The Effect of Personality Traits on the Quality of Life of Health Professionals in COVID-19 Reference Hospital

Dimitra Lekka 1 , Konstantina Orlandou 2 , Aikaterini Roubi 3 , Dimitra Darahani 4 , Sofia Mpoulougari 5 , Frosyna Anagnosti 6 , Spyros Baras 3 , Athanasios Tsaraklis 7 , Anastasios Stalikas 2

1. Department of Psychiatry, Sotiria Hospital, Athens, GRC 2. Department of Psychology, Panteion University, Athens, GRC 3. Department of Psychiatry, Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, Athens, GRC 4. Department of Cardiology, Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, Athens, GRC 5. Department of Administration, Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, Athens, GRC 5. Department, Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, Athens, GRC 6. Emergency Department, Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, Athens, GRC 7. Department of Dermatology, Sotiria Hospital, Athens, GRC

Corresponding author: Dimitra Lekka, lekkadim@yahoo.gr

Abstract

Introduction and objectives

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has affected the quality of life of both general population and the healthcare workers and has increased the psychopathology levels. The objective of this research was to study the personality traits and the quality of life of healthcare professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to organize and apply interventions for the well-being of the staff.

Materials and methods

The study sample consisted of 400 healthcare workers, in Thoracic Diseases General Hospital "Sotiria". Participants were asked to provide sociodemographic information and to complete: (1) the WHOQOL-BREF, (2) the NEO-FFI. The questionnaire was administered in person to the hospital staff. The data were collected between May and July 2021, in Athens, Greece.

Results

Younger healthcare professionals had a better quality of life and with regard to gender differences, males reported higher scores of physical and psychological health compared to females. Also regarding personality traits, neuroticism and extroversion have a statistically significant effect on the quality of life. In contrast, education level, work area and specialty did not appear to affect the quality of life of hospital staff.

Conclusions

From our research findings, it appears that quality of life has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Interventions are needed to apply mindfulness, increase well-being and form groups with the hospital staff in order to share their experiences.

Categories: Psychiatry, Psychology, Public Health **Keywords:** quality of life, personality traits, hospital staff, covid-19 reference hospital, greece

Introduction

In the end of December 2019, a virus named COVID-19 by WHO, was reported in Wuhan, China for the first time and spread rapidly around the world [1,2]. The declaration of the pandemic of COVID-19 produced big changes in healthcare professionals, because the main characteristic of the situation was the uncertainty. Scientific evidence has shown the impact of the pandemic and the confinement measures to psychopathology of healthcare workers, but we know little about the quality of hospital professionals' life [3-5].

Moderate and high levels of depression, post-traumatic stress and anxiety were observed, during the current COVID-19 crisis, in the frontline healthcare workers, who were particularly susceptible to developing psychiatric disorders [6–9]. The medical health workers and especially the frontline workers find themselves exposed to highly risky situations and feel insecure [10] so this may affect the quality of life of the staff. A previous study conducted in "Sotiria" Hospital, in Athens, Greece, found high rates of sleep disturbances among nurse participants and a significant correlation between stress levels and sleep disorders, which affect the quality of life of the hospital staff [11].

Moreover, several studies have lately been conducted worldwide investigating the associations between

Review began 08/26/2021 Review ended 09/03/2021 Published 09/12/2021

© Copyright 2021

Lekka et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0., which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

How to cite this article

Lekka D, Orlandou K, Roubi A, et al. (September 12, 2021) The Effect of Personality Traits on the Quality of Life of Health Professionals in COVID-19 Reference Hospital. Cureus 13(9): e17897. DOI 10.7759/cureus.17897 personality, with the NEO Five Factor Inventory, and the management of the COVID-19 pandemic in personal level [12]. Anglim et al. found that Neuroticism, Extraversion and Conscientious are strong correlates of well-being [13]. The environment (financial resources, information and skills, recreation and leisure, home environment, access to health and social care, physical safety and security, physical environment, transport) may still moderate the relationship between personality and well-being in the general population [14]. Therefore, the aim of this research was to study how the personality traits affect the quality of life of health care workers in a tertiary referral hospital of COVID-19 in Greece, so that interventions can be designed that will contribute to a better quality of staff's life and well-being.

Materials And Methods

Research design

The investigation was carried out at a tertiary referral hospital of COVID-19 in Greece after approval from the Clinical Research Committee (Number 9587/5-4-21). Thoracic Diseases General Hospital "Sotiria" is recognized as the largest pulmonary center in Greece and one of the largest in Europe, with its simultaneous and progressive transformation into a General Hospital after the establishment of Pathology and Surgery clinics. The hospital received the first case of coronavirus in February 2020 and remains until August 2021 a hospital specializing in COVID-19 cases.

Participants

This study was carried out with total sample of 400 health professionals in public hospital "Sotiria" in Athens, Greece: 69 doctors (17,3%), 211 nurses (52,8%), 57 administrative staff (14,2%), 16 scientific staff (4%) and 47 other (11,8%). Of the participants, 102 were men (25,5%) and 298 were women (74,5%). With regard to age, 76 (19%) were aged between 20 and 30, 122 between 31 and 40 (30,5%), 119 between 41 and 50 (29,8%) and 83 between 51 and 67 (20,8%).

Measures and instruments

The NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) has 60 Likert-type items (12 per domain) ranging from (1=it doesn't happen to me) to (5=it happens absolutely), derived from the original 240 items [15]. The five factor domains assessed by this measure are neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness [15]. The total scores of each subscale are within the range of 0-60. Regarding the reliability in our study, the total Cronbach's alpha coefficient was = 0.70 for the neuroticism scale = 0.75 for the extroversion scale = 0.77 for the openness scale = 0.64 for the agreeableness scale = 0.74 and for the conscientiousness = 0.72.

The WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment was developed by WHOQOL Group [16]. It was administered to measure physical health, psychological health, social relationships and environment. In the WHOQOL-BREF structure is reflected the recognition of the multidimensional nature of quality of life [16]. The WHOQOL-BREF contains a total of 26 questions. Also, one item from each of the 24 facets contained in the WHOQOL-100 has been included and two items from the Overall Quality of Life and General Health facet have been included [16]. The scores of four domains (physical health, psychological health, social relationships and environment) were transformed according to the WHOQOL-BREF manual, to a 0-100 scale [17], with higher domain scores denoting higher QOL. Regarding the reliability in our study, the total Cronbach's alpha coefficient was = 0.90 for physical health = 0.81 for psychological health = 0.69 for social relationships = 0.78 for environment = 0.80.The NEO-FFI is adapted to the Greek population and the WHOQOL-BREF has been weighted to the Greek population.

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSSv.26 and statistical significance was set to 5%. First, the assumption of normality and homocedasticity of variances were checked in order to decide whether to use parametric or non-parametric tests. Results were obtained by means of descriptive statistics, T-test, ANOVA, Pearson's correlation and regression. The critical level of p<0.05 of Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics was analyzed, as well as the levels of asymmetry and kurtosis. From these analyses it was concluded that the data did not follow a normal distribution, nevertheless we decided to use parametric tests because the distribution of the data was close to normal distribution.

Procedure

The technique of convenience sampling was followed for the selection of the sample. The sample was recruited from May 2021 to July 2021. The questionnaire was administered in person to the hospital staff. The questionnaire explains both the objectives of the study and the procedures to be followed during the questionnaire, as well as the right to voluntary withdraw from the study if appropriate.

Results

Of the participants, 102 were men and 298 were women. Most of the sample was between 31 and 40 years old

Cureus

(M = 3.71, SD = 0.52) (30,5%) and the majority were married or partnered (54,5%). 211 people were nurses and the majority worked in the nursing department (Table 1).

| AndmarNumber of the set of the | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Man 122 25% Momen 363 7.5% Ade group 7.5% 7.5% 20-30 7.6% 7.5% 31-40 22.0% 7.5% 31-40 12.0% 7.5% 31-40 12.0% 7.5% 31-50 3.6% 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% 31-60 10 7.5% | Variable | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
| Women9894.%Age group20.007694.%31-40120.5%31-40120.5%41-5083.000.6%5083.000.6%Marital status16.6%Single126.6%Markel dyname186.6%Markel dyname186.5%Money120.5%M | Gender | | |
| Ageoup20-30769%20-30769.6%31-40129.6%41-509.8%9.8%50836.8%Maritalsatu16.6%Single126.6%Maridopartnered186.5%Divored105.5%Midowidower126.5%Leviertorius129.6%Widowidower179.8%Lowiceducation179.8%Stracking Constraint179.8%Stracking Constraint129.6%Nareducation169.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Marinal Constraint129.8%Nareducation129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8%Straint129.8% | Men | 102 | 25.5% |
| 20-30769631-40525641-501958>508128Martal status168Single1768Marted/partnered1868Divored1468Moried/partnered1868University education1763Single1763University education1763Socondary school/lyceum1023%University education1023%Socondary school/lyceum1763Marted Size13%63Socondary school/lyceum13%63Muriesity education1213%Nurse1263Narse13%63Socondary school1863Narse13%63Narse13%63Narse13%63Narse13%63Narse13%63Socondary department1463Intensive care unit6363Emergency department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department1463Acconding department | Women | 298 | 74.5% |
| And <br< td=""><td>Age group</td><td></td><td></td></br<> | Age group | | |
| 41-501929.8%Add 15083.00000.8%Martal status16.8%Single1476.8%Marted/partnered24.00006.5%Divorced46.5%Widow/widower10.3%Level of education172.3%University education1760.3%Speciality170.3%Divorced102.5%University education1760.3%Speciality110.3%Speciality110.3%Narse210.3%Administrative staff611.4%Other121.3%Narse163.3%Other1530.3%Marting department1530.3%Intensive care unit1540.3%Accounting department441%Accounting department143.5%Accounting department143.5%Accounting department143.5% | 20-30 | 76 | 19% |
| SolutionAnalysisMartatataAnalysisMartatata14Single17Marted/partnered18Divorod4Modow/idower1Level of education17Stoendary school/yoeum10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary school/yoeum17More yoeuw10Stoendary school/yoeum10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary school/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary school/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary school/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary School/yoeuw10Stoendary School/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary School/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary School/yoeuw10Mirker yoeuw10Stoendary School/yoeuw10Stoendary | 31-40 | 122 | 30.5% |
| Marital statusImage: Constraint of the statusSingle176.8%Marited/partnered2186.5%Divorced36.5%Widow/widower10.3%University education179.3%Secondary school/yoeum173.8%Marited y Education7%3.8%Morisei y Education133.8%Morisei y Education102.3%Socondary school/yoeum63.8%Morisei y Education9.3%3.8%Morisei y Education113.8%Socondary school/yoeum113.8%Narse113.8%Administrative staff64.4%Other133.8%Morisei action133.3%Mirsing department533.3%Intensive care unit63.3%Intensive care unit41.1%Accounting department143.5%Accounting department143.5% | 41-50 | 119 | 29.8% |
| SingleinformationSingleinfactinfactMarried/parthered218infactDivoredinfactinfactWidow/widowerinfactinfactLevel of educationinfactinfactLevel of educationinfactinfactSocondary school/lycouminfactinfactMixersity educationinfactinfactSocondary school/lycouminfactinfactMixersity educationinfactinfactSocondary school/lycouminfactinfactNurseity educationinfactinfactNurseityinfactinfactNurseityinfactinfactNurseityinfactinfactOtherinfactinfactNursing departmentinfactinfactIntensive care unitinfactinfactAccounting departmentinfactinfactAccounting department< | >50 | 83 | 20.8% |
| Aminiary partnered 218 54.5% Divored 34 5.5% Divored 1 0.3% Widow/widowar 1 0.3% Level of education 17 9.3% Loversity education 17 4.3% Maried/partnerd 108 27% Monity School/lyceum 108 27% Speciality 1 5.8% Divored 69 1.3% Administrative staff 5 6.8% Other 12 4.3% Narsing department 16 4.8% Intensive care unit 53 6.3% Intensive care unit 53 6.3% Accounting department 44 1% Accounting department 64 1% | Marital status | | |
| NordAdditionDivored348.5%Widow/widower100.3%Level of education179.3%University education753.8%M.Sc. holder/ Ph. D holder107%Speciality113.8%Dotor691.3%Administrative staff514.8%Other104.2%Other614.2%Nursing department136.3%Intensive care unit533.3%Intensive care unit343.3%Accounting department445%Accounting department645%Accounting department645% | Single | 147 | 36.8% |
| Widow/widower10.3%Level of education179.3%Secondary school/lyceum1743.8%University education10827%Speciality517.3%Doctor6917.3%Nurse1152.8%Administrative staff614%Other164%Other13.8%Nursing department1538.3%Intensive care unit533.3%Energency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Andinisterio3.5%3.5% | Married/partnered | 218 | 54.5% |
| Lavel of educationInitial and the second | Divorced | 34 | 8.5% |
| Secondary school/lyceum1719.3%University education1754.8%M. Sc. holder/ Ph. D holder082%Speciality107%Doctor691.3%Nurse1152.8%Administrative staff574.4%Scientific staff164%Other471.8%Nursing department1538.3%Intensive care unit533.3%Intensive care unit441.1%Accounting department14.3%3.5%Accounting department14.3%3.5%Accounting department6.3%3.5% | Widow/widower | 1 | 0.3% |
| University education17543.8%University education17543.8%M. Sc. holder/ Ph. D holder10827%Speciality5017.3%Doctor6917.3%Nurse21152.8%Administrative staff574.2%Scientific staff164%Other4711.8%Nursing department15338.3%Intensive care unit533.3%Energency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Accounting department645.5% | Level of education | | |
| M.Sc. holder/Ph.D holder10827%Speciality57.3%Doctor697.3%Nurse21052.8%Administrative staff574.2%Scientific staff164%Other471.8%Work area513.3%Intensive care unit533.3%Intensive care unit441.1%Accounting department43.5%Accounting department63.5% | Secondary school/lyceum | 117 | 29.3% |
| Speciality Product of the second | University education | 175 | 43.8% |
| Doctor691.3%Nurse2115.8%Administrative staff5714.2%Scientific staff64%Other71.8%Work area538.3%Intensive care unit933.3%Emergency department141.1%Accounting department143.5%Accounting department65.5% | M. Sc. holder/ Ph. D holder | 108 | 27% |
| Nuse 211 52.8% Administrative staff 57 14.2% Scientific staff 16 4% Other 70 1.8% Work area 7 1.8% Intensive care unit 53 36.3% Emergency department 93 36.3% Accounting department 44 11% Accounting department 11% 35% | Speciality | | |
| Administrative staff574.2%Scientific staff6%Other71.8%Work area71.8%Nursing department1538.3%Intensive care unit933.3%Accounting department141.%Accounting department9.3%3.5%Accounting department6.3%6.5% | Doctor | 69 | 17.3% |
| Scientific staff 16 4% Other 47 1.8% Work area 53 3.3% Intensive care unit 93 3.3% Emergency department 44 11% Accounting department 14 3.5% Laboratories 34 3.5% | Nurse | 211 | 52.8% |
| Other4711.8%Work area5353.3%Nursing department5353.3%Intensive care unit9323.3%Emergency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Administrative staff | 57 | 14.2% |
| Work areaNursing department15338.3%Intensive care unit9323.3%Emergency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Scientific staff | 16 | 4% |
| Nursing department15338.3%Intensive care unit9323.3%Emergency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Other | 47 | 11.8% |
| Intensive care unit9323.3%Emergency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Work area | | |
| Emergency department4411%Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Nursing department | 153 | 38.3% |
| Accounting department143.5%Laboratories348.5% | Intensive care unit | 93 | 23.3% |
| Laboratories 34 8.5% | Emergency department | 44 | 11% |
| | Accounting department | 14 | 3.5% |
| Other 62 15.5% | Laboratories | 34 | 8.5% |
| | Other | 62 | 15.5% |

TABLE 1: Demographic characteristics of the sample.

One-way Anova was utilized to examine the effect of age on quality of life. Age has a significant effect on physical health [F(3,396)=4.12, p=0.007] and the younger ones had the best physical health (Table 2). Moreover, age has a statistically significant effect on psychological health [F(3,396)=3.46, p=0.002] and the younger ones had the highest score in psychological health (M=3.76, SD=0.61) in relation to those over 30 years old. The effect size was average, η 2=0.077. Also, age has a significant effect on social relationships

[F(3,396)=4.56, p=.004] and the effect size was average, $\eta 2=0.063$. The younger ones had the highest score in social relationships (M=3.90, SD=0.66) in relation to those over 30 years old. Furthermore, age affects the environment [F(3,396)=3.74, p=0.011] (Table 3).

| | м | SD | One-way Anova | η ² | р |
|-------------------|------|------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Age group | | | | | |
| 20-30 | 3.88 | 0.54 | F(3,396)=4.119 | 0.113 | 0.007 |
| 31-40 | 3.71 | 0.52 | | | |
| 41-50 | 3.62 | 0.48 | | | |
| 51-67 | 3.65 | 0.53 | | | |
| Marital status | | | | | |
| Single | 3.83 | 0.51 | F(3,396)=5.157 | 0.112 | 0.002 |
| Married/partnered | 3.64 | 0.51 | | | |
| Divorced | 3.58 | 0.53 | | | |
| Widow/widower | 3.36 | - | | | |

TABLE 2: Effect of age and marital status on physical health.

| | м | SD | One-way Anova | η ² | р |
|-------------------|------|------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Age group | | | | | |
| 20-30 | 3.42 | 0.58 | F(3,396)=3.744 | 0.076 | 0.011 |
| 31-40 | 3.22 | 0.58 | | | |
| 41-50 | 3.14 | 0.60 | | | |
| 51-67 | 3.16 | 0.62 | | | |
| Marital status | | | | | |
| Single | 3.33 | 0.60 | F(3,396)=4.240 | 0.087 | 0.006 |
| Married/partnered | 3.17 | 0.58 | | | |
| Divorced | 3.15 | 0.68 | | | |
| Widow/widower | 1.75 | - | | | |

TABLE 3: Effect of age and marital status on the environment.

Independent sample t-test was utilized to examine the effect of gender on quality of life. Gender has a significant effect on physical health and men had higher score (M=3.79, SD=0.55) in comparison to women (M=3.67, SD=0.50), p=0.04. The effect size was little, d=0.23. Gender has a significant effect on psychological health, with men (M=3.74, SD=0.55) had higher score in comparison with women (M=3.62, SD=0.52), p=0.04. The effect size was little, d=0.22. The specialty, the education level and the work area hadn't a significant effect on quality of life.

One-way Anova was utilized to examine the effect of marital status on quality of life. Marital status has a statistically significant effect on physical health [F(3,396)=5.157, p=0.002] and the single ones had the highest score in physical health (M=3.83, SD=0.51) in relation to the other marital status (Table 2). The effect size was average, η^2 =0.112. Also, marital status has a significant effect on environment [F(3,396)=4.240, p=0.006] and the effect size was big, η^2 =0.087. Singles had the highest score in environment (M=3.33, SD=0.60) in relation to those with different marital status (Table 3).

The results from the analyzes show that neurotism has a significant negative effect on physical health [β =-0.259, t=-5.765, p=0.001], extroversion has a significant positive effect on physical health [β =0.163, t=2.56, p=0.011], agreeableness has a significant positive effect on physical health [β =0.101, t=2.123, p=0.034] and conscientiousness has a significant positive effect on physical health [β =0.147, t=2.547, p=0.011]. The effect size was average, f2=0.335.

Additionally, the results from the analyzes show that neurotism has a significant negative effect on psychological health [β =-0.290, t=-6.704, p=0.001], extroversion has a significant positive effect on psychological health [β =0.310, t=5.06, p=0.011] and conscientiousness has a significant positive effect on psychological health [β =0.129, t=2.313, p=0.021]. The effect size was average, f2=0.344.

Finally, we found that neurotism has a significant negative effect on social relationships [β =-0.213, t=-4.15, p=0.001], extroversion has a significant positive effect on social relationships [β =0.470, t=6.49, p=0.011] and agreeableness has a significant positive effect on social relationships [β =0.220, t=4.07, p=0.001]. The effect size was big, f2=0.533.

Discussion

Analyzes have shown that personality traits have a significant effect on quality of life in hospital settings. Especially, we found that neuroticism and extroversion have a significant effect on physical health, psychological health and social relationships, agreeableness affects physical health and social relationships, and conscientiousness has a significant effect on physical health and psychological health. These findings are in agreement with other studies that have found that extraversion is associated with negative effect, during coronavirus crisis and the restrictions measures, because the most extroverted find it difficult to obey restrictive measures. [18,19]. Also, neuroticism is related to the negative estimation of COVID-19 crisis [20-22]. Individuals with higher levels of conscientiousness show stronger COVID-19 caused adaptation [23-25]. Further, a survey study in Canada in early May 2020 found that higher extraversion and lower emotional stability were related to higher perceived stress during the COVID-19 pandemic [26], which may be explained by the fact they are not accustomed to isolation.

With regard to gender differences, our findings are in line with previous studies that reported high levels of stress, anxiety, depression, sleep disturbance and burnout with more frequent and intense symptoms among women [3]. In addition, a research in Greek healthcare professionals has shown that women reported more PTSD symptoms in comparison with men [27]. Also, a study that took place in Italy revealed that being female and not in a relationship was found to be associated with higher depression levels [10]. This finding isn't in line with our results that shown that marital status had a significant effect only on physical health and environment and not on psychological health.

Moreover, our research highlighted that age affects statistically significant the quality of life and the younger ones are those with better quality. In contrast to this, the results of a research in Spain showed that younger healthcare workers had higher levels of stress, anxiety, depression and post-traumatic stress [28]. One possible explanation for this could be that these workers, have less experience in the field and they aren't resilient enough in order to handle situations like the COVID-19 pandemic. Research findings show that neuroticism and extroversion are associated with well-being [29] and in the present study neuroticism has a negative effect on physical and psychological health and social relationships perhaps because of the measures of self-protection against COVID-19.

Our study naturally faced some limitations worth mentioning. Firstly, further research is needed to generalize the results with a larger sample from various hospitals treating patients with COVID-19. Secondly, in the present study in the sample women are significantly more than men, as well as scientific staff is very few people (N=160).

Conclusions

With the present research, we see that personality traits affect a crisis situation with effects on the quality of life of the healthcare workers in a hospital of COVID-19 cases. Based on the research findings we can design and organize therapeutic interventions for the staff, with the aim of improving their quality of life and wellbeing. Our study hasn't find a significant effect of specialty, education level and work area on quality of life in a hospital setting. Based on the results, we suggest interventions that deal with psychological pressure, such as the application of mindfulness, enhancing self-care and creation of groups with the hospital staff, where the sharing of emotions and experiences is enhanced, offering one another help, the encouragement and the humor. Finally, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the impact of personality traits in crisis situations, such as pandemics.

Additional Information

Disclosures

Human subjects: Consent was obtained or waived by all participants in this study. Clinical Research Ethics

Committee issued approval 9587/5-4-21. **Animal subjects:** All authors have confirmed that this study did not involve animal subjects or tissue. **Conflicts of interest:** In compliance with the ICMJE uniform disclosure form, all authors declare the following: **Payment/services info:** All authors have declared that no financial support was received from any organization for the submitted work. **Financial relationships:** All authors have declared that they have no financial relationships at present or within the previous three years with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work. **Other relationships:** All authors have declared that there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

References

- 1. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, et al.: Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease. JAMA Netw Open. 2020, 3:e203976. 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976
- Mo Y, Deng L, Zhang L, et al.: Anxiety of nurses to support Wuhan in fighting against COVID-19 epidemic and its correlation with work stress and self-efficacy. J Clin Nurs. 2021, 30:397-405. 10.1111/jocn.15549
- Danet Danet A: Psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic in Western frontline healthcare professionals. A systematic review. Med Clin (Engl Ed). 2021, 156:449-58. 10.1016/j.medcle.2020.11.003
- Hall H: The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers' mental health . JAAPA. 2020, 33:45-8. 10.1097/01.JAA.0000669772.78848.8c
- Labrague LJ: Psychological resilience, coping behaviours and social support among health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review of quantitative studies. J Nurs Manag. 2021, 10.1111/jonm.13336
- Tan BY, Chew NW, Lee GK, et al.: Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health care workers in Singapore. Ann Intern Med. 2020, 173:317-20. 10.7326/M20-1083
- Chew NW, Lee GK, Tan BY, et al.: A multinational, multicentre study on the psychological outcomes and associated physical symptoms amongst healthcare workers during COVID-19 outbreak. Brain Behav Immun. 2020, 88:559-65. 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.049
- Xiang YT, Yang Y, Li W, Zhang L, Zhang Q, Cheung T, Ng CH: Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. Lancet Psychiatry. 2020, 7:228-9. 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8
- 9. Bao Y, Sun Y, Meng S, Shi J, Lu L: 2019-nCoV epidemic: address mental health care to empower society. Lancet. 2020, 395:e37-8. 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30309-3
- Di Tella M, Romeo A, Benfante A, Castelli L: Mental health of healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. J Eval Clin Pract. 2020, 26:1583-7. 10.1111/jep.13444
- 11. Tselebis A, Lekka D, Sikaras C, et al.: Insomnia, perceived stress, and family support among nursing staff during the pandemic crisis. Healthcare. 2020, 8:10.3390/healthcare8040434
- 12. Rammstedt B, Lechner CM, Weiß B: Does personality predict responses to the COVID-19 crisis? Evidence from a prospective large-scale study. Eur J Personality. 2021, 1-14. 10.1177/0890207021996970
- Anglim J, Horwood S, Smillie LD, Marrero RJ, Wood JK: Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: a meta-analysis. Psychol Bull. 2020, 146:279-323. 10.1037/bul0000226
- 14. Anglim J, Horwood S: Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic and big five personality on subjective and psychological well-being. Social Psychol Personality Sci. 2021, 12:1527-37. 10.1177/1948550620983047
- 15. Costa PT, McCrae RR: Revised NE0 personality inventory and NE0 five: factor inventory professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL; 1992.
- 16. World Health Organization: WHOQOL-BREF: introduction, administration, scoring and generic version of the assessment: field trial version. World Health Organization, Geneva; 1996.
- 17. Harper A, Orley J: WHOQOL-BREF: Introduction, administration, scoring and generic version of the assessment. Programme on Mental Health [Internet]. World Health Organization, Geneva; 1996.
- Carvalho LF, Pianowski G, Gonçalves AP: Personality differences and COVID-19: are extroversion and conscientiousness personality traits associated with engagement with containment measures?. Trends Psychiatry Psychother. 2020, 42:179-84. 10.1590/2237-6089-2020-0029
- Modersitzki N, Phan L, Kuper N, et al.: Who is impacted? STRESSFULNESS OF COVID-19 26 Personality predicts individual differences in psychological consequences of the COVID19 pandemic in Germany. Social Psychol Personality Sci. 2020, 12:1110-30. 10.1177/1948550620952576
- Gubler DA, Makowski LM, Troche SJ, Schlegel K: Loneliness and wellBeing during the Covid-19 pandemic: associations with personality and emotion regulation [Epub ahead of print]. J Happiness Stud. 2020, 1-20. 10.1007/s10902-020-00326-5
- Kroencke L, Geukes K, Utesch T, Kuper N, Back MD: Neuroticism and emotional risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Res Pers. 2020, 89:104038. 10.1016/j.jrp.2020.104038
- Lippold JV, Laske JI, Hogeterp SA, Duke É, Grünhage T, Reuter M: The role of personality, political attitudes and socio-demographic characteristics in explaining individual differences in fear of coronavirus: A comparison over time and across countries. Front Psychol. 2020, 11:552305, 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.552305
- Abdelrahman M: Personality traits, risk perception, and protective behaviors of Arab residents of Qatar during the COVID-19 pandemic [Epub ahead of print]. Int J Mental Health Addict. 2020, 1-12. 10.1007/s11469-020-00352-7
- Blagov PS: Adaptive and dark personality in the COVID-19 pandemic: Predicting health-behavior endorsement and the appeal of public-health messages. Soc Psychol Personal Sci. 2021, 12:697-707. 10.1177/1948550620936439
- 25. Clark C, Davila A, Regis M, Kraus S: Predictors of COVID-19 voluntary compliance behaviors: an international investigation. Glob Transit. 2020, 2:76-82. 10.1016/j.glt.2020.06.003
- Liu S, Lithopoulos A, Zhang CQ, Garcia-Barrera MA, Rhodes RE: Personality and perceived stress during COVID-19 pandemic: testing the mediating role of perceived threat and efficacy. Pers Individ Dif. 2021, 168:110351. 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110351
- 27. Blekas A, Voitsidis P, Athanasiadou M, et al.: COVID-19: PTSD symptoms in Greek health care professionals.

Psychol Trauma. 2020, 12:812-9. 10.1037/tra0000914

- Dosil M, Ozamiz-Etxebarria N, Redondo I, Picaza M, Jaureguizar J: Psychological symptoms in health professionals in Spain after the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. Front Psychol. 2020, 11:606121. 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.606121
- 29. Gutiérrez JLG, Jiménez BM, Hernández EG, et al.: Personality and subjective well-being: big five correlates and demographic variables. Personality Individual Diff. 2005, 38:1561-9. 10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.015