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Brief explanation of Indonesian and Javanese words

- **Gotong royong**: mutual cooperation
- **Nrimo**: acceptance
- **Pasrah**: acceptance of God's will
- **Bahasa**: language
- **Budaya**: culture
- **Lidi**: splintered palm leave rib
- **Rukun**: harmony
- **Sabar**: patience
- **Waspada-eling**: self knowledge
- **Andap-asor**: humbleness
- **Prasaja**: modesty
- **Kebatinan**: mysticism
- **Dukuh**: sub-village
- **Desa**: village
- **Kecamatan**: sub-district
- **Kabupaten**: district
- **Jamu**: traditional medicine
- **Arisan**: weekly women's meeting and savings system
- **Penjajan**: Islamic meeting
- **Pos Yandu**: local health post
- **Pengajian**: Islamic school
- **TPA**: Islamic school for children
- **Manfaat**: benefit (for others)
- **Sejahartara**: wellness
- **Ikhlas**: devotion, to be purified
Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 The 2006 earthquake
On May 27, 2006 the region South-west of Yogyakarta was hit by an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.3 on the Richter scale, followed by two after shocks with a magnitude of 4.8 and 4.6. According to the official figures, 5,749 people were killed, 38,000 physically injured and more than 127,000 houses were completely destroyed as well as an additional 450,000 houses that were damaged by the earthquake. It was estimated that this left 1,173,742 people homeless (ICRC, 2009). The epicenter of the earthquake was approximately 20 km southeast of Yogyakarta, with a depth of 10km.¹ One of the places hardest hit by the earthquake was Kiringan, a village located just 1½ km. from the epicenter of the earthquake.

1.2 Javanese values and psychosocial well-being
After the earthquake in 2006, most of the houses in the region were completely destroyed and as mentioned by Macrea, most of the areas that were affected were rather poor, so there was only a small percentage of people that had the resources to rebuild their homes. However, within Central Java, villages are known to have a very strong 'communal and egalitarian ethos' (Macrea, 2008, 195) where solidarity and cooperation are valued highly and this has helped them to manage the situation and rebuild their homes. There were of course other factors that facilitated the recovery of the affected villages, such as aid from NGO's and INGO's, donations from the Indonesian government and from other national and international sources, the area's proximity to a major city (Yogyakarta) with a good infrastructure and other facilities and the help of many volunteers and family members. Nevertheless, the ability of the affected communities to organize themselves and rebuild their villages was essential for their relatively fast recovery. In 2009, three years after the earthquake, virtually all houses have been rebuilt or replaced, and the economy has recovered to a

¹ For an overview of the affected area see Appendix A
level even higher than before the event of the earthquake.

This being said, the earthquake did have a significant impact on the people and communities that were affected. Disasters and emergency situations can have a huge impact on psychosocial well-being. At the same time however, culture can have a significant influence on how people and communities respond to disasters. The focus of this thesis will be on the village of Kiringan and its people, so as to get a better understanding of the importance of culture and values for psychosocial well-being, specifically in relation to disaster situations. It will look at how the earthquake has affected psychosocial well-being and the role of certain cultural concepts, characteristic for Javanese society, in this context. There are three cultural concepts in specific that will be examined in this thesis, namely the ideal of gotong royong (working together) and the values of nrimo (acceptance) and pasrah (acceptance of God's will)².

### 1.3 Research question

According to some, culture and values do not only have an influence on psychosocial well-being, but are in fact an important aspect of psychosocial well-being (Tov and Diener, 2007; PWG, 2003). As will be expanded upon later, there are many different factors that have an influence on psychosocial well-being. Within this research however I will look specifically at the ideal of gotong royong and the values of pasrah and nrimo as cultural concepts since they are considered to be representative for the Javanese attitude towards life. The aim is to get a better understanding of the role that culture and values play with regard to perceived psychosocial well-being at a local level, taking the event of the earthquake in 2006 into account. Therefore the overlapping research question is: ‘Are the cultural concepts of gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah of importance for local perceptions of psychosocial well-being after the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta province?’

---

² The definitions of pasrah and nrimo as used here do not necessarily reflect what is understood by these words on an individual level, as will be expanded upon later, there are many different interpretations of these values
1.4 Subquestions
In order to answer this question however, there are several subquestions that need to be examined. The aim of these subquestions is to find out how the event of the earthquake has affected the psychosocial well-being of people in Kiringan. Furthermore, they will try to map out the relevance of the three values as mentioned above and assess the importance of these values for perceived psychosocial well-being of individuals in the community and the community as a whole. The respective subquestions therefore are:

1. What is considered as psychosocial well-being within the community?
2. How has the 2006 earthquake affected the psychosocial well-being of people in Kiringan?
3. Does the ideal of gotong Royong, and the values of nrimo and pasrah have an influence on the attitudes and behavior of people within the community?
4. Is there a relation between these cultural concepts and perceived psychosocial well-being after the earthquake?

These subquestions will be addressed during the course of this thesis, mainly in chapter 4, where they will each be discussed separately. First however, chapter 2 will offer a review of relevant literature to provide a background on the subject of psychosocial well-being and the Javanese attitude to life. In chapter 3, the research methods will be explained extensively and the results will be discussed in chapter 4. Finally, chapter 5 will conclude with an answer to the main research question and a discussion.

1.5 Significance
With this research project I hope to contribute to the knowledge on both psychosocial well-being after a disaster and the importance of the cultural and social context in the aftermath of a disaster. The aim is to create a better understanding of what is considered to be important for psychosocial well-being on a local level and how this is related to culture. Even though this research is situated in one specific village, I hope to give an illustration of how culture and
values play a role in the way communities respond to crisis and how collective action and cooperation can recover and strengthen a community on a psychosocial level. Finally, I would like to emphasize the value of local perceptions and ways of working for the international arena of emergency response.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1 Psychosocial well-being and the impact of a disaster
As the words indicate, psychosocial well-being is a combination of the individual psychological well-being (emotions, thoughts and behavior) and the wider social context (relationships, traditions and culture) (PWG, 2003; IASC, 2007). Especially in a society where the individual and the group are not seen as mutually exclusive and where personal, social and cultural aspects are strongly related to each other (Mulder, 1978) it is not always possible to make a distinction between the individual well-being and the well-being of the community. This is why it is useful to take the two, psychological and social well-being, together. This means that psychosocial well-being is here considered to include the individual, the larger social units such as the family and the household and the community.

Within this study, the community is considered to be a bound territorial unit that has residential and other land uses, where the people make planning and governance decisions together (Beard and Dasgupta, 2006). This refers mainly to the physical characteristics of a community, but the social relationships that form a community are equally, if not more, important. Ferdinand Tonnies used the term Gemeinschaft to describe 'traditional' communities in which strong social networks within the family, tribe or village are the basis of human relationships and where the welfare of the whole has precedence over the individual (Tonnies, 1887/1955). I believe that this term is still viable in relation to the community as described within this research, especially when discussing psychosocial well-being.

The Psychosocial Working Group (PWG) has developed a model in which it considers psychosocial well-being to be affected by three key factors, namely human capacity, social ecology and culture and values (PWG, 2003). The human capacity is the individual mental and physical health of a person. The social ecology includes the social connections and support that people share (within a community for example). The third factor, culture and values, points at the
context and culture of people and communities, which influences how they experience, understand and respond to certain events. Von Peter argues that 'feelings can not be separated from intersubjective and public spheres, for they shape and motivate expression and experience'. Therefore, 'it is necessary to explore the particular ways in which cultural meaning and social structure relate to discourses and practices through which suffering is produced and represented' (2008, 639). The primary importance of cultural meaning systems for emotional experience is also emphasized by Lutz and White (1986) in their exploration of the anthropology of emotions. This underlines the necessity to explore the importance of culture and values for perceived psychosocial well-being.

These three factors as mentioned by the PWG are of course interconnected and what happens in one area will have an influence on the other areas as well as on the overall well-being of people. This model as proposed by the PWG is useful in the context of this research to get a comprehensive idea of the different issues that play an essential role when discussing psychosocial well-being. The relevance of the model for this research will be discussed further in section 3.2.

The impact of emergencies such as caused by natural disasters can have a grave influence on individual, family, community and societal levels. This impact can last for many years after the disruptive event, due to physical, material and economic losses and depletion or disruption of community resources (IASC, 2007). If we then look at the three factors influencing psychosocial well-being as defined by the PWG, it is easy to see how a natural disaster can have an influence on these different domains. Human capacity may be influenced because people become depressed, are physically disabled or withdraw from social life. The deaths of people can cause a loss of skilled labor within households and communities. At the same time, a feeling of having less or no control over events and circumstances may cause people to feel that they are not able to meet the challenges they face. When it comes to social ecology, this may be disrupted because relations between families and peers change, or because it is difficult for religious and civic organizations to function. Similarly, the culture and values may
be disrupted because values are challenged or because it is more difficult for people to follow cultural traditions that give them a sense of identity and unity. However, it might also be exactly the culture and values of a society that offer people something to hold on to or that serve as a source of strength. Similarly, peoples social ecology may offer them a sense of belonging and a common ground as well as support to rebuild their lives and their homes.

It needs to be taken into account that these factors are not the only issues that have an influence on psychosocial well-being. Loss of material and economic resources of families and households, disruption of infrastructure and degradation of the environment are other factors that can have a significant impact (PWG, 2003) and it is important to keep these in mind. In this research however, the focus will be mainly on human capacity, social ecology and culture and values, the three factors as mentioned by the PWG.

2.2 The Javanese attitude to life

In Java, culture and values play a central role. This is apparent in almost every aspect of daily life. As mentioned by Mulder, budaya (culture) is the essence of being Javanese. The 'Javanese way' is 'to know and show appropriate manners, to speak the appropriate words, to maintain an orderly and ordered existence in which things and persons are in their place, regular, predictable and without disturbance' (Mulder, 1978, 39). Mulder goes on to explain that Javanese society is characterized by three central values; harmony, unity and hierarchy. The value of unity is characterized by order, at both an individual and social level. It includes having the appropriate ceremonies at the right times, the appropriate coordination of behavior, the maintenance of harmonious form and the avoidance of conflict (Mulder, 1978).

For harmony, the term rukun (harmonious unity) is commonly used within Java. Iskandar describes rukun as 'quiet and peaceful', 'like the ideal relationship of friendship', 'without quarrel and strife' and 'united in purpose while mutually helping each other' (Iskandar, 1970, 981). These components of rukun should ideally be expressed at a community or social level. According to Mulder, the ideal
of *gotong royong* (working together or sharing of mutual burdens) is the most obvious expression of *rukun*.

The next value, hierarchy, is also very present on a social level. It becomes apparent in all social relationships as well as in the Javanese language which is expressive of the prevailing order and at the same time a means of social control (Mulder, 1978; Poedjosoedarmo, 1968; Laine, 1998). Language and manners serve to express respect and honor to another person. This respect is an expression of the ideal of maintaining the correct and polite social form that is considered to be essential for the maintenance of quiet and ordered relationships. Laine (1998) describes this ideal of order within society as best served if people adapt to the prevailing circumstances where one should accept fate without resentment. This philosophy is taken a step further by the idea that a harmonious society expresses the favor of God and is in line with the cosmic principles of order. The people within this society should be 'careful not to upset that order; they should not be ambitious or competitive but should accept their situation in life and simply make the best of it' (Mulder, 1978, 41). Religion plays an important role in Java and the common philosophy is that life is predestined and according to the will of God. At the same time there is a dependency on higher social forces and the idea that individually, one is not capable of achieving much. According to Mulder, moral, social and psychological dependence on the group and patience, acceptance, co-operation, obedience to those with a higher status and willingness to sacrifice for the common good are considered to be essential characteristics of a Javanese person (1978).

I will go on here to argue that the practice of *gotong royong*, and the values of *nrimo* and *pasrah* can be regarded as expressions of these broader values of harmony, unity and hierarchy.

2.2.1 Gotong royong

Rather than a value, *gotong royong* is an ideal and practical expression of *rukun*, or the values of harmony and unity. *Gotong royong* can be defined as 'mutual cooperation' or 'community self-help' (Echols and Shadily, 1990, 194). It is about...
'sharing each other's burdens and making voluntary contributions to those in need' (Mulder, 1978, 71). In everyday context though, *gotong royong* is commonly referred to as 'working together'. The underlying philosophy is that alone, one is not capable of doing anything. 'It is like a broom, when you have just one lidi (splintered palm leaf rib), you cannot sweep the floor, but if you have many together, you can'.³ In other words, to keep the feeling of harmony and unity in society, it is important to help each other and share the burdens of everyday life. This philosophy comes back in many aspects of society. In the language, when people are talking about certain occasions, in the practicality of religious festivities and ceremonies, during celebrations and rituals such as funerals, weddings and births, during harvest time and in times of need, it even comes back in Indonesia's national slogan since 1945; 'Unity through diversity' (*Bhinekka tunggal ika*) a motto which expresses the need for cooperation between different groups of people in one society.⁴ This seems rather pertinent considering the fact that Indonesia consists of more than 17,000 islands with distinct ethnic, religious and linguistic groups.

2.2.2 Nrimo

*Nrimo* (*nerimo, nrima* or *narima*)⁵ can be regarded as referring to ‘acceptance’ or ‘acquiescence to one's fate’ (Laine, 1998; Echols and Shadily, 1990, 387, Mulder, 1978, 20). This can be linked to the ideal of order within society where one should accept fate without resentment, as discussed by both Mulder and Laine. When one accepts fate and makes the best of it, one is *nrimo*. However, *nrimo* can also be translated with ‘passiveness’ (Echols and Shadily, 1990, 387). In this case, *nrimo* could lead to a passive acceptance of the situation without trying to make it better, which gives it a negative connotation. Every value and norm is of course subject to different interpretations, depending on the person and context.⁶

---

³ As mentioned during the focus group with the men
⁴ Although this national slogan shifted towards unity imposed form above during the time of Suharto's new order
⁵ Depending on the source
⁶ This idea is reinforced by the slightly different ways in which both *nrimo* and *pasrah* were explained by different people during the time of research.
Ideally though, the value of *nrimo* can be considered as a positive quality that is part of the moral codes of personal conduct, together with *sabar* (patience), *waspada-eling* (self-knowledge and self-control), *andap-isor* (humbleness) and *prasaja* (modesty) which, according to the Javanese *kebatinan* philosophy as described by Mulder (1978). Nrimo

2.2.3 Pasrah

For most people, *pasrah* is very closely related to *nrimo*. In fact, the two values are often understood to be the same or mutually reinforcing. However, when one looks closer it becomes clear that a distinction between the two can be made. Whereas *nrimo* can be understood as acceptance of the situation as it is in more general terms, *Pasrah* can be understood as not only acceptance but also as ‘to submit to one's fate’ (Echols and Shadily, 1990, 412) as given by God. Again however, '(...) it is different for each person what exactly *pasrah* is and if you feel *pasrah*. Everybody also values *pasrah* differently, for some it is to give up, for some it is to accept’.

2.3 Cultural tradition and every day reality

As has become clear, culture and values play an essential role within Javanese society. Within this research however, the focus lies specifically on *gotong royong*, *nrimo* and *pasrah* and their relation to psychosocial well-being. Why these three? While describing the Javanese peasant life Koentjaraningrat mentions the following:

’On the whole he (the peasant) is not terrified by the nature that surrounds him. When there are sometimes natural catastrophes such as volcanic eruptions or floods, he just accepts them as a fate that happens to be bad. When there are pests that may threaten his harvest, he is not afraid either; he knows the ways to overcome such catastrophes, and if he is not able to cope with these pests, he will still not die from hunger, because the system of mutual assistance in his community gives him a feeling of security that is sufficiently great. As long as he is able to harmonize himself with his surroundings, his

７As mentioned during the youth focus group.
life will be peaceful. This is the reason why he has to face his fellow villagers with the spirit of gotong royong, and he must be very conscious that he actually depends on his fellow villagers in his life; therefore he must always strive to safeguard good relationships with his fellow villagers’ (1969, 31-32)

Although this passage was written 40 years ago and may sound rather romantic, the essence of it is still very present in Kiringan. Nrimo, pasrah and gotong royong are part of every day reality and the passage above is a good illustration of what this means in practice, especially taking the event of the earthquake in to account.

As mentioned by Hildred Geertz however, 'the mere presence of any particular value in a cultural tradition does not in itself ensure its active pursuit nor its attainment' (1961, 147). Geertz mentions that equally desirable values may stand in the way, and situational or psychological factors may inhibit action in terms of the value. It is important to keep this in mind, even more when we consider the earthquake as a disruptive factor. It cannot be assumed that gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah have had an influence on psychosocial well-being after the earthquake. In case of an emergency and also in the period afterwards, the ideal might be very difficult to live up to. On the other hand though, when certain values and ideals are so strongly embedded in a society, it would not be strange if it is exactly this what gives people a way to deal with difficult circumstances.

Aside from the cultural aspects as mentioned above, it is also important to take into account that different contextual factors have played an important role in the response to the earthquake and mitigated the impact on the affected communities. The location of the earthquake was close to Yogyakarta, a major city with a strong infrastructure. There was good access and communications to most of the affected areas and essential resources including labor, materials, skills and organizations were present and facilitated a quick response (Macrea, 2008). The people in Kiringan received help from many sides within days after the earthquake. Family members, national and international NGOs and the
government all helped to take care of the injured, rebuild the village and re-establish the economy. Other factors that have most likely played a role are educational resources to which the village has access such as schools and teachers, and health resources (including traditional health) such as health posts and staff. Spiritual and religious resources such as practices of prayer and worship and religious leaders should also be taken into account (IASC, 2007).
Chapter 3. Methods

Kiringan is a Dukuh (sub-village) in the larger Desa (village) of Canden, Kecamatan (subdistrict) Jetis in Kabupaten (district) Bantul, Yogyakarta Province. The village consists of 230 families and 859 people. The main income generation within the village (85%) comes from the jamu (traditional medicine) industry. Other income generating activities include farming, catfish breeding and little grocery stores (toko's). The majority of the population in Kiringan is Muslim, there is one mosque in the village and no church. The people speak mostly Javanese, in fact, some of the elderly speak only Javanese and no Bahasa Indonesia.

Kiringan was chosen as a subject for the research because it is located so close to the epicenter of the earthquake and was hardest hit by the effect. The community lost 29 people and most houses were completely destroyed. At the same time though, the village has shown an amazing capacity to recover almost completely within three years after the earthquake.

3.1 Open interviews and focus groups

After a review of literature, it was essential to get a better understanding of the local perceptions of psychosocial well-being and if and to what extend gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah manifest in the daily life of the villagers and how they influence their actions. For this purpose, an exploratory research was done. Through open interviews with key informants using a set of unstructured questions with a mixed format, and 3 focus groups (Sarantakos, 2005) one with women, one with youth and one with men, an assessment was made of the situation after the earthquake and what was considered to be important for psychosocial well-being in the community. This information was then used as input for the survey (as will be described in section 3.2). Next to this, these interviews and focus groups aimed to get a better understanding of the meaning of gotong royong, pasrah and nrimo for the people in Kiringan. This exploratory

---

8 See Appendix A for an overview of the area
9 Information as collected from the demographic data kept by the village leader (Dukuh Kiringan)
research was also necessary to ensure cultural sensitivity and relevance of the survey.

The open interviews contained questions which were grouped under two headings; 'the community and the earthquake' and 'the values of gotong royong, pasrah and nrimo'. The questions addressed both practical issues and perceptions about the earthquake and about the three cultural concepts. Questions included 'What was according to you the impact of the earthquake on the community?', 'How did people in Kiringan show they were having a hard time?', 'Were many people complaining about physical problems?', 'Could you describe how according to you gotong royong influenced the behavior of people when they had to face the effect of the earthquake?' etc. The interview was not conducted completely with all respondents, mostly only part of the interview was conducted with one respondent either because certain questions appeared to be not so relevant or because of time constraints.

For the focus group discussions, two sheets were used, one with a drawing of 'Dusun Kiringan', the community, and one of an individual. During the discussion the participants were first asked what they considered as important for the well-being of the community and these concepts were written around the drawing. After this the participants were asked what they considered as important for the well-being of an individual on a mental and physical level. Again, the concepts were written around the drawing. The distinction between what is important for the community and what is important for the individual is often not clear (or even relevant for that matter) in a society where individual and group are not seen as mutually exclusive. Even so, the two were taken separately like this (taking the western bias of the researcher in to account) in order to get a more complete understanding of what constitutes well-being according to the people who are the object of this study. In addition, after the discussion about well-being, the focus groups were asked to explain the meaning of pasrah and nrimo\textsuperscript{10}, so as to get a further understanding of perceptions about these values in

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{10} Specifically the perception about nrimo and pasrah was asked because the meaning and importance attached to these concepts seems to be more varied than that of gotong royong.
\end{flushleft}
3.2 Surveys

One of the main tools used in this research is a survey interview (Sarantakos, 2005) conducted with 61 respondents in total. The aim of the survey was to first get an indication of perceptions of psychosocial well-being in Kiringan after the earthquake. Secondly, the aim was to get a better understanding of how important gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah are for perceptions of psychosocial well-being in Kiringan. As mentioned in section 2.1, the model as proposed by the PWG was used within this research to get a comprehensive understanding of psychosocial well-being. According to this model, psychosocial well-being is effected by three key issues, namely human capacity, social ecology and culture and values. However, these terms are very broad and it is important to have indicators for psychosocial well-being that make sense within the local context. Therefore, the concepts that came up in the focus groups and findings from the open interviews were used as indicators for human capacity and social ecology. From these indicators, the statements in the survey assessing perceived psychosocial well-being in the six months right after the earthquake\textsuperscript{11} were derived. In other words, theory form the literature and findings from the open interviews and focus groups were taken together to determine the indicators that gave rise to the statements in the survey on human capacity and social ecology. This approach is summarized in figure 1.

\textsuperscript{11} The focus of the research is on psychosocial well-being in an emergency situation and therefore it was decided to highlight the six months immediately after the earthquake, this was the emergency situation in Kiringan; the first three months people lived in tents, than they moved to temporary shelters and after six months they slowly started moving in to the newly build houses. The limitation of this approach however is the inadequacy of human memory.
**Figure 1: Development of survey**

The scores on the statements related to human capacity and social ecology were then used to get an indication of the psychosocial well-being of the respondents in the first 6 months after the earthquake.

Because the emphasis is on *gotong royong, nrimo* and *pasrah* as cultural concepts, the indicators that are used for the issue of culture and values are limited to these concepts, so as to single out their importance. The subsequent scores of the respondents on the statements related to these three cultural concepts give an indication of their presence and how they reflect in the attitude and behavior of the people in Kiringan. However, one of the findings of the exploratory research was that there are many different interpretations of *pasrah* and *nrimo*. As was mentioned in one of the focus groups: '(...) It is different for each person what exactly *pasrah* is and if you feel *pasrah*. Everybody also values *pasrah* differently (...).' Therefore, it was decided not to use a set definition of *nrimo* and *pasrah*, by making indicators or statements that imply what the meaning of the values is, but rather by using statements such as 'I felt *pasrah* after the earthquake' or 'After the earthquake, *nrimo* helped me to accept the situation'.

In sum, the survey addressed first the demographic characteristics including
age, gender, religion, education, occupation, household structure and marital status of the respondents. Psychosocial well-being was assessed by a set of statements addressing human capacity and social ecology and the subsequent influence of culture and values was addressed by a set of statements about gotong royong, pasrah and nrimo. For the data analyses, SPSS (version 16) was used. Figure 2 gives a schematic overview of the survey as explained above.

*Figure 2: Overview of survey*

*For the purpose of reliability of the survey the numbers of the statements are mixed up

To ensure the reliability of the survey, both favorable and unfavorable statements were used, 46 in total (see Table 1 for overview). To score the statements, the Likert scale (or numerical response set) with a range from 1 (completely agree)
to 5 (completely disagree) (Sarantakos, 2005; Reid, 2007) was used.

The survey was conducted mostly through randomized door to door sampling. For the youth however, a special meeting was arranged for filling in the survey. The survey was completed by a representative percentage of men, women, youth and elderly for the population in Kiringan.

*Table 1: Overview of numbers to corresponding statements in the survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Question Nr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human Capacity</td>
<td>29, 3, 44, 9,12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 16, 22, 20, 43, 30, 27, 38, 8, 35, 24, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social Ecology</td>
<td>2, 1, 23, 10, 39, 34, 13, 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45, 6, 14, 19, 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Culture and Values</td>
<td>36, 11, 32, 18, 7, 21, 41, 17, 15, 46, 37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40, 4, 26, 28, 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 This approach was chosen because it was more time effective, most of the youth have less obligations than the men and women which made it easier for them to come together.
Chapter 4. Findings

4.1 Local perceptions of psychosocial well-being

When discussing psychosocial well-being, it is essential to remember that the understanding of this concept is not uniform. What is considered as well-being, or as important for well-being depends on the social and cultural context (Camfield, Choudhury and Devine, 2007). A good illustration of this is the concept of happiness as discussed by Uchida et al. (2004), who compared the European-American context with the East Asian context. Their finding was that in the European-American context, happiness is more associated with the achievement of personal or individual goals, whereas in the East Asian context, happiness appears to depend more on the realization of positive social relationships “of which the self is a part” (Uchida et al., 2004, 226). The very notion of happiness however brings forward another point of discussion. In western literature, happiness is often equated with mental health (Jahoda, 1985; Ryff, 1989). Where the emotional state, or emotional satisfaction is often considered as the most important measurement of well-being (Taylor, 1985; Christopher, 1999). Within a collectivist society however, how someone feels about him or herself might not be so relevant for perceived life satisfaction. Rather, importance is given to one's view of proper behavior within the organized social order (Diener & Diener, 1995).

It is important to note the difference in conceptions about the 'personal' and the 'social' or 'relational', the distinction of which, especially in collectivist cultures (which is the context of this research), might not be so clear or relevant when discussing well-being. In most collectivist cultures, the 'personal', or 'the self' is seen as an aspect of the group, which is interdependent with the other members of this group and where the needs of the group have priority over personal needs. In this context, a high emphasis is placed on norms in determining behavior. Relationships are communal and include a lot of sharing, with little concern for the cost of the relationship for the individual. The emphasis is on the centrality of the group (Triandis, 2000). This is something which also became clear when discussing what is perceived as important for well-being according to the
respondents in Kiringan. The distinction between what was important for the individual and what was important for the community was often not clear. This is not so surprising however when we consider that the individual is given a central role mostly from a 'western' point of view.

Taking these considerations of social and cultural context into account, it was decided to make an inquiry of local perceptions on what is important for the well-being of both the community and the individual. As Summerfield (1999) mentions, it is easy to arrive with a preformed analysis when doing field research and from this only listen to the voices of survivors in a predefined framework. However, it is much more valuable to involve the community (or subjects of the research) in defining their own well-being, so as to develop a framework which is accurate and relevant within the context. Furthermore, Diener and Suh (2000) argue that people's ideas on their well-being give a reflection of their values. It is therefore safe to assume that ideas on well-being also give a better understanding of which values are considered to be important. This does not necessarily mean that values and general ideas of well-being are representative for the actual feelings of every member of the community, but they can provide a framework for operationalization.

4.2 Well-being in Kiringan

As mentioned in chapter 3, the perceptions of well-being in Kiringan were discussed during several focus groups with men, women and youth. The respondents were asked to mention the issues that they considered to be important for their own well-being, as well as what they considered to be important for the well-being of the community (Dusun Kiringan). In section 4.1 it has been discussed that the distinction between the individual and social or community level was often not very clear. Rather, the two were mixed and what was considered as important for the individual was directly related to what someone with a western bias (as the researcher in this case) might consider to be social or communal and in that sense separate from the individual. The next section will present a discussion of the issues that were mentioned as important
for well-being by the people in Kiringan. This discussion is divided in what is considered as important for the community and for the individual. Not because this is the most logical reasoning within the context, but rather to make sure that a comprehensive picture is created.

4.2.1 Well-being of the community
In section 2.2, the ideal of *rukun* has been described as one of the values that is central to the Javanese attitude to life. It is not surprising than that *rukun* is considered to be essential for the well-being of both the community and the individual. The people in Kiringan associate *rukun* not only with harmony, but also with respect for each other, which should be expressed both in formal and informal situations. It is exactly this respect for each other which creates harmony within the community. An example that is mentioned is the importance of *rukun* when talking about the relation between Christians and Muslims in the village. This demonstrates that *gotong royong* is seen as essential for *rukun*, as also suggested in previous literature (Mulder, 1978). Taking again the example of Muslims and Christians, this idea manifests in how the Muslims will help the Christians in the community when they have a religious celebration and vice versa. There is a general opinion that if you are *rukun* as a community, you will *gotong royong*. To explain this, one of the Pak RT's (neighborhood leader) stated: 'Crah agawe bubrah, rukun agawe santoso'. Which can be translated as: 'If you fight within the community, both you and the community will be destroyed. But if you rukun, you will feel safe'. To this it was added that if you are *rukun* as a community, you will become stronger, even if you have a different religion for example. Related to this is also the importance of giving *manfaat* (benefit) to others in order to ensure well-being.

Another aspect that can be linked to this is the importance that is attached to meetings (something which is evident in the amount of meetings that are held in the village) such as the *arisan* (weekly women's meeting or 'savings network') and *penjajan* (Islamic meetings for both men and women in the mosque), organizations (such as the different *kooperasie*’s that have been established in
Kiringan for the organization of economic activities including jamu production, catfish breeding and farming) and other community activities. The importance of participation in these activities was also emphasized. Similarly, having a strong bond among the members of the community and a feeling of 'togetherness' was mentioned as essential to the well-being of the community.

While talking about rukun the example of Muslims and Christians described above, was mentioned by the different discussion groups independently of each other. This is an indication of the central role religion plays within society. It comes as no surprise then that religion is another aspect that is considered to be very important for the well-being of the community. This also manifests in the meetings and activities that are being organized in the Mosque, the rituals that are being performed and that require the participation and presence of all the members of the community. Culture and religion are strongly intertwined with each other. Even more so, in one of the discussions, when talking about mental and physical health (which were also considered as important for the well-being of the community), two examples were given of how this can be maintained: For physical health there is the Pos Yandu (health post), which has regular control posts in Kiringan for elders and babies. For mental health however, the Pengajian (Islamic school) and TPA (Islamic school for children) were given as an example. This illustrates the central role religion plays within the community.

Work and education were also mentioned in relation to physical and mental health. Education is necessary so as to know about health issues, and it will enable one to work so as to fulfill basic needs. Especially in relation to the earthquake, when most people in Kiringan lost all their belongings, basic needs are mentioned as important for well-being. However, it was emphasized that you don't need much for the fulfillment of your basic needs: 'If you have food, clothes and a house, this is enough for your wellness' (this remark has to be seen in light of the period immediately after the earthquake, where most people did not have any belongings left as their houses were completely destroyed). This attitude was captured in the sentence: 'Nrimo ing pandung': 'You try hard and then accept
your condition’.\textsuperscript{14}

For sejahartara (wellness), material things such as a car, are not necessary. It is much more important that there is peace in the family in order for one to feel well. Physical and mental health as well as a healthy family and being able to pay school fees for the children are enough to feel sejahartara.

\textbf{4.2.2 Individual well-being}

While discussing what is important for the well-being of the community, many things were mentioned which might be considered as more important on a personal level from a 'western' point of view. What has been mentioned already in earlier sections will become clear in this section; it works two ways. What is referred to as important for the individual often includes things that may be considered as important for the well-being of the community, again, from a 'western' point of view. In Kiringan however, the two really go hand in hand and are hard to distinguish from each other. This reinforces the argument given in section 2.1 to take the well-being of the individual and the community together.

In Kiringan, having a healthy family is one of the most important things for individual well-being. The women also raised the point that having a big family and having their sons and daughters get married makes them happy. The youth on the other hand, referred to the importance of being a good child. Also, the value of rukun in the family was emphasized again. The meaning of peace and harmony in the family can of course be interpreted in different ways, but the most important thing appears to be that there are no verbal fights, which can be related to the importance attached to mutual respect in social relationships. One should also be able to share worries or problems within the family or with close friends. Connections with neighbors and people from outside the community are also valued highly. This is linked to feeling safe and secure within ones community, because connections are important in case something happens (like

\textsuperscript{14} This was explicitly mentioned in the focus group with the men, as part of their culture and religion, two very important things
another earthquake), but also to acquire new knowledge such as how to breed catfish. Feeling comfortable in the community and togetherness within the community is also essential for the well-being of the individual because it is important not to feel alone.

Physical and mental health are especially valued, taking the event of the earthquake into account.\textsuperscript{15} The ability to perform daily activities 'just like before the earthquake' and having work and a source of income are part of this. Religion is also directly related to mental health, along with being able to share your religious experience. Social relationships and helping one another, to give \textit{manfaat} to your family and neighbors is mentioned in this regard too, 'because if you help someone else, you will also get help when you need it'.

One could say that there is a symbiotic relationship between individual and community; both are equally dependent on each other.

\textbf{4.3 Psychosocial well-being after the earthquake}

Within quantitative social sciences it has been shown that exposure to disaster increases the risk of depression, anxiety, and physical complaints. It has also been found that there are several risk factors, such as gender, prior psychiatric history, severity of exposure to the disaster, perceived lack of control during the disaster, and inadequate social support after the disaster (Bromet and Havenaar, 2002; Batniji, van Ommeren and Benedetto, 2005). Prior life events, whether they are directly caused by the natural disaster or not, have a significant influence on psychological adjustment. The impact of pre- and post- natural disaster life events should therefore be carefully considered when trying to understand psychosocial well-being and psychological adjustment after a disaster (Freedy, Saladin, Kilpatrick, Resnick, and Saunders, 1994). One of the limitations of this research is the lack of data on the situation before the earthquake of 2006. This makes it impossible to take aforementioned issues in to account. It also

\textsuperscript{15} The women also emphasized the importance of having a house, which is not surprising considering the fact that the earthquake destroyed nearly all houses in the village.
means that it is not possible to say exactly what the influence of the earthquake has been on the psychosocial well-being of people in Kiringan, precisely because there is no data on the psychosocial well-being and situation of the respondents before the earthquake. Another limitation of this research is the reliability of human memory. Respondents were asked to go back and remember their situation as it was in the six months immediately after the earthquake. At the time of research however, it had been a little more than three years since the event of the earthquake. Even so, it is possible to give an indication of the self perceived psychosocial well-being in the first six months after the disaster.

To assess the psychosocial well-being of people in Kiringan after the earthquake as perceived by the respondents themselves, they were asked to rate statements on a scale from 1 to 5 (completely agree to completely disagree), which gave an indication of their human capacity and social ecology. The statements were derived from the issues that are considered important for well-being in Kiringan, as discussed in section 4.1. The scores on the statements were then translated into scores from 1 to 5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest score on psychosocial well-being.

The total number of respondents was 61, of which 31 female and 30 male, 22 of the respondents were youth (from 16 to 30 years), 32 adults (from 31 to 60 years) and 7 elderly (60+) as representative of the population in the village. Taken together, the respondents scored an average of 3.54 on psychosocial well-being.

4.3.1 Human Capacity
The average score on human capacity is 3.26 with a standard deviation of .43. This score is relatively high, considering that 54.1% of the respondents were physically injured by the earthquake. Besides physical injuries, many people indicated that they showed physical and mental signs of stress in the first six months after the earthquake, as shown in table 2.
Table 2: physical and mental signs of stress in the first 6 months after the earthquake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical signs of stress</th>
<th>% of the respondents</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Mental signs of stress</th>
<th>% of the respondents</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties sleeping</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Feeling afraid</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid heart beating</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Feeling worried</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Feeling sad</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomachaches</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Feeling unsafe</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=61

39.3% of the respondents had difficulties sleeping, 18.1% had rapid heart beating (or palpitation) at times, 54.1% suffered from headaches and 68.9% suffered from stomachaches. However, the respondents showed significantly less signs of mental stress factors such as sensations of fear, worries and sadness. 29.5% of the respondents said they felt afraid, 26.6% felt worried and only 21.3% indicated to have felt sad. This percentage is especially low when taking into account that 49.2% of the respondents lost family members or close friends because of the earthquake. The reason why most people did not worry so much might be that they received help from many sides. It may also be related to what Koentjaraningrat (1969) stresses, that the Indonesian peasant is not afraid of natural disasters; they are simply part of life. The youth explained that they did all feel sad after the earthquake, but that the feeling was not so heavy because they all felt sad together and this made it lighter and easier to accept. They also mentioned that the very fact that everyone shared the same feelings allowed them to recover as a community, because they did not feel alone.

However, a larger amount of people namely 57.4% felt unsafe. This can be largely explained by the fact that many of the respondents did not have any shelter in the emergency period right after the earthquake because their houses were destroyed. At the same time there was insecurity about the possibility of another earthquake. However, only 22.9% of the respondents indicated that they did not feel safe in the community, whereas 44.9% answered that they did feel
safe in the community, 22.9% remained neutral.

In spite of the high percentage of people that were injured and showed symptoms of physical stress, most people did feel that they were strong enough and that they had enough energy to participate in community activities and do their daily work or go to school. 63.9% of the respondents indicated that they felt physically strong enough to participate in community activities, whereas only 11.5% of the respondents indicated that they were not physically strong enough. The percentage of people that actually participated in community activities lays much higher, namely at 82%, as shown in table 3.

**Table 3: participation in community activities after the earthquake**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was physically strong enough to participate in community activities</td>
<td>63.90%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt enough energy to participate in community activities</td>
<td>50.70%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the earthquake I participated in community activities</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=61

Only 2 out of 61 respondents indicated that they did not participate in community activities after the earthquake. This could be due to several reasons. One could be that the respondents are more likely to agree with the statements in the survey then to disagree, or that they are inclined to give socially desirable answers. It could also be that there is social pressure to participate in community activities. As stated in section 2.2, in Java, people are often expected to sacrifice for the common good. This can be an important motivation for people to participate in certain activities. On the other hand, getting back to 'normal' everyday activities and working together as a community can have a positive influence on well-being. This assumption is especially likely considering the
importance that is attached to community activities and feeling togetherness in
the community as mentioned in the focus groups discussed in section 4.2. In light
of this, participation in community activities can be seen as an essential part of
coping with the emergency situation.

Almost all of the respondents, 93.5%, indicated that they felt motivated to rebuild
their lives after the earthquake. There was only one respondent who indicated not
to feel any motivation to rebuild his life and 4.9% of the respondents were
neutral. This might be related to the general culture of accepting life as it comes.
During the focus group with the men it was put like this: 'you accept anything
that happens and what God has given. First you pray, than you try to make it
better, than you nirimo and than you pasrah.' It was emphasized again and again
though that you have to accept the situation as it is given by God, but that you do
always have to work hard to try and make things better.

4.3.2 Social Ecology
The average score on social ecology is 3.89 with a standard deviation of .29,
which is significantly higher than the average score on human capacity. It can be
assumed that this is due to the fact that it is a communal society where strong
social ties and social relationships are valued highly.

A recurrent theme in section 4.1 is the importance of harmony, both within
the family and the community. In the survey, 86.8% of the respondents indicated
that they felt rukun within their family and 78.7% indicated that they felt rukun
within the community after the earthquake. However, there was also a part of the
respondents, 33.3%, according to whom there was conflict in the community
after the earthquake. This could be due to the fact that, as some respondents
mentioned in the in-depth interviews, immediately after the earthquake there was
not enough food for everyone, which was reason for conflict. When NGO and
government aid arrived in the village, some people felt that the aid was not
distributed equally among everyone, which was again cause for conflict. Indeed,
55.8% of the respondents indicated that they felt angry because the aid was not
distributed equally. The event of the earthquake also caused people to get angry more easily, 80.3% of the respondents indicated that they were angry because the earthquake had happened. At the same time however, it was mentioned that the emergency situation made people share more with each other, not only food and shelter, but also their experiences and worries about the future. This seems only natural taking into account the mutual experience of the disaster. In the survey this is reflected in the 68.9% of the respondents that expressed their feelings to family or friends, only 8.2% indicated that they did not and 23% remained neutral. Similarly, 86.9% of the respondents felt togetherness in the community, there was only one person (1.6%) who did not, and 11.5% indicated to be neutral.

It is interesting though that a high percentage of the respondents, namely 85.3%, said that they felt alone after the earthquake. Only 4.9% indicated that they did not feel alone and 9.8% remained neutral. An even slightly higher percentage of the respondents, 86.9%, indicated that they felt nobody could help them after the earthquake. The remaining 13.1% was neutral. This seems to be in contradiction to the 86.9% of the respondents who felt togetherness in the community. It is also in contradiction with the 90.2% of the respondents who indicated that everyone worked together to rebuild their houses and the 96.7% who received help from outside the community. Only two people indicated that they did not receive any help from outside the community and three people said that not everyone worked together to rebuild their houses. The most likely explanation for this contradiction is that there is a difference between the individual feeling of being alone and the realization that everyone in the community feels this way, which, as mentioned by the youth in relation to sadness, makes the feeling of being alone lighter, since it is a feeling shared by everyone and in that sense there is togetherness. It could however also be that the respondents are susceptible to giving desirable answers. In this case that means that they are more likely to agree with any of the statements in the survey than to disagree.
4.4 Gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah and the behavior and attitudes of people within the community

During my stay in Kiringan, the words *gotong royong*, *nrimo* and *pasrah* were often mentioned. Not only during the interviews, but especially *gotong royong* and *nrimo* also during everyday conversations between people, during meetings and in prayers. They are not only cultural concepts, but also words that are commonly used. Everyone knows these words, and attaches a meaning to them, albeit this meaning sometimes slightly differs. In this chapter, a closer look will be taken at how *gotong royong*, *nrimo* and *pasrah* actually manifest in reality.

4.4.1 'You do not build a house alone'

As has been explained in chapter 2, *gotong royong*, as a cultural concept, stands for mutual cooperation or, more commonly, for working together. Helping each other for free is another explanation of *gotong royong* which is often mentioned. It is questionable though if *gotong royong* really is for free. True, there is no money asked in exchange for the help that is given. However, *gotong royong* is not free in the sense of reciprocity. You help someone else so that when you are in need, you will receive help too. In his book 'The gift' Marcel Mauss (1923-1924) described giving as a societal activity which establishes a mutual dependency and relationship between the one who gives and the one who receives. Mauss emphasized the obligation of giving which is created through social pressure. The same goes for *gotong royong*; when you do not participate, you are considered to be individualistic which is not thought of highly in Javanese society. This is because the level of participation in *gotong royong* is an indication of how unified the community is and thus a reflection of harmony within the community.

In Kiringan after the earthquake, *gotong royong* mainly entailed helping each other to rebuild the houses. This is a good example of how the community works as one. Not unimportant here is that it is simply more efficient to work together. The general opinion is that 'you cannot build your house by yourself'. Especially in a disaster situation such as was left by the earthquake in 2006, the community simply has the best chances of survival by joining their powers.
Working together was also a way of coping with the destruction that was left. It is therefore not surprising that the mean score on the statements related to gotong royong in the survey was 4.21 with a standard deviation of .54. In fact, 88.6% of the respondents indicated that they helped their neighbors for free in the period after the earthquake. Only 4.9% indicated that they did not help their neighbors, and 6.6% of the respondents were neutral. A similar percentage indicated that they had received help from their neighbors. 86.9% said that they received help and only 3.3% (two people) indicated that they had not, 9.8% remained neutral. An even higher percentage indicated that everyone in the village participated in gotong royong after the earthquake, namely 90.2%. The same percentage said that Kiringan recovered so fast because of gotong royong. There was only one respondent who did not agree with this conclusion.

It shows then that gotong royong is not only something people speak of, or merely an ideal, it is also common practice. With only a few exceptions, all respondents participate in gotong royong and recognize the importance of the practice for the way they have dealt with the disaster caused by the earthquake.

Interestingly though, there is also a rather high percentage of respondents who believes that Kiringan could have recovered as well without gotong royong, namely 83.6%. Only 13.2% indicates that they believe Kiringan could not have recovered without gotong royong. This shows that although most people value the ideal of gotong royong highly and also live according to the principle, they do find that (in this case at least) there are other ways of overcoming difficulties, even though this may not be a very desired alternative.

4.4.2 'First you pray, then you try to make it better and then you nrimo'

The concept of nrimo is about acceptance. As was explained by the head of Kiringan: 'the word nrimo stems from 'menerima apa saja' (I accept anything). The underlying philosophy is that one should be grateful for what one has, no matter how much or how little it is. The importance of accepting whatever it is that one has, has a strong religious background. However, accepting the situation as it is does not mean that one should not work hard and do the best one can.
During the discussion with the men, it was put like this; 'first you pray, then you try to make it better and then you nrimo (...)'.

The mean score on the statements in the survey related to nrimo was 3.56 with a standard deviation of .56. In the survey 83.6% of the respondents indicated that nrimo helped them to accept the situation after the earthquake. Only 4.9% of the respondents indicated that they did not feel nrimo helped them, and 11.5% remained neutral. However, for more then half of the respondents, 57.4%, it was difficult to feel nrimo after the earthquake. Only 21.3% indicated that it was not difficult for them to feel nrimo and the other 21.3% said they were neutral. It is interesting to note here that it seems more difficult for Christians to feel nrimo then for Muslims. Namely, 75% of the Christian respondents indicated to find it difficult to feel nrimo, compared to 44.7% of the Muslim respondents.

It seems to be a little harder to accept the loss of a house, 73.8% of the respondents replied that they felt nrimo about losing their house due to the earthquake, another 14.7% replied that they did not and 11.5% remained neutral. It is not surprising that some of the respondents found it more difficult to accept the fact that their house was destroyed than to accept the general situation they were in when considering the importance that people attach to having a house for their general well-being, as discussed in section 4.2.1. However, even less people, 67.2% indicated that they felt nrimo about having lost their belongings. This is mainly due to the fact that 21.3% of the respondents remained neutral, especially among the youth, of which 36.4% indicated to be neutral. As it turns out, a rather high percentage of youth indicated to be neutral about some of the statements about nrimo and pasrah. It is also interesting that 57.2% of the elderly indicated that they did not feel nrimo about losing their belongings. This might be because it is more difficult for elderly to rebuild what they have established over the years.

Although 83.6% indicated that nrimo helped them to accept the situation after the earthquake, a lot of people felt that they would have been able to

---

16 To this it was added that 'after you nrimo, you pasrah'. This will however be further elaborated upon in section 4.4.3
handle the situation also without feeling *nrimo*. In fact, 49.2% indicated that they could have handled the situation without feeling *nrimo*. Only 26.3% indicated that they would not have been able to do so. The other 24.6% remained neutral. Here again, there were more Christians who indicated that they could have handled the situation without *nrimo*. 62.5% versus 47.2% of the Islamic respondents. A link can be made between the fact that there were more Christians who found it difficult to feel *nrimo* and the fact that more Christians indicated that they could have handled the situation without *nrimo*. It could be an indication that the value of *nrimo* is more strongly embedded in Islam than it is in Christianity.

During the focus groups the word *ikhlas* was mentioned several times while talking about *nrimo* and *pasrah*. *Ikhlas* is an Arabic word and it is translated as 'sincere devotion'\(^{17}\) or 'to be purified' or 'refined'\(^{18}\). However, as mentioned by the respondents in Kiringan and in discussions with students from the psychology department of Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, it can also be interpreted as 'a way of acceptance that goes very deep' or 'acceptance with one's whole heart and soul'. It was also mentioned by several people that *nrimo* and *pasrah* should not only be seen as part of their Javanese culture. More than that, it is inherent in their religious (Islamic) philosophy. This conclusion is reinforced again when we look at the percentages of respondents who indicated they would have felt much worse after the earthquake if they would not have felt *nrimo*. In total, 52.5% indicated that they would have felt much worse without *nrimo*. However, only 12.5% of the Christians belonged to this group, 87.5% indicated that they would not have felt worse, versus only 26.4% of the Islamic respondents.

Another interesting observation here is that for youth, the concept of *nrimo* seems to be less relevant. A large part remained neutral regarding most of the statements about *nrimo*. This could be due the fact that they are less informed about the meaning of the concept or because they are less eager to accept life as it is.

Another conclusion that can be drawn here is that although *nrimo* seems to

---

17 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Ikhlas#Arabic_Text.2C_Transliteration.2C_Translation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Ikhlas#Arabic_Text.2C_Transliteration.2C_Translation)
18 [http://wahiduddin.net/quran/ikhlas.htm](http://wahiduddin.net/quran/ikhlas.htm)
have played an important role for many of the respondents, they are not necessarily dependent on it. The results of the survey show that *nrimo* does certainly offer a hold on in difficult times. However, to most people it does not come naturally and although it might help to feel *nrimo*, it does not necessarily mean that all is lost when one does not feel nrimo.

**4.4.3 'God knows best'**

'First you pray, then you try to make it better, then you *nrimo* and then you *pasrah*. Or, in other words, 'first you pray, than you try to make it better, than you accept the situation and then you give it to God'. In section 4.4.2 this sentence has been explained already so as to emphasize the importance of working hard. You may accept the situation as it is, however, this does not mean that you do not have to take any action and try to make things better. However, the same sentence is also often used to explain the relation between *nrimo* and *pasrah*, because you accept the situation as it is since it is God's will. If you accept that God is powerful, that he wrote your destiny and that he knows what is best for you, then you *pasrah* (to God). Several respondents observed that after the earthquake, religion became more important. As mentioned before, next to the natural causes that were mentioned as responsible for the earthquake, it is generally believed that the earthquake was a warning from God. The event was so overwhelming, that most people were scared by God's power. This made them *pasrah* more than usually because it offered them an explanation for the disaster; God wanted them to be a better person. However, the overall mean score on statements related to *pasrah* was lower then the scores on *nrimo* and *gotong royong*, namely 3.34 with a standard deviation of .65, compared with 3.56 on *nrimo* and 4.21 on *gotong royong*.

Still, 80.3% of the respondents agreed with the statement 'the earthquake was fate, so I felt *pasrah*. Only 8.2% of the respondents did not agree with the statement and 11.5% remained neutral. However, it is rather likely here that some people answered with a perception of how they 'should feel', rather then how they actually felt. This conclusion is reinforced when the respondents were
asked if they actually felt *pasrah* after the earthquake. As can be seen in table 4, more than half of the respondents did indeed feel *pasrah*, namely 54.1%, however, another 24.6% did not and 21.3% was neutral. There was no significant difference between Christians and Muslims here.

**Table 4: *pasrah* after the earthquake**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The earthquake was fate, so I felt <em>pasrah</em></td>
<td>80.30%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the earthquake I felt <em>pasrah</em></td>
<td>54.10%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was difficult for me to feel <em>pasrah</em> after the earthquake</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=61

Table 4 also shows that for 59% of the respondents it was difficult to feel *pasrah*. Only 27.9% did not find it difficult to feel *pasrah*. It shows then, that even though one may find it appropriate to feel *pasrah*, it may not be easy to feel, nor is it necessarily the way one feels in reality. A striking example here is a conversation I had with one of the girls in Kiringan. Her little brother was covered under the ruins and nearly got killed. She mentioned that she had to feel *pasrah* about this. However, when I asked her if she did in fact feel *pasrah*, she started crying immediately and said that it had been very difficult for her.

Even though 59% of the respondents indicated that it was difficult for them to feel *pasrah*, only 27.8% also felt that they could have handled the situation without feeling *pasrah*. 52.5% of the respondents indicated to the contrary, namely that they would not have been able to handle the situation without feeling *pasrah* and 19.7% remained neutral. However, this does not necessarily mean that they would have felt much worse without *pasrah*. 41% did indicate that they would have felt worse versus 34.4% who indicated that they would not have felt worse, 24.6% remained neutral.

An interesting observation here is that although the mean score on *pasrah*
is lower than the mean score on *nrimo* and *gotong royong*, the percentage of respondents that indicate they could not have handled the situation without feeling *pasrah* is much higher then for similar statements about *nrimo* and *gotong royong*, as can be seen in table 5.

**Table 5: comparison between pasrah, nrimo and gotong royong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Freq.*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could have handled the situation without feeling <em>pasrah</em></td>
<td>27.80%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could have handled the situation without feeling <em>nrimo</em></td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We could have recovered without <em>gotong royong</em></td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=61*

It seems that many of the people in Kiringan felt that *pasrah* was important for them to handle the disaster situation. The reason could be that for most people *pasrah* is about their faith in God. All the respondents were either Muslim or Christian, so it can be assumed that they all believe in God. Similarly, it can be assumed that most people who believe in God trust that whatever happens is God's will. For many people, in many different cultures, this is an immense source of strength in difficult times. In the aftermath of the Tsunami in December 2004, the American Refugees Committee observed 'a high level of acceptance of the event' among the survivors. They explained this by arguing that it was more easy for people to accept that the losses they had suffered were beyond their control because of their strong religious affiliations and beliefs (ARC, 2005). The ARC even identified this as the reason why there was such a 'low incidence of trauma related symptoms' (ARC, 2005, 5). This reinforces the idea that *pasrah*, or faith in God and the knowledge that God's will is beyond one's control, make it easier to accept and handle a difficult situation.

It can be concluded then, that like *nrimo*, *pasrah* does play an important
role. However, it does not necessarily make one feel better, nor is it always easy 'to pasrah', or; 'to trust that God knows what is best'.

It is useful to summarize the mean scores of gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah here once more.

Table 6: summary of mean scores on culture and values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gotong royong</th>
<th>Nrimo</th>
<th>Pasrah</th>
<th>Culture &amp; values*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. deviation</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Culture & values reflects the statements on gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah taken together.

Looking at table 6, it becomes clear that there is a significantly higher score on the statements related to gotong royong than on the statements related to the two other cultural concepts. This leads to the conclusion that gotong royong as an ideal, but also as a practice played an important role in the way people in Kiringan responded to the disaster. This is not strange considering the fact that Javanese society is a collectivist society, in which mutual interdependence and working together are strongly embedded. At the same time, working together is simply the most practical thing to do when the whole community is affected by a disaster and all the houses have to be rebuild.

The values of nrimo and pasrah are also significant; however, they seem to be less present. This could be due to the fact that it is not always easy to accept God's will, especially when it concerns a major disaster. Moreover, these values are not practical; rather, they are philosophical, or experiential. Gotong Royong is a 'collective concept', it only makes sense in a relational context. Nrimo and pasrah however, are about an inner process of acceptance, rather than an outer, collective action of working together.
4.5 Relation between the cultural concepts and perceived psychosocial well-being after the earthquake

So far, this chapter has described what perceived psychosocial well-being in Kiringan is. An indication was given of the actual psychosocial well-being after the earthquake and the presence of the cultural concepts *gotong royong, nrimo* and *pasrah* has been reflected upon. Here, the actual relation between these cultural concepts and perceived psychosocial well-being will be explored.

Different from what was expected at the beginning of the research, there does not seem to be a very strong correlation between the mean scores on psychosocial well-being and the mean scores on culture and values. In fact, as can be seen in table 7, the relation is rather insignificant.

*Table 7: correlation between psychosocial well-being and culture & values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial well-being (mean)</th>
<th>Culture &amp; Values (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.. (2 – tailed)</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results as shown in table 7 indicate that there is no significant correlation between culture and psychosocial well-being in Kiringan after the event of the earthquake. However, when we specify the variables further by dividing psychosocial well-being into human capacity and social ecology again, and culture and values into *gotong royong, nrimo* and *pasrah*, we can find a correlation between some of the variables, as is shown in table 8.
Table 8: correlation between the three cultural concepts, human capacity and social ecology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable means</th>
<th>Pasrah</th>
<th>Gotong royong</th>
<th>Nrimo</th>
<th>Human capacity</th>
<th>Social Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasrah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gotong royong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nrimo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social ecology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As was to be expected, there is a correlation of .545 between *nrimo* and *pasrah*, with a significance at the level of 0.01. In section 4.4 it already became clear that the respondents strongly associate the values of *nrimo* and *pasrah* with each other, in fact the one (*pasrah*) follows, or leads to, the other (*nrimo*). The meaning of both values is rather similar too; both relate to acceptance, although on slightly different levels.

There is also a correlation between *nrimo* and *gotong royong*. This is interesting because during the focus groups and open interviews, most of the respondents mentioned that there was no relation between the values of *nrimo* and *pasrah* and the practice and ideal of *gotong royong*. However, one of the Pak Rt's in Kiringan mentioned that if people are *eklas* and if they *nrimo* and *pasrah*, they will do *gotong royong*. This could be an explanation for the correlation of .
318 between *nrimo* and *gotong royong*, although the significance at the level of 0.05 is less strong than the significance between *pasrah* and *nrimo*. There is no significant correlation between *pasrah* and *gotong royong*.

More interesting in the context of this section however, is the fact that there is a correlation of .367 with a significance at the level of 0.01 between social ecology and *gotong royong*. Although there is no significant correlation between the means of the complete set of statements about psychosocial well-being and the complete set of statements about culture and values, there is a correlation between the different parts of the larger whole.

Both social ecology and *gotong royong* are about social relationships. In fact, relationships with other people are inherent to both concepts. From this perspective it is not strange that someone who scores high on social ecology also has a high score on *gotong royong* and vice versa. Moreover, as has been mentioned before, Javanese society is a collective society. This comes back in the relatively high mean scores on *gotong royong* and social ecology compared to the mean scores on *nrimo, pasrah* and human capacity, as can be seen in table 9.

*Table 9: mean scores of variable sub-groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable sub-group</th>
<th>Gotong royong</th>
<th>Nrimo</th>
<th>Pasrah</th>
<th>Human capacity</th>
<th>Social ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. deviation</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature on emergency relief and how to reduce public stress encourages active participation in the community. Re-establishing cultural and religious events are mentioned in this regard too, as well as purposeful activities that lead to tangible results and are of interest to the whole community (van Ommeren, Saxena and
Saraceno, 2005). Rebuilding the houses together such as happened in Kiringan is an excellent example of this. If we then look at the scores on gotong royong and social ecology as presented in table 9, it shows how important social ecology (or social relationships) and collective action (or working together) can be in a (post)disaster situation.
Chapter 5. Conclusion

The question that was posed at the beginning of this thesis is: 'Are the cultural concepts of gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah of importance for local perceptions of psychosocial well-being after the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta province?' It has become clear that they are indeed. However, the answer to the question is not a straightforward 'yes'.

There are several issues that have become very clear during the course of this thesis. Not only about psychosocial well-being, but also about local perceptions, about culture and religion. One of the first conclusions is that there need not necessarily be a distinction between individual well-being and the well-being of the community. The meaning of well-being cannot be taken for granted and differs between cultures and people. In the West, the emphasis is often on individual well-being and happiness (Uchida et al., 2004; Jahoda, 1985; Ryff, 1989), whereas in Asia, the well-being of the community usually has priority over the individual (Uchida et al., 2004). Culture plays an essential role here. In Javanese culture, there are several things that are regarded as essential for well-being. Many were mentioned by the respondents in Kiringan, but the most important ones, apart from fulfillment of basic needs and schooling, are harmony and gotong royong, togetherness and religion.

This brings us to the second conclusion; the ideal of gotong royong seems to be more present than the values of nrimo and pasrah. This is most likely because gotong royong is an activity, it is something you do together, and it is reflected in almost every aspect of society. Nrimo and pasrah on the other hand are values that reflect a more internal process. Acceptance is a feeling, not necessarily an action and can therefore be more difficult, especially when dealing with a disaster situation. At the same time though, all three of the concepts, gotong royong, nrimo and pasrah are familiar to both young and old, both Christian and Muslim and both in the city as well as in rural area's. Moreover, they are not only concepts, they are integrated in people's everyday life and strongly
embedded in Javanese society and religion. This also reflects in the actual attitudes and behavior of the respondents as assessed in the survey.

Even so, the third conclusion that can be made is that at first sight, there does not appear to be a direct correlation between the three cultural concepts and the psychosocial well-being of the respondents after the earthquake in 2006. However, when taking a closer look at each of the different concepts and when psychosocial well-being is divided in human capacity and social ecology, an interesting correlation appears between social ecology and gotong royong. The correlation emphasizes the fact that Java has a collective society. It also shows that working together can be an important way of dealing with a disaster and that togetherness is essential for the well-being of the community. The idea of gotong royong is not exclusive to Java or Indonesia. In the Philippines, there is a similar concept, bayanihan, which also means working together, or helping each other in times of need. When a disaster happens, a typhoon for example, people help each other to rebuild their houses, they clean their fields and plant new crops together (van der Ploeg, Persoon and Masipiquena, 2007). Social relations and mutual dependency and cooperation are both the essence and standard of measurement for the well-being of the community. And thus, for the well-being of the individual. As Koentjaraningrat (1969) describes, villagers depend on each other in their life and the system of mutual assistance gives a feeling of security. This is only reinforced during emergency situations and in their aftermath.

Finally, the fourth conclusion that can be made is that the cultural and social context do not only determine in large part the definition of well-being (Camfield, Choudhury and Devine, 2007), they also play a role in the way communities respond to crisis. This calls for a closer look at local ways of handling adverse situations and dealing with natural disasters. The importance of local perceptions and interpretations as well as 'ways of working' should not only be emphasized here once more, they should receive more attention and value in the international arena of emergency response. In any emergency, there are (local) ways in which people respond to and cope with the situation. Especially in disaster prone areas, people have developed their own coping strategies. Both on a practical level, such
as surviving by working together, and on a more spiritual level, through accepting fate as it comes and trying to make the best out of it. Predefined concepts and ideas of outsiders, which might not be relevant to the context, do not do justice to these cultural ways of working and understanding. It is exactly these cultural ways of working and understanding however that should be the essence of any outside emergency response and they should receive more attention within the international aid community.

As Beard and Dasgupta (2006) argue, a community's capacity for collective action is largely determined by a wide range of contextual factors, both internal and external to the community. At the same time however, everything a community can achieve is fundamentally tied to the community's capacity for collective action. This rings just as true for the community on a relatively small local level in a village like Kiringan, as for the much larger level of the international aid community. Moreover -and more importantly in the context of this thesis- , collective action and cooperation can recover and strengthen a community on a psychosocial level.

In conclusion then, a few words by Krishnamurti;

'(…) are you quite sure that cooperation cannot exist when each of us is concerned with himself? But you are concerned with yourself, therefore you have no spirit of cooperation, you only cooperate when it pleases you. So what does it mean to cooperate? We are not playing parlor games. What does it mean to cooperate when there is no 'me'?' (1997, 160)

In Kiringan, the 'personal', or 'the self' is seen as an aspect of the larger whole, the community. The 'me' is interdependent with the other members of the group and the needs of the group have priority over personal needs. In other words, the emphasis is on the centrality of the group (Triandis, 2000). Because 'you cannot sweep the floor with just one lidi'. 
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Appendix A

## Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues that are of influence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Human Capacity:</strong> physical and mental health (factors inside the person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental - mentally strong enough to go to work/school - mentally strong enough to participate in community activities - emotional distress such as anger, fear, anxiety, worries - motivation to work - loss of family members and close friends - witnessing loved ones get hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Social Ecology:</strong> social connections and support (factors outside the person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- healthy family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- connection with people outside the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(make the situation better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa, kami membangun bersama tempat tinggal kami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. After the earthquake I expressed my feelings to family and/or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa saya mengekspresikan perasaan saya pada keluarga dan atau teman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My family was injured by the earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keluarga saya terluka saat gempa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. After the earthquake I received help from people outside the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa, saya menerima bantuan dari orang diluar lingkungan saya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. After the earthquake nobody could help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa tidak ada orang yang dapat membantu saya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Culture and Values:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>influences how people experience, understand and respond to events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. After the earthquake I helped my neighbors for free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa, saya membantu tetangga tanpa mengharapkan imbalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. After the earthquake I received help from my neighbors for free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetangga membantu saya dengan tulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Kiringan recovered so fast because of gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiringan mampu bangkit dengan cepat karena gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. After the earthquake everyone participated in gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setiap orang mengikuti ikut serta dalam gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. We could have recovered without gotong royong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kita dapat bangkit tanpa adanya gotong royong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nrimo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. After the earthquake, nrimo helped me to accept the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nrimo membantu saya menerima kondisi yang ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I felt nrimo that I lost my house after the earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya nrimo bahwa saya kehilangan rumah karena gempa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I felt nrimo that I lost my belongings after the earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya nrimo kehilangan harta benda akibat gempa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I could have handled the situation even without feeling nrimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mampu mengatasi situasi yang terjadi tanpa perasaan nrimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Without nrimo I would have felt much worse after the earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanpa nrimo, saya merasa semakin buruk setelah gempa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasrah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The earthquake was fate, so I felt pasrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya pasrah karena gempa adalah takdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. After the earthquake I felt pasrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setelah gempa saya merasa pasrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It was difficult for me to feel pasrah after the earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sulit untuk pasrah setelah terjadi gempa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I could have handled the situation without feeling pasrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
