

1 Coping with COVID-19 Pandemic: A Population-Based Study in 2 Bangladesh

3
4 K M Amran Hossain¹ ¶*, Karen Saunders² ¶, Mohamed Sakel³ ¶, Lori Maria Walton⁴ ¶, Veena
5 Raigangar⁵ ¶, Zakir Uddin⁶ ¶, Mohammad Anwar Hossain^{7, 10} ¶, Asma Islam¹ ¶, Faruq Ahmed⁷
6 ¶, Rafey Faruqi⁸ &, Tamanna Tasnim¹ &, Shohag Rana¹ &, Rubayet Shafin⁷ &, Md. Shahoriar
7 Ahmed⁷ &, Md. Obaidul Haque¹ &, Md. Feroz Kabir⁹ &, Mohammad Sohrab Hossain¹ &, Iqbal
8 Kabir Jahid¹⁰ &, Mst. Hosnara Yasmin¹¹ &, Sonjit Kumar Chakrovorty¹⁰ &, Md. Shahadat
9 Hossain¹² & & Joty Paul⁷ &

10
11 ¹ Department of Physiotherapy, Bangladesh Health Professions Institute (BHPI), Dhaka,
12 Bangladesh

13 ² School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent, Canterbury,
14 UK

15 ³ East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust, Canterbury, United Kingdom

16 ⁴ Department of Physical Therapy, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, United States

17 ⁵ Department of Physiotherapy, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

18 ⁶ School of Rehabilitation Science, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

19 ⁷ Department of Physiotherapy, Centre for the Rehabilitation of the Paralyzed (CRP), Dhaka,
20 Bangladesh

21 ⁸ Department of Neuropsychiatry, Kent and Medway Medical School & the University of
22 Kent, United Kingdom

23 ⁹ Department of Physiotherapy & Rehabilitation, Jashore University of Science and
24 Technology, Jashore, Bangladesh

25 ¹⁰ Department of Microbiology, Jashore University of Science and Technology, Jashore,
26 Bangladesh

27 ¹¹ Department of Speech and Language Therapy, Centre for the Rehabilitation of the
28 Paralyzed (CRP), Dhaka, Bangladesh

29 ¹² Department of Pharmacy, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

30 * Corresponding author

31 amranphysio@gmail.com

32 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

33 & These authors also contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

34 **ABSTRACT**

35 This study aims to investigate coping strategies used by Bangladeshi citizens during the
36 COVID-19 pandemic.

37 **Design:** Prospective, cross-sectional survey of adults (N=2001) living in Bangladesh.

38 **Methods:** Participants were interviewed for socio-demographic data and completed the
39 Bengali translated Brief-COPE Inventory. Statistical data analysis was conducted using
40 SPSS (Version 20).

41 **Results:** Participants (N=2001), aged 18 to 86 years, were recruited from eight administrative
42 divisions within Bangladesh (mean age 31.85 ± 14.2 years). Male to female participant ratio
43 was 53.4% (n=1074) to 46.6% (n=927). Higher scores were reported for *approach* coping
44 styles (29.83 ± 8.9), with lower scores reported for *avoidant* coping styles (20.83 ± 6.05).
45 *Humor* coping scores were reported at 2.68 ± 1.3 and *religion* coping scores at 5.64 ± 1.8 . Both
46 men and women showed similar coping styles. Multivariate analysis found a significant
47 relationship between male gender and both *humor* and *avoidant* coping ($p < .01$). Male gender
48 was found to be inversely related to both *religion* and *approach* coping ($p < .01$). Marital
49 status and education were significantly related to all coping style domains ($p < .01$).
50 Occupation was significantly related to *approach* coping ($p < .01$). Rural and urban locations
51 differed significantly in participant coping styles ($p < .01$). Factor analysis revealed two
52 cluster groups (Factor 1 and 2) comprised of unique combinations from all coping style
53 domains.

54 **Conclusion:** Participants in this study coped with the COVID-19 pandemic by utilizing a
55 combination of coping strategies. Factor 1 revealed both *avoidant* and *approach* coping
56 strategies and Factor 2 revealed a combination of *humor* and *avoidant* coping strategies.
57 Overall, a higher utilization of *approach* coping strategies was reported, which has previously
58 been associated with better physical and mental health outcomes. *Religion* was found to be a
59 coping strategy for all participants. Future research may focus on understanding resilience in
60 vulnerable populations, including people with disability or with migrant or refugee status in
61 Bangladesh.

62
63

64 **Keywords:** SARS CoV-2, COVID-19, Pandemic, Coronavirus, Coping, Resilience, Mental
65 Health, Bangladesh

66

67 INTRODUCTION

68 The arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh, in March 2020, adversely impacted
69 the health and everyday lives of Bangladeshi citizens in a variety of stressful ways.^[1]
70 Bangladesh is currently ranked 8th in the world in terms of estimated size of population and
71 6th by density^[2] and, as a country, has suffered from a history of natural disasters including
72 flooding, drought, and cyclones.^[3] The new coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, has severely
73 impacted communities that were already under substantial socio-economic pressures prior to
74 the pandemic. The negative impact of COVID-19 on socio-economic resources, in addition to
75 the high prevalence of illness and deaths from COVID-19 infection, have created new and
76 complex challenges and vulnerabilities for the people of Bangladesh, including specific
77 health concerns, food security, and nutrition.^[4]
78 The first positive case of COVID-19 diagnosed was reported on March 8, 2020.^[5] Since then,
79 562,752 cases of positive COVID-19 have been reported with 8,608 deaths and 515,989
80 individuals who have recovered and survived.^[6] The actual number of COVID-19 related
81 deaths will be is much higher than the reported number. The authors believe that this is likely
82 due to the significant under-reporting of COVID-19 related deaths in Bangladesh, which
83 cannot be accounted for at this time. The World Health Organization (WHO) dashboard
84 shows a spike of cases from May to October 2020 (First wave); from December 2020 to
85 January 2021 (Second wave)^[7] and in March 2021, a rise in the number of newly diagnosed
86 cases, where treatment within an Intensive Care Unit has been required and reported.^[8] A
87 cross-sectional sample survey of the general population, from March 2020 to December
88 2020, examined the knowledge, attitudes and behaviors toward COVID-19 across all
89 provinces in Bangladesh and reported a high prevalence of positive, preventive health
90 behaviors, including the wearing of face masks in public places.^[9] It was also evident that
91 “fear” and “knowledge of COVID-19” was strongly associated with the practice of such
92 preventive health behaviors. Since then, it is possible that a considerable change in coping
93 strategies, related to the pandemic, may have taken place in Bangladesh. Widespread
94 challenges, including mental health for frontline healthcare workers and the general
95 population in Bangladesh during the Lockdown periods, continue to create further
96 complications on an already overburdened health care system.^[10]
97 Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Bangladesh had already reported a severe burden on its
98 healthcare sector, including issues related to inefficiency, scarcity of human resources, and
99 corruption.^[11] The COVID-19 pandemic added an additional burden to an already

100 overburdened healthcare system. ^[11] It quickly became apparent that the pandemic was
101 precipitating an acute mental health crisis with profound impacts in people of all age groups.
102 ^[10] During the first wave, COVID-19 increased fear, ^[9] which necessitated multiple
103 approaches of coping. Many people experienced considerable stress because of fear and
104 anxiety, arising from the threat of COVID-19 disease during the first wave. ^[12] In
105 Bangladesh, the prevalence of COVID-19 related depression and suicidal ideation, during
106 this time, was reported at 33% and 5%, respectively. The risk factors for depression and
107 suicidal ideation include being young, female, smoking and/or having comorbid disease. ^[13]
108 The imposed lockdown intervention, self-isolation, and quarantine measures only intensified
109 mental health challenges across the country, as the majority of people were placed in survival
110 mode and left without any form of societal and/or financial support. ^[14] This resulted in an
111 increased report of loneliness, boredom, and anger during lockdown and may have
112 contributed toward the adoption of negative approach coping styles.
113 Historically, humans have developed various coping strategies to survive disasters. ^[15]
114 However, most people exhibit poor mental coping strategies over a prolonged period of time.
115 ^[16] Coping strategies are defined as “the activities one does to tolerate or decrease mental
116 strain”. ^[17] The Brief-COPE, ^[18] a primary tool for measurement of effective and ineffective
117 ways to cope with stressful situations, introduces four key coping styles seen in patients with
118 severe diagnosis, including: (1) Approach Coping Strategy (APC), (2) Avoidant Coping
119 Strategy (AVC), (3) Humor (H), and (4) Religion (R). In relationship to disease, coping
120 strategies are understood to be either “positive” or “negative” or a combination of both traits.
121 Positive coping, as seen in APC strategy is associated with higher adaptation to adversity,
122 better health outcomes, and more stable emotional response to disease. In contrast, negative
123 coping, as seen in AVC strategy is associated with negative attitudes toward the disease, poor
124 physical health and less effective mental health management. ^[18] Other categories, such as
125 humor and religion, may include both positive and negative coping approach attributes and
126 are independent of either approach.
127 The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the United States advised people to
128 learn how to cope with COVID-19 related stress in more healthy ways in order to develop
129 resilience. ^[19] The World Health Organization (WHO) has prioritized positive coping as a
130 strategy to deal with fear, anxiety, sadness, worry, depression, insomnia, physical illness,
131 substance use and other mental health issues. ^[20] Global concerns have been reported
132 regarding the utilization of negative coping approaches, such as substance use, which are
133 known to be related to a cascade of negative health outcomes at the societal, community,

134 family and individual levels. Negative coping strategies are, also, frequently linked to an over
135 exposure to more negative information about COVID-19. Hence, those with negative coping
136 strategies tend to ignore important objective information crucial to prevention. ^[21-23] There is
137 an emphasis in the global media on sensationalist reporting of negative news, related to the
138 number of people infected and/or deaths from COVID-19. This, in turn, may increase the
139 negative coping strategies related to the perceived risk of COVID-19 in the local population.
140 ^[24] Negative coping strategies, though common for some age groups, are not the primary
141 coping strategies reported as used by older adults. Older adults, a vulnerable population at
142 higher risk of COVID-19, have reported more positive approaches to coping than younger
143 counterparts, using resilience and life experience as a guide through the pandemic. ^[25]
144 Factors, such as *secondary and higher education*, ^[26] have, also, been linked to positive
145 coping strategies. However, other factors, such as *female gender* and *single or separated*
146 *marital status* have been found to be associated with poor coping strategies. ^[27] Furthermore,
147 at the individual level, *personality* may also influence the choice of coping styles, with
148 specific styles of self-blame, distraction, venting and anger associated with poor mental
149 health outcomes. ^[28] Religion is a common coping mechanism for people during times of
150 crisis, which may lead to an over dependency on religious institutions for perceived truths
151 and less belief of scientific evidence, especially when there are discrepancies in the public
152 health messages given by different governments and religions. However, this may also
153 provide an opportunity for religious and private institutions to take an active role in
154 supporting positive and effective public health messages for their local communities, and
155 provide another layer of systemic support for public mental and physical health preventive
156 measures. ^[9]
157 Coping strategies that are associated with better mental health include humor, acceptance and
158 positive reframing. ^[29] Encouraging the adoption of these strategies during the pandemic,
159 may provide one mechanism of facilitating the mental health of individuals and families. The
160 widespread societal behavioral change, across the world, in response to the pandemic has
161 shown an ongoing, pervasive shift in mental health response mechanisms to COVID-19. ^[30]
162 In Low to Middle Income Countries (LMIC), including Bangladesh, mental health may not
163 be a priority on the political agenda nor a central focus for funding, both internally and
164 internationally. However, understanding mental health coping strategies may be one
165 mechanism to understanding the differing adherence to public health measures and create a
166 path for future success in the pandemic response. Therefore, the purpose of this research was
167 to explore the range of coping styles utilized by a diverse sample of adult subjects, living

168 across 8 regions in Bangladesh, and to gain insight into the predominant coping strategies and
169 behaviors for future planning of educational initiatives, health policies, and the promotion of
170 better mental health for Bangladeshi men and women. This research is also a foundation for
171 future research on resilience programs to support physical and mental health throughout the
172 lifetime.

173

174 **METHODOLOGY**

175 **Study Design**

176 This was a prospective, cross-sectional study of adult men and women, across 8 regions in
177 Bangladesh.

178 **Participants**

179 Adult participants, ages 18 and above, were invited to take part in the “Brief-COPE
180 Inventory”,^[18] from October 2020 to January 2021. Participants were recruited via open call
181 and personal communication, and were approached for informed consent for face to face
182 interviews with face to face completion of the Brief-COPE^[31] (S1 File), in addition to
183 providing basic demographic information for the study. The aim of this research was to gain
184 insight and understanding into the main coping strategies, and subsequent coping styles,
185 participants employed during the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh.

186 The total population of Bangladesh is estimated to be 165,760,741^[2] and by the end of
187 January 2020, 535,139 cases of positive COVID-19 infection were reported,^[32] diagnosed by
188 real-time polymerase chain reaction test (RT-PCR). Respondent cluster estimates were
189 divided into 8 administrative divisions of the country and the sample size was calculated
190 using “EPI INFO” version 7.4.2.0 developed by the CDC in the US. The sample size
191 calculation was estimated to be 1088, with 99.9% confidence interval, 50% of expected
192 frequency, 5% margin of error, and 1.0 design effect. For 8 geographical clusters, the sample
193 size of 136 for each cluster was used.

194 **Ethical Permission**

195 Ethical permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Institute of
196 Physiotherapy, Rehabilitation, and Research of Bangladesh Physiotherapy Association on the
197 June 4, 2020 (BPA-IPRR/IRB/04/06/2020/068). Trial registration was obtained prospectively
198 from the Clinical Trial Registry of India (CTRI/2020/10/028196) on October 1, 2020. All
199 participants were given verbal briefs on the study objectives and voluntary written consent
200 was obtained prior to data collection. Participants were assured of confidentiality, ethics and

201 privacy issues and were maintained throughout the study, according to the principles of the
202 Helsinki Declaration ^[33] (S 2 File).

203 **Study procedure**

204 Data collection was undertaken, voluntarily, by 138 undergraduate students from Bangladesh
205 Health Professions Institute (BHPI). After gaining ethical permission, the data collectors
206 were trained, online, regarding the study objectives, ethics, Brief-COPE, and the process of
207 data collection. After training, feedback and evaluation from the data collectors was used to
208 refine the process. The data collectors reside in 55 of the 64 districts within the 8
209 administrative divisions of Bangladesh that were selected. Data collection was conducted
210 through face to face interviews within these 8 regions, with all data collectors adhering to
211 COVID-19 preventive precautions using personal protective equipment (PPE) and social
212 distancing measures. The respondents completed the Bengali translated version of the Brief-
213 COPE questionnaire, with support from the data collectors as requested by the respondents. A
214 hard paper copy of each completed consent form and questionnaire was scanned to a
215 password protected email for trial record keeping by the primary investigator. A small-scale
216 pilot study was conducted to examine the applicability and feasibility of the larger scale study
217 prior to implementation. All relevant safety and preventive health measures were
218 implemented and maintained by the data collection team throughout the study.

219 **Questionnaire**

220 The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first aimed to gather the socio-demographic
221 characteristics of the participants with six questions related to gender, age, marital status,
222 education, occupation, and place of residence. This part also included four questions related
223 to COVID-19 presence or absence of symptoms, as per the Ministry of Health and Family
224 Welfare in Bangladesh [34], COVID-19 positive status, per a RT-PCR test, and COVID-19
225 positive status of anyone close to them. Reported symptoms included fever, dyspnea
226 (shortness of breath), pneumonia, cough, sore throat, muscle weakness, rhinitis, abdominal
227 pain, vomiting, diarrhea, muscle pain, anosmia, ageusia, sicca syndrome, and fatigue. The
228 second part of the questionnaire focused on coping strategies as identified in the Brief COPE
229 questionnaire ^[31] (S1 File). The Brief-COPE Inventory is a 28-item questionnaire, ^[31]
230 developed from the original 60 item Coping to Orientation of Problems Experienced (COPE)
231 Inventory scale. ^[35] Each item on the Brief-COPE has 4 possible response categories, ranging
232 from 1 to 4. In the inventory, “1” corresponds to *I haven't been doing this at all*; “2”, *A little*
233 *bit*; “3”, *A medium amount*, and 4, *I've been doing this a lot*. All items except for Humor and
234 Religion are mapped onto the 2 theoretical constructs of Avoidant Coping (AVC) and

235 Approach Coping (APC) and results are calculated using the raw scores for participants in
236 these domains. ^[35] In addition, the instrument identifies 14 subscales within it, each linked to
237 2 items, as follows: “Self-distraction” (SD) (Items 1 and 19); “Active coping” (AC) (Items 2
238 and 7); “Denial” (D) (Items 3 and 8); “Substance use” (SU) (Items 4 and 11); “Seeking
239 emotional support” (SES) (Items 5 and 15); “Seeking informational support” (SIS) (Items 10
240 and 23); “Behavioral disengagement” (BD) (Items 6 and 16); “Venting” (V) (Items 9 and 21);
241 “Positive reframing” (PR) (Items 12 and 17); “Planning” (P) (Items 14 and 25); “Humor” (H)
242 (Items 18 and 28); “Acceptance” (A) (Items 20 and 24); “Religion” (R) (Items 22 and 27)
243 and “Self-blame” (SB) (Items 13 and 26)”. AVC is linked to the 6 subscales: D, SU, V, BD,
244 SD and SB, whilst APC is linked to the 6 subscales: AC, PR, P, A, SES and SIS. In terms of
245 more broadly defined coping strategies, the subscales of A, SES, H, PR and R have been
246 described as “emotion focused”. AC, SIS and P have been described as “problem-focused”
247 strategies and BD, D, SD, SB, SU and V have been described as “dysfunctional” strategies.
248 ^[35] Thus, the Brief COPE questionnaire enables individuals to express hypothetical responses
249 in terms of coping styles to a potential natural disaster event, such as the COVID-19
250 pandemic. ^[35] In so doing, a spectrum profile across the 2 constructs of AVC and APC can be
251 obtained, along with gaining insight and understanding of the mixture of strategies employed
252 by individuals, when confronted by a stressful life event. Regarding interpretation, AVC is
253 associated with a worse physical health status for those with medical conditions and has also
254 been shown to be less effective at controlling anxiety when compared to AP. ^[35] Whereas,
255 APC is associated with an individual person being able to consciously make a more
256 constructive response to adversity, which includes positive adaptive practical adjustments,
257 which can promote better health and emotional responses.

258 **Reliability and validity of the Brief COPE**

259 This questionnaire has been used in a number of sample population studies related to the
260 experience of stressors in a health-related context. ^[36-41] Within these studies, the scale has
261 demonstrated an acceptable level of internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.70$) and good convergent
262 validity regarding use with depression; with marginal test-retest reliability (test-retest = 0.6).
263 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) also demonstrated a good model fit and acceptable
264 reliability (Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient = 0.61) of the adapted scale. For this
265 research, the Brief-COPE was translated forward into Bengali and then back translated into
266 English by two bilingual British and Bangladeshi researchers. Content validity was later
267 reviewed and determined by a bilingual epidemiologist and a psychiatrist. In this study, the

268 Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the Bangladeshi translated version of the Brief-
269 COPE was determined to be .91.

270 **Statistical Testing**

271 All data was collated within an excel workbook spreadsheet and analyzed using statistical
272 software to obtain the relevant statistical analyses. We used the Statistical Package software
273 for Social Science, SPSS Version 20.0, for this study. Socio-demographic data was analyzed
274 using descriptive statistics in accordance with the nature of the data. After data collection was
275 completed from 2028 participants, further data audit found 2001 data to be eligible for data
276 analysis. The average and standard deviation values for the numerical data were calculated.
277 Normal distribution and skewness and kurtosis value were evaluated using the Kolmogorov-
278 Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk test. The categorical variables related to socio-demographics
279 were considered utilizing non-parametric statistics and scores for the Brief-COPE Inventory
280 were calculated as parametric data, per the normality test results. Relationships between the
281 categorical and the parametric data and between the two data categories were primarily
282 determined by an independent t-test for two variables and chi-square test for more than 2
283 variables (Table 1). Further binary logistic regression was performed for categorical data with
284 alternating respondents and covariates (Table 2). The relationship between parametric data
285 was determined by Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC). An Exploratory Factor Analysis
286 was completed for all the categorical domains in the Brief-COPE Inventory. We conducted a
287 Principal Component Analysis with a Varimax rotation in order to extract the maximum
288 variance from the data set with each component. The correlation matrix was determined by
289 using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test for Sampling Adequacy and further analysis was
290 undertaken if the value obtained was $>.50$ and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity tested for
291 significance. Any individual variables with a correlation matrix $>.40$ were considered to be
292 contributing factors. The correlation matrix was calculated and considered to be of value if
293 the figure obtained was more than or equal to $.80$. In addition, the minimal percentile
294 eigenvalue cut off rule was determined to be 1.104. The minimum threshold for each factor to
295 be considered was set as $.40$ (Figure 3). The alpha value was set as $p<.05$.

296


297 **RESULTS**

298 2001 participants aged 18 years to 86 years of age (31.85 ± 14.2 years) responded to the
299 survey. Response from male participants was 53.4% ($n=1074$) and female participants was
300 46.6% ($n=927$). Respondents represented all eight of the administrative divisions within

301 Bangladesh, including: (1) Dhaka 63% (n=1261), (2) Chittagong 12.8% (n=258), (3)
302 Rajshahi 11% (n=221), (4) Sylhet 04% (n=9), (5) Rangpur 4% (n=82), (6) Barishal 1.4%
303 (n=29), (7) Khulna 3.4% (n=69), and (8) Mymensingh 3.5% (n=72). They also represent 55
304 out of 64 districts of Bangladesh. The respondent distribution is presented in Figure 1.

305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334

335 Figure 1: The population distribution of the respondents



336

337

338 The majority of the responses came from the younger population (18-35 years) 70.3%
339 (n=1406) followed by middle aged adults (36-60 years) 24.8% (n=496). More than half
340 (52.1%) were single or divorced, and 44.4% were married. The educational status varied
341 from “no formal education” at 4% (n=81), and “primary education” at 9.5% (n=190) to
342 “secondary education” 16.2% (n= 325), “higher secondary education” at 35.6% (n=713),
343 bachelor’s degree at 25.4% (n=508), master’s degree at 8.5% (n=170) and Ph. D. degree
344 reported by .7% (n=14) of respondents. In occupational variants, a major part of the
345 respondents reported were students 48.3% (n=966); however, 17.9% (n=359) reported
346 housewife as their major occupation; 9.9% (n=199) reported being employed in a private job;
347 5.8% (n=117) worked in a government job; 2.6% were retired; 1.7% (n=34) were
348 unemployed; and 2.9% (n=59) reported other jobs. The “other jobs” reported related mostly
349 to daily work. Approximately 68% (n=1365) of the respondents lived in the urban area,
350 mostly near the district or sub-district of the Upozila Region and others were respondents
351 from remote villages. In addition, 9.2% (n=185) reported COVID-like symptoms once or
352 more in the period of March 2020 up to the data collection period. In multiple response
353 analysis, COVID-19-like symptoms reported were similar to a fever with common cold
354 symptoms, reported at 5.1% (n=103); fever, sore throat, cough with sputum were reported at
355 2.1% (n=42); viral symptoms with pneumonia were reported at 1% (n=20); viral symptoms
356 with anosmia and sicca syndrome at .7% (n=14); and virus symptoms with diarrhea at .1%
357 (n=3). 4.3% (n=87) were COVID positive in the RT-PCR test. Three hundred eight seven
358 (n=387) respondents (19.3%) reported being exposed to someone close to them with a
359 positive COVID-19 test. No known COVID-19 positive cases were interviewed during the
360 data collection phase in maintenance of the study protocol. The detailed socio-demographics
361 are presented in Table 1.

362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369

370 Table 1: Socio-demographic distribution and relationship with the coping domain

Variables	Number of participants, n (%)	Avoidance mean± SD	t/Chi	p-value (2tailed)	Approach	t/Chi	p-value (2tailed)	Humor	t/Chi	p-value (2tailed)	Religion	t/Chi	p-value (2tailed)
Gender							.114		4.7 ^a	.001		-1.36 ^a	.174
Male	1074 (53.4)	21.39±6.0	4.80 ^a	.001	30.13±8.7			2.82±1.4			5.58±1.9		
Female	927 (46.6)	20.18±5.9			29.49±9.1	1.579 ^a		2.53±1.9			5.70±1.8		
Age													
18-35	1406 (70.3)		85.5 ^b	.831		120.4 ^b	.194		25.5 ^b	.111		27.8 ^b	.065
36-60	496 (24.8)												
61-75	76 (3.8)												
76-90	23 (1.1)												
Marital status													
Single	1043 (52.1)		296.0 ^b	.001		155.2 ^b	.002		57.5 ^b	.001		30.5 ^b	.003
Married	889(44.4)												
Widowed	48 (2.4)												
Divorcee	21 (1)												

Education													
No formal education	81 (4)												
Primary education	190(9.5)												
Secondary education	325(16.2)		337.6 ^b	.001		296.1 ^b	.001		92.0 ^b	.001		90.26 ^b	.001
Higher secondary	713 (35.6)												
Bachelor	508(25.4)												
Masters	170 (8.5)												
Ph. D.	14 (.7)												
Occupation													
Government job	117 (5.8)												
Private job	199 (9.9)												
Farmer	40 (2)		305.2 ^b	.041		365.9 ^b	.001		77.4 ^b	.005		75.5 ^b	.005
Business	175 (8.7)												
Student	966(48.3)												
Retired	52(2.6)												
Housewife	359 (17.9)												
Unemployed	34 (1.7)												
Others	59 (2.9)												
Living area			-										
Rural	636 (31.8)	21.37±6	2.732 ^a		30.98±8.2	-		2.78±1.43	-		5.77±1.85	-	
Urban	1365 (68.2)	20.57±6		.006	29.30±9.2	3.944 ^a	.001	2.64±1.31	2.271 ^a	.023	5.58±1.91	2.148 ^a	.032
Tested COVID													
Yes	70 (3.5)	21.93±5.33	1.562 ^a	.121	33.64±7.13	2.678 ^a	.007	2.76±1.45	0.461 ^a	.645	6.17±1.45	2.403 ^a	.016
No	1931 (96.5)	20.79±6.07			29.72±8.98			2.68±1.35			5.62±1.90		

COVID													
Symptoms Present	185 (9.2)	22.23±4.52	3.314 ^a	.001	34.15±6.42	6.962 ^a	.001	2.63±1.23	-.595 ^a	.552	6.23±1.54	5.168 ^a	0.001
No	1816 (92.8)	20.68±6.17			29.39±9.05			2.69±1.37			5.57±1.91		
COVID													
Positive	87 (4.3)	21.91±4.93	1.706 ^a	.088	36.26±6.94	3.668 ^a	.001	2.60±1.13	-.603 ^a	.564	6.25±1.66	3.104 ^a	.002
Not tested or Negative	1914 (95.7)	20.78±6.09			29.68±9.00			2.69±1.36			5.61±1.90		
COVID anyone around													
Yes	387 (19.3)	20.59±4.20	-.856 ^a	.392	22.97±7.25	7.796 ^a	.001	2.37±.96	-	.001	6.12±1.62	5.669 ^a	.001
No	1614 (80.7)	20.88±6.41			29.08±9.15			2.76±1.42	5.097 ^a		5.52±1.93		

371 ^a Independent t test; ^b Chi-square test; *

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384


385 Table 2: Binary Logistic regression of Socio-demographics and Coping strategy

Variables	Avoidance				Approach				Humor				Religion			
	χ^2	β	OR	P	χ^2	β	OR	P	χ^2	β	OR	P	χ^2	β	OR	P
Male Vs Female	67.93	.135	.874	.003	31.9	-.135	.874	.003	25.49	.135	.874	.003	3.335	-.135	.874	.003
18-35 Vs others	32.0	-.860	.423	.001	50.80 4	-.860	.423	.001	15.37	-.860	.423	.001	20.67 6	-.860	.423	.001
Single Vs others	45.86	-.085	.919	.057	80.57 9	-.085	.919	.057	13.5	-.085	.919	.05	18.49 2	-.085	.919	.05
Higher secondary & Bachelor Vs Others	61.0	-.448	.639	.001	67.40 3	-.448	.639	.001	13.47	.448	.639	.001	5.62	-.448	.639	.001
Student Vs Others	53.7	.067	1.0	.123	76.12 7	.069	1.07	.123	14.37	.069	1.07	.123	8.91	.069	1.07	.123
Rural Vs Urban	83.4	-.764	.46	.001	99.99	-.764	.466	.001	11.354	-.764	.466	.001	22.84	-.764	.466	.001
Symptom present Vs absent	99.5	2.2	9.8	.001	135.6 0	2.28	9.81	.001	7.713	2.28	9.816	.001	40.96	2.28	9.81	.001
COVID positive Vs COVID negative	43.2	3.0	22	.001	68.17	3.09	22.0	.001	6.389	3.09	22.0	.001	16.52	3.091	22.0	.001

386 The Bangladeshi respondents showed a mixed coping strategy during the first wave of
387 COVID-19. Higher scores were reported for approach coping strategies (APC) (29.83 ± 8.9 ;
388 Range: 12- 48); avoidance coping strategies (AVC) were reported at lower levels, overall
389 (20.83 ± 6.05 ; Range: 12-48). Humor (HU) scores were reported at 2.68 ± 1.3 (2-8 scoring
390 scale), and Religion (RE) scores were reported 5.64 ± 1.8 (2 to 8 scoring scale). Figure 1
391 demonstrates that, among the respondents having the AVC style, 84.7% had a 2-3 score
392 related specifically to mild to moderate substance use. The same group also reported similar
393 scores for denial (72.4%), behavioral disengagement (61.4%) and self-blames (67.3%).
394 Respondents with APC style had more scores of 6 to 8 (medium amount to all-time) related
395 to inactive coping (45.3%), emotional support (37.2%), use of information support (35.5%),
396 positive reframing (36.6%), planning (34%) and acceptance (55.1%). From the cluster
397 sample, 24.5% of Bangladeshi respondents coped with the COVID-19 pandemic “all the
398 time” and 30.8% coped “majority of the time” based on religious belief (RE) during the
399 pandemic time frame for this study (Figure 2).

400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419

420 Figure 2: Population distribution of Coping



421

422

423 Male and females showed similar coping strategies, but male respondents reported higher
 424 score means for AVC (21.39 ± 6.0 , 20.18 ± 5.9) and APC (30.13 ± 8.7 , 29.49 ± 9.1) style in 12-48
 425 scales compared to female respondents (Table 1). Male gender was associated with AVC
 426 ($p < .01$), and humor ($p = < .01$); whereas, no association was found between gender and APC
 427 style. Further multivariate analysis found a significant positive relationship between male
 428 gender and AVC style ($\chi^2 67.9$, $\beta .135$, OR.874, $P < .01$) and Humor (HU) coping style (χ^2
 429 25.4 , $\beta .135$, OR.874, $P < .01$); inverse relationships were found between male gender and
 430 APC style ($\chi^2 31.9$, $\beta -.135$, OR.874, $P < .01$) and Religion (RE) coping style ($\chi^2 3.335$, β
 431 $.135$, OR.874, $P < .01$) (Table 2). In the Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC), overall age
 432 scores showed a statistically significant negative correlation with HU ($r = -.06$, $P < .01$) and RE
 433 ($r = -.101$, $P < .01$). Categorization of age group also found no statistically significant
 434 relationships with coping categories. However, respondents, aged 18-35 years, reported
 435 significantly higher scores related to AVC styles ($\chi^2 32.0$, $\beta -.860$, OR.42, $P < .01$), ACP
 436 styles ($\chi^2 50.8$, $\beta .86$, OR.42, $P < .01$), HU coping styles ($\chi^2 15.37$, $\beta -.86$, OR.42, $P < .01$),
 437 and RE coping styles ($\chi^2 20.6$, $\beta -.86$, OR.43, $P < .01$).


438

439 Marital status was positively associated with AVC styles (χ^2 45.8, β -.085, OR.919, $P < .01$),
440 approach (χ^2 80.57, β -.085, OR.919, $P < .01$), HU (χ^2 43.5, β -.085, OR.919, $P < .01$) and RE
441 (χ^2 18.492, β -.448, OR.69, $P < .01$). Similarly, Education had a statistically significant
442 relationship ($p < .01$) with all categories of coping strategy. In binary logistic regression,
443 Higher secondary and bachelor's education groups reported an inverse relationship with AVC
444 style (χ^2 61, β -.448, OR.63, $P < .01$) and RE (χ^2 5.62, β -.448, OR.69, $P < .01$), but exhibited
445 a significant linear relationship with APC style (χ^2 67.4, β .448, OR.63, $P < .01$) related to
446 other education sub-categories. Occupation had a significant positive relationship with
447 approach ($p < .01$). Rural geographical location was significantly different compared to urban
448 locations in AVC style (χ^2 83.4, β -.76, OR.46, $P < .01$), APC style (χ^2 99.9, β -.76, OR.46, P
449 $< .01$), HU (χ^2 11.3, β -.76, OR.46, $P < .01$), and RE (χ^2 22.8, β -.76, OR.46, $P < .01$). The
450 respondents who had COVID-19 like symptoms had a relationship with AVC ($P < .01$), APC,
451 and RE ($P < .01$). Respondents who experienced COVID-19 like symptom also showed a
452 significant difference with asymptomatic respondents with respect to AVC ($P < .01$).
453 Respondents who tested COVID positive ($n=87$) significantly associated with APC ($P < .01$)
454 and RE ($P < .01$) compared to respondents exposed to COVID positive cases in close contact
455 who showed positive association with APC, HU, and RE ($P < .01$). Details are provided in
456 Table 1 and Table 2.

457

458 In, Figure 3, the explanatory factor analysis revealed 2 major factors that were strongly
459 associated with the coping items. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test for Sampling
460 Adequacy found .91 (superior to .50) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was .001. Factor 1
461 found eigenvalue 5.645 (>1.14) and factor 2 found eigenvalue 3.010 (>1.14), other factors
462 were not found eligible. In the principal component analysis using with a Varimax rotation
463 and the minimum threshold for each factor to be considered at .40, the coping items found
464 two clusters with a significant positive correlation (Figure 3). Factor 1 was associated with
465 self-destruction (.739), venting (.670), active coping (.771), seeking emotional support (.800),
466 seeking information support (.833), positive reframing (.753), planning (.759), acceptance
467 (.556) and religion (.635). Factor 2 was associated with denial (.659), substance use (.716),
468 behavior disengagement (.580), self-blame (.616) and humor (.752).

469 Figure 3: Exploratory Factor analysis of Categories of coping strategy



470

471 * Factor 1 (eigenvalue 5.645 > 1.1.4) was associated (Correlation matrix value superior to .40)
 472 with self-destruction (.739), venting (.670), active coping (.771), seeking emotional support
 473 (.800), seeking information support (.833), positive reframing (.753), planning (.759),
 474 acceptance (.556) and religion (.635).

475 ** Factor 2 (eigenvalue 3.010 > 1.1.4) was associated (Correlation matrix value superior to
 476 .40) with denial (.659), substance use (.716), behavior disengagement (.580), self-blame
 477 (.616) and humor (.752).

478 **DISCUSSION**

479 This community-based population study of coping strategies for COVID-19, derived from
480 both rural and urban settings across Bangladesh and representing eight geographical
481 divisions, found significantly higher prevalence of the Approach Coping Strategy (APC)
482 compared to Avoidance Coping Strategy (AVC), overall. In addition, the overall reliance on
483 Religion (RE) as a coping strategy was moderately strong compared to Humor (HU). To our
484 best knowledge this is a groundbreaking population-based-survey on coping strategies
485 utilized during the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh. Results of this study reflect a mixed-
486 approach coping style, with two major factors showing significant association with individual
487 Brief-COPE domains.

488 In the population, higher scores (8 out of 8) were found to be more prevalent in APC and RE
489 and lower scores (2-3 out of 8) were more prevalent in AVC and HU (Figure 2). Population
490 mean scores showed a higher positive coping strategy, similar to APC (29.83 ± 8.9). However,
491 significant mean scores were also observed for negative coping strategies related to AVC,
492 such as struggling with poor health status (20.83 ± 6.05). Higher scores on the APC were also
493 related to higher scores, overall, on self-acceptance, active coping, emotional support,
494 positive reframing, information support and planning. Furthermore, higher mean scores on
495 APC strategies were positively associated with higher education levels, occupation, rural
496 location, and positive COVID-19 status, positive PCR test result, and symptoms. AVC was
497 associated with marital status, education less than secondary school, rural geographical
498 location and having positive COVID-19 symptoms. AVC scores were significantly higher in
499 males compared to females, showing higher dysfunctional coping strategies in Bangladeshi
500 men. Bangladeshi respondents, both male and female, reported a significantly high score for
501 RE coping (5.64 ± 1.8 in the 2 to 8 score range). However, there were no significant
502 differences by gender in reported scores by RE or APC styles.

503 Significantly higher mean scores were reported for the age group 18-35 compared to all age
504 categories with respect to AVC, APC, HU, and RE. Marital status was significantly and
505 strongly correlated with AVC, APC, HU, and RE, with mean scores higher for “single” status
506 compared to all other categories. Religious coping has been found to be the most frequently
507 utilized coping strategy for building resiliency in the face of life and health stress in
508 Bangladesh. ^[42-43] It is not surprising, therefore, to find a similar high report of reliance on
509 religion as one of the major coping strategies during the COVID-19 pandemic, for both men
510 and women, living in various regions throughout Bangladesh. Religious coping strategy has

511 not been categorized in either APC or AVC strategies and can be considered either a positive
512 or negative coping strategy, depending on the perspective of the individual. Though this
513 study did not focus on the specific positivity or negativity of religious coping strategies, there
514 is evidence that religious coping strategies in Bangladesh are considered as positive support
515 and are often mixed with traditional healing practices for over 80% of the population. ^[44]
516 Older adults in our study who showed significant association to APC, similar to other studies,
517 may be relying on resilience and coping mechanisms from previous life experiences. ^[25]
518 Previous studies suggest, greater education ^[26] is linked to positive coping approaches;
519 whereas female gender and single or separated people report more negative coping strategies
520 resulting in poor health outcomes. ^[27] In our study, we found a high prevalence of alcohol
521 (mild to moderate) use in male respondents as a means to cope for men and compared to very
522 low prevalence of alcohol use in women for those who identified in the AVC style. A high
523 prevalence of alcohol utilization for coping in our study is surprising, given that other studies
524 have indicated 94.4% abstinence and only 5.6% lifetime prevalence in studies across
525 Bangladesh. ^[45] In addition, women are much less likely to consume alcohol in Bangladesh
526 because of socio-cultural norms, legal prohibition, and religious adherence expectations and
527 when they do consume it, they may be much less likely to report use because of gendered
528 norm expectations. ^[46] Humor, though significantly higher coping strategy in males compared
529 to females, was not a major factor in coping for the overall population. The contributing
530 factors behind higher scores of APC have not yet been examined. From our previous
531 population-based survey ^[9] higher knowledge, education and female gender was correlated
532 with positive attitude and practice towards COVID-19. The AVC approach was presumed to
533 be higher, as one other study reported the seriousness of the mental health crisis during
534 COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh. However, the results of our study show, overall, the
535 APC style had higher overall scores among all participants. ^[10] AVC style was significantly
536 higher in males compared to females, in our study, and has been shown to be directly linked
537 to fear, ^[9] stress, ^[19] physical illness, insomnia, ^[20] misleading information or spreading of
538 unreliable information, ^[21-23] that was not examined in this study. Differences, by gender, in
539 coping styles may need further exploration to further evaluate all related variables.
540 Exploratory factor analysis found a higher score of eigenvalues 5.645 and 3.010 (Cutoff
541 1.1.04) associated to 2 factors. The categories of coping strategies are highly associated in a
542 positive direction to each other (correlation matrix value superior to .40). Factor 1
543 association was found for a mixed coping manner. The components of Factor 1 association
544 included a mixture of AVC and APC styles involving: (1) self-destruction, (2) venting, (3)

545 active coping, (4) seeking emotional support, (5) seeking information support, (6) positive
546 reframing, (7) planning, (8) acceptance and (9) religion. Factor 2 was associated with a
547 mixture of HU coping and AVC domains in denial, substance use, behavior disengagement,
548 and self-blame. In a comparison study of a low-income nation, caregivers helping with HIV
549 positive patients found 2 factors associated with APC and another 3 factors associated with
550 mixed coping (APC, AVC, RE, and HU) in an exploratory factor analysis also using the
551 Brief-COPE. ^[47] Our study sample represented 8 administrative divisions in Bangladesh, with
552 only 2 divisions reporting less than one-third of the represented cluster sample size. We
553 postulate that our study has adequate representation and strength and the results may be
554 externally generalized to all of Bangladesh. Our study also contributes to the understanding
555 of predominant coping strategies utilized by the Bangladeshi people during the COVID-19
556 pandemic and may, potentially, contribute to positive health policies related to the promotion
557 of mental health for Bangladeshi citizens in the future.

558 One limitation of our study is that the Brief-COPE is a self-report measurement tool and,
559 though highly valid and reliable for major domain areas such as Avoidance, Approach,
560 Humor and Religion, some of the individual subscales show lower internal consistency, when
561 considered in a separate analysis. However, for this sample and the report of the four domains
562 avoidance, approach, humor and religion the validity of the instrument is considered
563 reasonable and acceptable. This study also overcame the barriers to extensive data collection
564 within a short period of time by training skilled rehabilitation data collectors, who lived in the
565 local regions to conduct the face-to-face interviews for all participating respondents. Another
566 limitation of the study is the lack of pre-pandemic coping strategy data to compare the overall
567 effect of COVID-19 on coping strategy changes over time. Furthermore, examination of
568 specific detailed strategies of coping, particularly related to religious coping, would further
569 clarify meaning, both positive and negative strategies, in the context of a major infectious
570 disease threat. Future research would be improved by gaining more understanding of the
571 concept of resilience, while including consideration of how people with disability, ^[48]
572 refugees, ^[49] migrant workers, and other marginalized populations cope with adversities
573 caused by the pandemic. This research could also include the role of traditional and local
574 healing medicine as they relate to religious coping strategies in different regions. Future
575 research could also explore coping strategies and health equity concerns related to vulnerable
576 populations across the region and internationally to understand coping strategies in a global
577 context. Resilience and coping could then be explored in combination with other variables
578 such as region, race, gender identity, disability status and legal status in the case of people

579 with migrant and refugee status.

580

581 **CONCLUSION**

582 Two cluster factors were identified as significant coping style groups for the respondents in
583 this study. Factor 1 was identified as a mixture of AVC and APC styles, including self-
584 destruction, venting, active coping, seeking emotional support, seeking information support,
585 positive reframing, planning, acceptance and religion. Factor 2 was identified as a mixture of
586 AVC and HU coping styles. Overall, a higher utilization of APC was associated with better
587 responses to adverse circumstances, better physical and mental health outcomes. Male
588 respondents reported utilization of more coping strategies in each category (APC, AVC, &
589 HU), except religion, than females. Within the AVC strategy, alcohol utilization and denial
590 showed higher than expected prevalence rates in men. Religion was found to be an integral
591 component of coping all respondents. Limitations include study design and lack of detailed
592 information regarding positivity or negativity the RE and HU strategies reported. Future
593 research into the concept of resilience and how this could be of practical benefit to
594 individuals, families and communities would be extremely useful given that COVID-19 is
595 here to stay. It could also be useful to examine the differences in coping strategies for
596 vulnerable populations and consider any potential differences detected in relation to region,
597 race, gender identity, disability status, legal status in the case of people with migrant and
598 refugee status.

599

600 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

601 The data are available regarding this study and can be viewed in
602 <https://www.kaggle.com/kmamranhossain/population-cope>

603

604 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

605 Authors acknowledge the students of Bangladesh Health Professions Institute (BHPI) for
606 their voluntary contribution in data collection.

607

608 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

609 This is a self-funded study of the authors. Participation of the international authors from the
610 developed countries was voluntary without any institution or organizational affiliation.

611

612 **DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTERESTS**

613 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this
614 article.

615

616 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

617 S1 File: Questionnaire English and Bangla

618 S2 File: Helsinki Declaration

619 S1 Table: Socio-demographic distribution and relationship with the coping domain

620 S2 Table: Binary Logistic regression of Socio-demographics and Coping strategy

621 S1 Figure: The population distribution of the respondents

622 S2 Figure: Population distribution of Coping

623 S3 Figure: Exploratory Factor analysis of Categories of coping strategy

624

625 **REFERENCES**

626

- 627 1. Khan A, Sultana M, Hossain S, Hasan M, Ahmed H, Sikder M. The impact of
628 COVID-19 pandemic on mental health & wellbeing among home-quarantined
629 Bangladeshi students: A cross-sectional pilot study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*.
630 2020; 277:121-128. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.07.135
- 631 2. Bangladesh Population (2021) - Worldometer [Internet]. Worldometers.info. 2021
632 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from: [https://www.worldometers.info/world-](https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/bangladesh-population/)
633 [population/bangladesh-population/](https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/bangladesh-population/)
- 634 3. Islam M, Ingham V, Hicks J, Kelly E. From coping to adaptation: Flooding and the
635 role of local knowledge in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Disaster Risk*
636 *Reduction*. 2018; 28:531-538. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.12.017
- 637 4. Mandal S, Boidya P, Haque M, Hossain A, Shams Z, Mamun A. The impact of the
638 COVID-19 pandemic on fish consumption and household food security in Dhaka city,
639 Bangladesh. *Global Food Security*. 2021; 29:100526.doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2021.100526
- 640 5. Sakib S. Bangladesh confirms first case of coronavirus [Internet]. Aa.com.tr. 2021
641 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from: [https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-](https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-pacific/bangladesh-confirms-first-case-of-coronavirus-/1758924)
642 [pacific/bangladesh-confirms-first-case-of-coronavirus-/1758924](https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-pacific/bangladesh-confirms-first-case-of-coronavirus-/1758924)

- 643 6. Bangladesh Coronavirus: 568,706 Cases and 8,668 Deaths - Worldometer [Internet].
644 Worldometers.info. 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from:
645 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/bangladesh/>
- 646 7. Bangladesh: WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet].
647 Covid19.who.int. 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from:
648 <https://covid19.who.int/region/searo/country/bd/>
- 649 8. Ahmmed Sujam M, Islam Z. Front page [Internet]. thedailystar.net. 2021 [cited 21
650 March 2021]. Available from: [https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/number-](https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/number-critical-patients-surgin-2059989)
651 [critical-patients-surgin-2059989](https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/number-critical-patients-surgin-2059989)
- 652 9. Hossain M, Jahid M, Hossain K, Walton L, Uddin Z, Haque M et al. Knowledge,
653 attitudes, and fear of COVID-19 during the Rapid Rise Period in Bangladesh. PLOS
654 ONE. 2020;15(9): e0239646.Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239646
- 655 10. Hossain K, Roy S, Mosayed Ullah M, Kabir R, Arafat S. COVID-19 and Mental
656 Health Challenges in Bangladesh. Advances in Medical, Dental and Health Sciences.
657 2020;3(2): 31-33.DOI :10.5530/amdhs.2020.2.8
- 658 11. Al-Zaman M. Healthcare Crisis in Bangladesh during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The
659 American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2020;103(4): 1357-
660 1359.doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0826
- 661 12. Bavel J, Baicker K, Boggio P, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M et al. Using social
662 and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. Nature Human
663 Behaviour. 2020;4(5): 460-471.doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z.
- 664 13. Mamun M, Sakib N, Gozal D, Bhuiyan A, Hossain S, Bodrud-Doza M et al. The
665 COVID-19 pandemic and serious psychological consequences in Bangladesh: A
666 population-based nationwide study. Journal of Affective Disorders. 2021;279: 462-
667 472.doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.10.036.
- 668 14. Xiang Y, Yang Y, Li W, Zhang L, Zhang Q, Cheung T et al. Timely mental health
669 care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. The Lancet
670 Psychiatry. 2020;7(3): 228-229.doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8
- 671 15. Jarus O. 20 of the worst epidemics and pandemics in history [Internet].
672 livescience.com. 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from:
673 <https://www.livescience.com/worst-epidemics-and-pandemics-in-history.html>
- 674 16. CHENG S, WONG C, TSANG J, WONG K. Psychological distress and negative
675 appraisals in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). Psychological
676 Medicine. 2004;34(7):1187-1195. doi:10.1017/S0033291704002272

- 677 17. Folkman S. Stress: Appraisal and Coping. *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine*.
678 2013;:1913-1915.doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1005-9_215
- 679 18. Brief-COPE – NovoPsych Psychometrics [Internet]. *Novopsych.com.au*. 2021 [cited
680 21 March 2021]. Available from: <https://novopsych.com.au/assessments/brief-cope/>
- 681 19. COVID-19 and Your Health [Internet]. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*.
682 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/managing-stress-anxiety.html)
683 [ncov/daily-life-coping/managing-stress-anxiety.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/managing-stress-anxiety.html)
- 684 20. Protect mental health during COVID-19 [Internet]. *Who.int*. 2021 [cited 21 March
685 2021]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-update/protect-mental-health-during-covid-19)
686 [disease-\(covid-19\)-update/protect-mental-health-during-covid-19](https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-update/protect-mental-health-during-covid-19)
- 687 21. Noar S, Hall M, Francis D, Ribisl K, Pepper J, Brewer N. Pictorial cigarette pack
688 warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Tobacco Control*. 2015;25(3):341-
689 354.doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051978
- 690 22. Hsee C, Rottenstreich Y. Music, Pandas, and Muggers: On the Affective Psychology
691 of Value. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 2004;133(1):23-30.doi:
692 10.1037/0096-3445.133.1.23
- 693 23. Peters E, Västfjäll D, Slovic P, Mertz CK, Mazzocco K, Dickert S. Numeracy and
694 decision making. *Psychological science*. 2006 May;17(5):407-13.doi:10.1111/j.1467-
695 9280.2006.01720.x.
- 696 24. Ahmed O, Ahmed M, Alim S, Khan M, Jobe M. COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladesh
697 and associated psychological problems: An online survey. *Death Studies*. 2020;:1-
698 10.doi: 10.1080/07481187.2020.1818884
- 699 25. Fuller H, Huseth-Zosel A. Lessons in Resilience: Initial Coping Among Older Adults
700 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *The Gerontologist*. 2020;61(1):114-125.doi:
701 10.1093/geront/gnaa170
- 702 26. Ouwehand C, de Ridder DT, Bensing JM. Individual differences in the use of
703 proactive coping strategies by middle-aged and older adults. *Personality and*
704 *Individual Differences*. 2008 Jul 1;45(1): 28-33.doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.02.013
- 705 27. Berry E, Bachar E, Baras M, De Geest S. Correlates of coping based on the concept of
706 the sociotype: a secondary data analysis of an Israeli National Survey. *Health*
707 *Psychology and Behavioral Medicine*. 2017;5(1):177-196.doi:
708 10.1080/21642850.2017.1286497
- 709 28. Gurvich C, Thomas N, Thomas E, Hudaib A, Sood L, Fabiatos K et al. Coping styles
710 and mental health in response to societal changes during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- 711 International Journal of Social Psychiatry. 2020;;002076402096179.doi:
712 10.1177/0020764020961790
- 713 29. Shing E, Jayawickreme E, Waugh C. Contextual Positive Coping as a Factor
714 Contributing to Resilience After Disasters. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*.
715 2016;72(12):1287-1306.doi:10.1002/jclp.22327
- 716 30. Kehinde T, Eksin E. How fintech can help SMEs rebuild after COVID-19 [Internet].
717 World Economic Forum. 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from:
718 <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/05/fintech-can-help-smes-recover-covid-19/>
- 719 31. Carver C. You want to measure coping but your protocol' too long: Consider the brief
720 cope. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. 1997;4(1):92-
721 100.doi:10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6
- 722 32. Bangladesh COVID-19 Scenario & Trend [Internet]. Covid19bd.idare.io. 2021 [cited
723 21 March 2021]. Available from: <https://covid19bd.idare.io/>
- 724 33. WMA - The World Medical Association-WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical
725 Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects [Internet]. Wma.net. 2021
726 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from: [https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-](https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/)
727 [declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-](https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/)
728 [subjects/](https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/)
- 729 34. লাইভ করোনা ঝুঁকি টেস্ট (Live COVID Risk test) [Internet]. Livecoronatest.com.
730 2021 [cited 21 March 2021]. Available from: <https://livecoronatest.com/>
- 731 35. Carver C, Scheier M, Weintraub J. Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based
732 approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1989;56(2):267-
733 283.doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267
- 734 36. Laganà L, Zarankin K. A cross-sectional study on health and physical functioning in
735 relation to coping strategies among community-dwelling, ethnically diverse older
736 women. *BMC Women's Health*. 2010;10(1). doi: 10.1186/1472-6874-10-10
- 737 37. Culver J, Arena P, Antoni M, Carver C. Coping and distress among women under
738 treatment for early stage breast cancer: comparing african americans, hispanics and
739 non-hispanic whites. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2002;11(6):495-504. doi: 10.1002/pon.615
- 740 38. Cooper C, Katona C, Orrell M, Livingston G. Coping strategies, anxiety and
741 depression in caregivers of people with Alzheimer's disease. *International Journal of*
742 *Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2008;23(9):929-936. doi: 10.1002/gps.2007

- 743 39. Vosvick M, Koopman C, Gore-Felton C, Thoresen C, Krumboltz J, Spiegel D.
744 Relationship of Functional Quality of Life to Strategies for Coping With the Stress of
745 Living With HIV/AIDS. *Psychosomatics*. 2003;44(1):51-58.doi:
746 10.1176/appi.psy.44.1.51
- 747 40. Mohanraj R, Jeyaseelan V, Kumar S, Mani T, Rao D, Murray K et al. Cultural
748 Adaptation of the Brief COPE for Persons Living with HIV/AIDS in Southern India.
749 *AIDS and Behavior*. 2014;19(2):341-351 doi:10.1007/s10461-014-0872-2
- 750 41. Chodkiewicz J, Talarowska M, Miniszewska J, Nawrocka N, Bilinski P. Alcohol
751 Consumption Reported during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Initial Stage.
752 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
753 2020;17(13):4677. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17134677
- 754 42. Bhui K, King M, Dein S, O'Connor W. Ethnicity and religious coping with mental
755 distress. *Journal of Mental Health*. 2008;17(2):141-
756 151.doi:10.1080/09638230701498408.
- 757 43. Grace C, Begum R, Subhani S, Kopelman P, Greenhalgh T. Prevention of type 2
758 diabetes in British Bangladeshis: qualitative study of community, religious, and
759 professional perspectives. *BMJ*. 2008;337(nov04 3):a1931-
760 a1931.doi:10.1136/bmj.a1931.
- 761 44. Haque M, Chowdhury A, Shahjahan M, Harun M. Traditional healing practices in
762 rural Bangladesh: a qualitative investigation. *BMC Complementary and Alternative*
763 *Medicine*. 2018;18(1).doi:10.1186/s12906-018-2129-5.
- 764 45. Islam J, Zaman M, Bhuiyan M, Hasan M, Ahsan H, Rahman M et al. Alcohol
765 consumption among adults in Bangladesh: Results from STEPS 2010. *WHO South-*
766 *East Asia Journal of Public Health*. 2017;6(1):67.doi: 10.4103/2224-3151.206168
- 767 46. Dewan G, Chowdhury FR. Alcohol use and alcohol use disorders in Bangladesh. *Asia*
768 *Pacific Journal of Medical Toxicology*. 2015 Jun 1;4(2):83-90.
769 doi:10.22038/APJMT.2015.5091
- 770 47. Kimemia M, Asner-Self K, Daire A. An Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Brief
771 COPE with a Sample of Kenyan Caregivers. *International Journal for the*
772 *Advancement of Counselling*. 2011;33(3):149-160. doi:10.1007/s10447-011-9122-8
- 773 48. Alam S, Arafat S, Hossain K, Sakel M. COVID-19 impacts on Disability and
774 Rehabilitation in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Physiotherapy Journal*. 2020;10(1):02-05.
775 Doi: 10.46945/bpj.10.1.02

776 49. Hossain K, Walton L, Arafat S, Maybee N, Sarker R, Ahmed S et al. Expulsion from
777 the Motherland: Association between Depression & Health-Related Quality of Life
778 for Ethnic Rohingya Living with Refugee Status in Bangladesh. *Clinical Practice &*
779 *Epidemiology in Mental Health*. 2020;16(1):46-52. doi:
780 10.2174/1745017902016010046