



ehponline.org

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PERSPECTIVES

The Early Psychological Impacts of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill on Florida and Alabama Communities

**Lynn M. Grattan, Sparkle Roberts, William T. Mahan, Jr.,
Patrick K. McLaughlin, W. Steven Otwell, J. Glenn Morris, Jr.**

**doi: 10.1289/ehp.1002915 (available at <http://dx.doi.org/>)
Online 17 February 2011**



NIEHS

National Institute of
Environmental Health Sciences

National Institutes of Health
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

The Early Psychological Impacts of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill on Florida and Alabama
Communities

Lynn M. Grattan ¹

Sparkle Roberts¹

William T. Mahan, Jr.²

Patrick K. McLaughlin¹

W. Steven Otwell ²

J. Glenn Morris, Jr. ³

1. Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD

2. Florida Sea Grant Extension Program, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of
Florida, Gainesville, FL

3. Department of Medicine, College of Medicine, and Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of
Florida, Gainesville, FL

Corresponding Author: J. Glenn Morris, MD, MPH&TM, PO Box 100009, University of Florida,
Gainesville, FL, 32667, USA. (352) 273-7526; jgmorris@epi.ufl.edu

Running title: Community Impact of Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill

Key words: disasters; petroleum products; environmental epidemiology; occupational health; risk perception

Acknowledgments: Partial support for this project comes from the National Institute of Environmental and Health Sciences, 5R01ES012459-05S1. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official view of NIEHS. We gratefully acknowledge the support and contributions of Joseph Taylor, Executive Director of the Franklin's Promise Coalition, Apalachicola, FL; Darla Jones of the Alabama Seafood Association; and Maureen Rogerson, Jacqui Kostelec, Evonda Hill and Alexandra Toben from the Neuropsychology Laboratory, University of Maryland School of Medicine for their assistance with field work assessments and data management. The feedback from the reviewers was also greatly appreciated.

None of the authors has any actual or potential competing financial interests.

ABSTRACT

Background: While public concern has focused on the environmental impact of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the public health impact on a broad range of coastal communities is minimally known.

Objective: To determine the acute level of distress (depression, anxiety), mechanisms of adjustment (coping, resilience) and perceived risk in a community indirectly impacted by the oil spill and identify the extent to which economic loss may explain these factors.

Methods: Using a community based participatory model, standardized assessments of psychological distress (mood, anxiety), coping, resilience, neurocognition, and perceived risk were performed on residents of fishing communities who were indirectly impacted (n=71, Franklin County, Florida) or directly exposed (n=23, Baldwin County, Alabama) to coastal oil. Findings for participants who reported income stability (n=47) vs. spill-related income loss (n=47) were compared.

Results: There were no significant differences between community groups in terms of psychological distress, adjustment, neurocognition or environmental worry. Residents of both communities displayed clinically significant depression and anxiety. Relative to those with stable incomes, participants with spill-related income loss had significantly worse scores on Tension/Anxiety, Depression, Fatigue, Confusion and Total Mood Disturbance scales; higher rates of depression; were less resilient; and were more likely to use behavioral disengagement as a coping strategy.

Conclusions: Current estimates of human health impacts associated with the oil spill may underestimate the psychological impact in Gulf Coast communities that did not experience direct exposure to oil. Income loss after the spill may have a greater psychological health impact than the presence of oil on immediately adjacent shoreline.

INTRODUCTION

The Deepwater Horizon oil platform explosion and spill on April 20, 2010 generated substantial concerns about the ecological impact on the U.S. Gulf Coast environment. For five months, almost 5 million barrels of oil spilled into the Gulf of Mexico reaching more than 600 miles of the gulf coast shoreline in Florida, Alabama Louisiana and Texas (Devi 2010; McCauley 2010; Schmidt 2010). It was the largest off-shore spill in U.S. history (McCauley 2010). The oil spill disrupted the region's fishing industry, destroyed renewable natural resources and caused significant mortality of fish and wildlife. Numerous questions were also raised about the potential impact of the spill on human health in oil-exposed regions and surrounding communities.

Using a community-based participatory research model, our investigators worked with community agencies and leaders from two Gulf Coast fishing communities (Franklin County, Florida and Baldwin County, Alabama) to develop and implement a formal investigation of the acute psychological distress, neuropsychological baseline status, and personal resources for adjustment and adaptation of local residents. Extant data suggests that after disasters, mental health problems are most likely to appear after the acute crisis has abated (see Rubonis and Bickman 1991 for review, van den Berg et al. 2005). However, acute psychological data, collected in "real-time," are rarely available. These data are particularly important as the psychological impacts of an oil spill can be as substantive as the ecological impacts (Arata et al. 2000; Gill and Picou 1998; Palinkas et al. 1992, 1993; Sabucedo et al. 2009).

Because oil never reached Franklin County shores, effects of the disaster would have been indirect (i.e., not due to direct exposure to the oil), but may have been significant nonetheless. Residents observed daily media reports about the spill; provided clean up assistance

in other Gulf communities; and in anticipation of oil reaching their shores, actively engaged in protective environmental activities. Fears about seafood safety led to a dramatic reduction in local seafood harvesting, forcing lay-offs in packing houses and transportation because of a lack of product.

The potential for significant psychological sequelae after indirect exposure to oil spills and other environmental disasters has been well documented. These parallel the psychological distress associated with direct disaster exposure and include symptoms of depression, anxiety and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (Baschnagel et al. 2009, Carballo et al. 2006; Chung et al. 2005; Dixon et al. 1993; Gallacher et al. 2007). Three psychological factors consistently emerge as possible mediators of psychological distress after oil spills or disasters. These include coping, or the process through which people regulate distress and manage the problems related to it (Benight et al. 1999; Chung et al. 2005); resilience, the ability to bounce back after crisis, (Bonanno et al. 2006; Rajkumar et al. 2008); and perceived risk, the way people approach, think about and interpret the risks in their environment (Gallacher et al. 2007; Moffatt et al. 2000; Renn 2004). These processes guide the way an individual views the risks and challenges of the situation; define their pre-disposition to maintain emotional stability in the midst of crisis; and provide the basic tools for problem solving, planning and adaptation.

The most severe, lasting and pervasive psychological effects are often found after disasters which engender serious and ongoing financial problems (Nandi et al. 2009; Norris et al. 2002). Economic resource loss has specifically been associated with long term psychological and mental health symptoms after both the Exxon Valdez and Prestige oil spills (Arata et al. 2000; Sabucedo et al. 2009). We hypothesized that income loss during the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill disaster would be associated with similar acute psychological reactions.

Many factors impacting psychological reactivity after oil spills are potentially modifiable. With this in mind, our community-academic partnership was initiated to identify people at greatest risk for mental health problems for early public health intervention. The study objective was two-fold: 1) to determine the acute level of psychological distress (depression, anxiety), mechanisms of adjustment (coping, resilience), and perceived risk of individuals in a community who were indirectly impacted by the Horizon Oil Spill disaster and 2) to determine whether participants who sustained economic loss as a result of the oil spill had greater evidence of psychological distress, reduced capacity for adjustment (coping, resilience), and greater perceived risk than persons who were economically stable. We hypothesized that: 1) In Gulf coastal communities, the psychological distress (depression, anxiety), mechanisms of adjustment (coping, resilience) and perceived risk (environmental worry) associated with indirect impact will be similar to that of direct exposure to the oil spill disaster, and that 2) people with oil spill related economic losses will have more psychological distress, less resilience, be more likely to use maladaptive coping strategies and report more risk concerns than those with economic stability during the oil spill crisis.

METHODS

This study was undertaken as part of a larger and ongoing effort being conducted by the University of Florida to assess the acute environmental and health impact of the spill among persons living in fishing communities along the Florida and adjacent Alabama coast. Using a community based participatory model, we developed and implemented the project in collaboration with local community and religious leaders, mental health coalitions, trade associations and the University of Florida, Franklin County extension service. Our community

partners also provided insight into measurement selection and adaptation, the interpretation of our findings as well as recommendations for outreach and intervention.

Participants and Procedures

Study participants in Franklin County, Florida, included 71 adult volunteers, with permanent residence in the county (population 11,280; towns of Apalachicola, Eastpoint, and Carrabelle, on Apalachicola Bay (see map in Supplemental Material, Figure) who sustained an indirect impact or exposure to the oil spill. Indirect impact was defined as living in a community where oil did not reach their coastline but significantly impacted their fishing, recreation/tourism economies and required re-allocation of resources to protect their shellfish beds, wildlife and other coastal resources. Recruitment was targeted toward adults (18 to 75 yrs) working in the fishing/seafood and tourism/service industries as well as family members, recreational fishers or harvesters and retirees who lived and recreated in the community. Persons with a neurologic or psychiatric condition that would preclude understanding the informed consent or examination procedures were excluded. Recruitment was through advertisement on the local radio station (Oyster Radio) and contacts with members of the local fishing industry through the University of Florida Extension Office.

The direct exposure comparison group (persons living or working in a community where spilled oil reached the shoreline) included 23 participants from Baldwin County, Alabama (towns of Bon Secour and Foley on Bon Secour Bay/Mobile Bay, population 10,059). Our community partner in Bon Secour was the local office of the Alabama Seafood Association. Members (and family) of the association were contacted by phone (by the local association secretary) and invited to participate in the study. Exclusion criteria were the same as the primary study group.

All study participants underwent all study procedures. The community partners identified exam locations which included three sites for the primary, indirect exposure study group (two churches and the Carrabelle City Town Hall) and one church for our comparison group. A team of three examiners, formally trained in psychological and neuropsychological assessment, administered the standardized cognitive and psychological interviews and procedures. The team included a licensed psychologist, who supervised two additional research assistants responsible for reading forms and paper-and-pencil measures to participants with literacy or vision difficulties. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants in compliance with all applicable U.S.A. requirements according to standard procedures required by the University of Maryland and the University of Florida Institutional Review Boards. The examination procedures took approximately 90 minutes and included a standard interview and formal neuropsychological, psychosocial and risk perception measures described below. All measures were selected based upon their: 1) previously established reliability and validity for the constructs they measure and the populations to which they were applied; 2) ease of administration in the field; 3) repeatability for prospective studies; and 4) ability to assess the construct of interest with minimal participant burden. Participants were reimbursed \$40.00 for study participation. The data analyses were performed using the PASW Statistics Package – 18 (IBM 2009) and an alpha level of .05 was established as the cut off for statistical significance.

Demographic, Medical and Psychosocial History: Basic demographic, occupational, medical, psychiatric and drug/alcohol history data were collected using a modified Boston Occupational and Environmental Neurology Questionnaire (BOENQ, Feldman 1999) and Brief Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (BMAST, Pokorny et al. 1972). The BOENQ was modified to include questions relevant to fishing occupations and income since the oil spill. The BMAST

was modified to include questions about drug use and post-spill alcohol consumption.

Psychiatric history was determined by self reported lifetime history of treatment for depression and/or anxiety through therapy, hospitalization or medication.

Economic Loss: This was determined for each participant based upon their responses to the following two questions: Have you lost any income since the oil spill? (BOENQ, dichotomous response choice, with follow-up for reason attributed to reduced income). What has been the biggest impact of the oil spill? (Health and Coastal Environment Questionnaire-IV, open ended question). Participants were assigned to the economic loss group if they indicated they lost income since the oil spill, the income loss was related to the oil spill and the biggest impact of the oil spill on their life was economic.

Neuropsychological Battery: The neuropsychological battery evaluated neurocognitive functions within the context of possible exposure to oil and chemical dispersants. Cognitive impairments or associated exposures, if they exist, could potentially confound the assessment and interpretation of the psychological and behavioral variables of interest. The neuropsychological screening battery consisted of tests from the World Health Organization Neurobehavioral Core Test Battery (WHO-NCTB) recommended for use in studies of neurotoxin exposures (Johnson 1987). This included the Lafayette Pegboard (Lafayette Instrument Company, IN 2002) to assess psychomotor speed and dexterity, Digit Span (WAIS-3; [Wechsler 1997]) to measure simple attention; Symbol Digit Modalities Test (Smith 1982) to measure clerical speed and accuracy, Stroop Color Word Test (Golden & Freshwater 2002) to determine response inhibition, and the Trailmaking Test (Reitan 1992) to assess divided attention and mental flexibility. Age, gender and education corrections were applied in scoring.

Psychological Distress. The Profile of Mood States (POMS, [McNair et al. 2003]) assesses transient, fluctuating mood states and was used to determine current mood state (including anxiety and depression) in our study groups. Administration procedures require the respondent to read a list of 60 words (such as “friendly,” “tense,” “helpless) or short phrases (such as “unable to concentrate,” “uncertain about things”) that describe feelings that people have and indicate on a 5 point likert-type scale whether they experienced each feeling or state “since the oil spill, including today (0=not at all, 1=a little, 2=moderately, 3=quite a bit, 4=extremely). Responses were summed for six scales (Tension/Anxiety, Depression, Anger, Vigor, Fatigue, Confusion) and Total Mood Disturbance. Standard procedure for scoring this measure involves converting raw scores to t-scores (mean=50, sd=10) referencing an adult, normative data base provided in the manual (McNair and Heuchert 2005). With the exception of Vigor, higher scores indicate more adverse outcome on the subscale. Since clinical interpretation was of interest to our community partners, standard cutoffs for the POMS were applied (1.5 sd. [Nyenhuis et al. 1999]), to identify persons with suspected psychopathology or needing special attention. POMS protocols were reviewed after each administration. Persons who reported multiple symptoms related to depression or anxiety received a follow-up clinical interview by a licensed psychologist to determine if they were in acute distress or required immediate intervention and/or referral. The POMS has been widely used to evaluate mood state in a variety of normal, psychiatric, medical, and disaster-related neurotoxicology populations (Bowler et al. 1994a,b; Bowler et al. 1998; McNair and Heuchert 2005). It is sensitive to mood change and has excellent utility in studies where repeated measures are anticipated.

Coping Style. Coping strategies are used to describe the way people respond to stress. In this investigation, we studied the coping strategies people used during the oil spill. Coping was

assessed using the Brief COPE questionnaire (Carver 1997). The questionnaire comprised 28 items such as “I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation,” “I’ve been using alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better,” and “I’ve been praying or meditating.” Participants were asked to indicate how often they used each strategy to cope since the oil spill on a 4 point likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“I haven’t been doing this at all”) to 4 (“I have been doing this a lot”). The sum of the items were clustered into 14 coping strategies: self distraction, active coping, denial, substance use, emotional support seeking, instrumental support seeking, behavioral disengagement, venting, positive reframing, planning, humor, acceptance, religion and self-blame for data analysis. Scores for each strategy may range from 1 to 8 and a higher score indicates a greater use of the coping strategy. The Brief COPE was validated on a sample of adults participating in a study of psychological recovery after Hurricane Andrew (Carver 1997). The psychometric properties of The Brief COPE and its precursor, The COPE (Carver et al. 1989) have been well established in both normal and clinical populations. The 14 coping scales are intended interpreted independently in relation to variables under study (Carver 1997).

Resilience: Resilience refers to the ability to bounce back from adversity, and for the purpose of this study is operationally defined by responses on the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC, short form, [Campbell-Sills & Stein 2007]). The Connor-Davidson Resilience scale requires participants to consider 10 statements that are believed to be characteristic of a resilient person and rate them on a 0 to 4 scale based upon how closely the statement resembles their current state. Item examples include: “I can deal with whatever comes,” “I tend to bounce back after illness or hardship,” and “I can stay focused under pressure.” This measure is scored by summing the responses. The total score range is 0 to 40 with the higher score reflecting

greater resilience. The CD-RISC, short form and its predecessor scale were validated on a community sample, psychiatric outpatients, clinical trials for the treatment of PTSD, and victims of childhood trauma (Connor 2006). The measure has sound psychometric properties and distinguishes between people with greater and less resilience (Campbell-Sills and Stein 2007; Connor and Davidson, 2003).

Perceived Risk: Health and Coastal Environment Questionnaire-V, HCEQ-V (Roberts et al. 2007). A number of questions or questionnaires have been developed and used to measure perceived risk, or aspects of it (e.g. environmental worry). For the most part, these measures tend to be study-specific. None have been widely used, gained general acceptance or established primacy in the field. The measure of perceived risk used in this study, the Health and Coastal Environment Questionnaire-V (HCEQ-V), was previously developed and validated in several coastal communities facing threats of marine-based toxins. It assesses three facets of risk perception: environmental worry, environmental safety and environmental knowledge. It also identifies community sources of trusted information. The HCEQ-V It is a structured 19 item - survey that may be adapted to specific coastal environment threats. It is comprised of forced choice (“Scientists will succeed in providing ways to restore the natural environment,” response: yes, no, don’t know) and open ended questions (“What is the biggest problem(s) you have related to the oil spill?”). The question regarding who the respondent turns to for reliable health information allows for multiple responses. The most frequently selected items were reported. The survey was field tested and modified for content and language based upon community feedback (see Supplemental Material for HCEQ-V survey).

RESULTS

Recruitment

10% of the persons contacted for participation in the indirect impact group (Franklin County) declined participation for the following reasons: They were out of town (1%) busy managing oil-spill related problems during the time-frame of our evaluations (4%), or worried that our research was funded by BP (5%). In the direct exposure group (Baldwin County/Bon Secour) approximately 12% of the people contacted declined participation. The reasons stated were involvement in oil spill clean up operations (5%), managing other oil spill related problems during the evaluation period (2%), or worried that participation would represent a violation of contractual confidentiality agreements with BP (5%).

Demographic and Background Information

Table 1 contains the demographic and basic descriptive information for study participants by key variables: exposure community (indirect, direct) and income status (income stable, income loss). There was a significant difference between age, education and occupation between the two community exposure groups. Twenty-two of the 23 participants in the direct exposure group were men compared with only half of those in the indirect exposure group, and most were professional fisherman. The indirect exposure group included more retired professionals and persons in service/tourism industry and was older and had a higher average educational level than the direct exposure group. Only 1 participant in the indirect exposure group was involved in spill clean-up activity, compared with 70% of those in the direct exposure group. Economic loss was reported by 55% and 35% of those in the indirect and direct exposure groups, respectively ($p = 0.09$). There were no significant differences between the economic resource groups on any of

the demographic or background measures. Base rates for lifetime history of treatment for depression, anxiety or current alcohol problems were similar for all groups.

Neuropsychological Test Scores

There were no statistically significant differences between the exposure groups with respect to simple attention (Digit Span), response inhibition (Stroop), clerical speed and accuracy (Symbol Digit Modalities Test, SDMT), or divided attention and mental flexibility (Trails A and B) (see Supplemental Materials, Table 1). The direct oil exposure group was slower on the pegboard task (psychomotor speed and accuracy) than the indirect exposure group, but the differences were not clinically significant. Cognitive scores were comparable between the income groups, and cognitive performance scores for all four groups were within the normal and expected ranges.

Mood

There were no statistically significant differences in subscale scores between the exposure groups (Table 2). There were significant differences between the income groups on the POMS Tension/Anxiety, Depression, Anger, Fatigue, Confusion and Total Mood Disturbance subscales. The income loss group consistently scored higher on these scales than those with stable incomes, suggesting more distress in multiple psychological domains. Collapsing across all groups, there were no clinically relevant differences between participants with a lifetime history of depression or anxiety (n=9) and those who were never diagnosed or treated for anxiety or depression (n=85).. When standard cut-offs suggesting clinical impairment were applied, indicators of clinically significant anxiety and depression were found across all study groups (Table 2). A sizable proportion of participants (50% indirect impact, 35% direct exposure) in both community exposure groups had scores suggestive of clinically significant depression.

While the rate of clinical impairment was not statistically different between the exposure groups ($X^2 = 1.59$, $p = .21$), the depression rates of both groups were higher than reported in 2008 in the region: 9.8% Florida and 13% Alabama (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010).

The number of persons with clinically significant depression was elevated in both income groups (30% income stable, 62% income loss) relative to regional base rates (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010), with significantly more people in the income loss group meeting the criteria for probable depression (Table 2). With respect to Tension/Anxiety, 24% of people in the income stable group and 65% of people in the income loss group had clinically significant scores ($p < 0.001$).

Mechanisms of Adjustment

“Active coping,” was used significantly more by the direct exposure group than the indirectly impacted group (Table 2). Participants in the direct exposure group were more likely to agree with the following statements: “I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I’m in;” “I’ve been taking action to try to make the situation better.” When the income groups were compared, those with income loss were significantly more likely to use “behavioral disengagement” as a coping strategy. Behavioral disengagement as a coping strategy involves “giving up” trying to deal with or cope with the problem (Carver 1997).

There was no difference in the resilience scores between exposure groups. However, the income loss group had a significantly lower mean resilience score than the income stable group. Finally, when baseline history of anxiety or depression was considered across all groups, there was no statistically significant difference in Resilience Scores between participants with ($n = 9$, mean resilience = 27) or without ($n = 85$, mean resilience = 30) a prior history of anxiety or depression ($p = 0.10$).

Perceived Risk

Results of the Perceived Risk Survey (Table 3) indicate that 98 – 100% of study participants as a whole worried about the impacts of the oil spill on the environment, seafood safety and human health. A greater proportion of people in the indirectly impacted group thought BP would be successful in oil spill cleanup than the direct exposure group. Nine percent of the participants from the directly exposed community believed they were sickened by exposure to oil or dispersants and 17% were uncertain, or did not know. There was a significant difference between the exposure groups with respect to future health impacts. Of the people who believed there would be health impacts, 21% of participants in the indirectly exposed group believed the health effects would be only short term. In contrast, 100% of people who believed there would be health impacts in the directly exposed community thought the health impacts would be both short and long term ($p=0.03$).

When asked where they obtained their most reliable information about oil spill related health matters, more than 75% of all participants indicated newspapers or television (see Supplemental Material, Table 2). The Department of Health was viewed as a more reliable source of information by the indirectly impacted (25%) and income loss groups (32%) compared to their comparison groups (4% and 9%, respectively). Local fishermen were considered a reliable source of information by the persons who sustained income loss (66% vs 13%, $p=0.03$). Finally, 22% of the direct exposure group considered BP to be a reliable source of information, compared with only 5% of the indirect exposure group ($p = 0.01$).

Discussion

This study examined the effects of community oil exposure (direct, indirect) and income loss with respect to acute, psychological distress, coping, resilience and perceived risk following

the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Disaster. As hypothesized, during the spill, people living in a Gulf Coast community with indirect impact had similar, elevated levels of anxiety and depression as people living in communities where oil reaches their shores. When participants were divided by spill-related income loss, the expected differences in psychological distress emerged. People who suffered income losses as a result of the spill reported significantly more tension/anxiety, depression, anger, fatigue, confusion and overall mood disturbance than their income-stable counterparts. The income loss group also had a higher rate of clinically elevated depression scores than any other study group. In summary, these data highlight the potentially profound psychological impact the Deepwater Horizon disaster had on coastal communities with indirect impact, particularly if they sustained economic loss.

Mechanisms of adjustment such as coping strategy and resilience are often viewed as buffers to the psychological impacts of stressful life events. In our study, the income loss group was more likely than the stable income group to use “behavioral disengagement” or “giving up” as a coping strategy. Disengaging from coping efforts and other avoidant strategies has been previously associated with adverse psychological outcomes after disasters, including oil spills (Arata et al. 2000; Silver et al. 2002). The lowest resilience scores also were found in persons who sustained income loss and did not appear to be associated with baseline history of depression or anxiety. Resilience refers to the qualities that enable one to thrive, despite adversity (Campbell-Sills and Stein 2007; Conner and Davison 2003). It implies an inner strength which is thought to be protective against the development of psychiatric disorder (Rutter 1987). Income decline has been previously associated with reduced resilience and persistent psychological symptoms after disaster (Bonanno et al. 2007). The possibility is raised that

people with spill-related income loss may have fewer psychological resources for “bouncing back.”

Economic resource loss, socioeconomic adversity and/or loss of job opportunities have been associated with course of depression, number of PTSD symptoms, or psychological distress following other disasters including the Sierra Madre earthquake, Hurricane Hugo, and the 9/11 NYC terrorist attacks (Bonanno et al. 2006; Freedy et al. 1992,1994; Kaniasty and Norris 1995; Nandi et al. 2009). Six years after the Exxon Valdez oil spill, Arata and colleagues (2000) examined economic resource loss within the context of a broader, Conservation of Resources stress model (Hobfoll 1989). They found resource loss (having to sell possessions) to be significantly correlated with anxiety, depression and PTSD in commercial fishers after the Exxon Valdez spill (Arata et al. 2000). Socioeconomic factors, such as income loss may have a profound impact on psychological adjustment and adaptation after oil spills.

With regard to perceived risk, both exposure groups and economic resource groups had similarly high levels of worry about the impact of the spill on the environment, human health and seafood safety. Therefore, any direct relationship between environmental worry and acute psychological distress could not be examined. During the acute event, television and newspapers were considered the most reliable source of human health information for participants as a whole. People who sustained income loss were more likely to turn to the Local Fishermen and the Department of Health for their information. Meanwhile, BP was found to be a reliable source of information for the directly exposed community.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study are sample size and sampling procedures, which may have led to sampling biases. The indirect impact group was larger, older, better educated

and had more women than the comparison group (which focused on persons working directly on the water). The collective and acute nature of disaster creates a unique challenge for community based public health research. During this “real time” assessment of psychological distress, our community partners, who were also community leaders, were deeply entrenched in disaster-related related matters. This precluded the implementation of labor intensive, systematic sampling procedures. Within the context of this research model, we used the best available recruitment methods to assemble the participant samples. The absence of pre-exposure data and the cross sectional approach represent additional limitations which preclude the ability to directly establish a causal relationship between the oil spill and distress of community members.

Implications

Impacts of oil spills extend beyond communities where oil reaches the shoreline. This underscores the need to extend public health education and outreach, psychological monitoring, and mental health services beyond the direct spill areas. People at risk of income loss are particularly vulnerable populations from a mental health perspective. Therefore, this group should be specifically targeted for financial counseling and support; alternative employment opportunities; and psychological interventions. These interventions need to be immediately available in the communities where the impacted individuals live.

Post-traumatic Stress Disorder is the most often studied and most frequent and debilitating psychological disturbance that occurs after disasters (Galea et al. 2005). Longitudinal studies that study the range of factors associated with the development and/or persistence of PTSD or related disorders from the acute phase of psychological reactivity are needed. Income loss as well as other socioeconomic factors should be considered in predictive models. Most people who are exposed to disasters do not develop PTSD or other chronic

debilitating psychological conditions. Therefore, research on the factors associated with normal, adaptive recovery to disaster is also indicated. Subsequently, we could better identify target groups for varying levels of support or interventions. Finally, use of a community based participatory model enabled the development of a sustainable community-academic relationship dedicated to improving the public health of participating oil spill communities.

References

- Arata CM, Picou JS, Johnson GD, McNally TS. 2000. Coping with technological disaster: an application of the conservation of resources model to the Exxon Valdez oil spill. *J Trauma Stress* 13(1):23.
- Baschnagel JS, Gudmundsdottir B, Hawk Jr. LW, Beck JG. 2009. Post-trauma symptoms following indirect exposure to the September 11th terrorist attacks: the predictive role of dispositional coping. *J Anxiety Disord* 23(7):915-922; doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2009.05.005 [Online 31 May 2009].
- Benight C, Ironson G, Klebe K, Carver C, Wynings C, Burnett K, et al. 1999. Conservation of resources and coping self-efficacy predicting distress following a natural disaster: a causal model analysis where the environment meets the mind. *Anxiety Stress Coping* 12(2):107-126.
- Bonanno GA, Galea S, Bucciarelli A, Vlahov D. 2006. Psychological resilience after disaster: New York City in the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attack. *Psychol Sci* 17(3):181-186; doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01682.X.
- Bonanno GA, Galea S, Bucciarelli A, Vlahov D. 2007. What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources and life stress. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 75(5):671-682; doi: 10.1037/022-006X.75.5.671.
- Bowler RM, Hartney C, Ngo LH. 1998. Amnestic disturbance and posttraumatic stress disorder in the aftermath of a chemical release. *Arch Clin Neuropsych* 13(5):455-471; doi: 10.1016/S0887-6177%2897%2900092-9.
- Bowler RM, Mergler D, Huel G, Cone JE. 1994a. Aftermath of a chemical spill: psychological and physiological sequelae. *Neurotoxicology* 15(3):723-729.
- Bowler RM, Mergler D, Huel G, Cone JE. 1994b. Psychological, psychosocial, and psychophysiological sequelae in a community affected by a railroad chemical disaster. *J Trauma Stress* 7(4):601-624.
- Campbell-Sills L, Stein M. 2007. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *J Trauma Stress* 20(6):1019-1028; doi: 10.1002/jts.20271.
- Carballo M, Heal B, Horbaty G. 2006. Impact of the tsunami on psychosocial health and well-being. *Int Rev Psychiatr* 18(3):217-223; doi: 10.1080/09540260600655870.
- Carver CS. 1997. You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: consider the Brief COPE. *Int J Behav Med* 4(1):92-100.

- Carver CS, Scheier MF, Weintraub JK. 1989. Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 56(2):267-283; doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010. Current depression among adults. United States. 2006 and 2008. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 59(38):1229-1235
- Chung M, Dennis I, Easthope Y, Werrett J, Farmer S. 2005. A multiple-indicator multiple-cause model for posttraumatic stress reactions: personality, coping, and maladjustment. *Psychosom Med* 67(2):251-259; doi: 10.1097/01.psy.0000155675.56550.5f.
- Connor KM, Davidson JR. 2003. Development of a new resilience scale: the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depress Anxiety* 18(2):76-82; doi: 10.1002/da.10113.
- Connor K. 2006. Assessment of resilience in the aftermath of trauma. *J Clin Psychiatry* 67 Suppl 2:46-49.
- Devi S. 2010. Anger and anxiety on the Gulf Coast. *Lancet* 376(9740):503; doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61237-8.
- Dixon P, Rehling G, Shiwach R. 1993. Peripheral victims of the herald of free enterprise disaster. *Br J Med Psychol* 66(2):193-202.
- Feldman RG. 1999. Mercury. Chapter 6 in *Occupational and Environmental Neurotoxicology*. PA:Lippincott-Raven.
- Freedly JR, Saladin ME, Kilpatrick DG, Resnick HS, Saunders BE. 1994. Understanding acute psychological distress following natural disaster. *J Trauma Stress* 7(2):257-273.
- Freedly JR, Shaw DL, Jarrell MP, Masters CR. 1992. Towards an understanding of the psychological impact of natural disasters: an application of the conservation resources stress model. *J Trauma Stress* 5(3):441-454; doi: 10.1002/jts.2490050308 [Online 19 February 2006].
- Galea S, Nandi A, Vlahov D. 2005. The epidemiology of post-traumatic stress disorder after disasters. *Epidemiol Rev* 27:78-91; doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxi003.
- Gallacher J, Bronstering K, Palmer S, Fone D, Lyons R. 2007. Symptomatology attributable to psychological exposure to a chemical incident: a natural experiment. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 61(6):506-512; doi:10.1136/jech.2006.046987 [Online 2 August 2006].
- Gill DA, Picou JS. 1998. Technological disaster and chronic community stress. *Society and Natural Resources: Int J* 11(8):795; doi: 10.1080/08941929809381119.
- Golden CJ, Freshwater SM. 2002. *The Stroop Color and Word Test: A Manual for Clinical and Experimental Uses*. IL:Stoelting Co.

- Hobfoll SE. 1989. Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *Am Psychol* 44(3):513-524.
- Johnson BL, ed. 1987. *Prevention of Neurotoxic Illness in Working Populations*. Chinchester, UK:John Wiley and Sons.
- Kaniasty K, Norris FH. 1995. In search of altruistic community: patterns of social support mobilization following Hurricane Hugo. *Am J Community Psychol* 23(4):447-477; doi: 10.1007/BF02506964.
- Lafayette Instrument Company. 2002. Model 32025 Grooved Pegboard Test User Instructions IN:Lafayette Instrument Company.
- McCauley LA. 2010. Environments and health: will the BP Oil Spill affect our health? *AmJ Nurs* 110(9):54-56; doi:10.1097/01.NAJ.0000388266.51213.42.
- McNair DM, Heuchert JWP. 2005. *Profile of Mood States; Technical Update*. NY:Multi-Health Systems.
- McNair DM, Lorr M, Droppleman LF. 2003. *Manual: Profile of Mood States*. CA:Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Moffatt S, Mulloli TP, Bhopal R, Foy C, Phillimore P. 2000. An exploration of awareness bias in two environmental epidemiology studies. *Epidemiology* 11(2):199-208.
- Nandi A, Tracy M, Beard JR, Vlahov D, Galea S. 2009. Patterns and predictors of trajectories of depression after an urban disaster. *Ann Epidemiol* 19(11):761-770.
- Norris F, Friedman M, Watson P. 2002. 60,000 disaster victims speak: Part II. Summary and implications of the disaster mental health research. *Psychiatry* 65(3):240-260; doi: 10.1521/psyc.65.3.240.20169.
- Nyenhuis DL, Yamamoto C, Luchetta T, Terrien A, Parmentier A. 1999. Adult and geriatric normative data and validation of the profile of mood states. *J Clin Psychol* 55(1):79-86; doi: 10.1002/%28S1CT%291097-4679%28199901%2955.
- Palinkas LA, Petterson JS, Russell J, Downs MA. 1993. Community patterns of psychiatric disorders after the Exxon Valdez oil spill. *Am J Psychiatry* 150(10):1517-1523.
- Palinkas LA, Russell J, Downs MA, Petterson JS. 1992. Ethnic differences in stress, coping, and depressive symptoms after the Exxon Valdez oil spill. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 180(5):287-295; doi: [10.1097/00005053-199205000-00002](https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-199205000-00002).
- Pokorny AD, Miller BA, Kaplan HB. 1972. The Brief MAST: a shortened version of the Michigan alcoholism screening test. *Am J Psychiatry* 129(3):342-345.

- Rajkumar AP, Premkumar TS, Tharyan P. 2008. Coping with the Asian Tsunami: perspectives from Tamil Nadu, India on the determinants of resilience in the face of adversity. *Soc Sci Med* 67(5):844-853. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.05.014.
- Reitan RM. 1992. Trail Making Test: Manual for Administration and Scoring. AZ:Reitan Neuropsychology Laboratory.
- Renn O. 2004. Perception of Risks. *Toxicol Lett* 149:405-413
- Roberts S, Grattan L, Tracy JK, Rowe J, Parker S, Morris JG. A comparative study of perceived risk from two coastal communities: Implications for communication and education. In: 4th Symposium on Harmful Algae in the U.S., October 2007, Woods Hole, MA.
- Rubonis AV, Bickman L. 1991. Psychological impairment in the wake of disaster: the disaster-psychopathology relationship. *Psychol Bull* 109(3):384-399.
- Rutter M. 1987. Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *Am J Orthopsychiatry* 57:316-331.
- Sabucedo JM, Arce C, Ferraces MJ, Merino H, Duran M. 2009. Psychological impact of the Prestige catastrophe. *Int J of Clin Health Psychol* 9(1):105-116.
- Schmidt CW. 2010. Between the devil and the deep blue sea: dispersants in the Gulf of Mexico. *Environ Health Perspect* 118(8):a338.
- Silver RC, Holman EA, McIntosh DN, Poulin M, Gil-Rivas V. 2002. Nationwide longitudinal study of psychological responses to September 11. *JAMA* 28(10): 1235-1244.
- Smith A. 1982. Symbol Digit Modalities Test: Manual. CA:Western Psychological Services.
- van den Berg B, Grievink L, Yzermans J, Lebet E. 2005. Medically unexplained physical symptoms in the aftermath of disasters. *Epidemiol Rev* 27:92-106; doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxi001.
- Wechsler D. 1997. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale: Administration and Scoring Manual. 3rd ed. TX:The Psychological Corporation.

Table 1. Characteristics of Study Participants

<i>Characteristics^a</i>	Exposure		<i>p-value</i>	Income Status		<i>p-value</i>
	<i>Indirect (n = 71)</i>	<i>Direct (n = 23)</i>		<i>Stable (n = 47)</i>	<i>Loss (n = 47)</i>	
Gender (male) ^b	35 (49)	22(96)	0.00	32(68)	23(53)	0.14
Age ^c	48.99 (16.45)	41.91 (11.16)	0.02	49.32 (16.92)	45.19 (13.97)	0.20
Range	19—88	22—63		19—88	22—79	
Education ^c	12.39 (03.05)	10.52 (01.86)	0.01	12.26 (3.21)	11.59 (02.56)	0.27
Range	05—20	08—13		05—20	05—18	
Race ^b	-----	-----	0.31	-----	-----	0.40
Caucasian	64(90)	22(100)	-----	41(89)	45(96)	-----
African American	6(9)	0(0)	-----	4(9)	2(4)	-----
Native American	1(1)	0(0)	-----	1(2)	0(0)	-----
Occupation ^b	-----	-----	0.00	-----	-----	0.35
Fishing	26(38)	20(87)	-----	22(47)	24(53)	-----
Service/tourism	15(22)	1(4)	-----	7(15)	9(20)	-----
Retired	7(10)	0(0)	-----	5(11)	2(4)	-----
Relative of fish industry	2(3)	0(0)	-----	0 (0)	2(4)	-----
Other	18(27)	2(9)	-----	12(26)	8(18)	-----
Economic loss ^b	39(55)	8(35)	0.09	-----	-----	-----
Spill cleanup participant ^b	1(1)	16(70)	0.00	9(19)	8(17)	0.79
Psychiatric history ^b						
Depression	5(7)	1(4)	0.65	1(2)	5(11)	0.09
Anxiety	4(6)	2(9)	0.60	4(9)	2(4)	0.40
Alcohol problem ^{b,d}	4(10)	2(9)	0.89	4(13)	2 (4)	0.39

-----, Not applicable.

^aAll characteristics are reported as frequencies and (percentages) except for age and education which are reported as means (standard deviation). ^bProbability associated with a Chi square test (two-tailed distribution). ^cProbability associated with an Independent Samples t-test (two-tailed distribution). ^dPotential alcohol problem was determined by using the criteria from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAA).

Table 2. Psychosocial Scores for Study Participants

<i>Psychosocial measures^a</i>	Exposure			Income Status		
	<i>Indirect (n = 71)</i>	<i>Direct (n = 23)</i>	<i>p-value^d</i>	<i>Stable (n = 47)</i>	<i>Loss^b (n = 47)</i>	<i>p-value^d</i>
Profile of Mood States						
Tension/Anxiety	56.89 (17.97)	62.44 (11.33)	0.17	53.23 (16.09)	63.26 (15.94)	0.00
Depression	55.70 (20.22)	57.70 (12.99)	0.66	51.90 (18.37)	60.94 (18.14)	0.02
Anger	56.13 (20.63)	59.91 (13.24)	0.41	53.17 (19.27)	60.49 (18.30)	0.05
Fatigue	49.41 (16.87)	55.83 (12.95)	0.10	47.43 (16.55)	54.53 (15.15)	0.03
Confusion	54.92 (20.16)	60.78 (11.62)	0.19	52.77 (17.93)	59.94 (18.66)	0.06
Vigor	40.44 (13.94)	41.61 (10.16)	0.71	40.74 (14.33)	40.70 (11.83)	0.99
Total Mood Disturbance	55.66 (20.07)	61.13 (11.71)	0.22	52.93 (18.12)	61.06 (18.10)	0.03
POMS Suspected Clinical Impairment						
Tension/Anxiety ^{b, c}	44	48	0.76	24	65	0.00
Depression ^{b, c}	50	35	0.21	30	62	0.00
Brief COPE						
Self-distraction	4.60 (2.10)	4.40 (1.70)	0.72	4.40 (2.10)	4.60 (2.01)	0.39
Active coping	4.70 (2.10)	6.10 (2.00)	0.01	5.40 (2.10)	4.80 (2.20)	0.27
Denial	4.00 (2.20)	3.40 (2.00)	0.25	3.40 (2.20)	4.20 (2.20)	0.09
Substance use	2.80 (1.40)	2.70 (1.60)	0.81	2.80 (1.40)	2.70 (1.40)	0.64
Use of emotional support	3.80 (1.70)	3.60 (1.70)	0.71	3.50 (1.60)	4.00 (1.80)	0.15
Use of instrumental support	3.80 (1.90)	3.90 (1.80)	0.82	3.70 (1.70)	4.00 (2.00)	0.40
Behavioral disengagement	3.20 (1.50)	2.80 (1.40)	0.28	2.70 (1.10)	3.40 (1.70)	0.02
Venting	4.00 (1.70)	4.50 (1.60)	0.18	3.90 (1.60)	4.40 (1.70)	0.17
Positive reframing	4.60 (1.90)	5.10 (1.90)	0.21	4.70 (2.00)	4.70 (1.80)	0.96
Planning	5.10 (1.90)	5.80 (2.00)	0.13	5.00 (1.90)	5.60 (2.00)	0.19
Humor	3.00 (1.50)	4.00 (2.30)	0.08	3.30 (1.70)	3.20 (1.80)	0.68
Acceptance	5.60 (1.90)	6.30 (1.50)	0.09	5.90 (1.80)	5.70 (1.90)	0.63
Religion	4.60 (2.30)	5.60 (2.40)	0.11	4.80 (2.40)	5.00 (2.30)	0.77
Self-blame	2.80 (1.30)	2.80 (1.50)	0.77	2.50 (1.10)	3.00 (1.50)	0.07
Connor Davidson Resilience	29.07 (6.16)	29.87 (5.86)	0.59	30.02 (6.56)	28.51 (5.51)	0.04

^aRaw score means (standard deviations) reported for the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale and the Brief COPE. Age corrected t-scores (mean=50, sd=10) are reported for the Profile of Mood States subscales. ^bPercentage of participants impaired on the POMS Tension/Anxiety and Depression scales. ^cProbability associated with a Chi square test (two-tailed distribution). ^dProbability associated with an Independent Samples t-test (two-tailed distribution).

Table 3. Perceived Environmental and Health Risks of Oil Spill

<i>Perceptions^a</i>	Exposure		<i>p-value^b</i>	Income Status		<i>p-value^b</i>
	<i>Indirect</i> <i>(n = 71)</i>	<i>Direct</i> <i>(n = 23)</i>		<i>Stable</i> <i>(n = 47)</i>	<i>Loss</i> <i>(n = 47)</i>	
Worry about environment	68(99)	23(100)	0.56	98	100	0.32
Worry about seafood safety	68(99)	23(100)	0.56	98	100	0.32
Believe BP will succeed in cleanup	27(42)	3(15)	0.03	41	31	0.36
Science will succeed in cleanup	35(55)	8(40)	0.25	49	54	0.67
Worry about human health	66(96)	22(96)	1.00	96	96	1.00
Duration of health effects	-----	-----	0.03	-----	-----	0.52
Short term	11(21)	0(0)	-----	7(18)	4(12)	-----
Long term	42(79)	20(100)	-----	33(83)	29(88)	-----
Believe they had exposure-related illness	0(0)	2(9)	0.04	1(2)	1(2)	0.45
Don't know if exposure-related illness	11(17)	5(22)		6(13)	10(23)	

-----, Not applicable. ^aAll perceptions are reported as percentages. ^bProbability associated with a Chi square test (two-tailed distribution).