

# The Local-Social Supporting Approaches Scaling up the Capacity of Reconstruction in Nepal

**Nirmal Chongbang**

PhD student, Social Work Department, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Corresponding: [nirech2005@gmail.com](mailto:nirech2005@gmail.com)

Orcid number- 0000-0002-9461-8164



[doi.org/10.54099/ijebm.v1i1.126](https://doi.org/10.54099/ijebm.v1i1.126)

## ARTICLE INFO

### Research Paper

#### Article history:

Received: May 6, 2022

Revised: 19 May, 2022

Accepted: May 27, 2022

**Keywords:** Disaster, vulnerability, social protection, social support, resilience

## ABSTRACT

The paper brings out how the social support, and protection practices can scale up its cost in disaster recovery initiatives in disaster-affected communities in Gandaki province, Nepal. An online (google) based survey form was developed, and distributed to potential frontline workers, NGO staff, INGO staff, and UN staff based on their project area. Respondents were randomly divided into two groups (local support, and external support) and asked for their supporting practices while the disaster has occurred at the local level, and responses were analysed at the explanatory level through the regression. Study results suggested that household, neighbour, and local community support was quick, applicable, and easier to adopt than a comparison of external supporters. Based on the study, further development intervention should be centred on the capacity to strengthen local households, neighbourhoods, community-based organizations, and local states rather than expecting external support. The study paper explores the local supporting practices on reconstruction and recovery, which is the novelty approaches in local supporting engagement on speedy recovery initiatives in Nepal.

*This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.*

## INTRODUCTION

Local support practices can contribute to mitigating the existing shocks and stresses, especially in specific low-income, marginalized and targeted communities. The local support practices and social capital can be explained as social protection. Individual capacity, community-based socio-economic capacity, external support factors, and legal support components can be defined as local social support initiatives in this study that can contribute to bounce back better capacity of local communities, especially aftermath of disaster strikes. This can be facilitated by enhancing the capacity of needful support to vulnerable communities, while disaster strikes.

Local support practices can reduce the existing and future risk in targeted communities. Practices can be implemented from formal and informal modes which can be enforced formally through a legal frame and informally from a different programmatic package. It can guarantee individuals access to economic or social support whereas informal safety nets provide the likelihood of support to individuals to assure them recover from shock and stress due to disaster or unfavourable situations. The local support practices and their provision refer to the support that individuals can hope for from the government and public programs. Which can support the poor and vulnerable community through generating assets or employment, cash transfer, providing subsidies on education, livelihoods, shelter, and basic needs aftermath of emergency strikes. Paitoonpong, S. et. al. (2008) has compared the local support practices

that have emerged more prominently since the financial crisis of South Asia. Authors claim the issues on local and social support practices, there is still considerable confusion among scholars and national, and international organizations regarding the use and meaning of the local support practices term. Authors have considered the different definitions of the term—particularly as it was used during the Asian Financial Crisis—and attempt to clarify its meaning and proper use. It is explained in this paper, how the local social support began with structural adjustment programs related to the lending program, which is directly related to poverty alleviation, to make adjustment programs in Asian Financial Crises and how it has been practiced in the study area.

Disaster can contribute to socio-economic losses and a higher impact on the poor and vulnerable due to their coping and low preparedness capacities. Disaster losses can be reduced by better physical and socio-economic preparedness. Concern stakeholders can contribute to the resilience capacity of poor and targeted communities by adding the anticipative, absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacity of targeted communities. The Local support practices can contribute to social and economic recovery aftermath of disaster strikes and provide the chance for the affected community to bounce back to a better condition as social protection from public and private engagement. (Philip Brown, 2018) has explained how the natural disaster gives rise to loss and damage and may affect subjective expectations about the prevalence and severity of future disasters. These expectations about the occurrence and severity of future disasters. These expectations might then in turn shape individuals' investment behaviors, potentially affecting their incomes in the following years. As part of emerging literature on endogenous preferences, economists have begun studying the consequences that exposure to natural disasters has on risk attitudes, perceptions, and behavior. They explain further, that people in low-income countries are 12 times more likely to die from natural disasters and are similarly more likely to suffer serious economic consequences of disasters, even though high and low-income countries do not differ significantly either in terms of the number of disasters experienced or in terms of the number of people affected.

When disaster appears in communities, it has a huge negative consequence on social, economic, in ecological environments that affect human society. Many previous studies were based on disaster risk reduction, social protection, and social support practices separately, but the recent demand of study is formative results in disaster risk reduction through the future risk reduction with an anticipated capacity of communities. A systematic study on community-driven disaster risk reduction, affected-centered recovery, and preparation through local and social support practices or social protection is still lacking. This paper will try to find how the anticipated and well-practiced social protection or local support practices provision will reduce community risk aftermath of a disaster, to find out how humanitarian organization and the local authority has engaged in local and social support practices which make differences in response and recovery. This study will explore how local social support mechanism has been inline in organizational and local authority policies, plan, and activities that support a risk reduction model in disaster-affected communities in the study area. In the background setting, studies had explained on social support practices, and disaster risk is separate phenomena. Paitoonpong, S. et al (2008) and their peers were raising the existing social protection, its benefits, and future applications. And, Philip Brown has explained the disaster scenario, somehow trying to raise a voice to link with social protection and future sensitive actions. There were 460 incidents recorded in Gandaki province in the last year (Incident (bipadportal.gov.np, 2020) but hardly can promptly response from state and development partners due to remoteness, low structural response mechanism, and lower readiness at a local level. Hence, further, this study tried to explain how the response, reconstruction, and recovery initiatives have been accomplished, and how the local supporting factors make a difference in recovery, especially in the high earthquake affected Gorkha, and Tanahun districts of Gandaki province. Where I had tried to dig out what are the major local social support, what are the legal provisions of social protection from provincial governance in terms of disaster response mechanism, and why the affected people were not getting promptly support in the disaster-affected area? and what are the underlying factors making disturbance to address on recovery action, and what link with local and social protection initiatives or provisions from development partners and local authorities?. Overall this paper's goal is to explore the local supporting approaches which have contributed to scaling up the capacity of local communities in reconstruction and recovery. Specific objectives are envisioning to describe the existing



local social support practices during the disaster and to explain the resilience-building practices based on local supporting practices in reconstruction practices.

## LITERATURE REVIEW (if any)

The local support and social resources on which an individual can rely while dealing with life challenges and stressors are typically conceptualized in social support theory (Thoits, 1995 as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler, 2018). Cullen, Wright, and Chamlin (1999) as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler (2018) have expanded on this concept by defining social support as a process of transmitting human, cultural, material, and social capital, whether between individuals or between larger social units (communities, states) and their members. Support is generally given informally, through social interactions, but it can also be given formally by an organization with official statuses, such as government assistance programs or the legal system. Social support has both direct and indirect effects on delinquency and other well-being markers. People who receive social support may participate in less delinquency as a result. Social support may operate as a buffer between risk factors for delinquency and participation in a delinquent activity in an indirect way. There are various aspects to social support (Thoits, 2011 as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler, 2018).

To begin, support can be defined as perceived, feeling supported, or believing that support is accessible, as opposed to received, reporting that assistance was supplied. Second, assistance might be instrumental, informational, or emotional. The providing of resources or aid with practical activities or issues, such as lending money or renting assets, is referred to as instrumental support. Advice, direction, or the provision of knowledge that may assist a person in solving a problem is referred to as informational support. Expressions of sympathy, caring, regard, value, or encouragement constitute emotional support. Third, the source of social support can be distinguished. Members of a person's primary group, such as family members and friends, are frequently regarded as sources of support. Individuals may also seek assistance from secondary groups, such as schools, local groups, religious institutions, and local state authority, where interactions are more regulated or hierarchical and less personal. The most important sources of support, the level of support in a relationship, and the impact of support on behaviours change throughout a person's life (Umberson, Crosnoe, and Reczek, 2010 as cited in Lisa Kort-Butler 2018). For disaster-affected people, the most important local support sources are their family, neighbours, community groups, and informal support groups locally.

Over the last decades, social support and local protection has become a crucial term in the development field including government and even community development perspectives. Several governments, development partners, and local agencies have been working on social protection from different forms of intervention. Say for instance policies, programs, plans, and intervention actions. Which tried to protect, risk reduction and facilitate recovery from different shocks and stresses, especially in poor, vulnerable, and targeted communities. J.B. Asquith (2001) explains about East Asia experienced a major financial crisis in 1997, resulting in negative growth in Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand, and reversing decades of gains in poverty reduction. As a result, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and other international financial institutions made emergency loans to protect social sector spending and expand safety nets. During this time, ADB funding for social protection increased from 1% to 2% to 13% of total financing, prompting ADB to embark on a three-year process to draught its first Social Protection Strategy. Srawooth Paitoonpong (2008) elucidates the issues of Social support practices have emerged more prominently since the financial crises. She explains further in social and local support practices as considerable Asian financial crises. She explained further; the safety net analogy is drawn from high-wire walkers who can be protected while they fall. Social support practices can be defined as social protection which can facilitate on emphasis private and public support mechanisms to the needful and vulnerable community, while the disaster strikes.

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

It is very hard to define as every local and social support practice can be deserved as an anticipatory action that could reduce the existing and future risk in the vulnerable community on their socio-economic recovery. It is hard to be defined a strong bonding between social support practices and community resilience capacity, especially in the aftermath of a disaster. In the real ground, the poor and vulnerable people are more vulnerable with compare to socio-economically sound communities. Daniel Longhurst, (2020) explains major two dominant frameworks guiding work in this area. First, the framework of Adaptive Social Supportive Protection (ASP) considers how links between disaster risk management, climate change adaptation (CCA), and social protection can reduce the impact of shocks and stressors on peoples' livelihoods and build resilience. Longhurst compares further with the concept of Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) provides a framework and typology for thinking through the different ways in which climate vulnerability assessment (CVA) and social protection (SP) can be linked through the categories of horizontal and vertical expansion, piggybacking, alignment, and design tweaks. To try to advance programming and identify gaps and risks, in this paper we move away from categories and look at how the frameworks have been operationally applied in different contexts. In this paper were author raises the debate about linking Climate Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) and Social Protection (SP) as part of the wider and long-running discussion about ways to link relief and development. A core problem with this long debate has been that it tends to assume that stronger linkages are both right and achievable amongst different parties, assuming the right concept and technical solutions can be devised. But if this is the case, then the literature largely fails to explain why it has been so difficult to make happen in practice and tends to omit the fundamental differences in principle, approach, and ways of working that have made linkages difficult among disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and social protection.

A core problem with this long debate has been the gap between social support practices, social protection, and disaster risk management. The disaster-affected community can be resilient when the anticipated action for risk reduction was being used as a disaster management tool. But in this case, the large-scale literature fails to explain how social support initiatives and social protection packages have been operated as disaster anticipation tools or risk reduction tools in the practiced area. Social support initiatives and social protection can be defined as anticipating action which can contribute to future risk reduction and support the bounce back better capacity to the disaster-affected community. Wickramasinghe (2013) compares the significant impact of the disaster on poor and rich households in her study interrelation of social protection in Sri Lanka on disaster management via programs and policies. She describes Sri Lanka has witnessed a striking increase in both the frequency and intensity of natural disasters over the last few decades. Natural disasters have caused human, physical, financial, and environmental losses and made substantial impacts on the economy of Sri Lanka. She added further the impacts of natural disasters are not homogeneous across various segments of society. She was digging out the distribution of disaster impacts depending on the degree of physical vulnerability of a region to natural disasters and the socio-economic vulnerability. The poor, especially those who are dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods, such as farmers and fishermen are highly vulnerable to the negative impacts of natural disasters. Thus, through the present study, she tried to





assess the degree of protection provided by the present social protection system and social support practices in Sri Lanka against natural disasters, identifies gaps in doing so, and thereby suggests suitable recommendations to strengthen the further system. She added more, the present system of social protection and social support initiatives in Sri Lanka does not adequately protect the vulnerabilities caused by natural disasters. The outreach of the present social protection programs is very small, and the present system does not sufficiently respond to the actual needs of the disaster-vulnerable groups.

Bonding, bridging, social support activities are major social capital during the disaster reconstruction (Chongbang, 2021). The role of social protection action can be enhancing people's capabilities of using their connections and resources, which could be positive social capital as a survival mechanism to vulnerable communities. Rapeli (2017), compare how the practices of Finnish social work preparedness to develop future interventions and use of social capital in disasters. She further analysis based on the concept of social support initiatives and its forms of bonding, bridging and linking. The results show that micro-level social work and bonding social capital were emphasized capacity while disaster management. Bridging and linking social support initiatives work into disaster-related structures should be developed and social capital enhanced pre and post disasters responding capacities. She added further the concept of social capital was in this study used as representing valuable social networks between individuals, groups, or organizations, which take the forms of bonding, bridging, and linking.

The state authority policies, development partners' intermediate and immediate support, and community preparedness can reduce its impact when a disaster occurs. Sharma (2003) explained the Indian disaster management initiatives, related to the massive loss of life and property. The author describes social and economic disruptions caused by the increasing frequencies and severity of natural disasters. It was in this context that disaster management as an important issue draws the attention of various stakeholders in the disaster management community to introspect how prepared we are to tackle this type of disaster. The author raises the voice on multiple stakeholder engagement for disaster management at a different level due to its subjective complexity. Chemmencheri (2016), raise a rights-based approach to the local support through social protection, which was variously seen as rights of every citizen or tools of poverty alleviation mechanism or recovery shield from the market fluctuation or degradation due to disaster strike. Authors raised various social protection practices in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka with their comprehensiveness and implementation along with executive challenges.

The local support initiatives intervention can be emphasized based on the forecast and post-response capacity of state authority and existing other development organizations. Sometimes policy and program, and in some situations, response capacity can make a difference during recovery. The cash transfer scheme, saving capacity, livelihood support capacity, response, rescue capacity, and long-term livelihood support are major local and social protection examples in communities. SANN VATHANA et. al. (2013) explain the natural disaster scenario in Cambodia, by comparing the consequences of floods, and drought. This paper presents the impacts of disaster on household welfare, and the linkage impact of social support interventions by communities and state and shows how it was the failure to reach the rights of the poor and vulnerable people from the impacts of flood and drought. This study strongly emphasized the formulation of a strong policy design on social protection interventions to emphasize ex-ante (forecast) instruments rather than the ex-post (post) response to natural disasters as focusing on emergency assistance and relief. Nopphol, W. (2015) elicits examines the relationships between social participation and disaster risk reduction actions of the 2021 Indian Tsunami. Authors dig out the communication participation, received early warning system and application on daily behavior contributing on disaster risk reduction. The local practices of disaster mitigation measures, improving forecasting and warning systems, community resilience practices, local promotional awareness of potential disaster risks, and disseminating knowledge about disaster preparedness are major contributing

factors to risk reduction measures to reduce lives and livelihood damages. Individual protective measures, social supports, and collective actions are major tools of community engagement to reduce disaster risk. The cash transfer programs provide direct assistance in the form of cash to the poor. The ex-ante cash transfer program can a vital role in encouraging vulnerable households to invest in business rather than spending on food. The microfinance schemes can also support preparedness action to boost targeted household capacity while disaster occurs.

Community-based disaster risk reduction and preparedness planning are still lacking aligned with local and social support practices and social protection policy and plans for further disaster response and recovery. The existing local social support practices and social protection schemes were quite silent in interlinking with disaster preparedness and response. Where the existing policy and planning process has gaps between bounce back better capacity of communities with the support of local social support and protection policies intervention in the targeted area. The micro-level social protection and bridging with social capital in communities still seem to gap. This study's results can contribute to finding out how local social support practices and social protection mechanisms could contribute to building a resilient community in the disaster-affected area, especially during reconstruction. This study can contribute to finding out how it has been practiced in Gandaki province of Nepal, especially how the development partners, UN institutions, INGO, and local NGOs have been distributing their humanitarian actions, how they interlink programmatic views, and how they have been practiced as local social support practices while disaster strikes in vulnerable communities.

## METHOD

The study approaches testing objectives by examining the relationships among variables. Methodology explores the relation between existing local social support practices, social protection policies, plans, and practices in affected communities, and the supporting role of community organizations, development partners, and local authorities was major. The study explores the Anthropocene understanding of cause and effect between local social support practices, humanitarian initiatives, state support, and building resilience status of the disaster-affected household. This study required qualitative and quantitative data for descriptive and explorative research. Both primary and secondary data were collected. Primary data will analyse on cause and effect of social support practices and their impact on building resilience capacity (how scaling up the social cost of reconstruction), and secondary data will use to the interpretation of existing social protection policies in the study area. Made descriptive interpretation based on gathered information which will be contextual real world-based knowledge about the local social support initiatives, and their impact on the resilience capacity of households who were suffered from disasters.

Used non-probability convenience sampling due to limited researchers in the field. Most of the data collectors were from Gorkha, and some are from the Tanahun district of Gandaki province. Most of the informants were affected by the earthquake. Due to human resource limitation, I had selected respondents from disaster-affected communities, especially those from an earthquake and who has been reconstructing their story. Close-ended questions were formulated, shared with local data collectors via a google form, and responses were collected from direct email. Nearly ten days to two months were taken on response collection from the field, around 21 households, and 20 organization representatives were responded to this study. Existing secondary data was collected from government official *Bipdportal* ([www.bipadportal.gov.np](http://www.bipadportal.gov.np)), and historical data based was collected, and analysed for disaster trend analysis in Gandaki and major source of disaster in this province. Data will analyse in descriptive analysis based on 20 organizational respondents in qualitative data, which is largely analysed from survey data, FGD, and interviews, and multiple regression has analysed based on 21 household respondents in quantitative data to conclude study findings.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION



Based on the government disaster information website *Bipadporttal* ([www.bipadportal.gov.np](http://www.bipadportal.gov.np)), there are 8 events of an earthquake, 28 flood warnings in different river basins, and 112 heavy rainfall reported in the last year in Gandaki province (<http://bipadportal.gov.np/>). Due to weak infrastructure, lower preparedness, and the least social support practices in the study area 72.72% were affected by the earthquake, 9.09% were affected by the flood, and 18.18% were affected by the landslide. All respondents reported they have traditional house structures (non-RCC structures), even though they have lower information on low-cost retrofitting technology, and hardly they get technical support for retrofitting their existing houses before of earthquake. Respondents responded, that they had not reached early warning for flood and landslide and even they did not know about the heavy rainfall information. The genuine information was collected from radio Nepal, but they were not noticed as a high priority.

One respondent shared, that when disaster strike in the community; they only expect response and relief from state and non-state actors. Usually, the local state responded at the beginning and non-state actors played aftermath for a week if the disaster was highly impacted. 50% of respondents have shared the neighbours did immediate support, 36.36% of respondents share their local community had responded aftermath of the disaster, 9.09% shared the rural/municipal body was responded and only 4.5% were said the NGO has responded aftermath of disaster strikes in communities. During the focus group discussion (FGD), respondents said, the household or near neighbourhood should be more capacitated in terms of disaster response. They said, household members and neighbour were first responder's aftermath of the disaster and need to capacity strengthen local community members as first responders including tools and equipment. another FGD participant added ' the local disaster management committee, disaster response budget, stock-pilling, temporary food and shelter items were located in municipality and disaster was a strike in a remote area of our village, and due to remoteness, lack of communication and lack of prompt response team at the municipality, we could not get those services on time.

### Descriptive Analysis

Mean	9.761904762
Standard Error	0.487485101
Median	10
Mode	12
Standard Deviation	2.233937374
Sample Variance	4.99047619
Kurtosis	-1.138911018
Skewness	-0.235083003
Range	7
Minimum	6
Maximum	13
Sum	205
Count	21
Largest (1)	13
Smallest (1)	6

This result (Mean) reflects the average of respondents has received the local support from their neighbours support, temporary shelter making support, but they received a lower budget for the construction of new shelter from the state agency in the study area, and they received external support to construct their new shelter with an average of 50% loan, and could not get any financial support from local financial institutions. This result (mode) reflects the local support from the neighbours support, temporary shelter making support, new shelter making support, and ward supported households are high in the study area, but they build their new shelter in 50% loan, and could not get any financial support from local financial institutions. The minimum value shows the respondents, who has does not receive the first response from the state, received temporary shelter construction support, did not get a sufficient budget for the construction of a new shelter, and were limited to their new shelter in subsidy only. The maximum value shows the respondents who received the first response from the state and neighbours, received temporary shelter construction support, get a sufficient budget for the construction of a new shelter, and were not limit their new shelter construction only to the subsidy.

### **Local and social support practices:**

All respondents shared they received support from their neighbors, local community-based organizations, local state agencies, and external humanitarian organizations. 54.54% of respondents shared they received food and medicine, 22.72% said they received non-food items, 9.09% said they get other items, and 13.63% received temporary shelter support from external helping hands. During the FGD, respondents shared they received immediate external support from their neighbors who the first respondents of disaster in local communities are. Even neighbors are heavily engaged in response, relief, and reconstruction as well. Supporting the construction of temporary shelter, exchanging locally available food items, support on interest-free debt, providing temporary shelter, providing short-term shelter, and distributing food and non-food items were major social support aftermath of a disaster in communities.

72% of disaster-affected households have already built their new house, still, 18.18% are in temporary shelter, and 9.09% of respondents were not ready to share their current status. During the construction of a new house, the disaster-affected people received support from ward/local state authority, some received support from their neighbors, and some received support from their relatives. Among of who built their house, 86.36% of respondents said they received support and only 13.63% of respondents have not received any support while they did construct their homes. Due to remoteness, lower available working age groups in the community, no registration in the disaster-affected household in reconstruction authority, and land issues were major causes of not receiving social support while reconstruction of the home.

Among the disaster-affected households, 68.18% of respondents shared they received social subsidies while their children re-join schools, get subsidies on health support schemes, and they received agriculture support on livelihood support. But 31.82% of respondents shared they did not receive any subsidy on social engagement, in the aftermath of the disaster. Due to unavailability of identity cards, lack of citizenship cards, age cards, etc. affected to receive these subsidies. Having received these subsidies, received households experienced better coping capacity during the disaster. Education base subsidies reduce the parent's burden on school fees, uniforms, and additional benefits to children. In these received households, 45.45% of respondents said they received subsidies from the ward and municipal authorities, 18/18% were supported by INGO/NGO, 22.72% were supported by other agencies, and 13.63% of respondents does not know who provided subsidies to them. Most subsidies were distributed from state agencies.

Due to high response priority to disaster-affected people, addressing points to poor and vulnerable, and high priority to targeted population based on social protection to the disaster affected people received these subsidies immediately. Every municipal body has its social development wing and these wings





have addressed poor, vulnerable, disadvantaged, and socially excluded group member protection and promotion issues.

During the FGD, respondents share they got financial support when they did the construction of their temporary or permanent shelter in the community, some of the respondents get financial support from community-based financial organizations like agriculture groups, and mothers' groups, and some were from saving and credit groups. Only 27.27% of respondents said they received financial support from community-based organizations, 4.54% said they get financial support from the government-based social organization, 54.54% said they were not getting any financial support, and 13.63% were said they have no idea whether they received or not. Based on formal membership, most of the respondents were eligible to receive financial support from their formal groups, they did regular savings on a monthly or time interval basis and from their contingency fund if their group members were in crisis (disaster).

Reconstruction of houses was not cake work, most of the disaster-affected houses requested more than 50% of the loan from nearer financial institutions due to limited grant mechanism from state authorities, and inadequate financial resources of the house. 22.72% of respondents said they got financial support for the reconstruction of their house demolished by the disaster. 4.54% of respondents said they received financial grants from NGO/INGO project, 68.18% of respondents said they reconstructed their house based on a 50% loan and 4.54% said they constructed their home on a 100% additional budget loan.

In order to make our findings more reliable and valid, I had used the multiple regression to explain on how the local support, social grant, social support initiation, state support, and subsidy facilitating into scaling up reconstruction. Which can be elucidate as below;

### Inferential discussion

SUMMARY OUTPUT							
Regression Statistics							
Multiple R	1						
R Square	1						
Adjusted R Square	1						
	0						
	.						
	0						
Standard Error	0						
	2						
Observations	2						
ANOVA							
	Df	SS	MS	F	Significance F		
Regression	6	102.77	17.13	1.00	0.00		
Residual	15	0.00	0.00				
Total	21	102.77					
	Coefficient	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%

Scaling up the Cost of Reconstruction via local support	0.00	0.00	-2.96	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Who respond first aftermath of disaster?	1.00	0.00	814340218 6297510.00	0.0 0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Did you get any support while making temporary shelter?	1.00	0.00	359213095 8089740.00	0.0 0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Get supported from neighbor, local community, ward and local authority	1.00	0.00	146012006 94756700.0 0	0.0 0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Did you get any support while making new shelter?	1.00	0.00	471453925 1296950.00	0.0 0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
How you are being bounce back better aftermath of that disaster?	1.00	0.00	476906804 7202570.00	0.0 0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

The coefficient seems strong (nearly 1) which seems the positive relation between A17 (Scaling up the Cost of Reconstruction via local support) and A18 to A23 (Get respond the first aftermath of a disaster? get any support while making temporary shelter? get support from neighbours, local community, ward, and local authority, get any support while making a new shelter? And how they are bouncing back better aftermath of that disaster?). The F statistics seem significant for the entire regression. At a (alpha) is below value than 0.05, this regression is statistically significant because 'P-value is < 0.05. All five T values are not statistically significant, because their corresponding P-value is <0.05. Therefore, all six; X1 (Get response first aftermath of disaster), X2 (Received support while making temporary shelter), X3 (Received support from a neighbour, local community, ward, and local authority support), X4 (Received get any support while making new shelter), and X5 (How they are bouncing back better aftermath of that disaster), are individually in the prediction of Y (Scaling up the Cost of Reconstruction via local support). Therefore, the prediction equation  $Y = \text{Intercept} + B1*(X1) + B2*(X2) + B3*(X3) + B4*(X4) + B5*(X5) = 7$ . Significantly, through the local and institutional support, in the reconstruction, every household could scale up their recovery capacity by 7% and more, through the support from neighbours, the local community, and state & non-state actors.

## Theory testing

The social support theory originally begins with Cullen's (1994) through the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. In the beginning, Cullen argued that the notion of social support is threaded through many theories of crime and delinquency. Cullen distinguished between macro-level and interpersonal-level effects of social support, enhancing how the supportive initiatives had made formative relationships. Social support is commonly identified based on social resources and it made a difference when people supported to each-others in crises. Local and social support can be facilitated in the transformation of human, cultural, material, and social capital. Which can be interlinked with individuals and can be based on larger societal units with their dependent members.

Social support theory can be utilized in existing social assets within of community, which could be used as a social safety net while community members are in crisis. During the disaster preparedness, response, and recovery; the local and social support can be utilized as a coping tool for disaster shocks and stress in the community. Community people can support to each-other based on their available assets, exchange kind/cash, and support their neighbours through their assets like food, medicine, cash, and kind during disaster response. Common protective measures range from storing emergency food and water supplies, preparing a household emergency plan, and attending a first-aid course to purchasing insurance against natural disasters. Emergency preparedness allows households to carry out



appropriate responses if/when a disaster strikes and strengthens their capabilities to cope with the aftermath. Finally, they found that engagement in community-based activities increases disaster preparedness and intention to move away from disaster-risk areas suggesting that promoting social participation may generate a positive externality in reducing vulnerability and disaster risk.

Households and the community themselves contribute to their bounce-back capacity through collective action in the community. Chogbang, N. (2021), draws the community's existing resilience capacity-based practices on Gorkha earthquake resilience practices. According to the author the community-based organization, state agencies, and their collective engagement can make difference when disasters occur or when they rebuild their shelter. The neighbor, community-based organizations, and local authorities can make difference in resilience-building through collective engagement. The community itself can practice social support initiatives through collective action such as common interested groups, formulate social capital, and use it while disasters occur. Social protection was broadly making sense through policies and programs of local authorities that provide access to essential social services to the vulnerable community on bounce-back capacity. Social protection policies can base on the state's capacity, ideology, and economic opportunities which make more capital and investment in response capacity.

In the backdrop discussion, studies were discussed on how the policymakers in the countries with lack proper finalization of social protection policy at the local level include such programs in their social protection schemes policies and programs. In the existing situation, the local NGOs, development partners, and local state trying to address practices of local support, protecting indigenous support practices, social protection, and initiating social support practices as a partial offer to the limited community. Therefore, it is urgent to plan a common social support initiative and social protection policy for better crisis management. While making disaster resilience plans and policies the policymaker should aware of how they could inline future forecasting capacity (anticipative), adjust to existing changes (adaptive), cope with existing shocks and stresses (absorptive), and modify on demand of situation (transformative) capacity of the community. In future interventions, we need to protect and practice indigenous support practices, social support practices in the community, and social protection packages from state policies.

## CONCLUSION

Based on local and social support initiatives, disaster management, reconstruction, and recovery can be more effective, efficient, and affordable in the local community. When people do response to the disaster from the directly affected community based on their own resources, it could be easier and more accessible. Based on their local assets, adding their capacity based on their resources like; saving their capital, training locally, updating on their local social policies from the local authority, the local and social support initiatives, and social protection mechanism makes a multiplier impact during response and recovery. Based on an indigenous capacity, local and social support mechanisms, state support, and external humanitarian coordination can scale up the cost of response and recovery phase of disaster management.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

During this study, I would like to express my special gratitude to local responders, voluntarily engaged responders from UN agencies, INGO, NGOs, and disaster-affected households. Special thanks to Mr. Chandra Adhikari, MR. Birendra Bata, Mr. Tek Bahadur Sunar. Special gratitude to International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Management publication team, my university professors Dr. Komal Fuyal, Dr. Mahendra Sapkota, Dr. Sujit Karna, Dr. Sukra Raj Adhikari, and Dr. Tika Gautam on their comprehensive guidance. Special vote of thanks to my family member dad Mr. Tilok Sing Limbu, mom Ms. Prem kumari Limbu, my spouse Ms. Pramila Rai on providing me inspiration of study.

## References

- Chemmencheri, S. R. (2016). Social Protection as a Human Right in South Asia. *Human Development, SAGE Publications*, 10(2), 236–252. doi:DOI: 10.1177/0973703016671844
- Chongbang, N. (2021, June 18). Building Community Resilience: A Study of Gorkha Reconstruction Initiatives. *Molung Educational Frontier*, 11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3126/mef.v11i0.37849>
- Daniel Longhurst, P. H.-W. (2020). *LINKING SOCIAL PROTECTION AND HUMANITARIAN CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE*. Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO). Retrieved from <https://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/publications/linking-social-protection-and-humanitarian-cash-and-voucher-assistance>
- Kort-Butler, L. (2018). Social Support Theory. *University of Nebraska - Lincoln*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1783&context=sociologyfacpub>
- Iskamto, D., Puspa Liza Ghazali, Aftanoorhan, A., & Narti, S. (2020). Effect of Occupational Safety And Health on Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Islamic Studies and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 20.
- Iskamto, D., Yapentra, A., Budi Ansori, P., & Jupri, M. (2020, July 14). Effect of Working Discipline Toward Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *KnE Social Sciences*. International Conference on Islam, Economy, and Halal Industry, Malang, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i9.7347>
- Larissa Pelham, E. C. (n.d.). *Natural Disasters: What is the Role for Social Safety Net?* S P - D I S C U S S I O N P A P E R. Retrieved from [https://www.worldbank.org/404\\_response.htm](https://www.worldbank.org/404_response.htm)
- Philip Brown, A. J. (2018). Natural disasters, social protection, and risk perceptions. *World Development*, 104, 310-325. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.12.002>
- Rapeli, M. (2017, Mar 16). Social capital in social work disaster preparedness plans: The case of Finland. *International Social Work*, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872817695643>
- SANN VATHANA, S. O. (2013). *Impact of Disasters and Role of Social Protection in Natural Disaster Risk Management in Cambodia*. Retrieved from <https://www.eria.org/ERIA-DP-2013-10.pdf>
- Sharma, V. K. (January - June, 2003, ). Disaster Management - Approach and Emerging Strategies in India. *VISION : The Journal of Business Prespective*, pp. 135-144.
- Srawooth Paitoonpong, S. A. (2008). The meaning of “social safety nets”. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 467–473. doi:doi:10.1016/j.asieco.2008.09.01
- Wickramasinghe, K. (2013). *Role of Social Protection in Disaster Management in Sri Lanka*. *Sri Lanka journal of social sciences*, 35/36(1 & 2). doi:DOI: 10.4038/sljss.v35i1-2.7297