



Session 6: Perception of ionizing radiation risks

Chair: Grazyna Zakrzewska, INCT, Poland





5 Presentations:

- Why nuclear engineer should not complain about skewed risk perception, *Iztok Tiselj*, Jožef Stefan Institute, Slovenia
- Public perception on Education and Information about Ionizing Radiation Across EU, *Pavel Gabriel Lazaro*, UB, Romania
- Towards improved public perception of nuclear safety through strengthened role of research and higher education, *Leon Cizelj*, Jožef Stefan Institute, Slovenia
- Communication of risk and public perception during Fukushima crisis in a European non-nuclear country: experts, non-experts and media, *Isabel Paiva*, IST-CTN, Portugal
- Myths and reality about risks related to radiation exposure, subtitle: a practical approach to science-based communication about ionising radiation without reinforcing the radiation myths, *Tomaž Žagar*, ARAO, Slovenia



Content, what we learnt?

- All presentations touched ionizing radiation perception aspects, some were related to Euratom projects (EAGLE, PREPARE)
- Some addressed the education issues; presented the curricula related to IR in several countries and recognized differences between countries,
- One used Eurobarometer surveys to get information on the public attitudes, the other referred to other EU polls.
- One presentation directly discussed Fukushima disaster and showed implications for one, nonnuclear country - Portugal (analysis of two groups: nuclear expert and non-expert, and their role in management of the crisis)



Key challenges to take forward

- Because of a large role of education and training revealed: the necessity of improvements in curricula elaborated for primary and secondary schools– the role of basic knowledge in risk perception
- But also the need of information , mutual communication and dialog between stakeholders, are needed.
- The trust component was emphasized: the role of independent experts, international organizations working on peaceful uses of nuclear technologies, national safety authorities, as well as credible media;
- The role of science, scientific base, in confrontation of the myths regarding ionization radiation; scientific knowledge base is very important to face this task and provide the arguments;
- Reduce misleading information - the task for scientists; special debunking methodologies applied
- The necessity of cooperation of industry with science and universities; “science based decision making” in industry and regulatory organizations;
- The differences in risk perception between countries resulted from cultural and historical determinants (conditions)

ionizing radiation risks **training**
decision-making **informed behaviors**
education



Key recommendations/solutions

- The lessons learnt from Fukushima should be remembered;
- The methodologies of risk communication still should be improved, the new channels for communication should be continuously searched;
- All parties involved in risk communication should cooperate, especially in emergency situations;
- To use scientific achievements in the field of risk communication; permanent partnership science-industry
- To apply methodologies of debunking the myths and misleading information