# **RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

# **Predictors of Help Seeking Among Connecticut Adults After September 11, 2001**

Mary L. Adams, MS, MPH, Julian D. Ford, PhD, and Wayne F. Dailey, PhD

The unprecedented events of September 11, 2001, had widespread psychological and health effects in New York City as well as regionally and nationally. A study of 1008 Manhattan adults conducted a few weeks after September 11 showed that 7.5% of respondents had symptoms consistent with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and that 9.7% appeared to have major depression.<sup>1</sup> Approximately 75% of respondents who took part in a telephone survey of adult residents of New York State, New Jersey, and Connecticut reported 1 or more psychological or health problems as a result of September 11, with comparable results for all 3 states.<sup>2</sup> According to Schuster et al., 44% of a national sample of adults reported experiencing 1 or more of 5 psychological stress symptoms after September 11.<sup>3</sup>

Physical effects and behavioral changes were also reported in New York City and surrounding areas. Increases in symptom severity were found among respondents with asthma in lower Manhattan who reported difficulty breathing owing to smoke and debris.<sup>4</sup> Vlahov et al. reported that 28.8% of all respondents in that same survey population increased their use of cigarettes, alcohol, or marijuana after September 11.<sup>5</sup> More than 1 in 5 smokers (21%) reported increased smoking, and 3% of all respondents reported increased alcohol consumption, in a post– September 11 survey of Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York State adults.<sup>2</sup>

A key factor in recovery from the traumatic stress of disasters is timely receipt of appropriate support services.<sup>6</sup> Wang et al. found that people in communities less affected by a major earthquake were more likely to develop PTSD and exhibited poorer recovery 3 to 6 months later than people in more severely affected communities who received sustained help, including health and mental health services.<sup>7</sup> Receipt of help also was more strongly associated with postdisas*Objectives.* We conducted a population-based telephone survey in an attempt to determine correlates of formal and informal help seeking after September 11, 2001. *Methods.* Between October 15 and December 31, 2001, 1774 Connecticut Be-

havioral Risk Factor Surveillance System respondents were asked questions directly related to their experiences of September 11.

*Results.* Multivariate logistic regression analyses showed that receipt of formal help was predicted by sleep problems, close association with a victim, reports of increased smoking or drinking, and receipt of informal help. Age, gender, reports of 1 or more problems, and formal help seeking predicted receipt of informal help.

*Conclusions.* Public health planning and bioterrorism preparedness should include programs addressing increased smoking and drinking, sleep problems, and bereavement in the wake of disasters. (*Am J Public Health.* 2004;94:1596–1602)

ter readjustment than extent of exposure to the earthquake.<sup>8</sup> Despite the benefits of such services, Caldera et al.<sup>9</sup> and Wang et al.<sup>8</sup> found that most people in affected communities do not seek help for stress or psychological problems in the aftermath of disasters and that individuals with previous mental health problems are most likely to seek help.

Factors thought to play a role in seeking and receiving help for mental and behavioral health problems can be grouped into 3 categories, according to Andersen's model.<sup>10</sup> "Predisposing characteristics," such as age, gender, cultural factors, and degree of exposure to trauma or proximity to victims,<sup>11</sup> have been shown to affect reporting of traumatic stress and inclination to seek help in the wake of disaster.<sup>11–13</sup> "Enabling resources" such as health insurance coverage influence receipt of care by affecting social support or availability of services.<sup>14</sup> "Perceived need" leads a person to actually decide to seek help and to follow through with health care. Stress-related problems, such as sleep disturbances, mental and physical health problems, and increased smoking or alcohol consumption, are associated with perceived need for help.<sup>11,15</sup>

Our study was designed to investigate predictors of obtaining help after September 11, 2001, among Connecticut adults who were regionally proximate to New York City. In particular, we sought to learn more about the parameters that distinguished help seekers from those who did not seek help, examining all 3 categories of factors that have been shown to influence help seeking. We also saw this as an opportunity for public health practitioners, mental health practitioners, and members of academia to collaborate in an attempt to improve public health programs designed to respond to terrorism or other large-scale traumatic events or disasters.

#### **METHODS**

#### Data

Data were collected through the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), a state-based telephone survey of randomly selected noninstitutionalized adults coordinated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.<sup>16</sup> The sample of telephone numbers for each BRFSS state is updated quarterly to include newly connected phones, and each month a stratified subsample is drawn to ensure that results will accurately represent the full adult population. Connecticut decided to add questions in the fourth quarter of 2001 to address the effects of September 11, with a particular focus on the World Trade Center attacks. The 17 questions added to measure psychological and emotional effects of the attacks were modifications of questions used after an earlier disaster.<sup>17</sup>

In Connecticut, the monthly BRFSS sample was stratified by county (n=8) for 2001, and an annual total of 600 to 1500 interviews were conducted in each county, depending on population. A total of 7752 surveys were conducted in 2001; data derived from all 1774 interviews conducted between October 15 and December 31, 2001, were used in the present study. Twelve respondents who did not answer the question regarding receipt of help were removed from the analysis, resulting in a final sample size of 1762. Data were adjusted for number of adults and number of telephone lines in the household and for the different probabilities of selection in each stratum; data were further adjusted to be representative, in terms of age and gender, of the adult population of Connecticut. Missing values were excluded from our analyses.

#### Measures

In our analyses, we used 2 dependent variables based on type of help respondents reported receiving after September 11. Receipt of help was ascertained from a single question: "Did you get help with problems you have experienced since the attacks?" Type of help received was assessed with a single question focusing on sources of help. Those who received any formal support services (e.g., medical assistance, services provided by a psychologist, psychiatrist, social worker, other mental health professional, or religious counselor) were placed in the "formal help" group. The "informal help" group included those who reported obtaining help from family members, friends, neighbors, or any other source not identified as providing formal help. Twelve respondents who reported receiving both types of help were included in both groups.

Respondents were asked whether they, or anyone they knew personally (limited to family members, friends, coworkers, acquaintances, and members of their community), had been a victim of the attacks. A "victim" was defined as someone who witnessed the attacks, who was injured or killed in the attacks, or whose home or workplace was disrupted or damaged. In our analyses, we grouped responses into 3 categories: victims or family members of a victim, those with a personal relationship (other than family membership) to a victim, and those with no relationship to a victim. Respondents were asked how close they were in proximity to the World Trade Center attack, and responses were coded dichotomously as "in New York City" or "elsewhere." To assess access to support relevant to loss and grieving, we asked respondents whether they had attended funerals or memorial services for friends, acquaintances, or community members killed in the attacks. Presence of health insurance coverage was used as a general measure of health care accessibility.

As a means of assessing perceived problems subsequent to September 11, respondents were asked "Since the attacks, have you experienced any of the following feelings or problems?" (This question, the 12th in a series of items focusing on September 11, followed the question asking whether help was sought; however, it did not limit responses to problems directly resulting from the attacks.) Nervousness, worry, hopelessness, loss of control over external events, and worthlessness were grouped, and respondents were coded dichotomously as having reported none or 1 or more of these problems. Anger, reported by half of all respondents, was not included owing to its pervasiveness<sup>2</sup> and, potentially, short duration. Sleep problems were considered separately.

Information on only a few measures of interest was available before September 11, 2001. Physical and mental health status were obtained from questions asked over the entire year as part of the BRFSS core.<sup>18</sup> Poor physical health days were measured via the following question: "Now thinking about your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, for how many days during the past 30 days was your physical health not good?" Poor mental health (measured as poor mental health days) was ascertained from the question "Now thinking about your mental health, which includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 days was your mental health not good?" In most analyses, we were primarily interested in any indication of problems, so continuous variables were dichotomized (0 days vs 1 or more days).

Tobacco and alcohol prevalence rates were also measured throughout 2001. Smokers were defined as those who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and currently smoked on some days or every day. Respondents who reported that they had consumed at least 1 drink in the past 30 days were considered drinkers. Changes in smoking and drinking were measured only in October through December. Current smokers who increased their smoking, those who began smoking after September 11, and those reporting increased alcohol consumption since the attacks were considered to have increased their substance use.

Data on ethnicity were derived from several questions that permitted respondents to indicate more than one race/ethnicity. The result was the creation of 2 groups: White, limited to non-Hispanic Whites, and non-White, which included individuals of all other races and ethnicities, including multiracial respondents. Age was entered into the multivariate model as a continuous variable (although it is presented categorically in Table 1 to show representations of distinct age cohorts).

#### **Statistical Analysis**

Stata Version 8.0 (Stata Corp; College Station, Tex) was used in all statistical analyses to account for the complex sample design of the BRFSS. Characteristics of respondents receiving formal support services or informal help were examined and, via tests of independence based on the Pearson  $\chi^2$  statistic, compared with characteristics of respondents who did not receive such help. Multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to model receipt of (1) formal help and (2) informal help as a function of the predictor variables suggested by the Andersen model,<sup>10</sup> along with potential confounders of current smoking and drinking. Odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals, and Wald F ratios were computed.

### RESULTS

The response rate for the study period (completed interviews divided by sum of completed interviews, terminated interviews, and refusals) was 69%. Despite relatively low response rates, the quality of BRFSS data is high, and prevalence data have been shown to be valid and reliable.<sup>19,20</sup> Table 1 presents characteristics of the study respondents according to type of help received. The figures TABLE 1—Respondent Characteristics, by Type of Help Received After September 11: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2001

· · · ·	• 1	Formal Help		Informal Help	
	Overall, no. (%)	Yes, %	No, %	Yes, %	No, %
	Predispos	ing factors			
Gender					
Male	727 (48.8)	34.9	49.2	36.1	49.3
Female	1035 (51.2)	65.1	50.8	63.9	50.7
Р		.115		.111	
Age, y	•				
18-39	600 (37.3)	31.7	37.5	57.3	36.5
40-64	813 (44.1)	60.5	43.5	39.7	44.2
≥65	328 (18.6)	7.9	19.0	3.1	19.2
Р		.093		.002	
Race/ethnicity			-		
White	1498 (83.6)	82.2	83.6	78.5	83.8
Non-White	252 (16.4)	17.8	16.4	21.5	16.2
Р		.814		.383	
Location on September 11					
New York	59 (4.2)	11.7	4.0	10.7	4.0
Elsewhere	1696 (95.8)	88.3	96.0	89.3	96.0
P		.059		.045	
Victim status				•	
Self or family member victim	128 (7.7)	22.4	7.2	11.6	7.5
Other relation to victim	411 (22.3)	34.7	21.9	25.8	22.2
No association with victim	1217 (70.0)	42.9	70.9	62.6	70.3
Р		.0001		.459	
Smoking status				· · · ·	
Current smoker	365 (20.7)	34.1	20.3	20.1	20.7
Not current smoker	1391 (79.3)	65.9	79.7	79.9	79.3
Р		,034		.914	
Alcohol use status					
Current drinker	1120 (65.3)	59.4	65.5	64.1	65.3
Not current drinker	621 (34.7)	40.6	34.5	35.9	34.7
Р		.433		.862	
	Enabling	factors	•		
Health insurance coverage					
Yes	1638 (92.1)	88.6	92.3	93.4	92.1
No	121 (7.9)	11.4	7.7	6.6	7.9
Р		.504		.735	
Attended funeral					
Yes	135 (8.3)	11.1	8.2	17.2	7.9
No	1622 (91.7)	88.9	91.8	82.8	92.1
Р		.480		.056	
	Perceived nee	d for services	,		
No. of poor physical health days					
>0	571 (32.5)	56.2	31.7	38.5	32.3
0	1160 (67.5)	43.8	68.3	61.5	67.7
P ·		.002		.363	

in the first column reflect actual numbers of survey respondents; percentages are weighted and adjusted to be representative of all adults residing in the state. Results are grouped for convenience according to the 3 categories of Andersen's model,<sup>10</sup> although some variables may reflect more than 1 category.

Most respondents (84%) were non-Hispanic White, and about half were male. More than 90% had health insurance coverage, and about 81% were aged younger than 65 years. Nearly two thirds had consumed alcohol in the preceding 30 days, and one fifth smoked. One third reported that there were 1 or more days in the past 30 days on which they would categorize their mental health as poor, the same percentage reporting poor physical health days in that time period. Approximately half reported 1 or more problems, 5% reported increased substance use, and 30% either were victims or personally knew someone who was a victim. About 8% had attended a funeral, and 4% were in New York City on September 11.

Overall, 6.4% (n=117) of the survey respondents indicated that they had received help for problems experienced subsequent to September 11; 3.3% reported receiving formal support (unweighted n=55), and 3.7%reported informal help (unweighted n=74). Twelve respondents reported receiving both formal and informal help, 43 respondents had received only formal help, and 62 had received only informal help. None of the respondents reported receipt of help from a social worker or emergency worker representing an organization such as the Red Cross.

Table 2 shows the results of the multiple logistic regression analysis that included all of the variables listed in Table 1. The following variables were significantly associated with receipt of formal help after adjustment for other variables: being a victim, being a family member of a victim or being involved in another relationship with a victim, reporting sleep problems, reporting increased substance use, and reporting receipt of informal help. Predictors of receipt of informal help included being female, being younger, reporting 1 or more problems, and receiving formal help.

Comparisons of respondents surveyed (in 2001) before and after September 11 did not reveal changes in tobacco or alcohol use

#### TABLE 1—Continued

No. of poor mental health days					
>0	603 (33.9)	66.5	32.8	51.0	33.3
0	1124 (66.1)	33.5	67.2	49.0	66.7
Ρ		<.0001		.018	
No. of problems <sup>a</sup> reported					
1 or more	925 (51.2)	70.4	50.6	69.2	50.6
0	831 (48.8)	29.6	49.4	30.8	49.4
Р	.025		.018		
Sleep problems	1				
Yes	275 (15.5)	43.7	14.6	22.4	15.3
No	1487 (84.5)	56.3	85.4	77.6	84.7
Р	<.0001		.240		
Increased substance use <sup>b</sup>					•
Yes	81 (5.0)	22.1	4.4	21.0	4.4
No	1681 (95.0)	77.9	95.6	79.0	95.6
P	<.0001		<.0001		
No. of respondents	1762	55	1707	74	1688

Note. Respondent numbers are unweighted; percentages were adjusted to be representative of the state adult population by age and gender. P values were derived from Pearson  $\chi^2$  tests of association.

<sup>a</sup>Including worry, nervousness, worthlessness, hopelessness, and lack of control over external events.

<sup>b</sup>Tobacco or alcohol use, or both.

prevalence rates or in average number of drinks consumed per day. In addition, the percentage of respondents reporting any poor physical or poor mental health days in the preceding 30 days did not change after September 11. Finally, respondents interviewed before September 11 and those surveyed after September 11 did not exhibit differences in regard to mean numbers of poor mental or physical health days.

## DISCUSSION

Despite the potential benefits of receiving assistance in the wake of a traumatic event,<sup>11</sup> our findings are consistent with previous reports<sup>8,9</sup> indicating that most people affected by disaster do not receive help in the aftermath. Our results are also consistent with Andersen's<sup>10</sup> behavioral model of health care utilization, showing that predisposing factors and perceived need for services influence receipt of help. Three predisposing factors for seeking some type of help after September 11 were being a victim or a family member of a victim, being female, and being a younger adult. These results mirror findings indicating the potential effects of secondary traumatization<sup>21</sup> or traumatic grief<sup>22,23</sup> and suggest that not only direct exposure, but also secondary stress owing to a close relationship to a victim, can be a potential indicator of need for help in the wake of a disaster.

Although we did not directly assess perceived need for services, 3 variables likely to be associated with such perceived need were associated with receipt of some form of help. Reporting 1 or more problems, such as worry, nervousness, worthlessness, hopelessness, or lack of control over external events, was associated with receipt of informal but not formal help. Increased rates of smoking or drinking and sleep problems were associated only with receipt of formal support services.

Our results extend findings indicating that tobacco and alcohol use increased in New York City after September 11<sup>5</sup> by demonstrating that increases in use of these substances were also associated with receipt of help in a geographically proximate population. Exposure to trauma and exposure to posttraumatic stress have been found to be associated with increased tobacco and alcohol use problems among adolescents<sup>24,25</sup> and adults.<sup>26,27</sup> However, it was the increase in use rather than smoking or alcohol consumption per se that distinguished respondents who received help: current smokers and drinkers were no more or less likely to receive help than nonsmokers and nondrinkers.

It is encouraging to learn that these potentially stress-related changes in substance use were associated with receipt of formal help. Screening people for increases in tobacco use, alcohol consumption, and sleep problems may be a better method of identifying individuals in need of formal help in the wake of disaster than asking general questions regarding whether people are experiencing mental and behavioral problems (reports of which were unrelated to receipt of formal help in the present multivariate analysis).

We were not able to systematically assess enabling factors, and those measured (i.e., attending a funeral and possessing health insurance coverage) had no effect on receipt of help. Other enabling factors may have been more relevant, or the magnitude of the event and relief efforts may have increased the relative effects of predisposing factors and perceived need or resulted in enabling resources being more widely available than usual.

We found that rates of receipt of formal and informal help were similar but that predictors of these types of help were different. We believe that our findings related to receipt of formal help have significant implications for disaster relief systems. Providers sought for formal help (primarily medical or mental health professionals or religious counselors) included individuals who may have little or no training in disaster response yet often play key roles in disaster relief. This finding underscores the importance of preparing medical and mental health professionals and religious counselors to assist disaster victims and their families. In particular, our findings suggest that such providers may need training to identify and assist affected individuals in obtaining services that will address problems related to increased tobacco and alcohol use.

Informal help received from family and friends may be a critical source of social support mitigating the impact of postdisaster stress<sup>14</sup>; however, this form of help is difficult to define, and respondents who in fact received such help may not have reported it.

# **RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

 TABLE 2—Results of Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis: Predictors of Receipt of

 Help, by Type of Help Received: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2001.

Adjusted Odds Ratio         95% Confidence Interval         Adjusted Odds Ratio         95% Confidence Interval           Fredisposing factors         Fredisposing factors         5           Gender         1.00         1.00           Male         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.99**           Aege         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.99**           Rac/ethnicity         Witte         1.00         1.00         Non-White         1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98         1.02           Location on September 11, 2001         No         1.00         1.00         No         No           New York         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 9.55         Elsewhere         1.00         1.00           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19         Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status         Current smoker         1.00         1.00         No         1.00         No         1.00         No         No         1.00         No         1.00         No		Formal Help		Informal Help		
Predisposing factors           Gender         1.00         1.00           Female         1.27         0.58, 2.78         2.11         1.06, 4.19*           Agie         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.99**           Race/ethnicity         White         1.00         1.00         Non-White         1.00         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001         Non-White         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 9.55           Essewhere         1.00         1.00         Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Solf or family member victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Solf or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status         Current smoker         1.00         1.00         Not A4, 1.54         Not Current smoker         1.00         1.01         Not A4, 1.54           Not current drinker         1.00         1.00         Not A4, 1.54         Not A8, 1.75         Emabling factors         Mean         Mean         Mean         Mean         Mean         Mean <t< th=""><th></th><th>Adjusted Odds Ratio</th><th>95% Confidence Interval</th><th>Adjusted Odds Ratio</th><th>95% Confidence Interval</th></t<>		Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	
Gender         incol         incol           Male         1.07         0.58, 2.78         2.11         1.06, 4.19*           Age         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.99**           Race/ethnicity          1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001          1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001          1.00         1.00           New York         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 5.5           Elsewhere         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           Victin status          1.00         1.00         2.91, 1.19           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.29           Current smoker         1.24         0.51, 3.02         0.73         0.34, 1.54           Not current drinker         1.00         1.00         1.00		Pred	isposing factors	,	· · ··	
Male         1.00         1.00           Female         1.27         0.58, 2.78         2.11         1.06, 4.19*           Age         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.99**           Race/ethnicity	Gender					
Fenale         1.27         0.58, 2.78         2.11         1.06, 4.19*           Age         1.01         1.00, 1.03         0.97         0.96, 0.93**           Race/ethnicity         winte         1.00         1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         4.00         1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         4.2, 2.87         0.88         0.38, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001         1.00         1.00         1.00           New York         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 9.55           Elsewhere         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           Some relation to within         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status         Incurrent smoker         1.00         1.00         1.00           Not current smoker         1.00         1.00         1.00         Altended funerat         Incurrent finiker         1.01         1.02           Yes         1.00         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Kended funeral         <	Male	1.00		1.00		
Age       1.01       1.00, 1.03       0.97       0.96, 0.99**         Race/ethnicity       .00       1.00       .00         White       1.10       0.42, 2.87       0.88       0.39, 1.98         Location on September 11, 2001       .00       1.00       .00         New Work       2.40       0.66, 8.68       2.16       0.49, 9.55         Elsewhere       1.00       1.00       .00         Victim status       .00       1.00       .00         Self or family member victim       3.70       1.41, 9.72**       0.58       0.29, 1.19         Self or family member victim       5.40       1.88, 15.48**       0.80       0.24, 2.64         Smoking status	Female	1.27	0.58, 2.78	2.11	1.06, 4.19*	
Race/ethnicity         Wite         1.00         1.00           Non-White         1.00         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001	Age	1.01	1.00, 1.03	0.97	0.96, 0.99**	
White         1.00         1.00           Nor-White         1.10         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001	Race/ethnicity		1			
Non-White         1.10         0.42, 2.87         0.88         0.39, 1.98           Location on September 11, 2001	White	1.00		1.00		
Location on September 11, 2001         Ver York         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 9.55           Elsewhere         1.00         1.00         1.00           Victim status         1.00         1.00         1.00           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	Non-White	1.10	0.42, 2.87	0.88	0.39, 1.98	
New York         2.40         0.66, 8.68         2.16         0.49, 9.55           Elsewhere         1.00         1.00         1.00           Victim status         1.00         1.00         1.00           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	Location on September 11, 2001					
Esewhere         1.00         1.00           Victim status         1.00         1.00           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	New York	2.40	0.66, 8.68	2,16	0.49, 9.55	
Victim status       1.00       1.00         Some relation to victim       3.70       1.41, 9.72**       0.58       0.29, 1.19         Self or family member victim       5.40       1.88, 15.48**       0.80       0.24, 2.64         Smoking status	Elsewhere	1.00	1	1.00	,	
No association with victim         1.00         1.00           Some relation to victim         3.70         1.41, 9.72**         0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	Victim status		,			
Some relation to victim         3.70 $1.41, 9.72^{**}$ 0.58         0.29, 1.19           Self or family member victim         5.40 $1.88, 15.48^{**}$ 0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	No association with victim	1.00		1.00		
Self of family member victim         5.40         1.88, 15.48**         0.80         0.24, 2.64           Smoking status	Some relation to victim	3.70	1.41.9.72**	0.58	0 29 1 19	
Current smoker         1.24         0.51, 3.02         0.73         0.34, 1.54           Not current smoker         1.00         1.00         1.00           Alcohol use status         1.00         1.00         1.00           Current drinker         1.00         1.00         0.48, 1.75           Current drinker         1.77         0.87, 3.61         0.91         0.48, 1.75           Enabling factors           Health insurance coverage         Yes         1.00         1.00           No         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral         Yes         1.00         1.00           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         >         0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00 <t< td=""><td>Self or family member victim</td><td>5.40</td><td>1 88 15 48**</td><td>0.80</td><td>0.24, 2.64</td></t<>	Self or family member victim	5.40	1 88 15 48**	0.80	0.24, 2.64	
Current smoker         1.24         0.51, 3.02         0.73         0.34, 1.54           Not current smoker         1.00         1.00           Alcohol use status         1.00         1.00           Current drinker         1.00         1.00           Not current drinker         1.77         0.87, 3.61         0.91         0.48, 1.75           Emabling factors           Health insurance coverage           Yes         1.00         1.00         No         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral         Yes         1.00         1.00           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No. of poor physical health days         >0         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         >0         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1         1         1.00         1.00         1.00           No         1.00         1.00         1	Smoking status	0.10	100,10110		0.21, 2.01	
Not current smoker       1.24       0.01, 0.02       0.73       0.34, 1.04         Not current smoker       1.00       1.00       1.00         Alcohol use status       1.77       0.87, 3.61       0.91       0.48, 1.75         Enabling factors         Health insurance coverage         Yes       1.00       1.00       No         No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       1.00       1.00       No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       Yes       1.00       1.00       No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       Yes       1.00       1.00       No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       Yes       1.00       1.00       No       0.20, 1.28         Ves       1.00       1.00       1.00       No       0.20, 1.28         No       of poor physical health days       1.00       1.00       No       1.00       No         No       of poor physical health days       1.00       1.00       1.00       No       <	Current smoker	1.24	0.51.3.02	0.73	0 34 1 54	
Alcohol use status       1.00       1.00         Alcohol use status       1.77       0.87, 3.61       0.91       0.48, 1.75         Enabling factors         Health insurance coverage         Yes       1.00       1.00       1.00         No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       1.54       0.44, 5.39       0.50       0.20, 1.28         Yes       1.00       1.54       0.44, 5.39       0.50       0.20, 1.28         No       1.54       0.44, 5.39       0.50       0.20, 1.28         Yes       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00         No       1.54       0.44, 5.39       0.50       0.20, 1.28         Yes       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00         No. of poor physical health days       -       -       -       -         >0       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00       0         No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -	Not current smoker	1.00	0.01, 0.02	1.00	0.04, 1.04	
Not out out out out out out out out out o	Alcohol use status	1.00	1. The second	1.00		
Current drinker         1.00         1.00           Not current drinker         1.77         0.87, 3.61         0.91         0.48, 1.75           Enabling factors           Health insurance coverage         1.00         1.00         0.00           No         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral         1.00         1.00         1.00           Yes         1.00         1.00         0.020, 1.28           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services         0.00         0.20         0.20, 1.28           No. of poor physical health days         -0         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         -20         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         -20         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96         0           No. of problems reported*	Current drinker	1.00		1.00		
Not current of nicker       1.77       0.87, 3.61       0.91       0.48, 1.75         Health insurance coverage       Enabling factors       1.00       0.00       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Health insurance coverage       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       1.00       1.00       1.00       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Yes       1.00       1.00       1.00       0.50       0.20, 1.3, 2.74         Attended funeral       Yes       1.00       1.00       0.50       0.20, 1.28         Yes       1.00       1.00       1.00       0.20, 1.28       1.00       0.20, 1.28         No. of poor physical health days       Yes       1.00       1.00       0.00       0.61, 1.96       0         No. of poor mental health days       Yes       2.00       1.00, 4.04       1.09       0.61, 1.96       0         No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> I       I       0.76       0.32, 1.80       0       0       1.00       1.00         Sleep problems       Yes       2.46       1.11, 10.74*       2.62       0.61, 11.33       No       1.	Not eurront drinker	1.00	0.07.0.61	1.00	0 40 4 75	
Health insurance coverage         Yes       1.00       1.00         No       1.24       0.32, 4.88       0.59       0.13, 2.74         Attended funeral	Not current anniker	1.//	U.87, 3.01	0.91	0.48, 1.75	
Yes         1.00         1.00           No         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral          1.00         1.00           Yes         1.00         1.00         1.00           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           Perceived need for services           No. of poor physical health days         20         1.99         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09         0           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.01         1.00         1.00         1.01         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.01         1.00<	Health insurance severate	Ena	abling factors	-		
res         1.00         1.00           No         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral		1.00		4.00	4	
NO         1.24         0.32, 4.88         0.59         0.13, 2.74           Attended funeral	res	1.00		1.00		
Attended funeral         1.00         1.00           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No. of poor physical health days         .         .         .           >0         1.99         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09           0         1.00         1.00         .         .           No. of poor physical health days         .         .         .         .           >0         1.00         1.00         .         .         .           No. of poor mental health days         . <td></td> <td>1,24</td> <td>0.32, 4.88</td> <td>0.59</td> <td>0.13, 2.74</td>		1,24	0.32, 4.88	0.59	0.13, 2.74	
Yes         1.00         1.00           No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services         Perceived need for services         No. of poor physical health days         No. of poor physical health days         No. of poor physical health days         No. of poor mental healt	Attended funeral					
No         1.54         0.44, 5.39         0.50         0.20, 1.28           Perceived need for services           No. of poor physical health days         >0         1.17         0.65, 2.09           0         1.09         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09           0         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days	Yes	1.00		1.00		
Perceived need for services           No. of poor physical health days         >0         1.99         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         1.00         1.00         1.00           >0         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1.00         1.00         1.02, 3.90*         0           1 or more         1.31         0.51, 3.39         1.99         1.02, 3.90*         0           Sleep problems         1.00	No	1.54	0.44, 5.39	0.50	0.20, 1.28	
No. of poor physical health days         >0         1.99         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09         0           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         No. of poor mental health days         >0         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96         0         0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1.00         1.00         1.00         1.02, 3.90*         0         1.02, 3.90*         0         1.00         1.00         1.02         3.90*         0         1.00 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Perceive</td><td>d need for services</td><td></td><td></td></td<>		Perceive	d need for services			
>0         1.99         0.93, 4.25         1.17         0.65, 2.09           0         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days              >0         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96           0         1.00         1.00         1.00            No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1 or more         1.31         0.51, 3.39         1.99         1.02, 3.90*            O         1.00         1.00         1.00              Sleep problems           1.00              Yes         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80            No         1.00         1.00               Yes         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33            No         1.00         1.00              Yes         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62	No. of poor physical health days					
0         1.00         1.00           No. of poor mental health days         >0         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96           >0         1.00         1.00         1.00         0         1.00           No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1.00         1.00         1.00         1.02, 3.90*           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         Sleep problems           Yes         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80           No         1.00         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00	>0	1.99	0.93, 4.25	1.17	0.65, 2.09	
No. of poor mental health days         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96         0           0         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1.01         1.02, 3.90*         1.02, 3.90*         1.00         1.00         1.02         3.90*         1.00         1.00         Sleep problems         1.00         1.00         Sleep problems         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 1.00         1.00         1.00         Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 1.00         1.00         1.00         Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 1.00         1.00         Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> Increased substance us	0	1.00		1.00	<i>`</i>	
>0         2.00         1.00, 4.04         1.09         0.61, 1.96           0         1.00         1.00         1.00           No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1 or more         1.31         0.51, 3.39         1.99         1.02, 3.90*           0         1.00         1.00         1.00            Sleep problems               Yes         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80            No         1.00         1.00         1.00              Yes         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33            No         1.00         1.00         1.00             Received alternate form of help          1.00         1.00	No. of poor mental health days					
0         1.00         1.00           No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1         1.01           1 or more         1.31         0.51, 3.39         1.99         1.02, 3.90*           0         1.00         1.00         1.00           Sleep problems         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80           No         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 7es         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00         1.00	>0	2.00	1.00, 4.04	1.09	0.61, 1.96	
No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup> 1.31         0.51, 3.39         1.99         1.02, 3.90*           0         1.00         1.00         1.00           Sleep problems         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80           No         1.00         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 1.01         1.00           Yes         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00	0	1.00		1.00		
1 or more       1.31       0.51, 3.39       1.99       1.02, 3.90*         0       1.00       1.00       1.00         Sleep problems       2.59       1.14, 5.91*       0.76       0.32, 1.80         No       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00         Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 3.46       1.11, 10.74*       2.62       0.61, 11.33         No       1.00       1.00       1.00       1.00         Received alternate form of help       5.95       1.11, 10.74*       1.00	No. of problems reported <sup>a</sup>				•	
0         1.00         1.00           Sleep problems	1 or more	1.31	0.51, 3.39	1.99	1.02, 3.90*	
Sleep problems         0.76         0.32, 1.80           Yes         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80           No         1.00         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup>	0	1.00		1.00		
Yes         2.59         1.14, 5.91*         0.76         0.32, 1.80           No         1.00         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00	Sleep problems					
No         1.00         1.00           Increased substance use <sup>b</sup>	Yes	2.59	1.14, 5.91*	0.76	0.32, 1.80	
Increased substance use <sup>b</sup> 3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00	No	1.00		1.00		
Yes         3.46         1.11, 10.74*         2.62         0.61, 11.33           No         1.00         1.00         1.00	Increased substance use <sup>b</sup>					
No 1.00 1.00 Received alternate form of help	Yes	3.46	1.11, 10.74*	2.62	0.61, 11.33	
Received alternate form of help	No	1.00		1.00		
	Received alternate form of help				*	
Yes 6.52 2.55.16.72*** 6.13 2.24.16.74***	Yes	6.52	2.55. 16.72***	6.13	2.24. 16.74***	
No 1.00 1.00	No	1.00		1.00	,,	

<sup>a</sup>Including worry, nervousness, worthlessness, hopelessness, and lack of control over external events. <sup>b</sup>Tobacco or alcohol use, or both.

\*P<.05; \*\*P<.01; \*\*\*P<.001. *P* values represent the individual variables included in the model. In the case of each model, the overall *P* value for the Wald F test was  $\leq$ .0001.

For example, respondents may have viewed informal help not as "help" but simply as part of the ordinary support people provide to one another. Further research is needed to enhance our understanding of when, how, and from whom people seek and receive informal types of help following disasters.

That tobacco use, alcohol use, and poor mental and physical health days did not increase in the 3 months after September 11 provides some context for these results. Increases in substance use predicted receipt of help, but the increases observed were not sufficient, on a population basis, to affect survey results for smoking prevalence or alcohol consumption. Because recent changes in smoking and drinking are not normally measured on the BRFSS, we have no way of knowing whether, on a regular basis, 5% of adults exhibit increases in smoking or drinking (as shown by the present results) as part of fluctuating substance use patterns. This issue warrants further investigation.

More than half of the respondents reported nervousness, worry, feelings of worthlessness, or other stress-related problems, yet there was no increase in the number of poor mental (or physical) health days in the months immediately following September 11. We do not know the extent to which these reported poor mental health days might represent preexisting serious mental illness (which affects 5.4% of US adults<sup>28</sup>) or how much of the help received was part of ongoing treatment. It has been estimated that 15% of the US population receives mental health services each year,<sup>28,29</sup> while we found that 3.3% of our sample received formal help in a 3-month period. Given the limits of our data, we were not able to determine whether our figure represents an increase in use of services above that expected or whether this figure primarily represents treatment of individuals with preexisting mental health problems.

The lack of an increase in poor mental health days in the months subsequent to September 11 suggests that many of the respondents who reported mental health problems (and receipt of help) may have had ongoing (perhaps subclinical) difficulties. This finding is consistent with the results of other studies<sup>8,9</sup> indicating that individuals with preexisting mental health problems are more likely than individuals without such problems to seek help after disasters.

The findings that stress-related problems such as worry, nervousness, and hopelessness were associated with receipt of informal but not formal help and that 2% of respondents who reported no such problems obtained formal help suggest that other factors should be considered in postdisaster screening. Experiences of poor mental or physical health days in the preceding month were not significant predictors of receiving help but may still warrant consideration as factors in early identification of individuals likely to need help in the wake of a disaster. Although gender and ethnocultural background were not related to receipt of formal help in the first 2 to 3 months postdisaster, these factors may play a greater role in the development of posttraumatic stress and the need for help at more distal time points (e.g., 1 or more years postdisaster). More detailed examination of the types of problems associated with receipt of different types of formal help (e.g., medical, psychological, or crisis debriefing) over extended time periods is warranted.

Our findings are subject to a number of limitations. The BRFSS excludes individuals without telephones and those who are unable or unwilling to participate in a telephone survey, thus potentially excluding those most affected by the impact of a disaster. In addition, the survey questions did not address severity or duration of symptoms, so actual need for help was not assessed. We did not distinguish between problems associated with the attacks and other problems that could have been ongoing or unrelated to September 11. Also, we did not address quality of help received, and we had no way of measuring whether sufficient resources were available to meet service, needs.

We also do not know whether or not some of the respondents needed help but never sought it, whether others sought help unsuccessfully, or whether those who received help benefited from it. Moreover, it was impossible to isolate the effects of September 11 on the study population because of subsequent events that occurred during the time the survey was being conducted (e.g., the war on terrorism, deployment of troops abroad, anthrax threats and deaths, and a plunging stock market).

Patterns of help seeking and changes in substance and tobacco use among people affected by disasters have important implications for the design and implementation of disaster assistance response services. Findings such as those from this study should be considered in the development of service models and response systems for assisting communities in the aftermath of disasters. Public health professionals, physicians, mental health providers, and religious leaders should all be involved. Such plans also need to address ways to strengthen individual and community resilience and to respond to postdisaster behavioral health needs, which change over time. Finally, results of program evaluations should be used to develop interventions that provide the highest probability of success with the most efficient use of resources.

#### About the Authors

At the time of this study, Mary L. Adams was with the Connecticut Department of Public Health, Hartford, Julian D. Ford is with the Department of Psychiatry, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington. Wayne F. Dailey is with the Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Hartford, and the Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Conn.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Julian Ford, PhD, Department of Psychiatry MC1410, University of Connecticut Health Center, 263 Farmington Ave, Farmington, CT 06030 (e-mail: ford@psychiatry.uchc.edu).

This article was accepted November 12, 2003.

#### Contributors

All of the authors were involved in the conception of the study, interpretation of data, and drafting and editing of the article. M.L. Adams was responsible for data collection and analyzed the data.

#### Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by cooperative agreement from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (grant U58/CCU101991-13) and by contracts under the Terrorism Related Disaster Relief Grants administered by the federal Centers for Substance Abuse Treatment (grant T100974), Mental Health Services (grant T110365), and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (grant SM00146).

We thank Kevin Griffith for comments on the article.

#### Human Participation Protection

No protocol approval was needed for this study.

#### References

1. Galea S, Ahern J, Resnick H, et al. Psychological sequelae of the September 11 terrorist attacks in New York City. *N Engl J Med.* 2002;346:982–987.

2. Melnick TA, Baker CT, Adams ML, et al. Psychological and emotional effects of the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center–Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, 2001. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2002;51:784–786.

3. Schuster MA, Stein BD, Jaycox L, et al. A national survey of stress reactions after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. *N Engl J Med.* 2001;345:1507–1512.

4. Fagan J, Galea S, Ahern J, et al. Self-reported increase in asthma severity after the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center–Manhattan, New York, 2001. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2002;51: 781–784.

5. Vlahov D, Galea S, Resnick H, et al. Increased use of cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana among Manhattan, New York, residents after the September 11th terrorist attacks. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2002;155:988–996.

6. Eustace K, MacDonald C, Long N. Cyclone Bola: a study of the psychological after-effects. *Anxiety Stress Coping.* 1999;12:285–298.

7. Wang X, Gao L, Shinfuku N, Zhang H, Zhao C, Shen Y. Longitudinal study of earthquake-related PTSD in a randomly selected community sample in north China. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2000;157:1260–1266.

8. Wang X, Gao L, Zhang H, Zhao C, Shen Y, Shinfuku N. Post-earthquake quality of life and psychological well-being: longitudinal evaluation in a rural community sample in northern China. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2000;54:427–433.

 Caldera T, Palma L, Penayo U, Kullgren G. Psychological impact of Hurricane Mitch in Nicaragua in a one-year perspective. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2001;36:108–114.

10. Andersen R. Revisiting the behavioral model and access to medical care: does it matter? *J Health Soc Behav.* 1995;36:1-10.

11. Green B. Crossnational and ethnocultural issues in disaster. In: Marsella A, Friedman M, Gerrity E, Scurfield R, eds. *Ethnocultural Aspects of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: Issues, Research, and Clinical Applications.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 1996:341-361.

12. Norris F, Perrilla J, Ibanez G, Murphy A. Sex differences in symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder: does culture play a role? *J Trauma Stress.* 2001;14: 7–28.

13. Perilla JL, Norris FH, Lavizzo EA. Ethnicity, culture and disaster response: identifying and explaining ethnic differences in PTSD six months after Hurricane Andrew. J Soc Clin Psychol. 2002;21:20–45.

14. Kaniasty K, Norris F. In search of altruistic community: patterns of social support mobilization following Hurricane Hugo. *Am J Community Psychol.* 1995; 23:447–477.

15. Sattler DN, Preston AJ, Kaiser CF, Olivera VE, Valdez J, Schuster S. Hurricane Georges: a cross-national study examining preparedness, resource loss, and psychological distress in the US Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, and the United States. *J Trauma Stress.* 2001;15:339–350.

 Remington PL, Smith MY, Williamson DF, Anda RF, Gentry EM, Hogelin GC. Design, characteristics, and usefulness of state-based behavioral risk factor surveillance: 1981–1987. *Public Health Rep.* 1988;103: 366–375. **RESEARCH AND PRACTICE** 

17. Smith DW, Christiansen EH, Vincent R, Hann NE. Population effects of the bombing of Oklahoma City. *J Okla State Med Assoc.* 1999;92:193–198.

18. *Measuring Healthy Days*. Atlanta, Ga: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2000.

19. Arday DR, Tomar SL, Nelson DE, Merritt RK, Schooley MW, Mowery P. State smoking prevalence estimates: a comparison of the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System and current population surveys. *Am J Public Health.* 1997;87:1665–1669.

20. Nelson DE, Holtzman D, Bolen J, Stanwick C. Reliability and validity of measures from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). *Int J Public Health.* 2001;46(suppl 1):1–42.

21. Bramsen I, van der Ploeg HM, Twisk JW. Secondary traumatization in Dutch couples of World War II survivors. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2002;70:241–245.

22. Dechant E, Jellinek M, Goodwin J, Prince JB. Processing acute traumatic grief: exacerbation of posttraumatic stress disorder after September 11 in a 9-year-old boy. *Harv Rev Psychiatry.* 2002;10:231–241.

23. Shear MK, Zuckoff A, Frank E. The syndrome of traumatic grief. *CNS Spectrums*. 2001;6:339–346.

24. Acierno R, Kilpatrick DG, Resnick HS, et al. Assault, PTSD, family substance use, and depression as risk factors for cigarette use in youth: findings from the National Survey of Adolescents. *J Trauma Stress.* 2001; 13:381–396.

25. Kilpatrick DG, Acierno R, Saunders B, Resnick HS, Best CL, Schnurr PP. Risk factors for adolescent substance abuse and dependence: data from a national sample. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2000;68:19–30.

26. Beckham JC. Smoking and anxiety in combat veterans with chronic posttraumatic stress disorder: a review. *J Psychoactive Drugs*. 1999;31:103–110.

27. Op den Velde W, Aarts PGH, Falger PRJ, et al. Alcohol use, cigarette consumption and chronic post-traumatic stress disorder. *Alcohol Alcohol.* 2002;37: 335–361.

28. Kessler RC, Berglund PA, Zhao S, et al. The 12month prevalence and correlates of serious mental illness (SMI). In: Manderscheid RW, Sonnenschein MA, eds. *Mental Health, United States.* Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; 1996:59–70.

29. Regier DA, Narrow WE, Rae DS, Manderscheid RW, Locke BZ, Goodwin FK. The de facto US mental and addictive disorders service system: Epidemiologic Catchment Area prospective 1-year prevalence rates of disorders and services. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1993;50: 85–94.



# Second Edition

ISBN 0-87553-237-3 1998 ■ 546 pages ■ softcover \$32.00 APHA Members \$45.00 Non-members Plus shipping and handling

# Chronic Disease Epidemiology and Control

Edited by Ross C. Brownson, PhD, Patrick Remington, MD, MPH, and James R. Davis

### With this book, you'll learn to:

- Locate critical background information for developing appropriate interventions
- Enhance your technical capacity for delivering effective programs
- Improve your knowledge about the methods used in chronic disease epidemiology
- Identify diseases and risk factors
- Examine the underlying biological or physiological processes of disease
- Learn about high risk populations, geographic variations, and trends
- Plan, organize, and address prevention and control methods

### **American Public Health Association**



Publication Sales Web: www.apha.org E-mail: APHA@TASCO1.com Tel: (301) 893-1894 FAX: (301) 843-0159

CHRN04J5



COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

TITLE: Predictors of Help Seeking Among Connecticut Adults After September 11, 2001SOURCE: Am J Public Health 94 no9 S 2004 WN: 0425204624028

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited. To contact the publisher: http://www.apha.org/

Copyright 1982-2004 The H.W. Wilson Company. All rights reserved.