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Can you trust in risk perception surveys?

How concerned are you about the potential health risks of electromagnetic fields?
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Overview

• Why is risk perception important?
• How to measure risk perception?
• Is there a good theory that explains risk perception?
• How should we approach risk and exposure perceptions?
Why is perception important?
„If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequence“

Tomas Theorem, 1929
Risk is everywhere. Risk perception is selective.
Risk perceptions differ from risk assessment
The scientific community is divided
The perception that the scientific community is divided might be distorted.
Risk is a battlefield!

Risk perception drives protest.
Risk perception affects risk regulation

- Exposure limits
- Precautionary measures
- Information policies
- Research funding
How to measure risk perception?
Focus groups

Main features
• Qualitative data
• Based on introspections

Output
• Subjective views on issues
• Insight into reasons, but not causes

Caution
• Psychological processes are relatively inaccessible to introspection
Population surveys

Main features
• Shows the distribution of opinions, beliefs and attitudes

Output:
• Representative data set

Caution
• No causal explanations possible
• Limited insights into psychological processes

Source: Special Eurobarometer 2006
Pychometric Paradigm

Main features

• Seeks to determine the effects of various qualitative factors on risk perception

Output

• Main correlates of risk perceptions
• Explains some variance between different risk sources

Caution

• Instighs into correlations, but no causations

Source: Singleton, Herzog & Ansolabehere, 2009
Experimental studies

Main features
• Controlled conditions
• causal inference possible

Output
• Test of causal hypotheses
• Insight into psychological processes

Caution
• External validity: Extrapolation to other subjects and to the everyday-world

Source: Wiedemann, Schütz & Clauberg 2008
Some insights from risk perception studies

- Lay people approach risk questions different to experts.
- The applied study methods determine the perspective and therefore the findings.
- Key is how we conceptualize risk perception, i.e. the underlying psychological assumptions.
- Risk perception ≠ perception.
- Risk perception is a judgment.

- It is fast & frugal
- based on heuristic’s, not on analytical reasoning
- different heuristics can lead to the same risk judgment
- might differ in terms of focus, intensity, stability, and changeability
Is there a good theory that explains risk perception?
A good scientific theory of risk perception

- is a prohibition: it forbids certain things to happen. The more a theory forbids, the better it is.
- specifies the psychological processes that underlie risk judgments
- is not at odds with generic judgment theories
- is testable and refutable.
A good theory

- Construal level theory
  - Theory of mental construction
  - Any object can be mentally represented in different ways
  - Psychologically more distant objects are construed on a higher, more abstract level.
  - Psychological distance covers
    1. Social distance
    2. Spatial distance
    3. Temporal distance
    4. Hypothetical distance
    5. Experiential distance
Social distance

• Is EMF a personal relevant risk?
  – Risk for me
  – Risk for my family & friends
  – Risk for the others
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Social distance

Risks that are socially close are more relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal relevant risk: $M \geq F \geq O$
Social distance

Risks that are socially distant are less relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intesity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal irrelevant risk: M≤F<O

However, people might respond to personal relevant risk with an optimism bias.
Temporal distance

Risk information (Mononucleosis)
- Day frame
- Year frame

Source: Chadran & Menon, 2006
When does it strike, who does it affect, and how does it act?

- Every <day/year>, a significant number of people fall prey to Mono.
- Every <day/year>, a significant number of these happen to be high school and college students.
- Every <day/year>, a significant number of these happen to contract the virus by person-to-person contact, via saliva (on hands or toys, or by kissing) or by blood transfusion (in very rare cases).
- Every <day/year>, a significant number happen to suffer symptoms like fever, sore throat, swollen glands, and fatigue. Sometimes, the liver and spleen are affected. This could last from one to several weeks, and the disease is very rarely fatal.
Temporal distance

Source: Chadran & Menon, 2006
Hypothetical distance

- Reading a detailed, as opposed to more general, description of a future event increased the estimated probability that the event would actually occur.
  
  Sherman, Zehner, Johnson, and Hirt (1983)

- Diseases described in either a more concrete or abstract manner result in different likelihood of actually contracting the disease.
  Higher for those who imagined concrete symptoms
  Sherman, Cialdini, Schwartzman, and Reynolds (1985)
Experiential distance

- Risk perception of a car accident are different depending on
  - Sitting in a car
  - Sitting in a chair

- Risk perception - based on immediate experience-rich construals vs. based on abstract construals

- Makes a difference
How should we approach risk and exposure perceptions?
How should we approach risk and exposure perceptions?

Constructing a good EMF risk perception study

Starting point:
• From exposure to risk construals
Exposure construals
Exposure construals

Exposure sources and usage

- Tablet (iPad)
- Cell phone (surfing in the internet)
- Cell phone (making or receiving a call)
- Cell phone (reading mails)
- WIFI at home/ work
- Laptop with WLAN
- Wireless joystick
- Camera with WLAN
Risk construals

How dangerous do you consider this situation to be for the involved person?

How dangerous do you consider this situation to be for the person reading the newspaper?
risk magnitude construals

The potential health risks of electromagnetic fields from sources like mobile phones depends on

- Duration of the exposure
- Frequency of exposure
- Proximity of a exposure source
- Strength of the field emitted by the exposure source
- Number of exposure sources in close proximity
- The time of the day
- Physical size of the source
“What is simple is wrong, what is complex is useless.”

Paul Valéry
Thank you very much for your attention!

Questions?