Mutinke Zulu

The University of Zambia

Department of Midwifery, Women and Child Health

LUSAKA

28th September 2023

Dear Journal Editor

REF: MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

We wish to submit an original research article entitled **“Anxiety and Utilization of counselling services during COVID-19 pandemic among nurses and midwives in selected urban general hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia”** for consideration Journal of Nursing & Midwifery Research.

In this paper, we show that the COVID-19 pandemic increased anxiety levels among nurses and midwives. Providing counselling services as well as Personal Protective Equipment can reduce the psychological stress related to stressful care giving. This study is significant because it has generated knowledge relevant to the support and care of nurses and midwives who are frontline health workers including during pandemics.

We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by the Journal of Nursing & Midwifery Research because the journal aims at publishing relevant research in the field of nursing and midwifery to promote evidence based practice

We confirm that this work is original and has not been published elsewhere, nor is it currently under consideration for publication elsewhere.

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to me at [zulumutinke@gmail.com](mailto:zulumutinke@gmail.com)

Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,



Mutinke Zulu (Ms)

**Anxiety and Utilization of counselling services during COVID-19 pandemic among nurses and midwives in selected urban general hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia.**

**\* Mutinke Zulu 1, Kabwe Chitundu 2 , Sebean Mayimbo3,Samson Shumba4,Nedah Chikonde Musonda5, Deborah Nayame Mushamba6, Patricia Katowa-Mukwato7 Lonia Mwape8**

1,3 Department of Midwifery, Women’s and Child Health, School of Nursing Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia,

2 Department of Mental Health and Psychiatry Nursing, School of Nursing Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia,

4Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia,

5Ministry of Health, Ndeke, House, Lusaka, Zambia,

6 Women and New-born Hospital, University Teaching Hospitals, Lusaka,

7Department of Basic and Clinical Sciences, School of Nursing Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

8Department of Mental Health and Psychiatry Nursing, School of Nursing Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

**\* Corresponding author**

Mutinke Zulu - University of Zambia

School of Nursing Sciences

Lusaka

Zambia

+260976726588

zulumutinke@gmail.com

**Abstract**

**Introduction**

Caring for patients with COVID-19 is physically and emotionally stressful. Inadequate Personal Protective Equipment increases fears and anxieties of contracting the infection. Provision of counselling services to nurses and midwives is one coping strategy. In this study, nurses and midwives at the Women and New-born Hospital and First Level Hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia, had their anxiety levels and use of counselling services evaluated.

**Methodology**

This was a cross-sectional study conducted between December 2020 and May 2021.The total sample was 167 participants, 79 nurses and 83 midwives. The setting was the Women and New-born Hospital and five first level hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia. The health facilities and participants were selected purposefully. Ethical considerations were observed. Data were collected using self-administered semi structured questionnaire and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale with a 14-item, self-report questionnaire. Data were analysed electronically and associations between variables were measured statistically.

**Results and Discussion of findings**

Majority, 25 (86.21%) of female respondents had presence of anxiety compared to males 4 (13.79%). A survey conducted in Ethiopia reported that females nurses were more predisposed to anxiety and mood disorders. This could be due to various factors such as genetic, biological, hormonal, social, psychological factors including role pressure, difficulty in balancing work life, and inadequate support. This study showed that qualification and the research setting were significantly associated with anxiety with a P value of 0.017 and 0.013 respectively. Presence of anxiety was high in Kanyama (33.33%) and Chawama (33.33%). These first level hospitals are government owned and are highly populated; most often lack Personal Protective Equipment and face shortage of nurses and midwives, which worsens the anxieties among nurses and midwives. A similar study in Ethiopia reported that midwives who worked in government hospitals were more likely to experience anxiety compared to those that worked in the private hospitals.

Only 42.51% (71/167) were aware about the availability of counselling centres, and most 68.57% (24/35) of them were working in antenatal clinics. Lack of awareness of counselling services among would affect utilisation of counselling services.

**Conclusion:**

The COVID-19 pandemic increased anxiety levels among nurses and midwives. Providing counselling services as well as Personal Protective Equipment can reduce the psychological stress related to stressful care giving.

**Keywords: (Anxiety, Counselling, COVID-19, Pandemic, Nurses, Midwives).**

**Introduction:**Zambia, like any other country, was not spared from the COVID-19 pandemic. Nurses and Midwives risked contracting the infection as they were at the front line of care provision. Caring for patients with infectious diseases such as COVID-19 is both physically and emotionally stressful. Additionally, inadequate supply of Personal Protective Equipment put nurses and midwives at higher risk of contracting the infection which consequently increases their fears and anxieties of contracting the Virus and infecting their families. This study aimed at assessing the anxieties and utilization of counselling services among nurses and midwives attending to women at the Women and New Born Hospital and First Level Hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia.

**Materials and Methods:**

This was a cross-sectional study conducted between December 2020 and May 2021 on a sample of 167 participants that included nurses (79) and midwives (83). The study was conducted at the Women and New-born Hospital and five first level hospitals in the Lusaka Urban District, namely Chilenje, Kanyama, Chipata, Matero, and Chawama. The health facilities and participants were selected purposefully because they provided primary health care to clients including those with COVID- 19 and therefore rendering them at risk of receiving and caring for women who may be asymptomatic or symptomatic but positive for COVID-19. Ethical approval was sought from the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee and the National Health Research Authority. Consent was obtained from the participants. Utilizing special codes to identify participants allowed for the preservation of anonymity and privacy. Participation was voluntary, and no incentives were provided to the respondents.

The data was collected using self-administered semi structured questionnaire and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale which was developed by Zigmond and Snaith in 1983 and has 14-item, self-report questionnaire. The tool is valid for screening for anxiety and depressive disorders in non-psychiatric units such as medical and surgical wards; gynaecology and antenatal clinics of a teaching hospital and community settings. Data was analysed electronically. Frequencies and percentages were computed for categorical and dichotomous variables. A superimposed normal curve supported with Shapiro Wilk test was used to determine the normality of “age” (continuous variable) which was found not to be normally distributed (p<0.05), thus a reporting was done using the median and interquartile range (IQR). A Kruskal-Wallis or Ranksum test was used to measure the association of age and the outcome variables (counselling and anxiety status). Furthermore, to determine the association between categorical variables, a Chi-square or Fisher's exact test was used (if the expected values in the contingency cell were less than five, a Fisher's exact test was used; otherwise, a Chi-square test was preferred). A Multivariable Logistic Regression Model was used to determine the predictors of counselling. The likelihood ratio test, Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) were used to come up with the best model. A P-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**RESULTS**

**Socio-demographic characteristics of health practitioners and Anxiety status**

The study had a total population of 167 nurses and midwives from five health facilities. However, only 58 (34.7%) of the respondents indicated their health facility with the following distribution; Matero 1/58 (1.72%), Chilenje 17/58 (29.31%), Kanyama 23/58 (39.66%), Chawama 6/58 (10.34%) and Chipata 11/58 (18.97%). The study reported a median age of 29 (IQR; 26 – 35) years, 30.5 (IQR; 26 – 38) and 32 (IQR; 26 – 40) for those normal, suggestive anxiety and presence of anxiety respectively. However, there was no evidence of statistical significance (p>0.05). Furthermore, the study revealed that 85.06% (74/87) of female respondents had normal anxiety status compared to males, 95.56% (43/45) of females had suggestive anxiety compared to males and 86.21% (25/29) of females had presence of anxiety compared to males ***(Table 1).***


The study reported that 53.57% (45/84) and 65.12% (28/43) of midwives had normal and suggestive anxiety status respectively compared to nurses. However, 31.03% (9/20) of midwives had presence of anxiety compared to nurses. In relation to study setting, Chilenje and Kanyama 1st level hospitals reported the highest normal anxiety percentages compared to other hospitals. Suggestive anxiety was high in Kanyama (31.25%) and Chipata (43.75%) whereas presence of anxiety was high in Kanyama (33.33%) and Chawama (33.33%). The findings further show that qualification and hospital were significantly associated with anxiety with a P value of 0.017 and 0.013 respectively *(Table 1).*

**Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of nurses and midwives and anxiety status (n=161)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Anxiety Status** | | | **P-value** |
| **Normal (n=87)** | **Suggestive of Anxiety (n=45)** | **Presence of Anxiety (n=29)** |
| Age (Median, IQR) years | 29 (26 – 35) | 30.5 (26 – 38) | 32 (26 – 40) | 0.5486K |
| **Sex**  Male  Females | 13 (14.94)  74 (85.06) | 2 (4.44)  43 (95.56) | 4 (13.79)  25 (86.21) | 0.194C |
| **Marital status**  Married  Unmarried | 46 (52.87)  41 (41.13) | 24 (53.33)  21 (46.67) | 16 (55.17)  13 (44.83) | 0.977C |
| **Residence**  Low density  Medium density  High density | 7 (8.05)  68 (78.16)  12 (13.79) | 12 (26.67)  29 (64.44)  4 (8.89) | 5 (4.3)  22 (75.86)  2 (6.90) | **0.061** |
| **Qualification**  Nurse  Midwife | 39 (46.43)  45 (53.57) | 15 (34.88)  28 (65.12 | 20 (68.97)  9 (31.03) | **0.017C** |
| **Hospital**  Chilenje  Matero  Kanyama  Chawama  Chipata | 12 (40.00)  1 (3.33)  14 (46.67)  1 (3.33)  2 (6.67) | 2 (12.50)  0 (0.00)  5 (31.25)  2 (12.50)  7 (43.75) | 2(22.22)  0 (0.00)  3 (33.33)  3 (33.33)  1 (11.11) | **0.013F** |
| **Department**  Labour ward  ANC  Postnatal  Others | 42 (48.84)  29 (22.09)  7 (8.14)  18 (20.93) | 21 (46.67)  11 (24.44)  4 (8.89)  9 (20.00) | 11 (37.93)  3 (10.34)  6 (20.69)  9 (31.03) | 0.320C |
| **Duration in Employment**  Less than 1 year  1 to 5 years  Greater than 5 years | 15 (17.44)  39 (45.35)  32 (45.35) | 8 (17.78)  20 (44.44)  17 (37.78) | 4 (13.79)  12 (41.38)  13 (44.83) | 0.961 |
| **Reuse of PPEs**  No  Yes | 56 (65.12)  30 (34.88) | 27 (60.00)  18 (40.00) | 14 (48.28)  15 (51.72) | 0.274C |
| **Accessibility**  No  Yes | 63 (74.12)  22 (25.88) | 36 (80.00)  9 (20.00) | 27 (93.1)  2 (6.90) | 0.093C |
| **Confidence of Protection from PPEs**  Very confident  Moderately confident  Slightly confident  Not confident at all | 3 (3.49)  24 (27.91)  26 (30.23)  33 (38.37) | 2 (4.44)  10 (22.22)  9 (20.00)  24 (53.33) | 0 (0.00)  7 (24.14)  10 (34.48)  12 (41.38) | 0.574 |
| **Able to Fit PPE**  No  Yes | 54 (63.53)  31 (36.47) | 28 (63.64)  16 (36.36) | 18 (62.07)  11 (37.93) | 0.989 |
| **Training on use of PPEs**  No  Yes | 59 (68.60)  27 (31.40) | 30 (68.18)  14 (31.82) | 20 (68.97)  9 (31.03) | 0.997 |

**Availability of counselling centres**

The study showed that only 42.51% (71/167) of the respondents were aware about the availability of counselling centres in the facilities which was distributed as Chilenje, 29.41% (5/17), Matero, 0%, Kanyama, 56.52% (13/23), Chawama, 16.67% (1/6) and Chipata, 27.27% (3/11). Furthermore, those who were aware of the counselling centres in their health facilities, 42.25% (30/76) were working in the labour ward, 16.9% (12/36) were in Antenatal Clinic, 11.27% (8/17) and 29.58% (21/37) were working from Postnatal and other departments as shown in figures 1 and 2 below.



***Figure 1 and 2: Participant’s awareness of the counselling activities***

**Socio-demographic characteristics of nurses and midwives who received counselling**

Table 2 below shows the baseline characteristics of participants who received counselling. The mean age of participants who received counselling was 27 (IQR; 25 – 32) years compared to those who never received did, 31 (IQR; 27 – 38) years. There was sufficient evidence of a difference (P=0.0035). The findings also revealed that 81.58% (31/38) of female participants received counselling compared to 18.42% (7/38) males, however there was no evidence of a difference between the two.

The study further shows that 57.89% (22/38) of those who had been in employment for 1 to 5 years had received counselling compared to 21.05% for both those with less than 1 year and greater than 5 years employment duration. The results show evidence of a difference in the utilization of counselling.

**Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of nurses and midwives who received counselling (n=167)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Received Counselling** | | **P-value** |
| **No** | **Yes** |
| Age (Median, IQR) years | 31 (27 – 38) | 27 (25 – 32) | 0.0035 |
| Sex  Males  Females | 13 (10.57)  110 (89.43) | 7 (18.42)  31 (81.58) | 0.258 |
| **Marital status**  Married  Unmarried | 70 (56.91)  53 (43.09) | 16 (42.11)  22 (57.89) | 0.110 |
| **Residence**  Low density  Medium density  High density | 16 (13.01)  89 (72.36)  18 (14.63) | 3 (38.0)  28 (73.68)  7 (18.42) | 0.723 |
| **Qualification**  Nurse  Midwife | 62 (50.41)  61 (49.59) | 17 (44.74)  21 (55.26) | 0.541 |
| **Hospital**  Chilenje  Matero  Kanyama  Chawama  Chipata | 16 (33.33)  1 (2.08)  15 (31.25)  5 (10.42)  11 (22.92) | 1 (10.00)  0 (0.00)  8 (80.00)  1 (10.00)  0 (0.00) | 0.055 |
| **Department**  Labour ward  ANC  Postnatal  Others | 57 (46.72)  28 (22.95)  14 (11.48)  23 (18.85) | 16 (42.11)  7 (18.42)  2 (5.26)  13 (34.21) | 0.245 |
| **Duration in Employment**  Less than 1 year  1 to 5 years  Greater than 5 years | 17 (13.93)  52 (42.62)  53 (43.44) | 8 (21.05)  22 (57.89)  8 (21.05) | **0.045** |

**Accessibility to PPEs and utilization of counselling services.**

The study shows that 60.53% of those who never accessed PPEs utilized counselling services more than those who accessed (39.47%) p value = 0.001. Similarly, those who reported not confident and slightly confident in the use of PPEs (51.35% and 21.62% respectively) had utilized counselling services more than those who reported moderately confident (16.22%) and very confident (10.81%). The findings further show that accessibility to PPEs was significantly associated with confidence of protection from PPEs (P value 0.015) *Table 3*.

**Table 3:** A**ccessibility of PPEs and utilization of counselling services (n=167).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Utilization of counselling services** | | **P-value** |
| **No** | **Yes** |
| **Overall Availability of PPEs**  Enough at workplace  Enough but worried  Not enough  Don’t know | 10 (8.20)  13 (10.66)  97 (79.51)  2 (1.64) | 6 (15.79)  6 (15.79)  24 (63.16)  2 (5.26) | 0.182 |
| **Reuse of PPEs**  No  Yes | 69 (56.00)  54 (43.00) | 25 (67.57)  12 (32.43) | 0.214 |
| **Accessibility**  No  Yes | 104 (85.95)  17 (14.05) | 23 (60.53)  15 (39.47) | **0.001** |
| **Confidence of Protection from PPEs**  Very confident  Moderately confident  Slightly confident  Not confident at all | 1 (0.81)  32 (26.02)  39 (31.71)  51 (41.46) | 4 (10.81)  6 (16.22)  8 (21.62)  19 (51.35) | **0.015** |
| **Able to Fit PPEs**  No  Yes | 80 (66.67)  40 (33.33) | 21 (56.76)  16 (43.24) | 0.271 |
| **Training on use of PPEs**  No  Yes | 89 (72.95)  33 (27.05) | 21 (58.33)  15 (41.67) | 0.094 |

**Univariate and Multivariable Logistic regression**

The results in table 4 below shows the univariate and multivariable logistic regression model on utilization of counselling services in the health facilities. Controlling for other factors a year increase in the age of nurses and midwives reduced the odds of utilization of counselling services by nurses and midwives (AOR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.83 – 1.02; P<0.094), however there was no evidence to suggest an association. Nurses and midwives who reported the availability of PPEs had reduced odds of utilizing counselling services compared to those who reported not enough (AOR, 0.13; 95% CI, 0.02 – 0.71; P=0.018), holding all factors constant.

Furthermore, the findings show that the nurses and midwives who had access to PPEs had increased odds of utilizing counselling by a factor of 5.17 times (95% CI, 1.70 – 15.79), controlling for all other factors. Nurses and midwives who were moderately confident in the protection of PPEs had reduced odds of utilizing counselling services following Covid-19 exposure compared to those who reported to be very confident (AOR, 0.02; 95% CI, 0.002 – 0.27; P=0.003), controlling for other factors. Similarly, those who reported to have slightly confident on the protection of PPEs had reduced odds of utilization of counselling holding all factors constant.

Confidence in the protection of PPEs, accessibility and availability of PPEs was significant (P<0.05) in the multivariable model, however in the univariate model age, duration of employment, confidence in the PPEs, availability and accessibility of PPEs was as well statistically significant (P<0.05). The results were first run in the mixed effect logistic regression and the variance found was zero, which suggested that we did not have to worry about intra-cluster variance. To select the best model from competing models, the investigator led was used supported by the AIC and BIC. The likelihood ratio test from the best-fit model also suggested that this model was better than the null model (P<0.0001).

**Table 4: Univariate and multivariable logistic regression model**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **COR (95% CI)** | **P-value** | **AOR (95% IC)** | **P-value** |
| Age (Median, IQR) years | 0.92 (0.87 – 0.98) | 0.007 | 0.92 (0.83 – 1.02) | 0.094 |
| **Marital status**  Married  Unmarried | 1.82 (0.87 – 3.79) | 0.112 | 1.09 (0.36 – 3.28) | 0.878 |
| **Department**  Labour ward  ANC  Postnatal  Others | 0.89 (0.33 – 2.41)  0.51 (0.10 – 2.48)  2.01 (0.83 – 4.84) | 0.820  0.403  0.118 | 0.41 (0.09 – 1.89)  1.14 (0.13 – 9.98)  2.32 (0.83 – 6.54) | 0.252  0.907  0.110 |
| **Duration in Employment**  Less than 1 year  1 to 5 years  Greater than 5 years | 1.90 (0.34 – 2.39)  0.32 (0.10 – 0.99) | 0.831  0.047 | 1.35 (0.39 – 4.70)  0.99 (0.19 – 5.24) | 0.637  0.992 |
| **Overall Availability of PPEs**  Enough  Enough but worried  Not enough  Don’t know | 0.05 (0.004 – 0.50)  0.05 (0.005 – 0.52)  0.09 (0.01 – 0.89) | 0.101  0.018  0.039 | 0.20 (0.03 – 1.36)  0.13 (0.02 – 0.71)  1.65 (0.13 – 20.68) | 0.101  0.018  0.698 |
| **Accessibility**  No  Yes | 3.99 (1.74 – 9.13) | 0.001 | 5.17 (1.70 – 15.79) | 0.004 |
| **Confidence of Protection from PPEs**  Very confident  Moderately  Slightly  Not confident | 0.02 (0.002 – 0.27)  0.02 (0.002 – 0.32)  0.15 (0.01 – 1.77) | 0.003  0.005  0.132 | 0.02 (0.002 – 0.27)  0.02 (0.002 – 0.32)  0.15 (0.01 – 1.77) | 0.003  0.005  0.132 |

**Discussion of Findings**

The study participants comprised of nurses and midwives from the Women and New born Hospital and five first level hospitals (Matero, Chilenje, Kanyama, Chawama and Chipata) in Lusaka, Zambia. The study was conducted to determine the anxiety and utilization of counselling services among the nurses and midwives during the COVID-19 pandemic. Anxiety was measured in three categories namely normal anxiety, suggestive of anxiety and presence of anxiety.

**Socio-demographic characteristics of health practitioners and Anxiety status**

The study reported a median age of 29 (IQR; 26 – 35) years, 30.5 (IQR; 26 – 38) and 32 (IQR; 26 – 40) for those with normal, suggestive anxiety and presence of anxiety respectively. This shows that older nurses and midwives had presence of anxiety compared to younger ones although there was no statistical significance of this association. These findings are contrary to findings of descriptive correlational study conducted to determine anxiety levels and solution-focused thinking skills of nurses and midwives working in primary care during the COVID-19 pandemic in which overall, all participants' anxiety scores were above average, indicating a moderate level of anxiety (11). According to the findings of other recent studies, the healthcare workforce has faced high levels of anxiety since the COVID-19 pandemic (16, 17). This anxiety could be due to the infectious nature of the disease and fear related to acquiring the infection, spreading it to family members later or fear of death.

In this study, more female participants had normal anxiety status, suggestive anxiety and presence of anxiety compared to male respondents. This finding is similar to findings of a study conducted to evaluate the level of health anxiety in nurses caring for patients with COVID-19 which showed higher levels in female nurses caring for patients with COVID-19 compared to males (13). A nationwide cross-sectional survey conducted to determine the depression, anxiety and stress during COVID-19 pandemic among midwives in Ethiopia reported similar findings. Females are more predisposed to anxiety and mood disorders due to genetic, biological, hormonal, social and psychological factors (14). On the contrary, androgen receptors in men give them protection and resilience to stand stressful situations (14). Additionally, various stressors including role pressure, difficulty in balancing work life, and inadequate support uniquely affect females. It is expected that the psychological distress increased during the COVID-19 pandemic among female nurses and therefore contributing to this picture of higher numbers of female nurses presenting with anxiety than males (15).

This study showed that qualification and the research setting were significantly associated with anxiety with a P value of 0.017 and 0.013 respectively. The findings revealed that 53.57% (45/84) of midwifes had normal and suggestive anxiety status compared to nurses, 65.12% (28/43). The anxiety experienced by both nurses and midwives could be due to perceived high risk of getting the infection due to exposure to the infections as they attended to patients. Anxiety could be due to fear of being infected and infecting their loved ones back home. Additionally, it is difficult to maintain physical distance during care provision. The exposure is even more for midwives as most perinatal care visits require prolonged contact time with clients. Inadequate supplies of PPEs in the facilities could also heighten the anxiety among nurses and midwives. Similarly, a library review study conducted to investigate the relationship between the prevalence of COVID‐19 and nurses' anxiety disorder reported that nurses had a mental health breakdown and became very anxious during the COVID‐19 due to fear of infection when providing close-contact care to patients infected with COVID-19 (12). According to studies in Iran, the causes of anxiety among care provider caring for COVID-19 patients were fear of being infected, the difficulty of controlling the pandemic and lack of medical equipment (18, 19).

Additionally, on the facilities that had nurses and midwives presenting with anxieties, Chilenje (40%) and Kanyama (46.6%) first level hospitals reported the highest normal anxiety percentages compared to other hospitals. Suggestive anxiety was high in Kanyama (31.25%) and Chipata (43.75%) whereas presence of anxiety was high in Kanyama (33.33%) and Chawama (33.33%). All these first level hospitals are government owned, highly populated and most often with inadequate supply of PPEs. Another challenge faced by public or government hospitals is the shortage of nurses and midwives, which in turn leads to increased workload and worsens the anxieties among nurses and midwives. These findings are similar to that of a study conducted to determine the levels of depression, anxiety and stress, during COVID-19 pandemic among midwives in Ethiopia. The study reported that midwives who worked in government hospitals were more likely to experience anxiety compared to those that worked in the private hospitals (14). This could be attributed to non-availability and accessibility of the PPEs, which puts the nurses and midwives at risk of contracting the COVID 19. Similarly, participants of a study conducted to explore the challenges, strategies, and outcomes of stress management in nurses who faced and provided care to COVID-19 patients cited lack of personal protective equipment and coveralls, particularly in the early days of the pandemic, as one of the main obstacles to stress management (20).

**Availability of counselling centres**

This study revealed that less than half of the respondents 42.59% (69/162) were aware about the availability of counselling centres in the facilities. Most (56.52%), of the respondents who were aware of the availability of counselling services were from Kanyama while none (0.00%), of the respondents from Matero 1st level hospital were aware of the availability of counselling services. The study further showed that most 68.57% (24/35) of the respondents who were aware of the counselling centre in their health facilities were working in antenatal clinic, while the least, 39.19% (29/74), were working in the labour ward. Availability of counselling services is cardinal in helping nurses and midwives cope with anxiety because of caring for COVID -19 patients. However, this lack of awareness of counselling services would lead to lack of utilisation of counselling services by nurses and midwives caring for COVID-19 patients.

A study conducted to explore the challenges, strategies, and outcomes of stress management in nurses who face and provide care to COVID-19 patients recommended that nurses who are directly involved in providing care for COVID-19 patients should take steps to reduce stress and anxiety. Such measures include seeking counselling from a psychologist, as persistent anxiety can result in psychological distress, depression, and other problems (20).

**Nurses and midwives who received counselling**

Nurses and midwives were overwhelmed by the COVID-19 pandemic amidst the frontline roles they played during the pandemic (24). The pandemic took a toll on nurses and midwives both physically and psychologically as nurses witnessed numerous deaths, which left them traumatized as well as scared of possible infection (24). Nurses and midwives therefore needed strategies to deal with these challenges and anxieties. Counselling services could be such strategies to help nurses and midwives cope with these stressors.

This study showed that younger participants received counselling, median age 27 (IQR; 25 – 32) years compared to older participants 31 (IQR; 27 – 38) years. Age was significantly associated with receiving counselling services with a p value of 0.0035. The older one grows, the higher the chances of developing positive help-seeking attitudes. This study further revealed that more female participants 81.58% (31/38) received counselling compared to males 18.42% (7/38), although there was no statistical significance. Further, the study showed that more (57.89%) participants who had been in employment for at least 1 to 5 years received counselling compared to 21.05% for both those with less than 1 year and greater than 5 years in employment with a p value of 0.045.

A scoping review conducted to investigate the nature of work related with psychosocial challenges nurses encountered during the peak of the pandemic and the coping strategies recommended regular counselling and support for all nurses working at the frontline to help them better handle with the devastating effects of the pandemic so that they could build resilience towards future pandemics (21). Another study pointed out that the nurses could adopt several coping strategies to overcome their distress. Such strategies include self‐care management which involves using spiritual coping, physical exercise, and yoga. Self‐care is essential for nurses as a lack of it during times of stress will affect their ability to provide care and increase anxiety levels (22).

**Accessibility to PPEs and utilization of counselling services.**

This study showed that participants who did not access PPEs utilized counselling services more than those who accessed (39.47%). Univariate and Multivariable Logistic regression showed that nurses and midwives who reported the availability of PPEs had reduced odds of utilizing counselling services compared to those who reported not enough (AOR, 0.13; 95% CI, 0.02 – 0.71; P=0.018), holding all factors constant. Nurses and midwives who were moderately confident in the protection of PPEs had reduced odds of utilizing counselling services following COVID-19 exposure compared to those who reported to be very confident (AOR, 0.02; 95% CI, 0.002 – 0.27; P=0.003), controlling for other factors. The PPEs for healthcare personnel particularly nurses and midwives is an essential part of infection prevention and control. Protecting nurses and midwives from infection results in more effective infection containment (23). Utilisation of PPEs gives reassurance and protection from contracting the infection. As such, participants who accessed and utilised PPEs were less worried about contracting the infection and so did not seek counselling. The study further showed that accessibility to PPEs was significantly associated with confidence of protection from PPEs (P value 0.015). Participants who utilised PPEs during the pandemic felt less vulnerable of contracting the infection and so were less likely to be anxious nor seek counselling services.

**Conclusion:**

The current study has demonstrated that the COVID-19 pandemic increased anxiety levels among nurses and midwives providing care in maternity settings of the five first level hospitals in Zambia. These frontline workers need support in terms of counselling services in order to help them cope with stressful event of care giving. Availability of PPEs also played a major role in reducing the psychological stress that was due to care giving during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Acknowledgments:**

Special thanks to the nurses and midwives who participated in this study and gave valuable information that made this study possible.

**Funding Information:**  The study did not receive any funding.

**References:**

1. WHO (2020b). Coronavirus disease (‎ COVID-19)‎ outbreak: rights, roles and responsibilities of health workers, including key considerations for occupational safety and health: interim guidance.
2. Verbeek, J. H., Rajamaki, B., Ijaz, S., Sauni, R., Toomey, E., Blackwood, B., Tikka, C., Ruotsalainen, J. H. & Kilinc Balci, F. S. (2020). Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
3. WHO (2020c). Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports.
4. Pandey, S. & Sharma, V. 2020a. A tribute to frontline corona warriors--Doctors who sacrificed their life while saving patients during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Indian Journal of Ophthalmology, 68, 939-942.
5. Pariante, C. M. (2020). Brain, Behaviour and Immunity. London Elsevier
6. Pandey, S. & Sharma, V. (2020b). A tribute to frontline corona warriors&#8211;&#8211;Doctors who sacrificed their life while saving patients during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. 68, 939-942.
7. Alsubaie, S., Temsah, M. H., Al-Eyadhy, A. A., Gossady, I., Hasan, G. M., Al-Rabiaah, A., Jamal, A. A., Alhaboob, A. A., Alsohime, F. & Somily, A. M. J. T. J. O. I. I. D. C. (2019). Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus epidemic impact on healthcare workers’ risk perceptions, work and personal lives. 13, 920-926.
8. WHO 2020a. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): situation report, 57.
9. Huang, J., Han, M., Luo, T., Ren, A. & Zhou, X. (2020a). Mental health survey of 230 medical staff in a tertiary infectious disease hospital for COVID-19. Zhonghua lao dong wei sheng zhi ye bing za zhi= Zhonghua laodong weisheng zhiyebing zazhi= Chinese journal of industrial hygiene and occupational diseases, 38, E001-E001.
10. Zigmond AS, & Snaith RP. (1983). The hospital anxiety and depression scale. Acta Psychiatr Scand. Jun;67(6):361-70. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x. PMID: 6880820.
11. Selçuk Tosun A, Akgül Gündoğdu N, Taş F. Anxiety levels and solution-focused thinking skills of nurses and midwives working in primary care during the COVID-19 pandemic: A descriptive correlational study. J Nurs Manag. 2021 Oct;29(7):1946-1955. doi: 10.1111/jonm.13334. Epub 2021 Apr 24. PMID: 33838066; PMCID: PMC8250172.
12. Rad M, Rad M, Hefazi Torghabeh L, Fatemi N, Maleki MM, Seifi Z. Increased nurses' anxiety disorder during the COVID-19 outbreak. Brain Behav. 2022 May;12(5):e2552. doi: 10.1002/brb3.2552. Epub 2022 Apr 10. Retraction in: Brain Behav. 2023 Aug 24;:e3237. PMID: 35398986; PMCID: PMC9110903.
13. Mousavi SK, Kamali M, Azizkhani H, Mohammadi S. Health Anxiety among Nurses Caring for Patients with COVID-19. Iran J Nurs Midwifery Res. 2022 Mar 14;27(2):139-143. doi: 10.4103/ijnmr.ijnmr\_213\_20. PMID: 35419269; PMCID: PMC8997182.
14. Kassahun EA., Kassie BA., Tilahun. SY. Bizuneh DA. (2022). Depression, anxiety and stress, during COVID-19 pandemic among midwives in Ethiopia: A nationwide cross-sectional survey. Front. Psychiatry, Public Mental Health. Vol 13 - 2022 | https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2022.867040
15. Motahedi S, Aghdam NF, Khajeh M, Baha R, Aliyari R, Bagheri H, Mardani A. Anxiety and depression among healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Heliyon. 2021 Dec;7(12):e08570. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08570. Epub 2021 Dec 8. PMID: 34901484; PMCID: PMC8653403.
16. Khoshnood Z, Mehdipour-Rabori R, Nazari Robati F, Helal Birjandi M, Bagherian S. Patients' experiences of living with coronavirus disease 2019: a qualitative study. Evid Based Care J. 2021;11(1):44–50. [Google Scholar]
17. . Mira JJ, et al. Acute stress of the healthcare workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic evolution: a cross-sectional study in Spain. BMJ Open. 2020;10(11):e042555. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042555. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
18. Ahmadidarrehsima S, Salari N, Dastyar N, Rafati F. Exploring the experiences of nurses caring for patients with COVID-19: a qualitative study in Iran. BMC Nurs. 2022;21(1):1–7. doi: 10.1186/s12912-022-00805-5. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
19. Mohammadi F, Tehranineshat B, Bijani M, Khaleghi AA. Management of COVID-19-related challenges faced by EMS personnel: a qualitative study. BMC Emerg Med. 2021;21(1):1–9. doi: 10.1186/s12873-021-00489-1. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
20. Hosseini Moghaddam M, Mohebbi Z, Tehranineshat B. Stress management in nurses caring for COVID-19 patients: a qualitative content analysis. BMC Psychol. 2022 May 17;10(1):124. doi: 10.1186/s40359-022-00834-4. PMID: 35581589; PMCID: PMC9112256.
21. Iddrisu M, Poku CA, Mensah E, Attafuah PYA, Dzansi G, Adjorlolo S. Work-related psychosocial challenges and coping strategies among nursing workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: a scoping review. BMC Nurs. 2023 Jun 19;22(1):210. doi: 10.1186/s12912-023-01368-9. PMID: 37337228; PMCID: PMC10278312.
22. Maideen AA, Idris DR, Lupat A, Chung YF, Haji-Badarudin HS, Suhai HK, Abdullah HN, Omar HR, Kisut R, Abdul Rahman H, Abdul-Mumin KH. Nurses' mental health and coping strategies throughout COVID-19 outbreak: A nationwide qualitative study. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2022 Oct;31(5):1213-1227. doi: 10.1111/inm.13031. Epub 2022 Jun 17. PMID: 35714038; PMCID: PMC9349883.
23. Cohen J, Rodgers YVM. Contributing factors to personal protective equipment shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic. Prev Med. 2020 Dec;141:106263. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106263. Epub 2020 Oct 2. PMID: 33017601; PMCID: PMC7531934.
24. Huang L., Chen C., Chen S., Wang H. Roles of nurses and National Nurses Associations in combating COVID-19: Taiwan experience. Int. Nurs. Rev. 2020;67:318–322. doi: 10.1111/inr.12609. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
25. Newman K.L., Jeve Y., Majumder P. Experiences and emotional strain of NHS frontline workers during the peak of the COVID19 pandemic. Int. J. Soc. Psychiatry. 2021;68:783–790. doi: 10.1177/00207640211006153. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] [Ref list]
26. Mayimbo S, Chitundu K, Shumba S, Musonda NC, Zulu M, Mushamba DN, Mwape L, Katowa-Mukwato P. Personal protective equipment availability and accessibility among nurses and midwives in selected urban general hospitals in Lusaka, Zambia: a cross-sectional study. Pan Afr Med J. 2023 Jan 25;44:52. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2023.44.52.32936. PMID: 37128614; PMCID: PMC10148176.