

: (*risk perception*)

Reaction of the Residents to Nuclear Related Policies : in a Risk Perception Perspective

5

가 , , DAD(Decide -
Announce -Defend) .
(acceptance)


Abstract

In general, most of the nuclear related policies are discussed at governmental level. Siting nuclear related facilities policies is the same as this. The government, as the single decision-maker, tends to decide all procedures from policy drafting, decision making to implementation. That is to say, the government has been opting for DAD(Decide-Announce-Defend) measure. This resulted in many forms of discord because the government overlooked the importance of sufficient communication with resident or the public. However, the precondition for promoting nuclear related policies is public acceptance. Meanwhile, the public including resident fully understand the necessity of nuclear facilities but do not agree with the idea of having them in their residential area.


Therefore, the research focuses on identifying the affecting factors toward reaction of the resident derived from previous studies. It also aims to lay the foundation for devising effective communication strategies between the government and the public. The result of case study, it was found that these factors-trust, participation and compensation-have interacted to affect residents' reaction. Ultimately, the government must recognize the residents as decision-maker so as to gain the PA(Public Acceptance). It also necessary to create better decision making processes by substantial participation, reasonable compensation and trust are essential first steps toward improving the situation

1. 가

1.1



1.2



2.

2.1 (risk) (risk perception)

2.1.1

(risk) 가 가 (possibility of loss or injury : someone or something that creates or suggests a hazard) .¹
Williams C. Arher Richard M. Heins Jr. (risk)

(variation) Short F. Ames Jr. (risk)
 , O'Riordan Timothy (risk)³
 가 (risk)⁴
 , Mark R. Green (risk)
 (uncertainty)⁵ , Allen Willet
 6 (risk) Royal Society Group (risk)
 가 7
 가 (uncertainty)
 (dread), (catastrophic potential), (controllability), (equity),
 (risk to future generation) (qualitative) (complex) 8
 (risk) (uncertainty)
 (risk)

2.1.2 (risk perception)

(public) 가(experts) 가
 가
 (state of the mind)⁹
 가 (objective), (analytic), (rational)
 (real risk) 가 (subjective) 가
 (hypothetical), (emotional), (irrational) (perception of risk)
 10
 가 (bias) 가
 가
 가
 가
 가
 (participation) 12
 , Slovic (risk perception)
 (degree of familiarity) 가
 가 (unknown), 가 (uncontrollable),
 13

2.2

2.2.1

(benefit) 가
 (benefit) (cost)
 transaction cost가
 가

(acceptance)

(locality)

가
DAD(Decide-Announce-Defend)¹⁵

가

가

2.2.2

2.2.2.1 NIMBY

NIMBY

NIMBY

. Matin P. Seller

NIMBY

.¹⁶Micael Dear

(motivation of residents)

NIMBY

.¹⁷ Michael E. Kraft Bruce B. Clary

(adverse impacts)

NIMBY

NIMBY

, Abert R. Matheny Bruce A. Williams

(HWDF: Hazardous Waste Disposal Facility)

(strong incentive)

가 (counter incentive)

가

가 (political stalemate)

.¹⁸ Peter M. Sandman NIMBY

NIMBY

(rational choice)

2.2.2.2

(multidimensional character)

²⁰

가

가

(negative externalities)

(cost0benefit)

가

²¹

가

(rational choice)

NIMBY

2.3

2.3.1

(trust)

(trust)

Flynn

가

²²

DOE

(trust)

(risk perception)

(technically),

(politically),

(socially)

가

(acceptable)

²³

2.3.1.1

, Slovic

가

(trust)

(distrust)

가

가

(knowledge)

(experience)

²⁴

가

가 가 . 가 가

.
가 Baruch Fischhoff 가

.
가 .²⁵ 가
가 . 가

, ,
, 가 가
가 .

2.3.1.2

.
가 가
.²⁶ 가 .

,
가 . 가
(public) 가 .

2.3.1.3

.
가 가
가 framing 가 . Entman , framing
(selection) (salience) , frame
text

,
가 가
, 가 .²⁷ Allen

Mazur

,
가
. ²⁸ Michell Carson

,
.²⁹
가 .

2.3.1.4

가
가

가

가

가

가

가

2.3.1.5

Bary R. Weingast

30

가

(trust)

가

가

2.3.2

(participation)

(trust)

가

(decision-making)

(participation)

(acceptance)

31

가

가

가

32

33

34

가

가

가

가
(participation)
가

35

가

36

가

가

가

2.3.3

가 (negative externalities)

가

가

37

가

가

가

2.3.4

(trust)

(participation),

가

가

가

가

가

가

2

가

3.

:

3.1

3.1.1

80% 가

가 가

가

가 가

가

1983

3.1.2

1990 11 2

11 3

11 5

가

42

17

가

11 6

5

가

가

가

JC,

20

1

11 8

가

가

53

가

가

6

()

가

1991

10 7 ' .

'가 , 12 31

. 1992 1 7 ,

, 가

. 5 31

가 ,
1993 1 18

가 가

가 .

, ' 277

90%

가

4

가

가 ,

3.2

3.2.1

(trust)

3.2.1.1

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

3.2.1.2

1

6

가

가

3.2.1.3

. 1990 11 3

2

9

11 9

227

가

가

가

가

3.2.1.4

가

가

가

PA

가

3.2.1.5

가

가

,
5

,
,

1

가

3.2.2

(participation)

DAD

가

가

, 가

가

가

가

가

가

1991 9 25

가

가

,
가

3.2.3

1992

가

5

가

가

가

가
가

3.2.4

가

가
가

가

가

가

4.

가

가

가

가

가

2001 6 5 2
5

38

10

가

-
- ¹ <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>
- ² Williams, C. A., Jr. Richard M. H. (1981). *Risk management and Insurance*, McGraw-Hill, pp.4-11
- ³ Short A. F, Jr. (1984). The social Fabric at Risk : Toward the Social Transformation of Risk analysis. *American Sociological Review* 49: pp.711-725
- ⁴ O'Riordan, T. (1982). Risk Perception Studies and Policy Priorities. *Risk Analysis* 2: pp.95-100
- ⁵ Green, Mark R. (1968). *Risk and Insurance*, South-Western Publishing Co. pp.2-3
- ⁶ Willet, Allen. (1951). *The Economy Theory of Risk and insurance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. P.6
- ⁷ Royal Society. (1983). *The Assessment of risk: A Study Group Report*. London: Royal Society
- ⁸ Slovic. P. (2000). Trust, Emotion, Sex, Politics and Science: Surveying the Risk-assessment Battlefield : The Perception of Risk. P.394
- ⁹ Pffer, Irving. (1957). *Insurance and economic theory*, Richard. Irwin, Inc, P.42
- ¹⁰ DuPont, R. L. (1980). Nuclear phobia-Phobic thinking about nuclear power. Washington, DC: The Media Institute
- ¹¹ Slovic, P. (1999). *Rating the Risks, Resources for the future*, Washington, United States
- ¹² Nuclear Energy Agency. (2000). Nuclear Energy in a Sustainable Development Perspective. OECD 2000. P.47
- ¹³ P. Slovic. (1987). Perception of Risk, *Science* 236 April 17 : pp.280-285
- ¹⁴ Amour. (1991). P.24
- ¹⁵ Ducsic. (1983) pp.6-7
- ¹⁶ Martin P. Sellar. (1993). *NIMBY : A Case Study in Conflict Politics*, Public Administration Quarterly, P.460
- ¹⁷ Michael Dear. (1992). *Understanding and Overcoming th NIMBY Syndrome*, Journal of the American Planning Association, vol.58, no.3 P.288
- ¹⁸ Albert R. Matheny and Bruce A. Williams. (1988). *Rethinking Participation : Assessing Florida's Strategy for Siting Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities* : Charles E. Davis & James P/ Lester(eds.), Dimension of Hazardous Waste Politics and Policy (New York : Greenwood Press), P. 37
- ¹⁹ Peter M. Sandman. (1987). *Getting to Maybe : Some Communication Aspects of Siting Hazardous Waste Facilities*. : Robert W. Lake(eds.), Resolving Locational Conflict (New Jersey : Center For Urban Policy Research). pp.2-27
- ²⁰ S. F. Tierney. (1979). *The Nuclear Waste Disposal Contrvrsy* : D. Nelkin(eds.). Controversies : Politics of Technical Decision (Beverly Hills, CA : Sage), pp.91-101
- ²¹ N. Freudenberg and S. Steinsapir. (1991). *Not in Our Backyards: The Grassroots Environmental Movement*, Society and Natural Resources, vol. 4 pp.235-245
- ²² J. Flynn, W. Burns, C.K. Mertz, and P. Slovic. (1992). Trust as a Determinant of Opposition to a High-Level Radioactive Waste Repository: Analysis of a Structural Model, *Risk Analysis* 12 no.3, pp.417-429
- ²³ U.S. Department of Energy. (1993). *Earning Public Trust and Confidence: Requisite for Managing Radioactive Wastes: Final Report of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board Task Force On Radioactive Waste Management*(Washington D.C.)
- ²⁴ Slovic, P. (2000). *Trust, Emotion, Sex, Politics and Science: Surveying the Risk-assessment Battlefield* : Slovic P.(eds.), The Perception of Risk(UK and USA: Earthscan Publications Ltd), pp.390-412
- ²⁵ Baruch Fischhoff, (1983). *Acceptable Risk : The Case of Nuclear Power*, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, no.2, no.4, P.566
- ²⁶ Fessenden-Raden, J. Fitchen, J M & Heath, J S (1987). *Providing risk information in communities: Factors influencing what is heard and accepted*, Science Technology and Human Values, 12, pp.94-101
- ²⁷ Hadden, Susan G. (1989). *A Citizen's Right to Know : Risk Communication and Public Policy*, (Boulder : Westview Press) P.129
- ²⁸ Allen Mazur, (1989). *Communicating Risk in the Mass Media : D. Peck(eds.), Psychological Effects of Hazardous Toxic Waste Disposal on Communities*, (Springfield, IL : Charles C. Thomas), pp.119-137
- ²⁹ Michael & Richard T. Carson. (1986). *Property Rights, Protest, and the Siting of Hazardous Waste Facilities*, American Economic Review, vol.76 P.287
- ³⁰ Barry R. Weingast. (1980), *Congress, Regulation and the Decline of Nuclear Power*, Public Policy, vol.28, no.22, pp231-255
- ³¹ Slovic, P. (2000), *Trust, Emotion, Sex, Politics and Science*, The Perception of Risk, pp.390-412
- ³² Joel D. Aberbach & Bert A. Rockman. (1978). *Administrators' Beliefs about the Role of the Public : The Case of American Federal Executives*, Western Political Quarterly, vol.31, pp.502-522
- ³³ Walter A. Rosenbaum. (1976). *The Paradox of Public Participation*, Administration and Society, vol.8. no.3 pp.355-383
- ³⁴ Douglas Easterling. (1992). *Fair Rules for Siting a High-Level Nuclear Waste Repository*, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, vol.11. no.2, pp447-448
- ³⁵ Frank Heller, Eugen Pusic, George Struss and Bernhard Wilpert. (1998). *Organizational Participation : Myth and Reality* (New York: Oxford Univ.), P. 67
- ³⁶ Gail Bingham & Daniel S. Miller. (1984). *Prospects for Resolving Hazardous Waste Siting Disputes Through Negotiation*

, *Natural Resources Lawyer*, vol.17, no.3, pp.477-478

³⁷ Laerence S. Bacow & James R. Milkey. (1982). *Overcoming Local Opposition to Hazardous Waste Facilities : The Massachusetts Approach*, *Harvard Environmental Law Review*, vol.2, no.2, P.268

³⁸ . (2001). 2