



1 **Brief Communication - ALARM: an innovative protocol of educating**
2 **on seismic risk perception, and its assessment**

3 **Maria Vittoria Gargiulo^{1*}, Ferdinando Napolitano¹, Ortensia Amoroso¹, Raffaella Russo¹,**
4 **Paolo Capuano¹.**

5 ¹Dipartimento di Fisica “E.R. Caianiello”, Università degli Studi di Salerno, Fisciano (SA), Italia

6 * **Correspondence:**
7 Corresponding Author
8 mgargiulo@unisa.it

9 **Keywords: Science Communication, Serious Games, Risk Perception, Seismic risk, Climate**
10 **Change**

11 **Abstract**

12 The effectiveness of risk mitigation depends also on how well-prepared and informed society is about
13 the risk itself. The younger generation plays a key-role in the scientific awareness of society,
14 representing both the future of society, and a conduit to reach and educate their families. We developed
15 a didactic experience, based on Serious Games, dedicated to seismic risk that was tested and then
16 implemented during the whole COVID19 pandemic.

17 Before the start and at the end of any of these activities, an evaluation phase was carried out to assess
18 the learning experience and the effectiveness of the science communication technique.

19 **1. Introduction**

20 Science and its perception are of fundamental importance for the resilience of our society. COVID19
21 has been a huge “alarm bell” in this sense: the societal reaction to science, and the trust citizens have
22 in it, highly depend on how scientific results are communicated (Reuter and Spielhofer, 2017; Reuter
23 et al., 2019; Appleby-Arnold et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2008).

24 It is therefore crucial to develop new strategies and protocols to communicate science and risk (Belser
25 et al., 2018; Kikas et al., 2009; Fernandez and Shaw, 2013; Musacchio, G. and S. Solarino, 2019).

26 From the geological point of view, Italy is one of the most complex, hazardous, and therefore
27 scientifically interesting country in the world, characterized by high seismic hazard. In particular,
28 focusing on Campania region (Southern Italy), this area was struck on 23rd November 1980 by one of
29 the strongest seismic events in Italy (the Irpinia earthquake, M_W 6.9). It becomes thus of fundamental
30 importance educating and informing about the concept of risk in general, and specifically seismic risk
31 (Dallo et al., 2022). Furthermore, the younger generations play a key role in the scientific awareness
32 of society, representing, on the one hand, the future of society and, on the other hand, a conduit to reach
33 and educate their families. Nonetheless, when dealing with younger generations, one has to be careful
34 with setting up the correct language and to make them feel involved in the experience (Musacchio et
35 al. 2019).

36 In this perspective, the use of Serious Games, training tools in which serious and playful aspects are
37 ideally balanced, which is certainly an innovative practice in science communication (Fotaris and
38 Mastoras, 2019; Lathwesen and Belova, 2021; Lopez-Belmonte et al., 2020; Veldkamp et al., 2021), is
39 gaining momentum since it favours participants' learning through their active involvement in the
40 experience.

41 We developed an educational protocol dedicated to high school students that combined a seminar on
42 the basic concepts of seismology and seismic risk education with a serious game that would allow



Running Title

43 students to assimilate the content while keeping the overall experience light and interactive, and the
44 learning informal.

45 Our goal was to allow the students to be at the centre of the action while not only learning the scientific
46 content but also developing problem solving and leadership skills.

47 The experiences were, then, repeated in different contexts with classes from different parts of the
48 region, using different platforms. The results allowed us to better understand how to customise it for
49 different targets and situations. Finally, we developed an evaluation protocol with the aim of assessing
50 the impact of the use of our protocol when communicating and teaching the concept of seismic risk on
51 both risk perception and interest towards science and geophysics. This paper focuses on the results of
52 such evaluation.

53 2. Methods

54 In the following we will describe the protocol, the data used to perform the analysis and, finally the
55 methodology applied to analyse the collected data.

56 2.1 Protocol

57 Our protocol, which targets secondary school students (15-18+), consists of a frontal lecture part (1h)
58 and an innovative teaching part based on the use of a virtual escape room called ALARM (1h), a
59 crossword for eArthquake, heLp, mAgNitude, epicenteR, seisMologist. An escape room is a game in
60 which a team of players discover clues, solve puzzles, and accomplish tasks in one or more rooms to
61 reach a specific goal in a limited amount of time. The goal is often to escape from the site of the game.
62 In a virtual escape room, the “room” can also be figurative. Most escape games are cooperative but
63 competitive variants exist.

64 The number of simultaneous participants of the protocol oscillated in a range between 15 and 60 pupils.
65 For them to interact with in the Serious Game we used a platform for online pools. The platform in
66 which the videoconference was set is Google Meet (The use of a specific platform in this case was
67 related to a choice of the participant schools because of privacy policies, nonetheless many others
68 videoconference platforms are feasible).

69 The frontal lesson is dedicated to the basic topics of seismology such as the definitions of earthquake,
70 seismic waves, focal mechanisms, seismic risk, and the Italian map of hazard. During this part of the
71 protocol, pupils are given tools and keywords to solve riddles and puzzles of the following escape
72 room. On the other hand, the escape room single enigmas are customized on the targeted pupils and
73 their academic and social background.

74 In this way, the protocol allows students to acquire both specific topics, such as the physical quantities
75 of an earthquake, e.g. location and magnitude, and general concepts, such as the perception of seismic
76 risk and the impact of man in the prevention, in the possible induction and in the response to an
77 earthquake.

78 In our case, participants acquire basic concepts of seismology, learn the basic techniques for locating
79 an earthquake and determining its magnitude. They are given tasks and missions that they can only
80 solve with the knowledge they will gradually discover during the game. Moreover, the virtual character
81 of the activity makes it inclusive towards motor disabilities.

82 In the tuning phase, ALARM has been replicated in different contexts with classes from different parts
83 of the region and through different platforms (also for ethical/legal reasons due to the presence of
84 minors) with general and specific results.

85 2.2 Data collection and analysis methodology

86 Before and after the practices, students and teachers were submitted a form to assess, on the one hand,
87 the preliminary status of knowledge and interest and the expectation on the experience; on the other



Running Title

88 hand, the impact of the event. The form was a google form on which every pupil could access only
89 once from his/her own personal device by scanning a QR code. Due to the pandemic the students were
90 each one in his own house and thus we can presume they did not exchange each other information
91 concerning their answers, given the amount of time they were given to answer the forms and the
92 goodwill of the participating pupils.

93 Data were collected using anonymisation, furthermore no personal sensitive data (age, gender, religion,
94 etc) were used and collected if not in aggregated form. Nobody was obliged to respond to any of the
95 question if it could in any sense offended them.

96 The evaluation form consisted in multiple choice, Likert scales and open questions. The Likert scale
97 (Likert, 1932) is a psychometric scale commonly used to derive the attitude towards the given object,
98 event, or concept. Respondents make a choice on a numerical scale that we set from 1 to 5.

99 While the multiple choice and the open questions were used to allow more personal inputs which were
100 considered as qualitative results of the investigation. A test group experienced the protocol reversed,
101 i.e. virtual escape room followed by the frontal lecture, to evaluate the effect of the inversion.

102 To assess whether the pupils have assimilated the concepts proposed in the protocol, it is useful to
103 evaluate the statistical correlation of the answers before and after the experience, via a t-Student test
104 (Student, 1908) with a hypothesis on the significance of the distribution difference. In fact, 99%
105 probability and 112 degrees of freedom corroborates the significance of all the mean values differences
106 of the answers before and after the training section. To ensure internal consistency of data and retrieve
107 how closely related is a set of variables of as a single indicator, we verified the Cronbach alpha of all
108 the data sets. Such measure allows to use the mean values of the Likert scales to compare the before
109 and after results. Finally, the effect of the inversion on the test group was investigated via a Chi Quadro
110 test, with a rejection of the null hypothesis for $p < 0.05$.

111 112 students participated in ALARM of which 15 experienced the protocol reversed. 93% of the
112 students are minors 15 y.o. (3%), 16 y.o. (47%) and 17 y.o. (43%), while the rest 7% is 18+ y.o..
113 Gender wise the participants were almost twice as many females (63%) than males (34%), with 3%
114 not revealed. It is also clear that most of the students (96%) were not familiar with recreational or
115 educational escape rooms before this experience. Among the 4% of the students who had previously
116 participated in a Virtual Escape Room, only 1 had joined a recreational one, the rest had already
117 experienced a didactic/educative one.

118 3. Results

119 To ensure internal consistency of data and retrieve how closely related is a set of variables of as a single
120 indicator, we verified the Cronbach alpha, of all the data sets, i.e. Group 1 – pupils who experienced
121 the direct protocol; Group 2 – pupils who experienced the inverse protocol; Group 3 – all the pupils;
122 Group 4 – 15 randomly selected pupils from Group 1.

123

124 **Table 1 - Cronbach Alpha results**

125

Phase	Group	Cronbach Alpha	Phase	Group	Cronbach Alpha
PRE	1	0.72	POST	1	0.71
PRE	2	0.71	POST	2	0.85
PRE	3	0.73	POST	3	0.75
-	-	-	POST	4	0.71

126

127 As showed in Table 1, the obtained results (Cronbach alpha > 0,70) indicate a large correlation and large
128 consistency between the indicators.

129 Such measure has allowed to use the mean values of the Likert scales to compare the before and after
130 results.



Running Title

131 3.1 Pre vs Post : Group 3

132 In the following we will display the result obtained by confronting the pre and post evaluation for
133 Group 3: all the pupils.

134 3.1.2 Quantitative Results

135 To assess whether the pupils have assimilated the concepts proposed in the protocol, we evaluated the
136 statistical correlation of the answers before and after the experience, via t-Student test with a hypothesis
137 on the significance of the distribution difference for Group 3. The results are shown in Table 2.

138
139 **Table 2 - t Student test result for Group 3 comparing pre and post protocol**

	PRE		POST		p value
	μ	σ	μ	σ	
Question A	3	1	3,6	0,9	0,0002
Question B	2,6	0,9	3,3	0,8	5E-10
Question C	2,6	0,9	3,3	0,8	8E-08
Question D	2,7	0,9	3,3	0,9	1E-07

140
141 For all the questions in exam the test results in the rejection of the null hypothesis with 99% probability
142 ($p < 0.01$) and 112 degrees of freedom, corroborating that there is a significant divergence between the
143 two distributions, i.e. pre and post protocol.

144 It is interesting to see what this difference implies for each question.

- 145 • Question A - How much and how do you think the telematics mode will affect the experience?

146 The Likert scale was set from 1 (very negative impact) to 5 (very positive impact). The pre protocol
147 mean value is set on 3 (null impact) while the post protocol mean value is 3.6 (null to positive impact).
148 Which hints to the fact that the use of the Escape Room, which would not be possible in a live setting
149 with the same amount of people, was considered as a positive feature.

- 150 • Question B - How would you rate your knowledge of earthquakes?

151 The Likert scale was set from 1 (very low knowledge) to 5 (expert knowledge). The pre protocol mean
152 value is set on 2,6 (lower than average) while the post protocol mean value is 3.3 (higher than average).
153 Which hints to the fact that the students perceived the protocol as effective and a learning experience.

- 154 • Question C - How would you rate your awareness of your region's seismic risk?

155 The Likert scale was set from 1 (very low awareness) to 5 (very high awareness). The pre protocol
156 mean value is set on 2,6 (lower than average) while the post protocol mean value is 3.3 (higher than
157 average). Which hints to the fact that the students perceived the protocol as effective in communicating
158 the concept of seismic risk.

- 159 • Question D - How interested are you in geophysics?

160 The Likert scale was set from 1 (very low interest) to 5 (very high interest). The pre protocol mean
161 value is set on 2,7 (low to null interest) while the post protocol mean value is 3.3 (null to high interest).
162 Which hints to the fact that the protocol had a positive impact on the pupils' interest in science and
163 geophysics.

164 3.1.2 Qualitative Results

165 The post protocol questionnaire had three more questions, whose answer we report in the following.

166 To test the students' perception of their own learning in the overall experience, we asked them about
167 what educational goals they thought they achieved with the escape room.

168 Students perceived the overall experience as positive not only in the acquisition of new content
169 knowledge and skills but also in elaborating and testing on previous and acquired ones.



Running Title

170 Around 20% of the pupils have found the experience as team building and as a booster in the motivation
171 to further undergo studies of geophysics. A little more than 5% of the students have found the
172 experience as a formative assessment.
173 Moreover, to test the likeability of the protocol for, we used standard marketing questions for retention
174 and advocacy considering our protocol and “the product”. The protocol obtained a 98% of retention
175 and a 94% of advocacy.

176 3.1 Direct vs Inverse protocol: Group 2 & 4

177 In the following we will display the result obtained by confronting the direct and inverse protocol
178 post evaluation for Group 2 – pupils who experienced the inverse protocol – and Group 4 – 15
179 randomly selected pupils from the ones who were subject to the direct protocol.
180 We applied Chi Quadro test to Group 2 and 4, with a rejection of the null hypothesis for $p < 0.05$ (95%).
181 Table 3 shows the results.

182
183

Table 3 - t student and χ^2 test for post results of Group 2 and 4

	Group 4		Group 2		χ^2
	μ	σ	μ	σ	
Question A	4,0	1,1	3,4	0,7	0,40
Question B	3,7	0,8	4,0	0,8	0,98
Question C	3,2	0,7	3,6	0,6	0,93
Question D	3,5	0,7	4,1	0,7	0,93

184
185
186
187

Both tests fail to reject the null hypothesis with the significance we have chosen to be valid (95%)
and therefore it is not possible to conclude that the two distributions (for each question) significantly
differ.

188 4 Discussion and conclusion

189

190 We developed an educational protocol dedicated to high school students (15-18+) that combined the
191 theoretical phase with a seminar on the basic concepts of seismology and seismic risk education with
192 a serious game that would allow students to assimilate the content while keeping the overall experience
193 light and interactive, and the learning informal. By using the evaluation protocol, we managed to assess
194 the impact of our protocol when communicating and teaching the concept of seismic risk on both risk
195 perception and interest towards science and geophysics.

196 The results are very encouraging and show that the students perceived the protocol as effective and a
197 learning experience both in the basic concepts of seismology and in the risk perception. The protocol
198 had, also, a positive impact on the pupils' interest in science and geophysics. Among the qualitative
199 answers of the evaluation forms, in fact, many students referred to the realization of how close this
200 topic or science in general is to everyday life, hinting at a growth in the Science Capital of the
201 participants.

202 We also investigated the effect of an inversion in the protocol, i.e. the Escape Room was played before
203 the seminar, allowing the pupils to experience first what they would learn later. In this case the results
204 were, as expected, not significant. On one hand, in fact, our protocol is too short to allow a full
205 development of an Inquiry Based Learning (IBL) methodology, on the other hand, the test group with
206 which we were able to test the inversion was little. For these reasons, a deeper investigation of the
207 inversion consequences could be a future step of this research.

208 In our believes, one of the factors that helped the success of the protocol was the age of the selected
209 target. In fact, the developed puzzles and the discussed topics need a level of consciousness of both



Running Title

210 mathematics and logic that is generally developed in high school. (Kikas et al., 2009; Lefa, 2014;
211 Ojose, 2008).

212 Possible further developing of the protocol can investigate the impact of gender, socio-economic
213 context and psychological factors possible influencing the results.

214 Another possible feature to investigate is how the number of simultaneous participants impacts on the
215 efficacy of the protocol.

216

217 **5 Conflict of Interest**

218 *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial*
219 *relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*

220 **6 Author Contributions**

221

222 MVG and FN performed the data collection and analysis. MVG, FN and OA conceived this work.
223 MVG, FN, RR and OA were involved in the interpretation of results. MVG wrote the paper. PC
224 provided funding for this work and coordinated the working group. All co-authors were involved in
225 the review of the manuscript.

226 **7 Funding**

227 This work has been supported by European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program
228 under grant agreement No 101021746. This presentation reflects only the author's view and that the
229 Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

230 **8 Acknowledgments**

231 The data analysed in this paper were collected during the 2021/22 edition of the *Piano Lauree*
232 *Scientifiche* – PLS (Scientific Degree Plan) at the department of Physics “E.R. Caianiello” of the
233 University of Salerno. For this we acknowledge Prof. Roberto De Luca and the Piano Lauree
234 Scientifiche Committee of the Dipartimento di Fisica “E.R. Caianiello” of the University of Salerno.
235

236 **9 Reference**

237

238 Appleby-Arnold, S.; Brockdorff, N., and Callus, C. (2021). Developing a “culture of disaster
239 preparedness”: The citizens' view, *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, Vol. 56, 102133, ISSN 2212-4209.
240 doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102133

241

242 Belser, C.T., Shillingford, M.A., Daire, A.P., Prescod, D. J., and Dagley, M.A. (2018). Factors
243 Influencing Undergraduate Student Retention in STEM Majors: Career Development, Math Ability,
244 and Demographics. *The Professional Counselor* Vol. 8, Issue 3, Pages 262-276 NBCC, Inc. and
245 Affiliates. doi:10.15241/ctb.8.3.262

246

247 Cronbach, L.J. (1951) Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* 16, 297–334.
248 doi:10.1007/BF02310555

249

250 Dallo I., Corradini M., Fallou L. & Marti M. (2022). How to fight misinformation about earthquakes?
251 - A Communication Guide. doi:10.3929/ethz-b-000530319.

252



Running Title

- 253 Fernandez, G., and Shaw, R. (2013). Youth Council Participation in Disaster Risk Reduction in Infanta
254 and Makati, Philippines: A Policy Review. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Sci.*, 4 (3): 126–136.
255 doi:10.1007/s13753-013-0014-x
256
- 257 Fotaris, P., & Mastoras, T. (2019). Escape Rooms for Learning: A Systematic Review. Proceedings of
258 the 13th International Conference on Game Based Learning, ECGBL 2019 (pp. 235-243). Academic
259 Conferences and Publishing International Limited. doi:10.34190/GBL.19.179
260
- 261 Kikas, E., Peets, K., Palu, A., Afanasjev, J. (2009). The role of individual and contextual factors in the
262 development of maths skills, *Educ. Psychol.*, 29:5, 541-560. doi: 10.1080/01443410903118499
263
264
- 265 Lathwesen, C., and Belova, N. (2021). Escape Rooms in STEM Teaching and Learning - Prospective
266 Field or Declining Trend? A Literature Review. *Educ. Sci.*, 11, 308. doi:10.3390/educsci11060308
267
- 268 Lefa, B. (2014). The Piaget theory of cognitive development: an educational implications. *Educ.*
269 *Psychol.*
270
- 271 Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Psychol.*, 22 140, 55.
272
- 273 López-Belmonte, J., Segura-Robles, A., Fuentes-Cabrera, A., and Parra-González, M.E. (2020).
274 Evaluating Activation and Absence of Negative Effect: Gamification and Escape Rooms for Learning.
275 *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 17, 2224. doi:10.3390/ijerph17072224
276
- 277 Mitchell, T., Haynes, K., Hall, N., Choong, W., and Oven. K. (2008). The Roles of Children and Youth
278 in Communicating Disaster Risk. *Child. Youth Environ.*, 18 (1): 254–279.
279
- 280 Musacchio G, Eva E, Crescimbene M, Pino NA, Cugliari L. (2022) A protocol to communicate seismic
281 risk in schools: design, test and assessment in Italy. *Ann. Geophys.* <https://doi.org/10.4401/ag-8533>
282
- 283 Musacchio, G. and S. Solarino (2019). Seismic risk communication: an opportunity for prevention,
284 *Bollettino di Geofisica Teorica ed Applicata*, doi:10.4430/bgta0273.
285
- 286 Ojose, B. (2008). Applying Piaget’s Theory of Cognitive Development to Mathematics Instruction.
287 *TME*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 26–30
288
- 289 Solinska-Nowak, A., Magnuszewski, P., Curl, M., French, A., Keating, A., Mochizuki, J., ... &
290 Jarzabek, L. (2018). An overview of serious games for disaster risk management—Prospects and
291 limitations for informing actions to arrest increasing risk. *International journal of disaster risk*
292 *reduction*, 31, 1013-1029.
293
- 294 Student, 1908. The Probable Error of a Mean. *Biometrika*, 6, 1-25.
295
- 296 Reuter, C., Kaufhold, M.A., Schmid, S., Spielhofer, T., and Hahne, A.S. (2019). The impact of risk
297 cultures: Citizens' perception of social media use in emergencies across Europe, *Technol. Forecast.*
298 *Soc. Change*, Vol. 148, 119724, ISSN 0040-162. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119724
299



Running Title

- 300 Reuter, C., and Spielhofer, T. (2017). Towards social resilience: A quantitative and qualitative survey
301 on citizens' perception of social media in emergencies in Europe, *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, Vol.
302 121, Pages 168-180, ISSN 0040-1625. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2016.07.038
303
304 Veldkamp, A., Knippels, M.C.P.J., and van Joolingen W.R. (2021). Beyond the Early Adopters:
305 Escape Rooms in Science Education. *Front. Educ.* 6:622860. doi:10.3389/feduc.2021.622860