

Interactive comment on “Creative practice as a potential tool to build drought and flood resilience in the Global South” by Anne F. Van Loon et al.

Susanne Maciel (Referee)

susanne@unb.br

Received and published: 3 May 2020

This paper brings a very interesting review on creative practices in environmental issues, systematizing a large number of papers on art-based projects designed to foster awareness, behavioural change and communication between different groups. It also describes a pilot project in South Africa, where storytelling workshops were conducted to create community narratives about impacts of and preparedness for future droughts. I really enjoyed reading this paper, and in my opinion the paper is suitable for publication in Geoscience Communication. I would like to point out some considerations about the narrative and some minor issues throughout the text, that the authors and editors can feel free to incorporate into the final publication:

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



1) General comments

- The authors mention their project in South Africa as a pilot project, and they fit it in the narrative as filling a gap identified in the reviewed literature, when using creative process to promote awareness on floods and droughts issues in a co-production approach. In my opinion, the project should be described more as a complete research project rather than a pilot one, and include more aspects on the materials and methods, such as including pictures of the models that were presented to the community, and describing with more details how the workshops were conducted. This might be useful information for other groups that are conducting similar research.

- Still about the project in South Africa, it was unclear to me what is the relation between the researchers and the community. Why and how that specific community was chosen, and how the researchers are related to the community are important aspects when dealing with marginalized communities.

- The authors recognize the sensitivity of the research topic, when dealing with marginalized communities that are often denied access to structural measures (L42-45). This makes me comfort to point out some narrative aspects that might reinforce a hegemonic view on the subject. For example, it is repeated several times throughout the text that creative practices are useful to elevate hidden voices, but I think the authors should make it explicit to whom these voices are hidden. Also, the authors make an analysis of increasing number of papers in the literature focusing on art-based and creative practice in the research field of environmental and health issues. I was struck by the fact that “most art-based research is carried out in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom” (L129-130)”, and that Africa is the continent where most of these research projects are conducted. I am aware of several art-based projects happening in Latin America, by Latin American researchers. I can imagine that the same happen in other continents, and that these projects are usually not published in English. My point is that the authors could make a comment on the fact that since the keywords used by the authors are English words, you are automatically excluding a large num-

ber of papers written in other languages, and this turns your analysis biased. I don't think this is a problem, but I think it should be explicited in the text.

- I personally don't like the term "Global South", and I will explain why. According to Wikipedia, the term 'Global South' originated in postcolonial studies, and was first used in 1969. The term is highly used from 1980 till 2008, and even more afterwards, to define the set of countries that are poor, less-developed or oppressed and powerless. First of all, the term is inaccurate, because it refers to economic development notion by a geographic term. In this case, it includes communities in the North (L33), which is confusing and vague. Secondly, it homogenizes all countries in the southern hemisphere, and obscures important differences between them. The authors mention that "most researchers do not use the keyword 'Global South' in their titles or keywords" (L436), and I don't think this is a coincidence or lack of knowledge of the term. If the authors want to mention "poor communities", or "less developed communities", they should use these words, instead of highlighting a confusing term such as Global South. I highly recommend the authors to rethink the usage of the term.

- I agree with Louise Arnal's comments about Figure 4. I also found it difficult to follow. I would suggest that Table 1 be presented before Figure 4.

- The authors emphasize the need of evaluate the impacts of creative practice projects. In my experience, creative practice approaches usually show results in long term actions, and maybe this is an aspect that the autors could explore a little bit more in their literature review. The authors argue that the papers reviewed often describe a methodology without clear evaluation of its efficacy (L339), but how many of these papers describe long term projects?

- Still about evaluation, I would like to read how art-based projects usually evaluate their results, when they do. An interesting example is described by Strickert and Bradford: Of Research Pings and Ping-Pong Balls: the use of forum theatre for engaged water security research, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14, 1–14,

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

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915621409>, 2015.) They use the Forum Theater to engage the community and policy makers for water security issues, and they evaluate the impacts of the approach by analysing the audience interferences into the play for each scenario. It is a very interesting example of evaluation of how creative practice can foster communication between researchers, community and policy makers.

- Just for the sake of knowledge, and perhaps to complement the analysis made in L39-40, I also would like to mention some works that are carried out in Brazil, where long-term theater based projects are conducted with rural populations, that might interest the authors: Boas, R. L. V., Pinto, V. C., and Rosa, S. M.: The School of Political Theater and Popular Video of Federal District: formation by praxis, *Urdimento*, 1, 36–47, <https://doi.org/10.5965/1414573101342019036>, 2019. and Gomide, C. S., Villas Boas, R. L., Martins, M. L., Gouveia, L. R., and Dias, A. L.: Rural Education and Pedagogy of Alternance: UnB experience in the Kalunga historical site and cultural heritage, *The Brazilian Scientific Journal of Rural Education*, 4, 1–27, <https://doi.org/10.20873/uftrbec.e7187>, 2019.

- In L303, the authors mention that “in the workshops the narrative approach supported by data from the model scenarios allowed participants to use their imagination and exchange ideas”. I think this is a really important result of your work, and should be more explored in the text.

2) Specific comments

- Could you please give some reference on the usage of the term Traditional Ecological Knowledge? (L70)

- Could you please specify how did you infer the “preference for storytelling compared to other (more visual) methods”? (L230)

-L255: “attendance was low for some groups”. How low?

- How participants to the workshop were selected?

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

- In L273: Could you explain why and how did you inferred that the community members did not show understanding of how different types of drought were linked and space and time?

- In L296 the authors mention it was more difficult to communicate about scenarios related to human activities. Could you please explain why?

- I would like to see references on the usage of the SHETRAN model, and if possible, some figures of how these models were presented to the community.

-L324: Do you think your images could lead to biased illustrations of the community to the policymakers? Why?

3) Technical corrections

-L4 – In this study, (add a comma)

- L7 Art and creativity are for example often used for raising awareness of climate change and for encouraging behavioural change in relation to health issues. (change in relation to → concerning?)

- L14 These kinds or this kind of methodologies.

- L354 - Remove spaces between practioners/artists

- L32, Fig 4 caption, L194, L195, L330, L396 and L414 – Add an hyphen in end-product

- L247 3oC

-L358 Change “can lead to fatalistic views that are not helpful for instigating” to “can lead to fatalistic views that do not help instigate”

- L436 – Change specify to specified

- L437- 438 – Add an hyphen in Middle-Income and High-Income -L437 – Remove preposition “and vulnerable (indigenous) group

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

