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Abstract

Background: A wide range of evidence has shown that healthcare workers, currently on the frontlines in the fight against COVID-19, are not spared from the psychological and mental health-related consequences of the pandemic. Studies synthesizing the role of coping behaviours, psychological resilience, and social support in safeguarding the mental health of HCWs during the pandemic is largely unknown.

Aim(s): To appraise and synthesize studies examining psychological resilience, coping behaviours, and social support among healthcare workers (HWCs) during the coronavirus pandemic.

Design: This is a systematic review with a narrative synthesis.

Method: Using articles from PubMed, CINAHL, SCOPUS, MEDLINE and PsychINFO, a total of 31 articles were included in the review. Reporting followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta- Analyses statement guidelines.

Results: Healthcare workers were found to have moderate to high levels of psychological resilience and utilized both problem-centred coping (e.g., use of social support, praying) and...
emotion-centred coping (e.g., use of diversionary activities) to manage the stress-associated with the coronavirus pandemic. Coping behaviours, psychological resilience, and social support were associated with positive mental and psychological health outcomes.

**Conclusion:** Substantial evidence supports the effectiveness of coping behaviours, psychological resilience, and social support to preserve psychological and mental health among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Relevance to Practice:** In order to safeguard the mental health and well-being of HCWs during the pandemic, hospital and nursing administrators should focus on building coping skills, psychological resilience, and social support in HWCs through innovative and theory-based interventions, supportive leadership, and fostering a resilient work environment.
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**Introduction**

The COVID-19 pandemic is an urgent health concern worldwide that greatly affects the mental health, well-being, and possibly work effectiveness of healthcare workers (HCWs). The pandemic has placed increased demands on healthcare workers due to an influx of COVID-19 patients, a shortage of trained healthcare professionals, and limited hospital resources (McMahon *et al.*, 2020). These factors could potentially affect their mental, emotional, and psychological health and well-being (Alharbi *et al.*, 2020). Hospital administrators should pay attention to the mental well-being of HCWs as poorer mental health may put them at greater risk for PTSD and even suicide (Reger *et al.*, 2020).
Mounting evidence indicates that HCWs have suffered a deterioration in their mental and psychological health during the coronavirus pandemic, with reports from individual and review studies showing higher prevalence rates of anxiety, burnout, depression, PTSD, and psychological distress among HCWs compared to the general public (Chew et al., 2020; Shechter et al., 2020). In a systematic meta-analysis by Serrano-Ripoll et al., (2020) the pooled prevalence rate of stress among HCWs during the pandemic was 40%; furthermore, 30% of HCWs in the pooled analysis had anxiety, 28% experienced burnout, 24% had depression, and 13% had post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Factors known to contribute to poorer mental health were categorized into sociodemographic factors and organizational factors. Sociodemographic factors included younger age (Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020), female sex (Sahin et al., 2020; Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020), being in the nursing profession (Vizhen et al., 2020; Shaukat et al., 2020), a history of psychiatric illness, and a history of requiring psychiatric support (Sahin et al., 2020). Organizational factors that contributed to poorer mental health included assignment in high-risk units or wards, absence of structured trainings or updates related to coronavirus, and inadequate supplies and equipment needed to protect against the infection (Vizhen et al., 2020; Alshekaili et al., 2020).

Coping behaviours and psychological resilience have been identified as important strategies to facilitate an individual’s ability to positively rebound and adapt to stressful situations, hardship, traumatic events, and adversity in order to maintain optimal mental and psychological health (Hart, Brannan, & De Chesnay, 2014). Evidence suggests that during stressful events (including disasters, calamities, and disease outbreak), individuals are more likely to suffer adverse mental and psychological consequences when they are not equipped with sufficient levels of resilience and coping abilities (Labrague et al., 2018; Duncan, 2020). Support
from peers, colleagues, family, and friends has also been shown to help individuals sustain emotional balance in the face of threats and stress-inducing events (Langford et al., 1997). A wide range of studies have reported an association between higher social support and improved health and well-being among nurses and other healthcare workers during emergency situations and other disaster events (Labrague et al., 2018). Earlier studies conducted during other infectious disease outbreaks such as SARS, Ebola, and MERS-CoV identified a protective role for psychological resilience, coping behaviours, and social support in HCWs against the psychological and mental health burden of caring for infected patients (Bloom et al., Baduge et al., 2018). Meanwhile, studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic have shown a similar pattern: psychological resilience, coping behaviours, and social support safeguard mental health and well-being among healthcare workers who are on the frontlines of the fights against this deadly virus (Labrague & De los Santos, 2020; Blanco-Donoso et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020).

Despite the abundance of empirical studies on the topic, no studies have systematically synthesized and integrated the results. A broader perspective on the topic of protective factors for psychological and mental health among HCWs is vital for the formulation of effective organizational strategies to better support the mental health of HCWs on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, this systematic review was conducted to synthesize and integrate evidence pertaining to healthcare workers’ psychological resilience, coping behaviours, and social support during the coronavirus pandemic.
Methods

Design

This is a systematic review with a narrative synthesis with results reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) protocol.

Data Sources and Search Strategies

Relevant studies were identified through electronic database searches using PubMed, CINAHL, SCOPUS, MEDLINE, and PsychINFO from August 2020 to October 2020. The following MeSH and search terms (‘psychological resilience’, ‘psychological adaptation’ OR ‘coping’, ‘mental health’, ‘health personnel’ OR ‘healthcare workers’, ‘social support’, and ‘2019-nCoV’ OR ‘COVID-19’ OR ‘SARS-CoV-2’ OR ‘severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2’) were used individually and in combination using Boolean operators (AND, OR and NOT). In addition, cited literature in the articles reviewed were also checked for potentially relevant studies (Figure 1).

Inclusion Criteria

This review included primary studies assessing psychological resilience, coping, and social support among healthcare professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. The inclusion criteria were as follows: study participants were healthcare workers, study was peer-reviewed, published since the onset of the pandemic, and published in the English language. In this review, healthcare workers are defined as people who work in healthcare settings to provide healthcare services to patients – including doctors, nurses, midwives, nursing assistants, radiologists, physiotherapists, pharmacists, healthcare assistants, and psychologists. Only studies with
quantitative designs were included in this review to facilitate homogeneity of the included papers.

Search Outcomes

The initial search yielded 478 articles. One hundred eighteen articles remained after screening titles and abstracts based on the inclusion criteria. After full text reading of the articles, a total of 31 articles were deemed relevant to the review (Figure 1).

Appraisal of Methodological Quality

Two independent researchers appraised the quality of the articles using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies in order to avoid selection bias. The JBI appraisal checklist consisted of eight items examining inclusion criteria, subjects and settings, measurement exposure, use of objective and standard criteria for measurement conditions, confounding variables, management of confounding variables, outcomes measurement, and data analysis. Studies that fulfilled at least five assessment criteria were included in the review. After quality appraisal, thirty-one studies were included in this review.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Extraction and appraisal of data was completed by two independent researchers. Using a data matrix template, the following data were extracted from the studies: authors, year of publication, country, research approach, samples, measures, key findings, and quality score (Table 1). Due to heterogeneity in the scales used and in the findings of the included studies, statistical pooling was not possible. As such, we used a narrative synthesis to describe the
findings. In particular, constant comparison analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was performed to compare findings across studies and to identify patterns and commonalities between studies.

**Study Characteristics**

Thirty-one articles were included in the review. A majority of studies were conducted in China (14), with the remaining studies conducted in Italy (5), Philippines (2), the United States (2), Turkey (2), Spain (2), Israel (1), Palestine (1), Pakistan (1), and Egypt (1). Sample sizes ranged from 10 to 4,618 participants. Most of the HCWs included in the studies were nurses, doctors, nursing assistants, midwives, radiologists, physiotherapists, pharmacists, healthcare assistants, or psychologists.

Most studies had a cross-sectional research design (n = 30), mostly using online surveys, and one study had longitudinal research design. Most studies utilized standardized scales to measure psychological resilience, coping skills, and social support in HCWs. Six studies utilized research-designed questionnaires/items to identify coping skills in HCWs. The Cronbach’s alphas ranged from 0.81 to 0.96 in studies that reported internal consistency.

**Methodological Quality Score**

Using the JBI critical appraisal checklist, the majority of the studies were rated as moderate in quality (26/31) and five were rated high. Issues related to identification of potential confounding variables and how these confounders were managed and controlled were common in the included articles.
Major Findings

Study results were classified into the following categories: (1) levels of resilience and coping, (2) specific coping skills, (3) coping in relation to mental health, (4) resilience in relation to mental health, and (5) social support in relation to mental health.

Levels of Psychological Resilience and Coping

Six studies reported data on level of psychological resilience (Bozdag & Ergun, 2020; Huang et al., 2020a; Huang et al., 2020b; Khalaf et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020a) and three studies described level of coping behaviours in HCWs (Lin et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020). High levels of psychological resilience were reported in three studies (Bozdag & Ergun, 2020; Huang et al., 2020a; Lin et al., 2020) and moderate levels of psychological resilience were reported in four studies (Luceno-Moreno et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020b; Khalaf et al., 2020; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020a). In one cross-sectional study of HCWs assigned to radiology units in China, online survey data indicated that 83.8% of participants reported higher psychological resilience (Huang et al., 2020a). Similarly, a study by Lin et al. (2020) reported high levels of resilience in Chinese HCWs; however, among them, nurses were found to have lower resilience when compared to doctors and other medical staff. In a study from Turkey, HCWs scored 18.43 points out of a possible 30 points on the brief resilience scale (BRS), indicating a greater capability to rebound from the adversity associated with the coronavirus pandemic. On the other hand, four cross-sectional studies reported moderate levels of psychological resilience among physicians (Khalaf et al., 2020), medical staff (Huang et al., 2020b), and hospital nurses (Labrague & De los Santos, 2020a) who were on the frontlines during the pandemic. In another study, HCWs in Spain obtained a mean score of 3.02 on the
Brief Resilience Scale (BRS), indicating a moderate capacity to bounce back to a healthy state in the face of adversity (Luceno-Moreno et al., 2020).

With regards to coping mechanisms, three studies measured ways of coping among HCWs using the Simplified Coping Style Questionnaire (Lin et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020) and a researcher-designed coping behaviour scale (Mi et al., 2020). The three studies reported higher scores for positive vs. negative coping mechanisms, suggesting that when confronted with stress-inducing events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, HCWs are able to utilize positive coping mechanisms.

**Specific Coping Skills**

Fourteen studies identified specific coping mechanisms employed by HCWs during the pandemic (Blanco-Donoso et al., 2020; Cai, 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Giusti et al., 2020; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020; Maraqa et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Salman et al., 2020; Shechter et al., 2020; Vagni et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020). During the pandemic, HCWs utilized both negative and positive coping styles to manage stress.

Among these ten studies reporting specific coping styles among HCWs during the pandemic, eleven quantitative studies (Cai, 2020; Blanco-Donoso et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Giusti et al., 2020; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Maraqa et al., 2020; Vagni et al., 2020) indicated that HCWs use support from and communication with family, friends, and colleagues as their primary coping mechanisms to manage the adverse mental health consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. Religious coping mechanisms such as praying were reported as an important coping mechanism.
in three cross-sectional studies. For instance, in two separate studies involving HCWs in Pakistan (Salman et al., 2020) and Palestine (Maraqa et al., 2020), praying and other religious activities were the highest-ranked coping mechanisms. In the United States, where prevalence of COVID-19 is highest, frontline emergency healthcare workers identified religious coping mechanisms such as praying as one of the most important ways to combat the mental and psychological burden of the pandemic (Shechter et al., 2020).

Involvement in distraction activities (such as engaging in sports, exercise, music, yoga, or meditation) were also identified as an important coping mechanisms utilized by HCWs during the height of the pandemic (Shechter et al., 2020; Maraqa et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020). Other coping mechanisms identified by HCWs included learning about COVID-19 and its prevention (Chen et al., 2020; Cai, 2020) and adherence to infection control guidelines (Dong et al., 2020; Cai 2020; Maraqa et al., 2020).

Coping in Relation to Mental Health

Nine studies described the interaction between coping skills and mental health in HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic (Baboe et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020; Di Monte et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2020; Maiorano et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Vagni et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2020;). The use of positive coping mechanisms such as seeking social support, positive thinking, and problem solving were associated with lower levels of traumatic stress, stigma (Chew et al., 2020), psychological distress (Baboe et al., 2020), stress symptoms (Nie et al., 2020), anxiety, and depression (Zhu et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020). On the other hand, utilization of negative coping skills, such as avoidance, were strongly linked with increased levels of emotional stress (Chew et al., 2020), PTSD symptoms (Hou et al., 2020), psychological distress (Nei et al., 2020; Baboe et al., 2020), and fatigue (Hou et al., 2020). In one study, the use of
emotion-centred and avoidant coping styles were associated with increased levels of emotional
exhaustion, while problem-centred coping styles were strongly associated with decreased scores
on the depersonalization subscale and increased scores on the personal accomplishment subscale
of the MBI (Di Monte et al., 2020). Interestingly, unlike previous studies, a two separate studies
in Italy found that the use of a negative coping style – specifically, the blocking of unpleasant
emotions and thoughts – was found to effectively reduce psychological distress (Vagni et al.,
2020) and PTSD (Maiorano et al., 2020). Vagni et al. (2020) and Maiorano et al. (2020) both
argued that by blocking negative emotions, HCWs are able to continue their work and
experience lower perceived levels of stress.

**Resilience in Relation to Mental Health**

A number of papers examined the effects of psychological resilience on the mental health
of HCWs (12/31) (Di Monte et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020a; Khalaf et al., 2020; Labrague &
De los Santos, 2020a; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020b; Li et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020;
Lucero-Moreno et al., 2020; Maiorano et al., 2020; Mohave et al., 2020; Tam et al., 2020; Yoruk
& Guler, 2020). Of these, eight studies reported a protective role of psychological resilience
against coronavirus-related anxiety. Increased psychological resilience in HCWs was associated
with lower incidence of pandemic-related anxiety among nurses working in hospitals (Labrague
& De los Santos, 2020a) and public health centres (Labrague & De los Santos, 2020b). Results
obtained from Israel and Egypt showed a similar pattern in which lower levels of coronavirus-
related anxiety were associated with higher levels of resilience (Mosheva et al., 2020; Khalaf et
al., 2020). In two separate studies from China, HCWs with higher scores on psychological
resilience measures reported significantly lower levels of anxiety than those who obtained lower
scores on psychological resilience measures (Huang et al., 2020a; Lin et al., 2020). In a study
involving 720 healthcare workers in the United States, resilient participants were more likely than non-resilient participants to report reduced levels of anxiety, stress, fatigue, and insomnia (Huffman et al., 2020).

Four studies reported a strong link between personal resilience and depression (Luceno-Moreno et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Khalaf et al., 2020; Yoruk & Guler, 2020), suggesting that interventions to enhance resilience among HCWs may help prevent or reduce the occurrence of depression in this population during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to depression and anxiety, a few more studies confirmed the protective role of psychological resilience against psychological stress (Tam et al., 2020; Luceno-Moreno et al., 2020; Khalaf et al., 2020), emotional exhaustion (Di Monte et al., 2020), and PTSD symptoms (Maiorano et al., 2020; Lucero-Moreno et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020). In one study, resilience partially mediated the association between institutional support and coronavirus-related distress (Tam et al., 2020).

Social Support in Relation to Mental Health

Seven studies explored the causal relationship between social support and mental health outcomes in HCWs during the pandemic (Blanco-Donoso et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Giusti et al., 2020; Labrague & De los Santos, 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020). Mental health outcomes examined in relation to social support included traumatic stress, emotional distress, psychological distress, burnout, anxiety, and stress. Adequate managerial and supervisory support and support extended by colleagues, peers, friends, and family were associated with reduced levels of traumatic stress (Blanco-Donoso et al., 2020; Chew et al., 2020) and emotional distress (Dong et al., 2020).
In an online cross-sectional study involving nurses in China, higher perceptions of social support explained significant variance in the psychological distress measure (Nie et al., 2020), while in Italy, HCWs who perceived greater support from family and friends reported a significant reduction in burnout symptoms (Giusti et al., 2020). A study involving Filipino nurses showed a similar pattern: Frontline nurses who perceived higher social support were less likely to demonstrate dysfunctional anxiety related to the coronavirus (Labrague & De los Santos, 2020). In addition, adequate social support for HCWs was associated with a significant reduction in stress and an improvement in self-efficacy during the pandemic (Xiao et al., 2020).

**Discussion**

This systematic review is the first to examine psychological resilience, social support, and coping behaviours among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic and their effects on mental and psychological health. Thirty-one quantitative studies were included in this review. It is worth noting that most of the studies included in this review were conducted in China ($n = 14$), where the coronavirus originated, while very few studies involving HCWs from other countries were identified. With COVID-19 affecting all healthcare systems around the world, it is vital that more research be conducted to understand how HCWs from other parts of the world are able to cope with and adapt to the stress and demands of the pandemic. While cross-sectional research designs using online surveys may be the most practical way to collect data during the pandemic (given restrictions and social distancing protocols), future longitudinal studies will be vital to determining how mental health in HCWs changes over time. Coping and psychological resilience are both dynamic constructs which change, develop, and deteriorate with time (Hart, Brannan, & De Chesnay, 2014; Lazarus & Folkman 1987).
Despite the gap identified in the articles reviewed, this review found moderate to high levels of resilience among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychological resilience – that is, an individual’s ability to rebound from stressful situations like an emergency, disaster, or infectious disease outbreak – is critically important because it helps individuals effectively endure the adverse mental health consequences of stress-provoking events (Hart, Brannan, & De Chesnay, 2014). The protective role of psychological resilience in HCWs against various disaster/emergency-associated adverse mental health consequences has been well established in previous studies (Labrague et al., 2018; Duncan, 2020).

It was evident in this review that HCWs utilized both positive (e.g., use of social support and praying) and negative (e.g., use of distraction activities) coping strategies to effectively manage the stress associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. Seeking social support as a means of coping with adversity has been categorized as a problem-focused coping strategy (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987) and has been found to effectively reduce stress. Mounting evidence suggests that social support is an effective way to promote long-term reductions in the stress and anxiety caused by stressful events (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). The use of religious coping mechanisms – such as reading the Bible for Christians or reciting the Quran for Muslims – has been identified as an effective strategy to reduce stress, anxiety, and their adverse effects. As a coping strategy, prayer provides context, social connection, and inner strength, making an individual capable of managing stress more effectively. A substantial amount of studies have established a positive link between religious coping mechanisms and reduced anxiety, aggression, psychological distress, and depressive symptoms as well as enhanced optimism, hope, quality of life, and psychological health (Cain, 2019; Ramlee et al., 2016; Connor 2016; Achour et al., 2019). The use of distraction activities such as engaging in sports, exercise, music, yoga, and meditation (all
of which are categorized as emotion-focused coping strategies) only provides short-term stress-relief because it doesn’t address the main source of stress but rather reduces stress-associated symptoms and behavioural manifestations (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988).

In this review, psychological resilience, coping behaviours, and social support were demonstrated to protect HCWs against the adverse mental health consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. This result provided additional support for the value of positive coping mechanisms and the need for adequate resilience and social support to protect HCWs against the adverse impacts of threatening and demanding situations like the COVID-19 pandemic.

Support from peers, colleagues, managers, families, and friends is regarded as a vital resource for HCWs to adequately cope with various stressors in the workplace. During the pandemic, when stress and anxiety is elevated, the provision of adequate social support may help HCWs maintain healthy emotional states. Mounting evidence has strongly linked adequate support from managers, co-workers, family, and friends with positive mental health outcomes for both healthcare and non-healthcare professionals during stressful and traumatic events such as calamities, accidents, disasters, and disease outbreaks (Baduge et al., 2018; Labrague et al., 2018). This result confirms results from earlier studies in which lower levels of depression, anxiety, and stress were reported in healthcare workers who had greater perceived social support, suggesting that measures to foster increased social support may reduce negative psychological symptoms in HCWs (Hou et al., 2020).

Psychological resilience, like social support, has long been considered a protective factor against the adverse psychological effects of stressful or traumatic situations (Hart, Brannan, & De Chesnay, 2014). In the context of pandemic, a wide range of evidence has demonstrated that resilient HCWs are more likely to rebound effectively and endure the pandemic-associated
psychological burden than non-resilient HCWs (Foster et al., 2020). The role of psychological resilience in protecting individuals against the mental health consequences of an emergency or disaster situation has also been confirmed in previous studies (Labrague et al., 2018; Duncan, 2020). Our finding also add support to earlier research conducted prior to the pandemic in which higher resilience in HCWs was strongly linked to reduced burnout, compassion fatigue, anxiety, depression, and psychological distress (Mealer, Jones, & Meek, 2017).

Coping strategies – that is, mechanisms that an individual can employ to manage the impacts of potential threats– has been long considered an important personal resource to effectively reduce the impact of stress and its accompanying adverse consequences (Lazarus & Folkman 1987). During the pandemic, in which stress levels among HCWs are expected to rise, employing positive coping behaviours could relieve stress and safeguard mental health and well-being. Reports prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic have demonstrated the benefit of positive coping skills to combat stress and prevent psychological issues (e.g., loneliness, anxiety, depression and stress) (Ye et al., 2020; Tull et al., 2020). Furthermore, positive coping strategies were associated with increased self-confidence, reduced sleep disturbances, and decreased psychological and traumatic stress in nurses who were on the frontlines during the coronavirus pandemic (Xiao et al., Yu et al., 2020).

Implications for Practice

This review suggests that building resilience and increasing coping skills and social support among HCWs may protect them against the adverse mental and psychological health consequences of the coronavirus pandemic. As such, hospital administrators should foster psychological resilience and reinforce positive coping strategies among HCWs by implementing theory-tested interventions or programs. Due to restrictions including social distancing and
lockdown measures, these interventions could be delivered in innovative ways, such as webinars, online workshops, and on-demand videos. Interprofessional, web-based nightly debriefing programs (Azizoddin et al., 2020) and online cognitive behavioural therapy (Weiner et al., 2020) have been demonstrated to enhance resilience and morale in HCWs and improve clinical processes for quality patient care. Furthermore, increasing social support may provide a sense of greater emotional security among HCWs, thereby reducing their apprehensions and anxiety so they can function effectively during the pandemic. If HCWs are encouraged to express their feelings and concerns and openly discuss their experiences and challenges in the care and management of COVID-19 patients, their morale will improve and their mental health will be sustained.

As positive coping strategies were seen to improve mental health in HCWs, providing training in the development of self-efficacy and effective coping skills may help HCWs better manage the increased work pressures that have accompanied the COVID-19 pandemic. Hospital administrators should consider increasing HCWs’ access to mental health professionals during the pandemic in to support their mental health needs. Furthermore, providing psychosocial support and clear information about COVID-19 may further reduce anxiety and other adverse pandemic-associated emotional consequences among HCWs.

Conclusions

The review findings suggest that HCWs manage their stress during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic by utilizing both problem-focused (e.g., use of social support and religious practice) and emotion-focused (e.g., use of diversionary activities) coping strategies. Furthermore, this review found substantial evidence on the value and effectiveness of coping mechanisms, psychological resilience, and social support in preserving the mental health and
psychological well-being of HCWs during disease outbreaks such as the coronavirus pandemic.

Considering the global extent of the pandemic, this review is of interest to international readers – particularly hospital administrators. Organizational measures to sustain the healthcare workforce in the midst of the pandemic must include interventions to improve coping skills, psychological resilience, and social support.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Quality Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanco-Donoso et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>228 HWCs</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>● 13.9% of the variance in secondary traumatic stress measure was explained by lack of staff and supervisor support.</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Lower levels of support from co-workers amplify the negative effect of social pressure from work on traumatic stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Social pressure from work, high doses of exposure to suffering, lack of personnel and personal protective equipment, and minimal supervisor support were significant in explaining traumatic stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozdag and Ergun (2020)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>214 HCWs</td>
<td>BRS; MSPSS</td>
<td>● Mean scale score in the BRS was 18.43 out of 30.</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Higher levels of quality of sleep, positive affective state, age and life satisfaction raised the level of psychological resilience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Higher negative affective state and being a doctor meant lower psychological resilience level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babore et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>595 HCWs</td>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>● Lower positive attitude, higher social support, working with COVID-19 patients and higher avoidance strategies predicted higher levels of distress.</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>534 medical staff</td>
<td>RD-CBQ</td>
<td>● Coping strategies utilized by HCWs used strict protective measures, knowledge of virus prevention and transmission, social isolation measures, and positive self-attitude.</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The following provided psychological benefit in HCWs: the availability of strict infection control guidelines, specialized equipment, recognition of their efforts by hospital management and the government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chew et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>274 resident physicians</td>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>● Stress was positively predicted by the use of avoidance as a coping strategy.</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Stress was negatively predicted by the use of positive thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Traumatic stress was positively predicted by use of avoidance as a coping strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>92 nurses</td>
<td>SIQ</td>
<td>Avoidance as a coping strategy. The use of problem solving and use of social support as coping strategies were negative and positive predictors of traumatic stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>4618 (doctors, nurses, technician, health administrators)</td>
<td>RD-CBQ</td>
<td>HCWs utilized the following adaptation approaches: communication with family, learning about the disease, communication with colleagues and teamwork. Least influential coping were as follows: lack of support and understanding from family and relatives; lack of protective supplies; lack of social support and recognition for medical workers and unfamiliar with special work environments, working routine and use of equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Monte et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>102 general practitioners</td>
<td>CISS; RS</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion was positively correlated with emotion-oriented coping and negatively with task-oriented coping. Depersonalization correlated positively with emotion-oriented coping and avoidance-oriented coping and negatively with task-oriented coping. Personal Accomplishment scale was correlated negatively with emotion-oriented coping and positively with task-oriented coping. Resilience had a significant positive correlation with the personal accomplishment subscale and a negative correlation with emotional exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giusti et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>330 (doctors, nurse, nurse assistant)</td>
<td>RD-CBQ</td>
<td>Age, occupation, being home, work hours, psychological comorbidities, contact with COVID-19 patients, fear of infection, support from family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hou et al. (2020) | China | Cross-sectional | 528 HCWs | CSCQ | - PTSD symptoms were positively associated with negative coping and fatigue.  
- Negative coping moderated the relationship between self-efficacy and PTSD symptoms.  
- Negative coping also moderated the direct effect of self-efficacy on fatigue. |
| Huffman et al. (2020) | USA | Cross-sectional | 720 HCWs | CD-RISC | - Resilient HCWs reported less fatigue, insomnia, stress, and anxiety than non-resilient HCWs. |
| Huang et al. (2020a) | China | Cross-sectional | 377 HCWs | CD-RISC | - Psychological resilience was protective for the development of anxiety  
- 83.8% of HCWs had higher psychological resilience  
- 16.2% of HCWs had low psychological resilience |
| Huang et al. (2020) | China | Cross-sectional | 600 medical staff | CD-RISC | - Mean scale score of the CD-RISC was 65.76 out of 100.  
- Stress score, female, less knowledge of COVID-19, less knowledge of COVID-19 protective measures, and lack of protective materials in the hospital were important related factors for resilience of the medical staff. |
| Khalaf et al. (2020) | Egypt | Cross-sectional | 170 physicians | BRCS | - The BRCS score was 13.45.  
- 50% of physicians were low resilient copers, 30% were medium resilient copers and approximately 20% were high resilient copers.  
- Gender, marital status, academic degree, specialty, years of experience, living with vulnerable family members and chronic diseases did not predict BRCS score.  
- Psychological resilience had significant and negative correlation with depression, anxiety and stress. |
| Labrague & De los Santos (2020a) | Philippines | Cross-sectional | 325 nurses | BRCS; PSSQ | - Resilience, social support, and organisational support in front line nurses were moderate.  
- Social support, personal resilience, and organisational support predicted COVID-19 anxiety. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labrague &amp; De los Santos (2020b)</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>736 nurses</td>
<td>BRC; PSSQ</td>
<td>● Hospital nurses had higher scores on social support, personal resilience, and perceived general health measures than public health nurses. &lt;br&gt; ● Personal resilience predicted dysfunctional anxiety related to coronavirus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>114 (nurses, doctors, medical staff)</td>
<td>CD-RISC; SCSQ</td>
<td>● HCWs had a high level of resilience (67.04).&lt;br&gt; ● Active coping (26.61) score was higher than the score of passive coping (10.32).&lt;br&gt; ● Nurses obtained a lower resilience score compared to other professions. &lt;br&gt; Moreover, active coping, depression, anxiety and mental health training were significant predictors of resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luceno-Moreno et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>1422 HCWs</td>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>● Resilience is associated in a negative and significant way with post-traumatic stress, anxiety, depression. &lt;br&gt; ● The mean scale score of the BRS was 3.02 out of a possible score of 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>356 nurses</td>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>● Nurses with PTSD had a significantly lower resilience than those without PTSD. &lt;br&gt; ● An increase of CD-RISC score was associated with a decrease in PTSD. &lt;br&gt; ● An increase of CD-RISC score was associated with decreased PTSD symptoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosheva et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>1106 (physicians)</td>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>● Psychological resilience was negatively associated with anxiety in HCWs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marqa et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>430 (physicians, nurses, and other allied health professionals; lab and radiology technicians)</td>
<td>RD-CBQ</td>
<td>● The following coping approaches were identified by HCWs: prayers, sports, and exercise as the most common (80.5%); having clear guidelines for infection prevention (64.7%); availability of PPE (57.3%); and the support of colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiorano et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>140 (physicians, nurses)</td>
<td>DRS; CSES</td>
<td>● Coping strategies, especially stop unpleasant emotions and thoughts, and hardness are protective factors and reduce the effect of stress on secondary trauma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mi et al., (2020) | China       | Cross-sectional | 1029 HCWs   | RD-CBQ         | ● The mean score of coping measure was 18.48 (range 6–30).  
● The most common coping strategies were physical exercise, positive attitude, and expression feeling/emotion.  
● Coping was negatively related to depression and anxiety. |
| Nie et al., (2020)| China       | Cross-sectional | 263 nurses  | SCSQ; PSSS     | ● The mean score of positive coping style and negative coping style among all frontline nurses was 1.68 and 0.97 respectively.  
● Positive coping style and negative coping style were the risk factors of COVID-19 related stress symptoms.  
● Seven factors associated with the presence of psychological distress: working in ED, concern for family, being treated differently, the impact of the event, negative coping style, perceived social support, precautionary measures effective. |
| Salman et al., (2020) | Pakistan  | Cross-sectional | 398 (doctors, nurse, pharmacists) | Brief-COPE | ● Most frequently adopted coping strategy was religious coping followed by acceptance and coping planning.  
● Females were observed to have significantly higher scores for behavioural disengagement, venting and religious/spiritual coping than male respondents.  
● Respondents belonging to 26-30 years’ age group reported significantly less substance use than those from 31-35 years of age.  
● Nurses had significantly higher coping style scores on denial, substance use and behavioural disengagement than doctors. |
| Shechter et al., (2020) | USA        | Cross-sectional | 657 HCWs    | RD-CBQ         | ● Physical activity/exercise was the most commonly endorsed behaviour (59%), followed by engaging with faith-based religion and/or spirituality (23%), yoga (25%), and/or meditation (23%), engaging with talk therapy (26%) and virtual provider support groups (16%).  
● HCWs who screened positive for acute stress reported engaging in more coping behaviours than those who screened negative. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Measurement Tool(s)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tam et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>1280 HCWs</td>
<td>CD-RISD</td>
<td>- Psychological distress and COVID-19 stressors were negatively correlated with resilience.</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Resilience partially mediated the association between institutional support and psychological distress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagni et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>121 (doctors, nurses, psychologists, healthcare assistants)</td>
<td>CSES-SF</td>
<td>- HCWs utilized focused problem solving and support as coping strategies.</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Blocking unpleasant emotions and thoughts strategy had a significant impact on the stress levels and the components of secondary trauma, unlike the problem-focused and social support strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>180 medical staff</td>
<td>SSRS</td>
<td>- Social support correlated significantly with anxiety and sleep.</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social support negatively affected anxiety and stress levels, and positively affected their self-efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruk and Guler</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>377 midwives and nurses</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>- High psychological resilience was found to be protective against depression risk.</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu et al., (2020)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>79 doctors and 86 nurses</td>
<td>SSRS</td>
<td>- The total score of positive coping was negatively correlated with the total score of anxiety and depression.</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **SSW:** Social Support at Work
- **BRS:** Brief Resilience Scale
- **MSPSS:** Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support
- **COPE:** Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced
- **SIQ:** Stressor and Incidence Questionnaire
- **CISS:** Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations
- **RS:** Resilience Scale
- **CSCQ:** Simplified Coping Style Questionnaire
- **CD-RISC:** Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale
- **BRCS:** Brief Resilient Coping Scale
- **PSSQ:** Perceived Social Support Questionnaire
- **SSRS:** Social Support Rate Scale
- **RD-CBQ:** Researcher-designed Coping Behaviours Questionnaire
- **DRS:** Dispositional Resilience Scale
- **CSES:** Coping Self-Efficacy Scale
- **RSA:** Resilience Scale for Adults
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