Risk cultures emerge within risk societies

The concept of risk society and positioning of risks within institutional settings and structures of society is not sufficient. As Scott Lash presents, the concept of risk cultures can be seen as a response (Lash, 2000). He argues that risk cultures are "value-disordered, horizontally destructured, and communally based" (Lash, 2000, p. 50). In other words, while in the conception of risk society risk is normatively ordered and vertically structured risk cultures "presume not a determinate ordering, but a reflexive and indeterminate disordering" (Lash, 2000, p. 47). This point is very important for understanding the difference between the two concepts of risks, but also for recognizing the fact that risk cultures emerge within the risk society.

Note: See source document for full reference.

Applicable to:

Stakeholders: Norms/values

Disaster Phases: Prevention, Preparedness, Response, Recovery, All disaster phases

Types of Actors Concerned: Non-active citizens, National civil protection body, Local authorities, Active citizens, Entrepreneurs, Media, Government, National research bodies, Red Cross, NGOs, Military, Law enforcement agencies, Healthcare and emergency services, European Civil Protection Mechanism, UN and other international organisations, All types of actors

Hazards: Natural hazards, Man-made non-intentional hazards or emergency situations, Man-made intentional hazards

Recommendations:

- Develop risk assessments methodologies, which consider cultural factors, the manner in which people cognitively process information and which employ a gender perspective

---

Source

Deliverable D4.2 "Report on 'risk cultures' in the context of disasters" (page 13)

This file was generated automatically on: 12.02.2019.

Risk cultures emerge within risk societies

https://culturalmap.carismand.eu/a/4-2-2-risk-cultures-emerge-within-risk-societies