Appendix 1.

History of the Study.

As was the case for many in the world, DRC heard of the first earthquake via mass media reports on September 19, 1985. Although none of the Center's projects at that time allowed for cross-societal research, the media stories were monitored as a matter of standard data gathering for an obviously major disaster. Although on site data collection was not possible, DRC began to compile a file of mass media reports on the earthquake.

The involvement of the Center in the earthquake became more direct in two days when Alejandro Garnica Andrade, a research coordinator with the Instituto de Investigacion de la Comunicacion, arrived at DRC. The Instituto is a survey research center associated with TELEVIISA, the major private sector television and radio organization in Mexico. The research coordinator had come to DRC to gather information on organizational and individual responses to earthquakes. He remained at DRC for three days and spent many hours talking with the directors and utilizing the Center's library resources. His interest partly stemmed from the fact that the Instituto was considering undertaking a survey on the reactions of the population in Mexico City to the earthquake.

Upon his return to Mexico City, the Instituto undertook a survey of a random sample of the population in the capital city. Using in part some of the ideas obtained in the visit to DRC, data were gathered on a wide variety of earthquake related questions and issues. In particular an effort was made to find out the actual disaster helping behavior of the respondents, how they utilized mass media sources and information, and what citizens thought of the activities of various responding organizations. The sample was stratified with respect to sex and socioeconomic behavior. Since all the field work was completed about three weeks after the earthquake, the study represents one of the very earliest, systematic, and large scale population survey ever done after a major disaster.

Shortly after this first visit from Mexico, DRC was again host to another Mexican visitor. Dr. Julio Cesar Margain of the Secretaria de Gobernacion arrived at the Center and spent four days consulting with one of the directors and using the library facilities. Since the Secretaria de Gobernacion had been given important functions in the post earthquake period, he had been sent to discuss disaster issues with the staff.

Upon his return to Mexico, a Subsecretario de Gobernacion, Fernando Perez Correo, invited one of the DRC directors to come to Mexico City and to consult with the government on post earthquake issues. Russell Dynes went to Mexico and advised the Secretaria on a variety of disaster related matters, including legislation which
established the national system of Civil Protection. In addition, Dynes made contact with numerous high ranking Mexican officials involved in the post earthquake recovery effort.

Early in January, 1986, the possibility of DRC doing actual on site research on the Mexican City earthquake was created when the National Science Foundation (NSF) announced that funding was being made available for study on this specific disaster. The DRC perceived that an important opportunity existed for undertaking something that was very rare in social science disaster research, namely, a cross-societal study involving collaborators from two societies.

A proposal was developed that had two foci. First, it was proposed that DRC examine the response of various disaster relevant organizations during the immediate post impact period. Research of this nature had been a central focus of DRC studies for over twenty years. Second, the existence of the survey data from the Instituto not only provided a rich vein of information for sociological analysis, but also allowed for the opportunity to replicate and extend the survey one year later, thus adding a longitudinal component to the research effort.

The proposed effort clearly necessitated not only joint or common work with Mexican researchers but also the cooperation of the Mexican government. Therefore in January of 1986, Russell Dynes and Dennis Wenger, two DRC directors, went to Mexico City to discuss the proposed research with various Mexican officials and scholars. A meeting was first held with Juan Carlos Padilla, the newly appointed General Coordinator of the Civil Protection System, the new national level disaster planning organization. He was very helpful and supportive of the proposed research. He suggested a meeting with Professor Jose Luis Reyna, the Director of the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) to discuss possible collaboration on the organizational portion of the proposed work. At the meeting in which members of his faculty took part, it was agreed that FLACSO and DRC would undertake a joint research effort focusing upon the response by the Mayor's office and other important organizations in Mexico City in the first two weeks following the earthquake. Furthermore, it was agreed that the research would be truly collaborative, including the joint production of the study design and the field research instruments. It was additionally agreed that the interviews would be conducted in Spanish by representatives of FLACSO, and that DRC would provide some training for the interviewers regarding problems and procedures in doing organizational disaster research. All of the obtained data would be jointly owned and available for analysis by both FLACSO and DRC.

With regard to the public survey portion of the proposed research, the DRC directors met with Dr. Jose Ruben Jara, the Director of the Instituto de Investigacion de la Comunicacion, and Alejandro
Garnica Andrade. Once again, an agreement to collaborate was reached. It was agreed that DRC could have access to the survey data results that had been gathered in the first population survey by the Instituto. In addition, there was an agreement that the Instituto would undertake a second survey, approximately a year after the first one. This second study would reask some of the same questions used in the first survey in order that longitudinal comparisons could be made. Additional questions were however to be added in the second survey, with the survey instruments being jointly designed by DRC and the Instituto. However, the actual data collection would be completed by the staff of the Institute. In this instance too, there was an understanding that the obtained data were to be jointly owned and available for analysis by both DRC and the Instituto.

Upon the return of the directors to the United States, DRC produced a research proposal, discussed it with the Mexican collaborators, and submitted the protocol to NSF. While the proposal was being reviewed by NSF, Juan Carlos Padilla visited the DRC. Having been appointed the general coordinator for the newly created National System of Civil Protection, he came to the Center to consult with the directors regarding general issues of disaster planning and preparedness and specific concerns centering around the alternative structuring of the new organizations. His three day visit was mutually beneficial. He returned to Mexico with substantial material from the DRC library and Center staff members had learned much about certain aspects of Mexican society and disasters in that country.

With the awarding by NSF of the research grant to DRC, actual work on the project began in the summer of 1986. Certain planned collaborative activities were initiated. First, Professor Jose Luis Reyna of FLACSO visited DRC for one week. During this time he presented the Center with valuable information about the structure of the Mexican government and the emergency response pattern. In addition, a draft of the interview guide that would be used with organizational respondents and informants was constructed. Further revisions of the guide were subsequently discussed with FLACSO with Professor Reyna.

Second, Dr. Jose Ruben Jara and Alejandro Garnica Andrade also came to DRC for a week of collaborative work on the survey design. They discussed the first survey undertaken by the Instituto and presented their ideas for both the design and questions that might be used in the follow up study. At the conclusion of the week, the research design and survey instruments were finalized.

Data collection on both portions of the study began in October. Four staff members of DRC went to Mexico City and helped train the Mexican interviewers on DRC field techniques and research operations. This training period lasted for a total of ten days.
Some of the initial interviews were conducted jointly by both DRC staff members and FLACSO personnel.

It is important to note the assistance of Juan Carlos Padilla in the effort. For example, he called a meeting of various Mexican officials whose organizations had been involved in the earthquake response. The representatives of DRC and FLACSO were also present. After a discussion of the proposed organizational research, he requested that the officials present cooperate with the research effort. After that meeting, the interviews with organizational officials began.

Meanwhile, around the first year anniversary of the earthquake, the second survey was carried out as scheduled. The data were compiled, coded, put on computer tapes, and sent to DRC by the end of 1986. Data analysis on this part of the study began in the following months.

For reasons to be discussed in the following appendix, the gathering of the organizational data and its analysis took longer and proved to be more difficult than originally envisioned. A series of additional trips were taken to Mexico City by DRC directors and staff in connection with the organizational portion of the study. A total of four trips were undertaken over the year to collect the interviews that had been finished, to debrief the Mexican interviewers, and to discuss the progress and problems of the project.
Appendix II.
Data Obtained and Used.

With the assistance of our Mexican colleagues, DRC obtained three major sets of primary data. The Instituto de Investigacion de la Comunicacion carried out two population surveys. The first was done with minor DRC input. We did discuss and suggest some of the questions for the second survey. The Instituto after coding the answers to the mostly open ended questions in the surveys, provided DRC with computer ready disks of the completed data sets. Although some analysis of the frequency distribution was done in Mexico, the statistical analyses reported in this volume were done by DRC staff members.

The two population surveys undertaken by the Instituto differed in some respects (see Appendix III for the English language translated copies of both survey instruments). The first survey was conducted during the first week of October 1985 when 567 respondents from the general Mexico City area were contacted. All those interviewed were 16 years of age or older, the sample was stratified with respect to gender, age, and socioeconomic status. (The more technical aspects of how the sample was actually drawn, how weights were assigned, and such technical matters will not be discussed in this volume but will be presented in some of the specialized articles which will be written from other analyses of the data). The sample is statistically representative with a margin of error of three percent. Topics covered in the survey included: how well the government handled a dozen major earthquake related tasks such as search and rescue, the feeding of victims, the sheltering of the homeless, and the providing of information, etc.; usage of the mass media and attitudes about the reporting of the disaster; perceptions and evaluations of the actions of the Mayor’s Office, the military, the police, the President of Mexico, and volunteers following the earthquake; disruptions of services and damages to homes as a result of the disaster; what earthquake occasioned problems should have priority for action; and what kind of volunteer work the respondent did in the trans- and post-impact period of the disaster.

Each of the 567 respondents were also treated as informants for certain purposes. They were asked to provide information on earthquake-related activities of every member of their household. Therefore, information was available on the extent and nature of volunteer activity for a total of 2,965 individuals. The usual demographic survey background items were obtained for all respondents.

While the 1986 survey repeated some of the questions asked in 1985, it differed in the following respects. A total of 749 persons, sampled in the same way as indicated for the earlier survey, were interviewed. Topics covered included the following: the longer run
problems brought about by the earthquake; whether the respondent provided and/or obtained housing and sheltering as a result of the disaster, as well as the nature and duration of that kind of assistance; perceptions and attitudes regarding how the government generally and specific agencies (e.g., the police, the telephone company, the Red Cross, the Health Secretariat, the Social Security Institute, the fire department, etc.) had handled earthquake related problems; what had been individually learned from the experience and the knowledge that existed of disaster planning; comparisons of the handling of immediate post impact earthquake problems and later ones; evaluations of earthquake related tasks such as the handling of foreign disaster assistance, the reconstruction of hospitals and schools, the restoration of the water service, the demolishing of damaged buildings and the clearing of debris, the providing of shelters and housing for the victims, etc.; the nature and duration of any volunteering action undertaken; and some of the consequences of the earthquake on pre-existing social problems in the capital, as well as the usual demographic background items.

The two surveys did not present any unusual research problems, especially since the Mexican organization doing the field work was highly experienced in conducting market studies in the metropolitan area of Mexico City. The sampling procedures differed somewhat from what is most familiar to researchers in the United States (for example, a weighing in the samples towards the higher socioeconomic levels of Mexican society), but were logical and quite reasonable for the situations. The coding of certain answers to open ended questions and some of the categories used reflected the Mexican sociocultural scene and were valid within that framework, even though researchers in the United States might at times have proceeded in slightly different ways. On balance, these were minor matters, and we feel rather confident about the quality of the survey data: it is as good as survey data can be for the kind of study that was undertaken.

In addition to the survey data, there were the data obtained by FLACSO. They obtained over three dozen in-depth interviews of organizational officials who played major roles in the disaster response. DRC drafted the initial interview guide, provided field training in Mexico for the Mexican students who actually conducted the interviews, and recommended who should be interviewed in which organization. The Spanish language recorded tapes were translated in the United States under DRC supervision and their analyses were solely done at the Center.

Obtaining the organizational data proved difficult and presented a number of complex problems of sampling and entry that were not easy to resolve. Three difficulties in particular might be noted. For one, there is the very complex and complicated structure that exists in Mexico City. It is the capital city and as such there is a federal or national presence starting at the top with the
President of Mexico. But just as the President of the United States has little to do directly with the governing of Washington, D.C., the President of Mexico while having a more important role in Mexico City, is not involved with the day-to-day operations of the capital city. That is the responsibility of the Mayor’s Office.

The Federal District of Mexico City (DDF) and Washington, D.C. are similar in that they are both federal districts. However, the complexity of the former is far more significant than the latter. The Mayor or Regent of Mexico City is appointed by the President of the country. The "Mayor’s Office", furthermore, is far more complex than its counterpart term denotes in the United States. For most purposes, the "Mayor’s Office" is synonymous with the entire local governmental structure. Under its domain are such varied components as police and fire operations, water, sewer, transportation, communication, health, social security or welfare activities, streets and construction, and civil protection. In addition, the federal district of Mexico City is subdivided into 16 subareas (delegaciones in Spanish). Within there sixteen areas there is considerable autonomy and control of the various metropolitan governmental functions. Therefore, on a normal, daily basis, the structure of local government illustrates the dialectically posed forces of structural concentration and operational decentralization.

In actual fact as we found out in our study, the response of the Mayor’s Office to the earthquake indicated even more complexity than the official, formal structure of the organization might indicate. Because the federal government is located within the city, there was overlap of local and federal responses. Furthermore, various other national level organizations such as PEMEX (the national oil company), and many private organizations were also involved in the response. The multiplicity of organized entities operating at different levels presented serious problems for our data gathering efforts.

Given this complexity and our limited resources, we had to restrict our organizational sample to only the very most important of the groups. Therefore, the research design involved starting with core or centrally involved organizations and "snowballing" the sample as information became available about the activities of other organizations.

The second problem we had in obtaining data about organizational activities in the earthquake had to do with the matter of gaining entry and cooperation from relevant organizational officials. Although our joint study with Mexican researchers was very strongly supported from its initiation by high national officials in the Mexican government and some of the key bureaucracies, this did not always provide ready access or cooperation. (This of course is hardly unique to Mexico as DRC can attest from its own
organizational studies in the United States). Although most organizations presented no problems, there were a few that were reluctant to participate in the research even when they were promised anonymity. Data therefore was not obtained from the all the groups that we originally designated for study. Also, in one instance only the top official in a key organization could be interviewed even though it would have been desirable to have obtained information from other officials in the group. In other instances, the originally designated official to be interviewed, usually the head of the organization, designated his deputy as the person to be interviewed; this actually improved the quality of the data because as we have found in research in the United States, such deputies often have more operational knowledge of their groups than does the top official. In general we received data from almost all organizations in which the study had an interest, but the coverage was not complete.

The third problem is the rather familiar one encountered in almost any cross-societal study. The interviews were recorded in Spanish and thus had to be translated into English so they could be analyzed by DRC personnel. (An edited version of the two interview guides used for organizational personnel is presented in an appendix). There were a number of difficulties in the process. It was not easy to find competent translators at least at the hourly rates the center could afford to pay. The dozen or so translators we used varied rather widely in their skills as we found when we had several interviews independently translated by two different persons. Although we used some Mexican nationals as translators, few of our translators had much prior knowledge of the governmental structure in Mexico City. They therefore sometime missed more subtle points in the comments of some of the interviewees. Finally, it took far more time for a translation to be done well than we had estimated so that not all of the interviews were eventually translated. Because of these translation problems, the quality of the data was not as high as would have been desirable, and there was even a quantitative shortfall.

Our Mexican colleagues were helpful in one particular respect so as to partly counterbalance the problems we have just indicated. They provided a very extensive all day briefing to one of the DRC directors who went to Mexico City, on the general impressions that they themselves had obtained from the interviews they had conducted. The usefulness of the briefing was enhanced by their ability to set their observations within the larger context of their familiarity with Mexican society, the governmental structure, and the earthquake itself.
Appendix 3.

Field Instruments Used.

1985 SURVEY ON THE MEXICAN EARTHQUAKE

(Original questions in Spanish; rough English translation provided by the Instituto de Investigacion de la Comunicacion.)

On different aspects and consequences of the earthquake.

1. Thinking of the city's current situation, what do you have to say?

2. What rumors have you heard about the earthquake?

3. Of all the people, groups, associations or sectors that have been involved in the events after the earthquake, which of them in your opinion are those who:

   a. acted more admirably? acted less admirably?
   b. acted more responsibly? acted less responsibly?
   c. whose participation has been more valuable? whose participation has been less valuable?

4. How would you rate the actions taken by the following for coping with the situation created by the earthquake:

   a. DDF (the Mayor's office)
   b. army
   c. police
   d. the President (MMH)
   e. volunteers

   For each ask about how appropriate, organized, humanitarian, well time were their actions.

On the public image of the President.

5. Before the earthquake, were you more, the same, or less confident in President Miguel de la Madrid (MMH) than now?

6. Do you believe MMH has the situation created by the earthquake under control?

7. Do you believe the President is being objectively informed on the city's current situation, or do you believe he is being given nonobjective or distorted information?
8. Focusing on the government, how has it handled the following situations: (on a 5-point scale of very well to poorly)

   a. Rescue of survivors?
   b. Inspection of housing damage?
   c. Restoration of services?
   d. Medical aid/care?
   e. Sheltering of homeless?
   f. Feeding of victims?
   g. Order and protection?
   h. Volunteer organizations?
   i. Price control?
   j. Information and direction?
   k. Housing support?
   l. Relocation of public offices and employees?

9. What is your opinion about the information that has been telecast by TELEVISA’S channels? and by IMEVISION’S channels?

   On a 5-point scale indicate:

   a. Very complete---very incomplete.
   b. Very sensational---very realistic.
   c. Very directive---very nondirective.

10. Would you want to be more fully informed on the consequences of the earthquake, or would you rather hear less about them?

11. Identify the consequences of the earthquake that in your opinion the government should attack immediately.

12. Identify the consequences of the earthquake about which you would like to have more information about.

13. Did the earthquake(s) cause any damage to your house?
   a. No damage.
   b. Slight damage (cracks, broken objects)
   c. Considerable damage but the house is liveable
   d. Severe damage making the house uninhabitable
   e. Other

14. Was anyone living in this house injured?

   If yes, how many?
   What kinds of injuries were suffered?

15. This week, has your house regularly had the service of:

   a. electricity?
   b. water?  (indicate if this facility does not exist in the house)
   c. telephone?
16. Were you informed about the earthquake by the mass media?  

   a. The day of the earthquake: 
      How many hours did you hear, read, or watch TV, radio, or newspaper?  
      What radio station(s), TV channel(s) or newspaper(s) did you use?  
      Which radio station(s), TV channel(s) or newspaper(s) provided the best information?  

   b. After the day of the earthquake:  
      What radio station(s), TV channel(s) or newspaper(s) did you use?  
      Which radio station(s), TV channel(s), or newspaper(s) provided the best information?  

17. Have you changed any future plans because of the earthquake?  
   If yes, ask for details.  
   (The interviewer was asked to list all the persons---relatives or not---who lived in the house and obtain the following information).  

   a. Names  
   b. Age  
   c. Sex  
   d. Who is the housewife?  
   e. Who is the head of the family?  
   f. Who was a volunteer helper with respect to the earthquake?  
   g. How many day(s) did he or she help?  
   h. How many hours were worked (average per day)?  
   i. What kind of specific help did he or she provide?
1986 SURVEY ON THE MEXICAN EARTHQUAKE

*Means questions was included in the 1985 survey.

I. Background data on respondent:*

   Sex
   Age
   Age category
   Socioeconomic level
   Marital status
   Educational category
   Occupation
   Appliances and services available in the house

II. Questionnaire

1. What do you think about the situation brought about by last year’s earthquake?

2. Of all the people and organizations that were involved in the events following the earthquake, who performed well, who else?

3. And who acted badly, who else?

4. * Do you believe the President is being objectively informed on the work being done to deal with the problems brought about by the earthquake, or is he being given nonobjective or incorrect information?

5. * Would you want to have more information about the consequences of last year’s earthquake, or would you rather not?

   If yes, go to Question #6
   If no, why not?

6. * What would you like to have more information about?

7. * In your opinion, did the government have the situation under control in the weeks that followed the earthquake?

   a. total control
   b. only partly under control (if so, what aspects?)
   c. no control at all
   d. don’t know

8. Does the government have the situation under control now? (same a, b, c, or d)

9. * Identify the problems brought about by the earthquake that in your opinion must be solved as soon as possible.
10. Besides casualties, victims and collapsed buildings, what others of the city's current problems do you think are the result of the earthquake?

11. * Do you think the earthquake worsened some problems the city already had?

If yes, what problems?

12. * How would you rate the actions taken by the following persons or groups in responding to the earthquake?

DDF (The Mayor’s Office)
Army
Police
Telefonos De Mexico
The Red Cross
The fire department
The President
The IMSS (Social Security Institute)
Volunteers (individual people)
The Health Secretariat
The mass media
Providers of foreign aid?

13. For each of the above, are they now better organized, the same, or less organized to cope with another natural disaster in the city?

14. Looking at the government, how has it handled each of the following situations caused by last year’s earthquake?

(Rate as very well, well, average, poor, very poorly)

a. Inspection of houses for safety.
b. Restoring of telephone service.
c. Providing of shelters for the homeless.
d. Demolishing buildings and clearing debris.
e. Passing of laws to increase the earthquake resistance of buildings.
f. Moving government offices out of the city.
g. Honestly administering the NAFINSA donations account.
h. Improving and embellishing the city.
i. Honestly handling foreign aid.
j. Restoring damaged streets.
k. Providing housing for the victims.
l. Publicly recognizing heroic acts.
m. Reconstructing hospitals and schools.
n. Informing the public on how things are going.
o. Restoring water service.
15. Some aspects of city life are now going to be mentioned. Tell me if you believe the earthquake has anything to do with how they are now.
   a. The economic crisis. If yes, increased or decreased it?
   b. Trust in other citizens. If yes, increased or decreased it?
   c. People's desire to live outside of the city. If yes, increased or decreased it?
   d. Security on the streets. If yes, better or worse?
   e. People's confidence in the government. If yes, increased or decreased it?
   f. Love for the city. If yes, increased or decreased it?
   g. The desire to make an extra effort and pull through. If yes, increased or decreased it?

16. Since the first two weeks after the earthquake, have you participated in one way or another in helping with problems brought about by the earthquake?
   If yes, doing what?
   a. Donating money
   b. Helping victims
   c. Aiding in reconstruction
   d. Other (what?)
   If no, why not?

17. Would you be willing to participate in evacuation drills at your work place or school?
   If no, why not?

18. WHO should organize disaster preparation and rehearsals? The government, companies, or someone else?

19. Do you know of a government plan for a disaster?
   If yes, what is that plan?

20. Have you heard about the National System for Civil Protection?
   If yes, do you know what it is?

21. Have you made plans for you and your family in case of another earthquake?
   If yes, what kinds of plans?
   If no, why not?
22. Should another disaster happen, have you and your family already agreed on going to the safest part of the house?

23. Do you already have a first aid kit?

24. Do you already know what to do with children and/or the elderly?

25. Do you already have an agreed upon meeting place if you are apart when a disaster occurs?

26. Do you already know emergency numbers you can call if needed?

27. Do you already have such things as batteries, flashlights, pure water, etc.?

28. Do you already know the safest way to evacuate your house?

29. After the earthquake last year, did you consider moving out of the city?
   If yes, why did you not move?

30. After the earthquake, did you change your place of work?

31. Did you move out of your house?

32. Did you cancel an already planned trip?

33. In your opinion, has the distribution of new houses for the homeless been just?
   a. It has been just.
   b. It has been partly just and partly unjust.
   c. It has been unjust.
   d. Don’t know.

34. * Because of the earthquake, have you had this year problems in your house with:
   a. electricity?
   b. water? (indicate if there is no installation of the service)
   c. telephone?
   d. mail?

For each, what kind of problem?
   a. interruptions
   b. billing troubles
   c. cut offs
   d. other (what?)
35. * Because of the earthquake, was anyone living in this house hurt?  
   If yes, how many were hurt or injured?  
   If yes, what kind of injury was suffered?

36. After the earthquake, did you and your family stay in your house or did you go and live with relatives or friends?

37. To whom did the house where you lived in belong to?

38. Why did you look for shelter there?

39. How long did you live in that house?

40. (For those that did not move elsewhere)  
   Did some relatives or friends come to live in your house after the earthquake?

41. Why did they come to your house?

42. How long did they live in your house?

43. Please tell me if you:

   a. Sometime feel tremors?
   b. Are concerned about the safety of your relatives and friends?
   c. Are nervous to go to a theater or movie house because an earthquake might occur?
   d. Get along better with your family than before the earthquake?
   e. Watch the lights to see if they are moving?
   f. Feel more responsible to help your neighbors?
   g. Are nervous to be in a tall building?
   h. Are disposed to help other victims of some disaster?

44. *Finally, would you tell me if you live in a:

   a. Rented apartment?
   b. Rented house?
   c. House you own?
   d. Condominium you are still paying for?
   e. Condominium you own?
ORGANIZATIONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

(This is an edited and translated version of the 19 page guide that was actually used. To save space, most of the instructions provided, many of the probes suggested, and some of the less important questions that were in the actual guide used in the field have been left out of this edited version).

Instruction for interviewers:

As was pointed out in the training sessions, this is NOT an interview schedule but an interview guide. The questions given need not necessarily be asked exactly the way they are phrased or in the order given. The important point is that the questions indicate the major topics regarding which we want to obtain information. It is very important that enough detail be obtained so the probing procedures discussed in the training sessions should be carefully followed).

The guide has two parts:
Part #1 is to be used with all organizations except the Mayor’s Office.
Part #2 is to be used with the Mayor’s Office (as well as certain questions from Part #1).

The prime focus is on the efforts to coordinate the city’s response. We are interested in obtaining information on what each organization did in the trans- and the post-impact periods of the earthquake. We are also concerned with getting a picture of the interactions that the different organizations had with one another.

A secondary focus is on organizational planning and preparedness for disasters, especially earthquakes. The questions in the last half of both Parts #1 and #2 are designed to obtain such information.

Part #1

The initial questions in this guide are aimed at obtaining:
(a) a time ordered sequence picture of the tasks undertaken by the organization;
(b) the perception of the legitimacy, responsibility, and authority the organization had of the tasks undertaken; and
(c) the degree of perceived conflict and/or coordination in the overall organizational response to the earthquake.

I would like to ask some questions about the response of your organization to the earthquake. Perhaps we can go back to when your organization first heard about the earthquake and go step by step through what was done the first several weeks.
1. When and how did your organization first become aware of the earthquake?

2. At what point did the organization become involved?  
   In what way?

3. What tasks did your organization undertake?  
   (Probe: establish the order in which they occurred,  
   the timing and duration of each of the tasks,  
   what organizations if any undertook the same tasks,  
   and, why did the organization think it had to  
   do these tasks?)

4. What problems developed in trying to accomplish the tasks?

5. You mentioned a number of tasks your organization undertook  
   after the earthquake.  
   Which were the more important ones?  
   (Probe: most and least important, relative importance)

6. Let us now turn to a related matter.  
   Would you look a this card (hand to respondent)  
   Tell me if you know which organization did this task during  
   the emergency time period of the disaster. There may be more  
   than one organization involved.  
   For example, which organization was involved in:
   
   a. search and rescue activities?  
   b. activating an emergency operations center?  
   c. requesting emergency relevant resources from  
      other groups?  
   d. coordinating search and rescue activities?  
   e. providing emergency medical care?  
   f. setting up security measures (e.g., pass system,  
      roadblocks, etc.)?  
   g. making damage assessments?  
   h. opening shelters for victims of the earthquake?  
   i. releasing information to the mass media?  
   j. transporting the injured?  
   k. handling the dead?  
   l. compiling lists of missing persons?  
   m. establishing, if any, on-site command posts?  
   n. providing food for victims?  
   o. declaring that the emergency period was over?  
   p. restoring essential services?  
   q. coordinating relief supplies for victims?
   
   (Probe if there were any other important emergency time tasks  
   which were carried out that are not the list; if any, what  
   were they, and who did them?)

7. How was the response coordinated?
8. Who coordinated it?

9. Was there any changes in the coordination over time?

Let us now turn to other than local organizations.

10. Was there any involvement of organizations from the federal or national level?

11. What did they do?

12. How did they interact with local organizations or groups?

13. Were there any conflicts between or among the different groups from the local and the national levels?

We want now to look more specifically at the kinds of problems that had to be dealt with by your organization.

(Start with the problems or difficulties that the respondent may have already mentioned).

14. Were there any problems of a technical nature?
   (Probe regarding resources, information, and expertise)

15. Were there any intra/interorganizational problems or difficulties?
   (Probe regarding coordination, communication, authority, legitimacy, domain, and boundaries).

Would you look at this list (hand respondent card). Tell me what you can about these matters as they came up in the disaster response:

   a. damage assessment?
   b. special problems of search and rescue in an urban setting?
   c. decision making given the absence of relevant information?
   d. expectations as to how people would behave?
   e. mobilizing resources?
   f. coordination of public and private groups?
   g. dealing with different levels of government authority?
   h. the involvement of international organizations?
   i. the operations of the mass media?
   j. the convergence of information, goods, and persons?
   k. integrating volunteers into the response?
16. What are the things you feel that your organization did particularly well?

17. What advice would you give to others who might be faced with the same situation that you had?

18. In looking back at your experience, are there any alternatives to the actions you actually took?

We now want to get away from what your organization did in the earthquake and look at any prior planning for disasters. (If at all possible, lead into by making a link to any previous mention of disaster preparedness by the organization).

19. Setting aside what actually happened after the earthquake, what in your estimation was the state of overall disaster planning in Mexico City?

(Probe how well prepared the community as a whole was, and the respondent’s relative assessment of the situation).

20. Generally speaking, was there any overall disaster planning among the emergency organizations in this city?

(Probe what the planning involved, which organizations participated in the planning, and if any group took the lead.)

21. Which local organizations, if any, has been the most important in the overall disaster planning in this community?

Let us turn now to the role of the city in the disaster planning.

22. Do you know if the city:

a. had a written disaster plan?
b. conducted rehearsals and exercises of the plan?
c. made risk assessments?
d. had an emergency operations center?
e. made attempts to educate the general public about disasters and planning for them?
f. conducted disaster training programs?
g. linked up key emergency groups?
h. held informal meetings to exchange disaster planning information?
i. had mutual aid agreements?
j. helped organizations in drawing up their disaster plans?
23. What about your own organization’s contact with the city prior to the earthquake?

Did you have any contact with respect to disaster planning?

(Probe nature and frequency of contacts, assessment of whatever assistance was received).

24. Now as to your own organization, prior to the earthquake, did it:

a. have a written disaster plan?
   (If so, obtain a copy of the plan)
   (Probe when plan was last updated)

b. carry out rehearsals and exercises of the plan?

c. special facilities for disaster operations (such as a permanent command post or a mobile van)?

d. personnel assigned to planning specifically for disasters? (Probe who, what they did)

25. In addition, prior to the earthquake, did your organization:

a. do risk assessment?

b. educate the general public about disasters and planning for them?

c. conduct disaster training programs?

d. establish informal links with other emergency groups?

e. have mutual aid agreements?

f. help other organizations draw up their disaster plans?

In conclusion, let us talk about the past experience of your organization with disasters (in addition to the last earthquake).

26. What disasters have you experienced?

27. If you had disaster planning at that time, how well did the planning work?

Finally, to conclude:

28. Is there anything you would do differently in the future in the case of another disaster?

Thank respondent for giving the interview.
Obtain whatever relevant documents are available.
Indicate that organizations might be contacted again for more information in the future.

198
Part #2.

Instruction for interviewers:

This guide is to be used with officials from the Mayor's Office. Its purpose is to obtain information about the internal structure and functions of the office, the social links it has with other disaster relevant organizations, the emergency resources it has available, the kinds of preparedness activities undertaken prior to the earthquake, and what prior disaster experiences the office had.

TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONSE OF THE MAYOR'S OFFICE IN THE EARTHQUAKE USE QUESTIONS #1-18 FROM PART #1.

Internal structure and functions:

1. What is the legal jurisdiction of the Mayor's Office?

2. What is the table of organization of the office? (see if a copy of the table of organization can be obtained)

3. What is the division of labor in the office?

4. To whom is the office responsible? (Probe lines of authority and budget involved)

5. What are the major goals or objectives of the office?

Resources:

Let us turn to the disaster planning you have.

6. Is there a written disaster plan? (Probe if there was one before the earthquake, the time it was last revised, if the plans have ever been rehearsed or exercised, and when)

7. Did other organizations help to develop the plan?

8. What changes, if any, have occurred in the plan over the last five years?

9. Did the earthquake have any effect on disaster planning in the office?

10. What kind of emergency facilities are available?

11. What kind of emergency equipment is available?
12. Is there any stockpiling of emergency resources?

Let us now look at other aspects of disaster planning.

13. Prior to the earthquake, did the office:
   a. do risk assessment?
   b. attempt to educate the public about disasters and planning for them?
   c. conduct disaster training programs?
   d. maintain informal links with other key emergency groups?
   e. hold formal meetings to exchange disaster planning information?
   f. have mutual aid agreements with anyone?
   g. help other organizations draw up their disaster plans?

(Probe for all of the above on who has responsibility for the activity, what changes if any occurred as a result of the earthquake, and who was responsible for the change.)

14. What kinds of emergencies have occurred in Mexico City in the last five years?

15. What was the involvement of the Mayor’s Office in any of them?

Thank respondent.
Obtain relevant documents.
Indicate that organization might be approach later for additional information.