context as the basis of the analysis, Arnstein's concept seems can be applied in various development activities and settings due to its flexibility and practicality. Arnstein does not consider techniques and mediums of participation as the parameters in determining the level of participation which obviously vary among countries or localities. The main concern is to examine how much power citizens exercise regardless of how and in what arenas they gain the power.

Arnstein classifies community participation into three categories: non participation, tokenism, and citizen power -- based on the degree of power which citizens enjoy in decision making process. These categories are formulated as "eight rungs on a ladder of citizen participation." The classification is based on the American context and its experiences. According to her, in a hierarchal form, community participation categories from the lowest (the least meaningful) to the highest (the most meaningful) are as follows [24]:

1) Nonparticipation: In this category, community members are not allowed to participate in planning or conducting programs. Power holders ignore the involvement of community in the development process. This category has two levels (from the lowest to the highest):

a) Manipulation: The social elite are placed in the advisory boards of development programs aimed at engineering the community's support. At meetings, the officials persuade and advise the citizens, and not the reverse.

b) Therapy: The authority tries to be the savior by "curing" the "diseases" suffered by the community. For example, tenants of public housing are used for the sake of the authority's interest, such as through promoting cleanup campaigns. On the other side, they do not have a chance to deal with their urgent problems, such as arbitrary eviction or poor maintenance. The fact is that it actually does not solve their real problems because it doesn't touch on the basic underlying factors causing the problems.

2) Tokenism: This category introduces the initial steps toward legitimate citizen participation through the involvement of the community in decision-making. Unfortunately, this involvement doesn't guarantee their concerns will truly be taken into account. The levels of community participation in this category (from the lowest to highest) are as follows:

a) Informing: Citizens are informed of their rights, responsibilities, and options. Unfortunately the information is usually provided at a late stage and using a one-way flow of

information (from officials to citizens), so citizens can't influence the decision significantly.

b) Consultation: The community is invited to contribute ideas or considerations for the programs through surveys, neighborhood meetings, or public hearings. Participation is gauged by questionnaire responses, number of meetings/public hearings, or number of people attending the meetings/public hearings. The drawback is that there is no guarantee that their input will be really considered by the officials.

c) Placation: The officials invite the community to provide input for programs and accommodate the involvement of community through the existence of their representatives in related planning boards. However, the right to accept or reject the advice still depends a lot on them.

3) Citizen power: In this category, citizens have a determinant power to force and influence the decision-making. A degree of citizen power can be achieved if the citizens have mechanisms in place which will hold their leaders accountable. This category has three levels. From the lowest to highest levels are as follows:

a) Partnership: The power of citizens is gained through negotiation. The officials share planning and decision-making responsibilities through joint policy boards, planning committees, or other mechanisms of problem resolution.

b) Delegated power: Citizens can have dominant decision-making authority with regards to a certain program or plan as a result of negotiation with public officials. One of the models at this level is the implementation of the rights of citizens to veto decisions. Even though the veto rights had ever been agreed in Richmond, California, they had not been tested.

c) Citizen Control: This highest level of community participation enables citizens to govern a program, to handle managerial aspects, and to negotiate to change the conditions. In practice, in the American context, many people consider that no model city can meet the criteria of citizen control because the final power and accountability are held by the city council.

Given the above explanation, it can be concluded that community participation refers to a situation in which community members take part in decision making, planning, implementation, and evaluation process in the affairs they are interested in. The levels of participation vary from the "no power" to "superficial power" and "real power" levels.

IV. DISASTERS, EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION

In the field of public policy study, a disaster is often associated with a matter of social or government policy. The definition is used "in making decision about official disaster declarations or resource allocations connected with mitigation, preparedness, response or recovery" [25]. Disasters are also analyzed from the perspective of the surface features of an agent, that is, natural and man-made (catastrophic) disasters. Birkland, for instance, discusses how four types of man-made and natural disasters (oil spills, nuclear power plant accident, earthquakes, and hurricane) affect agenda setting and policy making process [26].

Birkland considers disasters as part of focusing events that are important in policy making. He defines a focusing event as "an event that is sudden, relatively rare, can be reasonably defined as harmful or revealing the possibility of potentially greater future harms, inflicts harms or suggests potential harms that are or could be concentrated on a definable geographical area or community of interest, and that is known to policy makers and the public virtually simultaneously" [26].

Emergency management is concerned with the process of dealing with disasters. In the disaster literature, other terms such as emergency preparedness, disaster planning or disaster management, are also interchangeably used in the context of efforts to manage and control disasters [27]. Emergency management can be defined as "the discipline and profession of applying science, technology, planning, and management to deal with extreme events that can injure of kill large numbers of people, do extensive damage to property, and disrupt community life" [28]. In this regard, emergency managers (those who are in charge in coping with disasters) should employ knowledge, techniques, strategies, tools, organization networks, and other community and external resources to reduce the occurrence of disasters and successfully deal with their impacts in order to protect people, property, and the environment.

Emergency management is basically a comprehensive management program covering hazard mitigation, disaster preparedness, disaster response, and disaster recovery [29]. Hazard mitigation deals with prevention and lessening the impact of a disaster. Disaster preparedness is related to preparation to mitigate against, respond to, and recover from any disaster, such as emergency operations plans, resource management plans, and training and exercises. Disaster response includes emergency operations to save lives and property through evacuating and providing supplies/logistics for victims and restoring damaged public services. Disaster recovery takes actions to return the system to normal to cope with disaster impacts, such as debris clearance, unemployment, temporary housing, and facility development.

Emergency management relates to many actors, i.e., the vulnerable communities, government institutions, non government organizations (NGOs), private sectors, and the general public. Therefore, emergency management should be supported by effective management strategies. Collaborative management among those actors is one of strategies necessary for coping with disasters [3, 30].

Agranoff and McGuire define collaborative management as "a concept that describes the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved, or solved easily, by single organizations" [31]. Due to complicated problems and negative impacts resulting from disasters, it is important to set up plans, structures, and arrangements to engage the efforts of governments, voluntary and private agencies and other related parties in a comprehensive and coordinated manner [32]

Promoting collaboration in complex organizations is extremely challenging. The reasons are people or parties in the organizations are expected to work together to share resources, power, and authority, so that they can embrace common goals that could not be achieved by only relying on a single individual or party [33].

V. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN POST-DISASTER REDEVELOPMENT

Despite its basic principles that can be implemented in general circumstances, the exercise of community participation is contingent upon the settings in which it is implemented. Community participation in an emergency situation, in a way, poses different challenges and constraints from that in a normal situation. The demand for quick decisions and actions and complicated issues caused are several main impediments for the implementation of community participation in post-disaster reconstruction [3, 32].

Research shows that community participation plays an important role in the recovery process after disasters. In post-disaster reconstruction taking place in Maldives, India, and Nepal, for instance, the involvement of the affected communities is vital to meeting the need of communities, improving capacity building of communities and maintaining the continuum of development [2, 3, 4].

Although there have been different opinions on the degree of community involvement needed in redevelopment efforts, research shows that participation of affected individuals and communities is a determining factor leading to the overall success. Despite the significant role of experts in assessment of planning and implementation efforts, local knowledge, strengths, and priorities affect the redevelopment success [2] The involvement of communities in needs assessment may be fraught with risk; however, this contributes to reducing disaster vulnerability and increasing resilience.

The involvement of communities can encompass the stages of need assessment, design, and implementation of the rebuilding efforts. This involvement "promotes the "recognition, acquisition, maturation and connection of community assets and produces self-reliant, self-sustaining and empowered communities" [2]. To support participatory approaches, education, training, and awareness building within communities, related departments, and other concerned parties is an inevitable need [4].

A study conducted by Vebry, Manu, and Berman shows that community participation in post-disaster reconstruction can be a realistic, satisfying, fast and high quality produced work [34]. The study examines community-based housing reconstruction programs implemented by three organizations, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), Canadian Red Cross (CRC) and Urban Poverty Linkage (UPLINK) in post-tsunami recovery in Aceh. The research findings show that these three organizations used various levels of community participation: the consultation level of CRC (top-down approaches, the beneficiaries gave feedback, the benefactor made a decision), the collaboration level of UN-HABITAT (the beneficiaries and the benefactor make a joint decision), and the empowerment level of UPLINK (bottom-up approaches, the beneficiaries make a final decision). Interestingly, the highest level of participation (empowerment) resulted in the highest score in terms of beneficiary's satisfaction, accountability and construction quality. On the contrary, the lowest level (consultation) resulted in the lowest score in those three aspects. Vebry et al. claim that the experience of UN-HABITAT, UPLINK and other organizations shows that homeowner's participation has speeded up reconstruction as a result of the increased sense of belonging [34]. This research demonstrates that community participation in post-disaster reconstruction can be a realistic, satisfying, fast and high quality produced work. According to Vebry et al., the success of these community approaches rests on an undelayed start of the process and adequate availability of well-trained facilitators [34].

Based on his research on community participation in post-tsunami reconstruction and redevelopment in the Maldives, Pardasani proposes a participatory model to implement a comprehensive disaster management and rehabilitation program [2]. This model suggests the establishment of two main councils: a National Advisory Council and Community Councils. The National Advisory Council functions to coordinate all redevelopment efforts involving all agencies, organizations, representatives from international development programs, financial experts, construction company executives, reconstruction experts, and community councils that are involved in the process of redevelopment. It also assists in creating a blue print for reconstruction and prepares reports and briefings for the public. Community Councils are based in villages and towns and consist of representatives of the local community from various backgrounds and professions, including at-risk groups. These councils have the right to review funding proposals and redevelopment efforts and propose modifications. These councils have representatives for the national advisory council elected by each community council.

Pardasani accentuates the important role of NGOs in the model [2]. According to him NGOs should be advocates for the affected communities and help empower communities in terms of, among others, supporting their rights and needs, educating and informing them with relevant information, assisting community councils to function, and guiding them in complex negotiating processes with bureaucracy and other institutions. Furthermore, he recommends that the whole process of reconstruction should be undertaken in an open, accessible, accountable, and transparent manner to build trust among all components involved. Considering its general and applicable principles, it seems that Pardasani's participatory model for post-disaster reconstruction can be adopted in different settings with some modifications and adjustments.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study indicates that participatory approach is a realistic and effective tool in dealing with post-disaster reconstruction

process as long as it is appropriately managed and implemented. Stakeholders need to work hand in hand in supporting the participatory approach in recovery efforts. Government's role is vital to making policies to regulate and encourage community participation. NGOs should be advocates for communities and help empower them. Support and cooperation among the prime stakeholders, backed up by adequate availability of well-trained facilitators and an undelayed start of the communities' involvement, will lead to the effective community-based programs in post-disaster redevelopment.

REFERENCES

[1] Kiminyi, M. S., G. Mwabu, "Policy advice during a crisis," *Journal of Third World Studies*, Volume: 24, Issue: 2, pp. 11-15, 2007.

[2] Pardasani, M., "Tsunami reconstruction and redevelopment in the Maldives: A case study of community participation and social action," *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Volume: 15, Issue: 1, pp. 79-91, 2006.

[3) Waugh W. L., Jr., G. Streib, "Collaboration and leadership for effective emergency management," *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, pp. 131-140, 2006.

[4] Newport, J. K., G. G. P. Jawahar, 'Community participation and public awareness in disaster mitigation," *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Volume: 12, Issue: 1, pp. 33-36, 2003.

[5] Pateman, C., *Participation and Democratic Theory*, University Press, Oxford, 1970.

[6] Dahl, R., *After the Revolution? Authority in a Good Society,* 2nd ed., Yale University Press, New Haven, 1990.

[7] Dahl, R., *Who Govern*? Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961.

[8] Truman, D. B., *The Governmental Process*, Knopf, New York, 1951.

[9] May, J. V., *Citizen Participation: A Review of the Literature, Exchange Bibliography No. 210-211*, Council of Planning Librarians, Monticello, 1971.

[10] Voth, D. E., W. S. Bonner, *Citizen Participation in Rural Development: Concepts, Principles, and Resource Materials,* Southern Rural Development Center, Rural Development Series No. 6, Starkville, MS, 1978.

[11] Dodge, W. R. Jr., *Public Involvement in Local Government in the 1970's*, International City Management Association, Management Information Service (Report), Vol. 6 no. 1, January 1974, entire issue, 1974.

[12] Liliental, D., *TVA: Democracy on the march*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1953 (revised).

[13] Selznick, P. , *TVA and the Grass roots*, Harper & Row, New York, 1966.

[14] United States Department of Transportation, *Effective Participation in Transportation Planning*, *Vol. I. Community involvement process, and Vol. II. A cataloq of techniques*, Federal Highway Administration, United States Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., 1976.

[15] Whyte, A., *Guidelines for Planning Community Participation Activities in Water Supply and Sanitation Projects*, World Health Organization, Switzerland, 1986.

[16] Osti, R., "Forms of community participation and agencies' role for the implementation of water-induced disaster management: Protecting and enhancing the poor." *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Volume: 13, Issue: 1, pp. 1-7, 2004.

[17] Ng'ayu, M., "Community participation and local development," http://www.Melissa.org/english/kenya97.htm, 1997.

[18] Rukmana, N., Steinberg, F., R. V. D. Hoff, *Urban infrastructure development management,* PT Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia, Jakarta, 1993.

[19] Hoff, R. V. D., F. Steinberg, *Innovative Approaches to Urban Development*, Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies, Rotterdam, 1992.

[20] Cobb, R. W., M. H. Ross, *Cultural strategies of agenda denial*, The University Press of Kansas, Kansas, 1997.

[21] Cogan, A., Sharpe, S., J. Hertzberg, The practice of state and regional planning, *American Planning Association*, pp. 283-304, 1986.

[22] Snel, M., "What is the role of community in urban management?" http://www.urbanicity.org/Site/Articles/Snel.aspx, 1999.

[23] Johnson, W. C., Citizen participation in local planning: A comparison of US and British experiences. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, Volume: 2, pp. 1-14, 1984.

[24] Arnstein, S. R., A ladder of citizen participation, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Volume: 35, Issue: 2, pp. 216-224, 1969.

[25] Perry, R. W., "What is a Disaster?," in Handbook of Disaster Research, Rodriguez, H., Quarantelli, E. L., R.R. Dynes, Eds., Springer , New York, 2007, pp. 1-15.

[26] Birkland, T. A., *After Disaster: Agenda Setting, Public Policy, and Focusing Events*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 1997.

[27] Pearce, L. D. R., "An Integrated Approach for Community Hazard, Impact, Risk and Vulnerability Analysis: HIRV," unpublished, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia, 2000.

[28] Hoetmer, G. J., "Introduction," in Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government, Hoetmer G.J., T.E. Drabek, Eds., International City Management Association, Washington, D.C., 1991, pp. xvii-xxxiv.

[29] Choi, S. O., "Emergency management: Implications from a strategic management perspective," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, Volume: 5, Issue: 1, pp. 1-21, 2008.

[30] Montjoy, R. S., J. J. Kiefer, "Incrementalism before the storm: Network performance for the evacuation of New Orleans," *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, pp. 122-130, 2006.

[31] Agranoff, R., M. McGuire, *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 2003.

[32] Moe, T. L., P. Pathranarakul, "An integrated approach to natural disaster management: Public project management and its critical success factors," *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Volume: 15, Issue: 3, pp. 396-405, 2006.

[33] Daka-Mulwanda, V., Thornburg, K. R., Filbert, L., T. Klein, "Collaboration of services for children and families: A synthesis of recent research and recommendation," *Family Relation*, Volume: 44, pp. 219-223, 1995.

[34] Vebry, M., Manu, C., L. Berman, "Community Development Approach in Aceh Reconstruction, Reflecting on Lessons Learned for Yogyakarta," presented at International Seminar on Post-Disaster Reconstruction: Assistance to Local Governments and Communities, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, July 10, 2007.