

ABSTRACT

This study has general objective as to develop household disaster management guideline for disaster prone II of Mt.Slamet, Indonesia. Since 2014 to 2015, Mt.Slamet has fluctuation seismic activities and made government were state standby status. It was impacted to the household who lived surround Mt.Slamet who most of them were worked in agriculture and tourism sector. Standby status in Mt.Slamet brought household to unpredictable livelihoods. Indonesia divide disaster prone as 3 area based on their risk zone. The disaster prone 3 is the highest risk and prohibited of human settled in this area. Disaster prone 2 is after 4 km from the peak of Mt.Slamet and it has highest quality of soil for agriculture sector. This research was use sequential mixed method which started using qualitative research methods to study the practical of disaster management for household who live in the border of disaster prone II of Mt.Slamet in the past and present time. The first phase was found the context of living and context of area for Sawangan and Guci village which located in the border of disaster prone II. Those area were mostly impacted from previous big eruption in 2014 to 2015. The second phase was carried out using Quantitative research method after having the result from first phase. The second phase were to describe the level of disaster management for household and to describe the factors support from household disaster management in the border of disaster prone II of Mt.Slamet. Researcher was took 538 household spread in five village who located in the border of disaster prone II of Mt.Slamet. Five villages were Sawangan, Guci, Dukuh Tengah, Ketenger and Gunungsari villages. Researcher collect the data using SIS (Structured Interview Schedule) with the help of questionnaire which divide into 8 theme, namely household characteristics, human capital, social capital, natural capital, physical capital, financial capital, transformation on process and structure and disaster management theme. Researcher analyze the data using univariate, bivariate and multivariate analysis. Univariate analysis was shown the frequency to support the qualitative data concerning the context of living. Household who lived in the disaster prone II was characterized mostly as farming (65%) and implemented disaster management in medium level (57.2%). Suprisingly, household who lived in disaster prone II has implemented low level of mitigation phase (55.4%), medium and high level of preparedness phase (72.5%), medium and high level of response phase (78.2%) and low level of recovery phase (80.7%). Response phase were the strongest phase

applied by household since most of them were supported by third parties, namely local governments and private institutions.