

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Nepal is the 11th most earthquake-prone country in the world.¹ Ever since the first recorded earthquake of 1255 AD that killed one-third of the population of the Kathmandu Valley and its King, Abhaya Malla, Nepal has experienced a major earthquake every few generations. The last great earthquake (of magnitude 8.4) in 1934 AD resulted in more than 10,000 deaths in the Kathmandu Valley. Most of the infrastructure and major heritage sites had to be rebuilt. There have since been earthquakes causing severe human and physical loss in 1980, 1988 and 2011.

On Saturday, 25 April 2015 at 11:56 local time, a 7.6 magnitude earthquake as recorded by Nepal's National Seismological Centre (NSC), struck Barpak in the historic district of Gorkha, about 76 km northwest of Kathmandu. Nepal had not faced a natural shock of comparable magnitude for over 80 years. There are over 8,790 casualties and 22,300 injuries. It is estimated that the lives of eight million people, almost one-third of the population of Nepal, have been impacted by these earthquakes. Thirty-one of the country's 75 districts have been affected, out of which 14 were declared 'crisis-hit'. The destruction was widespread covering residential and government buildings, heritage suites, schools and health posts, rural roads, bridges, water supply system, agricultural land, trekking routes, hydropower plants and sports facilities (PDNA Report-2015).

The subsistence-based households are badly affected in the rural areas as the earthquake hit Nepal. An overwhelming majority of the estimated losses and damages have been to private property such as residential buildings, commercial buildings, farmland and livestock. Public property such as roads, schools, heritage monuments and hospitals, has also suffered damage in severely affected districts.

1.2 Understanding Disaster and Family

1.2.1 Defining Disaster

Disaster can be defined as the natural phenomena which affects the society and the societal structures. Those events cause the loss of many lives and property that has

owned by the human beings in which the cause may be itself human or the nature. Also social scientist said that disaster is defined by human beings not by nature. For example natural calamities like earthquake, landslide, volcanic eruption, flood etc. it may occur in the nature frequently but unless it affects the human being it cannot be said it is disaster. although events such as hurricane, flood and earthquake serve as trigger for disaster, disaster themselves originate in social conditions and processes that may be far removed from events themselves, such as deforestation, environmental degradation, factors that encourage settlement in hazardous areas, poverty and other forms of social inequality, low capacity for self-help among subgroup within population and failure in physical and social protective systems. Classic research on extreme events was guided by the realist assumptions. On the one hand, it was long acknowledged that disaster events were not the product of natural forces alone. Instead, disaster represents the juxtaposition of physical agents like earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, industrial accidents etc. with vulnerable places and populations. Physical events then impinge on the built environment and on social systems. Unless those systems are vulnerable, physical events alone do not constitute disaster; an event is not a disaster unless human beings and social systems are affected in negative ways.

Historically, ideas about disasters have gone through three important phases. Traditionally, catastrophes were attributed to the supernatural. They were characterized as 'Acts of God', 'with the implication that nothing could be done about their occurrence' (Quarantelli 2001, 3). The rise of Enlightenment secularism led to an important shift in the way society conceptualized disasters. The development of science as the new source of knowledge altered people's perception of disasters. 'They were increasingly seen as 'Acts of Nature', writes Quarantelli. However, in more recent times, the view that disasters are caused by 'Acts of Nature' has been gradually, displaced by the idea that they resulted from the 'Acts of Men and Women' (Quarantelli 2001, 4). In the aftermath of a disaster today, the finger of blame invariably points towards human being. Government officials, big business or careless operatives are held responsible for the most disaster. The rumour that the Great 2004 Tsunami was not natural but caused by the nuclear testing readily found an audience skeptical of the official version events.

1.2.2 Defining Family

The family forms the basic unit of social organization and it is difficult to imagine how human society could function without it. The family has been seen as a universal social institution an inevitable part of human society. According to Burgess and Lock the family is a group of persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption constituting a single household interacting with each other in their respective social role of husband and wife, mother and father, brother and sister creating a common culture.

The family is the one of the few social structure which exists in all cultural and societies. It is a universal group which represents cultural continuity and tradition, a group which is said to fulfill important social functions such as introduction through birth and socialization of new members into society. Thus, family lives together, pools its resources and works together, and produces offspring. At least two of the adult members conduct a sexual relationship according to the norms of their particular society. Such norms vary from society to society. For example, among the Banaro of New guinea, the husband does not have sexual relations with his wife until she has borne a child by a friend of his father. The parent-child relationship, therefore is not necessarily a biological one. Its importance is primarily social, children being recognized as member of particular family whether or not the adult spouse have biologically produced them.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The family has long been considered a fundamental unit in the study of disaster behavior (Drabek, 1986; Trost & Hultaker, 1983). Supporting this belief is the historic continuity of institutionally embedded family disaster behaviors that have evolved and adapted themselves to both natural and human-made environmental changes. Families have proved themselves to be not only essential reproductive units but also core social units enhancing its member's survival (Clason, 1983). It is for this reason that researchers have long recognized that the family unit, based on the interaction of household, gender and kinship networks, is a critical linchpin for understanding and predicting disaster behavior (Kirschenbaum, 2003a; Wiest, 1998). Recognizing that the family represents a 'domestic social structure' implies that within its normative

framework, family units are able to generate behavioral cues to prompt actions, some of which have become clearly associated with disasters. Such behaviors are particularly critical before an actual disaster as they represent actions stemming from accumulated historical survival knowledge. They are, in addition, indigenous to family social processes. Intuitively, the family as a social mechanism promotes resilience and increases the capacity for survival (Patterson, 2002), initially from actions taken during disasters, afterward as a post-disaster resource to buffer the traumatic consequences of death and injury (Gerrity et al, 2003; Miller, 2003; Coffman, 1996; Alway et al, 1998) and in the longer term as a means of maintaining the structural integrity of the family (Cohan & Cole, 2002). Such processes are primarily formed before actual disasters. In short, the family appears to be a viable part of our survival repertoire primarily as an effective conduit for transmitting and reinforcing disaster behaviors.

In some cases, particularly during evacuations, emphasis has been put on the family household but again with studies based on the empirical analysis of individuals and not the household (Sorensen, 1999; Bateman & Edwards, 2002). On the one hand, these sets of research can be problematic due to methodological inadequacies. On the other, the information garnered from them can be extremely useful, especially in developing potential theoretical hypotheses. In either case, what still remains is to refocus on family household units as the core building block for an analysis and the social processes which identify them as family units.

Disaster causes the disorder and imbalance of the society including the great loss of property and also sometimes the family member also. Membership of the family is reflected by the family roles played by its members. Hence, every family member plays their respective role during the disaster or in the time of emergency.

Thus, my concern in this study is to find:

- a. How does family support each other during disaster time?
- b. Does disaster brings changes in family relation and its impact in Family?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

- a. To describe how family support each other during disaster time.
- b. To explore changes in family relation due to disaster and its impact in family.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study explores the impact of disaster in the family during earthquake as well as the changes in the family structure during the earthquake which will help to make rescue and know the nature of family or society as well as helps in further recovery plan after disaster.

By the literature review we know that family plays a critical role in facilitating adaptation to stress, emotional and marital support from formal and informal sources (Donald and Doglas,1980) but this study helps to explore whether all family plays important role and supports the family in the time of needy/crisis. Also Xiangming Chen et.al stated that disaster in china results the rapid and extensive reconstruction of family through remarriage (Chen et.al, 1992) also this study helps to find whether disaster/crisis brings the change in the family structure as in china.

1.6 Organization of the Research Results

This entire thesis has organized into six chapters. The introductory chapter is related with the introduction of the study mainly consist of the statement of the problems, objective of the study, significance of the study. Authentic literature are review, in this second chapter, which concerning both theoretical and empirical review of network analysis that get involve when disaster occurred. Research methodology has been incorporate in third chapter. The fourth chapter deals with the context of the Lanagol VDC, thus the general introduction of the study area is presented with active social network in the study area in this section. The fifth chapter illustrates about the social networks and support during disaster. The final chapter sixth includes summary and conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Disaster

Disaster has been defined by many scholars. Disasters are socially disruptive events which cause physical and social harm, strike suddenly and something can be done about them either before or after that happens (Perrow, 1984). Disasters are events, observable in time and space in larger subunits (e.g. communities, regions) incur physical damage and losses and/or disruption of their routine functioning. Both the cause and effects of these events are related to the social structures and processes of societies or their subunits (Fritz, 1961).

Disasters are required to be unique in that they affect a collective (as opposed to an individual or a family) and that losses exceed the capacity of the community to absorb the capacity of the community to absorb or resist them (Cordona, 2004). In other words, the affected collective is dependent on external resources to recover.

Disasters can be viewed as being created by a hazardous fleeting event (e.g. tornado, hurricane, earthquake) that disrupts routines (Davies, 2002).

Disasters can be defined as a social phenomenon, such that a disaster is socially constructed and rooted in the social structure of the community affected by a natural hazard (Quarantelli, 2005).

Natural hazards are those elements in the physical environment, harmful to man and caused by factors extraneous to him. A natural disaster results from spatial interaction between a hazardous environmental process and a population that is sensitive to that process and likely to experience tangible or intangible loss from it. The earthquake in the middle of the Atlantic ocean has minimal disaster potential while one in the vicinity of a major city is likely to be associated with considerable loss (Burton and Leates, 1964).

Disasters are events that can be designated in time and space which have impacts on social units. The social units enact responses that are related to these impacts (Simmel, 1908).

A natural disaster is a major adverse event resulting from natural processes of the earth; examples including floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis and other geologic processes. A natural disaster cause loss of life or property damage and typically leaves some economic damage in its wake, the severity of which depends on the affected populations resilience or ability to recover and also on the infrastructure available. But the social scientists argued that disaster is defined by humans beings not by nature, not every windstorm, earth-tremors or rush of water is catastrophe, if there are no any serious injuries of death and other serious losses, there is no disaster (Carr, 1932).

Quarantelli defined disaster as a social phenomenon, such that disaster is socially constructed and rooted in the social structure of the community affected by a natural hazard. (Quarantelli, 2005).

Disaster are events that can be designated in time and space. These events have impact on social units. The social units enact response that are related to these impacts. With the intent of describing and explaining social structure or the forms of human association (Simmel, 1908).

Disaster are recognized as unique in that they affects a collective (as opposed to an individuals or a family) and that losses exceed the capacity of a community to absorb or rsist them (Cardona 2004). In other words, the affected collective is dependent on external resources to recover.

Davies define disaster as being created by a hazardous fleeting event (e.g tornado hurricane, earthquake) that distrupes routine (Davies 2002).

Burton and kates defines natural hazards are those elements in the physical environment, harmful to man and caused by the factors extraneous to him (Burton and Kates, 1964, p.43).

Carr argued that a disaster is defined by human beings and not by nature. He noted that not every windstorm, earth-tremor or rush of water i.e. a catastrophe, unless there are no serious injuries of deaths and other serious losses, there is no disaster(Carr 1932,211).

Disasters are socially disruptive events which cause physical and social harm, strike suddenly and sometimes can be done about them, either before or after, that happen (Perrow, 1984).

Fritz defines disasters as events, observable in time and space, in which societies or their larger subunits (e.g. communities, regions) incur physical damage and losses and/or disruption of their routine functioning. Both the cause and effect of these events are related to the social structures and processes of societies or their subunits (Fritz, 1961).

Blaikie argued that although events such as hurricanes, floods and earthquakes serve as triggers for disasters, disasters themselves originate in social conditions and processes that may be removed from events themselves, such as deforestation, environmental degradation, factors that encourage settlement in hazardous areas, poverty and their forms of social inequality, low capacity for self-help among subgroups within populations and failure in physical and social protective systems.

Disasters are commonly divided into natural and manmade, but such definitions are generally artificial. A natural disaster is a major adverse event resulting from natural processes of the earth: e.g. floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis and other geologic processes. Geographers and geophysical scientists define disaster as natural hazard. Natural hazards like volcanic eruption, earthquake, landslide, flood, tsunami, tropical storms, famine etc are disasters. And classical disaster research treats disaster as events that originate in the earth and atmospheric system. While systematic studies of disaster began shortly after World War 2 (Quarantelli 2005). Different types of disaster are distinguished by catalytic agents as technological, terrorism/war and natural. But the social scientists argued that disaster is defined by human beings not by nature, not every windstorm, earthquake or rush of water is a catastrophe, if there are no any serious injuries of death and other serious losses, there is no disaster (Carr 1932).

At the most basic level, the cause of disasters are socially constructed. Calamities are natural but disasters are social. Disasters that result in a huge loss of life, assets and livelihood are instead socially created. Also argues that disaster doesn't kill and loss the property rather it depends on our political, economic and administrative regimes

(Mishra, 2015). For example, in Hurricane Katrina, the hurricane itself may have been natural, but the disaster is attributed more to human contribution made by neglect of the levees, over-reliance on large-scale flood control projects, the destruction of wetlands and barrier islands that could have buffered impacts of the hurricane and decision that put non-evacuees at risk of death and injury (Cutter, 2005). Dynes shows in his analysis of the 1755 Lisbon earthquake, which he terms the first modern disaster, how interpretation of and responses to that event reflected the broader transition from religious to secular world views that was occurring in Europe at that time. Both public perception and scholarly frames have shifted in ways that now see so-called natural disaster as human induced (Dyne, 1755).

Defining Family

G.P Murdock defines the family as a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and one or more children own or adopted of the sexually co-habiting adults (Murdok,1949).

The family is generally regarded as a major social institution and a locus of much of a person's social activity. It is a social unit created by blood, marriage, or adoption, and can be described as nuclear (parents and children) or extended (encompassing other relatives). (Charles B. Nam). Families are likely to seen multiple forms of care and support spontaneously but support found between nuclear family and joint family was different.

The family has often regarded as the corner stone of society. In the pre-modern societies alike it has been as the most basic unit of social organization and one which carries out vital tasks, such as socializing children. Until the 1960s few sociologists questioned the importance or the benefits of family life. Most sociologists assumed that family like was evolving as modernity progressed, and that the changes involved made family better suited to meet the needs of society and family members. A particular type of family, the nuclear family (based around a two generation household of parents and their children), was seen as well adapted to the demands of modern societies. From the 1960s, an increasing number of critical thinkers began to question the assumption that the family was necessary a beneficial institution. Feminists, Marxixts and critical psychologists began to highlight what they saw as

some of the negative effects and the dark side of family. In the following decades the family was not just under attack from academic writers. Social changes also seemed to be undermining traditional families. Rising divorce rates, cohabitation before marriage(living relationship), increasing numbers of single-parent families and single-person household, and other trends all suggested that individuals were basing their lives less and less around conventional families. Some have seen these changes as a symptom of greater individualism within modern societies. They have welcomed what appears to be an increasing range of choice for individuals. People no longer have to base their lives around what may be outmoded and, for many, unsuitable conventional family structures. However, others have lamented the changes and worried about their effects on society. Such changes are seen as both a symptom and a cause of instability and insecurity in people's lives and in society as a whole. This view has been held by traditionalist who follows the ideology of nuclear family. For them, many of society's problems are a result of increased family instability. Some postmodernists argue that there has been a fundamental break between the modern family and the postmodern family. They deny that any one type of family can be held up as the norm against which other family types can be compared. While modern societies might have had one central, dominant family type, this is no longer the case. As a result, it is no longer possible to produce a theory of family. Different explanations are needed for different types of family. Alongside these developments in society and sociology, family life has become a topic of political debate. What was once largely seen as a private sphere, in which politicians should not interfere, is now seen as a legitimate area for public debate and political action. As concern has grown in some quarters about the alleged decline of the family, politicians have become somewhat more willing to comment on families. Sometimes they have devised policies to try to deal with perceived problems surrounding the family. In short, family has come to be seen as more problematic than it was in the past.

Nimkoff says that family is a more or less durable association of husband and wife with or without child or of a man or woman alone with children. According to Maclver family is a group defined by sex relationships sufficiently precise and enduring to provide for the procreation and upbringing of children. Kingsley Davis describes family as a group of persons whose relations to one another are based upon consanguinity and who are therefore kin to one another. Malinowski opined that the family is the institution within which the cultural traditions of a society is handed over to a newer generation. This indispensable function could not be filled unless the

relations to parents and children were relations reciprocally of authority and respect. According to Talcott Parsons families are factories which produce human personalities.

The family is a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and one or more children, own or adopted, of the sexually cohabiting adults (Murdock,1949)

Variation in Family Structure

The structure of family varies from society to society. The smallest family unit known as **nuclear family** and consists of husband and wife and their immature offspring. Unit larger than the nuclear family are usually known as **extended family**. Such families can be seen as extensions of basic nuclear unit, either vertical extension-*for example*, the addition of members a third generation such as the spouses' parents and or horizontal extension- *for example*, the addition of members of the same generation such as spouses, such as the husband's brother or an additional wife. Thus the functionalist sociologist Bell and Vogel define the extended family as 'any grouping broader than the nuclear family which is related by descent, marriage or adoption'. Either on its own or as the basic unit within an extended family, Murdock found that the nuclear family was present in every society in his sample. This led him to conclude: the nuclear family is a universal human social grouping. Either as the sole prevailing form of the family or as the basic unit from which more complex forms are compounded, it exists as a distinct and strongly functional group in every known society.'

Some of the most common family types in modern Britain include.

The Nuclear Family – two parents with biological children living in one household

The Reconstituted Family – two partners living in one household sharing parental duties for one or more children, but only one of them is the biological parent.

The Single Parent Family – one adult with one or more children living in one household

The Extended Family – where relatives such as uncles/ aunts or grandparents reside permanently in the same household as those making up the nuclear family

Because of the diversity within family life in contemporary Britain, post-modern thinkers suggest that it is better to use a broader definition of ‘the family’, which includes a range of family types – one suggested definition of the family is ‘a group of people who are related by either blood or marriage/ similar form of committed **relationship**’

Disaster and Family

Based on a study of 1980 Italian earthquake, LeChat (1989) also reported that 97 percent of the injured victims that were successfully evacuated and transported to medical care were rescued by people around with bare hands and shovels, not heavy equipment. The Wenchuan data show similar patterns. In the survey we found some 130 respondents had been entrapped in debris. Among them, around 95% percent were rescued by relatives, neighbors and other persons around. Only a very small percentage of entrapped victims were rescued by external rescue personnel, including PLA soldiers, professional rescue teams, or volunteers. (Zhao, Yandong;)

In the process of rebuilding his business, aid from and ties to colleagues and acquaintances proved critical; financial and emotional support from network members cemented his desire to move forward. His story matches that of many other survivors and towns around the world who have displayed resilience in their recoveries. Individuals and localities bounced back from tragedy and hardship not solely through wealth, government aid, or top-down leadership, but through their neighbors, connections and social networks. (Daniel P. Aldrich, 1012)

Data from the Gujarat and Kobe earthquakes in India and Japan, respectively, further demonstrated the importance of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital in furthering recovery and rehabilitation efforts (Nakagawa and Shaw 2004). This comparative study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to better understand the factors responsible for speedier and more efficient recoveries. While the two areas

struck by earthquakes had very different cultures and levels of socioeconomic development, “At every stage of the disaster cycle (rescue, relief and rehabilitation), the communities played the most important roles among other concerned stakeholders” (ibid. p.27).

Flood survivors in Poland, For eg, dissatisfaction with aid, received, interpersonal and community animosities and disagreements experienced within the first 12 months after the flood were predictive of lower perceived social support and community cohesion at 20 months post flood as well as of lower levels of beliefs in benevolence of people and in efficacy of mutual helping behavior (Kaniasty, in press).

Disaster can instigate dramatic and complex changes in interpersonal dynamics within families, especially families with children and adolescents. There is strong consensus that post disaster family functioning is an important factor explaining variability in the psychological distress of their members. Parents are a primary source of social support for the children and adolescents (Cauce, Raid, Landesman and Gonzalez,1990) and primary source of coping assistance for the children in aftermath of disaster (Prinstein et al. 1996).

Disaster also may lead to changes within family (Cohan & Cole 2002). For e. In the state of South Carolina during the time of hurricane Hugo, time- series analyses of those data indicates that the rates of marriages, births and divorces all increased in the disaster declared countries in the year following the hurricane Hugo (Cohan & Cole 2002).

It is well documented that disaster survivors chiefly depends on and are taken care of by their families, relatives, friends and neighbours (Kaniasty & Norris, 2009).

Impact of Disaster in Family

Disasters can instigate dramatic and complex changes in interpersonal dynamics within families, especially families with children and adolescents. There is strong consensus that post disaster family functioning is an important factor explaining variability in the psychological distress of their members. When disasters impact entire families, coping becomes a fundamentally collective process. One aspect of family functioning that may interfere with adjustment is a reluctance to share feelings and reactions about the disaster. For example, parents and children may avoid talking

about the experience for fear of upsetting each other. One year after Hurricane Katrina, children who perceived their caregivers as unwilling or as being too upset to talk reported higher levels of posttraumatic stress symptoms (Gil-Rivas et al., 2010). In a study of families indirectly exposed to the September 11th attacks (Gil-Rivas, Silver, Holman, McIntosh, & Poulin, 2007), higher posttraumatic stress symptoms were reported by adolescents who chose not to talk about the event because they did not want to upset their parents and/or doubted that talking would help. Higher distress levels also were observed for adolescents who claimed that their parents recommended planning as a coping approach (e.g., "think about what steps to take"). Such findings highlight the fact that parents are often unaware of the extent of their children's postdisaster reactions and may be at a loss for knowing how to help their children cope.

Disasters also may lead to changes within the family. Cohan and Cole (2002) prospectively examined changes in various social circumstances in the state of South Carolina during a period that encompassed Hurricane Hugo. Time-series analyses of these data indicated that the rates of marriages, births, and divorces all increased in the disaster-declared counties in the year following the hurricane, prompting Cohan and Cole (2002) to conclude that Hurricane Hugo simply pressed people to take actions that were most likely contemplated before this potentially life-altering event.

Another source of family stress is conflict among family members. In analyses of older adult flood survivors that controlled for pre-flood resources, mental health, and socio-demographic characteristics, exposed survivors were more likely to report a new conflict with extended family than were non exposed survivors (Hutchins & Norris, 1989). In a study of bushfires in Australia (McFarlane, 1987a), disaster-related property loss predicted levels of family irritability and distress. Interestingly, 26 months after a disaster, the best predictor of family distress was the mother's (McFarlane, 1987a). Family conflicts and negative atmosphere have been related to higher levels child and adolescent disaster survivors (Bokszczanin, Green et al., 1991; Roussos et al., 2005; Tuicomepee & Romano, 2008; Wasserstein & La Greca, 1998). Multivariate analyses of data on survivors of Hurricane Hugo indicated that various facets of disaster exposure (e.g., trauma, injury, property damage) were associated with higher levels of marital stress and filial (caring for older relatives) stress (Norris

& Uhi, 1993). Familial stress was also found to mediate the impact of the hurricane on mental-health outcomes.

Despite these detrimental effects, disasters may have beneficial effects on interpersonal relationships, such as by increasing rates of marriage and births, as noted earlier. Myriad testimonials have been recorded in which people who faced disasters claim that these events brought them closer together with their families (e.g., Henry, Tolan, & Gorman-Smith, 2004; Kaniasty, 2003; Kessler et al., 2006). A number of studies have documented the salutary nature of such effects. Bolin (1982) and Bolin and Bolton (1986) observed that primary-group aid facilitated emotional recovery from disaster. Drabek and Key (1984) documented similar effects in their analysis of social functioning 3 years after the Topeka tornado. Controlling for the degree of damage, they found that tornado victims who received help from friends or relatives, compared with those who did not, reported being less alienated, healthier, happier in their marriages, and more involved in activities with friends, churches, or social organizations. Similarly, Hutchins and Norris (1989) reported that in the aftermath of flooding, elderly survivors had fewer children who chose to leave home during the recovery period than did comparably aged non victims.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Rational of the Site Selection

Gorkha earthquake 2015 devastate many districts of Nepal including big cities like Kathmandu and its surroundings villages which lost more than 1 million families and about 10000 people in Nepal. Lanagol is one of the oldestvillage inside Kathmandu valley, which is located 10 km away from center of Kathmandu, was also badly divested by earthquake 2015. This village was the most affected village in that ward as well as in Kirtipur municipality where there most of houses were destructed but less casualties. Also, when I went for the relief distribution in Lanagol village, I saw a special bonding in family and community coping with the earthquake to mitigate the loss and its effect. Hence, to find that special type of bonding will remain ever or if not how long it will remain in particular society Lanagol village was the best site for my study. With those bonding also we can see the changes in family relation in Lanagol. Thus, I choose this village Lanagol for my study which was the relevant site for my study where I could find impact of disaster in family.

Xiangming Chen et.al, stated that disaster in china results the rapid and extensive reconstruction of family through remarriage, this theory can applicable in Lanagol. I select Lanagol village for this study.

3.2 Research Design

This study aim is to explore the impact of disaster in family structure. The researcher collected qualitative data. Therefore, the appropriate research design of this study was explorative with qualitative method. The study was conducted on the basis of FGD, interview and KII.

3.3 Nature and Sources of Data

As mentioned earlier, the information collected in this study was qualitative in nature. The information was generated though primary source and previous information was gained through secondary data. The primary data was collected though interview, key

informant and from Lanagol village of kirtipur-6 while secondary data was collected from the local ward-6 of Kirtipur municipality as well as the local representative of the site and website, books, journals, article and newspaper etc.

3.4 Universe, Sampling Size and Sampling Method

The universe of the study was the total number of households living in the Langol Village which was 57 HHs. Among the 57 households, I selected the 18 households through simple random sampling method which would be adequate to represent the universe which would be appropriate to meet my objective of the study. I did the simple random sampling to select the 18 households by putting all the names of the households in a box and picked one by one. After selecting the households, I used convenient sample method to pick respondents from the households as there may be less chance to meet the main head of households so I picked one respondent from one family.

3.5 Data Collection Tool/Technique

The data collection tools under qualitative research that were applied while collecting field information was focus group discussion (FGD) and key Informant interview (KII) through semi structure questionnaire method was used to collect and generate required information. Each of these methods has been briefly describe below. The data collection tool under this research was open ended questionnaire. The question was open-ended because respondent are free to give their opinion freely which ultimately helps to generate needed information and also help to understand the circumstance completely with the amount of logical thought therefore, open-ended question has been used and questionnaire was prepared as guiding tools under data collection under interview.

3.5.1 Focus Group Discussion

FGD was conducted among the villagers who suffered from disaster; this method is very relevant for comparing and sharing. In this method respondent exchange their views as well as same issue is discussed in different ways. If one forget while sharing their experiences and issues than other can put their view on that issue. Moreover, it is

less time consuming therefore focus group Discussion help to foster the answer. In FDG, there are less chances of repetition as well as less chances of remaining hidden.

While conducting Focus Group discussion, I select the most affected household from disaster through the help of secondary data. In each FGD there were 6 respondents in which there were mixed age group from 35 to 60 years. I conducted three FGD groups with the help of my friend. The participants selected for interview was both male and female from different age groups for their experience. Mostly from aged 35 to 60 but one of them were over sixty also. The majority of the populations were newer only two of them were from Chhetri because this community is Newar dominant community. Among 18 respondents 12 were female and 6 were male. The majority of participants were from nuclear family only 4 of them were from joint family in total number. They were put in semi circle and me in front of them. Firstly, I have tried to maintain the ethical integrity, that I assure them their privacy would be protected by disclosing their identity and also asked permission to record their voice. I started to ask the question one by one and my friend nearby me and jotted down data in paper. The total time taken in each Focus Group Discussion was about 1 hour approximately for each group.

3.5.2 Key Informant Interview

All the information collected from FGD was not sufficient. For further information KII tools has been used. Key informant interview (KII) was conducted with key individuals within the community. It is in-depth interview with key stakeholders who knew what is going on in that particular field. Key informants were the people including community leader professional or resident who had firsthand knowledge about the community. While, conducting key informant interview, I selected professional people, one from Lanagol Bikash Samitte and one member of the club Lyamphucha. All total I select two people for key informant interview. While doing key informant interview I introduce myself and my purpose to visit then, In-depth interview was conducted approximately for 45 minutes with each respondent. In addition, the interviews were tape recorded with permission. The tape interview were transcribe for analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis

After the completion of the data collection, both primary and secondary data were processed manually. The collected information from field data was analyzed in rich narrative analysis in descriptive way.

3.7 Limitation of the Study

Any study cannot be free from short coming and drawbacks. In terms of area this study was delimited only single village of ward no 6. In method I have use purposive sampling methods to collect information. This is another limitation of this research. Regarding objective it may mislead somewhere. I have fully tired of my best to excavate the impact of Gorkha Earthquakein family and their existing relations within familybut it remain somewhere lack because this data collection process take after three year later so, the respondent might have forgotten some incidents at the time of disaster.

In terms of generalization, this study was done in one particular village so; it cannot be generalized to entire ward no 6 as well as entire country.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Context

Lanagol is the community situated in northern part which is only 10 km far from the center. This community lies in Kirtipur municipalities which has ward among it Lanagol is one of them, which is ward no 6 the largest ward having 11 other communities with 7282 population and 1676 household. However, Lanagol has only 57 household. After two major earthquakes Lanagol has loose its original structure and has turned into chaos. At that time one child age of 9 years lost her life and three of them were severely injured who had been admitted to hospital for 2 weeks. As being one of the most affected communities, “Lanagol”, was helped by both formal and informal sector including family, friends, and local religious and cultural assemblies, kinship, community and different community based organization such as mother groups, youth club, other different groups and various NGOs/INGOs were involved in disaster crisis. I found the community itself was active at the time of earthquake but also found special type of bonding in family and community. At the time of disaster there formed youth group named “Layamapucha” which youth group in Newari. They actively contributed to the community in rescuing people, taking entire community to the safe place, taking care of every member of the community by arranging shelter, food materials, medication by arranging health camp every week, patrolling at the night time for the security of the village, managing relief distribution very scientific way and also distributed among the community in equal. Also “Layamapucha” helped to clear rubbles of the ruined houses in the village for a month by going every house daily in a group. The “Layamapucha” received the relief distribution from the donor and distributed equal and fairly as per the need of the family there in Lanagol. Also they helped to settle temporary shelter for the community as well as managed food for the few days after the earthquake. They coordinated with the near hospital and did various medical camps in the Lanagol village for the community. Thus, there was no conflict in the community while distribution of relief materials. The local people said that because of co-operation and peace distributions of relief materials the donors who visit there were happy and visit them twice. Volunteers from different community were

there to dismantle the earthquake destructed houses. As well as different members from different community, they recite the name (Nagau, Chovar, Kalamati) also feeds them at the time of crisis. Foods include (dal, vat, tarkari, khir puri).

Further, different intuitions in Kirtipur municipality like Devdhoka Gajaran, cement factory, Jansewa School, IME money transfer, Charghare Aama Samuha, Rara hill foundation, Manushi Laghu Ughyooy, Lalitpur shakya shingh vihaar, (blanket, rice) Simirki Earthquake Relief Foundation also provide relief materials and cash fifteen hundred to all victim families and also provide cash support. As well as different medical intuitions like Vadhoya hospital, kirtipur PHT, Patan Das Farma, were also there to support injured people, they provide free health services, medicines, and provide sanitary materials (nail cutter, sanitary pad, hot bag, shop, bandage, etc). And also in Nepal Ayurvedik campus the Cubin doctors where there to treat free health services some of them also benefit from there. The major role played during earthquake was Kirtipur Channel too. It broadcast the live video of village after earthquake therefore the village grabs the attention of lots of local institution as well as from INGOs and NGOs. Some of the National celebrities were also there to support the family.

The different NGOs INGOs were also found there to rescue the people from disaster, Nepal police, Red Cross Society, HANDS4NEPAL, Muslim community (ALKHER), Buddhist community, NEW EARTH they provide different relief materials like basket, rice, dal, tarpaulins, soap, blankets, sanitary materials and so on. Hands4nepal Thai Buddhist helps in construction in Drum house and provides steel to all victims.

OXFARM conduct agricultural training to earthquake victims. They trained for all vegetables product and grant pipe, seeds tray, drum, manures, plastic and scissors etc. the program was run for five days. Another, Generation For Peace work for children's they provide readings materials, utensils, playing things, emergencies bag, and run different programs to make children refresh so that they don't lose psychological order. Disasters impact the lives of children in countless ways. Indeed, disasters harm the physical spaces in which children live (their homes, neighborhoods, schools, and playgrounds), disrupt their daily routines and may lead to long-term displacement, threaten their sense of safety and security in the world, cause stress within families and communities, and may result in the injury or death of loved ones. Because of their

age, levels of development, and lack of life experience, young children possess fewer strategies for coping with the after-effects of disaster, and thus may suffer more severe emotional and psychological problems (see La Greca et al. 2002; Rosenfeld et al. 2005) And from Nepal Government the whole community gets only six tarpaulins, fifteen thousand for steel only after four month later ten thousand for blankets. The family who lose their members in the quake they get hundred forty-five thousand. The people whom I interview they were very delighted with the work of different volunteers of different country and supports of different institutions but they were totally dissatisfied with the task of Nepal Government that they plan different program for disaster victim but they didn't accomplish any work yet. One two passed on but the role of Nepal Government appears minimal. Therefore the anger towards government is extreme.

4.2 Family Support during the Disaster

Family is the basic unit of the society; family plays the vital role in the time of disaster and its response. The types of family found in Lanagol were Joint and Nuclear family both. The number of nuclear family was in large number. Those whom are from nuclear family face problem because they have to depend upon others for different supports and face problem as well in reconstruction work too. It is because of less labor power. Family and friends residing to the disaster zone provided the first closest resources for relief (Andre Henderson 2015). In Lanagol village I found that there were special types of bonding in family. Aftermath the earthquake in Lanagol village most of the families stayed in shelter provided by the "Layamapucha" for a few days. But after the few days, most of the families started to make their temporary shelter and moved to the respective shelter with their family. This was because the families those were living separately before earthquake started to union again and lived together in same tent or temporary shelter with entire family. They shared the same shelter, floor, food, clothes and emotions within the family. At that time many families who were living separately joined together and lived together for few months only. Also who were not joined with their respective family and who didn't have their other families they stayed in shelter provided by the "Layamapucha" for few months. For a few months there was aftershock of the earthquake and people were scared of living inside their remaining house which were not affected by the

earthquake. After 2-3 months, families who haven't affected their house by earthquake went back to live in house while families who didn't have house had already made their temporary shelter and lived there.

One of the responder shared the experience of earthquake like this *“my name is Laxmi and I'm 56 years old. I have two daughters and a son. My son had got married and he has got 2 daughters while one of my daughter had got married who has one daughter and another is unmarried. On that day of earthquake I was sitting outside of my house doing different stuff. I couldn't imagine that earthquake would destroy that much. In my entire life, I haven't experienced like that big earthquake. I was sitting outside and heard the weird noise and suddenly the ground started to shake and I ran to edge of the compound and turned back. I saw my house collapsed instantly and whole compound was covered with dust even a meter far couldn't see. I couldn't think what to do but after few minutes I remember that my grand daughters were inside house. I started to shout and asked for help from the near neighbors. Suddenly, my son came running and started to rescue my granddaughters. Including my son and some of neighbors helped to take out granddaughters from the collapsed house. They struggled for about an hour to rescue them. Fortunately, my grand daughters were safe and a bit of scared. I console them and stopped crying and took them to safe place. In the evening, my son found safe place for us and we went to stay with our neighbor for few days and after my son made temporary house for our family and we moved there.”*

The research also reveals that, family was found the primary supporter in disaster crisis because they gain all sorts of supports within family because of cooperation, mutual understanding they are able to recovery abruptly from the situation therefore support of family is durable than any other network. The family copes with the situation by being the strongest supporter of each other .the family members involve in different task which they are capable. Specially, the male engage in reconstruction work and female involve in other households management work. According to their capacity all family members help and care each other in multiple forms and support simultaneously.

4.2.1 Psychological and Emotional Support

In the aftermath of disaster, young children are dependent on adults for restoring physical and psychological safety, routine, and order (Jagodic and Kontak 2002); offering a safe space for the expression of emotions (Fothergill and Peek 2006); and providing opportunities for play (Raynor 2002). At the time of earthquake in Lanagol, women and children were more vulnerable through the psychological aspect. Among the 18 respondents, 12 were the female and 6 were the male. As everyone's house was collapsed by the earthquake, most of them cried and were consoled by their family member while some were consoled by the neighbor and kin. None of them had psychological disorder but only they were very sad because face great loss due to earthquake. One girl, age of 9, was dead due to buried inside her house and were rescued but it was late. So, the entire community gave sympathy to the family who had lost their child.

4.2.2 Temporary Shelter

Immediately after the earthquake, Lanagol community was turned into ruined. Even those families, whose houses were not collapsed, were not able to stay in their house. They were scared of that devastated earthquake and also the aftershock was repeating the terror. So, at that time the "Layamapucha" found one tunnel house, which was made for the purpose to cultivate vegetables, near the village and made their settlement there for the few days. They managed materials like mattress, blanket, water, food and other things to spend one night also they informed people to settle there for few days.

During the interview with stake holder the representative of "Layamapucha" said "*if there was not the tunnel for the cultivation near our village in the open space, we would have to spend all night under the open sky and only we could find other option in the next day. It was lucky that just after earthquake we could find that place and also the owner was convinced to let us that place for a month. We arranged as much as possible to facilitate the community like shelter, food, mattress, medical camp, spraying medicine for bug and insects, patrolling for the safety at the night and etc. After few days, the families who are capable and didn't want to live in community moved to their respective shelter by constructing themselves.*"

After few days, the families started to construct their own temporary shelter in their own territory for their respective family. For the construction of shelter, the head of the family was helped by other family members and also some of them collected other necessary materials.

4.2.3 Economic Support

Parents and other family members are the ones who most often meet these needs for children during non disaster times, as well as post-disaster. Mostly in the family, main economic supporter will be father, mother and son if he capable of earning. So most of the families, father was the main head of the family while some of them are mother and son too. Hence, all sort of economic support family' main head did and also some of the family were supported by their son, daughter. Mainly in Lanagol village there were middle class family and few of them were lower class. So, when they need to reconstruct their house every family member were supporting economically. The family head decided to sell some part of land to reconstruct their house and they also get cash aid from the government.

4.3 Changes in Family Relation

4.3.1 Family Disputes

Families are the very important indeed during the disaster and people are more worried about the wellbeing of their families that about their own personal safety. But disaster also can instigate dramatic and complex changes in interpersonal dynamics within families, especially families with children and adolescents. In Lanagol villagethere was the special bonding in between the families at the time of earthquake and that lasted for few weeks only. After the earthquake, everybody need help and were ready to help anyone but after a month every family went back to their respective house and temporary shelter. So, the normal life started again and people behavior also changed but the relief and help didn't stopped. Many formal and informal organizations and communities were helping the community.

Among the 15 respondents, 9 families didn't have any types of disputes within family while 6 families had disputes within the family. Most of the family disputes were

about the land disputes. So, they have to divide the land own by the family within the family members but the main dispute were preferences of the land. And another dispute in family was about the distribution of relief, materials they receive from donor, within the family. In the relief distribution there were foods, household equipments, kitchen utensils and construction materials like zinc sheets for the construction of temporary shelter, construction utensils, tents and others including money. So, as many families had discussion about money and kitchen utensils.

4.3.2 Division of Family

When disasters impact the families, coping becomes a fundamentally collective process. One aspect of family functioning that may interfere with adjustment is a reluctance to share feelings and reactions about the disaster. But, disaster also may leads to changes within the family. In Lanagol village, among the 15 respondents, 9 families had separated and 6 hadn't separated. From the 9 families, 12 new families were emerged. There were few reasons behind the separation of the family after earthquake and one of those reasons was to make earthquake affected card from the local government bodies so that they can get relief and different concession from the local government bodies at the time of needy. Earthquake affected card can be used to get concession from municipality to get the permission for reconstruction of house and also many NGOs and INGOs based their relief distribution on that card. Few months after earthquake many NGOs and INGOs distributed relief to the community like tarpaulins, tent, sanitary packets, medicines, mattress, clothes and also agricultural trainings including seeds and utensils for the earthquake affected families only. Nepal government also gave 300 thousand rupees for the earthquake affected families who have those earthquake affected card from the local bodies.

“My name is Aasta Maharjan and we live in joint family with my 5 brothers and 4 sister in law and our 7 children. So it was impossible to live in a small house but also we are not capable of making our own house separately. So earthquake became a good reason for us to separate from the big joint family and make our own separate house. I think that was not only problem to make own respective house, also we need courage to build and that courage gave us by earthquake. Because after earthquake we have to make new house for all but it won't be possible in one so we decided to separate and make our own house. Again we didn't separated into six small families

rather we did separated only 5 different families and the youngest brother is still living with me. And other 4 brothers made their own house separately. Also we have got 5 different earthquake affected family card from the local government”

“My name is Sanu Maya Maharjan and I lived with my two sons and 2 daughters in law. One son is capable of making his own house and another is not. So, they wanted to get separated and wanted to build their own house. But still they don’t want to leave me, they were waiting for good time and the earthquake became good reason for them, as our house was totally collapsed and we have to build our new house. So, I suggested hem to make two separate houses so they can live happily. Also we were having issue of land distribution with my brother in law which was sorted easily after earthquake. They agreed to separate land as everyone wanted and we got to make our house in current location.”

From the above case also we can see that there were strong bonding within the families in Lanagol village but the reasons for separation of the family were many. The main reason for division of family was to get the relief materials from the different government and non government organizations as well as to get earthquake affected card from the local government. When a family get “Earthquake Affected Card” from the government, as government decided to give rupees 300 thousand to the every family who have got the earthquake affected card, they can get aid money from the government. Also there were many formal and informal organizations who were distributing relief materials and also many training programs to the earthquake affected family to minimize the affect of earthquake in family.

Among them 5 families already decided to become the nuclear family from the joint family but they couldn’t separate because of the limited source like a single house and land property were not divided between the brothers. Also before the earthquake, they were not capable of making new house and also they didn’t want to leave their old house. After the earthquake, as their house was totally collapsed, they were forced to build new house so at that time it was the best time to get separated from the joint family also.

There were many reasons for the division of family in Lanagol but the main reason was the earthquake as the respondents also said they could get aid money from the

government and the aid money was not enough to build new house. So, they decided to divide family to get more aid money for the family. Also some of the family wanted to get separated from the joint family and after earthquake it became easy to get separated as they have to build their new house. The aid money was not sufficient to build and rebuild houses so many families sold their piece of land to get money for a new house.

4.3.3 Union of Family

Among the 15 respondents in Lanagol, I found one family was united due to earthquake. In fact, parents were living separately and their sons were living separately in their respective house. The earthquake collapsed the house of parents and younger son's. So, after the earthquake, parents had to live in the elder son's house for few years but later the parents didn't like to live with elder son and moved to younger son's house. The parents were more than 70 years and they didn't want to build new house for them so they decided to live with their younger son.

There were many reasons but it happened after the earthquake, so earthquake became the main reason behind union of the two families in Lanagol.

4.4 Impact of Changes in Family

In Lanagol village, there was both good and bad impact was seen due to the changes in the relations in the family due to earthquake. The good impact were, many families were willing to be separated from the joint family to nuclear family but they were not capable and also didn't have big reason to be separated but the earthquake became the main motive to be separated from the joint family. Also after the earthquake they got many relief, help and concession from the government and non government organizations. From the today's date, most of them had build their new house by selling their land and they said they are very happy now before than before earthquake.

The bad impact was, they lost huge property including house, furniture, clothes and any more due to earthquake. Few of them got injured and hospitalized for few weeks and one family had lost their child age of 9 years. They had to suffer for many years

without living in house, all the time they had to fear of natural calamities like heavy rain, storm, lightening etc. to reconstruct and build new house, the government help was not sufficient so had to sell their property like land, some of them haven't left any piece of land in which their family was dependent for living.

Some of the families were living in joint family and they could divide their work and also consult for any problems but after earthquake they have to do by themselves. Some families had disputes while distribution of the property and land so they don't want to see their each others' face even.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

Nepal is one of the disaster prone countries in the world, because of its geographical and natural features. The widespread poverty prevailing in the country and lack of awareness among the people contribute to increase the risk of disasters. . Nepal falls in the top 20th list for the most multi-hazard prone country in the world and also ranked 11th in terms of risk from earthquakes. In the earthquake of 2015 April 25 and 13 the earthquake is also called Gorkha earthquake in it Nepal has face great losses of economic, physical, social and many other losses in it. At the time of disaster family plays the vital role at the time of emergency. This dissertation illustrates how family supports each other at the time of disaster and does disaster changes the relation in family and its impact on family.

Aftermath of earthquake 2015, there was chaos and terror in entire Nepal including Lanagol village. 50 seconds of shake of earthquake gave the feeling of apocalypse in the village. Mainly family were the main supporter for rescuing, indicating other family members if they are in danger and needy, take care of their members and children, taking to safe place, helping in console their family emotionally and psychologically, helping in reconstruction and many more.

This information was collected a highly divested village of Kirtipur municipality. At the time of crisis, different social institution played crucial role. Therefore to know about the role of formal and informal in that particular village I choose this topic. Qualitative research methods was applied to collect data and collected information was analysis in descriptive way. The primary data collected from Lanagol and other secondary information was taken from different sources (book, articles, internet and different organization) as well. In this research random sampling methods was used to generate information's. For the data collections qualitative tools are used which is focus group discussion and key informant interview.

The raw data reveals that the primary supporter found in Lanagol was family and others like neighbors, friends, local religious and cultural assemblies groups and youth club and various community based institutions like mother group, father groups and other different NGOs and INGOs were actively participate to minimize disaster crisis. And also a local club (Lyamphucha) was actively engage to help people. But, the earthquake created the strong bonding in between families and the community that every individual and families were helping each other. . At the time of disaster there form youth group named “Layamapucha” which actively contributed the community in rescuing people, taking entire community to the safe place, taking care of every member of the community by arranging shelter, food materials, medication by arranging health camp every week, patrolling at the night time for the security of the village, managing relief distribution very scientific way and also distributed among the community in equal. Also “Layamapucha” helped to clear rubbles of the ruined houses in the village for a month by going every house daily in a group. The “Layamapucha” received the relief distribution from the donor and distributed equal and fairly as per the need of the family there in Lanagol. Also they helped to settle temporary shelter for the community as well as managed food for the few days after the earthquake. They coordinated with the near hospital and did various medical camps in the Lanagol village for the community. Thus, there was no conflict in the community while distribution of relief materials. The local people said that because of co-operation and peace distributions of relief materials the donors who visit there was happy and visit them twice. They work or support in coordination with other support groups. Most of the social network supports them by providing relief, material and sanitary goods. Different organization like Oxfam alkher (muslim community), Jacyee club, Manusi laghu udhyog, Devdhoka Jagaran, Lalitpur Shakya Singh Vihar, Chovar cement factory, Ime, New earth and many other institutions help. Moreover community like Chovar, Nayabazaar, Charghare, Buddhist community and Muslim community help by providing food and other kinds support. Buddhist community also helps in construction work and provides steel as well. In similar manner Muslim community help by building drum house and grant food stuff also. Furthermore different health institutions like Das pharmacy, Vayodha hospital, Kirtipur pfect, Kirtipur health and research centre were also there to support they provide health service as well as sanitary things. This network were there because of being neighbor and people frequent visit before disaster and friend network also make

them to arrived there. Another organization helping hand also played a crucial role by supporting earthquake victim's children by providing reading materials, foods, medicine, playing things and so on. In additional, DPROX Nepal also helped by providing agricultural tanning and agricultural equipments.

5.2 Conclusion

Earthquake is natural phenomena unless there are no serious injuries of death and other serious losses(Carr, 1932). By Earthquake 2015, there were over 8,790 casualties and 22,300 injuries. It was estimated that the lives of eight million people, almost one-third of the population of Nepal, have been impacted by these earthquakes. By this earthquake Lanagol village was also badly affected.

Hence, from my dissertation I have found that in Lanagol village, there were strong bonding in between families and the community. Many groups and youth groups were formed after disaster and also they played important role during the disaster. Instead of the strong bonding in families there were division of families in village. the reason for division of families were first, the families divided to get aid and relief from the formal and informal organization including the local government, as government had decided to give rupees 300 thousand to every earthquake affected family. To get that aid from government, I found that families get divided. And after certain time some of the families were joined together also which shows that some of the families just pretended to separate their family for the sake of aid from the government. And second, some of the families who were living in joint family wanted to set separated but because of lack of sources like land, money to build new house and others, they couldn't do that but after the earthquake they found appropriate time to get separated.

Thus, from the above discussion we can generalize that, at the time of disaster family became the primary supporter while disaster also leads to the dispute and division of family. Disaster may not be the main reason of disputes and division of family but can be a cause of dispute and division in family.

REFERENCES

- Bell, W. and Boat, M.D. 1957."Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relation."
American Journal of Sociology. No.63, pp. 391-398.
- Bolin, R.C. (1994). *Household and Community Recovery After Earthquakes*.
Institute of Behavioral Sciences. Boulder, CO. University of Colorado.
- Carr LJ. 1932."Disaster and the Sequences-Pattern Concept of Social Change."
American Journal of Sociology.
- Chen, X., Dai, K., Parnell, A. (1992). Disaster tradition and change: remarriage
and family reconstruction in a post-earthquake community in the People's
Republic of China. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 23: 115-132.
- Chhetri, Meen B. 2001. "A Practitioner's View of Disaster Management in Nepal:
Organization, System, Problems and Prospects." *Risk Management*, vol. 3, No.
4, pp.63-72
- Clason, C. (1983). The family as a life-saver in disaster. *International Journal of Mass
Emergencies and Disasters* 1:43-62.
- Coffman, S. (1996). Parents' struggle to rebuild family life after hurricane
Andrew. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 17: 353-367.
- Cohan, C.L., Cole, S.W. (2002). Life course transitions and natural disaster:
marriage, birth, and divorce following Hurricane Hugo. *Journal of Family
Psychology* 16: 14-25.
- Dann, S., Wilson, P. (1993). Women and emergency services. *Symposium on
Women in Emergencies in Disasters*. Brisbane, Queensland, Bureau of
Emergency Services.
- De Man, A., Simpson-Housley, P. (1987). Factors in perception of tornado hazard:
an exploratory study. *Social Behavior and Personality* 15: 13-19.

- Drabek T.E. (1986). *Human Responses To Disaster: An Inventory Of Sociological Findings*. NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Drabek, T.E. (1969). Social processes in disaster: family evacuation. *Social Problems* 16: 336-349.
- Drabek, T.E., Key, W.H. (1984). *Conquering Disaster: Family Recovery and Long-Term Consequences*. New York, Irvington.
- Dunal, C., Gavira, M., Flaharty, J., Birz, S. (1985). Perceived disruption and psychological distress among flood victims. *Journal of Occupational Psychiatry* 16:9-16.
- Eade, D. Williams, S. (1995). *The Oxford Handbook of Development and Relief* (eds.). Vols. 1-3. Oxford, U.K. Oxfam.
- Faupel C.E., Styles, S.P. (1993). "Disaster education, household preparedness, and stress responses following hurricane Hugo". *Environment and Behavior*. 25: 228-249.
- Frank, F. (2007). The changing meaning of disaster. *Area*, vol. 39, No. 4 pp. 482-489.
- Gerrity, E.T., Steinglass, P. (2003). Relocation stress following catastrophic events in Ursano, R.J. (ed.) *Terrorism and Disaster: Individual and Community Mental Health Interventions*. Pp. 259-286. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Goenjian, A.K., Najarian, L.M., Pynoos, R.S., Steinberg, A.M., Manoukian, G., Tavosian, A., & Fairbanks, L.A. (1994). Posttraumatic stress disorder in elderly and younger adults after the 1988 earthquake in Armenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 151: 895-901.
- Goltz, J.D., Russell, L.A., Bourque, L.B. (1992). Initial behavioral response to a rapid onset disaster: a case study of the Oct. 1, 1987 Whittier Narrows earthquake. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 10:43-69.

- Hareven, T.K. (1991). The home and the family is historical perspective. *SocialResearch* 58: 253-285.
- Henderson, Andera.2006. "The Human Geography of Catastrophe: Family Bonds, Community Ties, and Disaster Relief after the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire." *SouthernCalifornia Quarterly*, vol. 88, No. 1, pp. 37-70
- Hultaker, O. (1985). Decision processes in evacuation. *Disaster Studies* 16: 1-31.
- Kaniasty, K., Norris, F.H. (2001). Social support dynamics in adjustment to disasters.in B.H. Sarason & S. Duck (eds).. *Personal Relationships: Implications for Clinicaland Community Psycholgy*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd. . (pp. 201-224).
- Kapinus, C.A., Johnson, M.P. (2003). The utility of family life cycle as a theoreticaland empirical tool: commitment and family life-cycle stages. *Journal of Family Issues*24: 155-184.
- Kim, A. (2002). The role of kinship in social networks. International SociologicalAssociation, Brisbane, Australia. Association Paper.
- Kirschenbaum, A. (2002). Disaster preparedness: a conceptual and empiricalreevaluation. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 20: 5-28.
- Leik R. K., Leik S. A., Ekker K, and Gifford G.A., (1982). *Under the Threat ofMount St. Helens, A Study of Chronic Family Stress*. Minneapolis: Family StudyCenter, University of Minnesota.
- Lystad, M.H. (1984). Children's response to disaster: family implications.*International Journal of Family Psychiatry* 5:41-60.
- Metz, W.C., Hewett, P.L., Muzzarelli, J., Tanzman, E. (2002). Identifying specialneedshouseholds that need assistance for emergency planning. *International Journalof Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 20: 255-281.

Miller, L. (2003). Family therapy of terroristic trauma: psychological syndromes and treatment strategies. *American Journal of Family Therapy* 31: 257-280.

Quaantelli, E L. 2001." Disaster Planning Emergency Management and Civil Protection: The Historical Development of Organized Efforts to Plan For and To Respond to Disaster." Unpublished Manuscript held at Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, Newark DE.

Unger, Donald G. and Powell, Douglas R. 1980. "Supporting Families Under Stress: Role of Social Network." *Family Relations*, vol. 29, No.4, Family Stress, Coping and Adaptation (Oct., 1980), pp. 566-574

