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Abstract

Indigenous youth’s inherent strength and resilience play a vital role in their well-being and mental health. Protective factors, closely linked to resilience, spanning individual, family, and community levels reinforce positive mental health outcomes. The purpose of the present scoping review was to summarize the available literature that describes resilience and/or protective factors promoting mental health and well-being among Indigenous youth in Canada. As a secondary objective, this review investigated community involvement reported in the identified sources. JBI scoping review methodology was followed, and the search of PubMed, EMBASE, CINHAL, PsycINFO, ERIC, and Scopus commenced in August 2021, and was updated in February 2023. A targeted Google search was also conducted to identify eligible grey literature. A total of 61 papers were included in data extraction. The types of sources identified were observational (n=22), participatory action research (n=11), mixed/multi-methods (n=10), qualitative (n=9), case study (n=4), quasi-experimental (n=1), experimental (n=1), and other designs such as quality improvement and program evaluation (n=3). Additionally, only a handful of included studies reported use of an Indigenous-specific
approach, such as Two-Eyed seeing. Protective and resilience factors were identified across various levels such as individual (n=52), interpersonal (n=37), and wider environmental beyond social systems (n=37) levels. Forty studies described community involvement, which included non-specified community members, like friends or citizens (n=21), youth (n=19), Indigenous community members such as leaders and workers (n=14), and Elders (n=11). These groups were engaged to varying degrees, functioning either as equal collaborators, consultants, or, in some instances, as decision-makers.

Introduction

Indigenous peoples in Canada include First Nations, Inuit, and Métis, and there are specific communities within them, such as the Cree, Ojibwe, and Dene communities. Indigenous youth possess inherent strengths and resilience that foster health and well-being (Peters et al., 2013; Smylie et al., 2010). Indigenous communities describe resilience as a healing journey, enabling individuals to overcome the various traumas and cultural losses stemming from historical and colonization processes (Goulet et al., 2011; Isaak et al., 2015; Tousignant & Sioui, 2009). The significance of culture in promoting mental well-being and resilience within Indigenous and ethnic/racial minority communities have been well documented in the literature (Kirmayer et al., 2011; Ungar & Theron, 2020). Protective factors, which are tightly linked to resilience, exist across individual, family and community levels, and they also promote positive mental health outcomes (MacDonald et al., 2013). Thus, these protective and resilience factors, all of which are inherent strengths within Indigenous youth, represent powerful assets for mental health and well-being. Yet they often remain overshadowed by the emphasis on challenges, vulnerabilities, and risk factors in mental health research.

Over the years, several reviews have contributed to our understanding of resilience among Indigenous youth, highlighting its multifaceted nature and the vital role of cultural, communal, and personal elements. In 2017, Rowhani and Hatala emphasized the significance of cultural continuity, community bonds, and empowerment in promoting resilience (Rowhani & Hatala, 2017). In 2016, Toombs and colleagues highlighted that resilience combines individual, community and cultural elements that are crucial for fortifying strength and fostering endurance among Indigenous youth which led to positive mental health outcomes (Toombs et al., 2016). Most recently in 2022, Heid and colleagues also echoed that resilience is complex and dynamic process and that resilience strategies involved future orientation, cultural pride, learning from nature, and community interactions for Indigenous youth in both Canada and USA (Heid et al., 2022).

Expanding upon earlier research initiatives and incorporating insights from grey literature, the present scoping review seeks to identify and summarize available literature that describes resilience and/or protective factors for mental health and well-being among the Indigenous youth in Canada. Although mental health cannot be separated from overall well-being in Indigenous conceptualizations of health, there are specific mental health concerns that are particularly salient and need targeted attention, such as suicide and substance misuse (Canada, 2019; Sikorski et al., 2019). We aim to bring strengths to the forefront, shedding light on the inherent capacities Indigenous youth possess to navigate adversity and foster their mental health and wellness. Furthermore, this review aims to include a comprehensive range of evidence types, recognizing that Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing are frequently documented in grey literature and personal narratives. This is particularly pertinent since Indigenous viewpoints on mental health can substantially diverge from Western perspectives.
As such, our review will incorporate diverse information sources typically omitted from traditional systematic reviews including those mentioned earlier. A preliminary search of PROSPERO, MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the JBI Evidence Synthesis was conducted at the time of writing a priori protocol in 2022, and no current or in-progress scoping reviews or systematic reviews on the topic were identified.

In recent years, there has been a growing body of literature originating from research conducted collaboratively with and led by Indigenous communities (Chu Yang Lin et al., 2020; Murphy et al., 2021). For instance, Kirmayer and colleagues discussed community resilience and its alignment with Indigenous values and beliefs about interconnectedness of a person with their surroundings and other people (Kirmayer et al., 2009). Collaborative research methods are encouraged to promote community resilience involving both Indigenous youth and their communities (Chu Yang Lin et al., 2020). As a secondary objective, this review explored community involvement reported in the included sources that describe protective and resilience factors for Indigenous youth mental health and well-being.

Review question(s)
The overall aim of this scoping review was to explore the resilience and protective factors that promote mental health and wellness for Indigenous youth in Canada. Specifically, our review will answer the following questions.

1. What does the literature identify as resilience or protective factors for the mental health and well-being of Indigenous youth (ages 10–25) in Canada?
   a. What is the level of community involvement reported in the included studies and how is community involvement described?

Inclusion criteria
Participants
In this review, we focused on research involving Indigenous youth in Canada aged 10 to 25 years. This approach aligns with the commonly adopted definition of 'youth' in many Indigenous communities and is consistent with current mental health literature (Malla et al., 2018; World Health Organization, 2005). We also included articles that feature participants with official mental health diagnoses, self-identified mental health concerns, psychological distress symptoms, and/or involved in mental health promotion and prevention initiatives.

Concept
We used the following definitions to conceptualize protective and resilience factors. Protective factors referred to influences that change, mitigate, or modify an individual's reaction to an environmental threat that increases the likelihood of an undesirable outcome (Rutter, 1985). Resilience or resilience factors referred to personality characteristics (Friborg et al., 2005), interactions with situational and contextual elements (Masten et al., 1990), or a dynamic progression that collectively contribute to favorable mental health outcomes (Luthar et al., 2000). This scoping review included all articles that explored resilience and/or protective factors for mental health and wellness of Indigenous youth. Articles exclusively concentrating on prevalence of mental health concerns without examining resilience or protective factors were excluded. It is noteworthy that articles sometimes do not explicitly reference "resilience" or "protective" factors. As such, we considered articles that explore factors that align with the
definitions for resilience or protective factors mentions above which promote positive mental health outcomes.

Context

We considered articles conducted within healthcare, education, or community contexts in Canada. Additionally, international articles containing relevant data about Indigenous youth in Canada were also considered for inclusion. The settings encompass urban, rural, or remote areas. Articles featuring Indigenous communities or Indigenous participants residing within settler communities were also considered for inclusion. However, articles lacking extractable Canadian data were excluded.

Types of sources

We considered all study designs such as quantitative, qualitative, and mixed/multi-methods study for inclusion. In addition, systematic reviews, scoping reviews, commentaries, and text and opinion papers were reviewed for their reference lists to identify original studies that met our inclusion criteria. We also included grey literature such as dissertations and reports from relevant organizations that met our inclusion criteria. Due to the resources available within our research team, we included papers written in English and excluded books. No restrictions were placed on the publication dates.

Methods

This scoping review was conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews and the manuscript was prepared in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR). Our a priori has been published elsewhere previously (Carrier et al., 2022), and it is summarized below.

Search strategy

The search strategy aimed to locate both published and unpublished primary studies, reviews, and text and opinion papers. We developed our search strategy with a health science librarian and followed the PRESS guideline (McGowan et al., 2016). An initial limited search of PubMed was undertaken to identify articles on the topic. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, and the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy. The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms was adapted for the following databases: PubMed, EMBASE, CINAHL, PsycInfo, ERIC, Scopus. The initial search was conducted on August 26th, 2021 and was updated on February 4th 2023. The full search strategies are provided in Supplementary File 1. In addition to database searches, we also conducted targeted Google search described by Godin and colleagues (Godin et al., 2015) to further identify reports and other sources such as dissertations that met our inclusion criteria. The first step involved conducting ten separate Google searches using various keyword combinations and analyzing the top 100 results from each search to identify relevant websites. Following this, the subsequent step included manually exploring the identified relevant websites to pinpoint reports and sources that align with the specified inclusion criteria. This focused Google search approach was used to complement our database searches, thus expanding the range of information sources.
Study/Source of evidence selection

Following the search, all identified records were collated and uploaded into the Covidence (Covidence Systematic Review Software, 2019) and duplicates were automatically removed. Titles and abstracts were screened by two independent reviewers (HDS, AD, EC, LC, HW) for assessment against the inclusion criteria for the review. Potentially relevant papers were retrieved in full, and their citation details were imported into the Covidence. Two independent reviewers (HDS, AD, EC, HW) read full-texts papers for a detailed assessment against the inclusion criteria. Full-text papers that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded, and reasons for their exclusion were documented. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion or with a third reviewer.

Data extraction

Data were extracted from the included papers by two independent reviewers (HDS, AD, RD, RAD, HW, JL) using a data extraction tool. We first trialed the tool with three papers to assess consistency in extraction. We extracted general characteristics of the paper (e.g., author, publication country), study characteristics (e.g., aim, design, methods, setting), information on resilience and protective factors, youth characteristics (e.g., reported Indigenous communities), information on community involvement, reported outcomes and measures. See Supplementary File 2 for a full list of items in a data extraction tool. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion or with a third reviewer.

Data analysis and presentation

Two independent reviewers (HDS, HW) used directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) to characterize extracted narrative data. First, we first organized reported protective and/or resilience factors using the adapted ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1994) into the following levels: 1) individual, 2) interpersonal (e.g., relationship with family and friends), 3) institutional, 4) community, 5) system and 6) wider environmental beyond social systems. The institutional level comprised organizational features, formal and informal rules, and regulations, encompassing entities like schools and hospitals. Community level encompasses the connections and interactions among organizations, institutions, and informal networks within specific boundaries. Community level also included community strengths, connection, and participation such as volunteering activities. The broader environment beyond social systems encompassed factors that extend beyond institutional and community levels, including historical, cultural, and natural elements. Protective and resilience factors were not mutually exclusive across the five levels. Second, reported community involvement was categorized following the framework called the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) (International Association for Public Participation, 2018). This framework organizes community involvement based on the level of decision-making power held by the community in the study or project: 1) inform, 2) consult, 3) involve, 4) collaborate, 5) empower. The participating knowledge users were subsequently grouped into categories, such as elders, youth, Indigenous community members, unspecified community members, and healthcare providers. However, due to lack of reporting, coding this information into specific categories posed challenges at times. Reviewers had to interpret the information to a certain extent, relying on what the authors had reported. Any differences in interpretation were addressed through discussion between the two reviewers. We present narrative summaries along with the tables and to address our reviews questions.
Results

Study inclusion

Our search strategy yielded 8,318 citations (Figure 1). After Covidence automatically removed duplicates, a total of 4,641 articles were screened based on their titles and abstracts. Among these, 331 articles proceeded to full-text evaluation, ultimately leaving 55 studies that met the criteria. In addition to this, our targeted Google search yielded 6 more citations that fulfilled our inclusion criteria, bringing the total to 61 citations included in this review. The most common reasons for exclusion were ineligible population (i.e., not youth), ineligible concept, and ineligible source being review or commentaries. Full list of reasons for exclusion can be found in Figure 1.

<Insert Figure 1. PRISMA>
Individual characteristics of the included citations are organized in Supplementary File 3. As indicated in summary Table 1, 49 were peer-reviewed studies, and the remaining 12 were grey literature such as dissertations and reports. The majority were observational (n=22), following participatory action research (n=11), mixed/multi-methods (n=10), qualitative (n=9), case study (n=4), quasi-experimental (n=1), experimental (=1) and other designs such as quality improvement and program evaluation (n=3). Of the 61 citations, 31 did not report using theory, model, or framework (TMF) guiding the study or program. Twelve reported using Indigenous-specific TMFs, such as Two-Eyed Seeing, Medicine Wheel, First Nations Mental Wellness Continuum Framework, Neehithuw Child Developmental Theory, Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) model, and Indigenous theory of planetary health. The remaining 18 reported using non-Indigenous specific TMFs, such as resilience theory, stress process model, behaviour theories, and attachment theory, competing life reinforcers model, and developmental psychopathology perspectives. There were a variety of mental health concerns for which studies or programs were examining, including substance use (n=25), general mental health and well-being (n=18), suicide (n=18), depression (n=9), anxiety (n=5), and trauma (n=3).

Table 1. Characteristics of included literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed literature</td>
<td>n=49</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Adams C et al., 2015; Ames et al., 2015; Ansloos &amp; Dent, 2021; Baydala et al., 2014; Bohr &amp; Merry, 2016; Chandler &amp; Lalonde, 1998; Crooks et al., 2010, 2017; Crooks &amp; Dunlop, 2017; C. A. Dell et al., 2011; D. Dell &amp; Hopkins, 2011; Fanian et al., 2015; Filbert &amp; Flynn, 2010; Flanagan et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2015; Gfellner, 2016; Goldstein et al., 2021; Hackett et al., 2016; Hatala et al., 2017; Hirsch et al., 2016; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Isaak et al., 2020; Ivanich et al., 2020; Janelle et al., 2009; Katapally, 2020; Kirmayer et al., 1998; Kral et al., 2014; Liebenberg et al., 2022; Linds et al., 2019; Litwin et al., 2023; Lys, 2018; Miller et al., 2011; Mota et al., 2012; Njeze et al., 2020; Paul et al., 2022; Petrasek MacDonald et al., 2015; Rawana et al., 2015; Rawana &amp; Ames, 2012; Ritchie et al., 2014, 2015; Schick et al., 2022; Scott &amp; Myers, 1988; Snowshoe et al., 2017; Spillane et al., 2020; Spillane, Schick, Goldstein, et al., 2021; Spillane, Schick, Nalven, et al., 2021; Thomas et al., 2022; Wood et al., 2020; Zahradnik et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(Ames et al., 2015; Chandler &amp; Lalonde, 1998; Dunlop, n.d.; Filbert &amp; Flynn, 2010; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Flanagan et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2015; Gfellner, 2016; Goldstein et al., 2021; Hallett et al., 2007; Hammond, 2000; Kirmayer et al., 1998; Mota et al., 2012; Paul et al., 2022; Rawana &amp; Ames, 2012; Schick et al., 2022; Scott &amp; Myers, 1988; Snowshoe et al., 2017; Spillane, Schick, Goldstein, et al., 2021; Spillane, Schick, Nalven, et al., 2021; Turner, 2001; Zahradnik et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory action research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Baydala et al., 2014; Crooks et al., 2010; Hackett et al., 2016; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Isaak et al., 2020; Ivanich et al., 2020; Liebenberg et al., 2022; Linds et al., 2019; Lys, 2018; Spillane et al., 2020; Wood et al., 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or multi-methods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(CGIPN FNIGC, 2021; Crooks et al., 2017; D. Dell &amp; Hopkins, 2011; Fanian et al., 2015; Filbert, 2014; Janelle et al., 2009; Mair Tiessen, 2008; Rawana et al., 2015; Ritchie et al., 2014; Walls, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Ansloos &amp; Dent, 2021; Arato-Bollivar, 2005; C. A. Dell et al., 2011; Feathers of Hope, 2014; Hatala et al., 2017; Kral et al., 2014; Litwin et al., 2023; Ritchie et al., 2015; Thomas et al., 2022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Adams C et al., 2015; Crooks &amp; Dunlop, 2017; Njeze et al., 2020; Petrasek MacDonald et al., 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Miller et al., 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Bohr &amp; Merry, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., program evaluation)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Eggertson, 2013; Hirsch et al., 2016; Katapally, 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mental health concerns** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental health concern</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(Adams C et al., 2015; Ames et al., 2015; Baydala et al., 2014; CGIPN FNIGC, 2021; Crooks et al., 2010; C. A. Dell et al., 2011; D. Dell &amp; Hopkins, 2011; Feathers of Hope, 2014; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Goldstein et al., 2021; Hammond, 2000; Hatala et al., 2017; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Ivanich et al., 2020; Katapally, 2020; Kirmayer et al., 1998; Lys, 2018; Mair Tiessen, 2008; Rawana &amp; Ames, 2012; Schick et al., 2022; Scott &amp; Myers, 1988; Spillane et al., 2020; Spillane, Schick, Goldstein, et al., 2021; Spillane, Schick, Nalven, et al., 2021; Turner, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General mental health and well-being</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(Crooks et al., 2017; Crooks &amp; Dunlop, 2017; Dunlop, n.d.; Fanian et al., 2015; Filbert &amp; Flynn, 2010; Isaak et al., 2020; Katapally, 2020; Kral et al., 2014; Liebenberg et al., 2022; Linds et al., 2019; Litwin et al., 2023; Njeze et al., 2020; Rawana et al., 2015; Ritchie et al., 2014, 2015; Snowshoe et al., 2017; Thomas et al., 2022; Wood et al., 2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suicide | 18 | (Ansloos & Dent, 2021; Arato-Bollivar, 2005; Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Eggertson, 2013; Feathers of Hope, 2014; Filbert, 2014; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Fraser et al., 2015; Hackett et al., 2016; Hallett et al., 2007; Hatala et al., 2017; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Janelle et al., 2009; Kirmayer et al., 1998; Lys, 2018; Mota et al., 2012; Turner, 2001; Walls, 2007)

Depression | 9 | (Ames et al., 2015; Bohr & Merry, 2016; Filbert, 2014; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Flanagan et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2015; Lys, 2018; Paul et al., 2022; Turner, 2001)

Anxiety | 5 | (Flanagan et al., 2011; Hirsch et al., 2016; Lys, 2018; Miller et al., 2011; Paul et al., 2022)

Trauma | 3 | (Feathers of Hope, 2014; Lys, 2018; Zahradnik et al., 2010)

* Not mutually exclusive

Many studies took place in the Central Canada (n=23), following Prairie Provinces (n=14), Northern Canada (n=12), Atlantic region (n=10), and West coast (n=7), and two being set across Canada. Involved Indigenous communities include First Nations, not specified (n=33), Inuit (n=24), Metis (n=15), Cree (n=5), Anishinaabe - Ojibwe (n=1), Mi'kmaq (n=2), Dene (n=2), and Th1,cho3 (n=1).

Review findings

RQ1. What does the literature identify as resilience or protective factors for the mental health and well-being of Indigenous youth (ages 10–25) in Canada?

Twenty-one citations provided definitions of protective, or resilience factors as shown in Supplementary 4. Many definitions extracted conceptualized protective and resilience factors at the individual (n=14), community (n=1), or both individual and community levels (n=4). One example definition for resilience is “An interactive process, integrating individual resources together with social and physical resources” (Wood et al., 2020, p. 392). Identified protective or resilience factors are organized into adapted socio-ecological model shown in Table 2. The three most commonly reported protective factors were found in individual level (n=52), interpersonal level (n=37), and the wider environmental level beyond social systems (n=36). Examples of individual level protective factors include self-awareness, self-confidence, self-esteem, and optimism. Examples of interpersonal level factors include relationships with family, friends and other close social networks. Examples of wider environmental level include connection to animals, plants, the Creator, ancestors and other elements in nature. Note, we characterized cultural strength and cultural identity as both individual and wider environmental level. Examples of community level factors include Indigenous community(ies) connection, community strength, and community participation, such as community volunteer activities. Of the 61 included studies, there were nine interventions or programs being implemented to promote mental health and well-being outcomes, and they include life skills training, Equine Assisted Learning program, Applied Suicide Intervention Skills training (ASIST), Substance Use Prevention Program, wilderness activity program, Smart, Positive, Active, Realistic, X-Factor thoughts (SPARX) cognitive–behavioral therapy, FRIENDS for Life cognitive behavioral program, and Outdoor Adventure Leadership Experience (OALE).
Table 2. Protective and/or Resilience factors identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level*</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Self-awareness, self-confidence, self-esteem, optimism, cultural identity/pride, fitness, courage, emotional intelligence, life skills, cultural strength and cultural identity</td>
<td>(Adams C et al., 2015; Ames et al., 2015; Ansloos &amp; Dent, 2021; Baydala et al., 2014; Bohr &amp; Merry, 2016; CGIPN FNIGC, 2021; Crooks et al., 2017; Crooks &amp; Dunlop, 2017; C. A. Dell et al., 2011; D. Dell &amp; Hopkins, 2011; Dunlop, n.d.; Fanian et al., 2015; Feathers of Hope, 2014; Ferguson et al., 2021; Filbert &amp; Flynn, 2010; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Flanagan et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2015; Gfellner, 2016; Goldstein et al., 2021; Hackett et al., 2016; Hammond, 2000; Hatala et al., 2017; Hirsch et al., 2016; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Janelle et al., 2009; Katapally, 2020; Kral et al., 2014; Liebenberg et al., 2022; Linds et al., 2019; Litwin et al., 2023; Lys, 2018; Mair Tiessen, 2008; Miller et al., 2011; Mota et al., 2012; Njeze et al., 2020; Paul et al., 2022; Petrasek MacDonald et al., 2015; Rawana et al., 2015; Rawana &amp; Ames, 2012; Ritchie et al., 2014, 2015; Schick et al., 2022; Scott &amp; Myers, 1988; Snowshoe et al., 2017; Spillane et al., 2020; Spillane, Schick, Goldstein, et al., 2021; Thomas et al., 2022; Turner, 2001; Walls, 2007; Wood et al., 2020; Zahradnik et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Relationship with family and friends</td>
<td>(Adams C et al., 2015; Ansloos &amp; Dent, 2021; Arato-Bollivar, 2005; CGIPN FNIGC, 2021; Crooks et al., 2010, 2017; D. Dell &amp; Hopkins, 2011; Dunlop, n.d.; Fanian et al., 2015; Feathers of Hope, 2014; Filbert, 2014; Filbert &amp; Flynn, 2010; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Fraser et al., 2015; Hammond, 2000; Hatala et al., 2017; Hirsch et al., 2016; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Isaak et al., 2020; Ivanich et al., 2020; Janelle et al., 2009; Kral et al., 2014; Lys, 2018; Mota et al., 2012; Njeze et al., 2020; Paul et al., 2022; Petrasek MacDonald et al., 2015; Rawana et al.,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional

| 13 | Connectedness in school, school success, church attendance, professional support from hospitals |


### Community

| 22 | Community connection, community strength, community participation (e.g., volunteering) |

(Adams C et al., 2015; Ansloos & Dent, 2021; Arato-Bollivar, 2005; CGIPN FNIGC, 2021; Crooks & Dunlop, 2017; Dunlop, n.d.; Feathers of Hope, 2014; First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014; Fraser et al., 2015; Hatala et al., 2017; Hirsch et al., 2016; Kral et al., 2014; Lys, 2018; Mota et al., 2012; Njeze et al., 2020; Paul et al., 2022; Rawana et al., 2015; Ritchie et al., 2014, 2015; Spillane et al., 2020; Wood et al., 2020; Zahradnik et al., 2010)

### System

| 1 | Land claims, self-government |

(Chandler & Lalonde, 1998)

### Wider environmental level beyond social systems

| 36 | Cultural connectedness, language, spirituality, nature, connection to animals, plants, the Creator, ancestors and other elements in nature, cultural strength and cultural identity |

(Arato-Bollivar, 2005; Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Crooks et al., 2017; Crooks & Dunlop, 2017; D. Dell & Hopkins, 2011; Dunlop, n.d.; Feathers of Hope, 2014; Filbert & Flynn, 2010; Flanagan et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2015; Goldstein et al., 2021; Hackett et al., 2016; Hallett et al., 2007; Hatala et al., 2017; Hirsch et al., 2016; Hutt-MacLeod et al., 2019; Ivanich et al., 2020; Janelle et al., 2009; Katapally, 2020; Kral et al., 2014; Liebenberg et al., 2022; Linds et al., 2019; Litwin et al., 2023; Mair Tiessen, 2008; Miller et al., 2011; Njeze et al., 2020; Paul et al., 2022; Petrasek MacDonald et al., 2015; Rawana et al., 2015; Ritchie et al., 2014, 2015; Snowshoe et al., 2017; Spillane et al., 2020; Walls, 2007; Wood et al., 2020; Zahradnik et al., 2010)

* Not mutually exclusive
**RQ1a. What is the level of community involvement reported in the included studies and how is community involvement described?**

As shown in Figure 2, there has been a notable increase in community involvement reported in the past 10 years of publication. Forty citations provided varying detail on community involvement in their study or program, and following the IAP2 Spectrum for Public Participation, community involvement was categorized as following: inform (n=2); consult (n=7); involve (n=9); collaborate (n=17); empower (n=5). Notably, varying levels of involvement have been observed more frequently over the past ten years. Figure 3 presents the various levels of community involvement based on the publication year, with intervals of five years. Involved community members were non-specified community members such as friends of youth, or public citizen (n=21), youth (n=19), Indigenous community members such as community leaders and workers (n=13), Elders (n=11), family (n=8), school or program administrators including teachers (n=8), healthcare professionals (n=7) and decision makers (n=5). See Supplementary File 5 for more detailed information.

<Insert Figure 2>

<Insert Figure 3>
Discussion

This scoping review identified 61 papers describing protective and/or resilience factors for diverse mental health and well-being concerns, such as substance use, suicide, and depression. Many of these papers used observational designs, followed by participatory action research approaches. Additionally, only 12 of included studies reported use of Indigenous-specific TMFs, such as Two-Eyed Seeing, to inform their projects. The study locations were primarily situated in the Central regions of Canada. The studies most commonly involved Indigenous communities including First Nations, followed by Inuit and Metis communities. Protective and resilience factors were conceptualized at the level of individual and/or community. These factors were identified across all levels, including individual, interpersonal, institutional, community, system, and wider environmental levels. There has been a marked increase in community member involvement over the past 10 years in research or programs at various stages, encompassing diverse members such as youth, Elders, Indigenous community leaders, teachers, and healthcare providers.

We found that the reported definitions of resilience and protective factors for mental health varied. While some conceptualizations of resilience were at the individual level, focusing on the ability to adapt or cope with adversity, a few papers conceptualized it at the community level, emphasizing the significance of culture and the availability of community resources. In some instances, it was understood at both levels, recognizing both individual strengths and the community's responsibility to provide a supportive environment. Furthermore, upon examining the levels of resilience and protective factors mapped onto the socio-ecological model in the current review, multi-layered and complex nature of these factors have been revealed. Existing literature also reported varying definitions of resilience across papers,
highlighting the fluid and intricate nature of the concept and the importance of adapting definitions to different Indigenous cultures and traditions (Heid et al., 2022). This intricate nature of resilience has been extensively discussed previously both nationally and internationally (Heid et al., 2022; Jongen et al., 2020; Usher et al., 2021).

It is not appropriate to use frequency counts to determine a hierarchy of resilience and protective factors for mental health and well-being (The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, 2021). There exist established methods for ranking protective factors, but it was beyond the scope of this review. Additionally, this review did not perform a meta-analysis to determine the overall effectiveness or causal relationships. However, it is worth noting that resilience and protective factors are most identified at both individual and wider environmental levels that extend beyond social systems. Additionally, cultural strength and cultural identity have been mapped onto both the individual and the wider environmental levels. This finding aligns with current research on the significance of Indigenous youth voices and their inherent strength, illustrating how youth establish cultural connections to define and redefine their own identities and positive impact of this on their overall well-being (Barker et al., 2017; Blanchet-Cohen et al., 2023; Snowshoe et al., 2017). For example, a study in Quebec examined the various layers of meaning embedded in Indigenous youth voices (Blanchet-Cohen et al., 2023). Working closely with First Nations youth representatives and youth, the study revealed that the defining characteristics of Indigenous youth voices are strength and passion, exemplifying innate resilience in the face of adversity (Blanchet-Cohen et al., 2023). Youth described their journey of 'bringing back' knowledge and traditions not as a way to return to the past, but as a means to draw on them in creating something new that reflects their present identity and context (Blanchet-Cohen et al., 2023). Through cultural connections, Indigenous youth understand their place in the world, find meaning in their culture, and navigate between the Western and Indigenous worlds to construct their identity being (Barker et al., 2017; Blanchet-Cohen et al., 2023; Snowshoe et al., 2017). As such, culture is crucial for identity-building and has a great connection to the promotion of mental health and well-being.

We found different levels of community involvement reported in 40 papers and ‘collaborate’ was the level most frequently inferred based on the reported details in each paper. We also observed that before 2014, we did not find community involvement reaching the level of empowerment, which involves giving decision-making authority to Indigenous peoples rather than sharing it with researchers. This is an area in need of further exploration. While non-reporting does not necessarily imply non-engagement, it is also important to recognize that reporting is not solely the responsibility of the authors but also of the editorial boards of academic journals. A previous review report examined community involvement in 211 Indigenous research papers on all topics from the Atlantic region in Canada and found that the reported community engagement remained relatively low and steady between 2001 and 2020 but observed increased interest in requesting Indigenous ethics approvals (White et al., 2021). Additionally, mental health was one of the most frequently studied topics and found that nearly half of identified papers reported community involvement (White et al., 2021). This is similar to the current review findings, and we observed that the level of detail varied across included papers. The literature on Indigenous mental health and resiliency still exhibits a noticeable gap in reporting related to community involvement, which makes the synthesis of evidence more challenging. Evaluation of collaborative approaches to research and the impact of such collaboration remains a gap in the current literature, not limited to Indigenous research (Boland et al., 2020). To facilitate clear communication and the accumulation of evidence for
evaluating the impact of community involvement and to advance this field, there is a need for improved reporting and reporting guidelines, such as CONSIDER (Huria et al., 2019), are available to support researchers.

The review initially started as a class project co-led by students (HDS, LC), which eventually evolved into a project with a small grant to support it. The authors' positionality statements are available in Supplementary File 6, providing brief self-location statements that include acknowledgments of our ancestral heritage and place-based positionality. This review was co-led by HDS and LC, and our team expanded during the process. Our review adopted a collaborative and relational approach to understanding Indigenous knowledge. Recognizing some team members' limited experience in this area, including myself, we emphasized close collaboration with those possessing Indigenous knowledge. This process reflected our commitment to humility, continuous learning, and valuing diverse perspectives. We view the review as a collective effort that honors the relationships among Indigenous, Two-Spirit, and non-Indigenous healthcare providers and researchers, highlighting our team's foundational strength in collaboration.

Although our review team includes Indigenous nurse research trainees, we recognize the missed opportunity for community engagement in this review. The lack of community involvement in this review is a major constraint that could influence the interpretation of findings. We have highlighted how resilience and protective factors have been described in both academic and grey literature, examined the level of community involvement identified in the included sources, and identified gaps in the literature including need for better reporting. There is a future opportunity for the findings to serve as a springboard for conversations with Indigenous communities in Canada, allowing the concept of resilience and protective factors to be refined and validated. Community involvement was not initially included in the protocol, but recognizing its significance, a secondary review to incorporate community engagement to validate and potentially rank the identified factors may be valuable. Second, we would like to acknowledge that many of the frameworks we used to map our findings are of Western origin. The papers included in this review were conducted in Canada, with most of them utilizing Western methodologies to generate new knowledge. Therefore, the mapping exercise using Indigenous-specific TMFs was limited in this review, in addition to the lack of detailed reporting in the identified sources. These are important considerations when interpreting and utilizing our review findings.

Conclusions

The papers examined here show that resilience is complex and varied in concept, and the identified heterogeneity in designs and methods confirms our appropriate choice of a scoping review methodology. Sixty-one papers included in this review discussed protective and resilience factors related to various mental health issues and well-being concerns, such as substance use, suicide, and depression. Many of these papers used observational methodologies, followed by participatory action research. Moreover, only a small number of the included studies mentioned the use of Indigenous-specific TMFs, such as Two-Eyed Seeing, to guide their projects. The majority of the study sites were located in the Central regions of Canada, primarily involving First Nations communities. Papers conceptualized protective and resilience factors at individual and/or community levels, and we mapped the identified factors across individual, interpersonal, institutional, community, system, or wider
environmental level. Notably in the last decade, a range of community members, such as youth, Elders, Indigenous community leaders, and educators, participated in various research projects or programs at different levels. The causal pathways of resilience factors for mental health and well-being remain unknown in this review as meta-analysis was not the objective. However, we have highlighted the significance of Indigenous youth's voice, one channel for demonstrating inherent strength, and their connection to culture, as well as several gaps in the literature, including the lack of reported details on community involvement. The need for resilience in the face of ongoing colonization of Indigenous Peoples persists due to systemic barriers. To address this issue, it imperative to mitigate these systemic barriers and meanwhile, examination of the protective and resilience factors highlighted in available literature offers direction for moving forward with a strengths-based focus.
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