

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Original citation:

Goodwin, Robin, Palgi, Yuval, Lavenda, Osnat, Hamama-Raz, Yaira and Ben-Ezra, Menachem (2015) Association between media use, acute stress disorder and psychological distress. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, Volume 84 (Number 4). pp. 253-254.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/66202>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

© 2015 S. Karger AG, Basel

Published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000377706>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk>

1 Title page: Research letter for publication (Ms. No. 201410010 – second revision)
2 Title: Association between media use, acute stress disorder and psychological distress
3 Short title: Media use and distress
4

5 **Authors**

6 Robin Goodwin^a, PhD

7 Yuval Palgi^b, PhD,

8 Osnat Lavenda^c, PhD

9 Yaira Hamama-Raz^c, PhD

10 Menachem Ben-Ezra^c, PhD

11

12 ^a Department of Psychology, University of Warwick, United Kingdom. Corresponding author.

13 ^b Department of Gerontology, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

14 ^c School of Social Work, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

15

16 **Corresponding author:**

17 Professor Robin Goodwin

18 Department of Psychology,

19 University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL

20 robin.goodwin@warwick.ac.uk

21

22 **Key words:** Social media, media, Anxiety, Psychological distress, natural disaster

23

24 **991 words + 10 references**

25

26

27

1 To the Editor

2 Recent research has emphasised the impact of the media on stress and anxiety responses to
3 disasters. In particular, 'media amplification' has been used to explain post-traumatic stress
4 responses well away from the 'bulls-eye' of any event, with media exposure even more strongly
5 associated with stress than direct exposure (1). More recently focus has turned to the influence of
6 social media following mass trauma (2). Social media is seen as having a more direct, personal
7 impact on risk assessment (3), with recent data suggesting greater amplification of anxiety by social
8 rather than traditional media (4). Previous studies have not, however, directly compared the
9 association between specific media sources and anxiety and distress, or their mediational role in the
10 relationship between disaster exposure and distress. This may be important for clinicians interested
11 in the impact of different media sources following a disaster.

12

13 We conducted an online panel survey in the Philippines three weeks following super-Typhoon
14 Haiyan (week of 27.11.13), working with Asia Opinions, a survey company specialising in East Asia.
15 All participants from which we drew our sample had access to the internet. The panel was created
16 using random stratified sampling methods and included respondents from across the Philippines,
17 using weights for key demographic elements (e.g. gender, region) that were compared with census
18 information to create a reliable approximation of a representative sample. Procedures followed
19 those established by the ICC/ESOMAR International Code on Market and Social Research (5). Of
20 1400 contacted 1001 completed the survey (50% female, Mean age 30.4 [SD 10.4]; response rate
21 71.5%). Our sample matched the 2010 Philippine census for sex distribution; consistent with the use
22 of an internet panel and the focus on social media our respondents were younger than the general
23 population (73% of respondents were under 36, versus 80% of the full Asia Opinions panel and 43%
24 of the Philippine population). Respondents reported a) disaster related experiences (personal
25 property loss, damage to home, witness injury, each scored 0 "no", 1 "yes") b) psychological distress
26 (K6: 6-item item Likert scale screening for anxiety and mood disorders scale (6) ($\alpha = .90$) c) Acute

1 Stress Disorder (ASD) (sum of 16 criteria assessing A, B or D symptoms in DSM-5, yes/no for
2 endorsement of ASD (7) ($\alpha = .94$), d) media source used to gain information about Haiyan (TV, Radio,
3 Newspaper, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, each scored 0 “not used” or 1 “used”). As the study was
4 co-ordinated from Israel approval was from the Ariel University School of Social Work Ethics
5 committee.

6

7 168 participants (17%) scored ≥ 13 on K6, indicating possible severe mental illness; 249 (25%)
8 displayed ASD symptoms. To test the mediating effect of different media usage on the association
9 between exposure to the typhoon and ASD or psychological distress, we conducted two separate
10 sets of hierarchical regressions, assessing associations with media type (traditional vs. social and the
11 six individual media sources). For both analyses we entered demographics at step 1, exposure and
12 media type used at step 2. This allowed us to test the unique contribution of each mediator [media
13 types] to the total indirect relationship between exposure and ASD/psychological distress. In order
14 to better approximate population parameters we employed a resampling technique (bootstrapping)
15 for both analyses on 1,000 samples (8), while controlling for age, gender, and marital status.
16 Multiple mediation analyses and bootstrapping were conducted using SPSS v21 and Hayes's multiple
17 mediation module (8).

18

19 In the first regressions the media mediators were the number of traditional media sources
20 (television, radio or newspaper) or social media sources (Facebook, Twitter, Youtube) used, with
21 each media type entered separately into the analyses. Examination of the 95% bias-corrected
22 confidence intervals revealed a significant mediating effect of the number of social media sources
23 used on both the relationship between exposure and ASD and the relationship between exposure
24 and psychological distress (Table 1). There was no such association for the number of traditional
25 media sources used. The media mediators used in the second set of regressions were the individual

1 six individual media sources (TV, Radio, Newspaper, Facebook, Twitter and Youtube, each scored yes
2 / no). Findings revealed a significant mediating effect for the use of Youtube on the association
3 between exposure and ASD, and significant mediating effect for the use of Twitter on the association
4 between exposure and psychological distress. For all analyses there was also a partial effect for the
5 control variable of age (from $B = -.03$ $p < .03$ to $B = -.10$ $p < .001$), with distress and ASD symptoms lower
6 amongst older respondents.

7

8 Recent evidence has pointed to emotional contagion in large social networks (9). In our study use of
9 multiple social, but not traditional, media was significantly associated with both ASD and
10 psychological distress following disaster. Social media therefore seem to offer considerable
11 opportunity for emotional contagion of stress following trauma. Only Twitter and YouTube were
12 significantly associated with (higher) ASD or K6, and only Twitter/YouTube mediated the relationship
13 between disaster exposure and distress/ anxiety. Although social networks such as Facebook have
14 been associated with the sharing of sentiment amongst established networks (9, Twitter and
15 YouTube allow for a more public sharing of emotion, and may promote rumours associated with
16 anxiety and distress (3). The use of an online panel may have helped us obtain our high response
17 rate, and also permitted us to collect data shortly after the disaster. Similar high response rates have
18 also been reported in other studies of Typhoon Haiyan (10). Limitations of this study include the use
19 of cross-sectional design, the relatively young age of the sample, and self-reported evaluation of
20 psychological symptoms. In particular, we are not able to ascertain whether it is anxiety itself that
21 drives social media use.

22

23 Findings have significant implications for practitioners. Clinicians and therapists might do well to
24 advise vulnerable clients about the potential deleterious impact of social media. While use of social

1 media has great potential following disaster (3), emergency responders should be aware of the use
2 of such media, and its associations with distress and anxiety.

3

1 References (now reduced to 10)

- 2 1. Bernstein KT, Ahern J, Tracy M, Boscarino JA, Vlahov D, Galea S. Television
3 watching and risk of incident probable posttraumatic stress disorder: A prospective
4 evaluation. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 2007; 195: 41–47.
- 5 2. Holman EA, Garfin DR, Silver RC. Media’s role in broadcasting acute stress
6 following the Boston Marathon bombings. *PNAS* 2013, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1316265110
- 7 3. Alexander DE. Social media in disaster risk reduction and crisis management. *Sci*
8 *Eng Ethics* 2013; doi: 10.1007/s11948-013-9502-z
- 9 4. Goodwin R, Palgi Y, Hamama-Raz Y, Ben-Ezra M. In the eye of the storm or the
10 bullseye of the media: Social media use during Hurricane Sandy as a predictor of
11 post-traumatic stress. *J Psychiatr Res* 2013; 47(8):1099-1100.
- 12 5. Esomar. Esomar guideline for online research. <http://bit.ly/1w9a1Md>
- 13 6. Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, Epstein JF, Gfroerer JC, Hiripi E, Howes MJ, Normand S-L,
14 Manderscheid RW, Walters EE, Zaslavsky AM. Screening for serious mental illness in the
15 general population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2003; 60(2):184-189
- 16 7. Bryant RA, Friedman MJ, Spiegel D, Ursano R, Strain J: A review of acute stress
17 disorder in DSM-5. *Depress Anxiety* 2011; 28(9):802-817
- 18 8. Preacher KJ, Hayes, A. F. Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing
19 indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behav Res Methods*. 2008; 40(3), 879-891.
- 20 9. Coviello L, Sohn Y, Kramer ADI, Marlow C, Franceschetti M, Christakis NA, Fowler JH. Detecting
21 Emotional Contagion in Massive Social Networks. *PLoS One* 2014; 9(3): e90315.
- 22 10. Kolbe A, Puccio M, Bautista M, Childs E, James L, Muggah R, Masipag J, Jean A. Assessing Needs
23 After the Super Typhoon: Results From a Random Household Survey in Samar, Leyte, Cebu, Iloilo,
24 Capiz, Aklan, and Palawan. Igarape Institute. <http://bit.ly/1ueMFiX>

1

2 Table 1: Unique contribution of media type on Acute Stress Disorder and Psychological Distress

	Acute Stress Disorder (DSM-5)		Psychological distress (K6)	
	Direct association with ASD (β , T)	Indirect (Mediational) relationship (β ; 95%CI)	Direct association with K6 (β , T)	Indirect (Mediational) relationship (β ; 95%CI)
Social media ^a	.10 (3.32)**	.20; 95%CI (0.06-0.39)*	.11 (3.57)**	.33; 95%CI (0.15-0.68)*
Traditional media ^a	.04 (1.24)	.05; 95%CI (-.04-0.16)	.00 (.08)	-.06; 95%CI (-.24-.07)
TV ^b	-.04 (-1.28)	-.00; 95%CI(-.06-.57)	-.05 (-1.56)	-.00; 95%CI(-.14-.09)
Radio	.05 (1.69)	.09; 95%CI(-.01-.04)	.03 (.88)	.06; 95%CI(-.12-.25)
Newspaper	.03 (.99)	.01; 95%CI(-.02-.09)	-.00 (-.15)	-.02; 95%CI(-.16-.02)
Facebook	.05 (1.70)	.01; 95%CI(-.02-.08)	.04 (1.15)	.02; 95%CI(-.02-.16)
Twitter	.09 (2.73)**	.11; 95%CI(-.00-.29)	.12 (3.88)**	.27; 95%CI(.10-.56)*
YouTube	.08 (2.45)*	.13; 95CI (0.02-0.30)*	.06 (2.06)*	.08; 95%CI(-.04-.28)

3

4 Notes: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

5 DSM-5 - Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders Fifth Edition. K6 – Kessler Psychological Distress Scale

6 The top half of Table 1 shows results from the first regressions, examining number of media types used. The lower half of Table 1 shows findings from the second regressions, which included all six media sources.

8 ^a Number of media sources (0-3)9 ^b All single media scored 0 (no), 1 (yes).10 ^c Each result with a value above 0 and a 95% CI range above 0 is considered a significant result.

11

12

13