

Online support groups: an overlooked resource for patients

Henry W W Potts

Lecturer, Centre for Health Informatics and Multiprofessional Education (CHIME), University College London

h.potts@chime.ucl.ac.uk

Online support groups: history, research, and sources

The Internet has enabled people to interact in new ways. 'Virtual communities' long predate the World Wide Web and online support groups exist in huge numbers, yet they are little researched.

History

Computer-based virtual communities allowing many-to-many communication date back to at least 1971 and their implementation on the Internet (or ARPANET as it then was) dates back to somewhere between 1971 and 1973.^{1,2} The idea was invented multiple times and emerged in many forms. Communication can either be synchronous or asynchronous. An example of synchronous communication is a chat room where multiple users can log on, the messages they type appearing in real time. The commonest asynchronous form is the email list: individuals send emails to a common address, which are automatically forwarded to everybody on a list. The favoured technology for online groups has changed over the years. By the late 1980s, email lists (using software like **LISTSERV**) and **Usenet** were dominant. The end of the 1990s saw a new generation of email lists with easy-to-use Web-based controls, like the popular **Yahoo!Groups** <<http://groups.yahoo.com/>>. Meanwhile, Web-based discussion boards have led to a resurgence in online groups. A 2001 US survey found that 84% of Internet users had contacted an online group.³ Commercial Web sites see the value of establishing online groups these

days.⁴ Online groups are central to Internet use.

Online support groups (OSGs)

Online support groups (OSGs) date back to at least 1982 and possibly the late 1970s.⁵ So, what is an OSG? For this article, I am defining them as online communities for those affected by a common problem, in particular those related to health or social circumstances. They involve mutual support and information provision (and the two can be inseparable). Compared to the use of Web sites, research on OSGs has lagged behind, despite the fact they are very numerous. Yahoo!Groups lists almost 25,000 support groups, although this may represent only 7000 active groups,⁶ and there are many other sources of OSGs. The aforementioned US survey found that 28% of Internet users had contacted an OSG,³ a figure that has grown since.⁷

Key advantages of OSGs are that they are informative, specific, flexible, and disinhibited.

OSGs are hugely diverse. Some are connected to organisations, many have an independent existence. Most are set up by individuals with problems rather than by health-care professionals (HCPs), which means that what they cover and who they are for is defined by the users, not the clinicians. OSGs exist for everything from alcoholism to Zollinger-Ellison syndrome and cover a range of issues beyond medical conditions (e.g. parenting, bereavement, victims of professional

misconduct). There are OSGs set up for particular social groups with problems (e.g. lesbians with breast cancer <<http://health.groups.yahoo.com/group/LBCKIT/>>, Jewish individuals with alcoholism or drug dependency <www.jacsweb.org/Join_us/discussion_list.html>). There are OSGs for carers as well as those directly affected by ill health (e.g. families and carers of children with Wolf-Hirschhorn syndrome <www.4p-supportgroup.org>).

Research evidence for benefits of OSGs

OSGs are much used, but are they useful? Systematic reviews suggest they are, although the lack of research is a common theme.⁸⁻¹⁰ Research is also biased in what groups it covers, tending to concentrate on groups set up by the researchers or HCPs. So in what way are OSGs useful? Key advantages of OSGs are that they are informative, specific, flexible, and disinhibited. OSGs have many of the same advantages and disadvantages as face-to-face groups: they bring together people with common experiences and allow them to share mutual support and information. They can share the sort of practical knowledge that HCPs can overlook. The commonality or specificity of the group is important both in terms of information being relevant and in terms of support, knowing others have gone or are going through the same experiences and allowing individuals to put their experiences in context. A difference with online groups is that they can be more specific than face-to-face groups as they have a potential world-wide

reach. Your local hospital may have a face-to-face breast cancer support group, but there will not be enough affected people locally for a Wolf-Hirschhorn syndrome group or a group just for lesbians with breast cancer. Moreover, once you have an Internet connection, OSGs can be more flexible and easier to access, not restricted to certain times and places.

Online communication is also known to be disinhibited.¹¹ The nature of online communication, the absence of social cues, the perceived intimacy and anonymity, mean that people may be less inhibited in their online behaviour. This may be a positive thing in the context of a support group, helping people to discuss difficult issues, overcoming problems of embarrassment.¹² Disinhibition, however, is seen as problematic in many online communities when it leads to 'flaming' (deliberately provocative or insulting posts). This can be a problem in OSGs,¹² although it seems less frequent. 'Spamming', unsolicited commercial messages, are another problem for many virtual communities. Note that most English-language groups are predominantly American and UK users can experience a culture shock.

A key use of OSGs identified by participants and researchers is the sharing of information and the quality of that information is probably the biggest concern for HCPs. Many early studies looked at the content of messages in OSGs, but this approach may be misleading. What matters is the effect that participation in the group has on the individual.¹³ We need to move away

We need to move away from considering single messages and look at the larger conversation. We need to understand the use of personal experiences rather than an evidence-based approach.

from considering single messages and look at the larger conversation. We need to understand the use of personal experiences rather than an evidence-based approach. While there is much mutual information sharing in OSGs, these groups also impact on how individuals use information. They can help people learn how to find and use

information: for example, users swap Web sites and discuss Web sites. They may also impact on individuals' underlying **illness representations**. (An illness representation is a person's understanding of, usually, their own illness, which has in many cases been shown to have a major impact on self-management.¹⁴)

The study of what makes a good information source and how we can identify it as such is well advanced. So, **what makes a good OSG and how can we identify one?** At present, it is hard to be prescriptive. There is a literature on what makes a good online group: Preece⁴ talks about the dual importance of sociability (how the online group works in terms of its social interaction) and usability (ease of use and functionality of the enabling technology). These issues are

For this article, I am defining OSGs as online communities for those affected by a common problem, in particular those related to health or social circumstances. They involve mutual support and information provision (and the two can be inseparable).

pertinent to OSGs too, but they do not address issues around information quality or use. A group may be lively and easy to use, but contain misinformation.

I suggest that the OSGs that should raise most concern are those with **illness representations very at odds with orthodox medicine** as happens with, for example, certain groups for functional disorders (like chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia) or alternative medicine. Other examples are

groups that promote or sanction behaviours that are more usually seen as psychopathological. Suicide groups have attracted much media attention.^{15,16} A pro-anorexia group¹⁷ like **Project Shapeshift** <www.plagueangel.net/psboard> may meet all the right criteria for sociability and usability, but we would see its ethos, to promote

anorexia nervosa 'as a lifestyle and a choice' to be harmful. However, such groups may not be as bad as they seem. Anecdotally, some 'pro-suicide' online groups are helpful to those with suicidal ideation and, in practice, actually discourage suicide.

Finding OSGs

OSGs appear valuable in terms of support and information; users report being better informed. However, they present a very different paradigm: instead of users accessing a (hopefully) reliable source of information presented in an ideal way, we have peer-to-peer communication, sharing information haphazardly, often based on personal experience, but offering information that can be more tailored and more practical. There can also be a group dynamic in how

people interpret and share information that is different from individuals acting on their own. Within that context, with its various caveats, it does seem worth recommending OSGs to patients and carers. Unfortunately, finding OSGs is not a simple task. There is no single, central database and OSGs are spread over multiple technologies (Web, email, Usenet, other bulletin board systems). It is possible to run an email list from a home computer, so some groups are only ever known of through word-of-mouth.

However, here are some suggestions for where to look. There are a number of major providers. I have mentioned **Yahoo!Groups** above: <http://health.dir.groups.yahoo.com/dir/Health_Wellness/Support> lists support groups. Another provider, **Topica**, has a list of support groups at <<http://lists.topica.com/dir/?cid=2460>>, while still others are **DelphiForums** <www.delphiforums.com>, **MSN Groups** <<http://groups.msn.com>> and **AOL Groups** <<http://groups.aol.com/>>. All these have directory structures,

He@lth Information on the Internet

generally with some sort of 'Health' category, and search facilities. I find a belt-and-braces approach is best as directories may be incomplete and directory placement user-defined, while finding the right search terms is difficult and the text on which searches are made may be short. **CataList** <www.lsoft.com/catalist.html> lists the 54,114 public LISTSERV email lists (as of 18/02/05); one then needs to perform a search.

Switching technology, if you are familiar with **Usenet**, browse the alt.support.* hierarchy or use **Google's Web interface** <<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/alt.support>>.

Many OSGs will have an associated Web site, others are Web-based fora. These will show up in Web searches. However, finding an OSG rather than any other Web site about a condition can be difficult as there is no consistent terminology for support groups. 'Support', 'group', 'chat' and 'discussion' are all worth trying as search terms. Voluntary organisations often offer some sort of online peer support, so their Web sites can be a good starting place.

There are a number of attempts at general directories of OSGs, but they include only a tiny proportion of existing groups. Condition-specific directories are better, although again rarely comprehensive. **MoSt GeNe** offers a directory of OSGs for genetic conditions, <www.mostgene.org/support>. The **Congenital Heart Information Network** offers a list of relevant OSGs at <www.tchin.org/support>. A University of Sydney study has a useful list of **depression groups**, <www2.fhs.usyd.edu.au/arow/isd/Resources/online_support_groups.htm>. Within **cancer**, **ACOR** <www.acor.org> is a provider of LISTSERV mailing lists for cancer-related groups with an extensive directory. I am not aware of any directory with a formal system for assessing the quality of OSGs.

CONCLUSIONS

While they have great potential, given the uncertainty about what makes a good OSG, it is best to forewarn patients and carers of their limitations. As with Web sites, look

to see who sponsors the group, although with most being privately run by individuals, this is not necessarily informative. Some OSGs have archives that can be viewed publicly, which can give you an idea of their content. However, do not be surprised if your patients are already using online support groups!

References

[All accessed 18/02/05]

1. Hardy IR. The evolution of ARPANET email. UC Berkeley thesis, 1996 <www.ifla.org/documents/internet/hari1.txt>.
2. Woolley DR. PLATO: The emergence of online community. 1994 <<http://thinkofit.com/plato/dwplato.htm>>.
3. Horrigan J. Online communities: networks that nurture long-distance relationships and local ties. Washington DC, Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2001 <www.pewinternet.org/PPF/r/47/report_display.asp>.
4. Preece J. *Online communities: designing usability, supporting sociability*. Chichester, UK, Wiley, 2000.
5. Ainsworth M. E-therapy: History and survey. <www.metanoia.org/imhs/history.htm>.
6. Potts HWW *et al*. The variety of internet support groups for those affected by cancer. Electronic response to: Eysenbach G *et al*. Health related virtual communities and electronic support groups: systematic review of the effects of online peer to peer interactions. *BMJ Rapid Responses*, 2004 <<http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/eletters/328/7449/1166#62587>>.
7. Fox S, Fallows D. Internet health resources. Washington DC, Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2003 <www.pewinternet.org/PPF/r/95/report_display.asp>.
8. Eysenbach G *et al*. Health related virtual communities and electronic support groups: systematic review of the effects of online peer to peer interactions. *BMJ* 2004; **328**:1166 <<http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/full/328/7449/1166>>.
9. Valaitis R *et al*. Electronic social support groups to improve health. Toronto, PHRED Program, Public Health Branch, Ontario Ministry of Health, 2000 <www.city.hamilton.on.ca/PHCS/EPHPP/Research/Summary/OnlineSupport.pdf>.
10. Klemm P *et al*. Online cancer support groups: a review of the literature. *Computers, Informatics, Nursing* 2003; **21**: 136–142.
11. Joinson A. Causes and effects of disinhibition on the Internet. In: Gackenbach J. (ed) *The Psychology of the Internet*. New York: Academic Press, 1998; 43–60.
12. Eysenbach G. The impact of the Internet

- on cancer outcomes. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians* 2003; **53**: 356–371.
13. Ferguson T. The Robert Wood Johnson Online Health Project: What kinds of online health research are really needed? *The Ferguson Report* 2002 (8) <www.fergusonreport.com/articles/fr00802.htm>.
14. Cameron LD *et al*. *The self-regulation of health and illness behaviour*. Reading, UK: Harwood, 2004.
15. Lewis L. Internet suicide pacts shock Japan. *The Times* 13 Oct 2004, 15.
16. *Chatting to Death*. 2003. Produced and directed by Durrance, Zizi. ZKK Limited for Channel 4.
17. Davies P *et al*. Ana's gone surfing. *Psychologist* 2003; **16**: 424–425.

Editorial Board

- Betsy **Anagnostelis**, Librarian, Royal Free Hospital Medical Library, University College London, London
- Harry **Brown**, General Practitioner, Leeds
- Nancy **Brown**, Project Director, Telemedicine Research Centre, Portland, Oregon, USA
- Tim **David**, Professor of Child Health and Paediatrics, University of Manchester
- Julie **Glanville**, Information Services Manager, NHS Centre for Reviews & Dissemination, York
- Alastair **Hutchison**, Consultant in Nephrology and General Medicine, Manchester
- Robert **Kiley**, Head of Systems Strategy (Library), Wellcome Trust, London
- Carol **Lefebvre**, Information Specialist, Oxford
- Joel **Newman**, PRHO, William Harvey Hospital, Ashford, Kent
- Ahmad **Risk**, GP and Chairman of British Healthcare Internet Association
- Ben **Toth**, Head of Knowledge Management, NHS Information Authority
- Rod **Ward**, Senior Lecturer in Health & Social Care, University of the West of England
- Richard **Wootton**, Professor of Online Health, University of Queensland, Australia
- Jeremy **Wyatt**, School of Public Policy, University College London