



Disaster Prevention and Management

Using reasoned imagination to learn about cascading hazards: a pilot study

Arnaud Mignan Anna Scolobig Anne Sauron

Article information:

To cite this document:

Arnaud Mignan Anna Scolobig Anne Sauron , (2016), "Using reasoned imagination to learn about cascading hazards: a pilot study", Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol. 25 Iss 3 pp. 329 - 344

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/DPM-06-2015-0137>

Downloaded on: 15 November 2016, At: 22:51 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 50 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 92 times since 2016*

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2016), "Monitoring and evaluating disaster risk management capacity", Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, Vol. 25 Iss 3 pp. 412-422 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/DPM-01-2016-0002>

(2016), "Assessing the benefits of organized voluntary emergency services: Concepts and evidence from flood protection in Austria", Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, Vol. 25 Iss 3 pp. 298-313 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/DPM-09-2015-0203>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:563821 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Using reasoned imagination to learn about cascading hazards: a pilot study

Cascading
hazards

329

Arnaud Mignan

*Institute of Geophysics, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology,
Zurich, Switzerland*

Anna Scolobig

*Department of Environmental Systems Science,
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, Switzerland, and*

Anne Sauron

HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Sion, Switzerland

Received 16 June 2015

Revised 17 December 2015

17 March 2016

Accepted 17 March 2016

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to present the results of a pilot study involving high school teachers in natural sciences. The aim was to foster critical thinking about cascading hazards via the use of reasoned imagination. Cascading phenomena can lead to extreme catastrophes and are thus a challenge for disaster prevention and management.

Design/methodology/approach – Following a presentation listing some known cascading phenomena, the participants completed a questionnaire consisting of a blank hazard correlation matrix (HCM) and some open-ended questions. The HCM qualitatively described possible interactions between 16 different perils selected from a large spectrum of natural, technological and socio-economic hazards.

Findings – Most participants were able to describe cascading phenomena within the HCM by reducing them into sets of one-to-one interactions. Based on their experience and imagination, the participants foresaw additional interactions that were not discussed, never observed but are scientifically plausible. The majority of the respondents reported that they learnt something new and wanted to learn more about cascading hazards.

Originality/value – The HCM is especially effective in translating complex hazard scenarios into basic interactions and vice versa. Being imaginative (here via the use of reasoned imagination) and accessible, the HCM could be used as basis for transformative learning in the education of the public and of practitioners on the role of cascading hazards in catastrophes.

Keywords Questionnaire, Critical thinking, Transformative learning, Cascading hazards, Hazard correlation matrix, Reasoned imagination

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

Our complex socio-economic system is subjected to both internal (anthropogenic/technological) and external (natural) hazards, whose combined effects may be difficult to anticipate. Recent major catastrophes have often resulted from such interactions. Some of the best known examples are the 2005 hurricane Katrina, USA, which produced a surge large enough to breach levees, ultimately triggering the wide-scale flooding of the city of New Orleans (Comfort, 2006) and the 2011 Tohoku, Japan, earthquake, whose unexpected high magnitude triggered a tsunami larger than planned in the protection of the Fukushima nuclear power plant, leading to a major nuclear accident with radioactive material released, along with other industrial accidents (Norio *et al.*, 2011; Krausmann and Cruz, 2013). Both disasters and their consequences triggered in turn a partial collapse of several production sectors (Hallegatte, 2008; Norio *et al.*, 2011). Gill and Malamud



Disaster Prevention and

Management

Vol. 25 No. 3, 2016

pp. 329-344

© Emerald Group Publishing Limited

0965-3562

DOI 10.1108/DPM-06-2015-0137

(2014) performed a review of almost one hundred potential interactions between various natural hazards, illustrating the richness of cascading hazard phenomena. Challenges in multi-hazard assessment and multi-risk governance are reviewed in Kappes *et al.* (2012) and Mignan *et al.* (2016), respectively.

Occurrences of extreme catastrophes – where losses are amplified due to the cumulated effects of cascading events – often appear as surprises, cascading scenarios being rarely considered in preparedness and mitigation plans (Komendantova *et al.*, 2014). In the case when cascading scenarios are considered (e.g. de Dianous and Fiévez, 2006), failure to correctly describe only one critical element or interaction may have severe consequences (Perrow, 2001; Norio *et al.*, 2011). This issue is being extensively re-investigated post-Fukushima and a proposed solution has been to consider “scientific” or “reasoned” imagination (Kameda, 2012; Paté-Cornell, 2012) in risk management. It means considering phenomena, which have not been observed but are scientifically plausible. Indeed, in view of the richness of cascading phenomena, it is evident that most possible combinations have not yet been observed.

Gill and Malamud (2014) already showed how the high variety of hazard interactions could be represented in matrix form with triggering events listed in rows and triggered events in columns. Mignan *et al.* (2014) developed a quantitative multi-risk framework where interactions are defined by conditional probabilities in an n -square matrix composed of n possible hazardous events. The hazard correlation matrix (HCM) approach is central to the description of cascading hazards over the entire $n \times n$ space of possible interactions. The main challenge then consists in filling the matrix with the proper hazards and interactions.

In this paper, the suitability of the HCM method to learn about cascading hazards using reasoned imagination is explored. As a pilot study, a critical thinking exercise is developed using the HCM as basis. It is then tested upon a group of high school teachers in natural sciences. Involving teachers instead of disaster risk reduction practitioners in a first step was done for the following practical reasons: first, by definition, these users have a critical approach to pedagogic tools and no preconception on multi-hazard assessment; second, being part of the general public, the targeted audience is in agreement with the concept of extended peer community, which includes those affected by the issue (Rosa, 1998), here the issue being extreme cascading disasters; third, there is a widespread agreement that education is crucial to increase public risk awareness and preparedness (e.g. Ronan *et al.*, 2010; Kuhlicke *et al.*, 2011; Sharpe and Kelman, 2011; Wachinger *et al.*, 2013; Lutz *et al.*, 2014); fourth, if the complexity of hazard interactions can be understood by non-experts, it would suggest the applicability of the method to a wide range of user groups.

2. Method

2.1 Critical thinking exercise on multi-hazard

An exercise was designed with the aim of learning about cascading hazards via the use of reasoned imagination. The exercise took place during the NERA Seismology@School (NERAS@S) workshop, organized by co-author A. Sauron and which took place on October 23, 2014 in Sion, Switzerland. Participants to the exercise were 38 high school teachers in natural sciences coming from 12 countries (Australia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Italy, Palestine, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, Turkey, USA).

The exercise lasted one hour and proceeded as follows:

- (1) A questionnaire including an empty HCM and some open-ended questions was provided to each participant (Figure 1).
- (2) A presentation made by lead author A. Mignan on “Extreme consequences of earthquakes” introduced the concepts of cascading event, HCM and reasoned imagination. It also explained how to fill the HCM taking as example the 2011 Tohoku earthquake case – this presentation is referred hereafter as the exercise guidelines.
- (3) In the first part of the exercise, the participants had to fill the HCM based on the examples of past catastrophes described in the guidelines. The examples focussed on, but were not limited to, earthquake triggers.
- (4) In the second part of the HCM exercise, the participants had to continue filling the HCM based on their own knowledge and reasoned imagination. A discussion was facilitated by the lead author.
- (5) The final part of the survey included a set of open-ended questions about the respondents’ learning experience and the usefulness of the HCM method for teaching purposes.

After the questionnaire collection, the data coding and analysis was performed.

The proposed exercise employs critical thinking by giving examples of hazard interactions to guide the participants into discovering by themselves more cascading phenomena (e.g. Bruner, 1961). While the use of reasoned imagination is promoted to better understand cascading hazards, it has the second advantage of making the learning experience more stimulating (e.g. Loewy, 1998; Sharpe and Kelman, 2011).

2.2 HCM method

The HCM is the main input to the recently proposed generic multi-risk (GenMR) framework (Mignan *et al.*, 2014). Each cell of this matrix gives the probability of a




Figure 1.
Exercise sheet
(questionnaire) with
the empty hazard
correlation matrix
(HCM) and list of
open-ended
questions

target event conditional on the occurrence of a trigger event. The HCM (input for hazard correlations) is combined in GenMR to a risk migration matrix or RMM (output for multi-risk analysis), whose suitability for multi-risk decision making has been tested in a previous multi-hazard exercise involving risk practitioners (Komendantova *et al.*, 2014). The present analysis is therefore complementary to that previous study, but with a different user group target (i.e. education professionals).

The HCM here uses qualitative measures with hazard interactions represented by the following symbols: “+” (positive interaction, i.e. cascading), “-” (negative interaction, i.e. inhibiting), “±” (both interactions possible) and “Ø” (no direct interaction possible). Such a qualitative approach makes the simplified HCM similar in concept to hazard matrices used by other authors (Gill and Malamud (2014) and references therein).

The selected events (or perils) are related to high-impact hazards, i.e. hydrological, geological, meteorological and extra-terrestrial hazards, technological hazards including various types of critical infrastructures, and finally socio-economic hazards. More precisely the matrix includes 16 perils: asteroid impact (AI), disease (Di), earthquake (EQ), fire (Fi), flood (Fl), mass slide (MS), volcanic eruption (VE), wind (Wi), dam and network failures (DF, NF), industrial accident (IA), business and health care interruptions (BI, HI), economic slowdown (ES), social unrest (SU) and war (Figure 1).

2.3 Exercise guidelines

The exercise guidelines first explained how to fill the HCM using as example the 2011 Tohoku earthquake case. The cascade was defined as follows: earthquake → tsunami → industrial accident. It was explained that cascades emerge naturally in the HCM from the combination of several one-to-one direct interactions. The cascade presented above is thus described in the HCM by noting “+” in the cells (EQ, Fl) and (Fl, IA), respectively, with cells of indices (trigger, target). It was emphasized during the exercise that the Tohoku earthquake did not directly trigger the Fukushima nuclear accident, such that the cell (EQ, IA) should remain empty for that particular catastrophe (a simplification from reality but used in the exercise for sake of illustration; Norio *et al.*, 2011).

The guidelines presented 14 historical catastrophes known for their cascading phenomena. Emphasis was made on earthquakes as triggers but examples were not limited to this initiator. The examples were chosen in order to show the diversity of possible cascades and included well-known catastrophic cascades as well as some more obscure ones. Table I lists all the catastrophes and interactions illustrated in the exercise guidelines, most of which obtained from the scientific literature (see references in Table I). The interactions were described in image and text form and not directly in form of cell indices. There was therefore an interpretation to be made by the participants to translate the provided information into the HCM. The direct interaction couples given in Table I represent the correct results of the exercise compared to which the participants are scored (see Section 3.1.2).

The guidelines finally gave two examples of reasoned imagination. The first example showed that asteroid impact scenarios on large cities, although never observed in reality, are imaginable (Harris, 2008) and can therefore be modeled (Mignan *et al.*, 2011). The second example showed that new ideas, such as geom mythology, could help in the understanding and quantification of extremely rare events (Piccardi and Masse, 2007). The goal was to clarify the concept of reasoned imagination to promote its use during the exercise.

Catastrophe	Cascades, as illustrated in the exercise guidelines	Likely interpretation
2011 Tohoku earthquake (Japan)	Earthquake → tsunami → Fukushima nuclear disaster (Norio <i>et al.</i> , 2011) → Switzerland energy turnaround	EQ → FI ^a FI → IA ^a IA → BI
2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcanic eruption (Iceland)	Volcanic eruption → air travel disruption → impact on economy and cultural events across Europe (Lund and Benediktsson, 2011)	VE → NF NF → ES
2008 Sichuan earthquake (China)	Earthquake → cargo train carrying petrol tanks derailed → fires → Damaged highways, telecommunications cut → rescue efforts delayed (Krausmann <i>et al.</i> , 2010) → Collapse of chemical plants → release of toxic materials (Krausmann <i>et al.</i> , 2010) → Landslides → rivers blocked → unstable “quake lakes” → landslides and downstream flooding (Cui <i>et al.</i> , 2009) → Stock exchange fluctuations (copper price rose, oil price dropped) ^c	EQ → IA IA → Fi EQ → NF NF → HI EQ → MS MS → FI FI → MS
2005 hurricane Katrina (USA)	Hurricane → storm surge → levee failure → New Orleans flooding (Comfort, 2006) → business interruptions → slow down in various production sectors (Hallegatte, 2008)	Wi → FI FI → DF DF → FI FI → BI BI → ES
2004 Sumatra earthquake (Indonesia)	Earthquake → aftershocks, tsunami → fishing and tourism affected (Levy and Gopalakrishnan, 2005) → Volcanic eruption several months later (Walter and Amelung, 2007) ^c	EQ → EQ EQ → FI FI → BI EQ → VE ^c
1994 Northridge earthquake (USA)	Earthquake → landslide (+wind) → outbreak of valley fever (Harp and Jibson, 1996)	EQ → MS MS → Di ^b Wi → Di ^b
1963 Vajont landslide (Italy)	Landslide → tsunami on artificial lake → dam overtopping (Kilburn and Petley, 2003)	MS → FI FI → DF DF → FI
1946 Sierre earthquake (Switzerland)	Earthquake → aftershocks, rockfalls, landslides, avalanches (Fritsche <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	EQ → EQ EQ → MS
1923 Kantô earthquake (Japan)	Earthquake → fires, landslides, tsunami, aftershocks → Water mains broken (+wind) → more fires (Borland, 2006) → Unsanitary conditions → jump in typhoid fever morbidity (Nagashima, 2004) → Toxic well water+fires → rumours of Koreans poisoning wells and arson acts → violence against Koreans (Borland, 2006) typhoon ^c → storm surge → earthquake (unverified Wikipedia source) “Yokohama Burning: The Deadly 1923 Earthquake and Fire that Helped Forge the Path to World War II” (Hammer, 2011) ^c	EQ → Fi EQ → MS EQ → FI EQ → EQ EQ → NF NF → Fi Wi → Fi ^b EQ → HI HI → Di EQ → SU Fi → SU
1906 San Francisco earthquake (USA)	Earthquake → gas leaks and water supply failure → extreme fires → 1907 panic and creation of the Federal Reserve System (Odell and Weidenmier, 2001) ^c	EQ → NF NF → Fi Fi → ES ^c

(continued)

Table I.
List of catastrophes (in reverse chronological order) and their cascades, as illustrated in the exercise guidelines

Catastrophe	Cascades, as illustrated in the exercise guidelines	Likely interpretation
1868 Hawaii earthquake (USA)	Earthquake → coastal subsidence → tsunami → mudslide → Reduced magma volumes in nearby volcanoes ^c	EQ → FI EQ → MS EQ → no VE ^c
1783 Laki volcanic eruption (Iceland)	Volcanic eruption → severe weather across Europe (poisonous cloud) → crops and cattle destroyed → poverty and famine (Thordarson and Self, 2003) → French Revolution ^c	VE → Wi Wi → ES
1755 Lisbon earthquake (Portugal)	Earthquake → tsunami and fires → long-term effects on society, politics, philosophy (de Almeida Marques, 2005) ^c	EQ → FI EQ → Fi Fi → ES ^c Fi → ES ^c
1584 Aigle earthquake (Switzerland)	Earthquake → rockslide → Subaquatic slide → tsunami → Aftershock (+rainfall+snow) → rockslide (Fritsche <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	EQ → MS MS → FI EQ → EQ

Notes: No reference indicates a Wikipedia source. ^aAnswer given during the exercise; ^bparticipates to the interaction; ^c(direct) interaction described in the guidelines as unverified indicating that different interpretations are possible. Note that only one example of negative interaction (inhibition) is shown (1868 Hawaii earthquake case)


Table I.

3. Results

3.1 HCM quality evaluation

3.1.1 Basic observations. Before starting the data analysis, it was necessary to select the criteria to evaluate reliable data. We consider unreliable any HCM in which the cascading effect: earthquake → tsunami → industrial accident (i.e. 2011 Tohoku earthquake case) was not properly described, although the answer was explicitly given in the exercise guidelines. Of the 38 HCMs shown in Figure 2, nine are thus considered unreliable (shown in lighter colors). The rest of the HCM analysis only considers the 29 remaining HCMs. The validity of this filtering approach is confirmed in Section 3.1.2.

Figure 3(a) shows the number of answers n per HCM cell. The minimum and average number of answers per cell are seven and 16, respectively. With only four different answers possible per cell, it indicates a reasonable sample size for the problem at hand. Figure 4(a) shows the number of answers per row, i.e. per trigger event. The most answered row corresponds to earthquake as a trigger with $\sum n(\text{EQ}, \{\text{AI}, \dots, \text{War}\}) = 377$, which is in agreement with the number of examples given with an earthquake trigger (Table I). The second most answered row corresponds to asteroid impact as a trigger with $\sum n(\text{AI}, \{\text{AI}, \dots, \text{War}\}) = 350$. Mention of asteroid impact hazard (without cascade) during the exercise may have pushed the participants to focus more on this potential trigger. Another reason could be that it is the first row of the HCM and that most participants started there. The main pattern that emerges from the graph of Figure 4(a) is the higher number of answers for natural hazard triggers compared to anthropogenic hazard triggers. This could be explained by the higher number of examples given in the first category (Figure 3(b)), by its upper position in the HCM and/or by the fact that natural and anthropogenic hazards are often considered primary and secondary hazards, respectively (see e.g. the concept of NaTech event;




Notes: HCMs considered unreliable are shown in lighter colors. The HCM row/column indices (i.e. events) are the same as in Figure 1

Figure 2.
HCMs defined by the 38 participants

Krausmann *et al.*, 2011). Figure 4(b) shows the number of answers per column, i.e. per target event. The variations are lower than the ones observed in the case of trigger events, with no clear pattern emerging.

3.1.2 Score per HCM. Cells shown with thick dashed contour in Figure 3 correspond to the interactions described in the guidelines (Table I; Figure 3(b)). Figure 3(c) shows




Notes: (a) Number of answers per HCM cell; (b) expected HCM result, defined from the examples of past cascades shown during the exercise; (c) most common result (including “not answered”) per HCM cell; (d) most common answer per HCM cell. Answers for cells with thick solid contour were given at the start of the exercise. Cells with thick dashed contour correspond to interactions shown during the exercise (Table I). The other cells were filled based on reasoned imagination by the participants

Figure 3.
Synthesis of the 29
HCMs considered
reliable

that there is a good agreement between the most common answer given for each HCM cell (by the participants considered reliable) and the expected HCM result (Figure 3(b)). The agreement becomes perfect once non-answered cells are removed (Figure 3(d)), which indicates a good overall understanding of the exercise and of the HCM method.

To estimate the quality of each one of the 29 HCMs previously considered reliable, we determine their score as the number of correct answers, assuming that the expected HCM result represents a perfect score $S=32$. Figure 4(c) shows the score per HCM (represented by black dots; unreliable HCMs by gray dots). We first remark that the HCMs originally considered unreliable perform indeed badly with scores in the range



Notes: (a) Number of answers considered reliable per trigger event; (b) number of answers considered reliable per target event; (c) score S per HCM, a perfect score corresponding to a perfect match to the expected HCM result (Figure 3b); (d) number of HCMs considered reliable as a function of score S ; (e) categorization of the answers to the open-ended questions. ^aQuestion Q1 changed from “Which cascading effect (see matrix) do you fear most? Why?” due to the lack of direct answers, indicating some ambiguity in the responses to Q1

Figure 4. Statistical analysis of the HCMs shown in Figure 2

$5 \leq S \leq 14$, which validates our decision to eliminate them from the analysis. However we also find that eight HCMs defined as reliable have a score $S < 16$, meaning that they fail to describe more than half of the interactions presented in the exercise guidelines. In total, 72 percent of the HCMs considered reliable manage to describe at least half of

the given examples on the HCM, and 14 percent more than 90 percent of the given examples. The score distribution of the reliable HCMs is shown in Figure 4(d). These results confirm the good understanding of the exercise and of the HCM method.

3.2 Identifying reasoned imagination in the HCM

3.2.1 *Main emerging patterns.* We now only consider the HCM cells, which were not described in the exercise guidelines (i.e. all gray cells in Figure 3(b)). Three rows (AI, Di and War) and one column (AI) are of particular interest since they are almost entirely filled in Figure 3(c) although no example was given during the exercise.

The participants stated that an asteroid impact is likely to trigger all other events considered in the HCM, except war. It is likely that asteroid impacts depicted in fictional films have shaped the participants' perception on the potential consequences of this hazard (Kirby, 2003). Let us note that a fictional film "has to be sufficiently credible to be possible in terms of what constitutes a rational possibility of the unknown" (Hallam and Marshment, 2000), which is by definition reasoned imagination (Kameda, 2012; Paté-Cornell, 2012). How fictional films may be useful in the process of reasoned imagination in the case of cascading hazards has yet to be fully addressed.

The participants also specified that no (earthly) event could trigger an asteroid impact, which is trivial. They also stated that a disease could obviously not trigger other natural hazards. This shows a clear distinction of the relative independence of extra-terrestrial and biological hazards from the geological, hydrological and meteorological hazards, the latter being more intertwined.

Results for war as a trigger are certainly based on the general knowledge of the participants. Most agreed that a war could trigger a disease (biological warfare) and fires (standard warfare). A general result is that most anthropogenic hazards were identified as potentially triggered by any other event, which is particularly clear on Figure 2(d). As discussed previously, these hazards are often known to be secondary hazards.

3.2.2 *Dubious cases.* Only a very limited number of imagined interactions appear dubious. One direct interaction proposed by most participants and subject to discussion is the case of an earthquake triggering a disease. In the strict meaning of "direct", the rupture of a fault is doubtfully able to trigger a disease. Examples described in the exercise guidelines included earthquake → health care interruption → disease and earthquake → mass slide (+wind) → disease (Table I). One could however imagine earthquake → disease in fact implying earthquake → (lack of hygienic practices; crowded conditions; population displacement) → disease, since this set of potential intermediary events, while imaginable (Shultz *et al.*, 2005), was not considered in the definition of the exercise's HCM. We here see that apparent anomalies in the HCM may in fact inform us about events possibly missing in the matrix. Those missing events could be added in an updated version of the HCM.

3.2.3 *From one-to-one interactions to complex cascading chains.* Although the participants were only asked to describe possible one-to-one interactions in the HCM, the combination of these different interactions led to the multiplication of potential chains of cascading events. This emphasizes the power of the method in generating complex, possibly unforeseen cascades, from simple interactions.

Based on the HCM shown in Figure 3(c), one can, for example stipulate that the following cascade is plausible: earthquake → earthquake → dam failure → flood → mass slide → network failure → fire → industrial accident → business interruption → economic

slowdown → social unrest or in a narrative form: “A large aftershock triggered a dike breach, which led to flooding. When receding, the flood in turn provoked a landslide on an unstable slope, which cut vital sections of the infrastructure networks of the area. With no water available, multiple gas leaks and roadblocks limiting access to first responders, fires quickly propagated. It led to a major industrial accident, the interruption of its business activities, and in consequence to a general slow down of the regional economy, which is highly dependent on this industry. In this situation, riots and lootings followed.” This is one example of a multitude of complex chains-of-events described from simple one-to-one interactions in the HCM built by the participants.

3.2.4 Open-ended questions. Results from the open-ended questions are represented in Figure 4(e). Different categories have been created in order to identify trends in the qualitative data analysis.

Q1: which cascading effect (see matrix) do you fear most? Why? Led to answers where each respondent listed one or more perils. In most cases, the proposed events were considered as the most frightening trigger events (e.g. asteroid impacts, earthquakes, disease or war), which were noted to have broad consequences. In other cases, the proposed events were clearly considered as the most frightening consequences (e.g. health care interruption, fire, social unrest, radioactive release). A less misleading question could have been: what event do you fear most (taking into account cascading effects)? Of the 16 perils in the HCM, six were found particularly worrisome, in order: earthquake (10), disease (9), war (8), flood (6), asteroid impact (5) and health care interruption (3). During the exercise the participants often mentioned the 2014 West Africa Ebola epidemics, which had its pick of activity in October 2014 (Pandey *et al.*, 2014) when the workshop took place. This may explain why disease ranked at the second place of the most frightening perils and why health care interruption was also part of the top-six list. However these results remain ambiguous due to the responses not exactly answering Q1.

For Q2: if you were a decision maker, what would you do first to reduce the risk of cascading effects?, the participants' answers were categorized as follows: improve risk assessment (7), improve resilience (13), improve communication (7), increase funding (2) and not clear on which action to take (2). For example the risk assessment should be improved by investigating the links between different events, by implementing the HCM method and by simulating cascade scenarios. Other proposed actions, such as fast response to crisis, restoration of critical infrastructures, redundancy of health care, better preparedness, avoidance of cascades and other mitigation measures, are all part of the concept of resilience. Improving communication meant in particular improving awareness, educating, informing first responders and the public of plans of actions, etc. The issue of funding was also raised, for both research and mitigation.

For Q3: did you learn something new today? What? Are you planning to use this new information in your teaching?, a positive answer was given by 84 percent of the respondents. They answered that they learned first about cascades (9) and how complex they are, and second about the modus operandi (5) or how complex cascades can be simply defined from direct links in the HCM. In rare cases (3), it was indicated that the learning experience was negative. The main reason was that the exercise was considered too short to clearly understand the concepts. Overall, a number of participants indicated their will to use the HCM approach in their class because of its simplicity and of the link between physical and societal aspects (statements in post-exercise discussions).

Only about one third of the participants answered to Q4: do you want to learn something more about cascading effects? If yes, what? In all, 12 respondents answered affirmatively (86 percent) and two negatively. The respondents were especially interested in learning more about how to teach about hazardous cascading phenomena in high schools and how to prevent cascades and mitigate their consequences.

4. Conclusions

The results on the present pilot study revealed that the HCM is a simple tool to describe known cascading phenomena (e.g. Figure 4(d)) and that it could also be used to integrate reasoned imagination into the description of additional – often unforeseen – cascades (Section 3.2). The participants, high school teachers in natural sciences, clearly stated that they learned about the complexity of cascading hazards and this especially thanks to the modus operandi, which is the HCM method. This suggests that the HCM method could be labeled as a cognitive and teaching tool (Jonassen, 1992), since it engages thinking processes on cascading hazard processes. More precisely, once the idea that complex cascades can be deconstructed into simple one-to-one interactions is assimilated, new knowledge can be inferred.

More work has yet to be done to confirm the usefulness of the HCM method in describing cascading hazards: for learning purposes and for disaster risk reduction. Only point (1) was tackled in the present paper. Future studies will need to define a more robust approach, including pre-post knowledge testing, a control group and potentially some modifications to the HCM (e.g. adding additional perils, changing the order of perils). It was also noted by some participants that the exercise might have been too complex, which makes the addition of more perils in the HCM challenging. Immediate solutions include longer exercises (e.g. half-day) and a better guidance through the exercises (also to avoid the HCM being seen as a mere box ticking exercise by some participants).

Although the results shown in Figure 3 are overall reliable, one can note that some interactions are missing, for instance geothermal power plants triggering earthquakes (or IA → EQ) (e.g. Mignan *et al.*, 2015). An in-depth analysis of imaginable cascades for multi-risk management will require the participation of risk experts and the definition of site-specific HCMs where more specific interactions are considered. As a first step in this direction, the HCM was recently used as a discussion interface to assess the range of potential cascades at dams prior to any probabilistic multi-risk analysis (Matos *et al.*, 2016). Figure 5 shows this dam-specific HCM where perils include reservoir rise and dam element failures.

In a broader context, the HCM method has yet to be treated in both normal accident theory (Perrow, 2001) and high reliability theory (La Porte, 1996) to situate its role in the risk management of complex interacting systems. A priori, use of the HCM could improve organizational learning and decentralized decision making by more knowledgeable operators (Rijpma, 1997). One important challenge in future uses of the HCM will be how to move from qualitative measures obtained from reasoned imagination to quantitative measures. A transitional multi-level framework could be used to make a clear distinction between qualitative and quantitative levels (Liu *et al.*, 2015) prior to being able to model cascading hazards in all their richness.

While the HCM has yet to be tested with risk practitioners in a systematic way, working with members of the public was shown to be beneficial for the improvement of the method in future exercises, in agreement with the idea of extended peer community,

	EQ	HR	FI	MS	BOF	HPF	SWF	DD	RR	OT	DF
Earthquake (EQ)	±	∅	+	+	+	+	+	∅	∅	∅	+
Heavy rain (HR)	∅	±	+	+	∅	∅	∅	∅	+	∅	∅
Flood (FI)	∅	∅	+	+	∅	∅	+	∅	+	∅	∅
Mass slide (MS)	∅	∅	+	±	∅	∅	+	∅	∅	∅	∅
Bottom outlet failure (BOF)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	-	+	∅	∅
Hydropower failure (HPF)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	-	+	∅	∅
Spillway failure (SWF)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	-	+	∅	∅
Drawdown (DD)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	-	∅	∅
Reservoir rise (RR)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	+	∅	+
Overtopping (OT)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	+
Dam failure (DF)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅

Notes: An extreme reservoir rise may lead to overtopping and, eventually, to dam failure. Different events can trigger the reservoir rise or directly dam failure, such as natural hazards and dam element failures. To avoid catastrophic failures, a drawdown of the reservoir can be initiated

Figure 5. Illustrative HCM for a conceptual embankment dam, defined from expert judgement (used for the Matos *et al.* (2016) analysis)

which “makes use of not only available scientific evidence, but also extended facts – lay, anecdotal, and other information [...] held by this larger community” (Rosa, 1998). The improvement of public preparedness to cascading hazards by reasoned imagination (via the HCM method) has yet to be demonstrated. However the exercise presented in this paper showed an “accessible, imaginative and innovative teaching resource [that] could excite teachers” and students alike into changing their behavior toward disasters (Sharpe and Kelman, 2011). In view of the limited practice of multi-risk in general (Komendantova *et al.*, 2014), such teaching would also likely be beneficial to practitioners. It could potentially act as a transformative learning process (e.g. Mezirow, 1997), to shift from the actual single-risk reference frame to a much-needed multi-risk reference frame in the field of disaster risk reduction.

Acknowledgments

The work leading to these results has been funded by the Swiss Competence Center for Energy Research – Supply of Electricity (SCCER-SoE) and by the “Harmonized approach to stress tests for critical infrastructures against natural hazards” (STREST) project, funded by the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007-2013] under Grant Agreement Number 603389. The workshop in which the multi-hazard experiment took place was funded by NERAS@S, a European educative project in seismology and earth sciences of teachers at schools.

References

Borland, J. (2006), “Capitalising on catastrophe: reinvigorating the Japanese state with moral values through education following the 1923 great Kantō earthquake”, *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 875-907. doi: 10.1017/S0026749X06002010.

Bruner, J. (1961), “The act of discovery”, *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 31, pp. 21-32.

- Comfort, L.K. (2006), "Cities at risk: hurricane Katrina and the drowning of New Orleans", *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 501-516.
- Cui, P., Zhu, Y.-y., Han, Y.-s., Chen, X.-q and Zhuang, J.-q. (2009), "The 12 May Wenchuan earthquake-induced landslide lakes: distribution and preliminary risk evaluation", *Landslides*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 209-223. doi: 10.1007/s10346-009-0160-9.
- de Almeida Marques, J.O. (2005), "The paths of providence: Voltaire and Rousseau on the Lisbon earthquake", *Cad. Hist. Fil. Ci., Campinas, Série 3*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 33-57.
- de Dianous, V. and Fiévez, C. (2006), "ARAMIS project: a more explicit demonstration of risk control through the use of bow-tie diagrams and the evaluation of safety barrier performance", *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, Vol. 130 No. 3, pp. 220-233. doi: 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2005.07.010.
- Fritsche, S., Fäh, D. and Schwarz-Zanetti, G. (2012), "Historical intensity VIII earthquakes along the Rhone valley (Valais, Switzerland): primary and secondary effects", *Swiss Journal of Geosciences*, Vol. 105 No. 1, pp. 1-18. doi: 10.1007/s00015-012-0095-3.
- Gill, J.C. and Malamud, B.D. (2014), "Reviewing and visualizing the interactions of natural hazards", *Reviews of Geophysics*, Vol. 52, pp. 680-722. doi: 10.1002/2013RG000445.
- Hallam, J. and Marshment, M. (2000), *Realism and Popular Cinema*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 280pp.
- Hallegatte, S. (2008), "An adaptive regional input-output model and its application to the assessment of the economic cost of Katrina", *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 779-799. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2008.01046.x.
- Hammer, J. (2011), *Yokohama Burning: The Deadly 1923 Earthquake and Fire that Helped Forge the Path to World War II*, Free Press, New York, NY, 336pp.
- Harp, E.L. and Jibson, R.W. (1996), "Landslides triggered by the 1994 Northridge, California, earthquake", *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, Vol. 86 No. 1B, pp. S319-S332.
- Harris, A. (2008), "What spaceguard did", *Nature*, Vol. 453, pp. 1178-1179. doi: 10.1038/4531178a.
- Jonassen, D.H. (1992), "What are cognitive tools?", in Kommers, P.A.M., Jonassen, D.H. and Mayes, J.T. (Eds), *Cognitive Tools for Learning*, NATO ASI Series F, Vol. 81, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 1-6.
- Kameda, H. (2012), "Engineering agenda on nuclear safety from the 2011 Tohoku-Pacific earthquake", *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Engineering Lessons Learned from the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, Tokyo, March 1-4*, pp. 102-121.
- Kappes, M.S., Keiler, M., von Elverfeldt, K. and Glade, T. (2012), "Challenges of analyzing multi-hazard risk: a review", *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 64 No. 2, pp. 1925-1958. doi: 10.1007/s11069-012-0294-2.
- Kilburn, C.R.J. and Petley, D.N. (2003), "Forecasting giant, catastrophic slope collapse: lessons from Vajont, Northern Italy", *Geomorphology*, Vol. 54 Nos 1-2, pp. 21-32. doi: 10.1016/S0169-555X(03)00052-7.
- Kirby, D.A. (2003), "Science consultants, fictional films, and scientific practice", *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 231-268.
- Komendantova, N., Mrzyglocki, R., Mignan, A., Khazai, B., Wenzel, F., Patt, A. and Fleming, K. (2014), "Multi-hazard and multi-risk decision-support tools as a part of participatory risk governance: feedback from civil protection stakeholders", *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, Vol. 8, June, pp. 50-67. doi: 10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.12.006.
- Krausmann, E. and Cruz, A.M. (2013), "Impact of the 11 March 2011, great East Japan earthquake and tsunami on the chemical industry", *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 67 No. 2, pp. 811-828. doi: 10.1007/s11069-013-0607-0.

- Krausmann, E., Cozzani, V., Salzano, E. and Renzi, E. (2011), "Industrial accidents triggered by natural hazards: an emerging risk issue", *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, Vol. 11, pp. 921-929. doi: 10.5194/nhess-11-921-2011.
- Krausmann, E., Cruz, A.M. and Affeltranger, B. (2010), "The impact of the 12 May 2008 Wenchuan earthquake on industrial facilities", *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 242-248. doi: 10.1016/j.jlp.2009.10.004.
- Kuhlicke, C., Steinfuehrer, A., Begg, C., Bianchizza, C., Bruendl, M., Buchecker, M., De Marchi, B., Di Masso Tarditti, M., Hoepfner, C., Komac, B., Lemkow, L., Luther, J., McCarthy, S., Pellizzoni, L., Renn, O., Scolobig, A., Supramaniam, M., Tapsell, S., Wachinger, G., Walker, G., Whittle, R., Zorn, M. and Faulkner, H. (2011), "Perspectives on social capacity building for natural hazards: outlining an emerging field of research and practice in Europe", *Environment Science & Policy*, Vol. 14 No. 7, pp. 804-814. doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2011.05.001.
- La Porte, T.R. (1996), "High reliability organizations: unlikely, demanding and at risk", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 60-71.
- Levy, J.K. and Gopalakrishnan, C. (2005), "Promoting disaster-resilient communities: the great Sumatra-Andaman earthquake of 26 December 2004 and the resulting Indian Ocean tsunami", *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 543-559. doi: 10.1080/07900620500363297.
- Liu, Z., Nadim, F., Garcia-Arístizabal, A., Mignan, A., Fleming, K. and Luna, B.Q. (2015), "A three-level framework for multi-risk assessment", *Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered Systems and Geohazards*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 59-74. doi: 10.1080/17499518.2015.1041989.
- Loewy, E.H. (1998), "Curiosity, imagination, compassion, science and ethics: do curiosity and imagination serve a central function?", *Health Care Analysis*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 286-294.
- Lund, K.A. and Benediktsson, K. (2011), "Inhabiting a risky earth, the Eyjafjallajökull eruption in 2010 and its impacts", *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 6-9.
- Lutz, W., Mutarak, R. and Striessnig, E. (2014), "Universal education is key to enhanced climate adaptation", *Science*, Vol. 346 No. 6213, pp. 1061-1062. doi: 10.1126/science.1257975.
- Matos, J.P., Mignan, A. and Schleiss, A.J. (2016), "Vulnerability of large dams considering hazard interactions: conceptual application of the generic multi-risk framework", *Proceedings of the 13th ICOLD International Benchmark Workshop on Numerical Analysis of Dams, Lausanne, 2015* (in press).
- Mezirow, J. (1997), "Transformative learning: theory to practice", in Cranton, P. (Ed.), *Transformative Learning in Action: Insights from Practice – New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, Vol. 74, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 5-12.
- Mignan, A., Grossi, P. and Muir-Wood, R. (2011), "Risk assessment of Tunguska-type airbursts", *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 869-880. doi: 10.1007/s11069-010-9597-3.
- Mignan, A., Wiemer, S. and Giardini, D. (2014), "The quantification of low-probability – high-consequences events: part I. A generic multi-risk approach", *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 73 No. 3, pp. 1999-2022. doi: 10.1007/s11069-014-1178-4.
- Mignan, A., Komendantova, N., Scolobig, A. and Fleming, K. (2016), "Multi-risk assessment and governance", in Madu, C.N. and Kuei, C.-H. (Eds), *Handbook of Disaster Risk Reduction & Management*, Chapter 16, World Scientific Press & Imperial College Press, London (in press).
- Mignan, A., Landtwing, D., Kästli, P., Mena, B. and Wiemer, S. (2015), "Induced seismicity risk analysis of the 2006 Basel, Switzerland, enhanced geothermal system project: influence of uncertainties on risk mitigation", *Geothermics*, Vol. 53, January, pp. 133-146. doi: 10.1016/j.geothermics.2014.05.007.

- Nagashima, T. (2004), "Sewage disposal and typhoid fever: the case of Tokyo 1912-1940", *Annales de démographie historique*, Vol. 108 No. 108, pp. 105-117.
- Norio, O., Ye, T., Kajitani, Y., Shi, P. and Tatano, H. (2011), "The 2011 Eastern Japan great earthquake disaster: overview and comments", *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 34-42.
- Odell, K. and Weidenmier, M.D. (2001), "Real shock, Monetary aftershock: the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and the panic of 1907", Claremont Colleges Working Papers in Economics, No. 2001-07, Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, CA.
- Pandey, A., Atkins, K.E., Medlock, J., Wenzel, N., Townsend, J.P., Childs, J.E., Nyenswah, T.G., Ndeffo-Mbah, M.L. and Galvani, A.P. (2014), "Strategies for containing Ebola in West Africa", *Science Express*, Vol. 346 No. 6212, pp. 991-995. doi: 10.1126/science.1260612.
- Paté-Cornell, E. (2012), "On 'black swans' and 'perfect storms': risk analysis and management when statistics are not enough", *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 32 No. 11, pp. 1823-1833. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01787.x.
- Perrow, C. (2001), "Accidents, normal", in Smelser, N.J. and Baltes, P.B. (Eds), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 33-38. doi: 10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/04509-5.
- Piccardi, L. and Masse, W.B. (Eds) (2007), *Myth and Geology*, Geological Society, Special Publication No. 273, London.
- Rijpma, J.A. (1997), "Complexity, tight-coupling and reliability: connecting normal accidents theory and high reliability theory", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 15-23.
- Ronan, K.R., Crellin, K. and Johnston, D. (2010), "Correlates of hazards education for youth: a replication study", *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 503-526. doi: 10.1007/s11069-009-9444-6.
- Rosa, E.A. (1998), "Metatheoretical foundations for post-normal risk", *Journal of Risk Research*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 15-44. doi: 10.1080/136698798377303.
- Sharpe, J. and Kelman, I. (2011), "Improving the disaster-related component of secondary school geography education in England", *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 327-343. doi: 10.1080/10382046.2011.619810.
- Shultz, J.M., Russell, J. and Espinel, Z. (2005), "Epidemiology of tropical cyclones: the dynamics of disaster, disease, and development", *Epidemiologic Reviews*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 21-35. doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxi011.
- Thordarson, T. and Self, S. (2003), "Atmospheric and environmental effects of the 1783-1784 Laki eruption: a review and reassessment", *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Vol. 108 No. D1, pp. AAC 7-1-AAC 7-29. doi: 10.1029/2001JD002042.
- Wachinger, G., Renn, O., Begg, C. and Kuhlicke, C. (2013), "The risk perception paradox – implications for governance and communication of natural hazards", *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 1049-1065. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01942.x.
- Walter, T.R. and Amelung, F. (2007), "Volcanic eruptions following $M \geq 9$ megathrust earthquakes: implications for the Sumatra-Andaman volcanoes", *Geology*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 539-542. doi: 10.1130/G23429A.1.

Corresponding author

Arnaud Mignan can be contacted at: arnaud.mignan@sed.ethz.ch

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com