

Documenting disaster in Yogyakarta: A case study of earthquake on May 27 th, 2006

Arif Rahman Bramantya¹, Sugiharto¹, Lillyana Mulya^{1,2},

¹Archives and Record Management, Vocational College, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

²Archival Studies, Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory, and Material Culture, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Abstract

Background of the study: The documenting of disasters through oral history programs carried out by educational institutions, archival institutions, memory institutions, and archival activists in the last few decades has begun to develop. The factors that have strongly led to the emergence of this phenomenon refer to the awareness of the importance of preserving information and historical awareness related to the shaping of memory.

Purpose: This study analyzes the contribution of oral history archives in forming social memory related to the Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27th, 2006, in a more communicative and creative dimension.

Method: This research is qualitative research conducted through interviews, observations, and literature studies

Findings: The Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27, 2006, has been placed in social memory through oral history archives and media reports that are remembered in social reality. Oral history archives are also presented creatively and collaboratively as a form of public history through Archival Dioramas at the *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*. The results of victims' experiences in oral history re-interviews can be analyzed in the context of the resilience of social memory.

Conclusion: The emergence of digital equipment impacts people's interest, awareness, and motivation to engage in disaster documentation, shaping social memory in Yogyakarta.

Keywords: social memory, earthquake, oral history, Yogyakarta

Paper Type:

Research Paper

Submitted: 27 February 2024

Revised: 6 March 2024

Accepted: 10 August 2024

Online: 4 December 2024

* Correspondence: Arif
Rahman Bramantya

E-mail:
arbramantya@ugm.ac.id

Introduction

Documentation products of people's empirical experiences placed in social memory are legacies constructed deliberately within memory. It is not surprising that nowadays, documentation culture and archival work are growing and developing as a response to a fear of forgetting, so people tend to record their experiences and knowledge in various mediums, primarily in audiovisual media. Institutions in the state domain and communities began to do archival work themselves. Their community's existence must be acknowledged (Soetomo, 2020). The increasing interest in documentation, influenced by the ease of use of recording equipment, indicates community awareness of archiving. Apart from that, it may also be due to the clarity of marginalized communities that they are beyond the reach of state archiving. For example, documentation for developing the treasures of oral history archives is a source that can reflect diversity. It can be seen as a “democratization” of archives, which influenced the historiography. Oral history archives can serve as a guide in finding other relevant sources, in historiographical writing.

Audiovisual recording methods are now an option that is often used by communities to record their activities that they think have valuable information. Previously, audio documentation methods had been massively used to record oral history in Indonesia, whether by archival institutions, media communities, or individuals such as historians and anthropologists. It has been proven that these oral history archives later became a source for historical writing, which contains various perspectives besides conventional archives produced by the state administration. For this reason, we are trying to examine to what extent documentation activity plays a role in enriching the archives of important events that concern people's livelihoods in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, the 2006 earthquake.

Concerning the historiography of natural disasters, [Reid \(2015\)](#) notes that most Southeast Asian historians have not written massive and comprehensive historical narratives due to limited resources. Historical sources related to natural disasters are thought to have been created after the discovery of seismographs in 1900. Therefore, Indonesia is underrepresented regarding historical sources of natural disasters. [Reid \(2015\)](#) explains that sources related to natural disasters were estimated only at 16% in the nineteenth century, 3% (only one was recorded) in the eighteenth century, 12.5% in the seventeenth century, and 9.5% in the sixteenth century. [Reid \(2015\)](#) considers natural disasters that occurred in Indonesia to be part of the narrative of Indonesian history. He argues that the use of Malay sagas, manuscripts, and literature has not received enough attention; thus, the reconstruction of Indonesian history is incomplete ([Reid, 2015](#)).

In the context of knowledge production, natural disasters provide new experiences and essential knowledge that can be carried out by utilizing social networks and preserving local knowledge regarding strategies for survival and disaster mitigation ([Suwignyo, 2019](#)). Assuming that stories about natural disasters contain important messages that must be passed on to later generations, oral sources are disseminated in the realm of remembering events and the history of disasters that have been experienced. Dissemination, memorization, and awareness of historical sources verbally are actions that the local community must take to respond to the messages from past events and as a form of preparation for future events ([Tulius, 2020](#)). To commemorate natural disasters, museums were built as a part of the canonization program of cultural memory ([Gerster & Maly, 2022](#); [Nazaruddin, 2023](#)).

In Yogyakarta, an area prone to earthquakes when viewed from the pattern of the geological structure, this research uses the 2006 earthquake as a case study of natural disasters that need to be archived. Historical records note an earthquake that caused a tsunami in Yogyakarta occurred in 1840 ([Supartoyo, Abdurahman, & Kurnia, 2016](#)). Furthermore, a large-scale earthquake also occurred in 1867, with the center of the earthquake on land. The impact



of the Yogyakarta earthquake in 2006 was estimated to be similar to the earthquake in 1867, which was in the Bantul Regency to Klaten Regency area ([Natawidjaja, 2016](#)). The earthquake disaster, with a magnitude of 5.9 on the Richter scale in Yogyakarta on May 27th, 2006, became one of the social memories of the people of Yogyakarta. Javanese people understand earthquakes as symbols in which they are constructed with various predictive meanings ([Gusmian, 2019](#)).



Figure 1. The Damage of Prambanan Temple caused by Earthquake on May 27th, 2006
(sources: *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*)

Experience and knowledge related to the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta have been captured in various mediums. The History Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, through the course of Oral History, has documented the experience of the Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27th, 2006. The 44 respondents were successfully interviewed in April 2008. Later, the *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* (DPAD DIY) has also packaged information on earthquake events in Yogyakarta in one of the Diorama Archive rooms (especially in Room 17) – in all there are 18 rooms – which were opened on February 24th, 2022 to maintain collective amnesia related to earthquake events. The process of remembering is always based on context and social material, which is then responded to through signs or symbols found in society. Memory is interpreted not only as a social framework for memory but also in how it has become a social framework ([Asmiyanto, 2019](#)).

The process of gathering information is packaged in an audiovisual medium. The process of gathering information to add, subtract, replace, strengthen, and reinterpret events is a process that can be said to be commonplace because knowledge products may originate from these efforts. Documentation culture and archiving work based on archival and historical awareness do not mean a narrow-scale activity process but a universal process that anyone can carry out, not limited to information institutions or memory institutions. Documentation culture and archiving work practices can be associated with knowledge systems to build a mental revolution, awareness of archival principles, and historical awareness, which are many aspects that are much needed if we want to develop a socio-cultural order of the nation. Reading a variety of documentary sources, including films, photographs, texts, oral histories, and other non-textual sources such as oral interviews, artifacts, and cultural expressions, can provide a holistic understanding of the events and people who had a significant impact on the

documentation process ([Nurfiantara, & Mirmani, 2022](#)). The metaphor of archives as memory is related to perceptions about creating, preserving, and using archives. Archives do not become "memories" where they can be retrieved, preserved, and articulated with their respective selectivity.

Information institutions, for instance, archives and museums are starting to build a participatory culture where users become active contributors to the production of archival-based knowledge in any medium ([Palista, Samosir, & Sa'Diyah, 2023](#)). The development of participatory archives is often heralded as a means to reveal the existence of informal institutions, communities, and community activists, including minority groups who may not be known or even excluded. On the one hand, the participatory archives approach sometimes seems to overlap with the role and function of the archivist as a trusted guardian of information in the realm of formal archival institutions. Participatory archives, as an ever-evolving paradigm, aim to embrace broader societal involvement ([Benoit & Eveleigh, 2019](#)).

As a heterogeneous nation, Indonesia can place aspects of cultural knowledge in a strategic position as a foundation for building national character, including cultivating a culture of documentation and archiving work practices. The connection between interest, awareness, and motivation in society in considering various needs to implement a culture of documentation and archiving work practices as a basis for acting is worth appreciating. This basis will later become the norm for accommodating the needs in the documentation culture and archiving work practices, starting from the process of capturing, processing, and storing to preserving information by archival rules, but also to place in the curatorial process of archives into a more democratic context in social reality.

A study conducted by [Sucha-Xaya \(2022\)](#) explains that documentation practices in Thailand have evolved along with the digital transformation. These changes are concerned with online accessibility, public archival programs, preservation standards, and access in the digital environment ([Zahara & Salim, 2022](#)). This also requires the archivists to take a role in educating the public and taking a participatory archives approach. This can provide constructive documentation knowledge about contemporary historical events which ultimately also encourages documentation practices in a socio-cultural perspective, to consider how to adjust traditional archival practices to the current context. Regarding the role of archivists, [Retting \(2019\)](#) explains that archivists are challenged to be proactive in documenting disasters. The selection and assessment of disaster documentation become clearer but more complex. The depth and richness of the data can provide a picture of the environment, vulnerable and under-documented communities, various levels and types of leadership, issues of science, economics, and politics, and various other fields that are not only important for archivists and historians, but also various disciplines. Another approach also used by [Maynor \(2016\)](#) is that archivists also have a role in documenting memorabilia about disaster condolences.

[Lee & Springer \(2020\)](#) explain that the use of oral history as a methodology is related to social engagement, especially in learning in a university environment. The position of the interviewer and narrator needs attention in terms of shared authority and interview experience. Ethics in collaboration to participate in oral history interviews is a very important aspect. In an academic environment, involvement between researchers, lecturers, librarians, and archivists to develop a model of social engagement in research and inclusive learning is important. The oral history integrated into the Archives and Record Management Study Program curriculum, Vocational College, Universitas Gadjah Mada, is one of the efforts to add the treasures of archives into a repository. It has enriched local content and a repertoire of studies on oral history archives, which will later be disseminated to the public. In this context, the vocational concept becomes directed, and student participation in creating learning products will be managed through the ARISAN (*Arsip Sejarah Lisan*) application with many themes ([Bramantya, et al.](#)



2021). The practice of collecting oral history that is integrated with the curriculum is an attempt to add to the treasury of archives for the benefit of future generations.

[Cramer \(2020\)](#) explains that the experiences of people affected by disasters, especially COVID-19, still have the opportunity to explore the narratives that will be conveyed. Therefore, the methodology of the oral history of the crisis is about how trauma and disaster experiences intersect. This information will be useful in mitigation efforts. The main purpose of oral history is to document history and culture as collective memory. About aspects of experience, testimony, and life learning, a case study conducted by [Leahy & Gay \(2024\)](#) on disasters through the memories of Australian parents has changed aspects of life. Along with the increasing frequency, severity, and severity of disasters in the era of climate change, the way parents understand, respond, and prepare for environmental crises has changed. Family decisions and behaviors change in response to shifts in understanding and the experience of climate-related disasters.

The object of this study is the experience of the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake through the efforts of oral history programs and other sources as a form of participatory archives and democratization of archives. Borrowing Handajani's term, 'culture in the making' might be associated with communicative and creative efforts limited to the emergence of a new 'social ethos' in conveying information ([Handajani, 2020](#)). The main problems encountered in media recording events as part of social memory mainly refer to the need for archives and conventional documents as well as new media documents related to society's social and cultural aspects, which lead to the preservation of information and the production of cultural knowledge. Based on this background, the main question to be answered in this research is how disaster documentation contributes to shaping social memory in Yogyakarta. This purpose study analyzes the contribution of oral history archives forming social memory related to the Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27th, 2006, in a more communicative and creative dimension. The culture of documentation and archiving work practices through oral history programs in various mediums is one of the efforts to procure the archives in which archival principles should be preserved. The efforts to protect information and the accumulation of archive treasures require in-depth studies, then give rise to new historical narratives. Documentation activities are not only just a matter of capturing and collecting but also how to build an ecosystem holistically.

Method

Research type

This qualitative descriptive research was conducted through interviews, observation, and literature study. This type of research is practical research (practical investigation) using oral data. This research was analyzed through the participatory archives approach. The participatory archives approach is motivated by advances in technology and information, and the emergence of digital equipment, which impacts people's interest, awareness, and motivation to participate in archiving work practices, which form collaborative and creative work in disseminating information.

Research location

This research was conducted in Yogyakarta. The location was chosen considering that this place was affected by the earthquake disaster on May 27th, 2006. The event still leaves memories in the community.

Data collection

The primary data needed in this study are the archives of the *Kedaulatan Rakyat*



newspaper, photo archives, and oral history archives collected in 2008 and 2022. In addition, this study also used in-depth interview techniques with informants related to the Yogyakarta earthquake of May 26th, 2006, with the same narrator, but different interviewers. The re-interview aims to explore experiences with various interpretations and narrative constructions that are built ([Chand, 2021](#)). The secondary data in this study is a literature study, which is used to strengthen the data that has been obtained from the interviews and is focused on the topic of natural disaster oral history and social memory. The research tool used in this study was an interview guide. The interview guide is used to complete the data and is clarified in nature. The interview guide is open and structured.

Data analysis

Data analysis in this study refers to data that has been obtained from interviews, participatory observation, and literature study. Activities in qualitative research analysis can be carried out through data reduction, data presentation, conclusion, and verification ([Sugiyono, 2014](#)). Data reduction is the process of improving data, by reducing irrelevant data and adding data that is still lacking. Presentation of data is the process of collecting information that is arranged based on categories or groups of data. After presenting the data, the researcher interpreted the data. Data interpretation is the process of interpreting the data set that has been compiled. Concluding is the answer to the problems posed.

Result and Discussion

Oral history archives and the creative process

Public history has many aspects related to archives, referring to memories, spaces, and symbols through historical experience. Oral history archives can be seen as a space for dialogue in the realm of remembering events that occurred in the context of their era. The concept of ‘shared authority’ in public history related to oral history is the distribution of knowledge that is shared more broadly and can be interpreted as a collaborative idea in documentation and archiving practices ([Benoit & Eveleigh, 2019](#)).

Archive exhibition programs and archival dioramas are a means of interaction between archives and historical experience. The history of the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake has become an experience that continues to be remembered every year. The *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* has built archival dioramas as a form of strengthening identity through the given historical experience. The involvement of archivists and historians in the process of developing archival dioramas is a form of participatory archives. Participatory archives in the development of archival dioramas provide space for historians and archivists to convey historical experiences. In this case, the Yogyakarta Provincial Library and Archives Service.

The archival diorama of the *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* consists of 18 rooms. Room 17 is one of the rooms related to disaster events in Yogyakarta. Archives related to the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake were presented through a creative and collaborative process, relying on oral history archives. Delivery spaces such as archival dioramas have significance in public history. Room 17 indirectly has an important meaning, namely as a deep educational space to understand the historical events of natural disasters. This diorama has diverse functions: recreational, memorial, educational, and economic. The locals have remembered the memory of the disaster.





Figure 2. Archival Diorama of DPAD DIY in Natural Disaster Room
(Source: Arif Rahman Bramantya)

Earthquake May 27th, 2006, in the daily newspaper Kedaulatan Rakyat

In a broader context, [Tapsell \(2017\)](#) states that the media have become a marker in every monumental transition in the memory of life in Indonesia. This means that the media also means the medium and the medium itself means information. Concerning documentation work, not all of the documented information is preserved, because there are outside interventions that have the power to select what information is appropriate for preservation. If the medium is information, and the information that is preserved relates to memory, then the *Kedaulatan Rakyat* print media can position itself as a medium that still exists today in sending a message. As the oldest local print media in Yogyakarta which was founded on September 27th, 1945, *Kedaulatan Rakyat* remains committed to maintaining moral values and honesty in the journalistic code of ethics ([Daulay, 2011](#)). Coupled with the role of the Jogja Library Center, which is a sub-unit of the *Dinas Perpustakaan dan Arsip Daerah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* in preserving the *Kedaulatan Rakyat* newspaper, it shows that a lot of information related to the history of Yogyakarta's development is important to be preserved in a sustainable manner ([Aisyiyah & Ganggi, 2019](#)). In the context of reporting related to the Yogyakarta Earthquake on May 27th, 2007.

Table 1. Earthquake news in *Kedaulatan Rakyat* (reminiscing one year)

No	Rubric	Date of issue
1.	Reflection One Year After the Earthquake, Momentum for Awareness of Natural Disasters	2007
2.	Remembering the Spirit of Life, Love, and Caring	2007
3.	One Year the Earth Speaks	2007
	Disaster, Ideality, and Our Spirituality	2007
4.	Various Events to Remember the Year of the Earthquake	2007



	Approaching a Year of Earthquakes in Various Places, Reflecting on Disasters with Dhikr	2007
5.	'KRT' Holds Jogja Culture Revives, From 'Gojekan' to the Champion	2007
6.	Seconds a Year After the Earthquake, Sirens Wailed, Tears Spilled	2007
7.	One Year After the Earthquake, Still Traumatized Children	2007
8.	A Year's Reflection on the Earthquake in Klaten, the 'Lindhu Gedhe' Monument to Remember	2007
9.	Commemorating a Year of the Earthquake, Residents of Tumpengan at a Crossroad	2007
10.	Valuable Lessons from the Earthquake	2007
11.	Earthquake Trauma Doesn't Easily Disappear, You Can Hear The Sirens Are Hiding	2007
12.	One Year Post-Earthquake Commemoration in Kotagede	2007
13.	1 Year Reflection in Front of the Post Office	2007
14.	PMI Holds 1-Year Post-Earthquake Reflection	2007

Source: *Kedaulatan Rakyat* Newspaper Collections

Various efforts were made to commemorate a year after the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake in each region. Gunungkidul residents performed *tirakatan* and prayed together and beat *kentongan* together at 05.50. At 04.00, the residents of Bantul performed the Fajr prayer in congregation, prayer, and dhikr, which was then followed by a moment of silence and prayer led by 5 religious leaders. Some commemorate the earthquake with competitions, art performances, exhibitions, *tumpengan*, and social services (Team KR, 2007).

Planning and construction of monuments or memorials were also built in Klaten. The *Lindhu Gedhe* (big earthquake) monument is located in the Prambanan sub-district and was inaugurated by H. Mardiyanto who was the governor of Central Java at that time. The construction of a residential facility in the form of a Dome House with its unique shape can be a reminder as well as a 'monument' related to the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake. The Dome House construction area is also a tourist asset worth visiting because it is a cultural site that teaches about the spirit of life, love, and care (Team KR, 2007). Most of the news in *Kedaulatan Rakyat* which was published on May 27th, 2007 carried the big theme 1 Year After the Earthquake with a 'message of reflection'.

The 2006 Yogyakarta Earthquake in Oral History Archives: Re-Interview

In practice, re-interviewing the victims of the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake was conducted with 10 informants based on the interest of exploring experiences that are still



in their memories. With several questions asked, the re-interview also attempted to explore issues that existed in the Yogyakarta earthquake, about social relations and everyday life. Reading the results of repeated interviews will help us with new interpretations, reviewing perspectives about the past, and understanding the present. The analysis that will emerge by comparing the first interview and repeat interviews with the same informant will provide interesting new insights related to the nature and practice of oral history, as well as the relationship between memory, sobriety, and intersubjectivity ([Chand, 2021](#)). In the practice of oral history, the narration displayed by the narrator can be in the form of an experience of an event that is likely to be accepted by the public as a form of testimony. The background of the interviewer, objectives, and approach to the interviewee can influence what needs to be conveyed to the public and the extent to which the positions and messages are conveyed. Memories related to the experience of the Yogyakarta earthquake constructed through interactive communication and the approach to sources can affect what needs to be conveyed to the public and the extent to which positions and messages are conveyed.

Discussion

The construction of a memory room for the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake in the realm of oral history practice was also carried out by students of the History Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences in 2008. However, oral history practice in the History Study Program, which is currently mostly carried out by students and academics, has not yet been followed up with a continuous processing program. Although the last downstream work, following the objectives of recording oral history, is writing historical narratives, it does not rule out the possibility that oral history recordings are in demand by other creative fields such as documentary making, online exhibitions, and so on ([Mulya & Bramantya, 2021](#)).

In the context of the development of Archival Dioramas, forms of creative historical communication by archivists are no less balanced than other archival aspects. Archivists are increasingly moving towards a form of public history, in which the archival institution under their auspices has many capabilities in presenting the archives they keep. In addition, the audience that archives reach is quite different from that of most public historical productions. They have a distinctly different repertoire of archives, each attracting a different and potentially new audience to create its own historical experience.

Recognition of the potential power of archives to influence audiences with given historical experience provides intervention for historians to make selections in historiography. Even public historians are starting to focus and be involved in creating displays of historical sources and objects and telling stories about history. Then what about the archivist position? According to [Haunton & Salzedo \(2021\)](#), archivists can act as practitioners of public history, and they have extraordinary insight into how archives can interact with historical experience. Historically, archives' focus on the user has led to theories about providing access, but less for the in-depth connection with the audience itself as part of the process of creating and understanding history. Of course, how the public interacts with history, in all its permutations, is at the heart of public history theory. This can be done with archives, including collecting, collaborative exhibitions, or similar participatory activities. In the context of understanding natural disasters. By realizing the importance of history, users who enjoy archival diorama space will also learn the importance of understanding risk due to natural disasters and what measures can be taken if a disaster occurs.

The impact of the media can be seen from the 'message' where the medium element is also important to read because the medium will shape the content. The medium sends 'messages' to all cultures shaping the way humans think, act, and interact ([Taspell, 2017](#)), *Kedaulatan Rakyat* newspapers and oral history archives are mediums that send messages about



the memory of the Yogyakarta earthquake which will probably always be remembered by everyone. Remembering the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake in the *Kedaulatan Rakyat* daily indirectly reconstructs social memory. The *Lindhu Gedhe* Monument and the Dome House in the context of identity development built in Klaten are representations of being in maintaining memory.

A re-interview with the narrator in the Yogyakarta earthquake was conducted in 2022 to explore traumatic experiences and impacts that remain in the victims' memories. In this context, the narrator will organize memories from their experiences so that they can be accepted by themselves and the public. The Yogyakarta earthquake in the memory of the narrator leads to experiences related to experiences resulting from the psychological dimension. The preparation of the narrator in the re-interview is obvious in constructing their memories and influences the need to construct memories for different reasons.

The 2008 oral history interview regarding the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake was conducted to fulfill an Oral History course assignment for UGM History Study Program students, while in 2022 it was conducted in the framework of research and to add to the treasures of oral history archives. When the interview was conducted in 2008, the age factor greatly influenced the narrator's memory of the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake, because the narrator's age range at that time was 18 to 45 years. In addition, the time difference between the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake and the oral history interview project conducted by UGM History Study Program students is 2 years, so the narrator's memory is still strong, and the traumatic feeling still lingers.

When the oral history re-interviews were conducted in 2022, the narrators' ages ranged from 34 to 65 years. The oral history re-interview was approximately 14 years from the interview that was conducted in 2008 so the memory or feeling of trauma of the event has begun to diminish. When the oral history re-interview in 2022 was conducted, the process of remembering the events and experiences conveyed by the narrator was quite long. In this context, differences in age, time, and background of the oral history interviews affected how the process of remembering when the narrator tells a story.

The interviewer's approach also influenced the depth of information conveyed by the narrator. The transcript of the 2008 oral history interview shows that the memory of the earthquake is still very fresh, so the narrator tells the chronology of the event in a very coherent way. However, the background of the interviews and the questions asked made the narrator limited in telling stories. This makes the information conveyed by the narrator less in-depth and appears as a question-and-answer session. The following is an excerpt from an interview with Siti Nurjanah in 2008

This quote shows how the narrator's story lacks depth because there is a boundary between the narrator and the interviewer through the questions asked. This can also be caused by a traumatic experience that is still very strong. An oral history re-interview was conducted with the same narrator in 2022. The following is an excerpt from the interview with Siti Nurjanah in 2022.

Maybe you can tell us first about your job during the 2006 earthquake, what was your job and what activities were you doing the day before the earthquake? Yes, thank you, my job is as a teacher, so the day before I was still teaching because the earthquake happened on Saturday, that's it. I taught on Friday and still taught school as usual. So when the earthquake happened, what were you doing that day and what activities were you doing that morning? Usually every morning I go to my mother's house, my parents there, in the morning to make drinks, then I came back here and was getting ready to cook, suddenly there was an earthquake. I was alone with my child, so I ran here, my



child also rushed to follow me, I fell and got up, hitting the wall. Getting out of here, in front of here, this house and the wall collapsed, as soon as we got down from this terrace, we were immediately hit by the collapsed wall, I couldn't walk anymore, I crawled, about 3 meters, hit by the kitchen next door. My legs can't walk anymore, I can't do anything because I'm the same way."

There are differences in the story of the narrator because the interviewer gave flexibility in telling the story. This was done to make the narrator tell his experience in detail and depth. From the 2008 interview transcript, the memory of the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake is still strong. The narrator talked about the chronology of events in a sequence that still leaves a traumatic feeling. This can be seen from the narrator's story related to panic, the condition of the house, family, and the surrounding environment as well as the atmosphere of the evacuation. This is also related to age and the difference in the time of the interview. In the results of the 2022 oral history interviews, there were several differences related to the process of remembering the earthquake events which were limited to stories that were not yet detailed and coherent. However, the traumatic feeling of the earthquake still left quite an impression. This can be seen from the narrator's gestures when telling a story and the change in voice that became sadder when the narrator tried to remember the event. There was an interesting thing when the oral history interviews were conducted which referred to the concern between people when the earthquake occurred. This memory is still firmly attached by the narrators.

By the time the oral history interviews were conducted in 2022, most of the narrators were speaking quietly and at ease. This is due to the faded sense of traumatism, even though at the beginning of the interview they lacked confidence. Most of the narrators also wanted to talk about their experiences regarding the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake disaster, because, for them, this experience is important to convey so that it can benefit later generations in dealing with disaster situations. The narrator was very comfortable when they told how the community felt about helping each other after the earthquake. Apart from that, they felt comfortable when they talked about the conditions in the evacuation.

There are also excerpts from an interview with Gatot Nugraha regarding lessons learned and messages related to the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake. On the other hand, there are some things that the narrator is reluctant to talk about the memories that still make an impression to this day. For them, this is related to a sense of trauma that they feel is something they want to forget. Because they struggled to recover their bodies and soul after the earthquake, it was not easy. In this interview, we obtained various stories about their experiences in surviving after the incident occurred. The following is an excerpt from the interview with Anik Nuryani.

Then how after the earthquake, how did you and your family try to recover from the trauma of the earthquake that had occurred? Ee recovering what trauma, sir. The first one was of course at that time, if I personally had just graduated from high school and had hopes of going back to college, oh how will it be like this, what will it be like in the future, but at that time I was determined, for what it's called, even though I didn't have a house, I had to go to school like that. So, day and night because after one night in the tent together, we built our own tents. Imagine, during the day it was hot and at night it was cold because of the direct sun. Well, all the items that could be saved were put in the tent, beds, mattresses, or whatever, we slept under the tent. Yes, because there was no electricity and no lights, at night when studying, we used to use a kerosene fire, that's what I felt. For, for my family, at that time I was still 18 years old, I didn't have the chance to observe how my parents responded, but maybe they were also trying to organize how to live after this incident.



Furthermore, there are also the results of an interview with Anik Nuryani regarding her and her family's efforts to survive after their house was badly damaged after the earthquake occurred. The interview excerpt above shows that memories related to caring, and solidarity are still attached. This can also be seen in how they carry out their daily lives with other communities to look after and help each other to survive even in the most difficult conditions.

Conclusion

The events of the May 27th, 2006, Yogyakarta earthquake have been placed in social memory through oral history archives, archival dioramas, and media reports which are remembered every year in social reality. Oral history archives related to the Yogyakarta earthquake are also presented in a creative and collaborative process as a form of public history through Archival Dioramas. Likewise, with the results of oral history re-interviews, victims' experiences can still be analyzed in the context of the resilience of social memory. A new paradigm for interpreting archiving culture as a social ethos emerged due to efforts to record community events and experiences as part of public memory. In this context, the creative process of utilizing oral history archives is a means of attracting public attention. Public history's general goal is to connect the broader public with the past.

In contrast, the goal of public history in archives is to connect the broader public with documentary evidence as central to authentic interpretations of the past. The meaning of archives and documents has been democratized so that archiving work practices have developed in a creative direction in their use. By comparing oral histories conducted in 2008 and 2022 with the same narrator regarding the May 27th Yogyakarta earthquake, the nature and practice of oral history can be seen in the interactions involving memory and intersubjectivity. At the same time, the goal of public history in archives is to connect the broader public with documentary evidence as central to authentic interpretations of the past. The meaning of archives and documents has been democratized so that archiving work practices have developed in a creative direction in their use.

Research on how to package documentation results, including oral history archives into more interesting audiovisual media requires further study, especially in implementing technological advances. In this case, integrated information that can integrate all available information is packaged in creative media so that public memory is maintained.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge and thank all those who have given valuable contributions to this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors have contributed to the final manuscript. The contribution of all authors: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, writing original draft preparation, writing review, and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

All authors have no conflict of interest related to this study.

Funding

This study receives funding from Dana Masyarakat, Vocational College, Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2022.



References

- Aisyiyah, B. M., & Ganggi, R. I. P. (2019). Dinamika Pelestarian Surat Kabar Kedaulatan Rakyat Koleksi Jogja Library Center. *Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan*, 7(1), 41-50. Retrieved from: <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/jip/article/view/22812>
- Asmiyanto, T. (2019). Metamorphosis of Archivists in The Era of Industry 4.0: Challenges in Facing the Digital Revolution. *Record and Library Journal*, 5(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.20473/rlj.V5-I1.2019.12-21>
- Benoit, E., III, & Eveleigh, A. (2019). *Participatory archives: theory and practice*. Facet Publishing
- Bramantya, A. R., Waluyo, Darajat, I. R., Mulya, L., & Ridwan, A. N. (2021) Engaging Students in Oral History in the Archival Science Study Program, Vocational College, Universitas Gadjah Mada. *Journal of Archival Organization*, 18(3-4), 130-146. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2022.2110551>
- Chand, A. (2021). Same Interviewee, Different Interviewer: Researching Intersubjectivity in Studies of the Reserved Occupations in the Second World War. *The Oral History Review*, 48(1), 3-19. Doi: 10.1080/00940798.2021.187960
- Cramer, J. A. (2020). “First, Do No Harm”: Tread Carefully Where Oral History, Trauma, and Current Crises Intersect, *The Oral History Review*, 47(2), 203-213. Doi: 10.1080/00940798.2020.1793679
- Daulay, H. (2011). Memahami penulisan artikel di Harian Kedaulatan Rakyat. *Jurnal Dakwah*, 11(1), 53-68.
- Gerster, J., & Maly, E. (2022). Japan’s Disaster Memorial Museums and Framing 3.11: Othering the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster in cultural memory. *Contemporary Japan*, 34(2), 187-209. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/18692729.2022.2112479>
- Gusmian, I. (2019). Earthquakes in Javanese theological interpretation: The study of Serat Primbon manuscripts from the Yogyakarta Sultanate Palace. *Sustinere: Journal of Environment and Sustainability*, 3(2), 75-89. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.22515/sustinere.jes.v3i2.79>
- Handajani, S. (2020). “Corona dan Hierarki Informasi” dalam Suwignyo, A. (ed.). *Pengetahuan Budaya dalam Khazanah Wabah*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.
- Haunton, M., & Salzedo, G. (2021) “A duty, an opportunity, and a pleasure”: connecting archives and public history. *Archives and Records*, 42(1), 40-57. Doi: [10.1080/23257962.2020.1843417](https://doi.org/10.1080/23257962.2020.1843417)
- Leahy, C. P & Gay. C. (2024) Care and crisis: disaster experiences of Australian parents since 1974, *The History of the Family*, 29(1), 131-156. Doi: 10.1080/1081602X.2023.2278161
- Lee, A. P. & Springer. K. (2020) Socially Engaged Oral History Pedagogy amid the COVID-19 Pandemic, *The Oral History Review*, 47(2), 227-239. Doi: 10.1080/00940798.2020.1793678
- Maynor, A. (2016). “Response to the Unthinkable: Collecting and Archiving Condolence and Temporary Memorial Materials Following Public Tragedies,” in *Handbook of Research on Disaster Management and Contingency Planning in Modern Libraries*, ed. Emy Nelson Decker and Jennifer A. Townes (Hershey, PA: IGI Global), https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=utk_libpub
- Mulya, L., & Bramantya, A.R. (2021). Program Sejarah Lisan dan Budaya *Recordkeeping* dalam Perspektif Kearsipan. *Jurnal Diplomatika*, 4(2), 99-111. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.22146/diplomatika.6819599>
- Nazaruddin, M. (2023). Contestations of cultural memory at a disaster monument: the case of the Aceh Tsunami Museum in Indonesia> *Social Semiotics*, 33(3), 560-579. Doi:



- <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2021.1900721>
- Nurfiantara, W., & Mirmani, A. (2022). Service Excellence in University Archive of Universitas Indonesia: A Kanban Approach. *Record and Library Journal*, 8(1), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.20473/rlj.V8-I1.2022.99-108>
- Palista, D., Samosir, F. T. ., & Sa'Diyah, L. . (2023). Analysis of Depreciation of Archives in The Central Khazanah Archives. *Record and Library Journal*, 9(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.20473/rlj.V9-I1.2023.13-24>
- Reid, A. (2015). History and Seismology in the Ring of Fire: Punctuating the Indonesian Past. In D. Henley & H. S. Nordholt (Eds.), *Environment, Trade and Society in Southeast Asia: A Longue Durée Perspective* (pp. 62–77). Brill. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w76vg1.8>
- Retting, P. J. (2019). Documenting Disasters: A Focus on Floods. *Journal of Western Archives*, 10(2), 1-19. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.26077/39ab-252b>
- Soetomo, I. (2020). *Direktori: Peta Kolektif Indonesia 2010-2020*. Jakarta: whiteboardjournal.com dengan British Council
- Supartoyo, Abdurahman, O., & Kurnia, A. (2016). 10 tahun gempa Yogyakarta. *Geomagz*, Vol. 6. No. 2
- Natawidjaja, D. H. (2016). Misteri patahan sumber gempa Yogya 2006. *Geomagz*, Vol. 6. No. 2
- Sucha-Xaya, Naya. (2022). Documenting Events in Times of Crisis: Investigating Traditional and Contemporary Thai Archival Practices. *Archivaria*, 93, 42-71. Retrieved from: <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13835>
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suwignyo, A. (2019). A Tsunami-Related Life History of Survivors in Banda Aceh, Indonesia and Sendai, Japan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 23(2), 120-134. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.49876>
- Tapsell, R. (2019). *Kuasa Media di Indonesia, Kaum Oligarki, Warga, dan Revolusi Digital*. Tangerang Selatan: Marjin Kiri.
- Tulius, J. (2020). Lesson From The Past, Knowledge For The Future: Roles Of Human Memories In Earthquake and Tsunami Narratives In Mentawai, Indonesia. *Paradigma: Jurnal Kajian Budaya*, 10(2), 147-168. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17510/paradigma.v10i2.396>
- Zahara, N. R., & Salim, T. A. . (2022). Preservation of Digital Archives: Systematic Literature Review. *Record and Library Journal*, 8(2), 285–297. <https://doi.org/10.20473/rlj.V8-I2.2022.285-297>

