A cross-sectional survey of psychological distress in a Mexican sample during the second phase of the COVID-19 pandemic

Toledo-Fernández, A.¹; Betancourt-Ocampo, D.¹; Romo-Parra, H.¹; Reyes-Zamorano, E.¹;
González-González, A.^{1*}

¹ Universidad Anáhuac México. Facultad de Psicología. México.

* **Corresponding author:** Dr. Alejandro González-González. Facultad de Psicología,
Universidad Anáhuac México – Campus Norte. Address: Universidad Anáhuac #46; Lomas
Anáhuac, Huixquilucan, Estado de México; ZIP code: 52786. E-mail:
alejandro.gonzalezg@anahuac.mx

Abstract

The objectives of this study were to describe severity of psychological distress (event-related stress, anxiety, and depression) during the second stage of COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico, and to explore associations between the indicators of psychological distress, sociodemographic characteristics and specific concerns about COVID-19. This report serves as a baseline measure of a longitudinal project to evaluate progression of psychological distress across stages of the COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico. An online survey was conducted in the State of Mexico from April 8th -18th, 2020, in a sample of men and women who are beneficiaries of a welfare institution in the region. Variables were measured with the Impact of Event Scale-6, Patient Health Questionnaire-9, General Anxiety Disorder-7, and a questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19. A total of 5974 participants were analyzed. Moderate levels of psychological distress (with 23.6% of participants meeting significant event-related stress, but mild levels of depression and anxiety) were found, as well as high values in all concerns about COVID-19, especially regarding financial disruption, worsening of local security and concern of a family member becoming infected. These concerns associated mild-to-moderately with the indicators of psychological distress. Higher values of event-related distress were found in women, individuals with higher educational attainment and those with any current high-risk medical diagnosis, though the effect sizes were mild. Though psychological distress and concerns about COVID-19 have reached significant levels during the pandemic in Mexico, overall, they have not yet reached dysfunctional levels.

Key words: COVID-19; psychological distress; depression; anxiety; Mexico.

1. Introduction

The 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) supposes a significant risk for mental health. As seen for other disease outbreaks with far lesser worldwide impact, psychological distress is expected to increase as the pandemic evolves because of several interrelated stressors, which include: fear of contagion (of oneself or significant others) and consequent health impairments or mortality; actual health effects of infection; stigma; inadequate delivery or understanding of the information about the pandemic; fearmongering in social media; scarcity of supplies; social distancing and potential lack of purpose and routine, boredom, frustration and anger; socioeconomical disruptions like financial losses, or increased criminality and political instability (Brooks et al., 2020; Venkatesh & Edirappuli, 2020; Xiang et al., 2020).

The mental health outcomes of the COVID-19 pandemic could be as severe as the medical ones themselves, although less acute and homogeneous as to constitute an important focus of overall social attention. Based on worldwide disruptive events of the past that share some of the stressors enlisted above, mental health consequences of the current pandemic may include significant increases in the incidence of depression, anxiety, posttraumatic stress, and substance use disorders, as well as related clinical manifestations like domestic violence, child abuse and suicidal behaviors (Beaglehole et al., 2018; Bromet et al., 2017; Tracy, Norris, & Galea, 2011),

It is of crucial importance to keep monitoring of the mental health of populations in order to allocate health care resources (Pfefferbaum & North, 2020; Xiang et al., 2020). Efforts are being made around the world to survey the psychological effects of the pandemic, with most of the currently published literature reporting moderate-to-severe symptoms of acute stress, anxiety and depression associated to the initial stages of the outbreak (Ahorsu et al., 2020; Li, Wang, Xue, Zhao, & Zhu, 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Roy et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020).

As of April 29th, 2020, there is no known published mental health data related to COVID-19 in Mexico. To this date, Mexican government is reporting 1,569 deceases and 16,752 accumulated confirmed cases (Secretaría de Salud, 2000) though, as with any other country, the precision of the epidemiological estimations depends on many factors. In any case, as time passes, the quantity, intensity and chronicity of COVID-19-related stressors are likely increasing, and formal scientific analysis of the phenomena is required.

To address this issue, we are conducting two online-based studies in two Mexican samples (18-60 and 61 or more years old) which aim at monitoring the progression of psychological distress trough stages of the COVID-19 pandemic and after ending of social distancing measures in Mexico (González-González, Betancourt-Ocampo, Toledo-Fernández, Romo-Parra, & Reyes-Zamorano, 2020). The objectives of the current cross-sectional report were to describe severity of psychological distress (event-related stress, anxiety, and depression) during the second stage of COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico, and to explore associations between the indicators of psychological distress, sociodemographic characteristics and specific concerns about COVID-19.

2. Method

2.1. Study Design

Analytical cross-sectional online survey.

2.2. Participants

The sample was comprised of men and women between the ages of 18 and 60 years-old, living in the State of Mexico (a large territory in the Center of the country, comprised of 125 municipalities, some of them being the most densely populated in the country). Potential

participants were contacted by the staff of the State Council for Women and Social Welfare (Consejo Estatal de la Mujer y Bienestar Social), via email or telephone registered in the database of their program's beneficiaries. Individuals were selected randomly by the staff.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Sociodemographic questionnaire

It included items about gender, years of age, educational attainment, relationship status, occupation, number of children and current high-risk medical diagnosis (any of the following: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, respiratory diseases, autoimmune disease or immunosuppression, obesity and dyslipidemia).

2.3.2. Impact of Event Scale-6 (IES-6)

It is a brief form of the widely used Impact of Event Scale-Revised (Weiss, 2007), which assesses self-report of posttraumatic stress reactions to specific events. The IES-6 includes two items for each of the dimensions of posttraumatic stress: intrusion, avoidance, and hyperarousal, and five response options ranging from 0 ("Not at all") to 4 ("Extremely"). A total score is computed, with higher values indicating more severe event-related stress, and values between 10 to 13 points as possible cutoffs for detection of posttraumatic stress disorder, from which we used the we used the 13-points score to maximize specificity of detection (Thoresen et al., 2010)

For this study, we used corresponding Spanish-translated items (Caamaño et al., 2011), and we instructed the respondents to answer them considering the COVID-19 pandemic as the potentially stressful event, as follows: "Some people often experience difficulties during stressful

events. In the following statements, think about the last 7 days and how stressful the situation we are living due to the coronavirus pandemic has been for you.”

2.3.3. Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)

This self-administered 9-items scale inquires the respondent about specific depressive symptoms corresponding to DSM-IV criteria in the last two weeks, according to a Likert scale with 0-to-3 values. A total score is computed, with upper values indicating a higher severity of depression, which can be ranked as follows: 0-4 = none, 5-9 = mild, 10-14 = moderate, 15-19 = moderately severe, 20-27 = severe (Kroenke, Spitzer, & Williams, 2001). The PHQ-9 is a very common scale in clinical research worldwide; evidence of its validity has been reported for Latin American and Mexican populations (Donlan & Lee, 2010; Familiar et al., 2014) and it has been used in online surveys (Ryung, Cho, & Kim, 2018; Sierra-Aparicio, Magaña-Quijano, Vargas-Quñones, Martínez-García, & Toledo-Fernández, 2019).

2.3.4. Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7)

It is a seven-item self-administered scale that was developed to assess general anxiety disorder following the DSM-IV symptom criteria (Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, & Löwe, 2006) and can be used to evaluate other forms of anxiety (Plummer, Manea, Trepel, & McMillan, 2016). Like the PHQ-9, the GAD-7 has 0-to-3 response options, with a total score between 0-21. Higher scores indicate more severe anxiety, with the following ordinal values: 0-4 = minimal, 5-9 = mild, 10-14 = moderate, 15-21 = severe. Evidence of good internal consistency and validity has been reported for Mexican samples (Castro Silva et al., 2017; García-Campayo et al., 2009), and the scale has been used in online survey (Parkerson, Thibodeau, Brandt, Zvolensky, & Asmundson, 2015).

2.3.5. *Questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19*

This 12-item questionnaire was elaborated *ex profeso* to explore different concerns regarding the COVID-19 pandemic, specifically: perception of utility and adherence to measures of hygiene and social distancing, news information seeking and trust of it, respondent's or a family member's concern of becoming infected, concern about the financial and security status of their social context, perception of impairment in daily-living due to the pandemic, and family awareness of the respondent during the pandemic (Table 2).

Participants were instructed to respond to each of these questions in a 0-to-10 scale. The granulation of the scale was established in this fashion in order to allow for a more continuous variability of the responses, for each item was considered independently in the main analyses.

2.4. *Procedure*

Individuals were contacted by the staff of the State Council for Women and Social Welfare through email and telephone, inviting them to participate in the online survey that was sent to them via email. The survey was designed in Google Forms and included a brief informed consent describing the general objective of the study, the subject-matter addressed by the questions, voluntariness and confidentiality of participation, and the institutions involved in the implementation of the study. Before starting the survey, individuals were asked to check box for consent.

Recruitment lasted 10 days, beginning at April 8th 2020, coinciding with the end of week two of the second phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico, which was announced by the government in March 24th 2020, and which included reinforcement of social distancing measures, such as closure of more public spaces (e.g. malls, parks, restaurants, etc.) and constant reminding

by the health authorities via daily press conferences and media advertising. By that time, social distancing measures had already been in place for almost three weeks.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed for sociodemographic characteristics, total scores of the PHQ-9, GAD-7 and IES-6, and each of the items exploring concerns about COVID-19, using the total sample and subgroups from the categories of the sociodemographics (e.g. relationship status: single, married, etc.). Between-group differences relative to indicators of psychological distress and each of the items of concerns about COVID-19 were estimated using Student's or ANOVA, reporting effect sizes with Cohen's d and η^2 , respectively. Pearson's product-moment correlations between these items and PHQ-9, GAD-7, IES-6, and age were also computed.

Missing values were handled for each inferential analysis via pairwise. All the inferential results were judged significant at a two-tailed $p < .05$, and effect sizes of between-groups differences were considered meaningful at a minimum of $d \geq .2$ or $\eta^2 \geq .01$. Statistical analyses were performed using JASP 0.11.1.0 (JASP Team, 2019).

3. Results

A total of 6023 individuals were reached to respond the survey; from this number, 49 did not consent to participate, thus leaving a total of 5974 cases to be analyzed. As displayed in Table 1, participants were mostly women (60.5%), with ages ranging from 18 to 59 years old. From all the cases, 44% reported having an elementary-to-high school degree, and 56% a technical, college or post-graduate degree; most of them were married or in free union (60%), retirees

(42.7%), and have adult children (48.6%). Almost 30% of the participants declared having been diagnosed with at least one of the high-risk medical diagnoses.

[INSERT TABLE 1]

[INSERT TABLE 2]

Regarding indicators of psychological distress relative to the total sample, mean values for severities of depression and anxiety reached the respective cutoff scores for mild degrees, and the mean score of the IES-6 was borderline with the minimum cutoff score for detection of significant distress (Table 2). Employing a 13-points cutoff score for the IES-6, 23.7% of the sample qualified as having significant event-related stress; besides, 6.7% and 12.5% of the sample met scores for moderate-to-severe depression and anxiety. Concerns about COVID-19 biased high for all the explored dimensions, particularly for respondent's or a family member's concern of becoming infected, and financial and security situation. Hygiene and social distancing were reported as being met frequently and to be considered useful, whereas seeking information and trust of it were assessed with the lowest values (Table 2). All concerns about COVID-19 correlated significantly with the score of the IES-6 (r ranging from .14 to .31), and mildly with severities of depression (r ranging from .03 to .15) and anxiety (r ranging from .02 to .14). Age proved positive mild associations (r ranging from .03 to .11) with all the concerns except financial situation (Table 3).

[INSERT TABLE 3]

Lastly, between-group differences (Table 4) were found in relation to several sociodemographic categories, showing more concerns about COVID-19 the following individuals: women, those with higher educational attainment, those with children, and those

with high-risk medical diagnosis. Effect sizes were below small for the most cases ($d < .20$, and $\eta^2 < .01$), except for women's concern about local security ($d = -.22$), concern about getting the virus in medically diagnosed individuals ($d = -.21$), and in-between educational attainments regarding follow-up of hygiene measures, information seeking, and concern of a family member becoming infected. Relationship status and occupation showed no clear-cut correlations and negligible effect sizes. Additionally, we found higher levels of psychological distress in women ($d \sim -.30$), higher educational attainments ($\eta^2 = .03$) and previous medical diagnosis ($d \sim -.33$).

[INSERT TABLE 4]

[INSERT TABLE 5]

4. Discussion

4.1. Findings

This study had the goal to explore the severity of psychological distress (event-related stress, anxiety and depression) during the second stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in Mexico, and to explore associations between these indicators, sociodemographic characteristics and specific concerns about COVID-19. Overall, we found moderate levels of event-related stress (with almost a fourth of the sample meeting significant event-related stress) and mild levels of depression and anxiety. Also, we found high values in all concerns about COVID-19, but especially regarding financial disruption, worsening of local security and concern of a family member becoming infected. These values associated mild-to-moderately with the indicators of psychological distress, suggesting that, thought concerns about COVID-19 have reached

significant levels during the pandemic in Mexico, they have not yet reached levels that could be considered dysfunctional.

When exploring psychological distress differences between subgroups of sociodemographic variables, we found higher event-related distress and specific concerns about COVID-19 in women, individuals with higher educational attainment and those with any current high-risk medical diagnosis, though the effect sizes were rather mild. These differences were expected. Women, overall, tend to score higher in measures of anxiety trait (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001), which could predispose them to be more concerned about the proximal and distal consequences of the pandemic; this was especially noticeable within our findings with regards to concern about local security, possibly in relation to the increased violence towards women and the perception of it in Mexico (Ávila, Martínez-Ferrer, Vera, Bahena, & Musitu, 2016). About education, individuals with higher attainment could be more concern about COVID-19 since they also reported more information seeking behavior and could be a group with better cognitive grasp of the consequences of the pandemic, which could also explain their tendency to better adhere to preventive measures, as has been indirectly observed for another epidemic (Bults et al., 2011). Lastly, increased risk perception could explain the tendency to higher psychological distress in individuals with a high-risk medical diagnosis, though this distress did not translate into better adherence to preventive measures in our sample, arguably because chronic medical conditions tend to be more prevalent in populations with low educational attainment (Fleischer, Diez Roux, Alazraqui, & Spinelli, 2008), and thus less cognitively prompt to think about future consequences.

4.2. Limitations

The first limitation of our study is that the sample is not representative of the Mexican population, since it was restricted to one delimited region in the center of the country, and deep socioeconomic differences between the North, Center and South regions could play a crucial role in how the pandemic is being experienced. Also, the sample was composed by individuals registered in welfare programs, which could have biased the socioeconomic status and the tendency of the responses. On the other hand, we had a well-balanced matching of genders (considering that online surveys are mostly responded by women) and of low versus high educational attainment.

Another limitation is the fact that the two main variables of the study, event-related stress and concerns about COVID-19, were assessed with instruments that have not been validated in the Mexican population. The IES-6 was selected both because of its widespread use and its brevity (an important consideration in online surveys), and we tried to minimize oversensitivity in the identification of cases with significant event-related stress using the highest cutoff score recommended by the authors of the scale (Thoresen et al., 2010). With regards to the items of concerns about COVID-19, there was no standard measure when we began the study (a scale for measurement of fear of COVID-19 has just recently been proposed [Ahorsu et al., 2020]), and we were interested in specific behaviors that could indicate concern with the pandemic, rather than a unitary score.

4.3. Conclusion

Our study is a first approach to the psychological response to the COVID-19 pandemic in a portion of the Mexican population. Its findings serve as a baseline measure to be compared with subsequent waves following the third stage of the pandemic and after ending of social distancing measures, as part of a project undergo by our research team (González-González et al., 2020).

This study is also an attempt to provide regional data to the global research efforts to assess the psychological impact of the pandemic.

Author's disclosure

Funding

None.

Declaration of interest

None.

References

- Ahorsu, D. K., Lin, C.-Y., Imani, V., Saffari, M., Griffiths, M. D., & Pakpour, A. H. (2020). The Fear of COVID-19 Scale: Development and initial validation. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00270-8>
- Ávila, M. E., Martínez-Ferrer, B., Vera, A., Bahena, A., & Musitu, G. (2016). Victimization, perception of insecurity, and changes in daily routines in Mexico. *Revista de Saude Publica*, 50, 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S1518-8787.2016050006098>
- Beaglehole, B., Mulder, R. T., Frampton, C. M., Boden, J. M., Newton-Howes, G., & Bell, C. J. (2018). Psychological distress and psychiatric disorder after natural disasters: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 213(6), 716–722. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.210>
- Bromet, E. J., Atwoli, L., Kawakami, N., Navarro-Mateu, F., Piotrowski, P., King, A. J., ... Kessler, R. C. (2017). Post-traumatic stress disorder associated with natural and human-made disasters in the World Mental Health Surveys. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(2), 227–241. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e31823da96d>

- Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227), 912–920. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)
- Bults, M., Beaujean, D. J. M. A., De Zwart, O., Kok, G., Van Empelen, P., Van Steenbergen, J. E., ... Voeten, H. A. C. M. (2011). Perceived risk, anxiety, and behavioural responses of the general public during the early phase of the Influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in the Netherlands: Results of three consecutive online surveys. *BMC Public Health*, 11, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-2>
- Caamaño, L. W., Fuentes, D. M., González, L. B., Melipillán, R. A., Sepúlveda, M. C., & Valenzuela, E. G. (2011). Adaptación y validación de la versión chilena de la escala de impacto de evento-revisada (EIE-R). *Revista Medica de Chile*, 139(9), 1163–1168. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0034-98872011000900008>
- Castro Silva, E., Benjet, C., Juárez García, F., Jurado Cárdenas, S., Gómez-Maqueo, M. E. L., & Valencia Cruz, A. (2017). Non-suicidal self-injuries in a sample of Mexican university students. *Salud Mental*, 40(5), 191–199. <https://doi.org/10.17711/SM.0185-3325.2017.025>
- Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 322–331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322>
- Donlan, W., & Lee, J. (2010). Screening for depression among indigenous Mexican migrant farmworkers using the Patient Health Questionnaire–9. *Psychological Reports*, 106(2), 419–432.
- Familiar, I., Ortiz-Panoso, E., Hall, B., Vieitez, I., Romieu, I., Lopez-Ridaura, R., & Lajous, M. (2014). Factor structure of the Spanish version of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 in Mexican women. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 24(1), 74–82.
- Fleischer, N. L., Diez Roux, A. V., Alazraqui, M., & Spinelli, H. (2008). Social patterning of chronic disease risk factors in a Latin American city. *Journal of Urban Health*, 85(6), 923–937. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-008-9319-2>
- García-Campayo, J., Zamorano, E., Ruíz, M. A., Pardo, A., Freire, O., Pérez-Páramo, M., ... Rejas, J. (2009).

- Cultural adaptation into Spanish of the generalized anxiety disorder scale-7 (GAD-7) scale. *European Psychiatry*, 24, S538. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-9338\(09\)70771-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-9338(09)70771-0)
- González-González, A., Betancourt-Ocampo, D., Toledo-Fernández, A., Romo-Parra, H., & Reyes-Zamorano, E. (2020). Psychological distress in a Mexican sample across stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. Retrieved from osf.io/sd6q7
- JASP Team. (2019). JASP (Version 0.11.1).
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. W. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 16, 606–613.
- Li, S., Wang, Y., Xue, J., Zhao, N., & Zhu, T. (2020). The impact of covid-19 epidemic declaration on psychological consequences: A study on active weibo users. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062032>
- Parkerson, H. A., Thibodeau, M. A., Brandt, C. P., Zvolensky, M. J., & Asmundson, G. J. G. (2015). Cultural-based biases of the GAD-7. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 31, 38–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2015.01.005>
- Pfefferbaum, B., & North, C. S. (2020). Mental health the COVID-19 pandemic. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 1–2. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2009027>
- Plummer, F., Manea, L., Trepel, D., & McMillan, D. (2016). Screening for anxiety disorders with the GAD-7 and GAD-2: A systematic review and diagnostic metaanalysis. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 39, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2015.11.005>
- Qiu, J., Shen, B., Zhao, M., Wang, Z., Xie, B., & Xu, Y. (2020). A nationwide survey of psychological distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: Implications and policy recommendations. *General Psychiatry*, 33(2), 19–21. <https://doi.org/10.1136/gpsych-2020-100213>
- Roy, D., Tripathy, S., Kumar, S., Sharma, N., Verma, S. K., & Kaushal, V. (2020). Study of knowledge, attitude, anxiety & perceived mental healthcare need in Indian population during COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51.
- Ryung, W. H., Cho, H., & Kim, D.-J. (2018). Prevalence and correlates of comorbid depression in a nonclinical

- online sample with DSM-5 internet gaming disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 226, 1–5.
- Secretaría de Salud. (2000). Comunicado técnico diario COVID-19 México 28/04/2020.
- Sierra-Aparicio, T. A., Magaña-Quijano, B. P., Vargas-Quiñones, J., Martínez-García, B., & Toledo-Fernández, A. (2019). Moderating effects of executive function between depression severity and work performance: A web-based cross-sectional study. *Salud Mental*, 42(2). <https://doi.org/10.17711/SM.0185-3325.2019.008>
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166(10), 1092–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>
- Thoresen, S., Tambs, K., Hussain, A., Heir, T., Johansen, V. A., & Bisson, J. I. (2010). Brief measure of posttraumatic stress reactions: Impact of Event Scale-6. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45(3), 405–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-009-0073-x>
- Tracy, M., Norris, F. H., & Galea, S. (2011). Differences in the determinants of posttraumatic stress disorder and depression after a mass traumatic event. *Depression and Anxiety*, 28(8), 666–675. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20838>
- Venkatesh, A., & Edirappuli, S. (2020). Social distancing in covid-19: What are the mental health implications? *The BMJ*, 369(April), 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1379>
- Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051729>
- Weiss, D. S. (2007). The impact of event scale: revised. In *Cross-cultural assessment of psychological trauma and PTSD* (pp. 219–238).
- Xiang, Y. T., Yang, Y., Li, W., Zhang, L., Zhang, Q., Cheung, T., & Ng, C. H. (2020). Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(3), 228–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8)

Table 1*Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants (N=5974).*

	Mean (SD) or n(%)
Sociodemographics	
Age	36.98 (10.98)
Gender	
Men	2361 (39.5)
Women	3613 (60.5)
Educational attainment	
No degree	33 (.5)
Elementary	336 (5.6)
Middle school	978 (16.4)
High school	1299 (21.7)
Technical degree	731 (12.2)
College	2150 (36.0)
Masters/Specialty	410 (6.9)
Doctorate	37 (.6)
Relationship status	
Single	1830 (30.6)
Married	2548 (42.7)
Free union	1031 (17.3)
Divorced/Separated	471 (7.9)
Widowed	94 (1.6)
Occupation	
Unemployed	710 (11.9)
Retired	2548 (42.7)
Student	1031 (17.3)
Employed	471 (7.9)
Home	94 (1.6)
Children	
Has children > 18 years-old	1353 (22.6)
Has children < 18 years-old	2906 (48.6)
No children	1715 (28.7)
Previous medical diagnosis	
One ore more	1667 (27.9)
None	4307 (72.1)

Table 2*Results of psychological distress and concerns about COVID-19 (N=5974).*

	Mean (SD)
Items of the questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19	
1. How often have you followed the recommended hygiene measures (e.g. constantly washing your hands, using alcohol for hands, disinfecting objects, using face masks, etc.) for the prevention of the coronavirus?	8.22 (1.74)
2. How useful do you consider these hygiene measures to be to avoid getting coronavirus?	8.77 (1.72)
3. How much have you complied with the measures of social distancing?	7.93 (2.00)
4. How useful do you consider social distancing to be against the pandemic?	8.72 (1.76)
5. How often do you seek information about the course of the pandemic?	7.88 (2.22)
6. How confident are you in the information you receive about the course of the pandemic?	7.22 (2.30)
7. How worried are you about getting the coronavirus?	8.48 (2.17)
8. How concerned are you that a family member will get coronavirus?	9.02 (1.79)
9. How concerned are you about your financial situation as a result of the pandemic?	9.16 (1.58)
10. How concerned are you about the security situation in your locality following the pandemic?	8.91 (1.72)
11. How much has your daily life been affected by the pandemic?	8.51 (1.88)
12. How much has your family been aware of you since the contingency (phone calls, providing food, medicine, etc.)?	7.92 (2.35)
Psychological distress	
IES-6 total score	9.05 (4.99)
PHQ-9 total score	4.90 (5.32)
GAD-7 total score	4.09 (4.60)

Abbreviations: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease; GAD-7 = General Anxiety Disorder-7; IES-6 = Impact of Event Scale-6; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9.

Table 3

Bivariate correlations between items of the questionnaire of concern about COVID-19, psychological distress and age (N=5974).

Items	IES-6	PHQ-9	GAD-7	Age
	<i>r</i> [95% <i>CI</i>]	<i>r</i> [95% <i>CI</i>]	<i>r</i> [95% <i>CI</i>]	<i>r</i> [95% <i>CI</i>]
1	.17 [.14, .19]***	-.03 [-.06, -.01]***	-.02 [-.05, -.00]*	.11 [.09, .14]***
2	.20 [.18, .22]***	-.01 [-.04, .00]	-.006 [-.03, .02]	.07 [.05, .10]***
3	.17 [.14, .19]***	-.01 [-.04, .01]	-.01 [-.04, .009]	.13 [.10, .15]***
4	.25 [.22, .27]***	.02 [-.00, .05]	.03 [.01, .06]**	.06 [.03, .08]***
5	.25 [.22, .27]***	.02 [.00, .05]*	.02 [.00, .05]*	.14 [.12, .17]***
6	.14 [.12, .17]***	-.04 [-.07, -.02]***	-.05 [-.08, -.02]	.09 [.06, .11]***
7	.32 [.30, .35]***	.07 [.04, .09]***	.08 [.06, .11]***	.07 [.04, .09]***
8	.31 [.29, .33]***	.08 [.06, .11]***	.09 [.07, .12]***	.03 [.00, .05]*
9	.24 [.22, .27]***	.10 [.07, .12]***	.11 [.08, .13]***	.2 [-.00, .04]
10	.29 [.26, .31]***	.10 [.07, .12]***	.10 [.08, .13]***	.06 [.03, .08]***
11	.26 [.24, .29]***	.15 [.12, .17]***	.14 [.12, .17]***	.05 [.03, .08]***
12	.16 [.14, .19]***	-.03 [-.06, -.01]**	-.04 [-.06, -.01]**	.05 [.02, .07]***

Notes: *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

Abbreviations: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease; GAD-7 = General Anxiety Disorder-7; IES-6 = Impact of Event Scale-6; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9.

Table 4*Between-group differences in responses to the items of the questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19 and sociodemographic characteristics (N=5974).*

Variables	COVID-19 items							
	1. Adherence to hygiene measures		2. Usefulness of hygiene measures		3. Compliance with social distancing		4. Usefulness of social distancing	
	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference
Gender								
Men	8.0 (1.8)	$t(5971)=-4.2^{***}; d=-.11$	8.6 (1.8)	$t(5971)=-5.8^{***}; d=-.15$	7.6 (2.1)	$t(5970)=-7.5^{***}; d=-.15$	7.6 (2.1)	$t(5970)=-7.0^{***}; d=-.18$
Women	8.2 (1.7)		8.8 (1.6)		8.0 (1.8)		8.0 (1.8)	
Education								
No degree	7.5 (2.7)	$F(7, 5965)=22.2^{***}; \eta^2=.02$	7.7 (2.5)	$F(7, 5965)=19.3^{***}; \eta^2=.02$	6.7 (3.1)	$F(7, 5964)=14.1^{***}; \eta^2=.01$	7.1 (3.0)	$F(7, 5964)=34.0^{***}; \eta^2=.03$
Elementary	7.7 (2.0)		8.1 (1.9)		7.5 (2.2)		8.0 (2.0)	
Middle school	7.8 (1.9)		8.4 (1.8)		7.5 (2.1)		8.2 (1.9)	
High school	8.0 (1.8)		8.7 (1.7)		7.8 (2.0)		8.6 (1.7)	
Technical degree	8.3 (1.6)		8.8 (1.7)		8.0 (1.9)		8.8 (1.7)	
College	8.3 (1.5)		8.9 (1.6)		8.1 (1.8)		8.9 (1.5)	
Masters/Specialty	8.7 (1.4)		9.1 (1.4)		8.2 (1.7)		9.2 (1.5)	
Doctorate	9.1 (1.0)		9.4 (.9)		8.6 (1.6)		9.5 (.9)	
Relationship status								
Single	8.2 (1.7)	$F(4, 5968)=3.7^{**}; \eta^2=.002$	8.7 (1.7)	$F(4, 5968)=2.5^{*}; \eta^2=.002$	7.8 (2.0)	$F(4, 5967)=6.9^{***}; \eta^2=.005$	8.7 (1.7)	$F(4, 5967)=2.6^{*}; \eta^2=.002$
Married	8.2 (1.6)		8.8 (1.6)		8.0 (1.8)		8.7 (1.6)	
Free union	8.0 (1.8)		8.6 (1.8)		7.6 (2.1)		8.5 (1.8)	
Divorced/Separated	8.2 (1.7)		8.8 (1.7)		7.9 (1.9)		8.7 (1.7)	
Widowed	8.2 (2.1)		8.5 (1.8)		7.9 (2.4)		8.5 (2.1)	
Occupation								
Unemployed	7.9 (1.9)	$F(4, 5968)=13.6^{***}; \eta^2=.009$	8.5 (1.9)	$F(4, 5968)=6.0^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	7.9 (1.9)	$F(4, 5967)=6.0^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	8.5 (1.8)	$F(4, 5967)=6.8^{***}; \eta^2=.005$
Retired	8.9 (1.1)		9.3 (1.0)		8.9 (1.1)		9.2 (1.3)	
Student	7.9 (1.9)		8.7 (1.7)		7.7 (2.1)		8.6 (1.8)	
Employed	8.3 (1.6)		8.8 (1.7)		7.8 (2.0)		8.7 (1.7)	
Home	8.0 (1.7)		8.7 (1.6)		8.0 (1.8)		8.5 (1.7)	
Children								
≥ 18 years-old	8.4 (1.7)	$F(2, 5970)=12.1^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	8.9 (1.5)	$F(2, 5970)=9.5^{***}; \eta^2=.003$	8.1 (1.8)	$F(2, 5969)=9.5^{***}; \eta^2=.006$	8.8 (1.7)	$F(2, 5969)=1.6; \eta^2=.001$
< 18 years-old	8.1 (1.7)		8.7 (1.7)		7.8 (2.0)		8.6 (1.7)	
No children	8.1 (1.7)		8.7 (1.7)		7.8 (2.0)		8.7 (1.7)	
Medical diagnosis								
None	8.1 (1.7)	$t(5971)=-3.8^{***}; d=-.11$	8.7 (1.7)	$t(5971)=-1.5; d=-.08$	7.8 (2.0)	$t(5970)=-3.0^{**}; d=-.08$	8.6 (1.7)	$t(5970)=-1.9^{*}; d=-.05$
One or more	8.3 (1.6)		8.8 (1.6)		8.0 (1.9)		8.7 (1.6)	

Notes: Bolds indicate meaningful effect size ($d \geq .2$ or $\eta^2 \geq .01$).

Abbreviation: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease.

Table 4*Between-group differences in responses to the items of the questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19 and sociodemographic characteristics (N=5974).*

Variables	COVID-19 items							
	5. Information seeking		6. Trust in information		7. Respondent becoming infected		8. Family member becoming infected	
	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference
Gender								
Men	7.7 (2.2)		7.1 (2.3)		8.3 (2.2)		8.8 (1.9)	
Women	7.9 (2.1)	$t(5970)=-2.3^*$; $d=-.06$	7.2 (2.2)	$t(5970)=-.8$; $d=-.02$	8.5 (2.0)	$t(5970)=-4.6^{***}$; $d=-.12$	9.1 (1.6)	$t(5956)=-5.8^{***}$; $d=-.15$
Education								
No degree	6.5 (3.0)		6.3 (3.1)		7.3 (3.0)		7.5 (2.9)	
Elementary	7.4 (2.2)		7.0 (2.2)		8.1 (2.2)		8.4 (2.0)	
Middle school	7.4 (2.4)		7.0 (2.3)		8.2 (2.2)		8.7 (2.0)	
High school	7.6 (2.2)	$F(7, 5964)=22.2^{***}$; $\eta^2=.02$	7.1 (2.2)	$F(7, 5964)=2.9^{**}$; $\eta^2=.004$	8.4 (2.1)	$F(7, 5964)=4.9^{***}$; $\eta^2=.006$	9.0 (1.7)	$F(7, 5950)=18.2^{***}$; $\eta^2=.02$
Technical degree	7.9 (2.2)		7.2 (2.3)		8.6 (2.1)		9.0 (1.8)	
College	8.1 (2.0)		7.3 (2.2)		8.5 (2.0)		9.1 (1.6)	
Masters/Specialty	8.4 (1.9)		7.2 (2.3)		8.5 (2.1)		9.3 (1.5)	
Doctorate	8.9 (1.6)		7.6 (2.3)		9.1 (1.3)		9.7 (.6)	
Relationship status								
Single	7.7 (2.3)		7.1 (2.3)		8.2 (2.3)		9.0 (1.8)	
Married	8.0 (2.0)		7.3 (2.2)		8.6 (2.0)		9.0 (1.7)	
Free union	7.6 (2.3)	$F(4, 5967)=6.2^{***}$; $\eta^2=.004$	7.1 (2.3)	$F(4, 5967)=3.5^{**}$; $\eta^2=.002$	8.4 (2.2)	$F(4, 5967)=6.9^{***}$; $\eta^2=.005$	8.9 (1.8)	$F(4, 5993)=.8^*$; $\eta^2=.001$
Divorced/Separated	7.8 (2.2)		7.3 (2.2)		8.5 (2.0)		9.0 (1.7)	
Widowed	8.0 (2.4)		7.3 (2.3)		8.4 (2.4)		8.7 (2.2)	
Occupation								
Unemployed	7.6 (2.3)		6.9 (2.5)		8.4 (2.1)		8.9 (1.9)	
Retired	8.4 (1.7)	$F(4, 5967)=10.8^{***}$; $\eta^2=.007$	7.5 (2.1)	$F(4, 5967)=6.5^{***}$; $\eta^2=.004$	8.7 (1.6)	$F(4, 5967)=3.4^{**}$; $\eta^2=.002$	9.2 (1.1)	$F(4, 5953)=2.4^*$; $\eta^2=.002$
Student	7.4 (2.3)		7.0 (2.3)		8.1 (2.4)		9.0 (1.7)	
Employed	8.0 (2.1)		7.3 (2.2)		8.5 (2.1)		9.0 (1.7)	
Home	7.7 (2.1)		7.1 (2.2)		8.5 (2.1)		8.9 (1.8)	
Children								
≥ 18 years-old	8.2 (2.0)	$F(2, 5969)=22.0^{***}$; $\eta^2=.007$	7.4 (2.2)	$F(2, 5969)=11.3^{***}$; $\eta^2=.004$	8.5 (2.1)	$F(2, 5969)=19.2^{***}$; $\eta^2=.006$	9.0 (1.7)	$F(2, 5955)=.5$; $\eta^2=.000$
< 18 years-old	7.7 (2.2)		7.2 (2.2)		8.5 (2.0)		9.0 (1.7)	
No children	7.7 (2.2)		7.0 (2.3)		8.2 (2.3)		8.9 (1.8)	
Medical diagnosis								
None	7.8 (2.2)		7.1 (2.3)		8.3 (2.2)		8.9 (1.8)	
One or more	8.0 (2.1)	$t(5970)=-4.3^{***}$; $d=-.12$	7.3 (2.2)	$t(5970)=-2.1$; $d=-.06$	8.8 (1.9)	$t(5970)=-7.5^{***}$; $d=-.21$	9.2 (1.6)	$t(5956)=-5.1^{***}$; $d=-.14$

Notes: Bolds indicate meaningful effect size ($d \geq .2$ or $\eta^2 \geq .01$).

Abbreviation: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease.

Table 4*Between-group differences in responses to the items of the questionnaire of concerns about COVID-19 and sociodemographic characteristics (N=5974).*

Variables	COVID-19 items							
	9. Financial situation		10. Security situation		11. Daily-life impairment		12. Awareness of a family member	
	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference
Gender								
Men	9.0 (1.7)	$t(5970)=-6.1^{***}; d=-.16$	8.6 (1.9)	$t(5970)=-8.5; d=-.22$	8.4 (1.9)	$t(5970)=-2.7^{**}; d=-.07$	7.9 (2.2)	$t(5959)=-.58; d=-.01$
Women	9.2 (1.4)		9.0 (1.5)		8.5 (1.8)		7.9 (2.3)	
Education								
No degree	8.4 (2.4)	$F(7, 5964)=8.7^{***}; \eta^2=.01$	8.1 (2.5)	$F(7, 5964)=2.9^{**}; \eta^2=.004$	8.000 (2.4)	$F(7, 5964)=5.9^{***}; \eta^2=.007$	7.7 (2.4)	$F(7, 5963)=16.2^{***}; \eta^2=.01$
Elementary	8.6 (1.8)		8.2 (1.9)		7.967 (2.1)		7.2 (2.5)	
Middle school	9.1 (1.5)		8.8 (1.7)		8.622 (1.8)		7.3 (2.5)	
High school	9.2 (1.4)		8.8 (1.6)		8.579 (1.8)		7.9 (2.2)	
Technical degree	9.3 (1.4)		9.0 (1.6)		8.661 (1.7)		8.0 (2.2)	
College	9.1 (1.5)		8.9 (1.7)		8.473 (1.8)		8.1 (2.2)	
Masters/Specialty	9.1 (1.6)		8.9 (1.7)		8.507 (1.8)		8.2 (2.2)	
Doctorate	8.5 (1.9)		9.2 (1.3)		8.297 (1.9)		8.9 (1.7)	
Relationship status								
Single	9.0 (1.6)	$F(4, 5967)=1.9; \eta^2=.001$	8.8 (1.8)	$F(4, 5967)=1.3; \eta^2=.002$	8.3 (2.0)	$F(4, 5967)=4.6^{***}; \eta^2=.003$	7.9 (2.3)	$F(4, 5966)=2.4^*; \eta^2=.002$
Married	9.1 (1.5)		8.9 (1.6)		8.5 (1.8)		7.9 (2.2)	
Free union	9.2 (1.4)		8.9 (1.7)		8.6 (1.8)		7.7 (2.4)	
Divorced/Separated	9.2 (1.5)		9.0 (1.6)		8.6 (1.8)		7.8 (2.3)	
Widowed	9.1 (1.8)		8.9 (1.9)		8.8 (1.8)		7.8 (2.6)	
Occupation								
Unemployed	9.4 (1.3)	$F(4, 5967)=5.4^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	8.9 (1.7)	$F(4, 5967)=2.0; \eta^2=.001$	8.9 (1.7)	$F(4, 5967)=10.0^{***}; \eta^2=.007$	7.5 (2.5)	$F(4, 5966)=8.8^{***}; \eta^2=.006$
Retired	8.9 (1.3)		8.8 (1.6)		8.4 (2.0)		8.4 (2.1)	
Student	9.0 (1.7)		8.7 (1.9)		8.4 (1.9)		8.0 (2.3)	
Employed	9.1 (1.6)		8.9 (1.7)		8.4 (1.8)		8.0 (2.2)	
Home	9.1 (1.5)		8.8 (1.6)		8.5 (1.8)		7.7 (2.4)	
Children								
≥ 18 years-old	9.1 (1.5)	$F(2, 5969)=18.4^{***}; \eta^2=.006$	9.0 (1.6)	$F(2, 5969)=18.9^{***}; \eta^2=.006$	8.6 (1.7)	$F(2, 5969)=25.1^{***}; \eta^2=.008$	8.1 (2.2)	$F(2, 5968)=11.7^{***}; \eta^2=.004$
< 18 years-old	9.2 (1.4)		8.9 (1.6)		8.6 (1.8)		7.7 (2.4)	
No children	8.9 (1.8)		8.6 (1.9)		8.2 (2.0)		7.9 (2.3)	
Medical diagnosis								
None	9.1 (1.6)	$t(5970)=-1.6; d=-.04$	8.8 (1.7)	$t(5970)=-3.5^{***}; d=-.10$	8.4 (1.9)	$t(5970)=-3.8^{***}; d=-.11$	7.8 (2.3)	$t(5969)=-1.3; d=-.03$
One or more	9.2 (1.5)		9.0 (1.6)		8.6 (1.7)		7.9 (2.3)	

Notes: Bolds indicate meaningful effect size ($d \geq .2$ or $\eta^2 \geq .01$).

Abbreviation: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease.

Table 5*Between-group differences between psychological distress and sociodemographic characteristics (N=5974).*

Variables	Scales					
	IES-6		PHQ-9		GAD-7	
	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference	Mean (SD)	Difference
Gender						
Men	8.1 (5.0)	$t(5972)=-11.3^{***}; d=-.30$	3.9 (4.8)	$t(5972)=-10.8^{***}; d=-.28$	3.1 (4.0)	$t(5972)=-12.5^{***}; d=-.33$
Women	9.6 (4.9)		5.4 (5.5)		4.6 (4.8)	
Education						
No degree	5.9 (5.0)	$F(7, 5966)=27.1^{***}; \eta^2=.03$	3.5 (4.8)	$F(7, 5966)=5.2^{***}; \eta^2=.006$	2.9 (3.4)	$F(7, 5966)=5.2^{***}; \eta^2=.006$
Elementary	6.6 (4.7)		3.6 (4.4)		2.8 (3.5)	
Middle school	8.4 (5.2)		4.6 (5.4)		3.9 (4.5)	
High school	8.6 (5.0)		4.8 (5.5)		4.0 (4.7)	
Technical degree	9.3 (4.8)		4.8 (5.0)		4.1 (4.6)	
College	9.5 (4.7)		5.1 (5.2)		4.2 (4.6)	
Masters/Specialty	10.6 (4.8)		5.6 (5.3)		4.6 (4.6)	
Doctorate	10.7 (5.2)		5.5 (5.3)		4.8 (5.0)	
Relationship status						
Single	8.7 (5.1)	$F(4, 5969)=5.7^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	5.5 (5.6)	$F(4, 5969)=13.7^{***}; \eta^2=.009$	4.4 (4.9)	$F(4, 5969)=3.6^{***}; \eta^2=.002$
Married	9.2 (4.9)		4.4 (5.0)		3.8 (4.4)	
Free union	8.7 (4.8)		4.7 (5.2)		4.0 (4.5)	
Divorced/Separated	9.7 (4.7)		5.2 (5.3)		4.0 (4.2)	
Widowed	9.5 (5.5)		4.6 (5.4)		4.1 (4.7)	
Occupation						
Unemployed	9.4 (5.3)	$F(, 5969)=4.9^{***}; \eta^2=.003$	6.0 (6.1)	$F(4, 5969)=27.1^{***}; \eta^2=.01$	4.9 (5.2)	$F(4, 5969)=15.8^{***}; \eta^2=.01$
Retired	8.1 (5.5)		5.0 (6.0)		3.5 (4.8)	
Student	8.2 (4.8)		6.7 (5.9)		5.0 (5.1)	
Employed	9.1 (4.9)		4.5 (5.0)		3.7 (4.3)	
Home	8.8 (4.9)		4.7 (5.2)		4.1 (4.5)	
Children						
≥ 18 years-old	9.4 (4.9)	$F(2, 5971)=16.4^{***}; \eta^2=.005$	4.5 (5.3)	$F(2, 5971)=12.4^{***}; \eta^2=.004$	3.8 (4.5)	$F(2, 5971)=2.8; \eta^2=.001$
< 18 years-old	9.2 (4.9)		4.7 (5.1)		4.0 (4.5)	
No children	8.4 (5.1)		5.4 (5.5)		4.2 (4.7)	
Medical diagnosis						
None	8.5 (4.9)	$t(5972)=-13.7^{***}; d=-.39$	4.4 (5.0)	$t(5972)=-11.62; d=-.33$	3.6 (4.3)	$t(5970)=-11.6^{**}; d=-.33$
One or more	10.4 (4.9)		6.1 (5.7)		5.1 (4.9)	

Notes: Bolds indicate meaningful effect size ($d \geq .2$ or $\eta^2 \geq .01$).*Abbreviation:* COVID-19 = coronavirus disease; GAD-7 = General Anxiety Disorder-7; IES-6 = Impact of Event Scale-6; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9.