5th International Workshop on Psychological intervention after Disasters Nov. 17th, 2016, Manila

Eight Personal Characteristics Associated with the **Power to Live** with Disasters as Indicated by Survivors of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake Disaster

> Motoaki Sugiura Tohoku University

Cognitive Neuroscience









Tohoku University



Institute of Development, Aging and Cancer





International Research Institute of **Disaster** Science





Outline

• **Power to live** with disasters

- What is it and how was it built?

- Cognitive Science Approach
 - Purpose
 - Methods

the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake Disaster



- March 11th, 2011- (@Sendai)
 - Some personal characteristics have advantage
 - personality trait, way of thinking, & habit (Power to live)
 - => Inventory construction!
- 2012: Interview with survivors (n=78)
 - Disaster experience and opinion about power to live



- March 11th, 2011- (@Sendai)
 - Some personal characteristics have advantage
 - personality trait, way of thinking, & habit (Power to live)
 - => Inventory construction!
- 2012: Interview with survivors (n=78)
 - Disaster experience and opinion about power to live
 - 700 opinions => 40 items of power to live
- 2013: Questionnaire survey (n=1412)
 - Self-descriptiveness
 - 40 items of power to live => Factor analysis
 - Behaviors/experiences in Disaster (160 items)

- Factor analysis => 8 factors
- Labeling:

- Factor analysis => 8 factors
- Labeling: F2 (for example)
 - When I am fretting about what I should do, I compare several alternative actions.
 - Before taking action, I think of a plan and the order of priority.
 - When talking to someone, I think about that person's personality, wishes, and abilities and choose an appropriate attitude and words accordingly.
 - The more agitated the people around me become, the calmer I somehow become.
 - In order to resolve a problem, I first of all initiate action.

- Factor analysis => 8 factors
- Labeling: F2 Problem solving

Breakout group work

- When I am fretting about what I should do, I compare several alternative actions.
- Before taking action, I think of a plan and the order of priority.
- When talking to someone, I think about that person's personality, wishes, and abilities and choose an appropriate attitude and words accordingly.
- The more agitated the people around me become, the calmer I somehow become.
- In order to resolve a problem, I first of all initiate action.

 Contribution to behaviors/experiences in Disaster – Context dependent!



- Contribution to behaviors/experiences in Disaster
 - Context dependent!

F6 Emotional regulation

F2 Problem solving

F3 Altruism

F1 Leadership

F8 Active well-being

F4 Stubbornness

F5 Etiquette

F7 Self-transcendence

Survival as a group

Support of others

Encouraged others during

tsunami evacuation

Helped others during tsunami evacuation

Supported by others

Had someone reliable

during tsunami evacuation

Being **helped** by others in refuge

- Age-related change
 - Different across factors: different educational approach



- Inventory application
 - Evaluation of the effect of training program
 - As material of disaster education
 - In other languages...



Outline

• **Power to live** with disasters

- What is it and how was it built?

- Cognitive Science Approach
 - Purpose
 - Methods

- Purpose
 - Is each factor reflected in **behavioral performance**?
 - self-report bias
 - causality
 - What **mental process** behind each factor?
- Application
 - Performance measure
 - => Objective measurement tool
 - Also for children
 - Mental process

=>Better understanding of the human responses to the disaster

=>Development of training/educational methods

- Methods
 - Behavioral experiment
 - Hypothesis (cognitive model)
 - Subjects: ordinary people; students
 - Task/Materials: "mock disaster" in part (<=hypothesis)
 - Conditions: manipulate the key factor
 - Measurement: behavioral performance
 - Analysis: factor score \Leftrightarrow behavioral **performance**



(<=hypothesis)

(<=hypothesis)

F2 Problem solving

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F2 is associated with problem solving, particularly under time pressure (TP)
- Subjects:
 - 30 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - LEGO composition reproduction task
- Conditions:
 - With/without TP
- Measurement:
 - Accuracy
 - Time spent for the task
- Analysis:
 - F2(high/Low) x TP(with/without) ANOVA





00:59:57

F2 Problem solving

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F2 is associated with problem solving, particularly under time pressure (TP)
- Subjects:
 - 30 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - LEGO composition reproduction task
- Conditions:
 - With/without TP
- Measurement:
 - Accuracy
 - Time spent for the task
- Analysis:
 - F2(high/Low) x TP(with/without) ANOVA

- Accuracy: n.s.
- Time spent for the task:
 - significant interaction



- Methods
 - Brain measurement (fMRI)
 - Hypothesis (cognitive model)
 - Subjects: ordinary people; students
 - Task/Materials: "mock disaster" in part
 - restricted measurement environment
 - Conditions: manipulate the key factor
 - at least 12 trials for each condition
 - Measurement: neural response
 - Neural activity => Regional blood supply => MR signal
 - Analysis: factor score \Leftrightarrow regional neural response
 - Interpret using neuroscientific knowledge



(<=hypothesis)

(<=hypothesis)

F2 Problem solving

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F2 is associated with problem solving, particularly for unexpected situation
- Subjects:
 - 18 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - Operation of the complex system (electricity supply control) after training
- Conditions:
 - Trouble trained (in manual)
 - Trouble **untrained** (not in manual)
- Measurement: fMRI
- Analysis:
 - F2 regression on [Untrained Trained]



F2 Problem solving

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F2 is associated with problem solving, particularly for unexpected situation
- Subjects:
 - 18 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - Operation of the complex system (electricity supply control) after training
- Conditions:
 - Trouble trained (in manual)
 - Trouble **untrained** (not in manual)
- Measurement: fMRI
- Analysis:
 - F2 regression on [Untrained Trained]



High F2: less difference! Always think the same (may be logical) way?

Breakout group work

- 1: Choose one (or more) P2L factor and give a better label than the original
 - Reasons for the choice (the member's background)
 - Reasons for the new label (experience, literature)
- 2: Create the hypothesis (cognitive model) of the mental processes underlying the factor.
 - Bases of the hypothesis (experience, literature)
- 3: Design behavioral experiment(s) to test the hypothesis
 - Subjects (community or students; not during disasters), Tasks ("mock disaster"), Materials
 - Conditions, Measurement (other than the P2L inventory)
 - Analysis (correlation with the factor score/ group comparison btw. high-/low- score groups)
 - Expected results based on the hypothesis
- 3a (optional): Design fMRI experiment
 - N.B.: restricted measurement environment; at least 12 trials for each condition
- 4: Implementation of the findings into the practice
 - Tool development, Training/Education, Policy making, etc.
 - Target, Benefit

- Labeling: F4
 - I am stubborn and always get my own way.
 - I unhesitatingly say whatever it is I want to say.
 - I clearly distinguish between black and white: what's good is good, and what's bad is bad.
 - I hate losing.
 - I am highly motivated with regard to things that I like or want to do.

- Labeling: F4 Stubbornness
 - I am stubborn and always get my own way.
 - I unhesitatingly say whatever it is I want to say.
 - I clearly distinguish between black and white: what's good is good, and what's bad is bad.
 - I hate losing.
 - I am highly motivated with regard to things that I like or want to do.
- Contributed to:
 - Physical health (resistant/resilient)
 - Reconstruction (residence after 5 yrs.; fast)

F4 Stubbornness

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F4 may affect decision making on future
- Subjects:
 - 30 university students
- Task/Materials/Conditions
 - Economical choice
 - Earlier low vs. Later high value
- Measurement:
 - Time discounting rate

Which option would you choose?

- (1) A: Get \$3,400 this month
- (2) A: Get \$100 now
- (3) A: Get \$100 now

B: Get \$3,800 next monthB: Get \$140 a year laterB: Get \$110 within 10 years

F4 Stubbornness

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F4 may affect decision making on future
- Subjects:
 - 30 university students
- Task/Materials/Conditions
 - Economical choice
 - Earlier low vs. Later high value
- Measurement:
 - Time discounting rate

High F4: Low time discounting Hope for the future? Less anxiety?

Which option would you choose?

- (1) A: Get \$3,400 this month
- (2) A: Get \$100 now
- (3) A: Get \$100 now

B: Get \$3,800 next month B: Get \$140 a year later

B: Get \$110 within 10 years

- Labeling: F6
 - During difficult times, I endeavor not to brood.
 - During difficult times, I endeavor to think positively, telling myself that this experience will benefit me in the future.
 - During difficult times, I compare myself with the situation around me and in society, and I think that matters cannot be helped.
 - When something happens, I try to stay calm and not panic.

Labeling: **F6** Emotional regulation

- During difficult times, I endeavor not to brood.
- During difficult times, I endeavor to think positively, telling myself that this experience will benefit me in the future.
- During difficult times, I compare myself with the situation around me and in society, and I think that matters cannot be helped.
- When something happens, I try to stay calm and not panic.
- Contributed to:
 - Tsunami evacuation (immediate)
 - Refuge-related problem solving (solved more)
 - Mental health (resistant/resilient)
 - Physical health (resistant/resilient)

F6 Emotional regulation

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F6 may affect processing of negative (but not neutral) emotional stimuli
- Subjects:
 - 40 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - Viewing picture
- Conditions:
 - Positive
 - Control (neutral)
 - Negative
- Measurement: fMRI
- Analysis:
 - F6 regression on [Negative Control]



F6 Emotional regulation

- Hypothesis (cognitive model):
 - F6 may affect processing of negative (nut not neutral) emotional stimuli
- Subjects:
 - 40 university students
- Task/Materials:
 - Viewing picture
- Conditions:
 - Positive
 - Control (neutral)
 - Negative
- Measurement: fMRI
- Analysis:
 - F6 regression on [Negative Control]



Summary

- 8 factors of the **Power to Live** with disasters
 - Associated with disaster survival (mostly self-report)
- Cognitive science approach
 - Correlates with them with:
 - Behavioral performance
 - Mental process
 - Practical implication

F2 Problem solving

F4 Stubbornness

F6 Emotional regulation





Take home 1

- Cognitive Science Approach
 - Just began; please join us!
 - Significant finding

		Behavior	fMRI
F1	Leadership		
F2	Problem solving		
F3	Altruism		
F4	Stubbornness		0
F5	Etiquette		
F6	Emotional regulation	0	
F7	Self-transcendence		
F8	Active well-being		0

Take home 2

- Cognitive Science Approach
 - Key to:
 - The understanding of human responses to the disaster
 - Development of training/educational methods



Acknowledgment

Collaborators

Tohoku University: Shosuke Sato, Tsuneyuki Abe, Keiyu Niikuni, Toshiaki Muramoto, Rui Nouchi, Toshiya Kageyama, Shohei Yamazaki, Naoki Togawa, Fumihiko Imamura Yamanashi Eiwa College: Akio Honda Project72: Ryuichi Asano

Grants

International Research Institute of Disaster Science,

Tohoku University

Special Project Researches (H24-27)

RIDES International Research Institute of Disaster Science

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

Topic-Setting Program to Advance Cutting-Edge Humanities and Social Sciences Research (H26-29)

Breakout group work

- 1: Choose one (or more) P2L factor and give a better label than the original
 - Reasons for the choice (the member's background)
 - Reasons for the new label (experience, literature)
- 2: Create the hypothesis (cognitive model) of the mental processes underlying the factor.
 - Bases of the hypothesis (experience, literature)
- 3: Design behavioral experiment(s) to test the hypothesis
 - Subjects (community or students; not during disasters), Tasks ("mock disaster"), Materials
 - Conditions, Measurement (other than the P2L inventory)
 - Analysis (correlation with the factor score/ group comparison btw. high-/lowscore groups)
 - Expected results based on the hypothesis
- 3a (optional): Design fMRI experiment
 - N.B.: restricted measurement environment; at least 12 trials for each condition
- 4: Implementation of the findings into the practice
 - Tool development, Training/Education, Policy making, etc.
 - Target, Benefit

 Contribution to behaviors/experiences in Disaster – Context dependent!



 Contribution to behaviors/experiences in Disaster – Context dependent!





Regression on [Self – Semantic]





HighF8 > Low F8

