

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-260-AC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Valeria Cigala et al.

Author comment on "Invited perspectives: "Natural hazard management, professional development and gender equity: let's get down to business"" by Valeria Cigala et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-260-AC1>, 2021

We wish to express our appreciation for both Reviewers' in-depth comments, suggestions, and corrections, which have greatly improved the manuscript. Each point raised has been answered, and the answers are highlighted in bold. Reference to lines refer to the marked version of the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1

In this perspective piece, the authors present and discuss the challenges related to gender within the natural hazards field on the bases of survey data. First of all, I want to congratulate the authors on this extremely relevant and well written piece. The article touches upon many issues around gender always in a critical way, which is what I appreciate the most about the piece. In my opinion, this article should be accepted for publication in NHES almost as is, but there is one clarification needed (which could play a rather large role for the meaning of this paper):

Was the survey aimed at women and men or only women? If both but only women replied, what does this tell us? If this is the case, I believe this is an extremely important point that should be discussed in the paper: e.g. why men did not take part in the survey? What could be the reasons? If it was only aimed at women, what were the reason? Could there be a risk of losing data on how men perceive (or don't perceive) this issue? I think then, in such case, this should be discussed. I am asking this because in p.2, line 46 it says "opinions of individuals working in the broad field of natural hazards".

Regarding your first question, the survey aimed at people identifying with genders, which are a minority in the field of natural hazards, i.e., mainly women, but also responses by non-binary individuals were considered. The reason is that we wished to highlight the usually unheard voices. The first "barrier" question was about which gender the responder identified with. If the answer was male, the survey stopped for the respondent; if the answer was female or non-binary, the respondent could continue to answer. As such we collected 121 answers from female respondents and 1 answer from a non-binary respondent.

We realised we hadn't addressed this point very clearly; therefore, we rephrased lines43-48 as follows: "In this 'invited perspective', we have put individuals identifying themselves with genders that are a minority in the field of natural hazards, i.e., female and non-binary genders, at the centre of the discussion. We

aim to concretely contribute to understanding the standpoint of these minorities who are often underrepresented, unheard and poorly considered professionally and in DRR policy and practice. Thus, this perspective qualitatively explores a collection of 121 opinions of individuals identifying themselves as female and one opinion of an individual identifying themselves as non-binary working in the broad field of natural hazards (in academia, in the industry, as practitioners or policymakers)."

In relation to the former point, how was the survey advertised? I think a few lines about this would help clarify the first point

The survey was distributed via email through Natural Hazards related mailing lists, NHESS Authors via Copernicus and a list of female professionals collected by the Authors through their networks. Moreover, the survey was advertised on social media, particularly Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook from the personal accounts of the Authors when available.

To clarify the promotion of the survey, we added the following text at lines 80-83: "The survey, i.e., link to the questionnaire with a short explanatory and motivational text, was advertised via email to the EGU NHESS author list and to a list of female professionals that the authors had collected in their networks. Moreover, the survey was advertised on social media, particularly on Twitter, through the personal accounts of the first two authors."

Minor points:

It may be that I couldn't find it, but it seems the abstract is missing (could only find the short summary)

We have not included an abstract in light of the structure of other NHESS invited perspectives. If the Reviewer or Editor thinks it is useful, we will add a few lines regarding the main objective, method, and general conclusions at the beginning of the paper as abstract. We hope for guidance by the editor, please let us know if we should provide an abstract during the revision of the paper.

1 line 19: I think it should be "... gender-based issues in DRR (even beyond ...)"

We accepted the suggestion of the Reviewer.

2 lines 30-31: this sentence needs referencing

The statement is the result of our personal search over the most common academic web engines. This is not the central core of the discussion, still we wanted to start the presentation of this topic with this broad statement. Thus, a new version of the paragraph has been proposed as follows (lines 33-38): "Based on our literature search, we recognise that for most disaster-related papers, gender was merely used as a dichotomous variable (usually together with a set of other socio-demographic variables) to test assessments and model results, which are the core of the papers."

2 line 33: I think this was actually discussed broadly also by Finucane et al. (2010), and more recently by Mondino et al. (2021)

We thank the Reviewer for the suggested references; we added them to the new version of this paragraph.

2 line 38: "non-technical" articles: do you mean articles in the social sciences sphere? Or articles that use qualitative as opposed to quantitative approaches?

Yes, we meant articles prominently in the social sciences that are often considered less technical. We clarified this in the new version of this paragraph.

2 line 56: I think this is a great approach to this type of data analysis!

We thank the Reviewer for the positive comment.

2 line 57: related to the first "major" point: was gender asked in the survey?

Yes, as pointed out above, gender was asked as a barrier question at the beginning of the survey. We also added a new sentence (lines 69-70) stating: "Individuals recognising themselves as male were excluded from the survey via a first barrier question about their gender."

4 line 84: "Samwise" do you mean "similarly"?

Yes, we have decided to rephrase with "similarly" for clarity.

7 lines 167-168: I think this sentence needs a reference

We added Cvetkovic et al. (2018) also at the end of this sentence.

7 line 200: "cognitive and experiential [...?]" I think a word is missing

We added the word "background" at the end of the sentence.

8 line 222: "aroused by" should be "brought up by"

We have rephrased it as suggested.

9 line 238: "unbalance" should be "imbalance"

We have rephrased it as suggested.

References:

Finucane, M. L., Slovic, P., Mertz, C. K., Flynn, J., & Satterfield, T. A. (2010). Gender, race, and perceived risk: The 'white male' effect. *Health, Risk & Society*, 2(2), 159–172, <https://doi.org/10.1080/713670162>

Mondino, E., Scolobig, A., Borga, M., and Di Baldassarre, G. (2021). Longitudinal survey data for diversifying temporal dynamics in flood risk modelling, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 2811–2828, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-2811-2021>

Personal opinion(s)

I would like to use this space to voice some of my personal opinions on the matter. These are not meant to influence the perspective piece in any way, but just to further discuss this relevant and (unfortunately) timely issue. While in general I agree with most strategies proposed in this perspective and in the other articles mentioned in Table 2, I find it hard to agree with the fact that "providing female-specific funding and support" is a good way forward. I am afraid this can very quickly turn into a double-edged sword, as in "she got that funding because it was women-only funding". Such approach in my opinion

would (maybe partly) address the symptoms, but without actually curing the disease. What we need in terms of funding, in my opinion, are evaluation panels that are diverse, that are held accountable, and that are trained. I have a similar opinion around quotas, which the authors also mention in their piece. Quotas are indeed controversial, and I found myself discussing their pros and cons many times with female and male colleagues. My personal opinion is that quotas can be detrimental to a woman credibility if she's put there because of quotas. Obviously, this would not be the case all the time, but it's definitely something that can be used against her at any point. I don't think it is worth the risk. At the same time, during discussions with colleagues, another point was brought up, i.e. that the "forced" presence of women through quotas can help normalise and promote gender balance within decision bodies. To be fair, I believe this entails a lot of wishful thinking and optimism.

We thank the Reviewer for sharing their valuable opinions. We fully understand the point raised, and we agree that quotas can be seen as controversial and that a general, more transparent reward structure could potentially be the way out of quotas. However, until more transparency is enacted, quotas can be a valuable tool as female-specific support.

As this comment brought very helpful comments, we decided to include this into the main body, now line 348-353.

In terms of motherhood support, I couldn't exactly understand what is meant by it in the paper, but again I believe that it's not only about "supporting motherhood" but rather "normalising fatherhood", even better so "parenthood". In my opinion, the intrinsic issue here is that, in most countries, parenthood seems to be a female-only prerogative. Now this would be one of the rare cases in which I would support a sort of "forcing", as in forcing both parties (i.e. both parents) to take an equal amount of parental leave, for example. I say I support this because I've seen it working in countries such as Sweden, where parental leave (maternal and paternal) is absolutely normalised.

We can only agree with the Reviewer; we also hope to see more countries taking political steps towards normalising co-parenting and genderless or gender equivalent parental initiatives. In the meanwhile, particularly in countries whereby work and parenting regulations for family caring tasks are taken over most if not only by the female part of the couple, we think it is essential that institutions and funding bodies provide female-specific support when needed. We have added this into the discussion, now lines 425-430.

Anyway, these were just two points that I felt like would be an interesting discussion-starter, and I hope the community will start discussing this seriously. Eventually, it is not about "making it easier" for women, it is about "not making it harder".

We couldn't agree more with the Reviewer, and we join you in the desire to see more discussion of the topic proposed here within the community.