

Examining Medical Student Volunteering During The COVID-19 Pandemic As A Prosocial Behavior During An Emergency

Matthew H V Byrne MBBS MRes¹, James Ashcroft MB ChB MSc MRes MRCS², Jonathan C M Wan MB PhD³, Laith Alexander MB PhD³, Anna Harvey⁴, Nicholas Schindler MBChB MRCPCH MSt^{5,6}, Megan E L Brown MBBS⁷, Cecilia Brassett MB MChir MA MChir FRCS⁸

¹Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

²University of Cambridge, Department of Surgery. Cambridge University Hospitals Trust, UK

³Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital London, UK

⁴King's College London, UK

⁵Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals Foundation Trust, Paediatric Department, UK

⁶University of Cambridge, Institute of Continuing Education, UK

⁷Hull York Medical School, Health Professions Education Unit, UK

⁸University of Cambridge, Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience, UK

Corresponding author

Name: Matthew Byrne

Email address: mhvbyrne@doctors.org.uk

Full Institution address: Oxford University Hospitals Trust, Oxford UK

Institution post code: OX3 7LE

Twitter: @mhvbyrne

Alternative contact:

Name: James Ashcroft

Email address: james.ashcroft@addenbrookes.nhs.uk

Full Institution address: Addenbrooke's Hospital, Hills Rd, Cambridge, UK

Institution post code: CB2 0QQ

Author descriptions

Dr Matthew H V Byrne is an Academic Clinical Fellow in Urology at Oxford University Hospitals Trust, UK. Dr James Ashcroft is an Academic Clinical Fellow in General Surgery at Cambridge University Hospitals Trust, UK. Dr Laith Alexander is an Academic Foundation Doctor at Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital London, Dr Jonathan Wan is an Academic Foundation Doctor at Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital London, Ms Anna Harvey is a medical student at King's College London, UK. Dr Nicholas Schindler is a tutor at the Institute of Continuing Education at the University of Cambridge and a senior pediatric registrar at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals Foundation Trust, UK. Dr Cecilia Brassett is a Fellow, Joint Director of Studies in Medical Sciences, College Lecturer, and Deputy Senior Tutor in Medicine at Magdalene College, University of Cambridge, and the University Clinical Anatomist, University of Cambridge.

Sources of support: Nil

Conflicts of interests: None financial or otherwise

Authorship: MHVB, JA, JW, LA were responsible for conceptualization. All authors were responsible for writing the first draft. MHVB, JA, JW, LA were responsible for data

collection. JW was responsible for quantitative data analysis, MHVB and LA were responsible for qualitative analysis. MHVB, JA, JW, NS, CB were responsible for interpretation of data. All authors were responsible for revisions. CB was responsible for supervision.

Data availability: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Study type: Cross sectional survey

Running Title: Medical student prosocial behavior during COVID-19

Key words (3-5 words): medical education; volunteering; preparedness; COVID-19; service learning

Number of figures: 2 + 3 supplementary

Number of tables: 3 + 2 supplementary

Word count: 3969

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Introduction: COVID-19 has caused major disruptions to healthcare, with voluntary
3 opportunities offered to medical students to provide clinical support. We used the conceptual
4 framework of prosocial behavior during an emergency – behaviors whose primary focus is
5 benefiting others – to examine volunteering during COVID-19.

6 Methods: We conducted an in-depth, mixed-methods cross-sectional survey, from 2nd May to
7 15th June 2020, of medical students studying at UK medical schools. Data analysis was
8 informed by Latane and Darley’s theory of prosocial behavior during an emergency and
9 aimed to understand students’ decision-making processes.

10 Results: A total of 1145 medical students from 36 medical schools completed the survey.
11 While 947 (82.7%) of students were willing to volunteer, only 391 (34.3%) had volunteered.
12 The majority (92.7%) of students understood that they may be asked to volunteer; however,
13 we found that deciding one’s responsibility to volunteer was mitigated by a complex
14 interaction between the interests of others and self-interest. Further, concerns revolving
15 around professional role boundaries influenced students’ decisions over whether they had the
16 required skills and knowledge to volunteer. Deciding to volunteer depended not only on
17 possession of necessary skills, but also seniority and identification with the nature of
18 volunteering roles offered.

19 Conclusions: We propose two additional domains to Latane and Darley’s theory of prosocial
20 behavior during an emergency that students consider before making their final decision to
21 volunteer. These are ‘logistics’ – whether it is logistically feasible to volunteer – and ‘safety’
22 – whether it is safe to volunteer. This study highlights a number of modifiable barriers to
23 prosocial behavior that medical students encounter and provides suggestions regarding how
24 Latane and Darley’s theory of prosocial behavior can be operationalized within educational

25 strategies to address these barriers. Optimizing the process of volunteering can aid healthcare

26 provision and may facilitate a safer volunteering process for all.

27 INTRODUCTION

28 On 24th March 2020, the UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care announced plans
29 for medical students to assist in the COVID-19 pandemic ¹. In response to this, medical
30 schools accelerated the graduation of over 5000 final year medical students to act as interim
31 postgraduate year one doctors ², and volunteering opportunities were created for non-final
32 year students ³. As clinical placements were cancelled and medical school examinations
33 postponed or replaced, there was the potential for many students to volunteer ^{4,5}.

34

35 Volunteering is a form of prosocial behavior – behavior which provides help to others where
36 a direct personal benefit is not a necessity but self-interest is considered ^{6,7}. As such it can
37 have positive benefits for both doctors and patients ⁷. Prosocial behavior is an important
38 professional value in medicine ^{8,9}. Indeed, the Situational Judgement Test that final year
39 medical students in the UK must pass prior to graduation examines prosocial decision making
40 ¹⁰. McCrea and Murdoch-Eaton highlighted that while medical students recognize the role of
41 prosocial behavior for doctors, they often possess limited awareness of the role of prosocial
42 behavior within their current role as students ¹¹. This has relevance for student volunteering
43 during COVID-19 – a form of prosocial behavior during an emergency. Latane and Darley
44 proposed that, in prosocial behavior theories, five factors influence an individual’s decision
45 to help during an emergency ¹², which Baron et al. posited to be the same for volunteering ⁶.
46 They are: 1. Noticing something is abnormal; 2. Interpreting the situation as an emergency; 3.
47 Deciding you are responsible; 4. Deciding whether you have the skills or knowledge to help;
48 and 5. Making a final decision on providing help ^{6,12}. It has yet to be established whether
49 Latane and Darley’s theory of prosocial behavior applies to medical student volunteering
50 during COVID-19.

51

52 Studies prior to the COVID-19 pandemic have reported the readiness of medical students to
53 volunteer in hypothetical disasters and infectious disease outbreaks ^{13,14}, and early studies
54 into COVID-19 indicate that the majority of students appear willing to volunteer ^{15,16}.
55 Rasmussen et al. showed that a high percentage of medical students from a single centre in
56 Denmark wanted to volunteer (82.4%) ¹⁵. However, other studies have shown that, whilst
57 students are willing to volunteer during COVID-19, fewer students have actually done so ¹⁷⁻
58 ¹⁹. A single centre study of 137 German medical students demonstrated that 70.1% were
59 willing to volunteer, but only 25.0% of students did ¹⁸. Despite this discrepancy between
60 motivation and practice, minimal literature exists on the factors motivating students to
61 volunteer during COVID-19 ^{18,20,21}. Understanding the factors that influence prosocial
62 behavior during the current pandemic is essential, as over 40,000 medical students who are
63 studying in the UK could represent a valuable asset if empowered and mobilized as
64 volunteers ²².

65

66 In view of the above, we conducted an in-depth, mixed-methods survey to explore
67 volunteering among UK medical students during COVID-19, using the conceptual
68 framework of prosocial behavior described by Latane and Darley, and Baron et al. ^{6,12}.
69 Through developing an understanding of students' motivations to volunteer, we aimed to
70 identify educational strategies which support prosocial behaviors during emergencies to
71 support medical education volunteering pathways.

72 **METHODS**

73 **Research approach**

74 This research was conducted within the paradigm of pragmatism. Pragmatism concerns itself
75 with problem solving, and often utilizes mixed-methods approaches²³. In line with our
76 pragmatic orientation, we chose not to forefront considerations of epistemology and ontology
77²⁴, and focused on designing an effective study expeditiously within the new research
78 landscape mandated by COVID-19. As such, an online survey was selected for data
79 collection for ease of dissemination and wide reach. Questions were asked with both
80 quantitative and qualitative outputs to provide broad and rich data reflective of a wide range
81 of experiences²⁵.

82 **Survey**

83 We conducted a cross-sectional survey from 2nd May to 15th June 2020 of students studying
84 at UK medical schools, following the STROBE guideline for cross-sectional studies²⁶. The
85 survey consisted of 53 questions assessing previous clinical experience, attitudes to
86 volunteering, motivation and barriers, volunteering role, medical education, issues currently
87 faced, and safety (Appendix 1). Survey development was informed by a systematic review of
88 existing literature on volunteering during pandemics and disasters, and previously used scales
89²⁷. Questions were then developed by MHVB and JA with expert input and consultation with
90 medical students, and final questions were reviewed by medical students to establish face
91 validity. The survey was hosted on Google Forms with no identifiable data collected, and
92 data were held on a secure server.

93 **Student recruitment**

94 We used a convenience sampling approach to recruit medical students. Medical schools listed
95 on the UK Medical Schools Council website were invited via email to distribute the survey to
96 their students²⁸. Messages were posted once a week to Twitter and Facebook asking medical
97 students to complete and share the survey to recruit more participants via a snowball
98 approach.

99 **Ethics**

100 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the University of Cambridge Psychology
101 Research Ethics Committee (PRE.2020.040).

102 **Quantitative analysis**

103 We asked students to indicate their level of agreement using a 5-point Likert scale
104 (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree) on items representing volunteering, role, clinical
105 skills, motivation/barriers to volunteering, issues with volunteering, and risk and safety.
106 Statistical analysis was performed by JW using R (version 4.0.1)²⁹. Data are presented as
107 mean \pm standard deviation (SD) and as percentages in each category of the Likert scale.
108 Correction for multiple testing was performed using a Benjamini-Hochberg correction in R
109 using the rstatix package.
110
111 Multiple linear regression of predictors for 'I am willing to volunteer (Likert)' was performed
112 in R using lm(). For this model, the variables used were 'year at medical school' and survey
113 responses around beliefs for the prediction of volunteering status. Data for subgroups were
114 analysed separately and included in the multiple regression model. These groups were chosen
115 to ascertain whether attitudes differed between years at medical school and if any differences
116 existed between those who chose to volunteer and those who did not. Entries with missing

117 data were excluded from the analysis using the na.omit function in R. Backward stepwise
118 model selection was performed using stepAIC() from the MASS package.

119 **Qualitative analysis**

120 Thematic analysis was used to analyse qualitative responses using the six-step approach
121 described by Braun and Clarke³⁰. Two authors (LA and MHVB) familiarised themselves
122 with the data, and created initial inductive, descriptive codes for all data. To identify themes,
123 a semantic approach was used. Initial codes were analysed for patterns, grouped,
124 summarised, and interpreted. Themes and subthemes were checked against the initial codes
125 and the data set as a whole, and any interpretative discrepancies explored and resolved by
126 consensus. Themes and subthemes were then reviewed, discussed, and agreed by all authors.

127 **Applying Latane and Darley's theory of prosocial behavior during an emergency as a** 128 **theoretical lens**

129 To analyse how our data applied to Latane and Darley's theory of prosocial behavior during
130 an emergency, we used a theory-informing inductive data analysis approach³¹. We did not
131 impose our definition of prosocial behavior during an emergency upon participants, instead
132 allowing them to express their own views in response to questions. We first performed our
133 quantitative and qualitative analysis, later applying Latane and Darley's theory to our data as
134 a 'sensitizing concept'. Though sensitizing concepts originate from the methodology of
135 constructivist grounded theory³², they have since been applied as part of reflexive analysis in
136 a way that aligns with Varpio et al.'s 'theory informing inductive data analysis' approach³³.
137 This is the way in which we utilized theory within this study.

138 Data were reviewed using this theoretical framework by MHVB and MELB, and areas of
139 concordance and conflict explored and highlighted, then discussed and agreed by all authors.

140 **Reflexivity statement**

141 The authors of this study comprise a diverse range of doctors in training, medical students,
142 medical education researchers, and consultants across multiple educational institutions. The
143 range of experiences at different stages and institutions permitted a wide scope of viewpoints
144 regarding the data, thus enriching analysis.

145 **RESULTS**

146 **Demographics**

147 A total of 1145 students from 36 medical schools were represented in this study (Figure S 3:
148 *Roles students are willing to perform while volunteering grouped by year.*). The median age
149 of respondents was 22 (interquartile range, IQR, 20-24), 835 (73.0%) were women, 75
150 (6.6%) were intercalating (taking time out of medical school to complete an additional
151 degree), and 170 (14.8%) were in their fifth or sixth year of medical school (Figure S 1). Of
152 these final-year students, 112 out of 170 (65.9%) had already graduated.

153

154 **Quantitative analysis**

155 Results are structured within both qualitative and quantitative sections following the domains
156 of Latane and Darley's theory of prosocial behavior during an emergency.

157 *Noticing something is abnormal and interpreting the situation as an emergency*

158 The majority of students (92.7%) recognized that medical students might be asked to
159 volunteer due to COVID-19. We interpret this as widespread recognition of an abnormal,
160 emergency situation.

161 *Deciding responsibility*

162 Across all year groups, 947 out of 1145 students (82.7%) strongly agreed or agreed with the
163 statement 'I would be willing to volunteer to work', which suggests that most students felt
164 responsible for helping (Figure S 2). The reasons for this were complex, with a wide range of
165 motivating and barrier factors for volunteering (Table 1). Factors influencing the
166 responsibility to volunteer can be divided into two groups: in the interest of others and self-
167 interest. The former included altruism, moral obligation, family or social commitments,

168 others' safety, societal expectations, medical school expectations, and peer pressure; the latter
169 included professional development, academic and work commitments, personal safety,
170 psychological impact, discrimination, and financial implications.

171 While most students were willing to volunteer, less than half of the students felt they should
172 be encouraged to volunteer (Figure S 2).

173 *Deciding whether you have the skills or knowledge to help*

174 Eighty percent of students felt they would have a positive impact by volunteering. We
175 assessed students' preference for specific volunteer roles, and their confidence in the skills
176 required for these roles.

177 We asked students to indicate the roles they were willing to perform as volunteers. Twenty-
178 six percent of students strongly agreed or agreed that they were willing to perform the full
179 clinical role of a doctor, whereas 857 (75.3%) and 882 (77.7%) were willing to undertake an
180 assistant medical role or provide indirect medical care (such as providing meals or moving
181 patients), respectively. The majority of students were willing to perform the same role on a
182 ward with patients with COVID-19 (n=943, 82.3% strongly agreed or agreed, Figure 1).

183 Senior students were more willing to perform the full clinical role expected of a doctor but
184 were less willing to provide indirect medical care (Figure S 3).

185 We looked at student confidence in skills required for these roles using a Likert scale (Figure
186 1). Across all year groups, students were most confident in clerking new admissions
187 (mean=3.4/5, 95% CI=3.3-3.5) and performing venepuncture (mean=3.4/5, 95% CI=3.3-3.5).

188 Students were least confident in prescribing medication (mean=2.0/5, 95% CI=1.9-2.0) and
189 initiating management plans for patients (mean=2.1, 95% CI=2.0-2.1). For all skills except
190 for donning and doffing PPE, there was a significant positive correlation between the
191 respondents' year group and their confidence in performing them (Benjamini-Hochberg
192 adjusted $P < 0.05$).

193 *Making a final decision to provide help by volunteering*

194 At the time of the study, 391 of 1145 students (34.3%) had volunteered during the pandemic
195 (Figure S 1). This ranged from 14.6% amongst first-year students to 54.1% in final year (year
196 five or six). A significantly lower proportion of intercalating students were volunteering
197 compared to their clinical counterparts in the same years (20.0% vs. 33.5%, $P=0.02$, Chi-
198 square test). The median start date of those who had begun volunteering was 16th April 2020,
199 three weeks after the UK was placed into lockdown. Of the 391 students who were
200 volunteering in the pandemic, 77 (22.2%) had taken up roles as interim postgraduate year one
201 doctors (Table S 1).

202

203 The strongest predictors of willingness to volunteer using multiple linear regression were the
204 beliefs that volunteering to work would benefit a student's medical education
205 (estimate= 0.35 ± 0.03 , adjusted $P<0.001$, Table S 2) and that the student would make a
206 positive impact (estimate= 0.33 ± 0.03 , adjusted $P<0.001$). Students who believed there were
207 ethical issues with asking medical students to volunteer were less likely to volunteer
208 (estimate= -0.08 ± 0.02 , adjusted $P<0.001$), as were those who had begun considering a career
209 outside of medicine because of the pandemic (estimate= -0.08 ± 0.02 , adjusted $P=0.001$).
210 Increasing age was a significant negative predictor of willingness to volunteer, independent
211 of medical school year group, after correction for multiple testing (adjusted $P=0.043$).

212 *Additional factors which influenced making a final decision to provide help*

213 Across all year groups, the median self-estimated probability of contracting COVID-19 was
214 50.0% (IQR = 20.0%-65.0%, $n = 962$), which was not influenced by year or volunteering.
215 43.5% ($n=475$) felt there was a lack of information regarding volunteering opportunities
216 available.

217 **Qualitative analysis**

218 Our qualitative analysis focused on the later stages of the decision-making process. We asked
219 students what ethical concerns they had about volunteering and the issues they anticipated
220 they would face while volunteering (Table 2). We defined five themes: Pressure to volunteer;
221 Education; Professional practice; Safety; and Logistics.

222 *Deciding responsibility*

223 Two themes were relevant to deciding responsibility: pressure to volunteer and education.
224 Students expressed feelings such as guilt, obligation and, even a sense of coercion. There
225 were concerns that opportunities may not be promoted in a neutral way and that it should be
226 students' own choice to volunteer rather than due to pressure from external organizations
227 (Table 2).

228 The theme of education was also relevant to deciding responsibility. Some students felt that
229 volunteering was an opportunity to replace disrupted teaching opportunities, whereas others
230 found there was a conflict between volunteering and studying for their medical degree, which
231 was compounded by a perceived lack of training for volunteers (Table 2).

232 *Deciding whether you have the skills or knowledge to help*

233 Regarding skills or knowledge required, we identified concerns surrounding the themes of
234 professional practice and safety. Students were concerned about their competency and
235 questioned the usefulness of inexperienced medical students, as they might constitute a
236 burden. These concerns were closely linked to safe practice – that patient care might be
237 affected due to working outside of competency, especially if there was a lack of supervision
238 or clarity regarding the professional role boundaries of new doctors.

239

240 *Additional factors which influenced making a final decision to provide help*

241 The theme of safety also played a key role in decision making. This included considerations
242 of personal safety, the risk of contracting COVID-19 (particularly with inadequate PPE, or
243 for students with pre-existing health issues), as well as the psychological impact and stress of
244 working during a pandemic. Students were concerned about transmitting COVID-19 to
245 others, the risk posed to vulnerable family members, or disruption to pre-existing caring
246 duties.

247 Our qualitative analysis revealed a final barrier not accounted for by Latane and Darley's
248 theory: 'logistics'. These were concerns of support outside of work, and difficulties with
249 transport, accommodation, and administration.

250

251 **DISCUSSION**

252 In this study, we identified that 82.7% of medical student respondents would be willing to
253 volunteer; however, only 34.5% were volunteering at the time of the survey. While other
254 studies have shown a similar association, they have not explored the reasons *why* this may be
255 the case in depth¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Studies in other fields have demonstrated an intention to behavior gap
256³⁴, which may explain part of the discrepancy. However, such a large difference suggests the
257 presence of additional factors influencing students' decisions to volunteer. Latane and
258 Darley's theory of prosocial behavior during an emergency outlines a five-step process
259 influencing the decision-making process to help in emergency situations that we have used as
260 a conceptual framework¹²⁶. But how do our findings fit with what is already known?

261

262 Although McCrea and Murdoch-Eaton suggest medical students possess little awareness of
263 the applicability of prosocial behavior to their role¹¹, our study shows this does not appear to
264 be the case during COVID-19. The majority of students *did* recognize that COVID-19 was an
265 abnormal situation, that it was an emergency, and that they may be responsible. This may be
266 due, in part, to widespread media coverage, but is also likely a result of clinical placement
267 suspension, and students witnessing the vast number of healthcare staff involved in
268 responding to the pandemic. Time to reflect on a situation³⁵, as well as the presence of others
269 providing help, has been shown to influence likelihood of a decision to help³⁶.

270

271 The gap between an intention to volunteer and volunteering in practice could be explained by
272 the ways in which students decided their responsibility to volunteer during in the pandemic.
273 This decision was complex, and influencing factors can be conceptualized as a balance
274 between the interest of others and self-interest. Although 82.7% of students were willing to
275 volunteer, prosocial behaviors can be influenced by others³⁷. This is shown in our cohort by

276 a ‘pressure to volunteer’. Prosocial peer norms³⁸, and external influences (such as school and
277 parents) have been shown to motivate prosocial behavior³⁷. Individuals are more likely to
278 volunteer with “in-groups” (those close to them) rather than “out-groups” (those distant to
279 them)³⁹. Thus, increased social distance between helpers and those being helped reduces
280 prosocial behavior⁴⁰, as does social exclusion⁴¹. For medical students, academic and clinical
281 studies were interrupted – especially for those in later years used to high levels of patient
282 contact – with many medical students returning home because of COVID-19. This may have
283 increased the perceived social distance between patients, as well as between peers, shifting
284 the balance of prosocial behavior towards self-interest.

285

286 Latane and Darley suggest that, after having assumed responsibility, people decide whether
287 they have appropriate skills to help during emergencies¹². Similarly, we found that medical
288 students make a series of ‘competency’ judgements regarding volunteering, which includes
289 considerations as to how their level of ability relates to the proposed volunteering role and
290 level of supervision, and how these factors might influence patient safety. There was an
291 incremental increase in their confidence in the required skills and their willingness to perform
292 more advanced roles as the year of the student increased, such that final year students were
293 less willing to provide indirect care even though they had the skills to do so. Our data suggest
294 that this decision depends not only on the skills required, but also on the *roles* offered and the
295 year of the student. We posit that this is a domain which could result in a large decrease in
296 prosocial behavior during COVID-19. Our qualitative data showed that students felt
297 uncertain as to the professional role boundaries of volunteers; they perceived a lack of clarity
298 regarding voluntary roles and were worried that they might be asked to perform tasks outside
299 of their competence. Concerns surrounding roles could also reflect the variation of roles
300 across the country^{42–46}. Clarity regarding roles and necessary skills could facilitate prosocial

301 behavior amongst medical students during emergencies. Presenting students with more
302 options involving a wider range of roles could also help, as having a number of options by
303 which one could help has been shown to facilitate prosocial behavior ⁴⁷.
304
305 Finally, in Latane and Darley's theory, an individual weighs the above considerations and
306 makes a final decision ¹². We found that significantly fewer students who were intercalating
307 (taking time out of medical school to complete an additional degree) volunteered. This lends
308 weight to our observation about social distance, as intercalating students may be further
309 removed from patients, healthcare professionals, and medical schools. We also showed that
310 far more final-year students had volunteered than first-year students. This supports our
311 arguments about role and skills alignment. Students in higher years are likely to possess a
312 higher level of self-efficacy – the ability to overcome barriers to achieve a goal – which can
313 influence prosocial behavior ^{6,48}. Interestingly, in contrast to this finding, Burks and Kobus
314 found that prosocial values decrease as students' progress through training ⁷. We posit that
315 the main reason for the difference between this study and Burks and Kobus' research is that
316 final year students had a clear interim postgraduate year one role that they could fulfil, which
317 students in other years lacked. Regarding barriers to volunteering, 43.5% of respondents felt
318 there was lack of information on volunteering opportunities available. 'Logistics' was the
319 first of two areas that had not been explained in Latane and Darley's theory of prosocial
320 behavior during an emergency. Our data would indicate that – a volunteer must decide
321 whether *logistically* they can volunteer. Previous literature surrounding the willingness of
322 medical students to volunteer in a disaster relied on the assumption that in a crisis there
323 would be an established framework and infrastructure for mobilizing medical students.
324 However, this was not the case in the UK during the early part of 2020. Early narrative work

325 from the USA has centered on development of volunteering infrastructure, including the
326 establishment of voluntary task forces ⁴⁹, with similar initiatives occurring in the UK ⁵⁰.

327

328 The second key area that had not been adequately encapsulated by Latane and Darley's
329 theory concerned 'safety'. Although considerations of safety may take place within decisions
330 of responsibility, or of skills and knowledge, our data demonstrate that concerns regarding
331 safety were an integral part of volunteering decision-making. We posit that medical students
332 must also decide whether it is safe to volunteer – in the interests of themselves and others.

333 We present our conceptual framework for medical student volunteering during COVID-19 in
334 Figure 2.

335

336 Understanding the factors that influence prosocial behavior during COVID-19 can support
337 future decision-making around the infrastructure and processes that must be put in place to
338 effectively facilitate the mobilization of students during the current pandemic and in any
339 future crises. Creating a comprehensive strategy for how to manage and implement
340 volunteers is beyond the scope of this article. We have provided suggestions in Table 3 of
341 how our conceptual framework can be used in educational strategies to facilitate medical
342 student prosocial behavior during pandemics and disasters ⁵¹. These could be introduced
343 using pre-existing frameworks for innovation, and could be used to develop a flexible
344 structure that is organized at a local level with national oversight, which could allow for a
345 rapid goal-orientated coordinated response ^{52,53}. Developing this infrastructure is even more
346 important in view of the 'second wave' of COVID-19 cases ^{54,55} in Europe ⁵⁶, and high
347 numbers of cases in the USA ⁵⁷.

348 **Limitations**

349 To expedite survey distribution, we did not perform focus groups and cognitive interviews as
350 part of our survey development, and this may have limited how participants interpreted the
351 questions⁵⁸. However, medical students were involved throughout the survey development
352 process. As we were unable to identify the survey response rate, our data may not be wholly
353 representative of the whole UK cohort. We tried to mitigate this by distributing the survey
354 through multiple channels. There is selection bias, as the types of medical student who opt to
355 fill in the survey may be more willing to volunteer. Further, the transferability of our findings
356 may be limited by the higher number of women who participated. Finally, this study was
357 cross-sectional in nature, and could not determine whether students' motivation to volunteer
358 evolved as the context of the pandemic changed. Longitudinal research regarding the ways in
359 which prosocial behaviors expression changes as emergency situations develop would be of
360 benefit in future.

361 **CONCLUSIONS**

362 This study demonstrates that Latane and Darley's theory of prosocial behavior during an
363 emergency can be applied to medical student volunteering during COVID-19. This study
364 expands on existing theory through addition of the domains of *safety* and *logistics* in the
365 decision-making process. We identified a number of modifiable barriers to prosocial behavior
366 encountered by medical students during COVID-19 and provide suggestions of how our
367 conceptual framework can be used within educational strategies to address such barriers.
368 Optimizing the process of volunteering can aid workforce planning and healthcare provision,
369 and may facilitate a volunteering process that is safer for students, staff, and patients.

370 **REFERENCES**

- 371 1. Siddique H. Final-year medical students graduate early to fight Covid-19. *The*
372 *Guardian*. 2020.
- 373 2. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: medical schools are urged to fast-track final year students.
374 *BMJ*. 2020;368:m1064. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1064
- 375 3. Medical Schools Council. *STATEMENT OF EXPECTATION Medical Student*
376 *Volunteers in the NHS.*; 2020.
- 377 4. O’Byrne L, Gavin B, McNicholas F. Medical students and COVID-19: the need for
378 pandemic preparedness. *J Med Ethics*. 2020:medethics-2020-106353.
379 doi:10.1136/medethics-2020-106353
- 380 5. Arora A, Solomou G, Bandyopadhyay S, et al. Adjusting to Disrupted Assessments,
381 Placements and Teaching (ADAPT): a snapshot of the early response by UK medical
382 schools to COVID-19. *medRxiv*. August 2020:2020.07.29.20163907.
383 doi:10.1101/2020.07.29.20163907
- 384 6. Baron RA, Byrne D, Branscombe NR. *Mastering Social Psychology*. Boston: Pearson
385 Education, Inc; 2007.
- 386 7. Burks DJ, Kobus AM. The legacy of altruism in health care: The promotion of
387 empathy, prosociality and humanism. *Med Educ*. 2012;46(3):317-325.
388 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04159.x
- 389 8. Arnold EL, Blank LL, Race KEH, Cipparrone N. Can professionalism be measured?
390 The development of a scale for use in the medical environment. *Acad Med*.
391 1998;73(10):1119-1121. doi:10.1097/00001888-199810000-00025
- 392 9. Leffel GM, Oakes Mueller RA, Ham SA, Karches KE, Curlin FA, Yoon JD. Project
393 on the Good Physician: Further Evidence for the Validity of a Moral Intuitionist Model
394 of Virtuous Caring. *Teach Learn Med*. 2018;30(3):303-316.

- 395 doi:10.1080/10401334.2017.1414608
- 396 10. Patterson F, Zibarras L, Ashworth V. Situational judgement tests in medical education
397 and training: Research, theory and practice: AMEE Guide No. 100. *Med Teach*.
398 2016;38(1):3-17. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2015.1072619
- 399 11. McCrea ML, Murdoch-Eaton D. How do undergraduate medical students perceive
400 social accountability? *Med Teach*. 2014;36(10):867-875.
401 doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.916784
- 402 12. Latané B, Darley JM. *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New
403 York: Appleton-Century Crofts; 1970.
- 404 13. Gouda P, Kirk A, Sweeney A-M, O'Donovan D. Attitudes of Medical Students
405 Toward Volunteering in Emergency Situations. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*.
406 September 2019:1-4. doi:10.1017/dmp.2019.81
- 407 14. Patel VM, Dahl-Grove D. Disaster Preparedness Medical School Elective: Bridging
408 the Gap Between Volunteer Eagerness and Readiness. *Pediatr Emerg Care*.
409 2018;34(7):492-496. doi:10.1097/PEC.0000000000000806
- 410 15. Rasmussen S, Sperling P, Poulsen MS, Emmersen J, Andersen S. Medical students for
411 health-care staff shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*.
412 2020;395(10234):e79-e80. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30923-5
- 413 16. Astorp MS, Sørensen GVB, Rasmussen S, Emmersen J, Erbs AW, Andersen S.
414 Support for mobilising medical students to join the covid-19 pandemic emergency
415 healthcare workforce: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(9).
416 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039082
- 417 17. Yu N-Z, Li Z-J, Chong Y-M, et al. Chinese medical students' interest in COVID-19
418 pandemic. *World J Virol*. 2020;9(3):38-46. doi:10.5501/wjv.v9.i3.38
- 419 18. Drexler R, Hambrecht JM, Oldhafer KJ. Involvement of Medical Students During the

- 420 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic: A Cross-Sectional Survey Study. *Cureus*.
421 2020;12(8). doi:10.7759/cureus.10147
- 422 19. Pasquier P, Luft A, Gillard J, et al. How do we fight COVID-19? Military medical
423 actions in the war against the COVID-19 pandemic in France. *BMJ Mil Heal*. August
424 2020:bmjmilitary-2020-001569. doi:10.1136/bmjmilitary-2020-001569
- 425 20. Patel J, Robbins T, Randeve H, et al. Rising to the challenge: Qualitative assessment
426 of medical student perceptions responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clin Med*
427 (*Northfield Il*). October 2020:clinmed.2020-0219. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2020-0219
- 428 21. The General Medical Council. *The State of Medical Education and Practice in the UK*
429 2020.; 2020.
- 430 22. The General Medical Council. *Medical School Annual Return 2017/2018.*; 2018.
- 431 23. Cresswell J, Plano Clark V. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*.
432 Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2007.
- 433 24. Brown MEL, Dueñas AN. A Medical Science Educator's Guide to Selecting a
434 Research Paradigm: Building a Basis for Better Research. *Med Sci Educ*.
435 2020;30(1):545-553. doi:10.1007/s40670-019-00898-9
- 436 25. Schifferdecker KE, Reed VA. Using mixed methods research in medical education:
437 Basic guidelines for researchers. *Med Educ*. 2009;43(7):637-644. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
438 2923.2009.03386.x
- 439 26. STROBE Initiative. STROBE Checklist for cross-sectional studies.
- 440 27. Byrne M, Ashcroft J, Alexander L, Wan J, Harvey A. 986 A Systematic Review of
441 Medical Student Willingness to Volunteer and Preparedness for Pandemics and
442 Disasters. *Br J Surg*. 2021;108(Supplement_2). doi:10.1093/bjs/znab134.185
- 443 28. Medical Schools Council. Medical schools.
- 444 29. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2017.

- 445 30. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*.
446 2006;3(2):77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- 447 31. Varpio L, Paradis E, Uijtdehaage S, Young M. The Distinctions between Theory,
448 Theoretical Framework, and Conceptual Framework. *Acad Med*. 2020;95(7):989-994.
449 doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000003075
- 450 32. Bowen GA. Grounded Theory and Sensitizing Concepts. *Int J Qual Methods*.
451 2006;5(3):12-23. doi:10.1177/160940690600500304
- 452 33. Patel R, Tarrant C, Bonas S, Yates J, Sandars J. The struggling student: a thematic
453 analysis from the self-regulated learning perspective. *Med Educ*. 2015;49(4):417-426.
454 doi:10.1111/medu.12651
- 455 34. Webb TL, Joseph J, Yardley L, Michie S. Using the Internet to Promote Health
456 Behavior Change: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Impact of
457 Theoretical Basis, Use of Behavior Change Techniques, and Mode of Delivery on
458 Efficacy. *J Med Internet Res*. 2010;12(1):e4. doi:10.2196/jmir.1376
- 459 35. Darley JM, Batson CD. "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and
460 dispositional variables in helping behavior. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1973;27(1):100-108.
461 doi:10.1037/h0034449
- 462 36. Latané B, Darley JM. Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *J*
463 *Pers Soc Psychol*. 1968;10(3):215-221. doi:10.1037/h0026570
- 464 37. Lai FHY, Siu AMH, Shek DTL. Individual and Social Predictors of Prosocial
465 Behavior among Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong. *Front Pediatr*. 2015;3.
466 doi:10.3389/fped.2015.00039
- 467 38. Choukas-Bradley S, Giletta M, Cohen GL, Prinstein MJ. Peer Influence, Peer Status,
468 and Prosocial Behavior: An Experimental Investigation of Peer Socialization of
469 Adolescents' Intentions to Volunteer. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2015;44(12):2197-2210.

- 470 doi:10.1007/s10964-015-0373-2
- 471 39. DiDonato TE, Ullrich J, Krueger JI. Social Perception as Induction and Inference: An
472 Integrative Model of Intergroup Differentiation, Ingroup Favoritism, and Differential
473 Accuracy. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2011;100(1):66-83. doi:10.1037/a0021051
- 474 40. Krueger JI, Ullrich J, Chen LJ. Expectations and decisions in the Volunteer's dilemma:
475 Effects of social distance and social projection. *Front Psychol.* 2016;7(DEC).
476 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01909
- 477 41. Twenge JM, Ciarocco NJ, Baumeister RF, DeWall CN, Bartels JM. Social exclusion
478 decreases prosocial behavior. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2007;92(1):56-66.
479 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56
- 480 42. Youssef S, Zaidi S, Shrestha S, Varghese C, Rajagopalan S. First impressions of the
481 foundation interim year 1 postings: positives, pitfalls, and perils. *Med Educ Online.*
482 2020;25(1):1785116. doi:10.1080/10872981.2020.1785116
- 483 43. UK Foundation Programme Office. Impact of COVID-19 on the UK Foundation
484 Programme 2020. 2020.
- 485 44. Lee J. How medical students are responding to Covid-19. *The Independent.*
- 486 45. Kinder F, Harvey A. Covid-19: the medical students responding to the pandemic.
487 *BMJ.* 2020;369:m2160. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2160
- 488 46. Thomson E, Lovegrove S. 'Let us Help'—Why senior medical students are the next
489 step in battling the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int J Clin Pract.* 2020;74(8).
490 doi:10.1111/ijcp.13516
- 491 47. Wang Z, Jusup M, Shi L, Lee JH, Iwasa Y, Boccaletti S. Exploiting a cognitive bias
492 promotes cooperation in social dilemma experiments. *Nat Commun.* 2018;9(1).
493 doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05259-5
- 494 48. Almeida L, Kashdan TB, Coelho R, Albino-Teixeira A, Soares-da-Silva P. Healthy

- 495 subjects volunteering for phase I studies: Influence of curiosity, exploratory tendencies
496 and perceived self-efficacy. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2008;46(3):109-118.
497 doi:10.5414/CP46109
- 498 49. Soled D, Goel S, Barry D, et al. Medical Student Mobilization During A Crisis:
499 Lessons From A COVID-19 Medical Student Response Team. *Acad Med.* April 2020.
500 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003401>
- 501 50. Medical Schools Council. Student volunteering.
- 502 51. Ashcroft J, Byrne MHV, Brennan PA, Davies RJ, Davies RJ. Preparing medical
503 students for a pandemic: A systematic review of student disaster training programmes.
504 *Postgrad Med J.* 2020;0:1-12. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-137906
- 505 52. Sheather J, Jobanputra K, Schopper D, et al. A Médecins Sans Frontières Ethics
506 Framework for Humanitarian Innovation. *PLoS Med.* 2016;13(9).
507 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002111
- 508 53. Whittaker J, McLennan B, Handmer J. A review of informal volunteerism in
509 emergencies and disasters: Definition, opportunities and challenges. *Int J Disaster Risk*
510 *Reduct.* 2015;13:358-368. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2015.07.010
- 511 54. Wise J. Covid-19: Risk of second wave is very real, say researchers. *BMJ.*
512 2020;369:m2294. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2294
- 513 55. Xu S, Li Y. Beware of the second wave of COVID-19. *Lancet.*
514 2020;395(10233):1321-1322. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30845-X
- 515 56. Willsher K, Henley J. Covid in Europe: second wave gathers pace across continent.
516 *The Guardian.*
- 517 57. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Cases in the US.
- 518 58. Artino AR, La Rochelle JS, Dezee KJ, Gehlbach H. Developing questionnaires for
519 educational research: AMEE Guide No. 87. *Med Teach.* 2014;36(6):463-474.

520 doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.889814

521

522 **AUTHOR DESCRIPTIONS**

523 Matthew H V Byrne is an Academic Clinical Fellow in Urology at Oxford. He has a PGCert
524 in medical education and has previously been awarded a MRes in Transplantation. He
525 founded a national charity that facilitates medical student volunteers delivering talks at
526 secondary schools.

527

528 James Ashcroft is an Academic Clinical Fellow in General Surgery in the East of England
529 Deanery with an interest in early academic education and technical performance training. His
530 educational work has explored cognitive interventions in technical skill (awarded MRes) and
531 early surgical learning (awarded MSc).

532

533 Dr Laith Alexander is currently an Academic Foundation Doctor in Psychological Medicine
534 & Psychiatry at Guy's and St Thomas' Foundation Trust with King's College London. His
535 interests lie in psychiatry and neuroscience. His PhD in neuroscience explored the role of the
536 ventromedial prefrontal cortex in the regulation of emotion and cardiovascular function.

537

538 Dr Jonathan Wan is an Academic Foundation Doctor in Oncology at Guy's and St Thomas'.
539 He carried out his PhD in computational cancer diagnostics and is continuing his research as
540 a Bioinformatics Engineer at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. He is interested in
541 medical and surgical oncology research and medical education.

542

543 Anna Harvey is a final year medical student at King's College London and former Editorial
544 Scholar at The BMJ.

545

546 Dr Nicholas Schindler is a pediatric registrar at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals
547 NHS Foundation Trust, and a Tutor in Medical Education the University of Cambridge
548 Institute of Continuing Education. His research interest is in methods of workplace-based
549 training and assessment in pediatric education (awarded MSt). As Royal College of Pediatrics
550 and Child Health trainee representative for Assessment and Examinations he is involved in
551 the adaptation of assessments and postgraduate examinations for pediatricians during the
552 COVID-19 pandemic.

553

554 Dr Megan Brown is a PhD student in medical education within the Health Professions
555 Education Unit, Hull York Medical School. Her research interests include professional
556 identity development, longitudinal integrated clerkships, empathy and the hidden curriculum.

557

558 Dr Cecilia Brassett is a Fellow at Magdalene College, Cambridge as well as their Joint
559 Director of Studies in Medical Sciences, College Lecturer in Medicine, and Deputy
560 Senior Tutor. She is also the University Clinical Anatomist. She is directly involved in the
561 changes being made to medical student teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic.

562 **FIGURES**

563 *Figure 1: Willingness to perform roles during the pandemic, both (a) on a general*
564 *ward, and (b) on a coronavirus ward. (c) Confidence in clinical skills by year. Mean values*
565 *and 95% confidence intervals are shown. The mean confidence score across all students is*
566 *shown with a dashed line.*

567 *Figure 2: Conceptual framework for medical student prosocial behaviour during COVID-19.*

568 **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES**

569 *Figure S 1: Respondent demographics. (a) Number of medical students from each medical*
570 *school, divided by gender. (b) Total number of students, by gender. (c) Distribution of year*
571 *groups of medical students divided by gender. (d) Pie chart indicating if students had already*
572 *started as volunteers during the pandemic. (e) Proportion of students volunteering by year.*
573 *The proportion of non-intercalating students volunteering at the time of the survey ranged*
574 *from 14.6% among first-year students to 62.8% in sixth-year students*
575 *Figure S 2: Opinions on volunteering on a Likert scale.*
576 *Figure S 3: Roles students are willing to perform while volunteering grouped by year.*

1 *Table 1: Motivating and barrier factors for volunteering*

Motivating factors	n=	%
Altruism (e.g. Helping those in need)	1030	90.7
Professional development and training (e.g. Opportunity to learn new skills and gain experience)	906	79.8
Moral obligation (e.g. Need to do the 'right' thing)	880	77.5
Pay	641	56.5
Career (e.g. Opportunity to improve cv make new contacts)	631	55.6
Guilt you would feel if not volunteering	525	46.3
Societal expectations	250	22.0
Medical school expectation or directive	194	17.1
Peer pressure	142	12.5
Other: Activity during lockdown	26	2.3
	26	2.3
Barrier factors	n=	%
Family/social commitments (e.g. Caring for a family member)	690	63.2
Academic commitments	618	56.6
Lack of personal protective equipment for healthcare staff	576	52.7
Lack of information on volunteering opportunities available	475	43.5
Personal safety (fear of catching coronavirus)	424	38.8
Pre-existing health conditions	318	29.1
Financial implications	240	22.0
Psychological impact	203	18.6
Work commitments	182	16.7
Other: Transmission to others; Transport; Unable to secure volunteering opportunity; Competence; Volunteer role; Support	75	6.9

2

1 *Table 2: Concerns about volunteering during a pandemic from medical students. 798 out of 1145 students (69.7%) described issues they*
 2 *believed they would face when volunteering, and 25 students stated they predicted no issues. 365 out of 1145 students (31.9%) described ethical*
 3 *concerns associated with volunteering, and three students stated there were no ethical concerns. From these responses we identified five themes:*
 4 *safety, professional practice, pressure to volunteer, finances and logistics, and education.*

Theme	Group	Subgroup	Example
Safety	Personal safety	Personal risk of coronavirus	“Medical students could be put in harms way if volunteering around COVID+ patients”
		Health issues	“Some medical students will have underlying medical conditions that may put them at risk of contracting or having more serious consequences from COVID-19”
		PPE	“Lack of PPE leading to medical students being exposed to danger”
		Psychological impact	“Medical students, especially younger years may not have had much clinical experience yet and may experience quite upsetting scenes”
	Other’s safety	Vulnerable family	“Transmitting to vulnerable family members I live with”
		Viral transmission to others	“The greater number of medical students that work, the more the virus spreads through them to their homes”
		Caring responsibilities	“Extra experience for those able to do unpaid work, while those who are carers ... are not able”
	Safe practice	Patient safety	“Is patient safety being put at risk by graduating doctors that haven’t sat finals”
		Working outside of competence	“Inability to say no to tasks I am not confident in”
	Support	Supervision	“Not having sufficient support due to overworked supervisory staff.”
Staffing issues		“Low staff numbers”	
Pressure to volunteer	Pressure to volunteer	General pressure	“Students should not feel pressured when being asked.”
		Coercion	“I would only be concerned if people felt that they had no choice but to volunteer to work”
		Obligated	“I don’t think asking medical students to volunteer is a problem, but it may cause some students to feel obliged to volunteer”
		Promotion	“I think the option should be offered, but in a very neutral manner”
		Own choice	“If students come forward, asking if they can help, that’s their decision”
		Guilt	“It is easy to feel guilty about not working in hospital”
		External pressure	“Universities pressuring students to volunteer”; “Peer pressure”

Professional practice	Competence	Inexperience	“Students may have insufficient experience”
		Burden	“Some students may be beneficial to the NHS while others may need too much support and supervision etc and therefore be a hindrance at this time.”
		Usefulness	“I am currently a junior medical student so I worry I would not be as useful as students who are more senior”
	Professional role boundaries	Unclear role for staff and student	“Blurred lines of responsibility and expectations for medical students”
		Ask outside of competence	“Concerned we will be asked to work beyond our capacity.”
	Discrimination	Discrimination by not volunteering	“Discrimination against Medical Students that did not volunteer.”
		Career prospects	“Pressure on students who think they need to work in case it negatively affects their career if they don’t.”; “expectations for future career interviews if someone did/did not volunteer and that being used against your application”; “need to ensure that there were no penalties for these students who did not volunteer”.
		Ethnicity	“with the recent issue of BAME healthcare workers being disproportionately affected from Covid-19 ... I worry that medical students volunteering may be disproportionately affected as well.”; “Patients may be racist, refusing help from Chinese medical students”
	Legal	Indemnity	“Lack of a protective union for students in particular”; “Insurance coverage should we make a mistake”
		Contract	“Starting work without a contract”
Work	Concerns about work	“Job will be boring/unglamorous”	
	Hospital issues	“Working in stretched system”	
Logistics	Logistics	Accommodation	“Will need new accommodation, won’t be able to stay at home”
		Transport	“I don’t have a car and would be unsure whether public transport would be appropriate - I live far out from major hospitals.”
		Administrative	“Admin issues”
	Support	Support outside of work	“Not being able to see my friends and family outside of my house will be difficult”; “Lack of peer and colleague support”; “Lack of university support”
	Financial	Lack of pay	“I think if students are asked to join the workforce during a pandemic then they must be paid something.”
Financial difficulties		“Students are considered financially vulnerable for clinical trial purposes, similar ethical concerns exist around paid volunteer opportunities”	
Education	University education	Educational disruption	“If we choose not to volunteer, we risk being under skilled compared to our contemporaries who do volunteer”; “Even further loss of study time”
		Work-educational balance	“Volunteering can take students away from their focus on the degree”; “we have exams imminently and have been told if we choose to volunteer we are expected to still perform in exams, and the exams will still contribute towards deciles ... Many of

			us have had to choose between doing what we can to help and risking our education”
	Professional education	Lack of training	“Inappropriate clinical training”; “Without proper training/preparation, harm may also be done to patients or healthcare staff supervising students”
		Learning how to work	“The 'learning' time it takes to learn how the job works”

5

6

7

1 *Table 3: Suggestions to facilitate medical student prosocial behaviour during pandemics and*
2 *disasters*

Recognising there is an emergency situation

- Transparency around communications with medical students

Deciding responsibility

- Transparency around communications with medical students
 - o Non-biased advertising of roles
 - o No mandated recruitment – if required (for example in a catastrophic disaster), this must be a last resort and should not expose vulnerable parties
- Planning should involve medical students and medical educators, and it should have clear triggers for activating medical students into the workforce.
- Distinction between service provision and training should be clear – again there should be clear triggers
 - o Remuneration for service provision positions
- Minimise disruption to education where possible
 - o Aim to align volunteering opportunities to learning outcomes where possible
 - o Hospitals to work with universities to allow education to continue where possible and to minimise conflict with work shifts
 - o Consider postponing or cancelling examinations depending on level of disruption
 - o Do not disadvantage those who did not volunteer in future interview processes
 - o Provide alternative learning arrangements for those who cannot volunteer

Deciding skills and knowledge

- Clear roles for medical students
 - o Personalised holistic volunteering roles:
 - These could be tailored to medical school year or competencies
 - Consider the roles that students who cannot volunteer in clinical settings can do (e.g. vulnerable individuals or family members) –such as contact tracing
 - o The limits of each role should be communicated to other staff members within the hospital
 - o Aim to reduce exposure to patients affected by the pandemic/disaster for junior students where possible
 - o Avoid assigning students to on-call shifts where possible.
 - o Ensure all volunteers have a contract and indemnity cover prior to starting
- Provide additional training
 - o Specific disaster/pandemic training following our previous suggestions (Ashcroft et al. ⁵⁷)
 - o Tailored induction program for volunteers who have had minimal hospital exposure previously

Deciding safety


- Ensure patient safety
 - o Named educational supervisor for every medical student
 - o Explicitly educate students on safety pathways such as exception reporting and clinical incident reporting
- Ensure volunteer safety
 - o Adequate PPE and PPE training for volunteers
- Provide wellbeing services
 - o Pastoral support for both those who are can and cannot volunteer
 - o Sign posting to financial support
 - o Support for students with caring responsibilities or health issues of their own
 - o Ensure adequate physical and mental health support services

Deciding Logistics


- Transparency around communications with medical students
 - o Clear process of how to sign up as a volunteer and obtaining work
 - o Clear description of transport and accommodation amenities

a

If I volunteer, I would be willing to carry out/perform...

**b**

If I volunteer, I would be willing to carry out/perform the following on a COVID-19 ward...

**c**