

A “Notification” on The Use of Social Media as A Means of Community Resilience in Crisis Management

Ü. Özlem Çerçi
Selcuk University
ozlemcerci@selcuk.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This comparative study explores the role of social media in building community resilience during the Covid-19 pandemic, focusing on citizens' communication habits. Community resilience, defined as the ability to withstand, adapt, and recover from adverse situations, is crucial, especially in the face of crises like pandemics. Effective strategic communication with the target audience is vital for creating and maintaining community resilience. Strategic communication plays a key role in helping communities prepare, respond, and recover by providing clear information, encouraging cooperation, and fostering adaptable behaviors. In the digital age, where a significant portion of the population lives online, social media platforms serve as essential tools for collecting information, disseminating crisis-related news, mobilizing the audience, and contributing to crisis management efforts. This study, conducted between May 5-10, 2020, with 800 participants from Turkey and 800 from the USA, reveals that individuals in both countries spend a considerable amount of time online, utilizing at least 3-4 social media applications. Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter are identified as popular platforms. Most importantly, both Turkey and the United States demonstrate resilient societies, and there is a significant correlation between community resilience and the use of social media for obtaining information during the Covid-19 crisis. This emphasizes the critical role of crisis communication as a key success factor in building community resilience.

Keywords: *Community Resilience, Social Media, Crisis Communication, Crisis Mangement*

INTRODUCTION

The changing nature of societies with radical developments in the field of technology has necessitated a change in the management of crises that affect a large part of the society, from economic shocks to natural disasters, and in the forms of crisis communication, which is one of the cornerstones of this management process. The global health crisis known as COVID-19 stands before us as an extraordinary, unexpected cycle of change that irreversibly shakes the dynamics of cultural life, usual ways of working and believes which are accepted as common knowledge that shape our social lives. Crises, which are sudden negative events, are difficult processes in which it is vital to build social resistance in the target audience, where the lack of resources and time creates a stressful environment for institutions, and the feelings of panic and unrest are at a high level. “Community resilience” can be defined as the collective capacity of a

community to effectively respond to, adapt to, and recover from emergencies, disasters, or unforeseen disruptions (Patel et al., 2017).

The emphasis on community resilience or the ability of community to adapt to unexpected and devastating situations such as crises and accompanying changes has been a key concept especially in recent years. South et al (2020) assert that establishing a communication channel and making decisions collaboratively between communities and services is a crucial instrument to comprehend and tackle needs and priorities. This process creates an effective environment of engagement and collaboration to increase community resilience on potential actions.

Recently, the world has faced many epidemics from ZIKA virus to various types of influenza (Bird, Swine), EBOLA to SARS, and recently the new Corona Virus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The COVID-19 epidemic was a respiratory disease that emerged in Wuhan, China, in December 2019 and quickly evolved into a global pandemic. The first cases were identified in an area where live animals were sold in a seafood market. The causative agent of the disease was identified as a coronavirus, later named Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).

This virus, which primarily causes respiratory symptoms such as cough, fever and shortness of breath, has rapidly spread among people and become a global threat. The World Health Organization (WHO) officially declared COVID-19 as a global pandemic on March 11, 2020. The pandemic has had serious effects worldwide, exceeding the capacity of health systems in many countries, causing economic problems and requiring comprehensive measures to be taken. Vaccine development studies were initiated rapidly and vaccinations began in many countries; however, the pandemic continues to have a challenging impact on societies and global health systems. Governments and the World Health Organization have sought to meticulously guide decision-making processes as the COVID-19 pandemic evolves.

In this context, while planning the measures to be taken in light of the course of the epidemic and scientific developments, they also bore the responsibility of informing the society with accurate and up-to-date information. This included transparent and regular communication to the public, taking into account the dynamic nature of the epidemic and the need to adapt to rapidly changing conditions. In addition to these efforts, the aim was to convey constantly updated information to societies through effective communication tools, ensuring that the public had access to accurate and reliable information about the pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic, which continues to have devastating effects on a global scale, has had an extraordinary impact not only on public health systems but also on crisis communications. The main task of crisis communication is to help people develop a realistic perspective and increase social resilience in the face of intense emotional situations they encounter. Social media has played a key role in terms of information consumption, providing clear and comprehensive crisis communication to different target groups. During this difficult pandemic process, studies examining the

effectiveness of health systems and the effects of economies on community resilience are of course important.

However, not evaluating crisis communication, which is a critical factor for success in crisis periods, would be a significant deficiency in the analysis of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. The aim of the study is to reveal and compare how social media is used as a means of getting and spreading information by individuals during the Covid-19 crisis, which communication tool is found most reliable, how community resilience is built through social media in the USA and Turkey.

LITERATURE REVIEW OR RESEARCH BACKGROUND

a. Community Resilience and Crisis Communication

When the literature is examined, there are many studies on community resilience. While some of these focus on its definition, the currents in the emergence of the definition, others focus on its components and influencing factors (Berkes and Ross, 2013; South and et al, 2020; Hou and et al, 2018; Chandra and et al, 2011; Zhang and et al, 2020; Smith, Emerson and Schuldt, 2018; Pinheiro and Matos, 2012; Katsikopoulos, 2021; Jordan and Will, 2012). In addition, some new research have been conducted that deal with community resilience within the framework of Covid-19 (Kimhi and et al, 2020). In the light of these studies community resilience can be defined as an interactive concept that refers to increasing local capacity , social support and resources (Herrman and et al, 2011), overcoming stress or adversity while decreasing risks (Turnbull, 2013; Twigg, 2007) and miscommunication (Chandra and et al, 2013; Patel and et al, 2017). Community Resiliency Assessment Measure (CCRAM) defines community resilience as "the community's ability to withstand crises or disruptions (p. 1732). Resilient community would have following characteristics (Chandra et al, 2011; Wang et al, 2018):

- a. Sense of unity and neighborhood integration leading to participation at the community level
- b. Pre-incident planning, exercises and agreements involving collaboration between organizations
- c. Sustainable local leadership supported by partnership with state and federal government
- d. Culturally appropriate risk awareness
- e. Access to quality healthcare for the best possible public health
- f. Public services' ability to understand and meet complex demands
- g. Preparation and health integration
- h. Rapid restructuring of services and social networks
- i. Preparedness and self-sufficiency at the individual level
- j. Relevant strategies that empower and engage vulnerable communities
- k. Financial resilience of families and businesses and effective use of resources for recovery.

Chandra et al states (2013) 5 core components of community resilience as seen at Figure 1: (1) physical and psychological health of the population, (2) social and economic well-being of the community, (3) effective crisis communication, (4) integration and involvement of organizations (both government and nongovernmental), and (5) social connectedness.



Figure 1: Core Components of Community Resilience

True community resilience involves accurate and timely dissemination of crisis information to stakeholders (Kar, 2019). Buzzanel (2010) explains community resilience as an ongoing process in which deliberate communicative choices facilitate adaptability to a new normal. Also, it is stated in the study of Ulmer, Seeger and Sellnow (2007) that crisis communication scholarship argue that resilience involves strategic moments for organizational learning and development. Houston et al (2015) and Rice and Jahn (2020) supports argue that strategic communication affects society's ability to make sense of a crisis, adapt to the changes caused by the crisis, and overcome it.

Organizations and institutions play an important role in the construction of this communication. In general, communication plays an important role in the management of crises to build community resilience (Tirkkonen and Louma-aho, 2011; Coombs and Holladay, 2008; Porfiriev, 2007; Austin, Liu & Jin, 2012, Houston et al, 2015; Vos and Sullivan, 2014).

Crisis communication refers to the verbal, visual, and/or written exchange between the organization and its stakeholders, typically conducted through the media, occurring prior to, during, and after a crisis event. The aim is to prevent or mitigate the adverse repercussions of the crisis (Coombs, 1999). Crisis communication consists of the flow of crisis information and efforts to manage stakeholder responses (Coombs, 2008). According to Freberg, Palenchar, and Veil (2013), crisis communication aims to describe a specific event, describe possible consequences, and convey information to affected communities in an honest, candid, fast, accurate and complete manner which are very effective factors on community resilience.

The traditional one-way communication approach is not enough to achieve goals to build community resilience (Katsikopoulos, 2021) so a more flexible, two-way communication is needed, which is social media. According to Schultz, Utz and Goritz (2011), communication medium used in communication in crisis situations is of greater importance than the message. Ngai and Jin (2016) explained that, in addition to traditional information sources, social media also has a more positive effect on crisis communication and public reactions. In this context, the selection and interaction of communication tools should be taken into consideration when creating crisis communication strategies.

b. Social Media

‘Social media’ and ‘community resilience’ are two critical concepts that appear increasingly in the crisis management and crisis communication literature. Many researchers believe that using social media to support community safety and educate societies to become resilient communities can help build community resilience (White,2012; Dufty,2011; Taylor et al, 2012; Vos and Sullivan,2014; Houston,2018). However, the most important role of social media in crisis situations is to support the flow of information, as it is known that inappropriate social media content can worsen the crisis

Meeting the need for information is one of the most important issues in times of crisis (Canöz, 2015). The pandemic is a distinctive crisis, constituting a crisis of collective responsibility that necessitates the swift activation of established communication techniques (Yoon,2022; Saliou, 1994). The likelihood of a rebound in crises is higher during a pandemic if the local population has access to trustworthy information (Çerçi et al, 2020).

Individuals frequently encounter challenges in effective communication as a result of unclear communication objectives and a shortage of crucial supporting messages. Prompt availability of dependable information sources, particularly during crisis situations, fosters increased confidence among local residents and facilitates swift adaptation to the circumstances. This enables them to take prompt actions without the necessity for extensive verification of information. (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2019).

Social media refers to a digital communication environment where users create, share, interact and network with content through internet-based platforms. Social media platforms allow users to share text, photos, videos and other content and often encourage interaction between users. Popular social media platforms include various applications such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, YouTube and Snapchat (Tyas & Hutagaol, 2021). Social media creates a global network of digital connections, enabling individuals, communities and organizations to reach a wide audience, share information and communicate (Helinsha & Margawati, 2022). Thanks to these applications users can reach the information they are looking for or the content they are

interested in, as well as sharing content and information with each other (Kamiloğlu and Yurttaş, 2014; Freberg, et al., 2013; Dufty, 2012).

Social media provides possibilities for engaging in immediate conversations with the intended audience, fostering trust, and inspiring them (Tirkkonen and Luoma-aho, 2011: 172). While traditional news outlets have consistently played a vital role in informing and influencing the public's perception of risks, social media has swiftly emerged as a crucial factor in determining public understanding and responses. Experts can employ social media as a tool in crisis intervention by swiftly disseminating information about hazards and educating the public and patients on actions that can be taken to mitigate risks (Ophir, 2018). The benefits of using social media in crisis are as follows (Prentice and Huffman, 2008; Currie, 2009; Sutton et al, 2008);

- a. **Rapid Information Dissemination:** Social media enables information to be delivered to large audiences quickly. In times of crisis, instant updates and important information can be shared quickly.
- b. **Providing Reliable Information:** Social media plays a crucial role in delivering trustworthy information during crises by facilitating the near real-time dissemination of information to citizens, employees, and the media.
- c. **Two-Way Communication:** Social media platforms allow people to give feedback, ask questions, and reach out to authorities directly. This makes it easier for the community to interact and exchange information.
- d. **Community Solidarity:** During crises, social media brings people together. Those who need help can find support, volunteers can organize, and community solidarity can increase.
- e. **Community Resilience:** Social media allows crisis communicators to track negative news and develop counter-discourse to build community resilience.
- f. **Immediate Reaction to Crisis:** Social media enables rapid reaction in times of crisis. Emergency notifications, evacuation instructions and other important information can be shared instantly.
- g. **Real-Time Updates:** Social media provides real-time updates on events. This helps the community stay updated on the latest developments and gives them a better understanding of the situation.
- h. **Information Mapping:** Social media can contribute to crisis mapping. Information from the community can be used to understand the extent and impacts of the event.

These advantages are important as social media enhances communication during times of crisis and helps societies cope more effectively.

According to Beatson (2017), social media can strengthen community resilience in three main ways. Firstly, it can assist in mobilizing volunteers, enabling them to form connections, express concerns, develop a shared identity, and establish the community required to coordinate and mobilize for collective civic engagement (2014). Secondly, social media can empower individuals by allowing a small group of influential users to engage with a significantly larger audience of non-engaged users (Skuse and

Brimacombe, 2014). Lastly, it can enhance information-seeking behaviors by enabling users to transition between the roles of information consumers and content producers (Currie, 2009).

In this sense, social media can play an effective role in enhancing community resilience in times of crisis. Social media derives its effectiveness as an information source from its ability to provide consolidated information flows that encompass both official (such as government Facebook pages) and unofficial sources. This includes real-time information contributed by the general public during a crisis, along with various information sources. The consolidated information flows offered by social media carry the potential to interact with a broad segment of society and enhance information sharing.

In the initial stages of a crisis, social media functions as a significant tool to balance the community's emotional state, alleviate concerns, and contribute to maintaining social harmony (Van der Meer and Verhoeven, 2013). The sharing of information across various platforms enables the rapid dissemination of current and accurate information related to emergencies, fostering awareness within the community and encouraging effective actions.

However, it is crucial to note at this point that the reliability and accuracy of the information provided by social media are of great importance. Incorrect or misleading information can adversely affect the crisis management process. Therefore, leveraging social media as an effective and reliable communication tool to enhance community resilience during crisis times requires careful and attentive information management. Effective use of social media enables early and rapid crisis intervention for the majority of the society (Ngai and Jin, 2016).

During critical situations where every moment is vital, it is essential for crisis managers to establish and activate their official social media accounts to distribute information to various segments of society, including citizens, journalists, and the global public (Guide for Crisis Communication by the Turkish Ministry of Interior, 2020). Alongside the advancements in communication technologies, the methods through which individuals obtain and share information have experienced notable transformations. Social media has gradually evolved into an essential component of movements related to information acquisition and dissemination over time.

METHODOLOGY

The research which was conducted with the aim of revealing and comparing; how social media is used as a means of getting and spreading information by individuals during the Covid-19 crisis, which communication tool is found most reliable, how community resilience is built through social media in the USA and Turkey, includes the qualitative and quantitative evaluation and interpretation of the data obtained via online questionnaire carried out with 800 participants from Turkey and 800 participants from the USA between 5-10 May 2020.

764 valid questionnaires from Turkey and 771 from the USA were analyzed. The questionnaire consists of three parts: demographic features of participants, social media usage behaviors and community resilience statements. The third part was constituted depending on Connor-Davidson resilience scale (2003) and National Resilience Scale developed by Kimhi et al (2018).

The data about demographic features of participants, social media usage behaviors about Turkish people obtained in Turkey was used in another study of author (Çerçi, et al, 2020) but “Community Resilience Results” weren’t used in that study. In the light of theoretical knowledge, the following questions were tried to be answered in the study.

- a. *Research Question 1.* How many social media applications do participants use?
- b. *Research Question 2.* Which social media application do participants use most?
- c. *Research Question 3.* Which information source do participants find most reliable in obtaining information about the COVID-19 pandemic?
- d. *Research Question 4.* Which information source do participants use most to get information about the COVID-19 pandemic?
- e. *Research Question 5.* Do Turkish people feel themselves part of their country?
- f. *Research Question 6.* Do American people feel themselves part of their country?
- g. *Research Question 7.* Are American community and Turkish community resilient?

To answer these research questions in the analysis of the data, respectively; descriptive statistical technique such as frequency distribution was used to reveal the demographic characteristics of the respondents and some behaviors related to their use of social media, and their social media usage status in the COVID-19 crisis. The relationship between the use of social media at the time of crisis and demographic characteristics, which is one of the main objectives of the research, was tested with Independent Samples T-Test (Independent Samples T-Test) in binary options such as gender, and Chi-Square in multi-choices, and the significance level was $p =$ less than or equal to 0.05 were evaluated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research, aimed at uncovering and comparing how individuals use social media for acquiring and disseminating information during the Covid-19 crisis, determining which communication tool is deemed most reliable, and exploring how community resilience is built through social media in the USA and Turkey, was conducted. The data collection process and analysis methods described in the methodology section have provided a reliable and comprehensive dataset for this purpose. The collected data and findings will be analyzed and evaluated in this section to answer the research questions. This

evaluation will provide an in-depth insight into how social media usage and community resilience have been affected during the Covid-19 crisis in Turkey and the USA.

Table 1: Demographic Features

GENDER		N	Percentage
TURKEY	Female	372	48,7
	Male	392	51,3
	Total	764	100
The USA	Female	396	51,43
	Male	374	48,57
	Total	770	100

When table 1 is analyzed, it is seen that there a balance in distribution of female and male participants, so gender difference is not an obstacle to evaluate the findings of the study.

Also, considering the age distribution of the respondents in Turkey, 17.9% of them are in the 15-25 age range, 31.9% are in the 26-35 age range, 26.2% are in the 36-45 age range, 17.8% are in the 46-55 age range. It is seen that 6.2% of them are in the age range of 56 and over. 8,7 % of participants in the USA are in the 15-25 age range, 22,9% are in the 26-35 age range, 39,9% are in the 36-45 age range, 22,8 % are in the 46-55 age range. It is seen that 5,7% of them are in the age range of 56 and over. According to these data, it can be said that there is a balanced distribution in terms of age distribution of the participants.

Table 2: Distribution of Time Spent by Participants on Social Media

How much time do you spend daily on social media?	TURKEY			The USA		
	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent
Less than 60 minutes	217	28,4	28,4	198	25,7	25,7
Between 61-120 minutes	287	37,6	66,0	441	57,1	82,8
Between 121 and 180 minutes	161	21,1	87,0	110	14,3	97,1
Between 181-240 minutes	55	7,2	94,2	22	2,9	100
241 minutes or more	44	5,8	100,0	-	-	-
Total	764	100,0		771	100	

Table 2 shows that 71,6 % of Turkish society spend at least 1 hour on social media in a day while 74,3 % of American people spend same time on social media in one day It can be concluded that both societies spend remarkable time being online so any government or institution that wants to convey messages to the people must use social media in a successful way.

Table 3: Number of Social Media Apps Used

How many of the social media apps do you use?	TURKEY			The USA		
	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent
1-2	335	43,8	43,8	220	28,5	28,7
3-4	331	43,3	87,2	418	54,2	82,9
5-6	78	10,2	97,4	110	14,3	97,1
7-8	13	1,7	99,1	22	2,9	100,0
9 and above	7	,9	100,0	-	-	-
Total	764	100,0		771	100,0	

It is seen in Table 3 that there is difference between two countries in terms of using 1-2 social media applications; in Turkey 43,8 % of participants use 1-2 apps but in the USA 28,5 % of participants use 1-2 social media apps. On the other hand, more people use 3-4 of these applications in the USA (54,2%) than in Turkey (43,3%) and in both countries it is possible to state that at least a 10% of people use 5-6 social media applications which means that it is not enough to use a single social media platform to reach the target audience in both societies, and it is very important to operate in at least 3-4 different channels in order to convey the messages to the desired number of people and reach the communication goals.

Table 4: Distribution of Social Media Applications Most Used by Participants

What social media app do you use the most?	TURKEY			The USA		
	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent
Twitter	64	8,3	8,3	47	6,2	6,2
WhatsApp	277	36,3	44,6	285	36,9	43,1
Instagram	206	27,0	71,6	166	21,5	64,6
Facebook	87	11,4	83	83	10,8	75,4
Messenger	5	0,7	83,7	24	3,1	78,5
YouTube	125	16,3	100	166	21,5	100
Total	764	100,0		771	100,0	

When table 4 is analyzed, it is clear that Whatsapp is the most used social media application both in Turkey (36,3%) and in the USA (36,9%), followed by Instagram, Youtube, Facebook and Twitter, respectively. Messenger draws attention with the least usage rate. So, it can be said that social media preferences show similarity in both countries.

Table 5: Distribution of Social Media Use for Informing in the COVID-19 Crisis

Do you get information about the Covid-19 crisis on social media?	TURKEY			The USA		
	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent	Frequency	Percent	Cumilative Percent
Yes	576	75,4	75,4	638	82,86	82,86
No	188	24,6	100,0	132	17,14	100,0
Total	764	100,0		770	100,0	

In the research, participants were asked whether they get information about Covid-19 crisis on social media or not. Obtained data is really interesting (Table 5) considering the power of traditional media. At least 75% of participants both in Turkey (75,4%) and in the USA (82,86%) have been using social media in order to get information about Covid-19 outbreak and this shows that since pandemic was declared with increasing deaths due to the Covid-19 virus worldwide, people who turned to compulsory restrictions in their daily life have turned to social media more in terms of accessing information about both social life and Covid-19.

It can be concluded from the data that along with the changing technology and daily lifestyles, people also needed different channels to obtain information and turned to new channels; this means that it is vital for the authorities to use social media in emergency and unexpected situations where it is absolutely necessary to convey messages to the target audience quickly and accurately, and to reach a large part of the public.

Table 6: Distribution of the Most Reliable Information Sources for Obtaining Information on the COVID-19 Crisis

What is the most reliable source of information about the Covid-19 outbreak?		Frequency	Percent	Cumilative
				Percent
TURKEY	Social media	118	15,4	15,4
	Television	141	18,5	33,9
	Newspaper	9	1,2	35,1
	Radio	2	,3	35,3
	Ministry of Health Web Page	170	22,3	57,6
	Minister of Health (Fahrettin Koca)	297	38,9	96,5
	Other Officials of the State	18	2,4	98,8
	My Neighborhood	9	1,2	100,0
Total		764	100,0	
The USA	United States Department of Health and Human Services Web Site	286	37,1	37,1
	CDC	198	25,7	62,9
	Television	132	17,1	80
	Social Media	66	8,6	88,6

Newspaper	44	5,7	94,3
Alex Azar	22	2,9	97,2
Other State Officials	22	2,9	100,0
Total	770	100,0	

According to Table 6, Fahrettin Koca who is the Minister of Health is the most reliable information source in Turkey (38,9%), but Alex Azar who is responsible for same duty in America is ranked sixth (2,9%). Ministry of Health web page is the second most reliable source in Turkey (22,3%) while in the USA, United States Department of Health and Human Services web site is seen as the most reliable one (37,1%). Another striking element among the results is the evaluation of television as a more reliable source of information than social media. From this, it is concluded that although the preferability of social media has increased, television, which is a traditional media tool for information purposes, has been preserving its place.

Table 7: Comparison of Community Resilience Results-I

		The USA		TURKEY	
		Freq	%	Freq	%
Do you feel yourself part of community?	Neutral	45	5,8	11	1,4
	1. Yes	638	82,7	689	90,2
	2. No	88	11,4	64	8,4
	Total	771	100,0	764	100,0
Do you feel left alone in the pandemic?	Neutral	89	11,5	61	8,0
	1. Yes	198	25,7	128	16,8
	2. No	484	62,8	575	75,2
	Total	771	100,0	764	100,0
Do you feel well informed about covid-19?	Neutral	1	,1	3	0,4
	1. Yes	638	82,7	617	80,8
	2. No	132	17,1	144	18,8
	Total	771	100,0	764	100,0
Do you feel connected to World?	Neutral	67	8,7	15	2,0
	1. Yes	660	85,6	623	81,5
	2. No	44	5,7	126	16,5
	Total	771	100,0	764	100,0

Questions in Table 7 were developed depending on Connor-Davidson resilience scale (2003) and National Resilience Scale developed by Kimhi et al (2018) and asked to participants. In the light of obtained data, it can be said that most of the people of both countries feel themselves part of their countries (82,7% USA; 90,2%Turkey), well informed about Covid-19 (82,7%USA; 80,8% Turkey), connected to world (85,6% USA; 81,5%Turkey) and they don't feel alone in the pandemic (62,8%USA; 75,2% Turkey). In other words, most of Turkish and American people have strong and positive feelings towards their countries even under this stressful pandemic.

Table 8: Comparison of Community Resilience Results-II

		The USA		TURKEY	
		Freq	%	Freq	%
I can depend on people in my country.	Maybe	220	28,5	201	26,3
	1. Yes	397	51,5	427	55,9
	2. No	154	20	136	17,8
	Total	771	100	764	100,0
I can cope with anxiety in this Covid-19 crisis.	Maybe	72	9,3	58	7,6
	1. Yes	581	75,4	517	67,7
	2. No	118	15,3	189	24,7
	Total	771	100	764	100,0
I believe in the ability of my community to overcome an emergency situation.	Maybe	242	31,4	256	33,5
	1. Yes	397	51,5	347	45,4
	2. No	132	17,1	161	21,1
	Total	771	100	764	100,0
I have faith in the decision makers about Covid-19.	Maybe	198	25,7	198	25,9
	1. Yes	375	48,6	392	51,3
	2. No	198	25,7	174	22,8
	Total	771	100	764	100,0
My country is organized for emergency situation.	Maybe	154	20	249	32,6
	1. Yes	397	51,5	357	46,7
	2. No	220	28,5	158	20,7
	Total	771	100	764	100,0
I feel a sense of belonging to my country and community.	Maybe	141	18,3	78	10,2
	1. Yes	517	67	638	83,5
	2. No	113	14,7	48	6,3
	Total	771	100	764	100,0

When the answers to the statements in Table 8, which were formed on the basis of mentioned scales, are evaluated, it is seen that more than half of the popularity of both countries can depend on people in their countries (51,5%USA; 55,9% Turkey), can cope with anxiety in this Covid-19 crisis (75,4% USA; 67,7% Turkey) and feel a sense of belonging to their countries and communities (67% USA; 83,5% Turkey). Despite a little bit doubt is felt, approximately half of the participants, in other words half of the population, believe in the ability of their communities to overcome an emergency situation (51,5% USA; 45,4% Turkey), have faith in the decision makers about Covid-19 (48,6% USA; 51,3% Turkey) and think their country is organized for emergency situation (51,5% USA; 46,7% Turkey). As a result of these findings, it is obvious that communities of the USA and Turkey are resilient. In addition, when the relationship between the expressions of community resilience in Table 8 and the use of social media for information purposes is examined, a positive and significant relationship emerges ($t=4,371$; $sd.=762$; $p<.05$).

CONCLUSION

Community resilience is crucial in adapting to sudden, unexpected events that impact society, such as pandemics, which induce widespread panic and necessitate robust crisis communication strategies. Effective crisis communication, which involves timely and accurate messaging, is essential for crisis management and is heavily dependent on social media. Social media provides interactive communication that is not bound by time or place, making it indispensable for successful crisis management.

This study explored how social media is utilized for information dissemination during the Covid-19 crisis, identifying which communication tools are deemed most reliable, and how community resilience is fostered through social media in the USA and Turkey. The research included qualitative and quantitative analysis based on an online survey of 800 participants from each country.

The findings reveal that people in both countries spend significant time online daily, frequently using social media platforms such as Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter to obtain information about Covid-19. The study concludes that both Turkish and American societies are resilient, with a significant relationship between community resilience and social media use for information during the Covid-19 crisis.

In light of these findings, it is evident that governments and authorities must actively engage on social media to communicate effectively with the public and manage crises, thereby fostering resilient communities.

BIODATA

Ü. Özlem Çerçi, *Ph.D* is an assistant professor at Selçuk University, Silifke-Taşucu Vocational School of Higher Education, Merisn in Türkiye. She received her Bachelor’s degree in English Linguistics from Hacettepe University, Ankara (2010), Master’s degree (2012) and PhD degree (2019) in Public Relations and Publicity from Selçuk University, Konya, Türkiye. Çerçi continue her research on crisis management, corporate image management and corporate social responsibility

REFERENCES

- AO, S. H., & Mak, A. K. Y. (2021). Regenerative crisis, social media publics and Internet trolling: A cultural discourse approach. *Public Relations Review*, 47(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2021.102072>.
- Austin, L.; Brooke F. & Jin, Yan (2012). How Audiences Seek Out Crisis Information: Exploring the Social-Mediated Crisis Communication Model, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(2), 188-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2012.654498>.
- Beatson, A. (2017). Community resilience in the age of social media: A Literature Review. Lower Hutt (NZ): GNS Science. 18 p. (GNS Science report; 2017/43)
- Berkes, F., & Ross, H. (2013). Community Resilience: Toward an Integrated Approach, *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(1), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.736605>.
- Buzzanell, P. (2010). Resilience: Talking, Resisting, and Imagining New Normalcies Into Being, *Journal of Communication*, 60(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01469.x>.
- Canöz, K., & Özdoğan, A. G. (2015). Kriz Yönetiminde Dönüşümcü Liderin Rolü, *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, 3(1), 36-61. <https://doi.org/10.19145/guifd.15810>.
- Chandra, A.; Joie D. A.; Stefanie H.; Lori Uscher-Pines, Malcolm V. ; Douglas Y.; Jeffrey G., & Lisa S. M. (2011). Building Community Resilience to Disasters: A Way Forward to Enhance National Health Security. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR915.html.
- Chandra, A.; Malcolm, W.; Plough, A.; Stayton, A. et al (2013). Getting Actionable About Community Resilience: The Los Angeles County Community Disaster Resilience Project, *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(7), 1181-1189. <https://doi.org/10.2105%2FAJPH.2013.301270>.
- Coombs, W. T. (1999). Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing and responding, Sage Publications, Londra.
- Coombs W. T. (2008). The Future of Crisis Communication From An International Perspective, *Krisenmanagement in der Mediengesellschaft* (Editörler: Nolting T., Thießen A.) VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.
- Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, J. S. (2008). Comparing Apology To Equivalent Crisis Response Strategies: Clarifying Apology's Role And Value In Crisis Communication, *Public Relations Review*, 34(3), 252-257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.04.001>.
- Currie D. (2009). Expert round table on social media and risk communication during times of crisis: Strategic challenges and opportunities. Special Report. McLean, VA: Booz Allen & Hamilton.
- Çerçi, Ö.; Canöz, N., & Canöz, K. (2020). Covid-19 Krizi Döneminde Bilgilenme Aracı Olarak Sosyal Medya Kullanımı, *Selçuk Ün. Sos. Bil. Ens. Der.* 2020; (44), 184-198.
- Dufty, N. (2012). Using Social Media To Build Community Disaster Resilience, *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 27(1), 40-45.

- Freberg, K., Palenchar, M. J. & Veil, S. V. (2013). Managing and sharing H1N1 crisis information using social media bookmarking services, *Public Relations Review*, 39(3), 178–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.02.007>.
- Helinsha, M., & Margawati, M. (2022). The Influence of Social Media Instagram Toward Purchase Decision Making Process in Organicsupplyco. *Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 1(2), 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.37535/105001220224>.
- Herrman, H.; Stewart, D.; Diaz-Granados, N.; Jackson, B. & Yuen, T. (2011). What Is Resilience?, *La Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*, 56(5), 258-265.
- Hou, Y.; Tan, Yi.; & Lim, W. (2018). Adequacy of public health communications on H7N9 and MERS in Singapore: insights from a community based cross-sectional study, *BMC Public Health*, 18(436), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5340-x>.
- Houston, B. (2018). Community resilience and communication: dynamic interconnections between and among individuals, families, and organizations, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 19-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1426704>.
- Houston, B.; Spialek, M.; Cox, J.; Greenwood, M. & First, J. (2015). The centrality of communication and media in fostering community resilience: A framework for assessment and intervention. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214548563>.
- Jordan, E. & Javernick-Will, A. (2012). Measuring Community Resilience and Recovery: A Content Analysis of Indicators, *Construction Research Congress 2012* © ASCE 2012, 2190-2199.
- Kamiloğlu, F. & Yurttaş, Ö. (2014). Sosyal Medyanın Bilgi Edinme ve Kişisel Gelişim Sürecine Katkısı ve Lise Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Alan Çalışması, *İleti-ş-im*, 21, 129-150. <https://doi.org/10.16878/gsuilet.96678>.
- Kaplan, A. & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media, *Business Horizons*, 53, 59-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>.
- Kar, B. & Cochran, D. (2019). *Risk Communication and Community Resilience*, New York: Routledge.
- Katsikopoulos, P. (2021). Individual and community resilience in natural disaster risks and pandemics (covid-19): risk and crisis communication, *Mind & Society*, 20, 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11299-020-00254-0>.
- Kimhi, S.; Marciano, H.; Eshel, Y. & Adini, B. (2020). Resilience and demographic characteristics predicting distress during the COVID-19 crisis, *Social Science & Medicine* 265, 113389, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113389>.
- Kimhi, S.; Eshel, Y.; Lahad, M. & Leykin, D. (2018). National Resilience: A New Self-Report Assessment Scale, *Community Mental Health Journal*, 55(4), 721–731. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-018-0362-5>.
- Longstaff, P. & Sung-un, Y. (2008). Communication management and trust: their role in building resilience to “surprises” such as natural disasters, pandemic flu, and

- terrorism, *Ecology and Society* 13(1): 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-02232-130103>.
- Ngai, C. B. & Jin, Y. (2016). The Effectiveness of Crisis Communication Strategies on Sina Weibo in Relation to Chinese Publics' Acceptance of These Strategies, *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(4), 451-494. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1050651916651907>.
- Ophir Y. (2018) Coverage of epidemics in American newspapers through the lens of the crisis and emergency risk communication framework. *Health Secure*; 16:147–57. <https://doi.org/10.1089/hs.2017.0106>.
- Patel, S.; Rogers, B.; Amlot, R. & Rubin, J. (2017). What Do We Mean by 'Community Resilience'? A Systematic Literature Review of How It Is Defined in the Literature, *PLOS Currents Disasters*, Feb.1, Ed.1.
- Pinheiro, M. & Matos, A. (2012). Exploring the construct validity of the two versions of the Resilience Scale in a Portuguese adolescent sample, *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 2(5), 178-189. [http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/FutureAcademy/ejsbs\(2301-2218\).2012.2.5](http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/FutureAcademy/ejsbs(2301-2218).2012.2.5).
- Porfiriev, B. (2007). Disaster and Crisis Management in Transitional Societies: Commonalities and Peculiarities, *Handbook of Disaster Research* (Eds: Rodríguez,H; Quarantelli ,Eve Dynes , R.), 368-387.
- Prentice, S. & Huffman, E. (2008). Social Media's New Role in Emergency Management Emergency Management and Robotics for Hazardous Environments, *Emergency Management and Robotics for Hazardous Environments*, New Mexico.
- Rice, R. M. & Jahn, Jody L. S. (2020). Disaster resilience as communication practice: remembering and forgetting lessons from past disasters through practices that prepare for the next one, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 48(1), 136-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2019.1704830>.
- Saliou, P. (1994). Crisis communication in the event of a flu pandemic, *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 10, 515-517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01719693>.
- Schultz, F.; Utz, S. & Göritz, A. (2011). Is the medium the message? Perceptions of and reactions to crisis communication via twitter, blogs and traditional media, *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.12.001>.
- Skuse, A., & Brimacombe, T. (2014). Social networking, social media, and complex emergencies: Issues paper. Queanbeyan (AT): Australian Civil-Military Centre.
- Smith, K.; Emerson, D., & Schuldt, M. (2018). A demographic and psychometric assessment of the Connor-Davidson resilience scale 10 (CD-RISC 10) with a US public accounting sample, *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 14(4) , 513-534. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-12-2016-0085>.
- South, J.; Stansfield J.; Amlôt R., & Weston D. (2020). Sustaining and strengthening community resilience throughout the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. *Perspectives in Public Health*, 140(6), 305-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757913920949582>.

- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration: Communicating in a Crisis: Risk Communication Guidelines for Public Officials. SAMHSA Publication No. PEP19-01-01-005. Rockville, MD, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2019.
- Sutton, J.; Palen L., & Shklovski, I.(2008). Backchannels on the Front Lines: Emergent Uses of Social Media in the 2007 Southern California Wildfires, Proceedings of the 5th International ISCRAM Conference – Washington, DC, USA.
- Taylor, M.; Wells, G.; Howell, G., & Raphael, B. (2012). The role of social media as psychological first aid as a support to community resilience building. A Facebook study from 'Cyclone Yasi Update', *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 27(1), 20-26.
- Tirkkonen, P. & Luoma-aho, V. (2011). Online authority communication during an epidemic: A Finnish example, *Public Relations Review*, 37(2), 172–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.01.004>.
- Tyas, A., & Hutagaol, O. (2021). The Effect of Social Media Content on Buying Decision ofHijUp.com. *Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 1(1), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.37535/105001120214>.
- Turnbull, M.; Sterrett, C., & Hilliboe, A. (2013). *Toward Resilience: A guide to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation*, Warwickshire; UK: Practical Action Publishing Ltd.
- Twigg, J. (2007) *Characteristics of a disaster-resilient community: A guidance note*. London, UK: DFID Disaster Risk Reduction NGO Interagency Coordination Group.
- Ulmer, R.; Seeger, M., & Sellnow, T. (2007). Post-crisis communication and renewal: Expanding the parameters of post-crisis discourse, *Public Relations Review*, 33(2), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.11.015>.
- Van der Meer, T., & Verhoeven, P. (2013). Public Framing Organizational Crisis Situations: Social Media Versus News Media, *Public Relations Review*. 39(3). 229–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.12.001>.
- Vos, M., & Sullivan, H. (2014). Community Resilience in Crises: Technology and Social Media Enablers, *Human Technology*, 10(2), 61-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/ht/urn.201411263368>.
- Wang, Y. C., Shen, J. K., Xiang, W. N., & Wang, J. Q. (2018). Identifying characteristics of resilient urban communities through a case study method. *Journal of Urban Management*, 7(3), 141-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2018.11.004>.
- White, C. (2012) *Social Media, Crisis Communication, and Emergency Management: Leveraging Web 2.0 Technology*, CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Zhang L.; Zhao J.; Liu J., & Chen K. (2020). Community Disaster Resilience in the COVID-19 Outbreak: Insights from Shanghai’s Experience in China, *Risk Manage Healthcare Policy*., 13, 3259-3270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S283447>.