



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)
June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore**

Panel P03 Session

Roles of Trust in Policy Process

Title of the paper

*Justification of Government Policy in Policy Conflict: the case of
Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill site in Korea*

Author(s)

*Sangjoon Shin, SungkyunKwan University, South Korea,
sangjoon415@gmail.com*

*Sookjong Lee, SungkyunKwan University, South Korea,
sjleepaik@gmail.com*

Date of presentation

29th June

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to find out what kind of justification strategies government agencies chose when they are faced with a policy conflict. The case for analysis is the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill site in South Korea. The Landfill site is a large-scale landfill facility involving four-party government agencies including Seoul City, Incheon City, Gyeonggi Province, and the Ministry of Environment. Analyzing the case of policy conflicts on the Landfill site into two periods, we identified which justification works governments attempted when establishing and enforcing the policy. In consequence, we found that government agencies have made efforts to achieve social consensus in the policy making period and promoted economic effects of the policy in the policy enforcement period.

keywords: justification work, policy conflict, the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill site.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to present the types of justification strategies government agencies employ when they are faced with opponents in the case of a policy conflict. For the strategy analysis, the case of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site was selected. The site is located in the western part of Incheon Metropolitan City. Most of the landfill waste generated in the Seoul, Incheon, Gyeonggi Provinces have been treated in the site since 1992. It had been planned to end the use of this landfill site by on December 31, 2016. However, due to the decrease in the amount of waste and space left for the landfill, on June 28, 2015, the four government agencies (Seoul, Incheon, Gyeonggi Province, and the Ministry of Environment) reached an agreement on the extended use of the site until another landfill site is formed as its replacement. This agreement is evaluated as a model of successful intergovernmental cooperation (Kwon, 2015), but as the opinions of civil stakeholders were not reflected in the decision-making process, conflicts arose over the issue.

Policies regarding the location and operation of hazardous facilities, such as landfills, are more likely to be adopted when civil stakeholders perceive them as just. They tend to accept such facilities only when their concerns about the risks are communicated, even in the event that government agencies promise to offer economic benefits as the purpose of enforcing these policies (Kunreuther & Easterling, 1990; Flynn et al, 1992). In order to dispel residents' worries about hazardous facilities, the process of decision-making on the location and operation of the facilities must include sufficient discussion via resident participation (Schachter, 1997: 9). In other words, it is when residents perceive the decision-making process for a hazardous facility as just that they try to better understand and accept related policies (Collingridge, 1982; Stirling, 2006).

Government agencies play a key role in determining and enforcing policies, and their acts are justified when the values sought by the community are met (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Miller, 2008). The public pursue different values and a government policy is determined through a

dynamic process in which such different values are excluded or selected. Administrative organizations have the obligation to explain to the community members the reasons for accepting or excluding certain values as public agencies that determine the selection of values. The logic is that as the government's policies imply the selection of certain values, the administrative organizations should justify the values. This series of processes is called justification work (Jagd, 2011).

If a particular policy is justified by the members of a community, they support the policy (Sniderman et al, 1996; Højlund, 2014). There have also been studies on policies or administrative organizations in Korea that focus on analyzing efforts and processes to secure policy justification (Kwon, 2014; Lee, 2015). However, there are few studies that have examined the justification work of government agencies in the case of policy conflict and the resistance of civil stakeholders. In order to fill this gap, this study analyzes the justification work of the government in the case of a policy conflict. As mentioned earlier, the case selected is the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. This study shall provide an in-depth analysis on the process of policy establishment and enforcement for the extended use of the landfill.

The logical composition of this paper is presented in 5 parts, which are as follow. The first section theoretically discusses the role of the government in policy conflicts and the work involved to justify the related policies. The second section provides an outline of the case of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. In the third section, the method of analysis for qualitative case study is discussed. In the fourth section, the government's justification work for the extended use of the site is identified in an empirical way. In the fifth and final section, conclusions are reached based on the findings of the analysis.

Theoretical Framework

1. Government Roles in Addressing Policy Conflicts

In the process of policy determination, it is highly likely that diverse interests will collide and thus conflicts will occur. The government can cause or resolve conflicts as a public institute that is responsible for policy determination and implementation. The government's ability to manage and cope with conflicts helps curtail its adverse effects in the public sector (Lan, 1997). Moreover, the role of conflict management and coping is one of the roles the government is expected to fulfill. However, in Korea, it is certainly difficult for the government to manage and cope with conflicts in the present situation. The reason is that the government often appears as a catalyst for conflict and that conflicts between the government and the private sector arise more often compared to conflicts between other actors (Ka et al, 2009). In such a domestic situation, the government's ability to manage conflicts has emerged as an important research subject.

In the view of Susskind and Field, conflicts occur when the government takes the following six positions: (1)The Stonewall: The government does not communicate with citizens when

faced with lawsuits and financial liability. (2)The Whitewash: The government denies wrongdoing and attempts to downplay concern raised by citizens. (3)The Smokescreen: The government erects a smokescreen to conceal the truth of the primary issue of conflict. For example, the government seeks out researchers who agree with its stance or promotes research results through magazines and newspapers, rather than through academic journals. (4)The False Front: The government organizes and puts forward interest groups and advocates that these groups speak for citizens. (5)The Block-and-Blame: When all the above strategies fail, the government defaults to the Block-and-Blame strategy. The government distances itself from the problem and blames a scapegoat. (6)The Slash and Burn: When worst comes to worst, the government attempts all-out warfare against criticisms raised by citizens.

In this respect, what are the government roles in resolving conflicts? If conflict actors perceive that a continuing conflict is negative and resolution through the court system is costly, they exhibit their intent to adopt Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods (Lieberman and Henry; 1986: 434). The most popular forms of ADR can present arbitration and mediation to resolve conflicts intervening third parties (Elleman, 1996; Davis & Netzley, 2001).

According to Senger(2004: 3-7), ADR has six benefits. To begin with, the use of ADR expedites the resolution-process faster than when deferring to litigation (Cole, 1995: 455). Therefore, ADR is (1) less time-consuming and (2) cost-effective. It is also (3) predictable and allows the actors decide for themselves. Since there are no generalized ways to resolve conflicts in this method, it (4) increases creativity. Furthermore, accumulated mutual trust (Cole, 1995: 456) (5) improves the relationship between actors. ADR also (6) increases mutual satisfaction. Meanwhile, when technical conflict issues in relation to patents are resolved through litigation, an unfair ruling is highly likely because it is difficult to find the facts about basic technologies (Elleman, 1996).

ADR methods such as arbitration and mediation need to be applied, when policy conflicts regarding the location and operation of hazardous facilities occur. Another suggested method of conflict resolution is the provision of adequate financial compensation to private stakeholders. Cooperation with citizens for environmental management can be smooth when the government's financial compensation is provided (Raymond, 2006). Lubell(2004) confirmed that when financial compensation is provided to private organizations, the establishment of partnerships and cooperation with private organizations can be smooth in the process of policy operation.

The operation of hazardous facilities is premised on their trust in the facilities, although adequate financial compensation is provided to local residents. Kunreuther & Easterling (1990) empirically proved that when the residents do not have confidence that the risk related to the facility operation is not high, they oppose its operation even with the financial compensation provided to them. Financial compensation did not affect the agreement or opposition of the location of radioactive waste repository. The tendency was that residents' perception about the facility risk and their trust level had a close correlation (Flynn et al, 1992).

In terms of promoting cooperation, financial compensation can have a positive effect. However, the level of trust toward the facility is required more than the value of the financial

compensation in the process of selecting the location of hazardous facilities. Kasperson(1986) said that trust in policies can be improved if correct information about hazardous facilities is delivered through citizen participation. Credibility is also increased when active communication with local residents occurs. If policies are determined through citizen participation, the community can enhance its acceptance towards policies (Easterling, 1992) and improve satisfaction of government policies (Yang and Holzer, 2006; Yang and Pandey, 2011). A series of processes to reflect citizens' opinions about policies, based on their participation, in the process of policy determination is mentioned as a factor that ensures democracy of government policies (Schachter, 1997: 9).

When cooperating with residents through their participation in the process of location selection and operation of hazardous facilities, the relevant actors should be identified and be considered as equal partners. King, Feltey and Susel (1998) termed this type of cooperation as an authentic participation, arguing that an equal opportunity should be provided to citizens through the participation in the process of policy determination. Citizen participation in the process of policy determination can be categorized into various types. Timney (1998) presented three models of citizen participation: active, passive and transitional. First, (1) the active participation means that the decision-making is controlled by citizens. Citizens take the lead in the process of policy determination and clearly express their policy preferences while public institutes only serve a consulting role. In (2) the passive participation, government agencies control the decision-making, while citizens participate as a mere formality. Last, in the (3) transitional participation, citizens and government agencies share power and they both control the process of policy determination, assuming advisory roles to each other.

Citizen participation certainly has positive aspects in the process of site selection and operation of hazardous facilities. However, if the participation is merely a formality, there can be opposition to the location of hazardous facilities. A public hearing is one of the forms that concretely realizes citizen participation. It is also a public venue where local residents are given explanations on the government policies on the location of hazardous facilities. Although public hearings can increase citizens' attention, their effect is not sustainable in the long term (Cole & Caputo, 1984). Citizens tend to accept the site of nuclear waste disposal sites when they are provided with information and notified of technological issues, and are encouraged to discuss the issues. When public hearings were held as formalities, they were not impactful (Kraft & Clary, 1991).

In the location selection of hazardous facilities, there is less tendency for citizens to oppose policies when there is an inclusive discussion, their opinions are reflected, and decisions are made with an equal partnership between citizens and government agencies. This is more effective than eliciting citizen participation as a mere formality. Lober (1995) empirically proved that in addition to financial compensation, the perception that the process of site selection is fair is an important factor affecting the opposition of the location of hazardous facilities. In other words, when citizens participate in the process of policy determination, the justification of policies can be confirmed for a successful execution of policies (Kraft and Clary, 1991: 299).

For the location selection and operation of hazardous facilities, local residents tend to accept policies related to hazardous facilities when they perceive that the government's process of policy determination is justifiable. Citizen participation in the process of policy determination is one of the factors that satisfy procedural justice. It can also be an effective means because it increases their understanding of policies (Collingridge, 1982; Stirling, 2006). Furthermore, involving citizen participation in policy making is effective when residents perceive that the reason they accept financial compensation is justifiable (Gerrard, 1994). Consequently, government policies are more likely to be accepted by citizens when they perceive that the policies related to hazardous facilities are justifiable.

2. The Justification Work of Administrative Organizations

Administrative organizations can be justified when their design and operation meet the needs and expectations of the audience and reflect the values that they pursue (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Miller, 2008; Kwon, 2014). Administrative organizations tend to operate in accordance with the values that the audience seek, and exist as groups that establish and enforce policies based on the values. Since policies involve values, discussion on what values should be reflected or excluded is one of the important research topics in the public administration (Spicer, 2009: 539; Atkins, 2010). Decision-making on a policy is progressed through conflicts between public values, and this feature is the main focus of the science of public administration (Kernaghan, 2003: 712; Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007: 355).

The conflicting values, which involve the selection and exclusion of values for the justification of an administrative organization, have been discussed by several authors. Those who focus on values see them as a trade-off process, while others believe that there is a limit to see them from such a viewpoint (Oldenhof, Postma, and Putters, 2014). Those who take the former stance assume that values are mutually conflictual and competitive, and can be calculated arithmetically, based on which they can be interpreted in terms of cost-benefit(Charles et al, 2008; Koppenjan, Charles and Ryan, 2008). On the other hand, those who have the latter viewpoint argue that values cannot be arithmetically calculated and thus their cost-benefits cannot be computed either (Spicer, 2001).

Then, in practice, what is the process for an administrative organization to prove its legitimacy? This study will discuss the topic based on the work of French sociologists Boltanski and Thévenot(2006): On Justification. They proposed practical sociology aimed at clarifying normative attitudes that actors can take to criticize or justify themselves (Jagd, 2011). Practical sociology is applied to observe how actors perform different types of justification work and criticize or justify orders of worth in concrete and real situations. Actors establish legitimacy as an essential condition when facing conflicts (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006). In other words, critics need to justify their criticism to criticize others, and the criticized must justify their actions in order to respond to the criticism.

“In other words, people do not ordinarily seek to invent false pretexts after the fact so as to cover up some secret motive, the way one comes up with an alibi; rather, they seek to carry out their actions in such a way that these can withstand the test of justification.” (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 37)

Boltanski and Thévenot(2006) proposed six types of polity based on the viewpoints of existing political philosophers in order to specify such discussions, explaining the justification work applied in each polity. The six types of polity are as follow. (1)the inspired(St, Sugustine), (2)the domestic(Jacques-Benigne Bossuet), (3)the fame(Thomas Hobbes), (4)the civic(Jean-Jaques Rousseau), (5)the market(Adam Smith), (6)the industrial(Henri de Saint-Simon). The values and orders of worth pursued in each polity is different. In the following table, six polity forms are classified and their characteristics are presented.

<Table 1> The characteristics of polity

	Inspired	Domestic	Civic	Fame	Market	Industrial
Elementary relation	Passion	Trust	Solidarity	Recognition	Exchange	Functional link
Human qualification	Creativity, ingenuity	Authority	Equality	Celebrity	Desire, Purchasing power	Professional competency, Expertise
State of Worth	Bizarre, Marvelous, Unusual, etc	Benevolent, Distinguished, Wise, etc	Unitary, Legal, Official, etc	Reputed, Recognized, visible, etc	Value, Millionaire, Salable, etc	Efficient, Functional, Reliable, etc

Source: Boltanski and Thévenot(1999; 2006)

Their order-of-worth framework is evaluated as a theoretical model that analyzes the ways to reconcile conflicts between different values and seek harmony (Jag, 2011: 347). Conflicts between actors arise from the differences in values that they pursue, and their conflicts in opinions may eventually result in a physical clash. Boltanski and Thévenot (2006: 223) named this phenomenon as a clash between worlds. People mutually express criticism, opinions, and complaints in order to justify their worldviews when they have differences. However, even if disputes arise due to differences in justification, compromise between worldviews can be attained. To this end, the work of persuading others should be premised. This work is a series

of tasks to convince the other party that it is legitimate to pursue the values that I/we seek as they are legitimate. This kind of work has been defined as "justification work" in preceding studies (Jagd, 2011, Oldenhof, Postma, and Putters, 2014).

This study examines the legitimacy of the government policies that it has established in the face of resistance from private stakeholders in order to justify the policies. Namely, a government policy is a product of decision-making that selects and excludes various values, and decisions on government policies involve the choice of specific values. If a policy is justified, the audience supports it (Sniderman et al, 1996; Højlund, 2014). In such a case, the government would present to the public the criteria under which the policy can be socially justified. The public would then judge the legitimacy of the policy in accordance with the criteria. This study explores the government's strategies in the justification work for policies as it analyzes the criteria proposed by the government in the process of the establishment and enforcement of policies to secure their social justification.

Case Outline of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site

The Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site is a large-scale landfill site that has handled most of the landfill waste generated in the Seoul, Incheon, and Gyeonggi Provinces. The waste landfill in the site, which began accumulation in 1992, was originally scheduled to be completed on December 31, 2016, but the amount of waste brought to the site was gradually reduced under the enforcement of the Ministry of Environment's waste reduction policy. Therefore, the Ministry of Environment announced that the use period of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site would be extended until 2044(The ministry of Environment, 2007), which set off the official debates on the issue in the Incheon community from 2010. The reason why the debates began taking place since then is that 2010 was the year when the Seo-gu area of Incheon, where the landfill site is located, started the process of urbanization. This led to a population increase in the area(according to depth-interviews with the related civil servants). The following table 1 is specific information on the landfill site.

The use of the Seoul Metropolitan Area Landfill Site was determined to be extended on June 28, 2015 by mutual consent among the four parties: Seoul, Incheon, Gyeonggi Province, and the Ministry of Environment. Previously, Seoul and Incheon, the largest stakeholders of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site, once had a conflict over the extended use of the landfill site. The Seoul Metropolitan Government approved the extended use while Incheon supported the closing of the site. Although there was a cooperative organization (T/F) between Seoul and Incheon, the two government agencies had different opinions on the issue. As a result, they engaged in a public relations war to win the support of their respective citizens in 2013. However, after the local elections were held in June 2014, the Incheon mayor was replaced. Moreover, as the end of use date of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site approached, the mayor, who had originally been opposed to the extended use of the site, changed his stance on the issue.

<Table 2> Size of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill site

	1 st landfill site	2 nd landfill site	3 rd landfill site	4 th landfill site	The Rest (Research Complex)	The Total
Total Area (10,000m ²)	404	356	307	338	136	1,541
Landfill Area (10,000m ²)	251	248	221	181		901
Landfill Capacity (10,000 ton)	6,400	7,800	8,600			22,800
Landfill Period	1992.2.~ 2000.10.	2000.10.~ now	unsettled	unsettled		

Source: The inside data of Incheon city

On December 3, 2014, the Incheon Mayor proposed a four-party consultative group to Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, and the Ministry of Environment to discuss the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. After seven months of the establishment of the consultative body, the four parties reached a final agreement on the use extension of the landfill site on June 28, 2015. However, this agreement was made under the condition that it would be used until another landfill site is developed to replace it. Although This agreement is evaluated as a successful cooperation between government agencies (Kwon, 2015), there was a backlash of the local residents against the decision in the process of reaching such an agreement. There were two main reasons for the opposition of the residents: First, the Incheon mayor, who won the local election in June 2014 and succeeded his predecessor had promised to end the use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site during his election campaign. Upon taking office, however, he did not honor his pledge. Second, the civil stakeholders were neither allowed to participate in the agreement process of the four-party body nor were their opinions reflected in the process. Based on these reasons, NGOs and local political parties in Incheon City and the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site Management Corporation's union developed a campaign against the agreement.

Those opposed to the agreement of the four-party consultative group jointly resisted the decision of the government agencies by conducting mass protests, debates, press conferences, and signature campaigns. Nevertheless, Incheon City did not accept their protests. In fact, Incheon City responded to the opponents' rallies by announcing that the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site would contribute to the development of the community. On December 29, 2015, the civil stakeholders announced that they would file two lawsuits against Incheon City to nullify the agreement. However, one of the two cases was dismissed on

February 1, 2016, and the other on February 9, 2017. Since then, their opposition movement was discontinued.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the government agencies tried to justify their policy by presenting a certain logic in the process of the decision and policy enforcement for the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. For this purpose, this study carries out the analysis by dividing the entire span of the process into two periods. This is because the entire period can be divided into two parts. The first period represented the timeframe of when the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site was determined. The second period represented the timeframe in which the execution of the decision was initiated. Also, the government took different stances on the civil stakeholders during each period. The first period (Period #1) spanned from December 2014, when the four-party consultative group was formed, until June 2015, when the final agreement was reached. This period corresponds to the process of establishing the policy related to the extended use of the landfill site, where the four government agencies cooperated to discuss the issue as the civil stakeholders started to express their resistance to the extension of the landfill site use. The second period (Period #2) spanned from February 2015, when the four parties reached the agreement, to February 2017, when the two lawsuits filed against them to nullify the agreement were dismissed. This period was marked by the efforts of the government agencies to enforce the four-party agreement as well as the opposition movement of the civilian actors. Based on this, the study examines the strategies implemented by the government to justify its policy.

Methods

This study uses the qualitative data to confirm the justification work of government for the extension policy of the Seoul metropolitan landfill site. The qualitative data used in the analysis are the primary data and the secondary data. The primary data are semistructured interviews with official & unofficial stakeholders related to the Seoul metropolitan landfill site and the field notes were taken by researcher directly participating in the field. Secondary data are media reports, government policy reports, academic research papers, statements and press releases from each stakeholder.

A total of 23 interviews were conducted in this study from May 2015 to December 2016. Before the interview, semistructured questionnaires were sent to the interviewees. The interviewees can be divided into private stakeholders, government's officials and the landfill specialists. Private stakeholders are those who have participated in, or have ceased to participate in opposing the use of extended landfills. They are local residents or representatives of civil society. Government officials are the public official of Seoul, Incheon, and Gyeonggi-do who are responsible for the metropolitan landfills site and actors who were senior officials in Seoul and Incheon in the past. Third, the specialists in the metropolitan landfills are actors who have published reports and thesis on this issue. The interviews were recorded with prior consent, but the interviewees who didn't agree with recording were just taking notes. Actors who can't

interview for personal reasons were conducted by written interviews. All of the recorded interviews were transcribed, and the transcript of records and the recording was continuously compared to the analysis process.

Additionally, ethnographic observations were conducted from June 2015 to February 2016 that was participated in press conferences, civic debates, meetings, starting with visits to demonstrations against the extension of the use of the landfills. Field notes were taken during observing in a place closely related to this case. This notes were written in this study is about 20 pages in B5 size.

Secondary data were collected widely along with these primary data. The media reports related to this case were downloaded from 'Korea Press Foundation', and the policy report was collected by accessing the internet of the relevant government agency. The academic paper refers to Kwon(2015), which analyzed the process of extending the use of this landfill site in terms of intergovernmental relations. Furthermore, statements and press releases of each stakeholder were collected and arranged by accessing the relevant agency site.

When presenting analysis results, we analyze the justification work of the government policy after describing the position of private stakeholders against the government policy. The member check is conducted on the interviewees, one of the qualitative research methods. This methods refers to a series of processes in which the analytical results modified and ameliorated after questioning about the results to the interviewee(Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Through this process, we tried to secure triangulation of qualitative research(Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

Results

1. Period #1: Social Consensus

a. Opponents' Opinions

During Period # 1, it was discussed whether to extend the use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site in the four-party consultative group. At this time, Incheon City formed a citizens' council to hear the opinions of the Incheon community. The citizens' council was held over a total of four sessions from January 26, 2015 to May 7, 2015. The aim of the council was to discuss a rational solution for the issue of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. The citizens' council acted as a governance body composed of civic groups, experts, journalists and residents from the Incheon community to share opinions on the issue.

However, some of the residents and civic group representatives who participated in the council stated that no discussion was carried out on the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. Moreover, the function of this council was limited to simply expressing or listening to the participants' opinions.

“At the end of the meeting, the mayor only said that he has understood our thoughts. He did not reveal what he would do in the future, but asked us to entrust him with full powers, saying that it is he who will take responsibility, no matter what the outcome may be.” - Civic group representative who participated in the citizens council

“At the citizens' council, we can only express our opinions, and we cannot make any decision...That's why we only talked about the opinions of the citizens during the meeting.” - Representative of community organization in Seo-gu, Incheon

In addition, the civil stakeholders who opposed the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site believed that the decision-making process of the government had neither involved the residents' participation nor had it disclosed information about the landfill site. There was no participation of the civil stakeholders in the discussion of the four-party consultative body. Despite the civil stakeholders' request for their participation, the government agencies did not accept their opinions. Furthermore, there was very little information available to the public about the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. The content, venue, and participant roster of the meetings of the four-party group were treated as private. The civil stakeholders pointed out that such a concealment of information is one of the biggest factors causing policy conflict.

“I do not think that the city honestly reveals its policies regarding the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site. In fact, it seems that the city makes most of decisions in private and informs us of its decision after the fact, as a formality of giving notice. That's why the citizens came to develop a distrust of the administrative acts related to the landfill site. We do not trust the city, and conflicts continue to arise.” - Civic group representative who engaged in opposition movement

b. Strategies of Incheon City

Since the establishment of the four-party consultative group, Incheon City has tried to achieve social consensus in the decision-making process and has taken a strategic approach to persuade the opponents of the policy. Efforts to achieve social consensus were materialized in the civil council. However, some civic groups declared their intention to boycott the council as they brought into question the composition of its members. As mentioned earlier, some of the citizens' council members said that the council only functioned as a platform to present their opinions, rather than to discuss the issue and reach a collective agreement. In response, one of the Seoul Metropolitan Government officials in charge of the policies associated with the Landfill Site said that he/she believes that Incheon City had a discussion with the community members and reached consensus with them.

“The Incheon Mayor continuously tried to persuade the city’s civic groups, politicians, and opposition parties. Then he formed the citizens' council to explain to the participants the reasons why the four-party consultative group cannot make its decisions using alternative means as the group collected participants’ opinions.” - Public official who is in charge of the landfill site in Seoul City Hall

On the contrary, those who participated in the council or opposed the decision to extend the use of the landfill site raised questions and speculations that Incheon City would have planned to use the council to fulfill its purpose, rather than to seek social consensus through the meeting. According to them, the citizens' council was held in order to promote the efforts of Incheon City to reach consensus with the community. It was also a stage for the Incheon Mayor to be released from the political burden that might be imposed on him in the event his election pledge was unmet.

“What was disappointing is that the mayor might have tried to take advantage of the situation. I don't think this was his 100% intention, and I'm not criticizing the council. However, I do think this was about 60% to 70% of his intent.” - Civic group representative who participated in the citizens council

Incheon city’s persuasion contents are discussed with the argument that it is inevitable to extend the use of the Landfill site. According to a report, the Incheon Mayor said that the city had no other choice but to agree to extend the use of the landfill site during a briefing session (May 19, 2015) held in the Incheon Metropolitan City Council in relation to the issue. The mayor explained that if the use of the landfill site is terminated in December 2016, the Seoul Metropolitan Government is highly likely to file an administrative lawsuit against Incheon City and that there would be a strong possibility that the city would lose the case.

2. Period #2: Economic Effects

a. Opponents’ Opinions

During Period #2, after the four-party consultative body reached an agreement on the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site, the civil stakeholders who opposed the decision expressed their resistance. The actors who opposed the extended term of use criticized the decision of the four-party consultative body and the resulting agreement. They

first resisted the decision of the consultative group. "The Seo-gu Area Committee for Countermeasures against the Closing of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site in 2016" and "the Incheon Citizens' Coalition for Economic Justice" criticized the Incheon Mayor for neglecting to observe his election pledge related to the extended use of the landfill site. The opponents further said that the Mayor had made an arbitrary decision without reflecting the citizens' opinions.

"The city's decision did not reflect the citizens' opinions at all. This is what caused the conflict." - Member of community organization in Seo-gu, Incheon

"It is a policy against Incheon citizen's opinions. I think that Incheon City made a mistake regarding the policy, and, what's worse, the decision was made without considering the citizens' opinions." - Civic group representative who engaged in opposition movement

The civil stakeholders not only criticized the decision-making process of the four-party consultative group but also resisted its agreement. There are two major reasons for the opposition. First, the agreement does not specify a duration of the extended use of the landfill site. Most interviewees criticized the fact that the four parties did not include a specific duration of the extension, pointing out that this renders the agreement defective.

"I can agree to additional landfills. However, the duration of the extended use should be specified in the agreement. Whether it would be 20 years or 30 years, it must be clearly stated. We may use it for another 20 or 40 years. The landfill technology is making great progress." - Specialist on the landfill site

Second, the agreement requires the transfer of the ownership of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site Management Corporation (SL Corporation) under the Ministry of Environment to Incheon City. It had been managed by the central government, but Incheon City, which is a self-governing body, agreed to the transfer of the ownership and elected to operate and manage the corporation. The civil stakeholders resisted the transfer the ownership citing that this would not benefit Incheon City's economic progress. They held a press conference in February 2016 and published a white paper entitled "Problems Arising from the Transfer of the Ownership of the SL Corporation to Incheon City and Solutions" and expressed a strong opposition to the transfer. The main purpose of this paper was that Incheon City should not agree to the transfer for it is not favorable to the economy.

b. Strategies of Incheon City

After the four-party consultative body reached the agreement, Incheon City made a series of efforts to prove that the extended use of the landfill site is economically efficient despite the resistance of the civil stakeholders. The first motion was the increase in the handling fee, which was included in the agreement reached by the four-party body. Incheon City claimed that the extended use of the landfill would yield economic benefits to the community. The reasoning was that additional fees would be imposed for all the waste landfills. This act would remedy the deficits of the SL Corporation, which was declared a problem by the civil stakeholders.

“Before the transfer of the ownership of the SL Corporation, we intend to raise the handling fee for wastes brought into the landfill site to restore financial stability.” - Public official who is in charge of the landfill site in Incheon City Hall

Second, Incheon City announced that the extended use of the landfill site economically benefited the city from both the increase in the handling fee of waste as well as Seoul City's compensation payment. With this, in July 2016, Incheon City unveiled its plan to use the profits from the extended use of landfill site to develop the surrounding areas for the local economic growth. The city also maintained that the decision restored its environmental sovereignty because it assumed authority over the landfill site in exchange for the agreement to the extended use of the site. It was in October 2016 that the city made this announcement about its environmental sovereignty. In addition, the city also revealed its plan to construct various convenience and research facilities such as a complex shopping mall, a camping site, and an environmental industrial research complex to promote the development of the local community.

“There are now many environmental improvement projects in progress in the area, including the construction of a theme park. In this respect, it can bring about the development of the area and benefit the residents.” - Public official who is in charge of the landfill site in Incheon City Hall

As seen above, during Period #2, there was a conflict between the civil stakeholders who criticized the decision and the agreement of the four-party consultative body and Incheon City, which emphasized the economic benefits from the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study analyzed the justification work carried out by the government agencies in the process of decision and policy enforcement related to the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site located in Seo-gu, Incheon, Korea. The landfill site had been scheduled for closure by December 2016. However, due to remaining landfill space, the four-party government agencies organized a consultative group and agreed to extend its use in June 2015. Although the agreement among these four government agencies presented a model of intergovernmental cooperation (Kwon, 2015), conflicts also arose as their decision-making process did not reflect the opinions of Incheon City's civil stakeholders. This study has significance in that it conducted an in-depth analysis on the government's justification work to cope with such policy conflicts. The following is a summary of the results of this study.

First, Incheon City employed a justification strategy to reach a social consensus with the local community. This objective was pursued in the process of the discussion of the four-party consultative body composed of the four related government agencies. While the decision-making process for the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site was in progress, Incheon City organized a citizens' council in the apparent attempt to discuss the issue with the local community. The citizens' council was aimed at functioning as a collaborative governance body. However, rather than being allowed to participate in the actual decision-making process, the participants were relegated to simply expressing their opinions in the council meetings. In response, Incheon City showed a justification work that emphasizes democracy in its decision-making process by suggesting that its decision on the extended use of the landfill site was made through the discussion with the local community.

Second, at the time of the enforcement of the agreement on the extended use of the landfill site, Incheon City attempted to justify the policy by promoting economic benefits. By agreeing to extend the use of the landfill site in the four-party consultation, Incheon City secured the increase in the handling fee for the waste brought into the landfill site as well as compensation from Seoul City. Incheon City announced these economic benefits to the Incheon community and claimed that this would have a positive effect on its local economic development. Although the civil stakeholders continued to criticize the decision-making process and agreement of the four-party body, Incheon City focused on securing justification for the policy, emphasizing the economic benefits arising from the decision.

The implication of the results of this study is that the strategies of the government to justify its policy changed in the course of the decision and enforcement of the policy. During the period in which the policy was determined, the citizens' council was established to invite civil stakeholders for discussion to ensure the justification of its policy. Discussion based on the participation of civil stakeholders in the decision-making process of a policy is an important factor with respect to collaborative governance (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006; Ansell and Gash, 2008; Emerson, Nabatchi, & Balogh, 2011). If the process of determining a policy is justified, the negative impact resulting from it is mitigated (Cropanzana et al, 2007: 38). Incheon City showed its intention to pursue social consensus in order to justify the procedures of the decision-making. On the other hand, during the period of policy implementation, Incheon City emphasized the economic benefits from the policy by announcing that its successful enforcement would lead to the economic growth of the local community. If local development

is achieved through the enforcement of a certain policy, the policy can be justified to an extent (Krutilla, 1955; Ashoff, 2005; Tregear et al, 2007). With this justification work for the policies of government agencies, the policies related to the extended use of the Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill Site are currently being implemented without facing strong resistance.

Reference

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 18(4): 543-571.
- Ashoff, G. (2005). Enhancing policy coherence for development: justification, recognition and approaches to achievement.
- Atkins, J. (2010). Moral argument and the justification of policy: New Labour's case for welfare reform. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 12(3): 408-424.
- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1999). The sociology of critical capacity. *European journal of social theory*, 2(3): 359-377.
- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton University Press.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of Cross-Sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public administration review*, 66(s1): 44-55.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London.: Tavistock.
- Charles, M. B., Ryan, R., Castillo, C. P., & Brown, K. (2008). Safe and Sound? The public value trade-off in worker safety and public infrastructure procurement. *Public Money and Management*, 28(3): 159-166.
- Cole, S. R. (1995). Incentives and Arbitration: The Case Against Enforcement of Executory Arbitration Agreements Between Employers and Employees. *UMKC L. Rev.*, 64, 449.
- Cole, R. L., & Caputo, D. A. (1984). The public hearing as an effective citizen participation mechanism: a case study of the general revenue sharing program. *American Political Science Review*, 78(2): 404-416.
- Collingridge, D., 1982. *Critical Decision Making: A New Theory of Social Choice*. Pinter, London.
- Davis, B. D., & Netzley, M. (2001). Alternative dispute resolution: a business (and) communication strategy. *Business communication quarterly*, 64(4): 83-89.
- Easterling, D. (1992). Fair rules for siting a high-level nuclear waste repository. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 11(3): 442-475.
- Elleman, S. J. (1996). Problems in patent litigation: mandatory mediation may provide settlements and solutions. *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.*, 12, 759.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 22(1): 1-29.

- Flynn, J., Burns, W., Mertz, C. K., & Slovic, P. (1992). Trust as a determinant of opposition to a high-level radioactive waste repository: Analysis of a structural model. *Risk analysis*, 12(3): 417-429.
- Gerrard, Michael (1994), *Whose Backyard, Whose Risk?* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press).
- Højlund, S. (2014). Evaluation use in the organizational context—changing focus to improve theory. *Evaluation*, 20(1): 26-43.
- Jagd, S. (2011). Pragmatic sociology and competing orders of worth in organizations. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 14(3): 343-359.
- Jørgensen, T. B., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values an inventory. *Administration & Society*, 39(3): 354-381.
- Ka, S. J., An, S. H., Lim, J. H., & Kim, H. L. (2009). Characteristics and Trends of Korean Public Disputes: 1990-2007. *Korean Political Science Review*. 43(2): 51-87.
- Kasperson, R. E. (1986). Six propositions on public participation and their relevance for risk communication. *Risk analysis*. 6(3): 275-281.
- Kernaghan, K. (2003). Integrating values into public service: The values statement as centerpiece. *Public administration review*, 63(6): 711-719.
- King, C. S., Feltey, K. M., & Susel, B. O. N. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public administration review*, 58(4): 317-326.
- Koppenjan, J., Charles, M. B., & Ryan, N. (2008). Editorial: Managing competing public values in public infrastructure projects.
- Kraft, M. E., & Clary, B. B. (1991). Citizen participation and the NIMBY syndrome: Public response to radioactive waste disposal. *The Western Political Quarterly*. 44(2): 299-328.
- Krutilla, J. V. (1955). Criteria for evaluating regional development programs. *The American Economic Review*, 45(2): 120-132.
- Kunreuther, H., & Easterling, D. (1990). Are risk-benefit tradeoffs possible in siting hazardous facilities?. *The American Economic Review*. 252-256.
- Kwon, H. S. (2015). *A Study on the Building Process of Collaborative Governance in Area-Wide Administration: Focusing on Sudokwon Landfill Site Use Period Extension Case*. PhD Dissertation in University of Seoul.
- Kwon, H. W. (2014), *Research strategies for legitimacy management in public administration*. *Korean Public Administration Review*. 48(3): 121-145.
- Lan, Z. (1997). A conflict resolution approach to public administration. *Public Administration Review*. 57(1): 27-35.

- Lee, H. Y. (2015). An Introductory Study on Social Justifications of Policy Intervention. *Korean Policy Studies Review*, 24(3): 347-376.
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School psychology quarterly*, 22(4): 557-584.
- Lieberman, J. K., & Henry, J. F. (1986). Lessons from the alternative dispute resolution movement. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 53(2): 424-439.
- Lober, D. J. (1995). Why protest?: Public behavioral and attitudinal response to siting a waste disposal facility. *Policy Studies Journal*, 23(3): 499-518.
- Lubell, M. (2004). Collaborative watershed management: A view from the grassroots. *Policy Studies Journal*, 32(3): 341-361.
- Miller, J. (2008). The ongoing legitimacy project: corporate philanthropy as protective strategy. *European Management Review*, 5(3): 151-164.
- Oldenhof, L., Postma, J., & Putters, K. (2014). On justification work: How compromising enables public managers to deal with conflicting values. *Public Administration Review*, 74(1): 52-63.
- Raymond, L. (2006). Cooperation without trust: Overcoming collective action barriers to endangered species protection. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(1): 37-57.
- Schachter, H. L. (1997). *Reinventing government or reinventing ourselves: The role of citizen owners in making a better government*. SUNY press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Carmines, E. G., Layman, G. C., & Carter, M. (1996). Beyond race: Social justice as a race neutral ideal. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(1): 33-55.
- Spicer, M. W. (2001). Value pluralism and its implications for American public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 23(4): 507-528.
- Stirling, A. (2006). Analysis, participation and power: justification and closure in participatory multi-criteria analysis. *Land use policy*, 23(1): 95-107.
- Susskind, L., & Field, P. (1996). *Dealing with an angry public: The mutual gains approach to resolving disputes*. Simon and Schuster.
- The ministry of Environment. (2007). *The 2nd Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan of Seoul Metropolitan Waste Landfill site*.
- Timney, M. M. (1998). Overcoming administrative barriers to citizen participation: Citizens as partners, not adversaries. in King, C. S. and Stivers, C., *Government is us: Public administration in an anti-government era*. Thousand Oaks.: Sage Publications. 88-101.
- Tregear, A., Arfini, F., Belletti, G., & Marescotti, A. (2007). Regional foods and rural development: the role of product qualification. *Journal of Rural studies*, 23(1): 12-22.

Yang, K., & Holzer, M. (2006). The performance–trust link: Implications for performance measurement. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1): 114-126.

Yang, K., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Further dissecting the black box of citizen participation: When does citizen involvement lead to good outcomes?. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6): 880-892.