Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Raising risk preparedness through flood risk communication" by E. Maidl and M. Buchecker

E. Maidl and M. Buchecker

elisabeth.maidl@wsl.ch

Received and published: 2 June 2014

Dear reviewer, dear editor

Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript.

Response to major comments:

Major comments:

1) We consider the recommendation of tailored information as an important point, so that we emphasized this strongly already in the beginning as well as in the discussion. Our main point on one-way-communication is that it certainly does have some effect on receivers of such information, especially if conditions are beneficial like in Zurich (high

trust in authorities fosters that the information is taken seriously and adopted). However, due to limited capacity, the authorities hardly consider this in practice. Therefore, often one-way communication is used. Our study shows the potential and limitation of such a strategy.

We agree to consider the points the reviewer suggested: - "More specific focus in the current state of the art on evaluating effects of risk communication": The section will be re-structured (see also other reveiewer comment and our response).

- "Mention the potential role of flood risk maps as a part of dialogic strategies in the discussion / conclusion of the paper:" We agree to refer to this point in the conclusion.

- "Revisiting open questions raised in chapter 2 in the discussion/conclusion section to link the current state of the art and the conclusions from the empirical findings better" We will consider this recommendation when restructuring section 2.

2) Indeed, we argue that the positive evaluation of the information material is a predictor for increasing flood risk preparedness. Of course, how the material is perceived is also influenced by other factors, most of all by trust in authorities. We are aware that dependent and indipendent variables are related in a more complex way that a simple regression model can display. In order to investigate this in a more detailed manner, we run several regression analysis' with a different choice of outcome and explaining variables. We agree that this is an important issue, and it was also in our response to the other reviewer comment. Answering shortly: we did not describe the process our regression model was developed, and we restricted the presentation of our results to those models who are most informative in respect of the research questions: what effect can a one-way risk communication strategy have, and what factors influence risk preparedness.

Apart from giving results that show a more differentiated relation between our variables, however, we cannot step beyond describing the way variables are correlated. A serious causal interpretation is not possible by conducting regression analysis in a

cross-sectional study. This would require a longtime study. Our results show clear and significant correlations that may be used for future research that focuses more on causal explanation. We will address this explicitly in the section on limitations of our study.

3) In social science r2 values around .300 can be considered relatively high. We can include examples of other studies.

4) The final manuscript will be proof-read again.

Minor questions and suggestions for minor changes: Thank you very much for carefully reading the manuscript and providing this list. This is very helpful. We will not address all single comments here in detail, but consider them for proof-reading (see point 3, major comments) and when re-structuring the paper. We will also revise the tables in the appendix in order to provide such tables that help the reader better to understand operationalization of our key concepts. However we would not like to reduce these tables too much, because we felt that it is very valuable for future research to able to compare the content of questionnaires, question wordings, and the choice for variables suitable for scale construction.