

Poverty and Disasters in the Disaster Hit Areas: A Review Work

Indu Patni^{1*}, and Parikshit Kala²

¹Research Scholar, UTU, Assistant Professor, Institute of Engineering and Technology, Gopeshwar,

Email: indupatni9@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, DOMS, COER School of Management, Roorkee,

Email: dicky38dr@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Abstract: This paper synthesizes the text on poverty and disasters in various disasters hit areas around the world and present the results from a broad series of studies performed over the past twenty years. The findings are organized into the stages of a disaster event. The review explains how people of different socioeconomic status observe, get ready for, and respond to natural hazard risks, how low-income inhabitants may be differentially obstructed, both physically and expressively, and how disaster consequences vary by communal category during the different stages of disaster response, recovery, and reconstruction. The results have important implications for communal fairness for future research and policy implementation if offered.

Keywords: Natural disasters, Poverty, Social equity, Socioeconomic status, United States.

I. INTRODUCTION

Natural disasters have frequently unnoticed as a place of social stratification because they were sighted as haphazard “operates of God” that have an effect on communities at random. In actual fact, due to this conception, disasters were supposed to be “grade levelers” or actions that democratized the social configuration. Whereas a disaster does unquestionably make threats the whole thing in its lane, and for a succintera of time during and instantly subsequent the incident nearby a loss of “culturally derived discriminations and social distinctions” (Fritz, 1961), catastrophes do not have an effect on all members of the general public equally. Disaster researchers, and to a lesser extent the general public, have acknowledged that disasters do not universally distribute risk and vulnerability or eradicate pre-existing systems of stratification (Couch and Kroll-Smith, 1985; Morrow, 1997; Fordham, 1999). Socioeconomic aspects take part in a significant position in all parts of social life, as they, too, are social phenomenon. Sociological learning reveals to facilitate one’s site in the social stratum repeatedly find out one’s life experiences, chances, connections, and overall life chances.

There has been a wrong division of vulnerability and the community system because be deficient in of extensive acknowledgment of correlations between the everyday hazards people face and the causes for their vulnerability to disasters. Certainly, catastrophes are the inventions of the social, political, and economic environment, as well as the ordinary occurrences that cause them as found by Blaikie (1994).

During 90s, social scientists who study disasters beganto explore different issues related to vulnerability. In the disaster context, vulnerability is a person’s or group’s “competence to expect, manage with, defend against, and recuperate from the collision of a natural hazard” as studied by Blaikie (1994). Scholars have found that vulnerability may be increased due to the various factors such as a person’s age, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity as said by Aptekar and Boore, 1990; Morrow and Enarson, 1998; Peacock 1997. To prolong this grave analysis, this article takes stock of what is known on these issues of discrepancy vulnerability. It has been identified that Past articles have reviewed the literature regarding how gender (Fothergill, 1996) and race and ethnicity (Fothergill *et al.*, 1999) play a role in disaster vulnerability in the United States, but no such review has been done yet to analyze on the literature on poverty, inequality, and disasters. By observing what is known on the topic of poverty, shortage and disasters in the United States, this review can assist in identifying gaps and thus help direct future scholarship on the topic.

This paper reviews the literature on poverty and disasters and discusses the noteworthy findings, paying particular attention to research done on U.S. populations over the last 20 years. The findings are organized into eight categories utilized to describe the literature review findings. The categories are based on the following stages of a disaster: risk perception; preparedness behavior; warning communication and response; physical impacts; psychological impacts; emergency response; recovery; and reconstruction. In the review, an attempt is made to be as comprehensive as possible, citing all the studies, diverse in size and methodology that could be located. Within these framed studies, authors use a range of social labels for individuals and

groups that are disadvantaged. When possible it is generally tried to use the original terminology, in an effort to stay close to the authors' intentions and measurements. However, it is seen that we treat the terms as similar concepts, all of which are trying to describe those who live with the fewest monetary and social resources in the United States. The paper concludes with policy and research recommendations.

II. FINDINGS

A. Risk Perception

This segment assesses the literature on how people have recognized the threats and risks of hazards and catastrophes, and the means where earnings and possessions influence such perceptions. The study sentences of how socio-economic status influences hazard and disaster risk preparation, while nominal, show that poor personages recognize hazards as more serious. The specific studies on these matters follow. It is analyzed from various sources that some research has revealed that low-income individuals have greater risk perceptions. Flynn (1994) said that public of lower socio-economic category incident delicate levels of risk perception, which the researchers argued, may be because wretched people have little categorize over their lives, and clutch little power in the world. In a study of California inhabitants and their views on technological hazards, the results showed that low-income personages, women, and less educated groups testimony the highest levels of concern as identified by Pilisuk (1987). While "professionals" argued these groups concerns were due to lack of technological knowledge, the authors argued that the concerns were genuine and should not be economical. The authors also converse the comparative lack of power of the poor, women, and the less-educated when taking into consideration risk perception and communication, and called for superior mechanisms for community contribution of these marginalized groups. Palm and Carroll (1998) in their study observed that lower income groups generally tend to worry more about the loss of their homes due to earthquakes than higher income groups.

Lamson (1983) have recommended that hazard and risk perception vary by livelihood. Studies have also proved that people who are of a lower socio-economic status are more likely to be worried in higher risk or more hazardous occupations, and thus are more likely to employ coping mechanisms to deal with the daily risks they face. Vaughan (1995) found that lower socio-economic status has been connected with contradiction or minimization of continual risks, mostly when economic concerns are prominent. Other researchers have also found that while community may be engaged in dangerous occupations and might be aware of the risk they tend not to define day to day disclosure as continually life threatening one as analyzed by Beach and Lucas, 1960. Vaughan (1995) may disagree on the degree that socioeconomic factors play in risk opinion, it is widely identify that those living in paucity have different social and risk event histories, as well as differential access to economic and other resources that may be relevant in any

particular risk situation. Thus, a distinguishing such as socio-economic status should be considered as a probable provider to, and interpreter of, how risks are perceived and interpreted easily and promptly.

B. Preparedness Behavior

Mileti (1999) commented that preparedness activities include a diversity of actions taken by families, house-holds, communities to get ready for a disaster. Preparedness activities may include planning disaster plans, meeting crisis supplies, training reaction teams, and educating inhabitants about a probable disaster. The limited research record, which shows that there is an affiliation between socioeconomic status (SES). Turne (1986) exposed that education, income, and traditions are related to volcanic activity preparedness. They exposed that preparedness increases steadily with income levels. They also reported that teaching struggle fatalism and thereby promote preparedness, but only up to the level of entering college. Vaughan (1995) eminent that people living in poverty or those with inadequate resources may be less likely to perform prearranged or essential events to alleviate the effects of vulnerability agents because of a lack of a sense of personal control over potential outcomes.

C. Warning Communication and Response

The warning communication and response stage involves getting official fore warning indications, such as tragedy transmits and deluge alarm bells, or other risk communication of an instantaneous threat and taking action with various responses to the warning, such as migration. Mileti (1975) certainly, caution credence, or definition of situational danger, is unswervingly associated to whether individual and groups react to and conform to warning messages. Moore (1958) described that lesser income factions were less probable to believe that warnings of imminent natural disasters comprised a matter which should be taken sincerely. Mack and Baker (1961) found that low-education and low-income respondents were less likely to interpret a warning signal as valid as individuals of moderate education and income. It is generally seen that the beyond belief of warning messages, another important factor for consideration is whether all groups receive warning messages. In his study of the 1987 tornado that hit Saragosa, Texas, Aguirre (1988) had discovered that many of those who died were residents at a Head Start graduation ceremony who had not received any warning messages.

D. Emergency Response

The post-impact, disaster response phase of a disaster is described as the instant consequences of a disaster, classically together with the first hours or days, perhaps up to one week, depending on the event. It delivers a distinctive prospect to observe social patterns, roles and behaviors. Socioeconomic

issues become visible to be considerable in some ways throughout the instant post-impact stage. In a study of tragedy relief bureaucrats from a diversity of associations, one of the major terminations was that the deprived are one of the groups most likely to “fall through the cracks” during emergency relief operations (Colorado State University, 1985). Rubin and Popkin (1990) studied reaction troubles to Hurricane Hugo. They discovered that a lot of the wounded had particular needs because of tremendous poverty, high illiteracy rates, and physical separation in rural community, fear and distrust of government officials, and lack of electronic media for weeks following the storm. Subervi-Velez (1992) reported that following the Loma Prieta earthquake, community-based organization invited the Red Cross to work with them to do outreach in low-income and Non-English speaking societies, but reports states that the Red Cross refused.

III. RECOVERY

The recovery stage which is typically the one-year period following a disaster, in the past it has indirect putting a disaster-wounded community back together as founded by Mileti (1999). This section tackle socioeconomic dissimilarity as life proceeds to a somewhat normal rebuilding, and lifeline repair. The fabric included below point out that there are significant differences in this era, especially in stare to accommodation issues, and that those with lower socioeconomic status may countenance more obstructions. The ease with which certain groups are able to consult practical systems may say aloud the achievements or malfunction of the recovery process. Rovai (1994) found that the higher-income Ferndale inhabitants knew how to work the system, fill out the forms, and obtain the financial aid they needed; while lower-income Rio Dell residents did not. Thus, a lot of in Rio Dell did not apply for finances support to which they were entitled.

Studies have established that low-income family units often lack admittance to reserves and income needed to cope all kinds of disasters (Bolin and Stanford, 1998 and Hewitt, 1997). During the recovery process, those with lower SES had a more difficult time as they had less indemnity, less economy, fewer personal resources and suffered from the strengthening of previous financial stress and problems as given by Bolin and Bolton, 1986; Cooper and Laughy, 1994; Tierney, 1988. Working class and middle class women veteran faces a greater disgrace when receiving assistance, public and private, after a flood disaster than low-income and high-income females. As analyzed by Fothergill, 2004, Middle class females who had once lived in poverty or accepted welfare experienced the maximum stigma receiving post-disaster help.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The review shows that socioeconomic status is important forecaster in the pre and post-disaster phases, as well as for the

substantial and emotional impacts. The poor are more likely to recognize hazards as risky; less likely to arrange for hazards or buy financial cover; less likely to respond to warnings; more likely to pass away, suffer injuries, and have proportionately higher substance losses; have more emotional trauma; and face more obstructions during the phases of response, recovery, and reconstruction. These differences are significant, and they illustrate a systematic pattern of stratification. Some findings may seem conflicting, such as the fact that most lower-income collections find disaster threats more serious and risky, probably due to a lack of authority and organize over many things in their lives, and yet low-income groups may be less likely to prepare for catastrophes and to abandon. However, these findings also make sense in that many attentiveness activities and the ability to abandon require access to economic and social possessions that the poor may not readily possess. Clearly, disasters often divulge larger societal inequities. Researchers are now recognizing and documenting how catastrophe vulnerability is entrenched in pre-existing prototypes of society resolution and expansion as analyzed by Morrow (1999). Moreover, the literature shows us that the underlying issue is one embedded in our social structures, which say aloud right of entrance to resources, power, and information. Given this knowledge, disasters may be viewed as opportunities to witness, understand, and thus proper steps and preparedness is required for remedy pre-existing social problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. C. Bolin, *Long-Term Family Recovery from Disaster (Program on Environment and Behavior Monograph Series)*, University of Colorado Natural Hazards, June 1982.
- [2] R. C. Bolin, and P. A. Bolton, *Race, Religion, and Ethnicity in Disaster Recovery*, Program on Environment and Behavior Monograph No. 42, University of Colorado, Jan. 1986.
- [3] R. Bolin, and L. Stanford, *The Northridge Earthquake: Vulnerability and Disaster* (1st ed.), Routledge, New York, Oct. 1998.
- [4] E. Enarson, “Women and housing issues in two U.S. disasters: Hurricane Andrew and the Red River Valley Flood,” *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 39-63, March 1999.
- [5] R. Palm, and J. Carroll, *Illusions of Safety: Culture and Earthquake Hazard Response in California and Japan*, Westview Press, 1998.
- [6] W. G. Peacock, B. H. Morrow, and H. Gladwin, *Hurricane Andrew: Ethnicity, Gender and the Sociology of Disasters* (1st ed.), Routledge, New York, Nov. 1997.