

# WHAT IS THE APPA ?

---

- A 48 YEARS OLD SCIENTIFIC ASSOCIATION
- AIR POLLUTION MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS
- DOCUMENTING HEALTH EFFECTS
- A PEDAGOGICAL MISSION
- SOME EXPERIENCE IN COMMUNICATION
- THE PARIS AND ITS REGION COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR AIR QUALITY
- SURVEYS AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS

# **EFFECTIVE AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION ON AIR QUALITY**

- INFORMATION OR COMMUNICATION ?  
*STILL SOME AMBIGUITY*
- INFORMATION
  - *ONE WAY PROCESS*
  - *ACCURACY, OBJECTIVITY, NEUTRALITY*
- COMMUNICATION
  - *SHOULD BE A TWO WAYS PROCESS*
  - *RELATIONSHIP OF INFLUENCE*
  - *RAISE AWARENESS, INCREASE KNOWLEDGE, MODIFY ATTITUDES, CHANGE BEHAVIOURS*
- INFORMATION ON AIR QUALITY INDEX AND COMMUNICATION ON AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT  
*SHOULD IT BE THE SAME EMITTER ? (neutrality versus influence)*

# CITEAIR OBJECTIVES

---

- WHAT WE MUST DO : *INFORMATION*
  - EU DIRECTIVE - AARHUS CONVENTION
  - NATIONAL REGULATIONS
  - CITEAIR COMMON INDEX – COMMON OPERATIONAL WEBPAGE
- WHAT WE WANT TO DO : *COMMUNICATION*
  - FROM REGULATORY AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS TO PUBLIC COOPERATION ?
  - CITEAIR TOOL BOX FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES

## A) INFORMATION : SOME REMARKS

---

- AIR POLLUTION OR AIR QUALITY ?  
*WHICH INTEREST AND CONCERN FOR THE PUBLIC ?*
- ASSESSING EFFICIENCY
  - *WHO LOOKS FOR WHICH INFORMATION ?*
  - *WHICH IMPACT OF INFORMATION ABOUT AQ LEVELS ON BEHAVIOURS ?*
  - *ALERT LEVELS FOR SENSITIVE GROUPS : AN EFFECTIVE HEALTH IMPACT PREVENTION MEAN ?*
  - *THE NEED FOR MORE INVESTIGATIONS AND SURVEYS : TOWARDS A POSITIVE COSTS BENEFITS BALANCE OF INFORMATION INVESTMENTS*
- THE MEDIAS EMPHASIZE EPISODES; WHAT ABOUT EVERYDAY CUMULATED POLLUTION ?

## B) EFFECTIVE AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION

---

- IS THE EXAMPLE OF ADVERTISING RELEVANT?  
*AIR IS A VERY SPECIFIC, ATYPICAL AND MOST DIFFICULT SUBJECT*
- A NON OBJECT
  - *INVISIBLE, ODOURLES*
  - *OMNIPRESENT, UBIQUITIOUS, UNAVOIDABLE*
  - *MULTIPLE SCALES, FROM PROXIMITY TO GLOBAL*
  - *DOES NOT BELONG TO ANYBODY*
  - *NO VALUE, NOT TRADABLE*
  - *APPARENTLY AND USUALLY HARMLESS ON A DAY TO DAY SCALE*

# EFFECTIVE AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION

---

- **COMBINING ALL SORTS OF DIFFICULTIES**
  - *ON A PHYSICAL POINT OF VIEW*
    - *COMPLEX MIXTURE....*
    - *MULTIPLE SOURCES, FROM LOCAL TO REGIONAL, STATIONNARY, MOBILE SOURCES, « HOME MADE » OR IMPORTED, NATURAL AND « MAN MADE », OUTDOOR AND INDOOR*
    - *TRANSFORMED DURING TRANSPORTATION*
  - *ON THE HEALTH POINT OF VIEW*
    - *APPROXIMATED EXPOSURE DATA*
    - *SHORT TERM AND LONG TERM EFFECTS*
    - *NO THRESHOLD*
    - *ODD RATIOS MEANINGLESS AT THE INDIVIDUAL LEVEL*
    - *LAG BETWEEN EVENT AND EFFECT*
    - *CAUSALITY?*
    - *PROOF OF HEALTH IMPROVEMENT FROM ABATEMENT POLICIES?*

# EFFECTIVE AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION

---

## A SPECIFIC SORT OF RISK FACTOR

*DIFICULT TO IDENTIFY, VISUALISE, IMAGINE, BOTH IN TIME AND SPACE AT THE INDIVIDUAL SCALE*

*CAUSALITY SURROUNDED BY UNCERTAINTY*

*CAN'T BE AS SIMPLE AS SAYING « FASTEN YOUR SAFETY BELT »*

THE GUIDEBOOK PROVIDES RELEVANT QUESTIONS FOR  
IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES  
NO MAGIC RECIPE

# THE SCOPE OF CITEAIR COMPONENT 3 AND THE GUIDEBOOK

---

- NOTABLY ENRICHED AND WIDENED FROM INITIAL SPECIFICATIONS
- THEORETICAL QUESTIONS AND ADVICE ON COMMUNICATION METHODOLOGY
- EXCHANGE AND ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCE ON COMMUNICATION GOALS AND STRATEGIES

# COMMUNICATION THEORY

---

- A USEFUL REMINDER FOR DECISION MAKERS
  - *COMMUNICATION GOALS, TARGET GROUPS, DEMAND ORIENTED, FEEDBACK.....*
- SOME ADDITIONNAL REMARKS
  - *WHO TALKS ?*
  - *TARGET GROUPS... AND RELAY GROUPS*
  - *DEMAND ORIENTED COMMUNICATION: WHAT IF NO DEMAND ?*
  - *FEEDBACK, THE TOO OFTEN MISSING LINK IN THE CHAIN*
  - *FEEDBACK UPSTREAM : ACCEPTANCE TESTS*
  - *COMMUNICATION GOALS : MODESTY AND LUCIDITY*
  - *PEOPLE WANT TO AND CAN CHOOSE BY THEMSELVES*
  - *SIDEWAYS TO PERSUASIVE ARGUMENTS : THE EXAMPLE OF INDOOR AIR POLLUTION*

# GENERAL REMARKS

---

- **A PROBLEM OF CULTURAL CHANGE**  
*A DIFFERENT TIME SCALE THAN COMMUNICATION  
CAMPAIGNS*
- **INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE  
RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTRIBUTION**
- **TOWARDS A NEW GOVERNANCE: THE  
INTEREST OF INVOLVING RELAYS**
- **THE EXAMPLE OF CITIZEN JURYS**

# Citizens' Jury on Air Quality

Sponsored by the UK Department for the Environment  
Food and Rural Affairs

Dr Suzanne King  
People Science & Policy Ltd

IUAPPA Conference  
Lille, France  
September 2006

# Rationale

Increasing recognition in UK to include public values in policy-making across Government

*'We recommend.... that direct dialogue with the public should move from being an optional add-on to science-based policy-making.... and should become a normal and integral part of the process'*

House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology (2000)

# Information Requested

- *“How far can we go? Is there a limit to what we can achieve?”*
- *“I would like somebody to talk about...blue sky things...what’s in the offing? ...what can we contemplate?”*
- *“Who’s most at fault? Is it business and industry? Each and everyone of us, where do we contribute in doing something about it?”*
- *“We assume that it is things like power stations that are the major contributors to air pollution...but are they?”*
- *“Perhaps we could get someone to talk to us about the political agenda maybe...how government are looking at it.”*

*“We do need to link the fact that saving energy is linked to health. I’d never put the two together...it’s for our health as much as about saving the planet”*

# Conclusions About the Method

- Research uncovers what ‘the public’ ‘think’
- Consultation highlights what interested parties want
- Deliberative methods
  - Enable informed debate
  - Provide reliable findings
  - Allow values to emerge from conversations
  - Identify motivators
  - One element to the decision-making process
- Evaluation
  - Showed fair and balanced
  - Spontaneous identification of behaviour change