Determining the level of beneficiaries' involvement in resource mobilisation for post disaster housing reconstruction

A.A. Adaji¹, Sulzakimin. M^{2,*}, Masrom M A N², Seow T W², Goh K C², Abd Rahim M H I²

¹Department of Building Technology | School of Environmental Technology | Kogi State Polytechnic, P.M.B. 1101, Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria

²Center of Sustainable Infrastructure & Environmental Management, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400 Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Johor, Malaysia

*Corresponding author's email: zakimin@uthm.edu.my

ABSTRACT: The importance of resource mobilisation for Post-disaster housing reconstruction (PDHR) cannot be overemphasised. PDHR is a process discrete from the construction of housing when circumstances are undisturbed because sensitive measures are put in place following disasters occurrence. Resource mobilisation is a driving force needed for a successful reconstruction. This study evaluates the level of beneficiaries' involvement in resource mobilisation for PDHR intervention. Data collection was done through a selfadministration of structured questionnaires beneficiaries of the reconstruction projects. Findings revealed that community involvement in resource mobilisation was insignificant due to misplacement of reconstruction priorities. This shows failure of the project as beneficiaries' requirements were not considered. This study suggests making the beneficiaries the central focus of the planning, procuring, scheduling, monitoring and allocation of resources mobilisation. This action will increase the resilience of the community to future hazards and climate change effects.

Keywords: Natural disaster; resource mobilisation; PDHR beneficiaries

1. INTRODUCTION

Post-disaster housing reconstruction (PDHR) that is not appropriately planned and instigated has the potentials to create more exposures in the disasterstricken community. This stresses a warning that the importance of resource mobilisation for PDHR cannot be overemphasised. Some possible consequences of inappropriate resource management in reconstruction projects motivated scholars to further elucidate on the prominent roles it plays in the cycle of disaster reconstruction and recovery process. Resource mobilisation is a driving force needed for a successful reconstruction [1]. [2] emphasised that material suspensions, especially long- lead items, are notable factors responsible for delays in construction and can initiate other relevant matters relating to resources. Also, it was identified that the correct plants or equipment unavailable reduces the proficiency of physical construction [3].

In the PDHR conditions, the mobilisation of resources is influenced by certain factors. [4] showed that the five factors influencing resource mobilisation in reconstruction are the ranking order of tasks, the capacity

to pool resources, the prime period of procurement, the prevailing contractual rapports and transportation in and out of the region affected by the disaster. In a related development, [5] added that the mobilisation of resources is determined by the governance policies and strategies laid down by the professionals responsible for the reconstruction. Reconciliation of materials with local desires for rebuilding houses is paramount. [6] and [7] said the consideration of economic and environmental repercussions of several types of materials used for buildings is significant. Considering the salient role of resource mobilisation in housing reconstruction and recovery intervention, this study deems it fit to explore the issues responsible for the unpleasant conditions of the beneficiaries on the general process of the intervention.

2. METHODOLOGY

A quantitative approach was adopted for this study. The survey tool used was a structured questionnaire designed on the factors derived from the literature. The questionnaires were administered by self to the respondents who are the beneficiaries of the housing reconstruction development. The respondents were asked to rank their level of involvement in resource mobilisation of the reconstruction from their perspective on a five-point Likert scale from 1 to 5, where 1 symbolises 'very Less' and 5 represents 'very high'. One sample t-test of the mean was conducted using SPSS, based on the sample's ratings to check if the factors identified within the questionnaire were important in affecting community level of involvement in resource mobilisation process. By using SPSS descriptive statistics, a ranking of the parameters perceived by respondents was carried out to identify major ones which significantly affected resource mobilisation process after the flood as relates to community involvement.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A mean ranking was conducted to evaluate the level of community involvement in resource mobilisation in the PDHR. It was observed that public financial assistance, resource mobilisation through international donors and gradual disbursement of bulky sums of reconstruction funding with mean of 3.32, 3.15 and 3.11 were ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd respectively. However, initiation of construction materials and skills that are

for the environment, Supervision and coordination of dispersal of reconstruction resources, risk assessment involving the gathering of data and the preparation of the loss estimates and interaction and decision making between many groups and institution, including households with mean of 2.25, 2.17, 1.94 and 1.80 were ranked 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th respectively in Table 1. This shows that community affected were not involved in the resource mobilisation strategy for the PDHR that was meant specifically for them. This result has faulted the recommendations of previous researches. The first decision to be embraced in PDHR is to fully comprehend the local context of the beneficiaries through holistic needs assessment and surveys to provide correct assistance to satisfy the beneficiaries [8],[9]. It is required that the reconstruction and recovery guidelines should then be designed based on local conditions to shape, support and preserve the culture and heritage of the beneficiaries. Results shows agreement with existing researches on non-involvement of beneficiaries in housing reconstruction projects after a disaster. According to [10] and [11], it is difficult to integrate the community in the preliminaries and management of the PDHR interventions. Similarly, the findings reconcile with previous studies that community engagement in post-disaster reconstruction including resources mobilisation was not observed in the initial stages of the British Red Cross Society (BRCS) Maldives posttsunami recovery program [12].

Table 1 Level of community involvement in resource mobilisation in PDHR

SN	Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Public financial assistance.	3.32	1.454	1
2	International donors	3.15	1.497	2
3	Gradual disbursement of bulky sums.	3.11	1.357	3
4	Initiation of construction naterials for the environment.	2.25	.992	4
5	Supervision and coordination	2.17	.829	5
6	Risk assessment	1.94	.905	6
7	Interaction and decision naking between many groups and households		.994	7

4. CONCLUSION

The results showed misplacement of priorities through non-involvement of the beneficiaries which might truncate the success of the project. Beneficiaries' satisfaction which is prerequisite to the sustainability of PDHR, is not in sight as shown by the empirical facts. Hence, this project can be seen as a colossal failure since the users' requirements were not adequately taken into consideration. This study suggests making the beneficiaries the central focus of the planning, procuring, scheduling, monitoring and allocation of resources mobilisation for PDHR.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Adaji, "Post disaster housing reconstruction framework for flood victims in Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria" PhD dissertation, Dept. of Real Est. and Fac. Mgt., Parit Raja, Johor, Malaysia, 2019.
- [2] M. R. Manavazhi, and D. K. Adhikari, "Material and equipment procurement delays in highway projects in Nepal", *Int. J. Prj. Manage.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 627–632, 2002.
- [3] K. T. Yeo, and J. H. Ning, "Managing uncertainty in major equipment procurement in engineering projects", *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 171, pp. 123–134, 2006.
- [4] B. Singh, "Availability of resources for state highway reconstruction: a wellington earthquake scenario", M.S. thesis, Dept. Civil and Environ. Eng., Uni. Of Auckland, New Zealand, 2007.
- [5] B. Singh, and S. Wilkinson, "Post-disaster resource availability following a wellington earthquake: aggregates, concrete and cement," in I-Rec 2008 Building Resilience: Achieving Effective Post-Disaster Reconstruction, Christchurch, New Zealand, 2008, pp. 1-11.
- [6] S. Barakat, Housing Reconstruction after Conflict and Disaster, Humanitarian Policy Group, *Network Papers*, vol. 43, pp. 1–40, 2003
- [7] D., O'Brien, I. Ahmed, and D. Hes, "Housing Reconstruction in Aceh: Relationships between House Type and Environmental Sustainability," in Building abroad: Procurement of Construction and Reconstruction Projects in the international Context, Université de Montréal, pp. 361–372, 2008..
- [8] S. Khasalamwa, "Is 'build back better' a response to vulnerability? analysis of the post-tsunami humanitarian interventions in Sri Lanka, Norsk Geofisk Tidsskrift", *Nor. J. of Geo.*, vol. 63, pp. 73–78, 2009.
- [9] A. A. S. Mannakkara, and S. Wilkinson, "Post-disaster legislation for building back better", *Constr. Law J.*, vol. 29, pp. 495–506, 2013.
- [10] C. H. Davidson, C. Johnson, G. Lizarralde, N. Dikmen, and A. Sliwinski, "Truths and Myths About Community Participation in Post-Disaster Housing Projects", *Habitat Int.*, vol. 31, pp. 100–115, 2007.
- [11] S. A. Andrew, S. Arlikatti, L. C. Long, and J. M. Kendra, "The effect of housing assistance arrangements on household recovery: an empirical test of donor-assisted and owner-driven approaches", *J. Housing and the Built Environ.*, vol. 28, pp. 17–34, 2013.
- [12] P. M. Lawther, "Community involvement in the post-disaster reconstruction-case study of the british red cross maldives recovery program", *Int. J. of Strategic Prop. Manage.*, vol. 13, pp. 153–169, 2010.