

Session No. 16

Course Title: Social Dimensions of Disaster, 2nd edition

Session 16: Non-Victim Responses to Disaster

1 hr.

Objectives:

- 16.1 Define convergence behavior and identify three types
- 16.2 Describe a model of organized disaster response systems
- 16.3 Discuss typical patterns of helping behavior
- 16.4 Define and illustrate the emergence of therapeutic communities
- 16.5 Identify and illustrate six social factors that constrain participation in therapeutic communities
- 16.6 Discuss four lessons for emergency managers pertaining to non-victim responses to disaster.

Scope:

Students are introduced to empirically based conclusions regarding non-victim behavior during disaster responses. Convergence and helping behaviors, the concept of the therapeutic community and lessons for emergency managers are emphasized.

Readings:

Student Reading:

Wedel, Kenneth R. and Donald R. Baker. 1998. "After the Oklahoma City Bombing: A Case Study of the Resource Coordination Committee." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 16:333-362.

Professor Readings:

Neal, David M. 1994. "The Consequences of Excessive Unrequested Donations: The Case of Hurricane Andrew." *Disaster Management* 6:23-28.

O'Brien, Paul W. and Dennis S. Mileti. 1993. "Citizen Participation in Emergency Response." Pp. B23-B30 in *The Loma Prieta California Earthquake of October 17, 1989—Public Response*, edited by Patricia A. Bolton. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Fritz, Charles E. 1961. "Disasters." Pp. 651-694 in *Contemporary Social Problems*, edited by Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nisbet. New York: Harcourt.

Background References:

Quarantelli, E.L. 1996. "Emergent Behaviors and Groups in the Crisis Time of Disasters." Pp. 47-68 in *Individuality and Social Control: Essays in Honor of Tamotsu Shibutani*, edited by Kian M. Kwan. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Fritz, Charles E. and J.H. Mathewson. 1957. *Convergence Behavior in Disasters*. (National Research Council Disaster Study #9). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Barton, Allen H. 1969. *Communities in Disaster: A Sociological Analysis of Collective Stress Situations*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. (Chapter 4 entitled "The Altruistic Community," pp. 203-279).

Taylor, James B., Louis A. Zurcher and William H. Key. 1970. *Tornado: A Community Responds to Disaster*. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press.

Nelson, L.D. 1973. "Proximity to Emergency and Helping Behavior—Data From Lubbock—Tornado—Disaster." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 2:194-199.

Dynes, Russell R. 1970. *Organized Behavior in Disaster*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath Lexington Books.

General Requirements:

Overheads (16-1 through 16-7 appended).

Student Handout (16-1 appended).

See individual requirements for each objective.

Objective 16.1 Define convergence behavior and identify three types.

Requirements:

Start this session with the student exercise and proceed with lecture material specified below.

Use Overheads 15-1 and 15-2.

Remarks:

I. Introduction.

A. **Exercise.**

1. **Remind** students of exercise procedures.
2. **Divide** class into four groups and assign roles.
 - a. Chair.
 - b. Reporter.
 - c. Timer.
3. **Announce** time limit: 5 minutes.

B. **Display** Overhead 16-1; “Workshop Tasks”.

1. Group 1 – Describe the event selected and methods used in the study by Wedel and Baker (1996).
2. Group 2- Describe the “model of organized response” used by Wedel and Baker (1996) and explain how the Resource Coordination Committee fit into this model.
3. Group 3 –Identify and illustrate six findings from the Wedel and Baker study (1996) pertaining to “leadership” and “decision making”.
4. Group 4 –Identify and illustrate six findings from the Wedel and Baker study (1996) pertaining to “confidentiality”, “accountability” and “networking”.

C. **Start** discussion.

D. **Stop** discussion.

E. **Explain** that group reports will be given periodically throughout the session.

II. Group1 report: 2 minutes.

A. **Supplement** as necessary by highlighting these points.

B. **The event** (see Wedel and Baker 1996, pp. 336-338).

1. **Date:** April 19, 1995.

2. **Location:** Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, downtown Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

3. **Consequences:**

a. **Killed:** 168.

b. **Injured:** 674.

c. **Damages:** 25 buildings destroyed or severely damaged; additional 300 with some damage.

4. **Terrorism:**

a. “. . . largest act of domestic terrorism in U.S. history . . .” (p. 336).

b. Timothy McVey found guilty and later executed (June 11, 2001).

c. Terry Nichols remains in prison awaiting outcomes of appeals.

C. **Research methods.**

1. **Descriptive/exploratory case study** of a unique case (p. 338).

2. **Data collection sequence.**

a. Preliminary interviews and collection of reports (p. 338).

b. RCC member survey (p. 339) (27 and 38 members).

c. In-depth interviews (n = 21): sample of membership (p. 339).

d. Observation: 2 meetings plus case manager sub-committee.

3. **Data analysis:** computer based content analysis of key concepts, e.g., “strength” and “weakness” followed by specific searches on such

concepts as leadership, decision-making, confidentiality, and accountability (p. 340).

III. Convergence behavior.

- A. **Definition:** the influx of people, information and material into a community impacted, or threatened, by a disaster.
- B. **Ask students:** “What examples of convergence were documented by Wedel and Baker (1996)?” (**Answer:** examples include individuals and agency representatives who assisted with the initial response to the bombing and recovery actions such as religious ceremonies, medical bills, funeral expenses, employment, sheltering, etc.)

IV. Types of disaster convergence.

- A. **Display** Overhead 16-2; “Types of Disaster Convergence.”
- B. **Review** each type of convergence and illustrate through student input by **posing a question** like this: “What examples of these three types of convergence were noted in the assigned reading (i.e., Wedel and Baker 1996)?”

1. **Personal convergence.**

- a. Fire and police personnel.
- b. Search and rescue units.
- c. Medical personnel.
- d. Social service agency personnel.
- e. Mental health personnel.

2. **Material convergence.**

- a. Rescue equipment.
- b. Body recovery equipment.
- c. Victim transportation.
- d. Mass care, e.g., food, water, etc.

3. **Informational convergence.**

- a. Computer network data (governor's office requested United Way of Metro Oklahoma City to establish) (p. 337).
 - 1) Requested on May 5, 1995.
 - 2) By April 15, 1996 contained over 6,681 entries; "Community Network Database".
 - 3) Information on 6,445 individuals, 157 businesses, and 79 funds.

- b. Resource Coordination Committee.
 - 1) Federal Emergency management Agency concept of "unmet needs committee" (p. 339).
 - 2) May, 1995, the RCC is named and becomes official.
 - 3) "After two years of operation the proportion of cases involved: 31 percent medical needs; 15 percent transportation; 23 percent miscellaneous; and 32 percent other (vehicle, lost wages, mortgage, education, etc.)." (p. 338).
 - 4) Three years later: meetings every other week (p. 338).

Supplemental Considerations:

The message of this section is to **enhance** student understanding of the **scope** and **complexity** of post-disaster convergence activity. The assigned reading illustrates the **duration** of such activities years after the emergency period. Some professors may wish to use a **local disaster event** to supplement the illustrations reflecting the assigned reading. These could be focused on the **emergency period** rather than recovery.

Objective16.2 Describe the model of organized disaster response systems.

Requirements:

Use Overhead 16-3.

Remarks:

- I. Group 2 report: 2 minutes.

- II. A model of organized disaster response system.
 - A. **Integrate** the following points with Group 2 report.
 - B. **Display** Overhead 16-3; “A Model of Organized Disaster Response Systems.”
 - C. **Origins.**
 - 1. **Disaster Research Center** (DRC) staff formulation during mid-1960s as field experiences and literature reviews were completed at the Ohio State University.
 - 2. Russell R. **Dynes** and E.L. **Quarantelli**, two of the three co-directors, used numerous versions of this typology in various publications, e.g., Dynes 1970.
 - 3. **Many DRC students** extended the typology, e.g., Stallings (1978) and Forrest (1978).
 - 4. **Contrast** the Overhead to Table 1 in Wedel and Baker (1996, p. 335) to highlight differences in nomenclature and similarity in content.
 - a. Structure: old and new in overhead vs. existing and new in article.
 - b. Tasks: old and new in overhead vs. regular and non-regular in article.
 - c. **Note:** in various publications changes in nomenclature have appeared, but **basic content** of the formulation has remained constant.
 - D. **Two theoretical dimensions.**
 - 1. Task.
 - 2. Structure.
 - E. **Four types of organized systems.**
 - 1. **Established systems.**
 - a. Old (existing) structure is used to accomplish old (regular) tasks.

- b. **Example:** typically fire and law enforcement agencies respond to disaster in this manner.

2. Expanding systems.

- a. New structure is used to accomplish old tasks.
- b. **Example:** These systems often reflect small numbers of staff who quickly experience rapid increases in the volume of service requests. New staff are added quickly as are new structural arrangements. Red Cross and Salvation Army units have been documented to reflect these types of systems.

3. Extending systems.

- a. Old structures are maintained, but new tasks are taken on.
- b. **Example:** National Guard units that accept the task of providing water for a community which has lost its supply. Dynes (1970) also noted “. . . an American Legion post begins to shelter evacuees; or nuns from a parochial school sort and distribute donated clothing from a relief center.” (p. 137).

4. Emergent systems.

- a. New structures are formed to accomplish new tasks.
- b. **Example:** the Resource Coordination Center described by Wedel and Baker (1996).

Supplemental Considerations:

The DRC typology is a **useful tool** to enhance student understanding of the **diversity** and **complexity** of the systems reflecting non-victim behavior during disaster responses. It has **relevance** to several other topics in this course, especially Sessions 19 and 22, i.e., “Emergent Social Groups in Disaster” and “Emergent Multiorganizational Networks.” The key message is that there are many types of actions taken by non-victims. In turn, these reflect many types of social systems, some of which **are born** during the disaster response. The Resource Coordination Center documented by Wedel and Baker (1996) is an excellent example of an **emergent system** and the **dynamics** of its birth.

Objective 16.3 Discuss typical patterns of helping behavior.

Requirements:

Use Student Handout 16-1.

Remarks:

- I. Emergency phase.
 - A. **Ask students:** “Based on your readings from other sessions in this course, what are some examples of helping behavior during the emergency phase of a disaster?”
 - B. **Record** student responses on the chalkboard.
 - C. **Distribute** Student Handout 16-1; “Types of Helping Behavior.”
 - D. **Highlight** such points as these.
 1. **Rates** of helping behavior: 60% in San Francisco; 70% in Santa Cruz.
 2. **Most common** behavior: “provided food and water to others” – San Francisco (14%); “cleaned/removed debris” – Santa Cruz (11%).
 3. **Actual numbers of helpers:** based on generalization of random samples to the two universes, i.e., San Francisco population in 1990 was 723,959 and Santa Cruz was 49,711.
 - a. San Francisco helpers numbered 434,375 helpers (i.e., 60% of 723,959).
 - b. Santa Cruz helpers numbered 34,798 (i.e., 70% of 49,711).
- II. Restoration and recovery phase.
 - A. **Ask students:** “According to the case study by Wedel and Baker (1996), what are significant examples of helping behavior?”
 - B. **Record** student responses on chalkboard.
 - C. **Supplement**, if necessary, with examples like these (p. 338).
 1. Medical needs.
 2. Transportation.
 3. Assistance with lost wages, mortgage payments, educational costs.

Supplemental Considerations:

The **key message** of this section is to enhance student understanding of the **scope** and **duration** of helping behavior stimulated by disaster. Some professors may desire to **expand** this section through use of additional examples. The patterns of helping behavior could be **related to** the types of systems depicted within the DRC typology. For example, the range of helping behaviors that extending or expanding systems often perform could be highlighted.

Objective 16.4 Define and illustrate the emergence of therapeutic community.

Requirements:

Use Overhead 16-4.

Remarks:

- I. The concept of therapeutic community.
 - A. **Definition:** networks of social support, both formal and informal, that victims participate in following a disaster.
 - B. **Origins:** documented by Fritz (1961) reflecting field studies conducted by staff of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago.
 - C. **Variations:** other researchers have introduced different terms to refer to similar or identical phenomena.
 1. Barton 1969: Altruistic community.
 2. Taylor et al. 1970: Utopian mood.
- II. Dimensions of the therapeutic community.
 - A. **Display** Overhead 16-4; “Dimensions of the Therapeutic Community.”
 - B. **Review** and illustrate each point listed (may wish to **request student** illustrations).
 1. Rise in informal helping behaviors.
 2. Excess donations given.
 3. Expanded volunteer behavior.

4. Decline in criminal activity.
5. Increased community morale.
6. Increased frequency of altruistic behavior.
7. Heroic behavior highlighted.

III. Donation patterns and problems.

A. **Neal** (1994) study.

B. **Event:** Hurricane Andrew, 1992.

C. **Prior research** indicated: (p. 24).

1. **Excessive amounts** of in-kind donations sent to disaster areas.
2. **Officials used** limited resources to manage donated goods.
3. **Donations inhibited** response effectiveness.

D. **Following** Hurricane Andrew, Neal documented: (p. 28).

1. **Excessive amounts** of in-kind donations arrived.
2. **Officials used** scarce resources.
3. “. . . **unrequested** donations inhibited an effective response to assist disaster victims.” (p. 28).

IV. Community dynamics.

A. Group 3 report; 2 minutes.

B. **Supplement** Group 3 report as required with examples like these from Wedel and Baker (1996).

1. **Leadership:** the leader should be: (p. 357).

a. Immersed.

- 1) Wedel and Baker use the term “**enmeshed**” which means “entangled” within agency networks.

- 2) Others would select other terms to convey **depth of involvement** and participation.
- 3) **Ask students:** “What are the implications of the variations in these terms for leaders of community groups?” (**Answer:** may reflect personality style of leader, i.e., many are “immersed” but others may be “entangled” reflecting ethnic, religious, extended family, etc. types of linkages across community sectors.

b. Neutral.

c. Inclusive.

d. Focused.

2. **Decision-making:** (p. 358).

- a. Separate decisions, i.e., whom to serve vs. service provider.
- b. Keep victim assessments and triage separate from other tasks.
- c. Professional social workers should assess needs and do case triage.
- d. Use negotiation and bargaining in selecting funding sources.

C. Group 4 report: 2 minutes.

D. **Supplement** Group 4 report as required with examples like these from Wedel and Baker (1996).

1. **Confidentiality** (pp. 358-359).

- a. Develop formal mechanisms immediately.
- b. Required signed statements by staff.
- c. Require signed releases by victims.
- d. Repeat need for confidentiality.
- e. Use informal social controls.

2. **Accountability** (p. 354).

- a. Placed at agency level.
 - b. Periodic expenditure reports.
 - c. Report types of victims and needs met.
3. **Networking** (p. 359).
- a. Equality of membership.
 - b. Agency and civil group differences in role and function.
 - c. Encourage direct member contacts.

Supplemental Considerations:

Some instructors may wish to **expand** this section through use of additional case study material like that contained in Barton (1969) or Taylor et al. (1970). The **key message** is to enhance student understanding of the processes and content of therapeutic communities. Other professors may wish to **incorporate** the elaborate **hypothesis networks** formulated by Barton and link these to the prior discussion of theoretical models, i.e., Session No. 14; “Constructing Theoretical Models” (see pp. 217-220 in Barton 1969).

Objective 16.5 Identify and illustrate six social factors that constrain participation in therapeutic communities.

Requirements:

Use Overheads 16-5 and 16-6.

Remarks:

- I. Victim participation.
 - A. **Display** Overhead 16-5; “Social Factors That Constrain Victim Participation in the Therapeutic Community.”
 - B. **Explain.**
 1. Not all victims are helped.
 2. Help is not distributed evenly.
 3. Drabek (1986) reviewed numerous studies.

4. These factors reveal “patterns of neglect”.

C. **Illustrate** social factors listed on Overhead 16-5.

1. **Socioeconomic status** (poor neglected).
2. **Age** (elderly neglected).
3. **Gender** (females obtain more help, especially from relatives).
4. **Ethnicity** (minorities neglected).

II. Helper participation.

A. **Display** Overhead 16-6; “Social Factors That Constrain Helper Participation in the Therapeutic Community.”

B. **Illustrate** social factors.

1. **Age** (elderly are less likely to assist in search and rescue).
2. **Gender** (males more frequently help strangers and participate in search and rescue).
3. **Location** (persons in or near impact area more frequently help than those further away).
4. **Impact** (victims with injuries or physical disaster losses more frequently donate funds than other community members).

C. **Example study:** Nelson (1973).

1. Disaster studied.
 - a. **Disaster agent:** tornado.
 - b. **Location:** Lubbock, Texas.
 - c. **Date:** May 11, 1970.
2. **Method:**
 - a. Random probability sample (n = 663).
 - b. Adult male residents.

3. **Conclusions:** documented that **location** and **impact** constrained helping behavior.

Supplemental Considerations:

The **key message** of this section is that there is **differential participation** in the therapeutic communities that emerge after disasters. Not all victims receive the same levels of help from the same range of potential help sources; some are **neglected**. And there are clear **patterns of neglect**. Conversely, not everyone in a community helps disaster victims and there is great variation in the amount and type of help provided. Various social factors like age and gender constrain these response patterns.

Objective 16.6 Discuss four lessons for emergency managers pertaining to non-victims responses to disaster.

Requirements:

Use Overhead 16-7.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. **Ask students:** “Based on the assigned reading and the ideas discussed throughout this session, what are the key lessons for emergency managers?”
 - B. **Record:** list student responses on the chalkboard.
- II. Lessons for emergency managers.
 - A. **Display** Overhead 16-7; “Lessons For Emergency Managers.”
 - B. **Review** points listed **and** integrate with student generated list on chalkboard.
 1. **Convergence behavior will occur: plan for it.**
 2. **Anticipate variety in organized response.**
 3. **Therapeutic community: policy requirements.**
 - a. **Example:** Who will decide on tasks?
 - b. **Example:** How will emergent groups be coordinated?

4. Plan for donations: policy and excesses.

- a. Where will donations be taken?
- b. Anticipate excessive donations.
- c. How will donations be distributed?
- d. Who will accept cash donations?

5. Pre-structure private sector responses.

6. Structure public awareness.

- a. Review FEMA guidance documents.
 - 1) “Guidelines for Sending In-Kind Donations to Disaster Victims.”
 - 2) “FEMA Donations Management Questions and Answers.”
 - 3) “Guidelines for Volunteer Service.”
- b. Encourage distribution of documents like these at public meetings and training sessions.
- c. Examples of questions addressed in these documents.
 - 1) “Why is it necessary to manage donated goods and services after a disaster?”
 - 2) “Why is cash often said to be the preferred type of donation?”
 - 3) “Why does FEMA plan to set up an 800 number for donations?”

7. Policy guidance for emergent systems.

- a. Leadership.
- b. Decision making.
- c. Confidentiality.

- d. Accountability.
- e. Networking.

Supplemental Considerations:

Unless clear **linkages** are made, some students will not understand why a knowledge of non-victim disaster behavior is relevant to the **practice** of emergency management. Additional time for **student discussion** and **research examples** may be desired by some professors to insure that **clear linkages** are made.

Course Developer References:

- I. Barton, Allen H. 1969. *Communities in Disaster: A Sociological Analysis of Collective Stress Situations*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- II. Drabek, Thomas E. 1986. *Human System Responses to Disaster: An Inventory of Sociological Findings*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- III. Dynes, Russell R. 1970. *Organized Behavior in Disaster*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath Lexington Books.
- IV. Forest, Thomas E. 1978. "Group Emergence in Disasters." Pp. 105-125 in *Disasters: Theory and Research*, edited by E.L. Quarantelli. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- V. Fritz, Charles E. 1961. "Disasters." Pp. 651-694 in *Contemporary Social Problems*, edited by Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nisbet. New York: Harcourt.
- VI. Fritz, Charles E. and J.H. Mathewson. 1957. *Convergence Behavior in Disasters*. (National Research Council Disaster Study #9). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
- VII. Neal, David M. 1994. "The Consequences of Excessive Unrequested Donations: The Case of Hurricane Andrew." *Disaster Management* 6:23-28.
- VIII. Nelson, L.D. 1973. "Proximity to Emergency and Helping Behavior—Data From Lubbock—Tornado—Disaster." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 2:194-199.
- IX. O'Brien, Paul W. and Dennis S. Mileti. 1993. "Citizen Participation in Emergency Response." Pp. B23-B30 in *The Loma Prieta California Earthquake of October 17, 1989—Public Response*, edited by Patricia A. Bolton. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

- X. Quarantelli, E.L. 1996. "Emergent Behaviors and Groups in the Crisis Times of Disasters." Pp. 47-68 in *Individuality and Social Control: Essays in Honor of Tamotsu Shibutani*, edited by Kian M. Kwan. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- XI. Stallings, Robert A. 1978. "The Structural Patterns of Four Types of Organizations in Disaster." Pp. 87-103 in *Disasters: Theory and Research*, edited by E.L. Quarantelli. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- XII. Taylor, James B., Louis A. Zurcher and William H. Key. 1970. *Tornado: A Community Responds to Disaster*. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press.
- XIII. Wedel, Kenneth R. and Donald R. Baker. 1998. "After the Oklahoma City Bombing: A Case Study of the Resource Coordination Committee." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 16:333-362.