Australasian fire agencies’ community bushfire safety policies recognise two safe courses of action under bushfire threat:

1. Leave well in advance of any predicted fire impact.

OR

2. Stay and defend a suitably prepared property.

These are encapsulated in the current AFAC bushfire safety position summary

PREPARE. ACT.SURVIVE

--and there is no provision for a ‘middle way’.
Act decisively the moment you know there is a danger. Do not wait for an official warning. Do not just “wait and see”.
QUESTION: DO PEOPLE ‘WAIT AND SEE’?

A. Rhodes (2007): several studies, most states, phone and mail surveys (N = 350 to 800), plus interviews.

*Across all the studies:*

‘Intended to wait until told by authorities what to do’:

11-23%

‘Intended to wait but leave if they felt threatened’

17-32%

---

QUESTION: DO PEOPLE PLAN TO ‘WAIT AND SEE’?

McLennan, Elliott & Omodei (2012)

Interviews with 457 survivors of the 2009 Victorian ‘Black Saturday’ bushfires:

*Bushfire Survival Plan?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave Safely</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay and Defend</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait and See</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear Plan</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Plan</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION: HOW MANY ‘WAITED TO SEE’?

McLennan, Elliott & Omodei (2012)
Interviews with 457 survivors of the 2009 Victorian ‘Black Saturday’ bushfires:

Bushfire Survival (?) Action:
Left previous day 2% X
Left early, no warning 4% XX
Left, warning 26% XXXXXXXXX
Left, threat imminent 17% XXXXX
Stayed and defended 49% XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Sheltered passively 2% X

DO PEOPLE STILL INTEND TO ‘WAIT AND SEE’?


Now imagine that during the fire season you and all those who normally reside with you are at home. It has been declared a day of “Extreme Fire Danger”, and there is a Total Fire Ban for your Region of the State/Territory. At about 3pm you become aware of a warning (on the radio, or a web site, or by email, or text, or telephone) that there is a large bushfire burning out of control and that it will probably hit your location in 1-2 hours. You look outside and see a large plume of smoke being blown toward your property.

What do you think you would most likely decide to do?
  a. Leave as soon as you can
  b. Stay to defend the home
  c. Wait and see what develops, before finally deciding whether or not to leave, or to stay and defend.
What do you think you would most likely decide to do? (N = 544)

a. Leave as soon as you can: N = 256 (47%)
b. Stay to defend the home: N = 126 (23%)
c. Wait and see what develops, before finally deciding whether or not to leave, or to stay and defend: N = 162 (30%)

WHY WOULD 30% OF THOSE SURVEYED INTEND TO ‘WAIT AND SEE’?

11 POSSIBLE REASONS, “HOW IMPORTANT?”:

% “VERY IMPORTANT”:
1. Need to be certain that it is safe to leave 41% XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
2. What if I could have saved my house? 19% XXXXXX
3. Worried about returning for livestock 18% XXXXX
4. Confident I could defend if not ‘catastrophic’ 14% XXXXX
5. Worried about not being able to return 13% XXXX
6. Inconvenience - unnecessary 8% XXX
7. Worried about looters 6% XX
8. Nowhere to take pets 5% XX
9. No suitable accommodation elsewhere 2% X
10. Elderly/disabled family members 1% .
11. Feel embarrassed if no fire came. 1% .
REASONS TO ‘WAIT AND SEE’ – OWN WORDS

162 residents who intended to ‘wait and see’, 91 “own words” write-in descriptions, 99 reasons for ‘waiting to see’:

1. Low risk involved in waiting: 52%
   • Probability of fire impact low
   • Threat level if fire impacted low
   • Safe, easy, last minute escape option
   • Ample time for decision.

2. Others will warn, advise, direct, protect: 19%
   • Agencies
   • Family/neighbours.

3. Self-reliant confidence of survival: 16%
   • Self-efficacy
   • Preparedness.

4. Reluctance to leave due to potential cost & risk factors: 9%
   • Unnecessary house loss; danger in leaving.

REASONS FOR NOT LEAVING EARLY – OWN WORDS

162 residents who intended to ‘wait and see’, 136 “own words” write-in descriptions, 150 reasons for not leaving early:

1. Low risk involved in waiting: 45%
   • Probability of fire impact low; Threat level if fire impacted low; Safe, easy, last minute escape option; Ample time for decision.

2. Reluctance to leave - potential cost & risk: 31%
   • Unnecessary house loss, danger in leaving.

3. Self-reliant confidence of survival: 12%
   • Self-efficacy; Preparedness.

4. Others will warn, advise, direct, protect: 7%
   • Agencies; Family/neighbours.

5. Need time to protect house: 3%

6. No means of leaving: 2%
162 residents who intended to ‘wait and see’, 95 “own words” write-in descriptions of their reasons for not deciding to stay and defend:

1. Dangers for self and others: 58%
2. Depends on the emerging level of threat: 21%
3. Age, infirmity, disability: 12%
4. Will depend on warnings from agencies: 7%
5. Renting – who cares about the house?: 2%

WHAT DO WE HAVE ABOUT ‘WAIT AND SEE’?

1. Fire agencies condemn such behaviour.
2. But significant numbers of householders in bushfire risk areas:
   (a) Have waited to see, on receipt of a bushfire warning.
   (b) Plan to wait and see in case of a bushfire warning.
   (c) Almost certainly will wait and see over the course of future fire seasons.
   (d) And do so for what seem (to them) very sound and sensible reasons!

-----Where does this leave those of us involved in our various ways with community bushfire safety?
[without any elephants?]
WHAT IS TO BE DONE ABOUT ‘WAIT AND SEE’?

Does anything need to be done? Since it is all so difficult, why not just ignore the situation about ‘wait and see’ and carry on as if people will do as directed and not ‘wait and see’?

Two potential problems:
1. IF ‘waiting to see’ is so dangerous, is there not a moral duty to address the issue?
2. Is there a danger that the messenger (fire agencies) may be discredited along with the (widely ignored) message?

Could fire agencies’ current community bushfire safety programs be made more effective? That is, more of the same only better: more resources, better directed, more effectively delivered?

Possibly?

OR is the current ‘do not wait and see’ message equivalent to a ‘just say no and don’t do it’ approach to sex education?
Are there other approaches which will have better outcomes—that is, fewer householders in danger under imminent bushfire threats?

*We now have some evidence about the reasonings which drive ‘waiting and seeing’.*

*How can it be used?*

---

**SOME DISCUSSION PROMPTS:**

1. **EMPHASISE PROPERTY/HOUSE PROTECTION MEASURES SEPARATELY FROM PROPERTY DEFENCE:**
   
   “SAFEST PLACE DURING A BUSHFIRE IS SOMEWHERE ELSE, EVEN BETTER WHEN YOUR HOUSE IS STILL THERE WHEN YOU RETURN!”

2. **CAN MORE BE DONE TO PROMOTE/ENCOURAGE LOW-COST SIMPLE MITIGATION MEASURES?**

3. **LOOK TO THE HEALTH PROMOTION AND INJURY PREVENTION RESEARCH LITERATURE—EMPHASIS OF THREAT AND INDUCTION OF FEAR NEEDS TO BE MATCHED BY “...AND THIS IS WHAT TO DO AND HOW TO DO IT: IT IS EASY AND NOT TOO COSTLY AND IT WORKS!”**

4. **EMBRACE THE FACT THAT MANY WILL WAIT AND SEE, ACCEPT IT AS AN INEVITABLE REALITY.**

   “DON’T JUST WAIT AND SEE—PLAN WHAT WILL TRIGGER YOUR SURVIVAL DECISION AND ACTION!”

*Over to you!*