



Interactive comment on “European education on natural disasters – a textbook study” by B. Komac et al.

B. Komac et al.

matija.zorn@zrc-sazu.si

Received and published: 27 September 2013

Comments to Referee 1:

According to Shaw et al. (2011, p. 2-3) our paper is classified as “formal” disaster education literature.

We’ll add suggested psychological references such as Paton and Johnson (2006), Terpstra (2011), Grothman 2006.

Reply to the question “Why was not better to review the appropriate curricula from each country instead of using textbooks”? We used textbooks instead of curricula because from curricula is almost impossible to figure out how much space is going to

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



be dedicated to natural hazards as the curricula is usually a guideline. Beside this the curricula differ very much among the countries - some are written on just a few pages with some general recommendations as others can be very precise and extensive. Also the curricula are somehow still just a theoretical frame, as textbooks are their implementation and reflect what actually is taught.

Reply to the question: "What is the hypothesis or research question for your research? ...". See comment to the Editor: A. Steinfuhrer C473.

Reply to the comment about the connection between finding and conclusion. See comment to the Editor: A. Steinfuhrer C473.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2255, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper