

Interactive comment on “Disaster Risk Reduction education in Indonesia: Challenges and Recommendations for Scaling up” by A. Amri et al.

A. Amri et al.

avianto.amri@gmail.com

Received and published: 5 July 2016

We very much appreciate the constructive comments provided. The reviewer provided critical analysis on several aspects of the research, including the limitations of the study. This article captures the first phase of a larger programmatic research regarding the implementation of DRR education in Indonesia (as noted in Page 2 Line 20). The information collected from teachers combined with NGO staff considered to be sufficient to captures the challenges in the implementation of DRR education in Indonesia.

The limitations in this study are currently being addressed in ongoing PhD research. Changes from the original manuscript are highlighted in yellow (please see revised manuscript, changes are marked in yellow highlight).

Specific comments:

C1

- The reviewer highlighted that the DRR dimension in the research were limited to “preparedness and emergency at the time of a ‘disaster’”

Author Reply: Comment accepted. The surveys with the students and educators focused on “preparedness and response” related-actions because it serves as a benchmark on their perspectives and understanding of DRR knowledge. This research is similar to a number of published previous DRR education studies as documented in the background literature review. Subsequent research that currently is being undertaken has expanded the themes where it uses broader dimension of DRR, which includes: (1) preparedness and emergency actions at the time of disaster; (2) disaster prevention and mitigation; and (3) climate change adaptation efforts. However, the material documented here serves as an important stand alone contribution to the literature and in particular advances the work conducted by Johnson et al 2014, into a developed world context. (Additional info explaining this has been inserted in Page 2 Line 17-24).

- The reviewer described that the NGO perspectives only captured international NGOs perspectives

Author Reply: Comment partially accepted. The selection of international NGOs that took part in the FGD serve as an important initial step to understanding the views of these organisations that are driving the DRR education agenda in Indonesia. These NGOs have been implementing CCDRR programs in many areas in Indonesia and collaborating with local government and non-government agencies. Therefore, perspectives of these NGO staff considered to be sufficient in providing an overview of challenges in the implementation of DRR education in Indonesia.

The next phase of the research is already planning to present the findings and analysis and captures perspectives from wider stakeholders of DRR education in Indonesia, including government officials and local NGOs. Additional info has been inserted in section 5 Limitation of study and future research in Page 29 Line 6-9

- The students were only from one school and the school has a DRR education program

C2

Author Reply: Comment partially accepted. Assessment on the perspectives and knowledge of children were utilised to strengthen the argument on the importance of DRR education and children participation in DRR. There have been previous CCRR studies in developing countries that have shown similar conclusion. Therefore it is considered to be not necessary to sample more children participants from other schools as this has been conducted in a number of different studies with corroborating findings in different countries, particularly developing countries.

On the other hand, the next stage of research is planning to include more schools in Jakarta and considering more diverse aspects, including type of schools (public, private, and religious schools), status of DRR education program (have ongoing DRR education program and no DRR education program), support from outside the school (NGO-supported, local-government supported, and no support), and types of exposure (school is frequently flooded, school is safe but the surrounding area is flooded, access to school disrupted due to floods). This approach is undertaken as the next phase is looking on developing new and innovative tools with children considering these different contexts. See section 5 Limitation of study and future research in Page 29 Line 11-18

- The reviewer also suggested adding supplemental reference

Author Reply: Comment accepted. Additional references were provided in the revised manuscript

- The reviewer suggested to add a closing line or two for consideration regarding the envisioned state of children “living in a safe, clean and healthy community, being aware of the well-being of their natural environment and the beneficial values of good health, science and understanding their local environment and weather among other established school subjects”.

Author Reply: Comment accepted. Additional information regarding wider scope of DRR has been added in Page 2 Line 17-24.

C3

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2015-344/nhess-2015-344-AC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-344, 2016.

C4