

1-1-1986

# Reactions to natural and man-made radioactive threat

Margaret S. Gibbs

Susan Belford

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fmhi\\_pub](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fmhi_pub)



Part of the [Mental and Social Health Commons](#)

---

## Scholar Commons Citation

Gibbs, Margaret S. and Belford, Susan, "Reactions to natural and man-made radioactive threat" (1986). *FMHI Publications*. Paper 10.  
[http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fmhi\\_pub/10](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fmhi_pub/10)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute (FMHI) at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FMHI Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).

HAZARD HOUSE COPY


KZ  
179

"Reactions to Natural and Man-Made  
Radioactive Threat"

Gibbs & Belford

QRR #6

HAZARD HOUSE COPY



Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center  
Campus Box 482  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0482

HAZARD HOUSE COPY

REACTIONS TO NATURAL AND MAN-MADE RADIOACTIVE THREAT

Margaret Gibbs  
Susan Belford

1986

Quick Response Research Report #06

This publication is part of the Natural Hazards  
Research & Applications Information Center's ongoing  
Quick Response Research Report Series.  
<http://www.colorado.edu/hazards>

Psychological research on the effects of toxic contamination have shown that people are adversely psychologically affected by knowledge that their communities have been toxically contaminated (Gibbs, 1986; Baum, Gatchel & Schaeffer, 1983). Specific psychological effects which have been linked to toxic exposure include depression (Gibbs, 1986), and a growing distrust of government (Levine, 1982).

A mediating variable of victim's reactions to toxic contamination is whether or not they can specify a causal agent of their misfortune. It has been suggested that those who see a disaster as naturally caused tend to be less adversely affected than those who see their troubles as caused by human acts. The former group is more likely to accept their situation as an unfortunate inevitability, while the latter tend to feel angry and distrustful toward the perceived causal agents (Edelstein, 1986). Such conclusions are generally made from group comparisons and integration of findings across studies. It is not generally possible to find a group of people who have been or may be exposed to two similar hazards, one of which is naturally-caused and one of which is human-caused.

A situation of this kind exists for the residents

of Warwick, New York. This town is in a region with underground deposits of uranium. When this substance decays it releases radon, a radioactive gas, which can become trapped in homes, releasing further radioactive products. Some researchers feel that radon in homes and buildings is one of the chief causes of lung cancer. Residents can determine whether or not radon gas is a problem in their homes by having them tested, but few have done so. Most residents could thus view themselves as potentially at risk. This situation received wide media coverage beginning about four months before this study, with findings published shortly before the present study finding about 25% of Warwick homes in need of radon remediation. At the same time, Warwick residents have been threatened with another source of environmental hazard. Plans have been made to dump radioactively contaminated soil in the bordering town. Warwick residents fear that this will lead to radioactive contamination of their shared water supply and thus to potential health hazards. Area residents have formed active protest groups, and much publicity has focused on the issue.

These two hazards are similar in that both

involve potential radioactive exposure with accompanying health risks. Another similarity is that regarding both situations, the majority of residents did not know if they were or would be exposed to the toxic. The main difference of interest between these situations which was hypothesized to be an important determinant of psychosocial reaction was the perceived cause. Human actions, particularly governmental decisions, are the perceived cause of the dump hazard; radon gas in homes is perceived as a naturally occurring situation.

#### Method

#### Subjects

Subjects were 73 Warwick residents who returned a questionnaire mailed to their homes. There were 20 males and 53 females with a mean age of 44. They represented a wide range of educational achievement from some high school to graduate and professional degrees, with approximately 50% obtaining less than an undergraduate degree and 50% obtaining an undergraduate degree or higher. They had resided in Warwick an average of 20 years. There were no

children in 47% of the homes, while the rest of the homes included 1 to 5 children with a mode of 2.

#### Procedure

A one page questionnaire was developed to assess attitudinal and psychological information regarding the two potential toxic threats to Warwick residents. It began with a brief introduction to the purpose of the study and identified the researcher, including an invitation to call with questions the subjects might have. It was organized so that questions about each of the situations were worded in parallel, with identical response alternatives. Subjects were to check off their responses and fill in demographic information. In addition they were invited to include any comments they had on the back of the sheet.

The questionnaire was sent to 270 households randomly selected from the Warwick phone directory, addressed to "residents of:". A self-addressed envelope was included. Of the 270 questionnaires, 11 were returned undeliverable and 73 completed questionnaires were returned, for a return rate of 28.2%.

Major experimental hypotheses of the study are

based on the perceived cause of the potential toxics. It was expected that since the radioactive dump was regarded as a potential hazard due to human action, in comparison to the naturally occurring hazard, subjects would be more concerned about it, would regard it as more dangerous, would be more emotionally aroused (particularly angry) about it, would be more aware of the problem, and would rate government handling of the issue as poorer. Another purpose of this study was to obtain descriptive data to clarify public opinion and behavior regarding these problems.

#### Results

Subjects had been asked to check ~~to~~ <sup>asked</sup> off their reaction to the proposed radioactive dump. The overwhelming majority reported being opposed to the dump. The remaining respondents reported being indifferent; none indicated that they were in favor. The means of their Likert item responses were in the portion of the scale that showed them to be "very" aware of the proposed dump, "highly concerned" about it, viewing it as "highly" dangerous, and rating government handling of the situation as "poor."

Subjects had also been asked to indicate whether they had tested their homes for geologically-originating radon. Few residents (4%) indicated that they had done so. Most (55%) simply checked off that they had not, while the remaining 41% checked "no, but considering it." The mean Likert levels for all subjects showed that they were "moderately" aware of naturally-occurring radon, were "moderately concerned" about it, saw it as "very" dangerous, and rated government handling of the issue as "poor."

Dependent t-tests were performed on subjects' responses across the two toxic situations to assess the hypotheses concerning source of contamination. As predicted, subjects viewed the dumped toxic as more dangerous than the naturally-occurring toxic ( $t(n69) = 5.30, p < .001$ ). They were both more aware ( $t(n73) = 4.53, p < .001$ ) and more concerned ( $t(n72) = 4.74, p < .001$ ) about the dump situation. In addition they rated government handling of the dump as poorer than government handling of the natural radon problem ( $t(n61) = 3.22, p < .01$ ).

Subjects also differed in their emotional reactions to the dumped vs. geographically-originating radon. Subjects had been presented with identical

checklists of emotions and asked to check off the emotions they had felt about each of the toxic situations. They checked more total emotions in relation to dumped radon than in relation to natural radon (dumped mean = 3.0, natural mean = 1.9,  $t(n72) = 7.34$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Table 1 shows the number of respondents that checked each emotion regarding each situation. Note that significantly more subjects indicated that they felt angry, upset and furious about the dumped toxic than about the natural toxic.

#### Discussion

Subjects' responses indicated that they did view each of the toxic situations as a potential danger about which they were concerned. On a checklist of emotions, they tended to use the more intense emotions to describe their reactions, rather than those which would have suggested that they minimized the problems. The assumption that most had not tested their homes for naturally-occurring radon was confirmed. As a result, at the time they completed the questionnaire, respondents likely viewed each of the toxic contaminants as a potential risk to which they could

be exposed.

At the same time, one of these risks was naturally-caused while the other was man-made. Subjects considered the man-made risk to be potentially more dangerous, and of greater concern. They were also more emotionally aroused by the man-made hazard, particularly endorsing emotions indicating that they were upset and angry regarding it. These findings support the hypothesis that perception of human causation leads to greater distress and anger than does perception of natural causation. Also the fact that differences in affective arousal appeared for highly negatively charged emotions suggests that there is greater potential for longterm stress reactions from the anticipated dump.

Although most respondents did not know if they had a problem with naturally-originating radon, their lack of knowlege did not negate the possibility that the gas was currently in their homes. Thus their lower levels of expressed distress might in part have been due to denial. Evidence for some use of this defense is that so few subjects have tested their homes, preventing themselves from even knowing if

remediation is warranted.

Responding residents may have been more aware of the dump because while both issues received media exposure, the coverage of the dump was more extensive and emotional. At the same time, it is possible that media coverage of the dump reflects the psychological reactions of the questionnaire respondents, but on a societal level. While subjects rated government handling of both situations in the "poor" range, there was a significant difference in their means, falling much closer to a "very poor" rating in the dump situation. Thus the anger expressed by these subjects and in the media may be evoked by the presence of an object of blame.

### References

- Baum, A.T., Gatchel, R.J., & Schaeffer, M.A. (1983). Emotional, behavioral, and physiological effects of chronic stress at Three Mile Island. Journal of Consulting and Clinical, 51, 565-572.
- Edelstein, M. (1986). Psychoaocial impacts of toxic exposure: an overview. Impact Assessment Today, Volume I, 761-775, Utrecht: Van Arkel
- Gibbs, M. (1986). Psychological impacts of toxic exposure. Impact Assessment Today, Volume I, 805-815, Utrecht: Van Arkel.
- Levine, A.G. (1982) Love Canal: Science, Politics and People. Boston: Lexington Books.