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Similarity with Cash for Work (CFW)

Advantages:

1) Empowers the disaster affected people (GTZ, 2009)
2) Promote disaster recovery projects (Myammer Red Cross, 2009)
3) Encourages people participating in recovery (Mercy Corps, 2008)
4) Stimulates local economy (Mercy Corps, 2008; GTZ, 2009)
5) Encouraging self-targeting (Mercy Corps, 2008)
Life support activities of temporary housing villages, by the survivors in Tagajo city

Photo 1. Visiting individual residents every morning and evening to check if they are fine

Photo 2. Crafting Mailbox for the temporary houses

Photo 3. Community meeting with the residents’ leaders and city government officials.
Emergency Job Generation Project

Figure 1: Ratio of the job generation program employment over labor force population; March 2011 to March 2013. Pie chart represents the outsourcing rate of the employment (Source: MHLW)

Figure 2: Ratio of employment sustained by government policy: March 2011 to March 2013. (Source: MHLW)
FEMA: Local hire program

Temporary Local Hires

What is a Temporary Local Hire?

FEMA hires local residents, who are themselves disaster survivors, to help their fellow citizens in the recovery process.

Selection: Most temporary local hires can be hired under a streamlined process instead of a competitive process.

How does Temporary Local Work Differ From Permanent Work?

Duration: A local hire's term of employment is 120 days. It may be extended in increments of 120 days for up to one year.

Career Tenure and Competitive Status: Temporary local hires do not earn career tenure or competitive status in the Federal government. This means that they must compete with the public for Federal jobs rather than receive preference.

Photo: Call center in JFO in Baton Rouge, LA, in Dec. 2005. Operators are all survivors of Hurricane Katrina
Research questions:

1. Does CFW scheme effective in the field of life supporting activities for promoting disaster recovery?
2. What kind of consideration should be made to promote the program?
Tagajo city and its damages caused by 2011 Tsunami

- Population: 61,408
- Number of households: 24,249
- Dead 188 (including non Tagajyo citizen)
- Housing Damage: 11,584, of which 1,746 totally.
- Inundated area: 662 ha. (1/3 of the city area)
Research method

1. Questionnaire survey for the residents in temporary housing villages
   - Evaluation of the life support services as consumers
   - 112 of 583 residential survivors answered

2. Interview survey on the working survivors (supporters)
   - Collecting 31 workers opinion.
Factor analysis: images of the supporters

‘feeling administrative’

N = 105

‘feeling intimacy’
Supporter’s services have encouraged the psychological resilience of the residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>explanatory variables</th>
<th>GHQ30</th>
<th>PTGI-J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feeling intimacy to supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling administrative to supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social capital before the disaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social participation before the disaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current social participation</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependency to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current satisfaction to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospect for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stresses caused by work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stresses caused by daily life</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2$  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Adjusted } R^2 & = .60 & \quad .53 \\
F \text{ value} & = 43.02 \text{ **} & \quad 42.43 \text{ **}
\end{align*}
\]

** $p < .01$

Eliminated variables by stepwise method are left blank.

Those who feel intimacy to supporters exhibits a higher score of Post Traumatic Growth Indicator (PTGI- J)
Evaluation of the supporting activities by the victims. (derived from interviews by KJ method)

The most pleased thing:
- Being appreciated by the residents.
- Being intimately with the residents, such as called by name and being said “thank you”
- Being encouraged by the residents

Advantages:
- No biased images of the victims
- Easy to understand the victims feelings and situation

Disadvantages:
- Lack of Special knowledge about caring
- Too much emotional involvement

Challenges:
- Unreasonable requests from the residents
- Jealousy of the residents
- Collaboration among city government
Conclusion

- CFW scheme is effective for life support activities in temporary housings, both for the residential and working survivors.
  - It may promote ‘ties’ among survivors
  - It may enhance ‘resilience’ of the community

- Need for ‘Supporting supporters’
  - Mental care is necessary
  - Backup support of the experts in caring support and medical services.