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Disaster Education Engagement

Hypothesis:

Disaster education engagement is the manner in which people access, learn, implement, and communicate a capacity to deal with major disruptive incidents.
Underlying influences on successful disaster reduction initiatives

(Collins, A.E. 2009 *Disaster and Development*, Routledge p.151)
An ongoing process

- the adoption of ideas and actions that extends beyond formal education systems by any part of society
- however, a myriad of influences guide people’s learning and action in this adaptive disaster education
Interpretation and engagement of knowledge for disaster risk reduction

- **Physical aspects** – a question of access to knowledge – in terms of being able to afford or know about information and technology, and in terms of a ‘right to know’
- **Cultural aspects** – i.e. Grounded knowledge
- **Motivational aspects** – people have to want change, the knowledge has to be seen as worth having – knowing about a risk does not necessarily change behaviour (i.e. HIV, housing, wars, pollution, residing in hazardous locations)

A major challenge resides with the personal, community and wider policy level ethics needed for multipurpose knowledge engagement – i.e. whose knowledge, for what purpose is it being used, and who chooses to use it.
Physical aspects: quantity of risk information

More information reduces unknown risks and the risk of poor engagement, but only to a certain point?
When the cost increases beyond the benefits it is necessary to question the worth of the information. (i.e. in terms of its innovation potential)?
Quality of information

Information is useful when;
• It indicates local realities,
• The users of the information are defined,
• It serves for decision making,
• Reflects change over time,
• Informs about the results of decision making,
• Its continuously evaluated.
Principles of information for education in the risk reduction system

- Information for communication
- Information for action
- The right amount of information
- A sustainable and adaptable use of information
- Participatory information
Idealised Proactive Disaster Education Engagement

• Strategy to engage civilians
  – Identify risks, vulnerabilities and hazards
  – Locally owned prevention and response
  – Investment in technology, justice, and recognition of human values in bringing about wellbeing
  – Counteract moral/social downturns in society, with potential economic and environmental benefits for people

• Benefits of citizen first
  – Engages knowledge, attitudes and practice
  – Is relatively sustainable
  – Addresses multiple hazards and risks, not just some
Community Risk Education Processes

**Additionality:** i) helps build system that can be adapted to multiple risks, ii) improves overall household wellbeing rather than just control risks.

**Community:**
- Assess and reduce identified risks

**Committee:**
- Communication of risk information with community and support group
- Motivate community to reduce risks
- Monitor identified risks

**Verification people:**
- Supervise & monitor activities
- Technical support and training in risk reduction and problem resolution
- Disseminate information
- Verify risks as real

**Support Institutions:**
- Facilitate emergency inputs
- Technical guidance on proven strategies
- Input development, rarely with pump priming resources if necessary

(Collins, A.E. 2009 *Disaster and Development*, Routledge p.151)
i.e) Community Involvement in Early Warning

i.e) Community Involvement in Early Warning and Development

Developmental and educational risk reduction process
Influences on disaster risk engagement - more detail

**Knowledge** - experience basis for reacting to changes in disaster risks.

**Power** - constraints in rights to access defences against risks.

**Culture** - personality, belief, tradition, choice of reaction to risk.

**Environment** – uncertain nature and time frame of hazards and people’s vulnerability in changing places.

**Flexibility** - to avoid hazards based on diversification of human security through livelihood / development options.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Core Contextual Influences</th>
<th>Intervening Influences*</th>
<th>Risk Management Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Experience - age, activity, education</td>
<td>experience, lack of experience, education</td>
<td>Knowledge base for reacting to risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Structure - economy, politics, society</td>
<td>uneven development, technology, access and rights</td>
<td>Presence or not of constraints to being able to react to risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Social origin - agency, tradition, faith</td>
<td>personality, altruism, strength of kinship, gender based risks, beliefs in immortality, faith and non-faith based traditions,</td>
<td>Rationale to choice, motivation or belief in reactions to risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environment - systemic and chaotic hazards, changing nature of places</td>
<td>vulnerable and resilient people in hazardous or safe locations</td>
<td>Place oriented interactions with risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Stakeholder reactions to the composition and context of risk

(Collins, A.E. 2009 *Disaster and Development*, Routledge p.151)
Some challenges (dilemmas) of addressing risk in disaster education

1. In gaining knowledge and wisdom about a risk, we may uncover lack of understanding about new risks and neglect knowledge and wisdom of old risks.

2. In reducing risk we may encourage further risks, whilst present increased risks may either offset or intensify future risks.

3. In not recognising a risk, we may allow further risks to develop and in recognising a risk we may construct new ideas about risks.

4. By avoiding hazards and vulnerability we can reduce a risk and by intervening in hazards and vulnerability we may manage risk for better or for worse.

Disaster education engagement therefore concerns constituent components of risk, risk stakeholders, and risk outcomes. The right to take risks and to decide on what is a risk is likely to be based on unique mixes of objective and subjective knowledge. The options are mediated by our choice of disaster education.
Some Findings

• Resilience as social relations and education
• Learning processes as a situation rather than for answers – i.e. education through ongoing monitoring and evaluation with varied solutions and actions – this process can also happen quickly
• Professionalism rather than managerialism in disaster education would be a sensible objective
• Disaster education also involves the capacity to be able to live with uncertainty in a manner that builds disaster preparedness and resilience – note pastoralists of southern Angola.