

Media and Risk

A Phase Model Elucidating Media Attention to
Nuclear Energy Risk

Silje Kristiansen



Universitätsverlag Ilmenau

2017

Imprint

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de> .

This work was accepted as a PhD thesis by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Zurich in the fall semester 2015 on the recommendation of the Doctoral Committee: Prof. Dr. Heinz Bonfadelli (main supervisor) and Prof. Dr. Mike S. Schäfer, Universität Zürich.

Technische Universität Ilmenau/Universitätsbibliothek

Universitätsverlag Ilmenau

Postfach 10 05 65

98684 Ilmenau

<http://www.tu-ilmenau.de/universitaetsverlag>

readbox unipress

in der readbox publishing GmbH

Am Hawerkamp 31

48155 Münster

<http://unipress.readbox.net>

ISSN 2197-6937

ISBN 978-3-86360-159-1 (Druckausgabe)

URN urn:nbn:de:gbv:ilm1-2017100025

Coverbilder:

1. Front page of Neue Zürcher Zeitung, March 14, 2011
2. Front page of Tages-Anzeiger, March 12, 2011
3. Steam emerges from a cooling tower of the nuclear power plant Leibstadt near Leibstadt, Switzerland, November 18, 2014.
CREDIT LINE: REUTERS/Arnd Wiegmann, IMAGE ID: RTST3K5
4. Tokyo by night, Lina Ingmarsdotter
5. Teddy bear in Pripjat, Ukraine, Lina Ingmarsdotter

Logo: Iwanja Wolling

Contents

Table index	8
Figure index.....	9
Acknowledgement.....	12
1. Introduction	13
2. Nuclear Energy: Benefits and Detriments	21
3. Nuclear Energy Context in Switzerland.....	26
4. What is Risk?	29
4.1. Perspectives on Risk.....	29
4.2. Existing Risk Definitions	31
4.3. A Compiled Risk Definition.....	37
4.4. Risk Communication.....	42
5. Media Attention & Media Reality	46
5.1. The Role of Events to Media Attention.....	63
5.2. Media Reality – Key Event and Media-Hype Studies	67
5.3. Interim Conclusion – Attention Models & Phases; Key Events’ and Media-Hypes’ Implication for Media Coverage	78
6. Media Reality & State of Research – Risk Communication and Nuclear Energy.....	86
6.1. What Happens in the Media When Nothing Much Happens in the Plants?.....	89
6.2. Interim Conclusion of Nuclear Energy Studies in Routine Situations.....	99
6.3. What Happens in the Media When Nuclear Fission Gets Out of Hand?	101
6.4. Interim Conclusion of Nuclear Accident Coverage Studies	111
7. Research Questions & Hypotheses	116
7.1. Risk Attention Phase Model.....	120
7.2. Phase One: Prospective Optimism	121
7.3. Phase Two: “Media Storm”.....	122
7.4. Phase Three: Window of Opportunity.....	124
7.5. Phase Four: Reconsideration	125
7.6. Phase Five: Slumber.....	126

8. Method	128
8.1. Topic of investigation	128
8.2. Media of investigation	129
8.3. Time period of investigation.....	130
8.4. Sampling strategy	132
8.5. Data gathering instrument.....	134
8.5.1. Operationalization and the codebook	135
8.5.2. Intercoder reliability	141
8.6. Front-page analysis	143
9. Results	145
9.1. Sample Description.....	147
9.1.1. Amount of coverage	147
9.1.2. Author and article types.....	150
9.1.3. Extent of coverage	150
9.2. Descriptive Results	153
9.2.1. Topics	153
9.2.2. Actors.....	157
9.2.3. Alignment of article topic.....	163
9.2.4. Journalistic bias	164
9.2.5. Controversial news coverage.....	166
9.2.6. Sensational news coverage	168
9.3. Interim conclusion – nuclear energy coverage before and after Fukushima.....	170
9.4. Risk Analysis	174
9.4.1. Risk Dimension Decision	178
9.4.2. Risk Dimension Benefit.....	183
9.4.3. Risk Dimension Benefit Degree	187
9.4.4. Risk Dimension Benefit Probability.....	188
9.4.5. Risk Dimension Benefit Uncertainty.....	189
9.4.6. Risk Dimension Detriment	189
9.4.7. Risk Dimension Detriment Severity.....	195
9.4.8. Risk Dimension Detriment Probability	195
9.4.9. Risk Dimension Detriment Uncertainty	196
9.4.10. Factor analysis of risk coverage dimensions	197
9.5. Interim conclusion – risk coverage.....	199

9.6. Phase analysis.....	203
9.6.1. Phase One – a prospective risk deliberation.....	205
9.6.2. Phase Two – detriment coverage	213
9.6.3. Phase Three – detriment deliberation.....	219
9.6.4. Phase Four – risk reconsideration	226
9.6.5. Phase Five – slumber.....	234
9.6.6. Multinomial logistic regression.....	235
9.7. Interim conclusion – phase analysis.....	239
9.8. Risk coverage pattern in the phases	248
9.8.1. Risk coverage pattern in phase one	248
9.8.2. Risk coverage pattern in phase two.....	251
9.8.3. Risk coverage pattern in phase three.....	253
9.8.4. Risk coverage pattern in phase four	255
9.9. Interim conclusion – risk coverage pattern in the phases	257
10. Summary.....	259
11. Discussion and Outlook	265
12. References	278
13. Attachment.....	294

Table index

Table 1	Nuclear energy—benefits and detriments	22
Table 2	Overview of Issue Attention Phase Models	61
Table 3	Comparison of key event, focusing event, media hype and media storm effects	81
Table 4	Research overview summary.....	111
Table 5	Hypothesized Characteristics of the Risk Phases.....	121
Table 6	Analysis sample.....	133
Table 7	Codebook overview.....	135
Table 8	Risk analysis – benefits examples	138
Table 9	Risk analysis – detriment examples	139
Table 10	Risk analysis – decision examples	140
Table 11	Intercoder reliability	142
Table 12	Topics 2010 to 2015	156
Table 13	Summary of exploratory factor analysis results	198
Table 14	Topics phase four	232
Table 15	Number of articles April to August, 2015	235
Table 16	Multinomial logistic regression.....	237
Table 17	Characteristics of the Risk Phases.....	241
Table 18	Cluster analysis phase one.....	249
Table 19	Cluster analysis phase two	251
Table 20	Cluster analysis phase three	254
Table 21	Cluster analysis phase four.....	256
Table 22	Clusters across the phases	257

Figure index

Figure 1	World Electricity Production in 2012	21
Figure 2	International Nuclear Event Scale	23
Figure 3	Time Line of Important (Swiss) Nuclear Energy Events.....	26
Figure 4	Illustration of Risks versus Dangers	35
Figure 5	Visualization of Risk Dimensions	39
Figure 6	Number of Swiss Sunday Newspaper Articles and Their Most Prominent Topics One Year after Fukushima	110
Figure 7	Number of Nuclear Energy Newspaper Articles in NZZ and TA from June 2008 to March 2015	131
Figure 8	Nuclear energy event time line, 2010 to 2015	147
Figure 9	Overview of the total number of nuclear energy articles in NZZ & TA from	148
Figure 10	Sample overview.....	149
Figure 11	Author and article types	150
Figure 12	Average length of articles per month over the whole sample period	151
Figure 13	Length of articles in TA & NZZ	152
Figure 14	Topics of the coverage, 2010 to 2015	155
Figure 15	Actor types present in the coverage 2010-2015.....	158
Figure 16	Percentage of actors present in the articles 2010-2015.....	159
Figure 17	Percentage of the same actor type in the same article	160
Figure 18	The three most cited actors, 2010 to 2015	161
Figure 19	Actor types present in the coverage of TA and NZZ.....	162
Figure 20	Positive, neutral or negative topic alignment, 2010 to 2015.....	164
Figure 21	Journalistic bias, 2010 to 2015.....	165
Figure 22	Journalistic bias in TA and NZZ, 2010 to 2015.....	166
Figure 23	Controversial journalistic presentation, 2010 to 2015	167
Figure 24	Controversial journalistic presentation in TA and NZZ, 2010 to 2015.....	168
Figure 25	Sensational journalistic presentation, 2010 to 2015	169

Figure 26	Sensational journalistic presentation in TA and NZZ	169
Figure 27	Risk dimension decision and its geographical distribution	175
Figure 28	Risk dimensions benefit and detriment	176
Figure 29	All risk dimensions, 2010 to 2015	177
Figure 30	Any decision regarding nuclear energy, in any country, 2010 to 2015	179
Figure 31	Comparison of the risk dimension decision between geographical regions	180
Figure 32	Comparison of the risk dimension decision between geographical regions, 2010 to 2015	181
Figure 33	Comparison of type of decision split by geographical region, 2010 to 2015	182
Figure 34	Nuclear energy benefits, 2010 to 2015	183
Figure 35	Type of benefit reported on over 2010 to 2015	184
Figure 36	Percentage of benefits reported on over 2010 to 2015	185
Figure 37	The most reported benefits, 2010 to 2015	186
Figure 38	Benefit categories, 2010 to 2015	187
Figure 39	Degree of benefit, 2010 to 2015	187
Figure 40	Benefit probability, 2010 to 2015	188
Figure 41	Benefit uncertainty, 2010 to 2015	189
Figure 42	Nuclear energy detriments, 2010 to 2015	190
Figure 43	Types of detriments reported on 2010 to 2015	191
Figure 44	Percentage of detriments reported on from 2010 to 2015	192
Figure 45	The most reported detriments, 2010 to 2015	193
Figure 46	Detriment categories, 2010 to 2015	194
Figure 47	Detriment severity, 2010 to 2015	195
Figure 48	Detriment probability, 2010 to 2015	196
Figure 49	Detriment uncertainty, 2010 to 2015	197
Figure 50	Risk dimensions 2010 to 2015	206
Figure 51	Decision, benefit and detriment January 2010 to May 2011	208
Figure 52	Comparison of benefit before and after Fukushima	210

Figure 53	Comparison of decision before and after Fukushima	210
Figure 54	Average number of nuclear energy articles per month, 2010-2015.....	212
Figure 55	Average length of articles	212
Figure 56	Risk dimensions phase two.....	214
Figure 57	Topic Fukushima accident and actors.....	216
Figure 58	Risk dimensions phase three.....	220
Figure 59	Topics across the three first phases.....	222
Figure 60	Selected actors across the first three phases	223
Figure 61	Journalistic bias in TA and NZZ across the first three phases.....	224
Figure 62	The most common risk dimensions phase four.....	227
Figure 63	Amount of coverage during 2013	229
Figure 64	Risk dimensions 2013	230
Figure 65	Total amount of nuclear energy coverage in NZZ and TA 2012 to 2015.....	233
Figure 66	All risk dimensions across the four phases	242
Figure 67	Amount of coverage across the phases	244