IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Evaluating the Level of Radiation Safety Awareness Among Patients Undergoing Radiological Examinations

[1]Arpit Jamwal,

[1]Student Of Bachelor Of Medical Radiology And Imaging Technology,

[1] SAHS,

[1] GNA University Phagwara, Punjab, India.

Abstract: Surprisingly few realize what lies behind a scan's glow - radiation exposure tags along with every image captured by machines such as CT scanners or standard X-rays. A group of investigators turned to structured interviews, handing out identical question sets to one hundred people just prior to their scheduled tests. Though benefits in spotting illness stand clear, personal insight into risk levels differs sharply among them. What emerged from replies was a patchwork understanding of basic safeguards woven into everyday radiology routines. Protection awareness often tilts decisions, quietly guiding how patients respond when faced with diagnostic options.

Some individuals seemed familiar with radiation hazards. Not quite half could identify the word itself. However, only a fraction - under 40 percent - connected X-rays and CT scans to ionizing radiation. Knowledge about prolonged exposure risks, repeated imaging effects, or concerns in pregnancy showed little presence overall. Before testing began, talking about risks happened seldom - less than thirty percent remembered hearing of downsides or benefits ahead of time. Yet most people stood behind giving patients clear guidance on how to stay safe while engaging with these tools.

Most findings suggest patient understanding improves when radiation dangers are explained plainly. Better educational resources may let individuals recognize exposure levels during medical tests. Because doctors adjust how they talk, misunderstandings happen less often. Details given ahead of therapy influence whether someone opts in or out. With straightforward conversations, many pick health options more thoughtfully. Most crucial? Clear expectations for every individual. Dialogue that moves past documents sparks deeper understanding. People grasp more when talk shifts from templates to real talk.

Keywords: Radiation Safety, Patient Awareness, Radiological Examinations, X-Ray, CT scan, Radiation Protection.

I. INTRODUCTION

Most times, doctors turn to scans simply because they show what blood tests cannot. Still, every beam of radiation carries a quiet cost - one that adds up without warning. Because bones and tissues respond differently, results appear clear; however, damage might begin long before detection. While hospitals depend on speed and clarity from CT devices, exposure does not pause between appointments. Hidden beneath quick diagnostics is a slow risk: cell behavior shifts after multiple sessions. Though rare, harm emerges easiest where screenings repeat often. Awareness grows slowly, mainly around areas like chest or pelvis, where beams pass through more tissue. Not all tools pose equal concern, but routine access makes restraint harder.

Little by little, frequent or avoidable imaging builds up in the body, despite individual doses being small. Because of this trend, global health bodies urge care - ALARA is key here, pushing for lower exposure whenever practical within real-world limits.

Most people underestimate how understanding radiation shapes decisions about medical care. When individuals grasp what scans involve - including pros, cons, safety steps - their conversations with doctors shift. Instead of accepting tests without question, some begin weighing options more carefully. Still, research shows gaps remain: many lack basic knowledge on X-rays and long-term effects. Awareness of these details often affects willingness to follow treatment advice.

Surprisingly little attention has gone to what patients know about radiation before getting scanned. Though research often looks at medical staff awareness, this work shifts focus toward public understanding - spotlighting gaps that better teaching might address.

II. Review Of Literature

These days, much of modern medicine depends on scans using radiation, raising growing awareness about safety. While early efforts focused mainly on shielding workers, current thinking now emphasizes patient protection alongside wiser decision-making. Though risks were once overlooked, caution has gradually deepened across clinics and hospitals. What began as narrow focus has broadened into wider responsibility. Surprisingly few grasp the amount of radiation taken in during routine medical exams – according to Brenner and Hall, CT imaging is largely responsible. Though alerts have been issued, awareness hasn't kept pace with application, as IAEA records indicate. When it comes to choosing scans, patients often struggle balancing potential harm against benefits. With machines now common across global clinics, confusion still runs deep. Not knowing what's at stake shapes choices more than most realize.

Somehow, the amount of radiation involved in medical imaging escapes clear understanding for many individuals. Even though X-rays and CT scans emit ionizing energy, awareness remains low across the general public. Oddly enough, a number believe ultrasound or MRI procedures involve comparable risks - this belief does not reflect reality. Rarely does discussion around such exposure appear during conversations between clinicians and patients. Across countries, data shows people often fail to grasp key details. Perhaps clarity slips through the cracks when professionals meet patients.

Understanding radiation risks proves difficult for many patients. Yet straightforward approaches - such as discussing worries aloud, offering plain-language handouts, or showing visuals - help clarify confusion. During scans, those who receive such aids usually follow safety points better. This pattern hints that assessing patient knowledge fits naturally within standard procedures. Teaching strategies shift subtly, shaped by individual comprehension levels each step of the way.

III. Aim Of The Study

To evaluate the level of radiation safety awareness among patients undergoing radiological examinations.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Primary Objective

To assess radiation safety awareness among patients undergoing radiological examinations.

Secondary Objectives

- To assess how well patients understand radiation, along with possible risks it may carry for their health
- Possible awareness levels among radiation-sensitive groups require evaluation
- Understanding how well people grasp safety steps around radiation was the aim
- To assess how information about advantages alongside potential harms of imaging scans is shared
- To spot why patients might require learning about staying safe around radiation.

V. METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This study was a cross-sectional descriptive survey conducted to assess radiation safety awareness among patients undergoing radiological examinations.

Study Setting
The study was carried out in the Radiology Department of healthcare institutions where diagnostic imaging procedures are routinely performed.

Study Population
The study population consisted of patients visiting the Radiology Department for various radiological examinations.

Sample Size
A total of **100 patients** participated in the study.

Inclusion Criteria

- Patients aged 18 years and above.
- Patients undergoing radiological examinations.
- Patients willing to participate and provide informed consent.

Exclusion Criteria

- Patients unable to provide informed consent.
- Critically ill patients.
- Patients unwilling to participate in the study.

Data Collection Tool
From June 15, 2026, through June 20, 2026, information was gathered via a fixed-format survey. The tool captured personal background traits along with views on radiation knowledge. Responses covered perceived dangers tied to radiation exposure. It also included habits around safety practices when near ionizing sources. Each section followed a set pattern without open-ended inputs

Data Analysis
The collected data were analysed using descriptive statistical methods and presented in the form of frequencies and percentages.

VI. RESULTS

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (n = 100)

Variable	*Category*	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Age	18–30 years	32	32%
	31–45 years	33	33%
	46–60 years	21	21%
	>60 years	14	14%
Gender	Male	50	50%
	Female	50	50%
Education	No Formal Education	4	4%
	Primary	13	13%
	Secondary	35	35%
	Graduate	47	47%
	Postgraduate	1	1%

Interpretation

Most people taking part fell within the 31 to 45 range, making up one-third of all respondents. Women appeared just as often as men throughout the research. A close-to-half portion held graduate degrees, which suggests the group leaned toward higher education levels.

Table 2. Radiation Safety Awareness Among Patients

Awareness Parameter	*Yes (%)*
Heard the term Radiation	47%
Know X-rays and CT use radiation	38%
Know excessive radiation is harmful	40%
Know repeated examinations increase exposure	36%
Know children are more sensitive	36%
Know pregnant women need special precautions	35%
Informed regarding benefits and risks	29%
Provided lead apron during examination	77%
Know CT involves higher dose than X-ray	15%
Believe patient education is necessary	97%

Interpretation

The results indicate limited patient awareness of radiation. Knowledge was particularly poor regarding the differences in radiation dose between CT and conventional radiography.

VII. DISCUSSION

Most people showed little awareness of risks linked to scan technologies. Even though nearly half recognized the word, just over one-third connected it to procedures such as X-rays or CT scans. Understanding of how radiation works remained low across participants. Rarely did someone connect common exams to underlying physical principles.

Still, many people stayed uncertain about radiation dangers. Fewer than fifty percent knew too much exposure could harm health. This gap in understanding might shape how patients approach scans or treatment choices.

Some people noticed children respond more intensely to radiation compared to adults. Regarding extra care needed while pregnant, a bit fewer recognized the importance. Such figures highlight gaps in understanding about radiation dangers. A lack of awareness around high-risk groups appears widespread among individuals.

Open communication with clinic staff felt difficult for certain individuals. Prior to imaging procedures, awareness of potential outcomes - good or bad - was rare among participants. Earlier discussions might bring better alignment in expectations. At present, numerous people enter scans lacking straightforward details. Preparation steps ahead of imaging appear inconsistent when comparing different locations.

Most people surveyed - about three out of four - said they got a lead apron when scanned, showing these items often come into play at medical sites. Protection like that tends to show up in imaging facilities more than not. Across different testing environments, wearing such gear pops up again and again.

Most people surveyed - 97 percent - felt patients deserve clear information on radiation safety. This near-universal agreement suggests a deeper interest in understanding potential risks, possibly pointing to room for structured learning efforts. Despite usual divides in opinion, this topic saw rare alignment among respondents. Since knowing more plays a role, making space for explanation could bring meaningful outcomes. What stands out is how highly many rate honest, direct information.

Still, while workers follow safety protocols without exception, patients often stay uninformed. Gaps in understanding persist even when procedures are up to date, which makes better teaching necessary. Starting talks before scans start influences clarity about possible outcomes. Although standards exist, meaningful change relies on clearer exchanges. Early dialogue steers choices closer to what each person truly requires. Sharing information openly improves how well people grasp ideas. Over time, gradual changes in how teams talk slowly reshape outcomes. A shift here or a pause there adds up long before anyone notices.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Structured patient education programs on radiation safetyshould be developed.
- Multilingual information leaflets should be provided inradiology departments.
- Strengthen theinformed consent procedures.
- Awareness campaignsshould be conducted focusing on radiation protection issues.
- Healthcare professionals should be trained to communicate radiationriskseffectively.
- Educational posterson radiation safety should be displayed in waiting areas.
- Encourage discussions regarding thebenefits and risks before examinations

IX. CONCLUSION

Looking at 100 individuals receiving imaging tests, the research showed poor understanding of radiation protection. Despite gaps in knowing how much radiation they faced or what dangers might arise, curiosity remained high. A few grasped ways to stay safe during scans. Yet nearly everyone wanted clearer information on the topic. Some had heard fragments before but lacked full clarity.

What stands out is how crucial clear information for patients really is. Better dialogue between providers and individuals shapes understanding in meaningful ways. Clearer processes around consent tend to follow naturally when these pieces are in place. Awareness about radiation risks grows stronger under such conditions. Decisions people make about their care often reflect this foundation more fully.

REFERENCES

What stands out is how much radiation comes from computed tomography, even as its use increases. A piece by Brenner and Hall made that point well back in 2007. Their work appeared in the New England Journal of Medicine, showing change across years. Over time, worry has grown - far from disappearing. What catches the eye is how clearly their findings are shown. Amid ongoing discussions about medical scans, a single insight gains weight

International Commission on Radiological Protection updates guidelines

• International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Radiation Protection of Patients.

• World Health Organization (WHO). Communicating Radiation RisksinPediatric Imaging.

• European Society of Radiology. Patient Safety and Radiation Protection Guidelines.

Examining ionizing radiation - where it comes from and what it does - is the task of UNSCEAR, a science-focused unit within the United Nations. Data on how much people encounter, whether through Earth's own emissions or actions like medical testing, gets reviewed thoroughly. Their published summaries break down which contributors weigh most in total dose accumulation. While looking closely at health effects, attention shifts depending on how intense or prolonged the contact happens to be. Though progress moves slowly, cooperation among specialists worldwide keeps it going, rooted in data you can count. Understanding grows with every study shared - caution stays intact

• Frush DP. Radiation and Pediatric Imaging. Pediatric Radiology.

One study by Smith-Binbinder R looked into radiation levels during standard CT scans. This work appeared in the Archives of Internal Medicine. Focus was placed on how much exposure patients typically receive. Measurements came from frequent imaging procedures. Results highlighted notable differences across scan types. The analysis included data from multiple centers. Attention went toward real-world clinical settings. Findings helped clarify risks tied to repeated use.