INTERSECTIONAL RISK: AN EXPANDED DEFINITION OF RISK FOR THE AVALANCHE AND GUIDING PROFESSION

Rachel D. Reimer[1]*

[1] *University of British Columbia, Okanagan, Kelowna, BC, Canada*

ABSTRACT: The Rise Study is a feminist appreciative Action Research project that utilized in-depth interviews amongst 17 mountain guides and avalanche professionals from Canada, the United States, France, and Switzerland. It sought to centre experiences of risk, inclusion and psychological safety among 2SLGBTQ+, women, BIPOC, or trauma-affected members of the profession. Study findings offer an expanded definition of psychological safety and psychological risk, and identify human-caused hazards in the profession. Two key conceptualizations of participants' experiences as mountain guides and avalanche workers emerged from the analysis: intersectional risk, and the second shift of risk management. *Intersectional risk* challenges and expands on the traditional concept of risk, and is an interplay between mountain hazards and human-caused hazards, exposure and vulnerability. This paper focuses solely on the concept of intersectional risk, while other findings of the Rise Study are shared elsewhere. The interplay between psychological safety, risk, and physical safety provides a clear connection to culture change and safety outcomes in nature-facing, high-risk professions beyond the avalanche and mountain guiding profession. This paper points to intersectional risk provides as a more suitable framework for coping with emerging needs within the profession to address increasing risk complexity due to the cascading processes of climate change.

KEYWORDS: Risk, psychological safety, human factors, intersectional feminism, climate change.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Rise Study is grounded in the workplace culture of a globally networked mountain guiding and avalanche profession. This workplace culture evolved from a historical legacy linked to conquest in relation to mountain alpine geographies. Wilderness as a concept was embedded within imperialism, creating a sense of meaning in connection with a physical geographical space (Efran et al., 2014). "Wilderness" was rooted in a colonial discourse of unspoiled and untamed nature, removed and distinct from the realm of Western human development; it was the fictive concept that informed a "frontier" mentality. Frontiers, became the stage upon which the White male was the "conqueror" of both the lesser aspects of himself, and nature; a hero in his own story (Sontag, 1966). Direct experiences of 'wilderness' or 'adventure' were filtered through intersecting oppressions, that constructed both a physical and cultural space to be inhabited by heroes of those spaces – namely, cis-het White men. The connection between heroic masculinity and wilderness established a "particular way [of] thinking about space and place [that is] tied up with…social constructions of gender relations" (Massey, 1994, p.2). The cultural and physical boundaries of the spaces designated as mountain wildernesses become one and the same; certain roles (e.g., mountain guide) are sequestered by 'ground rules' and gatekept (Ardener, 2021).

The history of the mountain guiding and avalanche profession rests on these colonial space-place gender relations, and the mountain guiding and avalanche profession today remains dominated by cis, het, White, male individuals (85% male; Canadian Avalanche Association, 2019). The Rise Study's feminist critique of this historic legacy, and its current impacts, is based on the foundational assumption that the "identities of place are always unfixed, contested, and multiple", and therefore up for discussion over space and time (Massey, 1994, p.5). By bringing perspectives from marginalised identities within the cultural narrative into the centre, this study associates queerness, racialized identities – and beyond – with physical mountain spaces. This simple, yet profound decision, in sample demographics is an intentional means of disrupting the associations between gender and place, challenging the ground rules and gatekeeping implicit within the culture of the profession (Massey, 1994; Ardener, 2021).

* Corresponding author address:
Prof Rachel D. Reimer, Department of Community, Culture and Global Studies, University of British Columbia, Okanagan, 1147 Research Road, Room ART 274, Kelowna, BC V1V 1V7
tel: +1 250-814-3399
email: r.d.reimer@gmail.com

Existing research within the avalanche and mountain guiding field contains primarily practitioner-derived studies exploring snow science and avalanche risk. Quantitative studies form the majority of the literature. These are primarily focused on convenience survey sampling amongst recreational users of backcountry ski areas. Emerging areas of research that explore psychological and behavioural aspects of workplace culture are limited (Johnson et al., 2016; Sommer & Ehlert, 2004). What research does exist within the human side of mountain risk-based decision-making has been organised under the heading of 'human factors.' This body of research has skimmed the surface of the complexity of decision-making within professional groups, and has yet to integrate or even engage with critical theory, identity, intersubjectivity, or the effects of intragroup power dynamics on decision-making outcomes based on changing demographics within the profession. Many of the contributions under the label of 'human factors' are considered 'grey literature' (Haegeli et al., 2023; Hetland et al., 2025).

Further, the increasing complexity of risk management in nature-facing professions due to climate change has placed risk management professionals in a "cascading process" of risk escalation linked to glacial retreat and permafrost warming in the high alpine (Magnin et al., 2023; Ravanel et al., 2023). In highly studied geographical areas such as the Mont Blanc massif, research has identified that "steep rock slopes in cold environments have become increasingly unstable, with more frequent rockfalls and large-scale events" (Magnin et al., 2023, para. 35). Canadian studies have found that 99% of mountain guides noted changes in the mountain environment attributed to climate change over the course of their careers (Rushton & Rutty, 2023); and, adaptations to climate amongst mountain guides are affected by socio-cultural norms such as tenure in the profession and economic factors (Hanly & McDowell, 2024).

Given the context of increased risk, vulnerability, and exposure to hazards in high mountain environments due to climate change, and the socio-cultural influence on adaptive strategies among mountain guides, the Rise Study's focus on risk amongst non-dominant groups offers important insights on this issue urgently facing mountain guides and avalanche workers. By inquiring into participants' definitions of risk and psychological safety in an open-ended way, fresh ways of conceptualising risk in relation to human-caused hazards and mountain hazards emerge. This is especially relevant as climate change dramatically shifts the mountainous contexts in which risk management is occurring, and existing risk frameworks struggle to adapt. The Rise Study models the kind of curiosity, open-mindedness, and freshness that are required for paradigm-shifting insights to emerge.

2. AIM & GOALS OF THE RISE STUDY

The aim of the Rise Study is to explore the lived experiences of mountain guides and avalanche workers from among the non-dominant group in relation to their felt sense, and intersubjective experiences of, inclusion, psychological safety and participation in risk management in the context of mountainous, alpine place-based geographies.

The overarching goals are to engage members of the mountain guiding and avalanche profession whose intersecting identities Two-Spirited, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer (2SLGBTQ+), Black, Indigenous, People Of Colour (BIPOC), and/or workplace trauma survivors for the purpose of:

1. Inquiring into the intersectional complexities of identity, inclusion and psychological safety within the traditional male-dominated, cis-het, White, high-risk professions of mountain guiding and avalanche work. This achieves the disruption of invisibility of members of the profession from the non-dominant group by creating space for visibility, context, and agency.
2. Inquiring into risk taking, risk management, and leadership practices amongst members of the profession from the non-dominant group. This includes intersubjectivity, perceptions of risk taking, risk management, and the intersectional social and cultural contexts where risk taking, risk management, and leadership occur.
3. Providing evidence-based, participant-derived recommendations for culture change within the profession. This is in service of furthering inclusion, psychological safety, and effective risk management. And, as a means of amplifying the voices of members of the non-dominant group by creating a space for agency in shaping culture change.

3. METHODOLOGY

Consistent with its aims and key questions, the Rise Study utilized an intersectional feminist appreciative approach to insider Action Research (AR). AR is a practical, collaborative problem-solving process with an aim to create concrete

benefits for the community in focus, while also providing rich opportunities for theory (Thiollent, 2011). Traditional AR is a three-step process of 'Look, Think, Act' (Stringer, 2014), but in this study I detached the third step, which focuses on implementation of study findings. Providing actionable, practical recommendations based on the Rise Study findings fulfils this third step. This choice was made to ensure that the psychological safety of myself as researcher, and my study participants as minorities within the profession were protected from blowback or harm.

The study took an intersectional feminist approach to AR by cultivating sensitivity to power imbalances, and using an intersectional and critical feminist lens of analysis (Campbell, 2003; Hesse-Biber, 2012; Taylor, 1998). My practice of feminist research is based on disrupting "traditional ways of knowing to create rich new meanings…taking on a multitude of different standpoints and negotiating these identities simultaneously" (Hesse-Biber, 2012, p.3). I follow hooks' definition of feminism as: "A movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression" (2000, p. iii), which focuses on systems that sustain power rather than identity groups within those systems (e.g. cis-het White males, or 'toxic masculinity'). Gender, race and other non-dominant groups also fall within the purview of intersectional feminism, as does masculinity theory (Anderson, 2023; Johnston, 2018). Every choice made in this study reflects my foundational commitment to intersectional feminist research and praxis: to "challenge knowledge that excludes, while seeming to include…as though what is true for dominant groups must also be true for women and other marginalized groups" (Hesse-Biber, 2012, p.3).

This study is also an example of 'insider' AR (Coghlan & Shani, 2008). My professional role was linked to guiding when this study began*, and my social and professional networks were extensive within the North American guiding and avalanche community due to volunteer work on the Association of Canadian Mountain Guides' (ACMG) Diversity and Inclusion Committee (Co-founder and Co-Chair 2017-2020), as well as research consulting work within the Canadian avalanche and guiding community.* This experience informed the research process at numerous points, including: 1) sensitivity to emerging and commonly invisible themes among non-dominant groups; 2) an intuitive understanding of trust-building and data collection methods for gaining access to highly guarded insights; and, 3) an understanding of the nature of pushback, potential risks to participants and to myself as lead research, and insights into study design that provided protection for all people involved.

4. ETHICS, SCOPE & LIMITATIONS

This study followed the Australian ethical guidelines for research involving humans and was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Wollongong, Australia (National Health and Medical Research Council, n.d.; HREC 2023/062). To mitigate my insider status in the industry of study in North America, and expand the analytical reach, the study was extended to France and Switzerland. I also engaged in a rigorous practice of critical "self-reflexivity" (Coghlan & Brannick, 2005; Yost & Chmielewski, 2013). The study utilized 'member checks' to check the validity of emerging findings, build trust through enhanced agency, and engaged in iterative conversation through sharing interview transcripts with participants (Kornbluh, 2015). Participation in the Rise Study was limited to mountain guides and avalanche workers whose certifications were from IFMGA member countries (IFMGA, 2025). Their certifications needed to be valid at the time of the study, or, they needed to be enrolled in courses with relevant guides' associations to achieve their certifications (aspirant guides, for example). Additionally, participants needed to self-identify as either 2SLGBTQ+, female, BIPOC; or, as a survivor from workplace traumatic incidents involving rockfall, icefall, avalanches, and related context. I gave potential participants the opportunity to interpret 'workplace trauma' broadly based on their own experiences. Many provided a brief summary of their traumatic experiences in an open-ended answer within the intake form, ranging from mountain hazard incidents (e.g., rockfall) to human-caused hazard incidents (e.g., harassment and discrimination).

5. METHODS

Participants were recruited using snowball sampling (word-of-mouth), and convenience sampling (online via social media, and member-only email lists via the International Federation of Mountain Guides' Associations). Regardless of recruitment method, potential participants filled out an intake form to ensure they met inclusion criteria.

Data collection in the Rise Study consisted of in-depth semi-structured interviews (n=17; t=1-2 hours), conducted virtually via Zoom (n=15) or in-person (n=2), and, the submission of digital stories by participants, if they so chose (n=9). Interviews were recorded via Zoom for virtual interviews (n=15) or using the iPhone Voice Recorder app for in-person interviews (n=2). Video files were immediately discarded in the Zoom recordings, and audio files were kept and transcribed. I followed a five-step approach outlined by Alessi

and Khan (2023) for qualitative trauma-informed interview practices, which are: 1) preparing for community entry by learning about the impacts of traumatic events and historical trauma; 2) establishing safety and trust in the interview; 3) extending safety and trust throughout the interview; 4) knowing when to change course or pivot to avoid re-traumatization in the interview; and, 5) committing to regular and radical self-reflection and self-care in the research process. Interviews offered a collaborative opportunity to "co-construct" a story of participants' reality, which was true for them in that moment, "always contextual…never [the] ultimate truth" (Yost & Chmielewski, 2013, p.245). However, even with the most nuanced feminist approach to interview-based data collection, there is always an element of power and privilege that I hold as a researcher that cannot be erased (McCorkel & Myers, 2003). This was especially true when interviewing people of colour (I am White), or trans and genderqueer individuals (I am queer, but cis-passing). See Table 1 for participant demographics. Participant employment details (e.g. avalanche forecaster; guide) are not provided in order to protect participant identities

6. DATA ANALYSIS

Semi-structured interviews were transcribed using machine-based learning via Microsoft One-Note, and then edited manually. Transcripts were coded manually using in vivo (not the software), which is an approach that uses participants' own words to develop codes (Saldana, 2009). I created a code list in Google sheets, using descriptive codes from participants own words, and colour coded findings based on three main themes that emerged: ***psychological safety, risk,*** and ***inclusion*****.**

I completed coding and analysis in consistent collaborative discussion with the study supervisors. I took a feminist approach to data analysis by implementing sensitivity to power dynamics based on identity factors, and how each participants' knowledge was situated within the larger systems of the socio-cultural frameworks of the mountain guiding and avalanche profession (Harding, 1987; Hesse-Biber, 2012).

Self-reflexivity played an important role during analysis (Ackerly & True, 2008). Continuous 'relational dialogue' with the study supervisors at the University of Wollongong was key, underscored by mutual trust, disclosure, vulnerability, and radical self-reflection (Drozdzewski & Dominey-Howes, 2015).

7. FINDINGS

Findings from the Rise Study are shared in three articles, and each article addresses one of three distinct yet interrelated themes: psychological safety (Reimer & Eriksen, 2025); risk (Reimer et al., 2026); inclusion (Reimer, in review). This proceedings paper for the 2026 Whistler International Snow Science Workshop highlights a key finding related to safety outcomes in high-risk professions, and will focus on ***intersectional risk.***

7.1 Current definitions of risk

The current definition of risk in avalanche and mountain guiding professional training materials

Table 1: Study demographics

Certifications	Gender	Sexuality	Racial identity	Workplace trauma history	Country
Mountain guide n=4	Women n=14	Hetero-sexual n=7	White/ Caucasian n=11	Yes n=5	Canada n=7
Mountain guide candidate n=5	Men n=1	Bisexual n=4	Biracial Korean n=1	No n=8	USA n=6
Alpine and ski guide n=1	Transgender n=1	Queer n=3	Chinese n=1	Did not disclose n=4	France n=2
Avalanche professional n=6	Non-binary/ gender queer n=1	Did not identify n=3	Did not identify n=4		Switzerland n=2
Speciality guide n=1					

rests heavily on the international standard ISO 31000, which is "the effects of uncertainty on objectives" (ISO 31000, 2018). The risk-management framework in place is based on a theory-in-use originally developed by Statham (2008), which was further expanded into the *Conceptual Model of Avalanche Hazard* (CMAH), and is widely used beyond the scope of avalanche risk, informing risk management for summer alpine hazards (Statham et al., 2018). The framework rests on four key concepts: hazard, risk, vulnerability, and exposure, which are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Risk in the avalanche and mountain guiding profession: Key concepts from Statham's model

Hazard	'Avalanche hazard', which is "the potential for an avalanche to cause damage to something of value. It is a function of the likelihood of triggering [an avalanche] and the destructive size of the avalanche(s)" (Statham, 2008, p. 225).
Vulnerability	"Susceptibility to the impacts of avalanche hazard." Statham used the example of a human being versus an old growth tree, and the comparatively larger size avalanche that would be required in order to cause harm to the tree versus the person. The person in this example has a higher vulnerability, "and subsequently a higher risk" (Ibid.).
Exposure	Where, and for how long, the element at risk is positioned in the terrain. The question of consequence is then raised and summarized as a simple question: "if it goes, what will happen?" (Ibid.)
Risk	Risk, specifically avalanche risk, is "the probability of harm resulting from interactions between avalanche hazard and specific element(s) at risk". Elements at risk are evaluated based on their vulnerability and exposure (Ibid.).

However, even when Statham et al.'s framework is applied consistently, risk management is highly subjective. This is because risk assessment and management are affected by uncertainty. Mitigating uncertainty means "the avalanche specialist clearly states the underlying assumptions and the approximate nature of the results" (Statham, 2008, p. 226; see also McClung, 2002; McClung et al., 2006; Statham et al. 2018). The Rise Study inquired into how identity shapes perceptions about risk, exploring the ambiguous ground where uncertainty and risk collide.

Participants in the Rise Study were asked to define risk in their own words; to evaluate whether they felt listened to when sharing insights on risk management equally to their peers; and, to share anything further on the subject of risk they wished. When defining risk in their own words, they mirrored Statham's (2008) framework, which points to a salience of these key concepts across geographic contexts and diverse professional pathways: 'the effect of uncertainty' (n=5); 'hazard and vulnerability' (n=4); 'exposure' (n=2); and, 'consequence and probability' (n=2). However, there was a significant departure in the data from how Statham has defined both ***vulnerability*** and ***exposure***.

7.2 Findings on vulnerability

Participants equated vulnerability to mountain hazards (e.g. being harmed in an avalanche or rockfall) *in a causal relationship with emotional vulnerability amongst their team members* (e.g. sharing openly about risk). There was agreement in the data that the ability to 'be vulnerable' on a team and use their voices to positively affect risk management decision-making was linked to psychological safety (n=8), and psychological safety was linked to physical safety. When teams felt psychologically unsafe, some participants voiced feeling intense internal pressure to share at their own expense: "Even if I don't feel people are that supportive…it's my job to vocalize anything [I observe]"; "If I'm not making observations and contributing to the discussion in relating my thoughts and paying attention…then I'm not doing my job. And I'm putting even more people at risk."

7.3 Findings on exposure

Participants defined risk as a combination of exposure to *both* mountain hazards *and* human-caused hazards:

"There's personal risk, and the risk you take with your group, and the risk you take as a whole team of guides, and there's psychological risk, and there's emotional risk. And so, it's a very big topic."

"A hazard is the potential to do harm to something. And when we're exposed to that, that becomes a risk. And…there's a lot at stake when you choose a profession…I underestimated the potential to do harm…And I think there have been costs to my financial stability, to my relationships, to my mental and physical health. Those risks are very real within this profession."

The lived experience of risk management spanned from mountain hazards into daily life,

which highlights the interconnected nature of exposure to risk. This explodes the confines of the working day beyond the 'formal' workplace.

7.4 Intersectional risk in lived experiences

Participants further shared of their experiences that outlined specific identity-based risk management challenges. These go well beyond mountain hazards, and the scope of the traditional risk framework currently in use (Statham, 2008; Statham et al., 2018):

"Sexual harassment and discrimination and assault and…being passed over for certain jobs…and being pulled into my [supervisor's] room for a closed-door meeting where he asked me if I was going to have children because that was to determine whether or not I was promoted."

"On a first night [of a guided trip] this guest…goes on this rant, it's only [the two of us]…about how basically…there's no way in hell he's ever gonna get on board with they/them pronouns…non-binary people aren't [real]…and it just went on and on…Then I had to guide him and his wife for three days in fricking gnarly terrain…The safety [issue] is…not knowing what I'm going to potentially face from guests."

"There's just a lot of White males that are…right at the top and they see less of themselves in a woman or a person of colour, they just don't connect the same way."

"The hardest part wasn't actually the attitude of my boss [who harassed me]…The hardest part was the other colleagues…They didn't care. They were like, 'oh yeah, we know. He's like that with women, and that's all.' And they were just normalizing his attitude."

This complexity of lived experience within the profession pushes us into new territory beyond the current scope of 'human factors' literature (Haegeli et al., 2023; Hetland et al., 2025), and traditional conceptualizations of risk (Statham, 2008; Statham et al., 2018). I have proposed the concept of 'intersectional risk' as a comprehensive way to integrate *both* mountain hazards *and* human-caused hazards into a standardized definition of risk (see also Reimer et al., 2026). For ease of use within the profession, I have adapted the original framework developed by Statham to describe avalanche risk (2008, p. 225), as visualized in Fig. 1 (Reimer et al., 2026).

Fig. 1 Intersectional risk in the avalanche and guiding profession: A function of two types of hazards, vulnerability, and exposure.

The concept of 'intersectional risk' rests on Crenshaw's (1989) definition of intersectionality, which was originally based on recognizing the "multiply-burdened" nature of Black women's experiences within the American court system (p. 140). In Crenshaw's analysis, the "intersectional experience" was far greater than the sum of gender discrimination and race-based discrimination, for example. In listening to participants in the Rise Study, I learned that members of the non-dominant group within the mountain guiding and avalanche profession are facing 'new' – or rather, *a formerly invisible and unacknowledged* – set of hazards. These hazards had been compartmentalized to the margins. In order to acknowledge the work of risk management that is already occurring by some members of the profession, it is imperative to challenge the dominant language, create more suitable language, and bring those experiences of risk management related to human-caused hazards *to the centre*, as Crenshaw argued.

Further, the data revealed that it is insufficient to separate human-caused hazards from the process of risk management that occurs related to mountain hazards–for example, to align these under 'human factors'. Members of the non-dominant group in the Rise Study shared that they are integrating any number of overlapping mountain hazards (e.g. icefall, rockfall, avalanche hazard, meteorological hazards) *and* any number of human-caused hazards (e.g. gender discrimination, sexual harassment, racism, ableism) *simultaneously.* The concept of intersectional risk captures the complexity of lived experience that arose in the data, and brings these experiences from the margins to the centre. By expanding on the current definition of risk, there is an opportunity to truly acknowledge and engage with the changing nature of risk management within the profession *writ large,* based on these insights from among the non-dominant group.

7.5 Intersectional risk and uncertainty

The uncertainty described in relation to mountain hazards within established snow science literature (McClung, 2002; McClung et al., 2006; Statham, 2008, 2018) is mirrored in relation to human-caused hazards. Some of the challenging experiences shared by participants in the Rise Study were registered as simply annoying (e.g. having a tall male client be addressed as the leader of the group by other climbers simply due to gender and height), and others were shocking and deeply harmful (e.g. sexual assault by a formerly trusted peer & coworker). The uncertainty

of timing, intensity, and severity of the impact of these experiences took a cumulative toll. In addition, the emotional energy and interpersonal risk involved in attempting to explain to male peers or supervisors that an incident involving human-caused hazards had occurred was significant in many cases.

To capture the complexity of uncertainty and intersectional risk, I have borrowed a concept from a participant in the Rise Study who described risk management in relation to human-caused hazards like managing a deep persistent slab (DPS) avalanche problem. Statham et al. (2018) define DPS's as "the most difficult avalanche problem to asses, predict and manage due to a high degree of uncertainty." (p. 677). I've expanded on the participants' use of metaphor to show how human-caused hazards can result in 'invisible avalanches', analogous to snow avalanches. I've compiled all of the experiences of human-caused hazards shared in the Rise Study data into Table 3, which organizes them based on established terms from the CMAH, as if they were an 'avalanche problem' (Reimer et al., 2026). These are not an exhaustive list of human-caused hazards within the profession, and represent a snapshot of experiences shared in this study alone at a specific timeframe. In presenting the data shared in the Rise Study about human-caused hazards as an analogous 'deep persistent weak layer' within the culture of the profession, I hope to provoke thought and challenge assumptions about human-caused hazards. In many cases, a human-caused hazard can exist, and the absence of harm (e.g. non-event feedback due to nothing happening) might support the belief in the façade of psychological safety and hazard mitigation.

Table 3: Human-caused hazards through the CMAH lens

Type of Problem
Racism; transphobia; homophobia; sexual assault; physical assault; gender discrimination; sexual harassment; stigma due to mental health.
Location
Co-workers (trusted or adversarial, of all backgrounds, identities). Clients (new or familiar; of all backgrounds, identities). Members of the public (recreational skiers & snowboarders; recreational climbers & alpinists; of all backgrounds, identities).
Sensitivity to Triggers
Reactive. The greater the visibility of difference (race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, etc), and the greater the homogeneity of the group, the more sensitive the problem is to trigger.
Spatial Distribution
Widespread. Islands of safety exist with high standards of psychological safety; anecdotally these are very challenging to find or create, and to sustain over time.
Likelihood (of triggering)
Likely to Very Likely (based on the frequency with which human-caused hazards negatively impacted participants in this study).
Destructive Impact (of incident)
Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (C-PTSD); adjustment disorder; depression; anxiety disorders; suicide; job loss (being fired); job loss (choice made due to exclusion issues); financial instability; loss of intimate relationships; loss of opportunity for other life goals (e.g. starting a family); physical harm from assault (both sexual and physical assault); hospitalization; loss of career progression opportunities and/or career plateau; reputational damage due to blowback from reporting harassment or discrimination; loss of team-level performance due to low trust; avalanche accidents; mountain hazard near-misses.

8. CONCLUSION

I began the Rise Study with the intuition that there was more going on beneath the surface of existing narratives about risk, psychological safety, and inclusion. In this paper, I have offered a clear description of human-caused hazards in the profession, such as gender discrimination, sexual harassment, racism, and the like. I have presented the concept of intersectional risk as an expanded framework to meet the complexity of lived experience among non-dominant group members in avalanche and mountain guiding profession–insights that are relevant to other nature-facing, high-risk professions. Following Crenshaw's (1989) insights on intersectionality, I bring the workload of managing human-caused hazards to the centre, and call it what is it: risk management. Most importantly, this study has borne witness to the pioneering work of risk managers from the non-dominant group whose work ethic, complex risk management frameworks, self-mastery and commitment to the betterment of the entire profession I find deeply inspiring.

FOOTNOTES

*Apprentice ski guide candidate; Apprentice hiking guide; Top-Rope Climbing Instructor, Association of Canadian Mountain Guides. Avalanche Operations Level 2 (avalanche forecaster qualification), Canadian Avalanche Association.

*I was commissioned as Principal Investigator (PI) on a national study into diversity, inclusion and mental health in the Canadian avalanche and mountain guiding industry in 2019, and awarded the Silver Member Services Award for pioneering DEI issues in the profession.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Rise Study was supported by the University of Wollongong, School of Geography and Sustainable Communities; the International Federation of Mountain Guides' Associations; Canadian Mountain Holidays; the Association of Canadian Mountain Guides; and, the Canadian Avalanche Association. Thank you to the study participants, and to my mentors, Dr. Andrew Warren and Dr. Christine Eriksen. I honour the unceded ancestral lands of the Sinixt people, where I live.

REFERENCES

Ackerly, B. and True, J.: Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations, International Studies Review, 10, 693–707, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2008.00826.x, 2008.

Alessi, E.J., & Kahn, S.: Toward a trauma-informed qualitative research approach: Guidelines for ensuring the safety and promoting the resilience of research participants., Qualitative Research in Psychology, 20, 121–154, https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2022.2107967, 2023.

Anderson, E.: The impact of feminist approaches on masculinity scholarship, Curr Opin Psychol, 50, 101583, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101583, 2023.

Ardener, S.: Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps, Routledge, 216 pp., 2021.

Campbell, E.: Interviewing men in uniform: a feminist approach?, International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 6, 285–304, https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570110109115, 2003.

Coghlan, D., Shani, A.B. R.: Insider action research: The dynamics of developing new capabilities, in: The SAGE Handbook of Action Research: Participative inquiry and practice, edited by: P. Reason, H. Bradbury, SAGE, London, 643–655, 2008.

Coghlan, D. and Brannick, T.: Doing Action Research in Your Own Organization, SAGE, 365 pp., 2014.

Crenshaw, K.: Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics, University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989, 139–167, 1989.

Drozdzewski, D. and Dominey-Howes, D.: Research and trauma: Understanding the impact of traumatic content and places on the researcher, Emotion, Space and Society, 17, 17–21, 2015.

Efran, J. S., McNamee, S., Warren, B., and Raskin, J. D.: Personal Construct Psychology, Radical Constructivism, and Social Constructionism: A Dialogue, Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 27, 1–13, https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2014.850367, 2014.

Haegeli, P., Clair, A. S., McNeil, K., Mannberg, A., and Hetland, A.: Reflections on how to improve the contribution of social science research to avalanche safety practices, 2023.

Hanly, K. and McDowell, G.: Climate change vulnerability and adaptation among mountain guides in the Canadian Rockies, Reg Environ Change, 25, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-025-02368-y, 2025.

Harding, S. G.: Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues, Indiana University Press, 214 pp., 1987.

Hesse-Biber, S. N.: Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis, SAGE, 793 pp., 2012.

Hetland, A., Hetland, R. A., Skille, T. T., and Mannberg, A.: Review article: A scoping review of human factors in avalanche decision-making, Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 25, 929–948, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-25-929-2025, 2025.

hooks, b.: Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics, Pluto Press, 138 pp., 2000.

ISO 31000:2018(en), Risk management — Guidelines, https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/en/#iso:std:iso:31000:ed-2:v1:en, last access: 15 May 2025., 2025.

Johnson, J., Haegeli, P., Hendrikx, J., and Savage, S.: Accident causes and organizational culture among avalanche professionals, Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 13, 49–56, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.11.003, 2016.

Johnston, L.: Intersectional feminist and queer geographies: a view from “down-under.,” Gender, Place & Culture, 25, 554–564, https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1460329, 2018.

Kornbluh, M.: Combatting Challenges to Establishing Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research, Qualitative Research in Psychology, 12, 397–414, https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2015.1021941, 2015.

Magnin, F., Ravanel, L., Ben-Asher, M., Bock, J., Cathala, M., Duvillard, P.-A., Jean, P., Josnin, J.-Y., Kaushik, S., Revil, A., and Deline, P.: From Rockfall Observation to Operational Solutions: Nearly 20 years of Cryo-gravitational Hazard Studies in Mont-Blanc Massif, Journal of Alpine Research | Revue de géographie alpine, https://doi.org/10.4000/rga.11703, 2023.

Massey, D. Space, Place, and Gender, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, UNITED STATES, 1994.

McClung, D. M.: The Elements of Applied Avalanche Forecasting, Part I: The Human Issues, Natural Hazards, 26, 111–129, https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015665432221, 2002.

McClung, D.M, Stethem, C.J., Jamieson, J.B., Schaerer, P.A.: Guidelines for snow avalanche risk determination and mapping in Canada., Canadian Avalanche Association, Revelstoke, British Columbia, 2006.

McCorkel, J. A. and Myers, K.: What Difference Does Difference Make? Position and Privilege in the Field, Qualitative Sociology, 26, 199–231, https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022967012774, 2003.

Ravanel, L., Roy, M. L., Magnin, F., and Chiarle, M.: The Glaciated Slopes of the High Alpine Mountains: Holocene Evolution and Impacts of the Current Climate Crisis, Journal of Alpine Research | Revue de géographie alpine, https://doi.org/10.4000/rga.12294, 2023.

Reimer, R. D. and Eriksen, C.: Feeling safe enough: Psychological safety in the mountain guiding and avalanche profession, Journal of Rural Studies, 120, 103834, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2025.103834, 2025.

Reimer, R. D., Eriksen, C., and Warren, A.: The Second Shift in Mountain Guiding and Avalanche Work: Intersectional risk, human-caused hazards, and risk-management effectiveness among non-dominant groups, International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 139, 106144, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2026.106144, 2026.

Reimer, R.D.: Inclusion and belonging among non-dominant groups in the avalanche and mountain guiding profession, Emotion, Space, and Society. *In review.*

Rushton, B. and Rutty, M.: Gaining insight from the most challenging expedition: climate change from the perspective of Canadian mountain guides, Current Issues in Tourism, 26, 3903–3915, https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2023.2185506, 2023.

Saldana, J.: Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers, Reprinted., SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, Calif, 2009.

Sontag, Susan: The anthropologist as hero, in: Against interpretation and other essays, Picador Press, 1966.

Sommer, I. and Ehlert, U.: Adjustment to trauma exposure: Prevalence and predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in mountain guides, Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 57, 329–335, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2004.01.010, 2004.

Statham, G. and Canada, P.: AVALANCHE HAZARD, DANGER AND RISK – A PRACTICAL EXPLANATION, International Snow Science Workshop, 2008.

Statham, G., Haegeli, P., Greene, E., Birkeland, K., Israelson, C., Tremper, B., Stethem, C., McMahon, B., White, B., and Kelly, J.: A conceptual model of avalanche hazard, Nat Hazards, 90, 663–691, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-3070-5, 2018.

Stringer, E. T.: Action Research, SAGE Publications, 329 pp, 2014.

Taylor, V.: Feminist Methodology in Social Movements Research, Qualitative Sociology, 21, 357–379, https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023376225654, 1998.

Thiollent, M.: Action Research and Participatory Research: An Overview*, International Journal of Action Research, 7, 160–174, 2011.

Yost, M. R. and Chmielewski, J. F.: Blurring the Line Between Researcher and Researched in Interview Studies A Feminist Practice?, Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37, 242–250, https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312464698, 2013.