

Community Participatory Project for Rehabilitation after Tsunami Disaster 2011 *

การมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชนในโครงการฟื้นฟูหลังภัยพิบัติคลื่นยักษ์สึนามิ 2011

Kannapa Pongponrat (กาญจนันภา พงศ์พนรัตน์)**

Abstract

Although Japan has a long historical knowledge of development and responsive practices in the area of disaster prevention and reduction, the unexpected disaster of Great East-Japan earthquake and tsunami on March 2011 generated massive and unprecedented deconstruction in the greater Tohoku region included Iwate, Miyagi, and Fukushima prefectures. This catastrophic destruction had an impact on tsunami victims both in terms of physical conditions and towns and communities and socio-economic vulnerabilities of living conditions. However, there are evidences of willingness of tsunami victims - local people in tsunami effected communities - with assistance from non-profit organizations trying to rehabilitate their communities through participatory community projects, bouncing back to normal life. This is appearing in different disaster affected areas. This paper is an extended outcome from a research project focusing on Ishinomaki in Miyagi prefecture, one of the worst tsunami-hit communities, as an example of such a project. Interviews with selected nine key informants, who actively involved in rehabilitation project, were conducted to obtain data on plans and activities of community participatory projects for rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster. Findings and discussion show how the participatory community approach was conducted to rehabilitate the community after the disaster. Social capital was addressed as a main mechanism to engage people for their community project. Consequently, lessons learned from the experience of disaster affected communities and the use of a participatory community project approach for rehabilitation were provided with some suggestions for future development.

Keywords: participatory project, rehabilitation, social capital, tsunami disaster

* This paper is an extended outcome of International Collaborative Project supported by Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), Kyoto University.

บทความนี้เป็นผลงานต่อยอดจากโครงการวิจัยภายใต้ความร่วมมือระดับนานาชาติ สนับสนุนโดย CSEAS มหาวิทยาลัยเกียวโต

** Lecturer, College of Innovation, Thammasat University,

อาจารย์ประจำ วิทยาลัยนวัตกรรม มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

บทคัดย่อ

แม้ว่าประเทศญี่ปุ่นมีการพัฒนาองค์ความรู้และการเตรียมการป้องกันและรับมือกับภัยพิบัติทางธรรมชาติมาเป็นเวลานานในประวัติศาสตร์การพัฒนาประเทศ แต่เหตุการณ์มหันตภัยแผ่นดินไหวและคลื่นยักษ์สึนามิที่เกิดขึ้นในปี ค.ศ. 2011 นั้นเกินความคาดหมายอย่างมาก ก่อให้เกิดความเสียหายอย่างหนักในภูมิภาคโทโฮกุ ซึ่งจังหวัดที่ได้รับความเสียหายและผลกระทบอย่างหนัก คือ จังหวัดอิวาเตะ จังหวัดมียากิ และจังหวัดฟุกุชิมะ เหตุการณ์มหันตภัยในครั้งนั้น นอกจากสร้างความเสียหายทางกายภาพแล้วยังส่งผลกระทบต่อชีวิตความเป็นอยู่และสุขภาพจิตของผู้ประสบภัยอย่างต่อเนื่อง แต่ในความสูญเสียและความเสียหายกลับพบว่าผู้ประสบภัยและผู้คนในชุมชนที่ได้รับผลกระทบจากคลื่นยักษ์สึนามิมีการรวมตัวกันผ่านกระบวนการมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชน โดยได้รับการสนับสนุนจากองค์กรไม่แสวงผลกำไรและหน่วยงานอาสาสมัครต่างๆ เพื่อฟื้นฟูและเยียวยาผู้ประสบภัยและพลิกฟื้นชุมชนของตนที่ได้รับผลกระทบให้กลับมาใช้ชีวิตชีวาอีกครั้ง บทความนี้เป็นการศึกษาต่อยอดจากโครงการวิจัยที่มีการศึกษาและสำรวจภาคสนามในพื้นที่ประสบภัยโดยการสัมภาษณ์ผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องซึ่งเป็นตัวแทนจากองค์กรและหน่วยงานในโครงการฟื้นฟูชุมชนทั้งหมดเก้าท่านเพื่อรับทราบข้อมูลที่สำคัญและประเด็นที่ควรนำมาพิจารณา ผลของการศึกษาและวิเคราะห์ พบว่าคนในชุมชนและผู้ประสบภัยพร้อมทั้งหน่วยงานต่าง ๆ มีการทำงานร่วมกันผ่านกระบวนการมีส่วนร่วมในโครงการฟื้นฟูชุมชนเพื่อฟื้นฟูชุมชนของตนหลังภัยพิบัติ ทูนทางสังคมเป็นกลไกสำคัญในการก่อให้เกิดการมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชนในการฟื้นฟู เยียวยา และพัฒนาชุมชนหลังเหตุการณ์ภัยพิบัติ

คำสำคัญ : การมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชน การฟื้นฟูหลังภัยพิบัติ ทูนทางสังคม ภัยพิบัติสึนามิ

Introduction

There was unexpected and massive destruction around the Sanriku-coastal zone, Tohoku region which was caused by the Great East-Japan Earthquake with a 9.0 magnitude and resulting tsunami with a height reaching 20 meters on March 2011. Destroyed areas with significant losses included Iwate, Miyagi, and Fukushima prefectures with approximately 18,500 disaster victims. The effect of the earthquake and tsunami triggered the continuing crisis of the nuclear power plant breaking down at Fukushima Dai-Ishi Nuclear Power Plant leading to radioactive releases which became a triple disaster of the Tohoku region that never happened before in the country's history. The National Police Agency (2013) addressed that the numbers of dead and missing people were 15,882 and 2,668, respectively. The Japanese government tried to respond to this great disaster by setting up a 'Reconstruction Agency' to pursue a 'Basic Policy on Reconstruction for Disaster Recovery and Management'. The National Police Agency, as a core body, worked with various domestic and international relief organizations and numbers of volunteer groups, to respond with disaster relief initiating from emergency plans, recovery programs, and rehabilitation programs in the long term. Although we are now past

the period of immediate disaster, tsunami victims are still in vulnerable situations with emotional problems from losing their families, friends, jobs, houses, and their hometown. They are facing psychological stress without certain future prospects. This situation was created double pressure with difficulties of rebooting local business after the disaster with the majority relying on fishery and seafood processing in household-bases and manufacturing. In trying to restore livelihoods of people, community participatory projects were launched in different areas to restore and to rehabilitate both physical damage from the disaster and socio-economic living conditions of the tsunami victims. This was supported by local community stakeholders included local people, local interest groups, local authorities, and local business sectors through participatory processes for community rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster.

As mentioned in earlier studies, community participation requires people who are affected by disaster to be involved in both decision-making and the implementation of policies, plans, and action plans through participatory planning processes. This concept is meant to ensure that development meets the perceived needs of the local community (Estrella, 2002). The outcome of participatory planning is likely to live far longer since people identify with the project and see the project as belonging to them (Dendi and Shivakoti, 2003). Given the potential sustainability of the outcome of participatory planning processes, the bottom-up approach is often recommended (NDPC, 2002). Participatory development activities could enhance local capacity in finding solutions to problems, and to give everyone a chance to contribute and share their common interest (Meshack, 2004). To rehabilitate communities after disaster, participatory projects are an important mechanism to implement. They require people who are affected by disaster to be involved in both decision-making and the implementation of policies, plans, and action plans through participatory planning processes. This was confirmed by Pongponrat (2006) that community participation usually begins with a bottom-up approach involving major stakeholder groups through the process of decision-making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and benefit sharing on the matters that affect their living.

This paper is an extended outcome of a research project, aiming to explore community participatory projects for rehabilitation after the Japan tsunami disaster in 2011. It presents and discusses on how the participatory process was organized and conducted by local stakeholders for designing projects, decision-making, implementing, and evaluation. Ishinomaki, Miyagi prefecture, one of the worst hit by tsunami disaster was selected as a case study since it has a progressive community participatory project to rehabilitate its community,

focusing on community tourism development which has community stakeholders' involvement. This paper shows that the main mechanism imperative for the success of the community tourism development project was significantly addressed by participatory planning and implementation as a process and social capital as a mechanism in various stages of rehabilitations after disaster.

Literature Review

To understand concepts and practices of community participatory project for rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster, this paper provides literature review for significant concepts and theories. These included concepts of community participation to develop and implement community project and social capital as a mechanism to drive community participation.

Concepts of community participation

Participation in planning and development projects was introduced to international development assistance since the 1980s following Chambers (1983) and adoption of approaches such as participatory rural appraisal that emphasize facilitation and the pre-eminence of local knowledge (Chambers, 1997). Since the 1990s, participation has become a buzzword in development contexts since it has several interpretations in terms of purposes, forms, and implications. It has more particularly been linked up with personal promises of self-fulfillment, ownership and self-determination as well as with democratic ideals such as justice, equivalence and freedom (Kerlign, 2006).

Several definitions of participation have been identified. Most of them are similar in principle but differ in terms of the stages of participation. The nature of participation in the development process gives rise to much controversy regarding its definition and modalities since there is no single universally accepted definition. Pongponrat (2006) mentioned that people's participation can be viewed through different aspects including 'who' will be involved, in 'what' roles and responsibilities, and 'how' to implement based on those identified roles and responsibilities. Participation has the potential of enhancing project uptake and impact as well as contributing information for project evaluation. It refers to the involvement of people in various communication process (e.g. feedback, conflict resolution, decision-making), either directly or indirectly via representatives of associations. Transparency is considered to be an essential factor for the success of a participatory process (Tyler, 2001; Knierim & Nagel, 2001; & Illsley, 2003).

The need for community participation in development and management has been widely accepted and recognized for decades as well. Brand (1983) and Westguard (1986) defined 'community participation' as the practice of involving as many people as possible through consensus building in the planning and implementation and as a 'collective effort' to increase and exercise control over resources. Community participation, transferred from concept into practice, with co-management as a complementary approach, has gained prominence due to the sustained interest in participatory forms of natural resource management. Empowerment is an aim of co-management as it involves bringing previously excluded, disenfranchised and sometimes alienated user groups and stakeholders into the management decision-making process by reshuffling power and responsibility among those who form the management chain (Jentoft, 2005). Co-management is a 'social action process' that promotes participation of people, organizations, and communities towards the goals of increased individual and community control to improve the quality of community life. Co-management process establishes horizontal and vertical networks of social partners or stakeholders who agree to share access to and management of resources through a process of negotiation and learning, and to revise their practices in a further process of continuing adaptive management (Borrini-Feyerabend, et al, 2000). Co-management process can be characterized with concepts such as pluralism and linkages, communication and negotiation, trans-active decision-making, and social learning, as many studies have investigated (Plummer and FitzGibbon, 2006; Ruitenbeek and Catier, 2001; Berkes, 2004; and Olsson et al, 2004). Schumann (2007) addressed that effective co-management requires good linkages between participating stakeholders. The networks of stakeholders must be understood and encouraged to share information. Although the concept of participation was developed and implemented for decades in world development, there is a continuous using of this concept for local development in various aspects with more analysis on factors associated with community participation, constraints, limitations, and potential of extensions. Definitely, this concept is also applied in the field of disaster risk reduction which has generated comprehensive knowledge and techniques of development to apply. Sanyal and Routray (2016) asserted that when a disaster strikes, it not only destroys buildings and infrastructures, but also creates a huge loss of lives and affects the community adversely. The social aspect is one of the most important links in managing disasters at the community level, which require participation from community members in different stages of the disaster risk cycle which also includes stages of rehabilitation.

Social capital as a mechanism

Community participation can be seen as an active process by which beneficiaries or stakeholders influence the decision-making and implementation of a development project with a view of enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish (Sanoff, 2000). Community planning depends very much on a community building approach, which is based on the idea that residents must take control of their destiny and communities. Community building grows from a vision of how communities function normally, where community members create community institutions that help to achieve their aspirations as well as strengthen community fabric (Sanoff, 2000).

To understand community participation, there needs to be an understanding and appreciation of the various factors associated with the level of people participation within their community development. Self-interest; encouragement by local leaders; knowledge and skills; availability of time, money and materials; benefits received from participation; gender and age; communication processes; influence of culture; and interest in contributing to society are components of social capital that support active community participation. Jones (2005) stated that power structure is an element that underpins the participation process. Its influence was translated to mean something more akin to 'participation'. Leader and leadership style are vital issues to be considered. Harris and De Renzio (1997) provided a classification of social capital which included family and kinship. This was supported by Putnam (1993), who noted that social capital is considered as features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated action. Social capital provides solutions to collective action problems. It is the property of societies rather than of individuals, which appears as a set of horizontal associations between people, or networks of civil engagement and associated norms that enable things to be done (Francis, 2002). The role of trust also focuses on the individual and the quality of interpersonal relationships. It is an important element of any social relationship and a key component of contemporary democracies (Parkins & Mitchell, 2005). The core idea of social capital is that social networks have values as interactions and connections that develop shared norms and trust. This in turn fosters cooperation to achieve common ends (Jones, 2005). There is a clear relationship between trust and successful participatory processes, and this trust factor is repeatedly articulated at the interpersonal level among given communities to involve local people when there is need of participation. Sanyal and Routral (2016) confirmed that social capital is seen as actual and potential resources that stimulate multiple functions for mutual

benefits carried out by the members of the network bonded by a formal or informal social structure. They developed a social capital model by classifying its dimensions into structural and cognitive elements including institutions, associations, networks, rules and guidelines, and participation. Meanwhile, the cognitive dimension includes shared values, reciprocity, trust, attitude, and norms of behavior. Besides dimensions of social capital, there are also different forms of social capital which play a significant role in community participation for various project. This includes bonding social capital (e.g. trust, social cohesion, information gathering and dissemination, mental support, and resource sharing); bridging social capital (e.g. awareness raising, co-management, volunteering work, social networks, connections); and linking social capital (e.g. knowledge training, capacity building, policy implementation, support programs, subsidy).

Considering disaster risk reduction and rehabilitation processes, Dynes (2006) addressed that social capital has a vital role in strengthening capacities at the community level for better risk reduction. Social networks and social associations are considered as the basic social units to respond to disaster. Social capital uses its social network at times of emergency not only to provide financial support in the forms of loans and gifts for repairing property but also to provide non-financial resources like helping in search and rescue, debris removal, sheltering, child care during recovery, emotional support, and information dissemination.

Data Gathering

This paper presents an extended outcome of a research project in fieldwork, focusing significant issues appeared in Ishinomaki, Miyagi prefecture, one of the worst hit by the tsunami disaster in 2011. It was conducted by fieldwork with stakeholders of disaster relief related organizations including volunteer centers, educational institutions, local authorities, private sectors, non-profit organizations, and local people. This aims to obtain data on a community participatory project for rehabilitation, especially in relation to Ishinomaki's tourism development. Target group included Miyagi International Association (MIA), Ishinomaki 'mangattan Museum, Ishinomaki Disaster Recovery Assistance Council Inc. (IDRAC), Ishinomaki Future Support Association (IFSA), Tohoku University, Kokusai Shien Chikyu-mura (NPO), and local representatives. Field observation around Ishinomaki, a target study area, was launched and interviews with selected nine key informants were conducted to gain understanding on living conditions of the community pre and post tsunami as well as to obtain information on plans and activities of community participatory projects for rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster since there was a limited document to reviewed. These nine key informants were

actively involved in rehabilitation projects since they were representative from organizations and authorities. Content analysis was employed to analyze critical issues, focused on community conditions after the tsunami disaster. Social capital was also identified with content analysis to understand drivers which motivated people to participate in the community participatory project, especially for community tourism development.

Findings and Discussion

From data gathering and analysis, it shows significant data on how Ishinomaki people rehabilitated their community after the tsunami disaster through the community tourism development project. This section provides a background of Ishinomaki and an overview of the impact of the tsunami disaster in 2011. Then, it will explain how community participatory projects developed and were implemented for rehabilitation, especially through the community tourism development project.

Ishinomaki and Impacts of the Tsunami Disaster

The Great East-Japan Earthquake with a magnitude of 9.0 generated a massive and devastating tsunami that descended upon the Tohoku region on March 11, 2011. This led to catastrophic destruction in the coastal areas of Iwate, Miyagi and Fukushima prefectures. Miyagi prefecture was the most disaster affected area with numbers of dead at 9,571 and missing people at 1,302 (National Police Agency, 2013). The height of the tsunami of more than 15.5 meters occurred in Ishinomaki, leading to numbers of dead and missing people there being 3259 and 448 respectively. The effect of the earthquake and tsunami was triggered by the continuing crisis at Fukushima where Fukushima Dai-Ishi Nuclear Power Plant was attacked by the triple disasters: earthquake, tsunami, and radioactive releases. There were constructions of roads, buildings, housing, and other infrastructures in Ishinomaki, one of the worst tsunamit effected areas, to restore the destroyed community into a normal condition. The reconstruction plan was initiated by government agencies with a town planning designed by community committee in different areas of Tohoku region which were destroyed by the tsunami disaster. Considering Ishinomaki, it has an estimated population of 145,805 which mostly engages in fishery, seafood manufacturing, and trading as the main economic generator for the community. Ishinomaki traditionally has been a center for commercial fishing especially for oysters cultivating practice. After the tsunami disaster, many seafood manufactures were closed down due to destruction and taking time for rebuilding. This led to a declining of the local economic generating and labor force conditions, resulting in a jobless situation for local

people. They were facing the difficulties of living without a job and income compared to their lives before.

Compared with other areas in the Miyagi prefecture such as Sendai, a main city of the Tohoku region, tourism in Ishinomaki was a small economic generating source with few tourist attractions. However, one of the main tourist attractions in Ishinomaki is 'Ishinomori Manga' Museum' also known as 'Ishinomaki Mangattan Museum' which opened in 2001, ten years before the tsunami disaster. It is accounted as a main tourist attraction of Ishinomaki city that is dedicated to the famous 'manga' artist and author Shotaro Ishinomori, who was born in Ishinomaki city. He was an artist of an all-time favorite, 'KamanRidar', a famous 'manga' from previous decades and also, he created several dozen influential 'manga' series including Cyborg 009. His work essentially pioneered the super-powered and transforming ranger 'manga' genres, and new adaptations of his series are still produced for TV and turned into movies today. This museum is located on 'Manga Island' where people need to cross Kitakami River from the city's mainland, providing a beautiful walking route for visitors and tourists. The museum displays a collection of comics, statues, and artworks from his numerous 'manga' series. Some of his creations are also displayed in the streets of Ishinomaki downtown, including several statues depicting characters from the 'manga' series. Much of the museum's collection was destroyed in the disaster, but the sturdy building itself survived more or less intact. After time consuming restoration works, the museum was fully reopened in March 2013, two years after the tsunami disaster. This museum provided an important role to support the community during the disaster recovery period, acting as an evacuation shelter for tsunami victims, later becoming a center for community participatory projects which will be discussed in the following section.

Community Participatory Project for Rehabilitation

After the tsunami disaster destroyed Ishinomaki and put this community into a vulnerable state, there were various stakeholders involved in emergency rescue, recovery, and rehabilitation stages. Early volunteer supporting programs for recovery included medical teams, relaxation and entertainment, mental healthcare, child care, community support, transfer transportation, shelter's sanitary reform, livelihood support, support to fisheries, mud clearance, hot meal supply, material distribution, and community rehabilitation. Ishinomaki Disaster Recovery Assistance Council Inc. (IDRAC) and Ishinomaki Future Support Association (IFSA) were the main volunteer coordinating bodies to work with different volunteer programs

and placement from both individual volunteer and groups of volunteer. This function was coordinated among volunteers, local authorities, and NPOs. It was also known as a 'Disaster Volunteer Center' (DVC) which mostly received volunteers from university volunteer programs, sending students to work for disaster recovery. These practices were supported by the concept of networking, both in terms of horizontal and vertical aspects (Plummer and J. FitzGibbon, 2006). From this research, it significant showed that networking among different stakeholders played vital role to design and implement project for community both from center authority to local authority as vertical aspect as well as linear organizations in community working together like horizontal aspect, creating network in different aspects. This is to confirm that social capital is important mechanism to revitalize community after disaster since stakeholders share common goals and work through participatory approach.

There was a five-year town and city plan which included zoning, construction and a local tourism development plan. This city plan was developed by brainstorming, meetings, and group discussions among different sectors of the community including government, private, non-profit organizations, and local people which were supported by a series of community participation in which people were involved in different aspects from decision-making, implementation, to monitoring and evaluation (Santos et al, 2006; Pongponrat, 2006), which generated by social capital as discussed earlier. Co-management was applied in community participatory processes to design suitable plans and identify roles and responsibilities of stakeholders involved in community projects. This action supported by study of Borrini-Feyerabend et al (2000) on the significance of social action processes that are implemented through co-management to promote the participation of people, organizations, and communities towards the goals of increasing individual and community control to improve the quality of community life. For the Ishinomaki community participatory project, the main body of coordinating and taking action on this city planning is Ishinomaki City Council and a private sector called 'Man-Bow.com'. This private sector is also the one that manages the Ishinomaki 'Mangatten Museum. This is supported by the idea that there must be some stakeholder in-charge as the main power to arrange a co-management for effectively implementing a concept.

From community participation in the decision-making process to formulate rehabilitation plans, one of the important projects is to develop community tourism for re-generating the local economy after the great loss of the tsunami disaster. This is supported by Wachirasirodom and Tadanithi (2016) that community tourism concept is significant related to

sustainable livelihood outcomes in economic, social and environmental aspects as it emphasizes on the improvement of community residents' livelihood and to enhance quality of living such as health, education, amenities, and infrastructure. There was a plan to rehabilitate Ishinomaki as a 'manga' city which was everywhere decorated with 'manga' statues and 'manga' paintings painted by local people and student volunteers on walls of restaurants, shops, houses, office buildings, and even train stations. This was meant to create the environment of being a 'manga' city'. Streets within the city were developed as a 'manga' route where tourists and visitors could walk about the 'manga' tourist maps, searching for 'manga' statues and paintings. This becomes attractive for a family one-day trip to bring children to Ishinomaki 'Mangatten Museum along with walking on the 'manga' city route. Beside being involved in brainstorming, focus group discussion, and community meeting as mentioned earlier, local people who live or run business in the city were also involved in this project by decorating 'manga' styles in front of their house or building, selling 'manga' souvenirs, selling 'manga' books, selling food with 'manga' decoration, or even being a local guide for a walk tour within the city. These practices were supported by the concept of co-management which focuses on an effective of networking among communities with a clear direction (Schumann, 2007) to implement in consensus which requires participation from different stakeholders in the community to exchange information, knowledge and experiences, and resources (Singleton, 2001 and Schumann, 2007) for their community's rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster.

However, rehabilitation for a community that has experienced disaster can be conducted in many directions, which may create conflict and misunderstanding among community members. Therefore, it requires trans-active activities in real practice (Berkes, 2004) where social capital can be a mechanism to be involved with community members in a community participatory project. Social capital which identified in this case significantly played a huge role in community participation for rehabilitation. The private sector, Man-Bow.com, was obviously presenting a leadership style (Jones, 2005) and acted as the main body of the participatory process, to provide a channel for people involved in brainstorming and discussion about the rehabilitation plan. This also occurred as a 'social organization' with trust, norms and networks being facilitated by coordinated action among the community (Putnam, 1993). To develop a community project for rehabilitation, this case shows the collective action of the community with network-engaging among stakeholders including local authorities, the private sector, volunteer groups, non-profit organization, and local people. It appears as a set of civil engagement with social relationships (Francis, 2002; Parkins and Michell, 2005). Mostly,

stakeholders who were involved in this community participatory project 'feel' that they should be involved to help rehabilitate their community, a concept supported by Harpham et al (2002) with bonding and bridging social capital appearing in this case when people trust each other and help to work for their community by sharing their knowledge, experiences, times, labor, cash, and help to promote their local community in a consensual way, using "manga" painting as a theme all over the community area. This rehabilitation received support from center government since it also related with the policy of Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). Tangthongtongkul (2016) addressed that the MEXT's policy emphasizes on fostering creative people with warm-hearted human nature specifically by advancing education and promoting lifelong learning and encouraging sports, and cultural activities which appeared in this case study since the project was designed through participatory approach among different stakeholders from center government, local authorities, private sector and local community. To confirm, this research addressed that knowledge, trust, networking, and creativity, under social capital concept (Sanoff, 2000; Parkins & Mitchell, 2005; and Sanyal & Routral,2016) became an important mechanism for community rehabilitation after disaster.

Conclusions and Suggestions

From this paper, it is clearly the case that community members from different sectors were involved in the participatory process for their community rehabilitation after the tsunami disaster of 2011 and this can be accounted as an exemplary case. The community participation concept was able to be applied among community members consisting of local people, related organizations and government authorities in rehabilitating Ishinomaki after facing vulnerable conditions in the wake of the tsunami disaster. This appears especially in local tourism development where stakeholders in any given place can be involved in many ways as occurred in Ishinomaki . Although it is still limited to domestic visitors and tourists from other prefectures of the country to visit Ishinomaki, at least it has helped to rehabilitate community lives both in terms of the local economy generation after a big loss from the tsunami disaster as well as helping to resolve social ills such as mental problems.

Community participation is one of the mechanisms that have been applied in various development stages of local tourism planning observed in this paper. It was effective in responding to people's problems and needs and thus improve the quality of life for themselves and their community after tsunami disaster. This paper explored community

participation as employed by stakeholders in a community to rehabilitate their destroyed community after the tsunami disaster, a locally initiated project. Tourism development also helped to support local cultural awareness on 'manga' which is a significant part of Japanese popular culture. Co-management, addressed by various studies (Plummer and FitzGibbon, 2006; Ruitenbeek and Catier, 2001; Berkes, 2004; & Olsson et al, 2004), once it is applied into real practice, can help to rehabilitate communities and people who experienced disaster with its core idea of social action for development through community participation in decision-making, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation process which emphasizing on quality of life. With the unique resources of the local community to develop and promote local tourism, co-management concepts can help to identify such local resources that belong to different community members, then create a pool of resources for development for a whole community with clear identifications of roles and responsibilities.

Social capital as a mechanism led to increased participation of the local people who had a strong sense of belonging to their hometown, and with mutual respect for each other, enabling them to work for their community development. Trust, linkages, communication, and social learning among community members, therefore, become the keys to mobilizing social action for community rehabilitation, focusing on socio-economic functions where community members themselves are the main beneficiaries for such development. Results from this research supported previous studies (Harpham et al (2002); Francis, 2002; and Parkins & Michell, 2005) in expect to confirm that social capital is main mechanism of community participation in development project including a rehabilitation. This paper showed the potential for successful participatory community tourism development, with its strengths in the existence of local capacity to implement a participatory approach with strong leadership, effective social networking, and local supports. Based on this research, suggestions for improving effective rehabilitation project after disaster includes incorporating community participation into any participatory planning process since it is a possible means of bringing together various sets of people to be involved in the planning and implementation processes. This will enhance a sense of ownership and increasing commitment of people to involve for their community development in the long term. There should be strategies to maintain community participatory project which include creating incentives for participation through benefit-sharing which can be recognitions as social benefits or cash and kinds as economic benefits. Promoting roles of local leadership would be possible to strengthening local networking creation in local level. Information dissemination also helps to generate

community participation since people aware of community situations, needs, and way to move forward as collective actions in their own community, especially in times after disaster.

Acknowledgement

This paper is an extended outcome of International Collaborative Project supported by Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), Kyoto University. The author is grateful to the kind cooperation and advices provided by Prof. Yukio Ikemoto, Tokyo University and Prof. Shinjiro Omori. She extends her deep gratitude to Prof. Yoko Hayami, Director of CSEAS and Assoc. Prof. Kayoko Ishii, Rikkyu University for their great supports and precise advice. The author also offers her sincere thanks to all key informants in Ishinomaki and Sendai for their kind cooperation for data gathering.

References

- Chambers, R. (1983). **Rural Development: Putting the Last First**. London: Longman.
- Chambers, R. (1997). **Whose Reality Counts? Putting the Last First**. London: IT Publications.
- Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking Community-based Conservation. **Conservation Biology**, Vol.18 (No.3), 621–630.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Farvar, M.T., Nguingiri, J.C. & Ndangang, V. (2000). **Co-Management of Natural Resources: Organizing Negotiation and Learning by Doing**. Heidelberg, Germany: Kasperek.
- Brand, P.S. (1983). **Community Participation on California's Coast-Coastal Zone 83**: 2654-2661.
- Dendi, A. & Shivakoti, G. (2003). Assessment of Participatory Extension Approaches for Sustainable Agriculture Development in Uplands of West Sumatra, Indonesia. **Asia Pacific Journal of Rural**
- Dynes, R. (2006). **Social Capital: Dealing with Community Emergencies**. Homeland Security Affair, II (No.2)
- Estrella, M. (2000). **Mobilizing the People**. **ADB Review March-April**. Philippine: The Asian Development Bank.
- Francis, P. (2002). Social Capital, Civil Society and Social Exclusion, In Kothari, U. & Minoque, M. (eds), **Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspective**. Hampshire: Palgrave.

- Harpham, T., Grant, E., & Thomas, E. (2002). Measuring Social Capital Within Health Surveys: Key Issues. **Health Policy and Planning**, Vol.17, 106-111.
- Harriss, J. & De Renzio, P. (1997). "Missing Link" or Analytically Missing?: The Concept of Social Capital. An Introductory Bibliographic Essay. **Journal of International Development**, Vol.9 (No.7), 123-146
- Jentoft, S. (2005) Fisheries Co-Management as Empowerment. **Marine Policy**, Vol.29, 1-7.
- Jones, S. (2005). Community-Based Ecotourism: The Significance of Social Capital. **Annals of Tourism Research**, Vol.32 (No.2), 303-324
- Kerlign, Q. (2006). Participation for Free: Exploring Limits of Participatory Government **Educational Philosophy and Theory**, Vol.38 (No.4), 497-511.
- Knierim, A. & Nagel, U. J. (2001). **Challenges and Constraints for Cooperative Conflict Management among Land Use Stakeholders**. In Peters, G.H. & Pingali, P. (Eds), *Tomorrow's Agriculture: Incentives, Institutions, Infrastructure and Innovations: Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth International Conference of Agricultural Economists*. Ashgate, Hants.UK, 527-537.
- Illsley, B.M. (2003). Fair Participation: A Canadian Perspective. **Land Use Policy** Vol.20, 265-273.
- Olsson, P. ,Folke, C. & Berkes, F. (2004). Adaptive Co-Management for Building Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems. **Environmental Management**, Vol.34 (No.1), 75–90.
- Parkins, J. R. & Mitchell, R.E. (2005). Public Participation as Public Debate: A Deliberative Turn in Natural Resource Management. **Society and Natural Resources**, Vol.18, 529-540.
- Plummer,R. (2006) Sharing the Management of a River Corridor: A Case Study of the Co-management Process. **Society and Natural Resources**, Vol.19, 709–721.
- Plummer, R. & FitzGibbon, G. (2006) People Matter: The Importance of Social capital in the Co-Management of Natural Resources. **Natural Resources Forum**, Vol.30, 51–62.
- Pomeroy, R.S. & Berkes, F. (1997). Two to Tango: The Role of Government in Fisheries Co-Management. **Marine Policy**, Vol.21, 465–480.
- Plummer, R. & FitzGibbon, J. (2006). People Matter: The Importance of Social capital in the Co-Management of Natural Resources. **Natural Resources Forum**, Vol.30, 51–62.
- Putman, R.D. (1993). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. **The American Prospect**
- Pongponrat, K. (2006). Initiation of Participatory Tourism Planning by Local Government: A Case Study of Community Cleaning Day, Koh Samui, Surat Thani Province, Southern Thailand. **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism**, Vol.4 (No.2), 65-89.

- Ruitenbeek, J. & Catier, C. (2001). The Invisible Wand: Adaptive Co-Management as an Emergent Strategy in Complex Bio-economic Systems. *Center for International Forestry Research Occasional Paper No.34*. (online) URL: /http://www.cifor.cigar.org.
- Sanoff, H. (2000). **Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning**. Canada: John Wiley and Son Inc.
- Sanyal, S. & Routray, J. (2016) Social Capital for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management with Empirical Evidences from Sundarbans of India. **International Journal of Disaster Risk and Reduction**, Vol.19, 101-111
- Santos, R., Antunes, P. Baptista, G., Mateues, P, & Madruga, L. (2006). Stakeholder Participation in the Design of Environmental Policy Mixes. **Ecological Economic**, Vol.60, 100-110.
- Schumann, S. (2007). Co-Management and “Consciousness”: Fishers’ Assimilation of Management Principle in Chile. **Marine Policy**, Vol.31, 101-111.
- Singleton, S. (1998). **Constructing Cooperation: the Evolution of Institutions of Co-Management**. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- National Police Agency. (2013). **Countermeasures for the Great East Japan Earthquake** (NPA). Japan.
- Mansuri, G. & Rao, V. (2004). Community-Based and Driven Development: A Critical Review. **The World Bank Research Observer**, Vol.19, (No.1), 1-39.
- Tangthongtongkul, C. (2016). The Education Provided by the Local Government: A Comparative Case Study between Japan and Thailand. **Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University**, Vol. 9 (No.5) July-December, 95-113.
- Taylor, G. (1995). The Community Approach: Does it really work? **Tourism Management**, Vol.16 (No.7), 487-489.
- Wachirasirodom, R. & Tadanithi, S. (2016). An Analysis of Sustainable Livelihoods through Community-based Tourism in Andaman Coastal Communities, Thailand. **Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University**, Vol.9 (No.4) January-June, 48-62.
- Westguard, K. 1986. **People’s Participation in Local Government and Rural Development: The Case of West Bengal**. Copenhagen: India. Center for Development Research.
- Woolcock, M. (1998). Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. **Theory and Society**, Vol.27, 151-208.