Situating preparedness education within public pedagogy

Kaori Kitagawa

Cass School of Education and Communities, University of East London

k.kitagawa@uel.ac.uk

Abstract
Both 'disaster preparedness' and 'public pedagogy' have been broadly defined and diversely utilised. Preparedness has been dealt within the disciplines such as civil engineering, sociology of disasters, public health and psychology, rather than education. Recently, inquiries into the learning and teaching of preparedness is increasing in the field of education, and some of them position preparedness education within the field of public pedagogy. However, conceptual discussion as to how and why the two fields are associated has been limited. The primary aim of this paper is to fill this gap by drawing on public pedagogy literature that conceptualises 'publics' and 'pedagogies'. By doing so, the paper attempts to respond to Burdick et al's call for *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*.

Introduction
This paper contributes to the conceptualisation of two growing sub-disciplines in education: 'preparedness education' and 'public pedagogy'. Both concepts have been broadly defined and diversely utilised, and the treatment of 'preparedness education' as part of 'public pedagogy' has been increasingly seen in recent literature (e.g. Chadderton 2015a; Izumi and Show 2014; Preston 2012; Preston et al 2011). However, conceptual discussion as to how and why the two fields are associated has been limited – this paper aims to fill this gap. The approach taken by the paper is first, to review the intra-relationships within each concept – 'preparedness' as 'education' and 'publicness' of 'pedagogy' – and then to discuss the inter-relationship of the two concepts, situating 'preparedness education' in the realm of 'public pedagogy'. The paper broadly uses the term 'preparedness education' to encompass 'civil defence education', 'emergency education' and 'disaster education', which are utilised in preparedness literature.

Preparedness education is relatively 'a new enquiry in the field of education' (Preston 2012 1). According to the United Nations (UN/ISDR 2008), 'preparedness' refers to: 'The capacities and knowledge developed by governments, professional response organisations, communities and individuals to anticipate and respond effectively to the impact of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions.' Governments are pressured to enhance preparedness for disaster scenarios – whether manmade or natural – in order to cope with increasing and diversifying risks and threats. Preparedness operations are implemented through diverse methods, including leaflets, warning signs, school curricular, broadcasting and social media. Their purpose is to urge citizens to think about 'what they would do' and 'how they would respond' in case of a disaster. Such operations have tended to be considered as 'information transmission' rather than educational activities (Preston 2012 3). Moving beyond such 'advertising or public relations models', Preston (2012 3) proposes a 'pedagogical' approach based on the models of learning and teaching because preparedness activities are educational, aiming to change 'individual conditions concerning emergencies', including behaviours, emotions and perceptions. Instead of providing individuals with 'instruction', pedagogies of preparedness 'engage individuals in learning about emergency situations whether in preparation, response or recovery from a disaster' (Preston 2012 3). The observation that preparedness has been dealt within the disciplines such as risk management, civil engineering, sociology of disasters, public health and psychology, rather than education also applies to disaster-prone countries like New Zealand and Japan that have a rich history of preparedness (Chadderton 2015b; Kitagawa 2015a).

'Public pedagogy' is generally understood as 'various forms, processes, and sites of education and learning beyond or outside formal schooling' (Burdick et al 2014 2). As an outcome of an extensive mapping exercise, Sandlin, O'Malley and Burdick (2011) suggested a typology of public pedagogy literature as follows: 1) citizenship within and beyond schools; 2) popular culture and everyday life; 3) informal institutions and public spaces; 4) dominant cultural discourses; and 5) public intellectualism and social activism. The exercise revealed that the term had been 'given a variety of definitions and meanings by those who employ it' (Burdick et al 2014 2), and what 'public' means 'is almost unexplored in the literature' (Sandlin et al 2011 365). Burdick, Sandlin and O'Malley (2014) in their subsequent book *Problematizing Public Pedagogy* reinforce their concern towards this 'fragile' nature of public pedagogy literature in which 'authors often citing the term without adequately explicating its meaning, context, or location with differing and contested articulation of the construct'. Their call for 'problematising public pedagogy' aims to diminish 'conceptual confusion' and to endorse 'distinct theorizations' (Burdick et al 2014 3). To achieve this, three questions are posed: 1) the conceptualisation of the terms 'public' and 'pedagogy'; 2) what is 'pedagogical' about 'public pedagogy'; 3) why 'pedagogical', not 'curricular' (Burdick et al 2014 5). This paper aims to respond mainly to the first question in relation to preparedness education scholarship.

Methodologically, this paper uses a wide range of preparedness education literature and public pedagogy literature. Few educationalists have authored disaster preparedness (Preston 2012).[1] The paper consequently draws on a small group of authors who have written about the learning and teaching of preparedness. The leading scholar is Preston, whose sole-authored theoretical contributions (2008; 2010; 2012; 2015), as well as co-authored pieces focused on empirical findings (2011; 2014; forthcoming) are examined in the paper. The paper also interrogates a few other developments that connect disaster education to public pedagogy (Chadderton 2015a, 2015b; Kitagawa forthcoming). It should be noted that there is a rich body of literature available on preparedness 'curricula' (e.g. Johnson et al 2014; Adamson 2014), which focuses on 'what should be learned and taught'. It is significant to differentiate the two areas for the purpose of the discussion on 'public pedagogy'. In terms of public pedagogy literature, based on the typology offered by Sandlin, O'Malley and Burdick's in 2011, the paper reviews wide-ranging resources from their subsequent book of 2014, *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*, and the *Handbook of Public Pedagogy* edited by Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick in 2010. The paper particularly focuses on two conceptual works from *Problematizing Public Pedagogy* to explore the conceptualisation of 'public' and 'pedagogy': Savage's (2014) framework of *political, popular* and *concrete publics*, and Biesta's (2014) framework of *a pedagogy of the public, a pedagogy for the public* and *a pedagogy in the interest of publicness*. As an example of preparedness education *in the interest of publicness*, the paper draws on one particular theory from Japan – 'everyday-life preparedness [*seikatsu bosai*]' (Yamori 2011; Shiroshita 2010).

The paper is structured as follows. The first section discusses the key texts of preparedness education to identify how 'preparedness' has become educational, and how preparedness education has been linked to 'public pedagogy'. This is followed by a section on public pedagogy, in which the problematisation of the concept is discussed. The paper then turns to examine Savage's and Biesta's frameworks which theorise 'publics' and 'pedagogies'. In parallel, the section explores how 'publics' in preparedness education scholarship can be understood, applying those frameworks. The final section focuses on 'everyday-life preparedness', which is a new way of 'doing' preparedness currently promoted in Japan. The

---

[1] There is a book entitled *Disaster Education* (2011), edited by Shaw, Shiwaku and Takeuchi. The authors specialise in environmental studies.

paper concludes that the conceptual association between 'preparedness education' and 'public pedagogy' could be strengthened by the application of the framework of *a pedagogy of the public, for the public* and *in the interest of publicness*, which clarifies the nature of 'publics' in preparedness education scholarship. It is also suggested that the particularity of the field of preparedness education is that preparedness pedagogies cannot solely be *in the interest of publicness* but require all three forms.

Public pedagogical approaches to disaster preparedness
Preston's (2008) study on civil defence pedagogies in the US in the 1950s and the UK in the 1980s is one of the first works that considered 'preparedness' within the domain of education. Accepting the equivocal nature of the term, Preston (2008) conceptualises 'preparedness' as 'a set of *pedagogical* strategies', which encompass governments' efforts to educate the populations in preventing and reducing disaster impacts, as well as raising their readiness for disasters. As Preston (2008 469) indicates, the challenge for preparedness research lies on the fact that preparedness is 'rarely pedagogical in a didactic sense', like other synonyms such as 'civil defence', 'homeland security' and 'civil contingency'. Consequently, these terms have allowed various interpretations: 'behavioural ("Duck and Cover" drills used from the 1950s in the US)'; 'emotional (the 2005 DfES publication "Getting over 7/7")'; and 'cognitive (the short "Protect and Survive" films' made by the Central Office of Information). These 'preparedness scripts' (Preston 2008 469) are learning and teaching materials which guide the public 'how to' behave during and after an emergency. Preston thus links 'preparedness' with 'pedagogy' – which is about 'learning how to behave', not 'curriculum' – which is about 'what should be learnt', which corresponds to one of the questions on 'public pedagogy' raised by Burdick et al.

A clear link between preparedness and public pedagogy was made in the study that examined a security information campaign for citizens in the UK named 'Preparing for Emergencies'. Preston et al (2011 760) define 'preparedness' as 'a form of public pedagogy', arguing that 'public education campaigns on "preparedness"' should be considered 'within the sphere of education and pedagogy', 'rather than being associated with public information or marketing', 'to consider their functions beyond the provision of facts or state propaganda'. Preparedness as a public pedagogy is not only 'pedagogised', but also 'politicised' (Preston et al 2011 760) because such state interventions aim to inculcate in the public a sense of responsibility and an active learning spirit. As can be seen, the major focus of preparedness research has been on the pedagogical nature of preparedness, rather than a discussion on 'publicness'.

Preston (2012) in *Disaster Education: 'Race', Equity and Pedagogy* further classifies six 'pedagogies of preparedness', placing 'public pedagogies' as one of them. The term is referred to as the 'domains of popular culture which are not frequently considered to be an educational arena' (Preston 2012 5), which corresponds to Sandlin and Burdick's (2010 349 cited in Preston 2012 5) broad definition that 'public pedagogies take place in "spaces, sites, and languages of education and learning that exist outside schools"'. The book demonstrates the changing and diversifying nature of disaster education, which has become 'a multi-modal phenomena' in terms of 'pedagogical modalities (affective, [2] behavioural, cognitive, performative and "construction kit"[3])', types of 'mass media' '(print media, film, books, television)' and more recently, the use of 'social networks', 'citizen journalism' and mobile

---

[2] Designed as strategies for emotional management for citizens to cope with trauma and upheaval, aiming to foster in them 'a positive emotional attitude to preparedness' (Preston 2012 4).

[3] Meaning 'Do It Yourself instructions', provide guidance to citizens for them to construct their own shelters or to store food and water in the event of a crisis.

technologies (Preston 2012 95). In reference to those 'new media', Preston (2012 89-90) argues that preparedness 'has penetrated popular culture and individual consciousness…. Unlike earlier types of preparedness education (which operated through national and civil defence programmes) preparedness has become individuated, not even familial, in nature'. For example, 'zombie apocalypse' films are often applied to teach 'crude lessons' on preparedness (Preston 2012 91-93). Moreover, 'transmedia activities', where 'old media' – official narratives – and 'new media' – represented by popular culture – interact and form new narratives 'both in preparing for disasters and as disasters unfold'. 'Transmedia' is defined as: 'the telling of multiple stories in the same (fictional or non-fictional) "universe" across multiple platforms' (Preston 2012 97). A transmedia audience is 'omnivorous (browsing, grazing and searching out new information from a variety of media)', and also 'creative (creating sense from media and developing "new" stories such as fan-fiction)'. Preston's in-depth interrogation has illuminated the transformative nature of preparedness pedagogies, although with a restricted utilisation of the term, 'public pedagogy'.

Drawing on Preston (2008), Chadderton (2015a) conceptualises 'civil defence' – one of the synonyms of preparedness – in discussing disaster education in Germany. She discusses the two dimensions of disaster education: lifelong education and public pedagogy. Her argument is while disaster education being a type of education and learning 'over the life course, encompassing formal, nonformal and informal education' (Chadderton 2015a 589), it can also be defined as 'civil defence pedagogy' – 'a type of public pedagogy' – 'which contributes to the shaping narratives of national identity' (Chadderton 2015a 590). 'Civil defence pedagogy' being 'a type of public pedagogy' is accepted without a consideration as to why it is the case.

Chadderton (2015b) also looked at the 'Resilient New Zealand' programme promoted by the government of New Zealand, which aims to integrate resilience building at the national, regional and community levels. It is suggested that 'resilience' can be understood as a 'public pedagogy' because 'resilience has to be a learned behavior and resilience is therefore a form of political intervention – people have to be taught to be resilient' (Pollard 2014 199 cited in Chadderton 2015b 3). Referring to Sandlin et al's (2011) typology of public pedagogy, Chadderton does situate 'pedagogies of resilience' under 'dominant cultural discourses', which are circulated through public policy, political discourse and widespread cultural values. However, the focus of the analysis is on 'pedagogy', and 'public' is taken for granted.

I also referred to 'public pedagogy' in describing disaster preparedness in Japan. Examining a wide range of laws, policies, initiatives and campaigns developed and implemented by the government, researchers, not-for-profit organisations and educational institutions, the paper uses the term to indicate one of the pedagogical forms identified in the case of Japan (Kitagawa forthcoming). The application of the term is generic, and again, no conceptual clarification is made as to why preparedness education can be considered as 'a type of public pedagogy'.

An argument may be made that the publicness of preparedness is 'obvious' in preparedness education because preparedness is a national agenda, and it is under the government leadership that preparedness policies and initiatives are developed; hence it is rather the 'pedagogy' element that requires investigation. Such perspectives explain the approaches taken in the preparedness research examined above. In agreement with Savage (2014 80), this paper takes a step backward to revise such perspectives: '*public* is the framing device used to qualify the *pedagogical*…. A failure to define the public is a failure to frame the pedagogical'. Before discussing how to frame 'publics', the following section clarifies the major issues raised in the field of public pedagogy.

'Problematising public pedagogy'
According to Sandlin et al (2011), it was in the 1970s[4] when 'a subgenre of inquiry' in education – public pedagogy – became noticeable. Since then, public pedagogy literature have discussed 'educational activity and learning in extrainstitutional spaces and discourses' (Sandlin et al 2011 338), some of which seeking 'to broaden and deinstitutionalize conceptualizations of teaching, learning, and curriculum across the discipline of education' (Burdick et al 2014 2). The diversity of the interpretation and the utilisation of 'public pedagogy' is substantiated in the *Handbook of Public Pedagogy* composed in 2010, which includes a range of forms, processes and sites of learning 'in institutions such as museums', 'in informal educational sites such as popular culture…and the Internet' and 'through figures and sites of activism, including public intellectuals and grassroots social movements' (Burdick et al 2014 2).

The mapping exercise by Sandlin, O'Malley and Burdick (2011) was a breakthrough in the field of public pedagogy as it demonstrated 'an overwhelming absence of definitive and/or clear understanding of the term *public pedagogy*, either in terms of theorizations or empirical accounts' (Burdick et al 2014 4), although with some exceptions which were grounded on 'feminist, critical, cultural, performative, and/or activist dimensions' (Burdick et al 2014 2). The uses of the term have been 'mythologizing' (Burdick et al 2014 3) and 'totalizing' (Savage 2010 103). One example of such uses can be identified in Salvio's (2014) study, in which Battaglia's photographic works of anti-mafia movements is positioned as a public pedagogy. This type of public pedagogy falls under the second category of Sandlin et al's typology – 'informal learning and educational experiences that take place outside formal schooling within popular culture, popular media and everyday life', such as 'advertising, cinema and social media' (Salvio 2014 101). Referring to Giroux, who contributed to the development of 'how public pedagogy…perpetuates dominant, neo-liberal values', Salvio (2014 101) suggests public pedagogy 'at times imposes a hegemonic force, while at other times is used to enact cultural and political resistance and counter-hegemonic possibilities as well as generate critical engagements with knowledge that is difficult to recognise or to come to terms with'. This is then demonstrated through the analysis of Battaglia's works. As Salvio (2014 101) herself indicates, 'public pedagogy is understood as "a fluid concept"'.

The lack of theorisations identified in the mapping exercise was further clarified in the book *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*, which presented three particular questions: 1) the conceptualisation of the terms 'public' and 'pedagogy'; 2) what is 'pedagogical' about 'public pedagogy'; 3) why 'pedagogical', not 'curricular' (Burdick et al 2014 5). Following the 'problematizing public pedagogy' call, Savage (2014 79) strongly states that 'both *public* and *pedagogy* tend to lack clarity and together produce a theoretical haze, rendering the term both deceptive and theoretically airy'. This paper approaches these problems drawing initially on Savage's (2014) strategy, which is to establish 'clarity over what we mean by *public*' (Savage 2014 80):

public is the framing device used to qualify the *pedagogical*. By framing the pedagogical, the public maps the terrain through which pedagogical forces are claimed to be operating…. It is through this *act of framing* that a particular public is evoked, and this 'evoked public' is that which is ostensibly educated.

---

[4] Prior to this, there were five works published from 1894.

Researchers will be 'lost in the wilderness from the onset' if they 'do not clarify the public they are evoking when using the term *public pedagogy*' (Savage 2014 81). From here, Savage (2014) introduces three different publics – *political, popular* and *concrete*. This paper first employs this framework to probe the question of 'public' in disaster preparedness research.

***Political, popular* and *concrete publics* in preparedness education**
The first public is *political* that was originated in the idea of 'a specific polity' in political philosophy. According to Savage (2014 81), this public shares the 'membership of a particular political field', being spatially bounded and referred to as 'the' public rather than 'a' public. In Sandlin et al's typology, this public comes under '4) dominant cultural discourses'. An apparent example of this group is the nation state. Almost all preparedness education research is about political publics because the state is the primary stakeholder in making sure of national survival and security. Savage (2014 83) indicates two challenges in evoking a political version of public pedagogy. The first is that despite the high level of generalisability of the 'political and cultural norms' of this public, 'how exactly pedagogical processes operate' is not easy to be investigated. This point does apply to preparedness research which tends to focus on examining governments' policy approaches – a political and cultural norm. Preston et al's (2011) work is one of the rare empirical studies that investigated the operation of a pedagogical process. They conducted interviews of policy-makers and focus groups of two different ethnic communities to find out in Savage's terms, 'what exactly *educate* the public' and 'what educates *the people*' in the examination of the 'Preparing for Emergencies' campaign against 'terrorism threats'[5].

The other challenge posed by Savage (2014 83) stems from the public sphere becoming increasingly transnational because of cultural, economic and political globalisation. As a result, 'notions of coherent political publics carry less weight'. This does not seem to be the case in the field of preparedness education. One piece of comparative research (Kitagawa et al forthcoming) concludes that the distinctive systems of preparedness have arisen historically in each country, and that it is difficult to change the trajectory of a system, which has led to fewer cases of effective policy borrowing from other systems. Again, an explanation for the non-convergent nature of preparedness systems can be that preparedness agendas vary from country to country. However, Savage's (2014 83) following point is relevant to preparedness research: in the current global and transnational climate, 'the people and their politics…are educated by many other peoples and politics…. the education of citizens within a public cannot be understood by focusing solely on the educative influences produced within that specific political public'. Such 'interconnectedness' is increasingly recognised in the field of disaster management,[6] and pedagogies for preparedness should also take the interconnected nature of disasters into consideration.

Popular publics, which is the second public, have been dominant in cultural studies that treat 'everyday' 'cultural texts, artefacts and discourses as educative' (Savage 2014 84), which corresponds to Sandlin et al's typology '2) popular culture and everyday life'. 'Popular publics are less likely to be spatially referenced, because they come into being through processes of cultural distribution and consumption that often transcend specific geographical or political fields' (Savage 2014 84). As opposed to an individual being 'the political public', an individual can potentially be limitless 'popular publics', each of which operating differently within and across different political publics (Savage 2014 85). Such phenomenon is amplified under rapid

---

[5]A leaflet was distributed to every household in the UK, which was followed by a television campaign.
[6] 'Interconnectedness' is one of the major themes in the Anytown Project led by London Resilience in the Greater London Authority.

technological advancement and cultural globalisation. This group of publics is 'self-organizing' (Warner 2002 cited in Savage 2014 84) and self-nurturing, but their formation depends on 'complex processes of address and response' because 'the way this public is *assembled* and the scale of its *publicness* depends on the extent to which the act of addressing an unknown pubic…elicits a response' (Savage 2014 84). Popular publics often communicate about disaster-related matters via social media such as blogs and Twitter. Disaster alert applications, such as American Red Cross' mobile apps (2016) or 'Disaster Alert' developed by the Pacific Disaster Center (2016), which are becoming widely available, can also evoke popular publics because of their borderless nature, although these platforms are provided by professional bodies, not necessarily 'self-organizing'.

The third public is *concrete*. By this Savage (2014 86) means a form of public that is 'evoked to analyze *spatially bounded* spaces of learning, including cultural institutions…or geographically defined spaces'. This public differs from other publics for its focus on 'the concrete audience', who are a group of a public 'bounded by' an event or a shared physical space, such as theatre plays and public demonstrations (Savage 2014 86). Such feature leads to specific processes of address and response. The scale of address is 'relatively tight' since it is by choice of the addressees to be addressed – attending a theatrical performance or a demonstration. However, 'the *concrete* nature of these publics has the potential to become *popular*, and this can have *political* implications' (Savage 2014 87) because current technology permits the sharing of almost any address. A number of spatially-bounded preparedness projects have been developed around the world, which include the September 11 Memorial & Museum in the US, the Disaster Reduction and Human Renovation Institution in Japan[7] or the Tangiwai Memorial in New Zealand[8]. These sites are built on the basis of the 'earnest wish of people who experienced' the disaster 'to better prepare our society against…disasters' (Disaster Reduction and Human Renovation Institution 2015). Their purposes are clearly defined, put forward and shared with addressees. Concrete publics fall under '3) informal institutions and public spaces' in the Sandlin et al's (2011) typology. These sites are from the outset, built with specific pedagogical aims, and the visitors are very much aware of what to expect.

Savage's framework has helped clarify the types of 'public' that preparedness literature deals with and their pedagogical implications. While this paper agrees with Savage's (2014 89) point that 'it is crucial to recognize that *different publics exist*' and that public is 'not one thing' and everybody belongs to 'multiple and intersecting publics', inquiring 'publics' simply by spatial boundaries does not fully detect the complexity of 'publicness' involved in preparedness. This paper therefore draws on Biesta's (2014 16) work that offers 'an understanding of public pedagogy as…a specific form of doing educational "work", in which pedagogy "operates" in a public way'. On the basis of the role of pedagogues – 'who conducts intentional educational work' – as well as pedagogical locations and pedagogical forms, Biesta (2014 21) proposes three distinctions: *a pedagogy for the public, a pedagogy of the public* and *a pedagogy in the interest of publicness.*

A pedagogy for the public, of the public and *in the interest of publicness* in preparedness education

---

[7] A museum and research institute built in memory of the 1995 Hanshin/Awaji Earthquake in Japan, which killed 6,500 people.
[8] A night express plunged into the flooded Whangaehu River at Tangiwai on Christmas Eve 1954, killing 151 passengers. The worst railway disaster in New Zealand's history.

Biesta (2014 16) views that the role of public pedagogy scholarship is to join 'the educational and the political' and locate 'both firmly in the public sphere'. Drawing on Marquand (2004), Biesta (2014 17) starts by articulating the discussion on 'the decline of the public sphere[9]'. Biesta defines 'the public sphere' as a set of 'institutions and activities that mediate the relations between society and the state' (Mitchell 1995 116 cited in Biesta 2014 17). The public sphere has been threatened because the public logic of democratic decision-making, public duty and collective-interest have been taken over by the neoliberal market logic of choice, quality and self-interest, turning citizens into 'consumers of public services'. The public sphere should not be considered as 'a physical location but as a certain quality of social interaction', in which 'the public interest' is defined and 'public goods' are produced. For Marquand (2004 4 cited in Biesta 2014 18), the public sphere has 'its own norms and decision rules'. The human relationships in the public sphere therefore differ from those of 'love, friendship and personal connection' or of 'interest and incentive' that characterise the private sphere.

In probing what 'norms and decision rules' characterise the public sphere, Biesta turns to Arendt's theory on the interrelationships between *action, plurality* and *freedom*. 'Action', which is one of the modes of human beings' 'active life' (Arendt 1958 cited in Biesta 2014 18), is 'an end in itself, and its defining quality' is 'freedom' – the freedom 'to take initiative, to begin something new, to bring something new into the world'. '"Freedom as beginning" implies that freedom is not an inner feeling or a private experience but something that is by necessity a public and hence a political phenomenon (Biesta 2014 18).' Freedom hence requires a public space to make its appearance. Freedom thus only exists *in action*, but '*we cannot act in isolation*' (Biesta 2014 19):

If I were to begin something but no one would respond, nothing would follow from my initiative, and, as a result, my beginnings would not come into the world. *I* would not appear in the world. But if…others do take up my beginnings, I *do* come into the world, and in precisely this moment – but not before or after – I *am* free.

Actions are never possible without others, without 'plurality'. 'As soon as we erase plurality – the otherness of others by attempting to control how they respond to our initiatives – we deprive others of their actions and their freedom, and as a result, we deprive ourselves of our possibility to act, and hence of our freedom' (Biesta 2014 19). Plurality is therefore 'the condition of human action' (Arendt 1958 8 cited in Biesta 2014 19), and it is only under the condition of plurality that action is possible and freedom can appear – 'democratic freedom-as-beginning, not liberal freedom-as-sovereignty or communitarian freedom-as-sameness' (Biesta 2014 20). Once 'acting in concert' (Arendt 1958 cited in Biesta 2014 20) is reduced by regulating or filtering public spaces and by 'prescribing and policing what is "proper" and what is "deviant"', the conditions under which action is possible and freedom can appear will be eliminated.

With the above understanding of 'acting in concert' to 'begin something new', Biesta (2014 21) offers three 'readings' of public pedagogy and explores what kind of activities are appropriate in the public sphere. 'Each provides a different conception of what it means to make pedagogy public' and 'to conduct intentional educational work "in" the public sphere'. Biesta emphasises 'in which public sphere' is significant because the three conceptions of public pedagogy consider the 'location' differently, and therefore 'the connection between *pedagogy* and *public*' differently. What distinguishes the three most, however, 'lies precisely in what the public pedagogue *does*'.

---

[9] Marquand's term is the public 'domain'. Habermas favours the public 'sphere'. Biesta treats both as equivalent.

A pedagogy *for the public* refers to a pedagogy 'aimed at the public' (Biesta 2014 21). The pedagogical form taken in this pedagogy is instructive, and the pedagogical location becomes something like an imagined 'giant school'. Under such circumstances, the main role of the pedagogue is 'to instruct' the citizens 'how to behave' (Biesta 2014 22). This form of public pedagogy can be identified when the state, or its agent, teaches legal or moral lessons to its population. There may well be 'public curricula' which prescribe what to teach. A pedagogy for the public is the most visible and conventional form of public pedagogy in the field of disaster preparedness. Research has been focused around preparedness for the public as well. As discussed in an earlier section, 'Duck and Cover' drills introduced in the 1950s in the US and the 'Getting over 7/7' film made in 2005 in the UK are the examples of the states – the pedagogue – instructing their populations 'how to behave' in an emergency situation.

Biesta's view that a pedagogy for the public has a risk of 'the erasure of plurality' and 'the conditions for politics and freedom' can also be identified in the context of preparedness education. For example, based on critical whiteness studies and critiques of white supremacy, Preston (2008; 2010) argues that the protection of whiteness – particularly that of the white middle-class family – was prioritised in civil defence pedagogies in the US in the 1950s and the UK in the 1980s, which was 'a joint and reflexive project' of the states, communities and families. He goes on to argue that the state deployed 'racialised and eugenic discourse' to emphasise the importance of the continuity of whiteness in the context of an 'emergency' – both real and 'imagined' – for 'symbolic maintenance' (Preston 2008 480). Preston (2015) also looks at US government propaganda films of the 1960s. Promoting post-nuclear survival by building protected schools and other facilities, those films conveyed another message about racial assimilation. An absence of disaster education in Germany is an unusual example of a pedagogy for the public. Chadderton (2015a) argues that one of the major reasons for the German state not promoting disaster education derives from Germany's war history – the state has to portray itself as 'a functioning democracy', which successfully provides the citizens with safety. This is the 'lesson' given to the citizens – but by not offering public disaster education.

Biesta (2014 22) then moves on to suggest the next level of public pedagogy – a pedagogy *of the public*. In order for public pedagogy to be operated as 'a form of human togetherness in which freedom can appear', it is argued that the pedagogical form has to be 'learning rather than instruction'. 'The pedagogical work is not done from the outside…but is located within democratic processes and practices'. Nominated by the public themselves, the pedagogue plays the role of a facilitator in an imagined 'giant adult education class'. No prescribed curriculum is necessary for this public, but there may be a set of agreements to be shared. Referring to Freire's notion of 'conscientization' – 'a process aimed at the generation of critical awareness and "critical consciousness"', Biesta (2014 22) indicates that this form of public pedagogy values the processes of 'collective political learning', which relates 'much better to the idea of plurality'. The perspective that preparedness is pedagogical, not the transmission of information, sits well in this form of public pedagogy.

Biesta (2014 22) however, expresses a concern for this form of public pedagogy because it 'brings democracy under a regime of learning'. More concretely, 'learning is not some kind of open and natural process that can go in any direction but is rather a very particular and specific regime', which demands citizens to learn and allows the 'politics of learning' in place. Under such regime, social and political problems are replaced with learning problems, which then become learners' individual responsibilities (Biesta 2014 23). A similar point is also suggested by Preston (2010; 2012). A shift in policy discourse from 'national defence' or 'homeland security' – or 'disaster management' for that matter – to 'preparedness' and 'resilience' is about

transferring the focus from the state to the individual. Within the former, 'the individual is in the service of the nation and individuals are patterned on the survival of the state', whereas in the latter, 'the individual embodies the values of the state, with a covert form of nationalism in evidence' (Preston 2012 2). The 'politicised' nature of learning is discussed in the study of the 'Preparing for Emergencies' campaign. Preparedness as a public pedagogy draws 'increasingly on theories of learning rather than public information' (Preston et al 2011 750). This means that preparedness is increasingly aimed at 'realizing the political' (Giroux 2004 quoted in Preston et al 2011 750) 'in terms of not only responsibilisation but also through defining the subject of security as "the other"'. Another example of a politicised pedagogy of the public can be identified in the 'Resilient New Zealand' programme, which is a government intervention. However, as the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 states, one of the main purposes of the programme is clearly to 'encourage and enable communities to achieve acceptable levels of risk by identifying risks and applying risk reduction management practices' (Ministry of Civil Defense & Emergency Management 2016). Such focus on 'community resilience' is linked with 'community learning', permitting the state to renounce responsibility (Chadderton 2015b).

For Biesta (2014 23), both a pedagogy for the public – which permits the authority of 'the instructor' – and a pedagogy of the public – which shifts responsibilities from the collective to individuals – eradicate 'the public condition of plurality under which action is possible and freedom can appear'. Moving beyond these restricted forms of public pedagogies, Biesta (2014 23) argues for an alternative form, which works 'at the *intersection* of education and politics', in pursuance of democracy – that is, a pedagogy *in the interest of publicness*. This form of public pedagogy aims at 'an enactment of a concern for "publicness"', which is 'a concern for the public quality of human togetherness and thus for the possibility of actors and events to *become public*'. Becoming public is therefore about 'the achievement of forms of human togetherness in which action is possible and freedom can appear'. The pedagogical form is no longer instruction or facilitation as was the case in the previous two forms of public pedagogies, but becomes more 'activist', 'experimental' and 'demonstrative' (Biesta 2014 23). Being activist means that the action aims to develop 'real alternatives' – 'alternative ways of being and doing' and 'of acting in concert' – 'that reclaim opportunities for public relationships-in-plurality'. Such alternatives 'resist and push back' both 'the logic of the market' and 'incursions from the private sphere'. Such alternatives are therefore bound to be experimental. 'New ways of "doing" schooling', for example, are suggested – instead of focusing on 'individual advantage, competition and excellence', 'public ways of acting in concert' can be developed through 'cooperation and the hard work of living together in plurality and difference'. This form of public pedagogy is 'a pedagogy of demonstration' (Biesta 2014 23) – 'not a curriculum that has to be taught or has to be learned' – because 'such forms of experimental activism…demonstrate…that things not only should be done differently but actually can be done differently', and that 'there is always an alternative…against the often heard claim from politicians and policy makers that there is no alternative'. Thus, a pedagogy in the interest of publicness is 'entirely public, both in its orientation and in its execution' (Biesta 2014 23). For Biesta, it is this form of public pedagogy that restores the public sphere, in which the public logic of democratic decision-making, public duty and collective-interest is served.

There is not sufficient enough evidence on disaster preparedness initiatives which are activist, experimental and demonstrative because preparedness education research has so far focused on the policy and practice at the national level. Amongst what Preston (2012 6) refers to as 'folk preparedness pedagogies', which is an under-researched area being outside of 'official

discourse', a pedagogy in the interest of publicness may be found. The challenge for researchers is, however, folk pedagogies tend to be 'individual depiction of the best strategies to undertake in an emergency' (Preston 2012 6), which are less likely to be oriented toward 'acting in concert' to allow 'relationships-in-plurality'. Pedagogies of 'transmedia' mentioned earlier also have a potential. Transmedia has changed the perception of 'citizens' from '"passive" responders' to official correspondents, and to 'active agents'. It can be considered that pedagogies of transmedia are activist, experimental and demonstrative. Nevertheless, to what extent transmedia activities have 'plurality' is questionable, given the individualised nature of new media discussed earlier. One probable model of 'doing' preparedness differently and 'in concert' is what is referred to as 'everyday-life preparedness [*seikatsu bosai*]' (Yamori 2011; Shiroshita 2010) promoted by a group of preparedness education researchers in Japan.

Everyday-life preparedness in the interest of publicness
Until the 1995 Hanshin/Awaji Earthquake, the pedagogical approach to disaster preparedness was state-led and instructive, delivered by experts in Japan. The earthquake made the government and the population realise such preparedness for the public had limitations in case of a catastrophic disaster. As the year 1995 has been referred to as 'the start year of volunteering', the earthquake triggered civic participation in preparedness activities (Kitagawa 2010). Volunteering of the public was considered as part of lifelong learning activities, contributing to the development of 'the third sector'. Nevertheless, when the government promoted volunteering, it became subjected to 'politics of learning' – because of its individual responsibility which suits neo-liberal principles (Kitagawa forthcoming). As an alternative to these forms of preparedness pedagogies, everyday-life preparedness emerged.

Everyday-life preparedness involves a new conceptualisation of disaster preparedness. Yamori (2011 1) – one of the advocates of everyday-life preparedness – explains that it is 'rooted in life as a whole' and 'embedded in the culture of life':

Everyday-life preparedness does not consider disaster prevention/reduction as an independent activity separated from other aspects of everyday life. Rather, it emphasises integrating disaster prevention/reduction activities into every activity in daily life – ranging from work, study, hobby and leisure at the individual level, to elder care, children's safety, festivals and sport events at the societal level. In other words, disaster prevention/reduction activities must be 'built in' to these daily activities.

Everyday-life preparedness requires a shift from the preparedness of which goal is 'optimisation' to the preparedness which starts with 'what your own circumstances are' (Yamori 2011 29). When preparedness is instructed by the state and taught by a small number of experts, local communities and individual citizens tend to be reluctant to get involved due to a lack of resources and time. 'Built-in' preparedness is not additional. One well-known example of such preparedness is what is called 'cherry-blossom viewing on the riverbanks [*dote no hanami*]' (Yamori 2011 27). Cherry-blossom viewing in spring is a cultural event in Japan that the public enjoy every year. In many cities, cherry trees are planted along the rivers – and the reason for this involves preparedness. The riverbanks frost and freeze during winter. If nothing is done to maintain the soil before the rainy season comes in June, there is a risk that the banks may collapse, causing flooding. Cherry-blossom viewing on the riverbanks is a means to manage the risk by gathering many people to tread down the soil of the banks, while providing them with an opportunity to socialise and enjoy cherry-blossom.

The significance of 'built-in' preparedness has been reinforced since the Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami of 2011 (Kitagawa forthcoming). Both the government and the population realised that the existing preparedness approach was not sufficient enough, even if

individual disaster reduction systems were all optimised, and that there was a need to focus more on building 'a sense of community', 'a helping culture' and 'readiness as usual' (Yamori 2011 30) – to build 'a wealth of culture of disaster preparedness' to cohabit with natural disasters (Kitagawa 2015b). In this light, everyday-life preparedness focuses more on the notion of 'disaster reduction' that appreciates the benefits of nature and to minimise possible damage, than the notion of 'disaster prevention' that controls the power of nature (Yamori 2011 3).

It can be suggested that the pedagogical location, the pedagogical form and the pedagogue of everyday-life preparedness are corresponding to those of a pedagogy for the interest of publicness. Yamori (2011 9) suggests that although everyday-life preparedness is embedded in individuals' daily lives, it is supposed to be developed and put into practice by plurality in a public space in which 'equal partners in the common life of the society' encounter each other (Marquand 2004 27 cited in Biesta 2014 17). Yamori (2011 43; 81) also argues that everyday-life preparedness is initiated by the general public who know about their daily lives. They are the ones who voluntarily and 'actively' engage in preparedness building and 'experientially' try out and yield new preparedness methodologies. Moving away from the mode of instruction or facilitation, preparedness built into everyday life is thus 'a pedagogy of demonstration'. This form of preparedness education is 'entirely public, both in its orientation and in its execution'.

Conclusion
This paper was initially developed on the basis of an observation that there was a missing conceptual link between 'preparedness education' and 'public pedagogy'. Because of informal approaches often taken in the pedagogies of preparedness, preparedness authors have tended to claim that preparedness education is 'a type of' public pedagogy. The paper has argued that this association could and should be strengthened conceptually. Highlighting how preparedness education research had focused on examining 'pedagogies' of preparedness, the paper delved into the different meanings of 'publics' and their implications for pedagogies. Two theories were applied in deepening the understanding of 'publics'. Savage clarifies the spatial boundaries of publics, questioning 'where' a public belongs. Although 'publics' in preparedness literature can be classified under *political, popular* and *concrete publics*, the paper demonstrated that the framework does not necessarily capture the current debates in the field of preparedness education. The paper hence chose Biesta's theory, which addresses the forms of pedagogies and pedagogues, as well as the locations of pedagogies, emphasising the political functions of public pedagogies. The framework of a pedagogy *of the public, for the public* and *in the interest of publicness* has allowed a depiction of a variety of approaches in preparedness education, ranging from a state-led instruction model, to an individual-learning model and to an everyday-life model. The paper went on to suggest that everyday-life preparedness is a pedagogy in the interest of publicness, being an alternative experimental pedagogy of demonstration, in which citizens act in togetherness to develop their own preparedness methodologies.

The above analysis thus confirms that preparedness education can comfortably be situated within the field of public pedagogy, with the clarification of the differences in 'publics', utilising Biesta's theory. Preparedness education research has focused on the 'pedagogy' aspect of public pedagogy, overlooking the 'public' aspect of it. It is argued that the theoretical connection between preparedness education scholarship and public pedagogy scholarship can be enhanced through the differentiation between a pedagogy *of the public, for the public* and *in the interest of publicness*. It is also suggested that being aware of different publics will also broaden the areas of inquiries in the field of preparedness education.

One further observation is that it is probably unrealistic for a country to have all its preparedness education taking a form of a pedagogy *in the interest of publicness*. In fact, preparedness education should not entirely be pedagogies *in the interest of publicness*. In order for a population to be prepared for various disaster scenarios, preparedness education requires the combination of all three forms of pedagogies – state-led instructions, facilitated individual learning and act-in-concert civic activities. This is the specific feature that disaster preparedness entails. For instance, the first responders after a large-scale disaster should be organised by the government – the central and/or the regional – rather than citizens because the former caters for resources and equipment. In comparison with Biesta's 'evolutionary' perspective that public pedagogies should move away from a pedagogy *of the public* and a pedagogy *for the public* to become a pedagogy *in the interest of publicness*, the goal of preparedness education is not necessarily about evolving into the third model, but balancing between the three (Kitagawa forthcoming).

Two particular agendas remain, which require clarification in order to establish the relationship between preparedness education and public pedagogy. The first is about how to deal with public-private collaboration in preparedness that is increasing in, for example, New Zealand and Japan. Both the governments and experts argue that the notion of collaboration is very much at the centre of preparedness building (Kitagawa forthcoming). Does the field of public pedagogy accept such involvement of 'private'? How can we understand such collaboration that occurs in the public sphere? These questions deserve investigation. The other agenda is a need for inquiries into the practice of built-in preparedness. Ishihara and Matsumura (2012), for example, propose three different types of everyday-life preparedness – *everyday-life preparedness in the local community, everyday-life preparedness in the family,* and *various resources for everyday-life preparedness*. Empirical studies to probe how they manifest in practice, and what their processes of acting in concert are required.

References
Adamson, C. 2014. "A Social Work Lens for a Disaster-informed Curriculum." *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education* 16(2): 7-22.

American Red Cross. 2016. Mobile Apps. Accessed 11 May, 2016. http://www.redcross.org/get-help/prepare-for-emergencies/mobile-apps.

Biesta, G. 2014. "Making Pedagogy Public: For the Public, of the Public, or in the Interest of Publicness." In *Problematizing Public Pedagogy,* edited by J. Burdick, J. A. Sandlin and M. P. O'Malley. London: Routledge: 15-25.

Burdick, J., Sandlin, J. A. and O'Malley, M. P. 2014. *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*. New York; London: Routledge.

Chadderton, C. 2015a. "Civil Defence Pedagogies and Narratives of Democracy: Disaster Education in Germany." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 34:5: 589-606. DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2015.1073186.

Chadderton, C. 2015b. "Pedagogies of Community Resilience and the Implications for Social Justice: Contradictions from New Zealand". A conference paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research in Budapest. 11 September 2015.

Giroux, H. A. 2004. "Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-liberalism: Making the Political More Pedagogical." *Policy Futures in Education* 2 and 3: 494–651.

The Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake Memorial Disaster Reduction and Human Renovation Institution. 2015. "Message from Executive Director." Accessed 20 February, 2016.http://www.dri.ne.jp/english/center/index.html.

Ishihara, R. and Matsumura, N. 2014. "The Development and Evaluation of Teaching Material for Disaster Reduction in Daily Life." *Journal of Japan Society of Civil Engineers* 70(1): 1-12.

Izumi, T., and Shaw, R. 2014. "Civil Society and Knowledge, Education and Training in Risk Reduction." In *Civil Society Organization and Disaster Risk Reduction,* edited by T. Izumi and R. Shaw. Tokyo: Springer Japan: 115-133.

Johnson, V. A. et al. 2014. "Implementing Disaster Preparedness Education in New Zealand Primary Schools." *Disaster Prevention and Management* 23(4): 370-380.

Kitagawa, K. 2015a. "Continuity and Change in Disaster Education in Japan." *History of Education* 44 (3): 371-390.DOI: 10.1080/0046760X.2014.979255.

Kitagawa, K. 2015b. "Living with an Active Volcano: Informal and Community Learning for Preparedness in South of Japan." In *Volcano Crisis Communication: Observing the Volcano World,* edited by C. J. Fearnley et al. New York: Springer.

Kitagawa, K. Forthcoming. "Disaster Preparedness, Adaptive Politics and Lifelong Learning: A Case from Japan."

Kitagawa, K., Preston, J. & Chadderton, C. In print. "Preparing for Disaster: A Comparative Analysis of Education for Critical Infrastructure Failure." *Journal for Risk Research*.

Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management. 2016. "Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002." Accessed 22 February, 2016. http://www.civildefence.govt.nz/cdem-sector/cdem-framework/civil-defence-emergency-management-act-2002/.

Okumoto (Kitagawa), K. 2010. *Lifelong Learning in England and Japan: A Comparative Analysis*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Pacific Disaster Center. 2016. "Disaster Alert." Accessed 11 May, 2016. http://www.pdc.org/solutions/tools/disaster-alert-app/.

Pollard, T. J. 2014. "Education, the Politics of Resilience, and the War on Youth: A Conversation with Brad Evans." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 36:3: 193-213. DOI: 10.1080/10714413.2014.917902.

Preston, J. 2008. "Protect and Survive: 'Whiteness' and the Middle-class Family in Civil Defence Pedagogies." *Journal of Education Policy* 23 (5): 469-482. DOI: 10.1080/02680930802054412.

Preston, J. 2010. "White Apocalypse: Preparedness Pedagogies as Symbolic and Material Invocations of White Supremacy." In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz and J. Burdick (eds.) *Handbook of Public Pedagogy*. London: Routledge: 555–563.

Preston, J. 2012. *Disaster Education*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Preston, J. 2015. "Two Nations Underground: Building Schools to Survive Nuclear War and Desegregation in the 1960s." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 23 (5): 1-12. DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2015.1095174

Preston, J. et al. 2011. "Emergency Preparedness as Public Pedagogy: The Absent-Presence of Race in 'Preparing for Emergencies'." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 30 (6): 749-762. DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2011.625518.

Preston, J., Chadderton, C. and Kitagawa, K. 2014. "The 'State of Exception' and Disaster Education: A Multi-level Conceptual Framework with Implications for Social Justice." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 12 (4): 437-456.

Salvio, P. M. 2014. "Reconstructing Memory Through the Archives: Public Pedagogy, Citizenship and Letizia Battaglia's Photographic Record of Mafia Violence." *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*. 22(1): 97-116. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2013.877620.

Sandlin, J. A., O'Malley, M. A. and Burdick, J. 2011. "Mapping the Complexity of Public Pedagogy Scholarship: 1894-2010." *Review of Educational Research* 81(3): 338-375. DOI: 10.3102/0034654311413395.

Savage, G. C. 2014. "Chasing the Phantoms of Public Pedagogy: Political, Popular and Concrete Publics." In *Problematizing Public Pedagogy,* edited by J. Burdick, J. A. Sandlin and M. P. O'Malley. London: Routledge: 79-90.

Shaw, R., Shiwaku, K. and Takeuchi, Y. 2011. *Disaster Education*. Bingley: Emerald.

Shiroshita, H. 2010. "Towards the Actualisation of Collaborative Learning for Disaster Prevention [bosaikyoiku no jitsugen ni mukete]." In *Safety Science for Disaster Prevention and Reduction – A Proposal in Building a Safe and Secure Society [bosai/gensai no tameno shakaianzengaku – anzen/anshin na shakai no kochiku eno teigen],* edited by Faculty of Safety Science, Kansai University. Kyoto: Mineruva shobo: 98-114.

United Nations Secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN/ISDR). 2008. *Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response: Guidance and Indicator Package for Implementing Priority Five of the Hyogo Framework.* Geneva: UN/ISDR and the United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN/OCHA).

Yamori, K. 2011. *Promoting 'Everyday-life preparedness' ['seikatsu bosai' no susume]*. Kyoto: Nakanishiya.