

Interactive comment on “Exploring the change of Risk Perception and Adaptation Behavior among Varied Social Character Before and After Earthquake Disaster – A Case Study in Taiwan” by Tzu-Ling Chen et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 March 2020

Summary: As the title indicates, the objective of this manuscript is to explain changes in seismic risk perception and adaptation behavior after an earthquake among different demographic groups. The literature review references a number of relevant citations but also cites tangentially related and outdated citations and overlooks two important reviews and some very relevant recent citations (see the list below). The Introduction fails to state specific research questions or research hypotheses. The data set appears to be excellent but the procedures for sampling cases and measuring items are inadequately described. The Results section is subdivided by the major demographic

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



variables, but those headings don't accurately describe the presentation of results—some of which are about pretest-posttest differences that appear to be unrelated to the demographic variables. Moreover, the results are presented in a series of unconventional figures that fail to provide the reader with adequate information about the effects sizes for the impact of the demographic variables on the dependent variables or correlations among dependent variables. The Discussion and Conclusions focus on the effects of the demographic variables on risk perception and adaptation behavior but ignore the pretest-posttest differences. This is a significant limitation because these sections fail to address a major part of the study's stated objective. In addition, systematic reviews of the disaster research literature indicate that demographic variables have small and inconsistent effects on adaptation behavior, so the authors are probably focusing on the least important part of their study's results. Finally, as a general comment, I know from personal experience how difficult it is to submit papers that is not written in my native language. Accordingly, I seek the assistance of a professional editor before submitting papers in other languages. The authors of this manuscript should have done this already and should definitely do so before resubmission.

Line Comment 44 The section on risk perception cites literature that is either overly general (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, is about attitudes rather than risk perception) or outdated (Sjöberg, 2000; Sjöberg, 1996). Moreover, although risk perception might be influenced by internal and external factors, it does not “sum up” those factors.

64 The title makes it reasonably clear what are the study's research objectives, but there is no clear statement of research questions or research hypotheses at the conclusion of the Introduction. This might be why the Results and Discussion sections fail to adequately describe the changes in risk perception and adaptation behavior.

78 Figure 1a is sufficient for a research article. Figure 1b, 1c, and 1d are only of interest to local authorities.

89 It is unclear what it meant by “simple random sampling”. Is this simple random sam-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

pling from a sample frame (i.e., a list of telephone numbers) or random digit dialing?

99 The section describing the measures should not be referring to the research literature. Those references should have already been cited in the Introduction's literature review. Instead, this section should specifically describe each item in the questionnaire and how it was measured. Thus, the description of the items "probability of an earthquake disaster occurring within ten years", "fear of earthquake", and "worry of building collapse" should list the exact English translation of those items and list the rating scale anchors that were used (e.g., "Not at all = 1 to Almost a certainty = 7" for the earthquake probability rating). The items measuring "the impacts they expected from the disaster" should be replaced by a statement of the specific impacts that were listed.

114 Most of the first paragraph in this section is, or should be, common knowledge among survey researchers. Consequently, all but the last sentence should be deleted—should be Figure 2.

142 Table 1 should also contain data for the distributions of gender, age, education, occupation, and homeownership for the study area so readers can assess the extent of sample bias.

144 Section 3.1 is labeled sex but presents a number of results that appear to be unrelated to sex differences. Specifically, "the earthquake probability (the P value of 0.049), the fear of earthquake (the P value of 0.000), and the willingness on house retrofit (the P value of 0.002) are statistical significance indicating a serious earthquake indeed increase awareness of disaster" seems to be a pretest-posttest comparison that is unrelated to sex differences. This problem continues throughout the rest of the Results section.

148 Figure 3 presents the results in a format that is rather inventive, but extremely confusing and relatively uninformative, compared to the conventional method of presenting a matrix containing the variables' means in the first column, the standard deviations in the second column, and the intercorrelations in the remaining columns. In addition

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

providing effect sizes for to the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables, a correlation matrix allows the reader to see the correlations among the dependent variables (see Lindell & Hwang, 2008, for an example). Providing this correlation matrix will eliminate the need for Figures 4-7, as well.

191 The Discussion section only addresses the effects of the demographic variables, ignoring the effects of changes in risk perception and their possible effects on risk reduction actions.

200 Figures 8-10 might be useful for guiding local officials' hazard awareness programs, but they do not contribute to general scientific knowledge. Thus, they should be deleted.

References J.S. Becker, D. Paton, D.M. Johnston, K.R. Ronan, A model of household preparedness for earthquakes: how individuals make meaning of earthquake information and how this influences preparedness, *Nat. Hazards*. 64 (2012) 107–137. J.S. Becker, D. Paton, D.M. Johnston, K.R. Ronan, J. McClure, The role of prior experience in informing and motivating earthquake preparedness, *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 22 (2017) 179–193. J.S. Becker, S.H. Potter, S.K. McBride, A. Wein, E.E.H. Doyle, D. Paton, When the earth doesn't stop shaking: How experiences over time influenced information needs, communication, and interpretation of aftershock information during the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence, New Zealand, *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 34 (2019) 397–411. E.E.H. Doyle, J. McClure, S.H. Potter, J.S. Becker, D.M. Johnston, M.K. Lindell, S. Johal, S.A. Fraser, M.A. Coomer, Motivations to prepare after the 2013 Cook Strait Earthquake, N.Z., *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 31 (2018) 637–649. M.K. Lindell. North American cities at risk: Household responses to environmental hazards. In H. Joffe, T. Rossetto & J. Adams (Eds.). *Cities at Risk: Living with Perils in the 21st Century*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2013:109-130. M.K. Lindell, S.N. Hwang, Households' perceived personal risk and responses in a multihazard environment. *Risk Anal.* 28 (2008) 539-556. C. Solberg, T. Rossetto, H. Joffe. The social psychology of seismic hazard adjustment: Re-evaluating the international literature. *Nat. Haz. Earth Sys.*

Sci. 10 (2010) 1663-1677.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-422>, 2020.

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

