





Public Response: Causes, Consequences and Mitigation

William J. Burns Decision Research CREATE CSUSM

August 11, 2009

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers SES-0728934 and SES-0901036. It was also supported by the U. S. Department of Homeland Security through the Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events (CREATE) under grant number N00014-05-1-0630. However, any opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect views of the National Science Foundation or the U. S. Department of Homeland Security.







Objectives

• Research Findings Emerging from the Literature and Research Forums

 Three-Dimensional Taxonomy of Modeling Approaches

Potential Consequences





Summary Findings: Risk Literature, National Surveys & Risk Perception Workshop









Some Observations

- **Currently**: Descriptively Rich Portrayal of People's Perception of Risk.
- Limitations: High Resolution Snapshots Still Unable to Provide Insight into Dynamic Processes Driving Community Preparedness and Response
- **Consequences**: Difficult to Estimate the Ripple Effects (*social, political, economic*).
- **Approach**: More Focus on Context-Rich, Dynamic and Prescriptively-Informative Modeling





Modeling Risk-Related Behavior Along Three Dimensions

Dynamic: How do we respond to system feedbacks and delays? Individual:

How do we differ?



Descriptive: What do we perceive or do?

Prescriptive: What actions or policy will help?

Context:

How are we influenced by group membership or community?

Snapshot:

What is the state of our response now?





Modeling Risk-Related Behavior Along Three Dimensions





Descriptive Snapshot: Perceived Risk by Event Type 2004 vs. 2006









ГF

Risk Perception: Males vs. Females















What Factors Are Likely to **Cause the Greatest Fears?**

Natural Disasters \longrightarrow Industrial Accidents \longrightarrow Terrorism

Explosions — Biological/Radiological

Competence — Negligence

Military/First Responders — Citizens — Children





Context: Risk Perception vs. Compliance for Different Levels of Preparedness

USC



Context: Risk Perception Over Time for Different Levels of Preparedness (*illustration*)

USC

CREA







Community Response to Anthrax Release (Based on System Dynamics Simulation Model)







London Train Bombings: Predicted vs. Actual Passengers (Prager, Asay, Lee & von Winterfeldt)



2005



The Economic Impacts of a Terrorist Attack on the U.S. Commercial Aviation System¹

Peter Gordon, James E. Moore, II, Ji Young Park and Harry W. Richardson (2007)





Diffusion of Investor Fear Following Announcements of "Potential Financial Meltdown"¹



1: http://finance.yahoo.com. Retrieved data March 7, 2009



How Does Fear Translate into Economic Impacts?











Photo by Stephen Friday (Alossix)







Adam Rose, James Gieseke, Tony Barrett, Ergin Bayrak, Paul Slovic, Bill Burns







Preliminary Results

- Computable General Equilibrium Model (CGE)
 - Los Angeles County
- Direct Effects -
 - Casualties
 - Property Damage
 - Business Interruption
- Indirect Effects (155% Increase)
 - Increased Required Rate of Return (3%)
 - Increased Required Wages (3%)
 - ReducedSspending (3%)



The Careful Art of Risk Messaging

- On Sears hairdryer: "Do not use while sleeping."
- On Marks & Spencer Bread Pudding: "Product will be hot after heating."
- On packaging for a Rowenta iron: "Do not iron clothes on body."
- On most brands of Christmas lights: "For indoor or outdoor use only."
- On a bottle of ALL laundry detergent: "Remove clothing before distributing in washing machine."