

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/146627>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

© 2020 Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.


For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

## Journal Pre-proof

The associations of cognitive and behavioral components of psychological resilience with anxiety amid COVID-19: A population-based study

Wai Kai Hou , Horace Tong , Li Liang , Tsz Wai Li , Huinan Liu ,  
Menachem Ben-Ezra , Robin Goodwin , Tatia Mei-chun Lee

PII: S0165-0327(20)33217-1  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.12.127>  
Reference: JAD 12877



To appear in: *Journal of Affective Disorders*

Received date: 25 August 2020  
Revised date: 26 October 2020  
Accepted date: 24 December 2020

Please cite this article as: Wai Kai Hou , Horace Tong , Li Liang , Tsz Wai Li , Huinan Liu , Menachem Ben-Ezra , Robin Goodwin , Tatia Mei-chun Lee , The associations of cognitive and behavioral components of psychological resilience with anxiety amid COVID-19: A population-based study, *Journal of Affective Disorders* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.12.127>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V.

### **Highlights**

- Worry about COVID-19 infection is positively related to higher risk of anxiety.
- Resilient mentalities are related to better mental health across levels of worry.
- Regular daily routines are related to better mental health across levels of worry.
- Facets of resilience are not related to mental health among persons without worry.
- Facets of resilience could be more relevant to persons with high stressor exposure.

Journal Pre-proof

Resilience, stressor exposure, COVID-19

**The associations of cognitive and behavioral components of psychological resilience with anxiety amid COVID-19: A population-based study**

Wai Kai Hou, PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Horace Tong, MSc<sup>3,4</sup>, Li Liang, BSocSc<sup>2</sup>, Tsz Wai Li, MSc<sup>2</sup>, Huinan Liu, MA<sup>1,2</sup>, Menachem Ben-Ezra, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Robin Goodwin, PhD<sup>6</sup>, Tatia Mei-chun Lee, PhD<sup>3,4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, The Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Psychosocial Health, The Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

<sup>3</sup> State Key Laboratory of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

<sup>4</sup> Laboratory of Neuropsychology, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

<sup>5</sup> School of Social Work, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

<sup>6</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom

\* Correspondence to:

Wai-Kai Hou, PhD, Department of Psychology, The Education University of Hong Kong, 10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po NT, Hong Kong SAR, China.

Email: wkhou@eduhk.hk; Phone: (852) 2948-8841; Fax: (852) 2948-8454

Tatia M.C. Lee, PhD, State Key Laboratory of Brain and Cognitive Sciences and Laboratory of Neuropsychology, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong.

Email: tmclee@hku.hk; Phone (852) 3917-8394; Fax (852) 2858-3518

## Abstract

### Background

This study examined the associations between components of psychological resilience with mental health at different levels of exposure to COVID-19 stressors.

### Methods

A population-representative sample of 4,021 respondents were recruited and assessed between February 25th and March 19th, 2020. Respondents reported current anxiety symptoms (7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale [GAD-7]), cognitive components (perceived ability to adapt to change, tendency to bounce back after adversities) and behavioral components (regularity of primary and secondary daily routines) of resilience, worry about COVID-19 infection, and sociodemographics.

### Results

Logistic regression revealed that cognitive and behavioral components of resilience were not correlated with probable anxiety ( $GAD-7 \geq 10$ ) among those reporting no worry. Among respondents who were worried, all resilient components were inversely associated with probable anxiety. Specifically, propensity to bounce back and regular primary routines were more strongly related to lower odds of probable anxiety among those reporting lower levels of worry.

### Limitations

The cross-sectional design limits causal inference. Second, other resilient components and some key daily routines that could be related to better mental health were not assessed. Third, generalizability of the findings to other similar major cities is uncertain because cases and deaths due to COVID-19 in Hong Kong have been comparatively lower.

**Conclusions**

To foster mental health, cultivation of confidence in one's ability to adapt to change and a propensity to bounce back from hardship should be coupled with sustainment of regular daily routines. Such assessment and intervention protocols are more relevant to those who suffer heightened levels of exposure to COVID-19 stressors.

**Keywords:** COVID-19; anxiety; psychological resilience; stressor exposure

**Introduction**

Different forms of lockdown, quarantine, and social/physical distancing have been implemented across most countries affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. These infection control strategies have changed key life domains, impacting on personal mobility (e.g. activity limitations due to home confinement), interpersonal relationships (e.g. reduced face-to-face interaction), and occupational/educational activities (e.g., changes in employment roles and daily activities of workers and students). These changes in life could be a reference of functional impairments consequential to common mental disorders such as depression, suggesting a probable mental health toll (Holmes et al., 2020; Üstün and Kennedy, 2009). There is therefore an urgent need for identifying adaptive psychological and behavioral pathways that reduce the potential burden on mental health services.

Using convenience samples studies have already identified a handful of psychosocial predictors of mental health since the outbreak of the pandemic. Loneliness was related to higher levels of anxiety, depressive, and PTSD symptoms in a community sample of 3,480 Spanish people (González-Sanguino et al., 2020). Perceived effective social distancing and lower

negative impact of COVID-19 were associated with more positive and less negative feelings amongst Italians both in Italy and living abroad ( $N=9,000$ ) (Zanin et al., 2020). Higher levels of social support and greater self-efficacy were associated with lower perceived stress and anxiety symptoms amongst Chinese medical staff treating COVID-19 patients (Xiao et al., 2020) as well as college students (Cao et al., 2020). Compared with people unaffected by quarantine, depressive and PTSD symptoms were higher among Chinese people under quarantine during COVID-19, with higher levels of symptoms related to absence of perceived support from the community and government (Lai et al., 2020).

### **Psychological Resilience**

One construct that is of high relevance to adaptation to the current COVID-19 pandemic is psychological resilience. Resilience has been intensively investigated as an outcome that reflects a human potential to lead a normal living, even after experiencing major life challenges. Masten (2001, 2014) suggested this “ordinary magic” is present among children and adolescents who demonstrated normative psychological functioning despite past and present adversity. “Ordinary magic” means that resilience is not attributable to extraordinary qualities but normative adaptation and coping resources in everyday life. Across stressful life events such as bereavement, terrorist attack, mass violence, natural disasters, and life-threatening illnesses, the majority of the people demonstrated subclinical levels of psychological distress or psychological well-being over time (Bonanno, 2004; Galatzer-Levy et al., 2018; Hou et al., 2010; Infurna and Luthur, 2017). During the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) epidemic in Hong Kong, patients of SARS who demonstrated consistently subclinical levels of psychological distress reported lower levels of SARS-related worry and higher levels of perceived social support relative to those demonstrating clinically significant psychological distress over time (Bonanno

et al., 2008).

Psychological resilience has also been considered as a multidimensional construct regulated dynamically by the complex interaction of external and internal social, behavioral, cognitive, biological, and neural factors (Kalisch et al., 2017). Resilience encompasses at least three key components: (1) flexible adaptation to changing external/environmental and internal/mental demands (e.g. Luthar et al., 2000); (2) propensity to bounce back and demonstrate positive functioning in adversity (e.g., Zautra et al., 2010); and (3) effective interpersonal interactions and quality relationships that buffer individuals from psychosocial distress (e.g., Skodol, 2010). These components of psychological resilience have been used to reflect overall coping ability in adversity and are associated with adaptive psychological functioning (Connor and Davidson, 2003; Hu et al., 2015). Longitudinal investigations have reported that survivors who demonstrated stably high psychological resilience also reported lower levels of anxiety, depressive, or PTSD symptoms in the years following the Great East Japan Earthquake (Okuyama et al., 2018; Kukihara et al., 2014). There is further evidence suggesting the importance of considering individual cognitive components in evaluating mental health during COVID-19. Perceived tenacity and strength of overcoming difficulties were lower among health care workers who lacked experience in public health emergency treatment compared to those with more relevant experiences and resources. Both these two components were inversely associated with psychological distress (Cai et al., 2020).

Apart from such cognitive components, patterns of daily behavior are concomitant with underlying processes of psychological resilience during trauma and chronic stress conditions (Hou et al., 2018; Miller and Rasmussen, 2010). Regularized routines have been found to buffer the adverse impact of stress exposure on mental health. Survivors of natural disasters tend to



maintain regular daily activities in response to post-disaster stress (Fukuda et al., 1999; Parks et al., 2018), with the restoration or preservation of pre-disaster daily routines predictive of lower psychological distress prospectively in the years following the Great East Japan Earthquake (Goodwin et al., 2019). Meta-analysis of conflict-affected forced migrants found that a disruption in different types of daily experiences mediated the positive association between premigration trauma exposure and postmigration psychiatric symptoms, with premigration trauma related to more disrupted daily living and greater mental health problems in postmigration settings (Hou et al., 2020). While resilience factors such as self-efficacy and social relationships/support have been found to predict lower psychological distress during COVID-19 (Lai et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020), cognitive and behavioral components of psychological resilience were understudied.

### **COVID-19: Stressor Exposure**

To examine associations between the components and outcomes of psychological resilience during COVID-19, it is important to take into account stressor exposure (Bonanno, 2004; Masten, 2014). Proxies for indicating stressor exposure include perceived or actual threat to human functioning (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984) or subjective feelings of stress (Cohen et al., 2007). In particular, in Hong Kong, a region that was badly impacted by SARS in 2003, perceived risk of infection by SARS was associated with higher depressive symptoms three years after the SARS outbreak (Liu, et al., 2012). Worry about infection and perceived susceptibility were associated with higher psychological symptoms including anxiety, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder (Kwok et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020).

### **The Present Study**

This study aims to examine associations between the understudied aspects of

psychological resilience (i.e., cognitive and behavioral components) and mental health during COVID-19 in Hong Kong. We expect that both cognitive and behavioral components will be inversely associated with probable anxiety (i.e. Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale [GAD-7] score  $\geq 10$ ) across different levels of exposure to COVID-19 stressors. We also investigated whether the inverse associations between cognitive and behavioral components and the risk of anxiety will be positively or inversely related to levels of worry.

## Methods

### Respondents and procedure

Upon obtaining Ethics Committee's approval from the university (masked for peer review), respondent recruitment and telephone interviews were conducted by the Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, and Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute between February 25 and March 19, 2020 (the acute phase of the epidemic in Hong Kong). A Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system was used. Random digit dialing was used to recruit a population representative sample of Hong Kong residents. A dual-frame approach of sampling with both landline and mobile phone numbers (50% each) was utilized. Telephone numbers were randomly extracted from databases of telephone numbers released by the Hong Kong Communication Authority. A person was considered eligible if he/she was (1) a Hong Kong Chinese resident, (2) 15 years of age or older, and (3) Cantonese-speaking. For the landline phone calls, if multiple household members were eligible after successful contact, the one with the closest birthday to the interview date was selected. Further attempts would be arranged by CATI to the dial-out numbers which were “no answer,” “busy,” or “eligible respondent not at home.” Oral informed consent was obtained at the beginning of interview. All interviews were conducted during both working and non-working

hours from 2pm to 10pm on weekdays and weekends.

Among the total 92,509 telephone numbers attempted, 38,538 (41.7%) of them were ineligible for interview (i.e., invalid, non-resident/business telephone, fax numbers, no eligible respondent); 48,765 (52.7%) were unconfirmed whether eligible or not. Among the 5,206 (5.6%) contacted eligible cases, interviews were completed by 4,021 (77.2%), whereas 884 (17.0%) indicated refusal and 301 (5.8%) eligible respondents did not complete the interviews. A cooperation rate of 77.2% was recorded (i.e., number of completed interviews / number of contacted eligible cases). The sampling error was within  $\pm 2.2\%$  at 95% confidence level. The participation and nonparticipation rates were acceptable and comparable with the population-representative samples in prior studies in Hong Kong (Galea and Tracy, 2007; Hou et al., 2015; Leung et al., 2005).

## Measures

***Cognitive components of resilience.*** Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale-2 (CD-RISC2) was used to assess the cognitive components of “ability to adapt to change” and “tendency to bounce back after illness or hardship” within the construct of psychological resilience (Vaishnavi et al., 2007). Respondents were asked to rate the items with reference to their experience in the past two weeks on a 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not true at all) to 10 (true nearly all the time). This abbreviated scale was translated into Chinese and have been validated among Hong Kong Chinese with good validity and reliability (Ni et al., 2015). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.78 in the current administration.

***Behavioral components of resilience.*** Items from the Sustainability of Living Inventory (SOLI; Hou et al., 2019) were adapted to assess regularity of primary and secondary daily routines. Primary routines are necessary for maintaining livelihood and biological needs whereas

secondary routines are optional in accordance with motivations and preferences (Hou et al., 2019). Respondents rated to what extent healthy eating and sleep (primary routines) and socializing and leisure activities (secondary routines) were disrupted in the past two weeks on an 11-point scale (0=high level of disruption, 10=no disruption). The two items have been found to be validly associated with mental health in population survey (Lai et al., in press). Higher scores indicated greater regularity.

**Anxiety symptoms.** The 7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale (GAD-7) was used to assess anxiety symptoms (Spitzer et al., 2006). Respondents rated each item on a 4-point scale (0=not at all, 1=on several days, 2=on more than half of the days, 3=nearly every day) based on their experience in the past two weeks. Higher scores indicated greater severity of anxiety symptoms (range=0–21). High internal consistency and validity of the scale has been shown in different populations (Spitzer et al., 2006). Alphas in the current study was 0.93. Scores of 10 or higher were used to indicate clinically significant anxiety symptoms (Plummer et al., 2016), with the scores recoded into 0 (scores=0–9) or 1 (scores=10–21).

**Worry about COVID-19 infection.** Respondents reported the extent to which they felt worried about being infected with COVID-19 on a 4-point scale (0=not at all, 1=some, 2=quite a bit, 3=very much).

**Sociodemographics.** A standardized proforma was used to ask respondents' age in years, gender, marital status, education level, employment status, monthly household income, and income change since the COVID-19 outbreak.

### **Analytic plan**

Multiple imputation was conducted to replace missing data (<1%) using SPSS (Version 26; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). COVID-19 stressor exposure referred to responses to the item on

worry about infection: not at all (0), some (1), quite a bit (2), and a lot (3). Prevalence of probable anxiety and descriptive statistics of the cognitive and behavioral components of resilience, namely ability to adapt to change, propensity to bounce back, and regularity of primary routines (i.e., healthy eating and sleep) and secondary routines (i.e., socializing and leisure activities) were identified for respondents at different levels of worry separately.

The associations of probable anxiety ( $GAD-7 \geq 10$ ) with resilient components (cognitive and behavioral) were tested in multivariable logistic regression models, adjusted for gender (female vs. male), age group (15-24 vs. 25-34, 35-44, 45-64,  $\geq 65$ ), marital status (unmarried vs. married), education level (primary/below and secondary vs. tertiary/above), employment status (dependent and unemployed vs. employed), monthly household income (<HK\$20,000, \$20,000-\$39,999, \$40,000-\$59,999, and \$60,000-\$79,999 vs.  $\geq$ \$80,000), and income change (increased/stable vs. decreased). The resilient components and sociodemographic factors were treated as continuous variables and categorical variables in the models, respectively. Separate models were conducted for those without worry (“not at all”) and with worry (“some,” “quite a bit,” and “very much”). Adjusted odds ratio (aOR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) indicated the associations between each resilient component and the odds of probable anxiety. The model of respondents reporting worry was stratified by the levels of worry in order to (1) demonstrate the component-outcome associations on each level of worry and (2) compare the component-outcome associations between different levels. The logistic regression was conducted using the `glm` function of Stats Package in R software environment (R Core Team, 2016).

## Results

### Sample and Descriptive Statistics

The 4,021 respondents ranged in age between 15 and 92 years ( $M = 46.1$ ,  $SD = 17.7$ ,

1

median = 46); 2,220 (55.2%) were female. A total of 67 (1.7%) respondents reported receiving no formal education, 304 (7.6%) primary education, 1,759 (43.7%) secondary education, and 1,891 (47.1%) tertiary education or above. The current sample resembled the population in terms of age group distribution, gender, education level, and monthly household income level (Census and Statistics Department, 2020). The demographics are summarized in Table 1.

The prevalence of probable anxiety (GAD-7  $\geq 10$ ) in different groups of worry about infection were 4.9% (not at all), 6.2% (some), 16.3% (quite a bit), and 35.4% (very much). Prevalence linearly increased with higher ratings on worry, with a small difference between the group without worry and the group at low worry. A decreasing trend was observed on the scores on ability to adapt to change, propensity to bounce back, regularity of primary routines, and regularity of secondary routines as ratings on worry increased (Table 2). The trends are illustrated in Figure 1.

### **Logistic Regression Analysis**

Controlling for demographic and socioeconomic variables, the odds of probable anxiety were not associated with ability to adapt to change, propensity to bounce back, and regular healthy eating and sleep among respondent without worry about infection (“not at all”) (Table 3). All four cognitive and behavioral components were associated with reduced odds of probable anxiety at each level of worry, except for ability to adapt to change on “some” worry (Table 4). The inverse associations of propensity to bounce back (aOR = 0.74–0.86, 95% CI= 0.65–0.75, 0.86–0.98) and regularity of healthy eating and sleep (aOR = 0.76–0.83, 95% CI= 0.69–0.76, 0.84–0.91) with probable anxiety were stronger at lower levels (“some”/ “quite”) of worry relative to higher levels (“very much”). In addition, people reporting decreased income were at higher odds of probable anxiety across all levels of worry, compared to those reporting

increased/stable income (aOR = 1.36–4.40, 95% CI = 1.09–1.34, 1.69–14.39).

### Discussion

This study examined the associations between components of psychological resilience with the odds of probable anxiety during the acute phase of COVID-19 in Hong Kong. Consistent with our expectations, ability to adapt to change, propensity to bounce back, and regularity of primary and secondary daily routines were significantly inversely related to probable anxiety at each level of worry, suggesting that despite comparable levels of stressor exposure both cognitive and behavioral components are related to mental health increments. In contrast, only regularity of secondary routines was related to lower odds of probable anxiety in the absence of worry. We also found that propensity to bounce back and regular primary routines were more strongly related to lower odds of probable anxiety at lower rather than higher levels of worry. Finally, income loss was related to higher odds of probable anxiety among people with and without worry.

Living in one of the most densely populated regions in the world, Hong Kong population has been demonstrating major changes in behaviors in response to the threat of the pandemic (Cowling et al., 2020). Perceived ability to adapt to change and propensity to bounce back are relevant to such substantial population behavioral changes, and the inverse associations of them with clinically significant anxiety symptoms were consistent with previous evidence collected among Mainland Chinese (Cai et al., 2020). Similar findings have also been obtained from a sample of Italians ( $N=220$ ) during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, with coping abilities relating to resilience associated with lower psychosocial distress and higher subjective well-being (Yildirim and Arslan, 2020). The inverse associations between components and probable anxiety were significant across all levels of worry about infection with the exception of

the association between ability to adapt to change and the risk of anxiety, which occurred only at the higher of worry. This is consistent with previous evidence on the importance and relevance of the ability to adapt to change to mental health in the aftermath of more extreme levels of stress/trauma, such as the experience of war (Connor, 2006; Tran et al., 2013).

Regular primary (healthy eating and sleep) and secondary (socializing and leisure activities) routines were inversely associated with the risk of anxiety. COVID-19 arguably impacts the daily life of all people with different backgrounds. College students who reported being under home quarantine and had shorter sleep duration (<6 hours/night) were more likely to demonstrate higher depressive and PTSD symptoms (Tang et al., 2020). Working adults who stopped working due to the pandemic reported higher levels of psychological distress relative to those who returned to the office and worked from home after a month of quarantine, with the inverse association between severity of COVID-19 in a person's home city and life satisfaction strongest amongst people who exercised less (Zhang et al., 2020). We add to this evidence by showing that regularizing daily routines is related to lower risk of anxiety at different levels of stressor exposure (Hou et al., 2019). This can have important implications for public health messages and interventions both during and after COVID-19. For many disease control strategies involving physical distancing and quarantine it might be difficult to increase the practice of adaptive routines such as healthy eating, sleep, socializing, and leisure activities, and any subtle suggestion involving increases in frequency could lead to confusion that would compromise mental health and increase infection risk (Hou et al., in press). Rather, people should focus on regulating those routines which improve mental health. For example, weekly video calls with closer social partners living apart can be seen as a reliable source of emotional support (Rea et al., 2015), whereas leisure activities on a regular basis reduces the adverse impact of ongoing stress



on mental health (Wada et al., 2007).

We report stronger associations of a propensity to bounce back from adversities and regular healthy eating and sleep with lower odds of anxiety at lower levels of exposure to COVID-19 stressors. This suggests that these resilient components could be complementary to other core correlates of psychological resilience among person with high stressor exposure, such as frontline healthcare professionals and essential workers including cleaners, couriers, and porters. These people face an increased exposure to the risk of infection. Previous studies have showed that health care workers treating patients with COVID-19 directly and indirectly reported considerable levels of psychological distress and anxiety and depressive symptoms, which were inversely related to sleep quality, self-efficacy, and perceived social support (Lai et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020). The most direct and effective resources for these people to cope with the increased risk of infection are sufficient supplies of protective gears, shorter working hours, and reduced workload (Greenberg et al., 2020). Apart from these external factors, a resilient mentality along with regular healthy eating and sleep may be under greater personal control (Galea et al., 2020; Ryan et al., 2020). These resilient components should be prioritized in order to maintain adaptive psychological functioning, despite the continuous challenges of the pandemic (Harper et al., in press).

We also observed that, compared to people with increased/stable income, those with decreased income were at higher odds of anxiety across all levels of worry about being infected with COVID-19. The world faces huge financial insecurity with global mass lay-offs and reduced income potential as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic (World Bank Group, 2020). Conservation of resources (COR) theory proposes that loss of personal, social, and material resources is a significant predictor of poorer psychological adaptation during trauma and chronic

stress conditions (Hobfoll, 2010; Hou et al., 2015). Loss of financial resources during and after disasters can have a significant adverse impact on the affected populations' coping and mental health and meanwhile elevate vulnerability to further and future resource loss (Hobfoll, 2010). Those losing financial resources may be more susceptible to infection through lower access to quality health care and greater financial strain (Galea and Abdalla, 2020).

### **Limitations and conclusion**

Cautions are warranted in interpreting our findings due to some limitations. First, the cross-sectional design limits causal inference, although it seems less likely that anxiety symptoms are driving cognitive and behavioral components of resilience while the association between symptoms and worry can be reasonably seen as bidirectional. It is nonetheless important to note that our cross-sectional measure of clinically significant anxiety symptoms is not readily comparable with a resilient trajectory over time. Resilience may be best studied examining outcomes in prospective studies (Kalish et al., 2017). Our cross-sectional data can thus be best seen as offering an initial evidence base for future longitudinal investigations and interventions assessing psychological resilience during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, we did not consider other resilient components that are related to better mental health during COVID-19, such as self-efficacy and social relationships/support (Lai et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020). Perceived ability to adapt to change and propensity to bounce back from illness and hardship were focuses of study because they have both been suggested as the core components of psychological resilience (Connor, 2006; Kalisch et al., 2017; Masten, 2014) but were understudied in the current pandemic. We used the two items in Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale to reflect cognitive components of psychological resilience, while the two items are commonly considered as reflecting trait resilience that explained a small part of variance in

resilient outcomes in previous studies (Meyer et al., 2019). Third, other key daily routines were not assessed in the current study, including personal/household hygiene, household chores, exercising, and work/study involvement that could have been disrupted and may impact mental health (World Health Organization, 2020). Fourth, regular socializing might be in contradiction to disease control strategies of physical distancing (Gerhold, 2020). Our item nonetheless reflected overall regularity that encompasses both face-to-face and indirect means such as phone and internet. Finally, because confirmed cases and deaths due to COVID-19 in Hong Kong have been lower than those in other major cities or regions such as Singapore, London, and New York, future studies need to confirm the current findings in other similar regions.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the current study offers one of the largest population-representative analyses of psychological resilience during COVID-19. Governments (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020; Public Health England, 2020) and representative non-governmental organizations (Mayo Clinic, 2020; World Health Organization, 2020) have provided structured guidelines for people to improve their mental health through cultivating positive attitudes and restoring regularity and normalcy in daily living. This study provides additional, more focused information for fostering psychological resilience among those exposed to heightened stress. In conjunction with consolidating useful routines (e.g., good sleep and leisure activities at home) and developing novel meaningful routines (e.g., via connections with close social partners living apart), it is also important to maintain or cultivate confidence in one's ability to adapt to change and bounce back from hardship.

#### **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

WKH and TMCL conceived and designed the study. LL and HT prepared and conducted the data analysis. WKH oversaw the data analysis and conducted data interpretation. The manuscript was

1

written by WKH and TMCL with input from HT, LL, TWL, HL, MBE, and RG. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

**Role of the Funding Source**

This research was supported by the Collaborative Research Fund from the University Grant Committee of Hong Kong (C7069-19GF, awardees: TMCL and WKH). The funding source had no role in any process of our study.

**Declaration of Competing Interest**

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Acknowledgements**

None

### References

- Bonanno, G., 2004. Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events?. *Am. Psychol.* 59 (1), 20–28.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.59.1.20>.
- Bonanno, G., Ho, S., Chan, J., Kwong, R., Cheung, C., Wong, C., Wong, V., 2008. Psychological resilience and dysfunction among hospitalized survivors of the SARS epidemic in Hong Kong: A latent class approach. *Health Psychol.* 27 (5), 659–667.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.27.5.659>.
- Cai, W., Lian, B., Song, X., Hou, T., Deng, G., Li, H., 2020. A cross-sectional study on mental health among health care workers during the outbreak of Corona Virus Disease 2019. *Asian J. Psychiatr.* 51, 102111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102111>.
- Cao, W., Fang, Z., Hou, G., Han, M., Xu, X., Dong, J., Zheng, J., 2020. The psychological impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res.* 287, 112934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934>.
- Census and Statistics Department. 2020. Hong Kong in Figures.  
<https://www.statistics.gov.hk/pub/B10100062020AN20B0100.pdf> (accessed 22 August 2020).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020. Stress and coping.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/managing-stress-anxiety.html> (accessed 22 August 2020).
- Cohen, S., Janicki-Deverts, D., Miller, G., 2007. Psychological stress and disease. *JAMA* 298 (14), 1685–1687. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.298.14.1685>.
- Connor, K.M., 2006. Assessment of resilience in the aftermath of trauma. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 67

(Suppl 2), 46–49.

Connor, K.M., Davidson, J.R., 2003. Development of a new resilience scale: the Connor-

Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depress. Anxiety* 18 (2), 76–82.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>.

Cowling, B., Ali, S., Ng, T., Tsang, T., Li, J., Fong, M., Liao, Q., Kwan, M., Lee, S., Chiu, S.,

Wu, J., Wu, P., Leung, G., 2020. Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 and influenza in Hong Kong: An observational study. *Lancet Public Health* 5 (5), E279–E288. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034660>.

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034660>.

Fukuda, S., Morimoto, K., Mure, K., Maruyama, S., 1999. Posttraumatic stress and change in

lifestyle among the Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake victims. *Prev. Med.* 29 (3), 147–151.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.1999.0528>.

Galatzer-Levy, I., Huang, S., Bonanno, G., 2018. Trajectories of resilience and dysfunction

following potential trauma: A review and statistical evaluation. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 63, 41–

55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2018.05.008>.

Galea, S., Abdalla S.M., 2020. COVID-19 Pandemic, Unemployment, and Civil Unrest:

Underlying Deep Racial and Socioeconomic Divides. *JAMA* 324, 227–228.

[doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11132](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.11132)

Galea, S., Merchant, R., Lurie, N., 2020. The mental health consequences of COVID-19 and

physical distancing. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 180 (6), 817–818.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1562>.

Galea, S., Tracy, M., 2007. Participation Rates in Epidemiologic Studies. *Ann. Epidemiol.* 17 (9),

643–653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2007.03.013>.

Gerhold, L., 2020. COVID-19: Risk perception and coping strategies. *PsyArXiv Preprints*

<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xmpk4>.

González-Sanguino, C., Ausín, B., Castellanos, M., Saiz, J., López-Gómez, A., Ugidos, C.,

Muñoz, M., 2020. Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. *Brain Behav. Immun.* 87: 172–176.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.040>.

Goodwin, R., Sugiyama, K., Sun, S., Aida, J., Ben-Ezra, M., 2019. Psychological distress after the Great East Japan Earthquake: two multilevel 6-year prospective analyses. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 216, 144–150. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2019.251>.

<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2019.251>.

Greenberg, N., Docherty, M., Gnanapragasam, S., Wessely, S., 2020. Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ* 368, m1211.

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1211>.

Harper, C., Satchell, L., Fido, D., Latzman, R., in press. Functional fear predicts public health compliance in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict.*

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00281-5>.

Hobfoll, S.E., 2010. Conservation of resources theory: Its implication for stress, health, and resilience. in: Folkman, S., (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Stress, Health, and Coping*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 127–147.

Holmes, E., O'Connor, R., Perry, V., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C.,

Christensen, H., Silver, R. C., Everall, I., Ford, T., John. A., Kabir, T., King. K., Madan. I., Michie. S., Przybylski A., Shafran. R., Sweeney. A., & Worthman. C., et al., 2020.

Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: A call for action for mental health science. *Lancet Psychiatry* 7 (6), P547–560. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2215-0366\(20\)30168-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2215-0366(20)30168-1).

- Hou, W.K., Hall, B.J., Canetti, D., Lau, K.M., Ng, S.M., Hobfoll, S.E., 2015. Threat to democracy: Physical and mental health impact of democracy movement in Hong Kong. *J. Affect. Disord.* 186, 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.07.005>.
- Hou, W.K., Lai, F., Ben-Ezra, M., Goodwin, R., in press. Regularizing daily routines for mental health during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *J. Glob. Health*  
<http://www.jogh.org/documents/issue202002/jogh-10-020315.htm>.
- Hou, W.K., Law, C. C., Yin, J., Fu, Y. T., 2010. Resource loss, resource gain, and psychological resilience and dysfunction following cancer diagnosis: A growth mixture modeling approach. *Health Psychol.* 29 (5), 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020809>.
- Hou, W.K., Hall, B., Hobfoll, S., 2018. Drive to Thrive: A theory of resilience following loss, in: Morina, N., Nickerson, A. (Eds.), *Mental Health of Refugee and Conflict-Affected Populations*. Springer, Cham, pp. 111–133. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97046-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97046-2_6).
- Hou, W.K., Lai, F., Hougen, C., Hall, B., Hobfoll, S., 2019. Measuring everyday processes and mechanisms of stress resilience: Development and initial validation of the Sustainability of Living Inventory (SOLI). *Psychol. Assess.* 31 (6), 715–729.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000692>.
- Hou, W.K., Liu, H., Liang, L., Ho, J., Kim, H., Seong, E., Bonanno, G., Hobfoll, S., Hall, B., 2020. Everyday life experiences and mental health among conflict-affected forced migrants: A meta-analysis. *J. Affect. Disord.* 264, 50–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.11.165>.
- Hu, T., Zhang, D., Wang, J., 2015. A meta-analysis of the trait resilience and mental health. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 76, 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.039>.
- Infurna, F., Luthar, S., 2017. The multidimensional nature of resilience to spousal loss. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 112 (6), 926–947. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000095>.



- Kalisch, R., Baker, D., Basten, U., Boks, M., Bonanno, G., Brummelman, E., Chmitorz, A., Fernández, G., Fiebach, C., Galatzer-Levy, I., Geuze E., Groppa, S., Helmreich, I., Hendler, T., Hermans, E., Jovanovic, T., Kubiak, T., Lieb, K., Lutz, B., Müller, M., 2017. The resilience framework as a strategy to combat stress-related disorders. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 1, 784–790. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0200-8>.
- Kukihara, H., Yamawaki, N., Uchiyama, K., Arai, S., Horikawa, E., 2014. Trauma, depression, and resilience of earthquake/tsunami/nuclear disaster survivors of Hirono, Fukushima, Japan. *Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 68 (7), 524–533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.12159>.
- Kwok, K., Li, K., Chan, H., Yi, Y., Tang, A., Wei, W., Wong, S., 2020. Community responses during early phase of COVID-19 epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 26 (7), 1575–1579. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200500>.
- Lai, F., Hall, B. J., Liang, L., Galea, S., Hou, W.K., in press. Socioeconomic gradient of mental health amid the anti-extradition bill protests in Hong Kong: The mediating role of daily routine disruptions. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2019-213693>.
- Lai, J., Ma, S., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Hu, J., Wei, N., Wu, J., Du, H., Chen, T., Li, R., Tan, H., Kang, L., Yao, L., Huang, M., Wang, H., Wang, G., Liu, Z., Hu, S., 2020. Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA Netw. Open* 3 (3), e203976. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976>.
- Lazarus, R.S., Folkman, S., 1984. *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer, New York.
- Leung, G., Ho, L., Chan, S., Ho, S., Bacon-Shone, J., Choy, R., Hedley, A., Lam, T., Fielding, R., 2005. Longitudinal assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after

the 2003 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 40 (12), 1713–1720. <https://doi.org/10.1086/429923>.

Liu, X., Kakade, M., Fuller, C., Fan, B., Fang, Y., Kong, J., Guan, Z., Wu, P., 2012. Depression after exposure to stressful events: lessons learned from the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic. *Compr. Psychiatry* 53 (1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2011.02.003>.

Luthar, S., Cicchetti, D., Becker, B., 2000. The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Dev.* 71 (3), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164>.

Masten, A.S., 2001. Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *Am. Psychol.* 56 (3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>.

Masten, A.S., 2014. *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press, New York.

Mayo Clinic, 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) - Symptoms and causes. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/coronavirus/symptoms-causes/syc-20479963>. (accessed 22 August 2020).

Meyer, E.C., Kotte, A., Kimbrel, N.A., DeBeer, B.B., Elliott, T.R., Gulliver, S.B., Morissette, S.B., 2019. Predictors of lower-than-expected posttraumatic symptom severity in war veterans: The influence of personality, self-reported trait resilience, and psychological flexibility. *Behav. Res. Ther.* 113, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2018.12.005>

Miller, K.E., Rasmussen, A., 2010. War exposure, daily stressors, and mental health in conflict and post-conflict settings: bridging the divide between trauma-focused and psychosocial frameworks. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 70 (1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.09.029>.

Min, J., Jung, Y., Kim, D., Yim, H., Kim, J., Kim, T., Lee, C., Lee, C., Chae, J., 2013.

Characteristics associated with low resilience in patients with depression and/or anxiety disorders. *Qual. Life. Res.* 22 (2), 231–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-012-0153-3>.

Ni, M., Li, T.K., Yu, N.X., Pang, H., Chan, B.H., Leung, G.M., Stewart, S.M., 2015. Normative data and psychometric properties of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) and the abbreviated version (CD-RISC2) among the general population in Hong Kong. *Qual. Life Res.* 25, 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-015-1072-x>.

Okuyama, J., Funakoshi, S., Tomita, H., Yamaguchi, T., Matsuoka, H., 2018. Longitudinal characteristics of resilience among adolescents: A high school student cohort study to assess the psychological impact of the Great East Japan Earthquake. *Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 72 (11), 821–835. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.12772>.

Parks, V., Drakeford, L., Cope, M., Slack, T., 2018. Disruption of routine behaviors following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *Soc. Nat. Res.* 31 (3), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2017.1377794>.

Plummer, F., Manea, L., Trepel, D., McMillan, D., 2016. Screening for anxiety disorders with the GAD-7 and GAD-2: a systematic review and diagnostic metaanalysis. *Gen. Hosp. Psychiatry* 39, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2015.11.005>.

Public Health England, 2020. Guidance for the public on the mental health and wellbeing aspects of coronavirus (Covid-19). <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-the-public-on-mental-health-and-wellbeing/guidance-for-the-public-on-the-mental-health-and-wellbeing-aspects-of-coronavirus-covid-19> (accessed 22 August 2020).

R Core Team, 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>

Rea, J., Behnke, A., Huff, N., Allen, K., 2015. The role of online communication in the lives of

military spouses. *Contemp. Fam. Ther.* 37 (3), 329–339. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-015-9346-6>.

Ryan, B., Coppola, D., Canyon, D., Brickhouse, M., Swienton, R., 2020. COVID-19 community stabilization and sustainability framework: An integration of the Maslow hierarchy of needs and social determinants of health. *Disaster. Med. Public Health Prep.* 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.109>.

Skodol, A.E., 2010. The resilient personality. In: Reich, J.W., Zautra, A.J., Hall, J.S.

(Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience*. The Guilford Press, New York, pp. 112–125.

Spitzer, R.L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J.B., Löwe, B., 2006. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 166 (10), 1092–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>.

Tang, W., Hu, T., Hu, B., Jin, C., Wang, G., Xie, C., Chen, S., Xu, J., 2020. Prevalence and correlates of PTSD and depressive symptoms one month after the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic in a sample of home-quarantined Chinese university students. *J. Affect. Disord.* 274, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.009>.

Tran, U.S., Glück, T.M., Lueger-Schuster, B., 2013. Influence of personal and environmental factors on mental health in a sample of Austrian survivors of World War II with regard to PTSD: is it resilience?. *BMC Psychiatry* 13, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-47>.

Üstün, B., Kennedy, C., 2009. What is “functional impairment”? Disentangling disability from clinical significance. *World Psychiatry* 8 (2), 82–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2051-5545.2009.tb00219.x>.

Vaishnavi, S., Connor, K., Davidson, J.R., 2007. An abbreviated version of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC), the CD-RISC2: Psychometric properties and

applications in psychopharmacological trials. *Psychiatry Res.* 152 (2–3), 293–297.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2007.01.006>.

Wada, K., Satoh, T., Tanaka, K., Tsunoda, M., Aizawa, Y., 2007. Associations of depressive symptoms with regular leisure activity and family social support among Japanese workers. *Ind. Health* 45 (1), 181–185. <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.45.181>.

Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C., Ho, R., 2020. Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 17 (5), 1729. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051729>.

World Bank Group, 2020. *Global Economic Prospects*.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects> (accessed 20 October 2020).

World Health Organization, 2020. Mental health and psychosocial considerations during the Covid-19 outbreak (WHO reference number: WHO/2019-nCoV/MentalHealth/2020.1). <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/mental-health-considerations.pdf> (accessed 22 August 2020).

Xiao, H., Zhang, Y., Kong, D., Li, S., Yang, N., 2020. The effects of social support on sleep quality of medical staff treating patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in January and February 2020 in China. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 26, e923549-1–e923549-8. <https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.923549>.

Yildirim, M., Arslan, G., 2020. Exploring the associations between resilience, dispositional hope, preventive behaviours, subjective well-being, and psychological health among adults during early stage of COVID-19. *PsyArXiv Preprints* <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vpu5q>.

- Zanin, G., Gentile, E., Parisi, A., Spasiano, D., 2020. A preliminary evaluation of the public risk perception related to the COVID-19 health emergency in Italy. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 17 (9), 3024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17093024>.
- Zautra, A., Arewasikporn, A., Davis, M., 2010. Resilience: Promoting well-being through recovery, sustainability, and growth. *Res. Hum. Dev.* 7 (3), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427609.2010.504431>.
- Zhang, S., Wang, Y., Rauch, A., Wei, F., 2020. Unprecedented disruption of lives and work: Health, distress and life satisfaction of working adults in China one month into the COVID-19 outbreak. *Psychiatry Res.* 288, 112958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112958>.

## Legends

**Table 1***Demographic variables and sample characteristics by different levels of worry.*

	Overall <i>N</i> = 4,021 <i>n</i> (%)	Not at all <i>N</i> = 429 <i>n</i> (%)	Some <i>N</i> = 1,757 <i>n</i> (%)	Quite a bit <i>N</i> = 818 <i>n</i> (%)
<b>Mean age (<i>SD</i>)</b>	46.1 (17.7)	53.3 (17.1)	48.7 (17.3)	39.8 (16.8)
<b>Sex</b>				
Female	2,220 (55.2)	195 (45.5)	989 (56.3)	436 (53.3)
Male	1,801 (44.8)	234 (54.5)	768 (43.7)	382 (46.7)
<b>Education level</b>				
No formal education received	67 (1.7)	13 (3.0)	25 (1.4)	3 (0.4)
Primary school	304 (7.6)	58 (13.6)	141 (8.0)	28 (3.4)
Junior high school	491 (12.2)	74 (17.2)	232 (13.2)	60 (7.3)
Senior high school	1,268 (31.5)	135 (31.5)	567 (32.3)	236 (28.9)
College (Non-degree)	417 (10.4)	36 (8.4)	186 (10.6)	97 (11.9)
College or above (Degree)	1,474 (36.7)	113 (26.3)	606 (34.5)	394 (48.1)
<b>Marital status</b>				
Married	2,291 (57.0)	256 (59.7)	1079 (61.4)	403 (49.3)
Single	1,312 (32.6)	104 (24.2)	487 (27.7)	368 (45.0)
Divorced	212 (5.3)	36 (8.4)	91 (5.2)	25 (3.0)
Widowed	203 (5.1)	33 (7.7)	100 (5.7)	22 (2.7)
<b>Employment status</b>				
Employed	2,272 (56.5)	216 (50.3)	960 (54.7)	518 (63.3)
Unemployed	179 (4.5)	23 (5.4)	77 (4.4)	29 (3.5)
Retired	745 (18.5)	130 (30.3)	382 (21.7)	88 (10.8)
Housewife	444 (11.0)	43 (10.0)	204 (11.6)	57 (7.0)
Student	381 (9.5)	17 (4.0)	134 (7.6)	126 (15.4)
<b>Monthly household income (HK\$) *</b>				
\$9,999 or below	544 (13.5)	87 (20.3)	234 (13.3)	53 (6.5)
\$10,000 – \$19,999	532 (13.2)	70 (16.3)	244 (13.9)	86 (10.5)
\$20,000 – \$29,999	612 (15.2)	64 (14.9)	267 (15.2)	132 (16.1)
\$30,000 – \$39,999	598 (14.9)	62 (14.5)	272 (15.5)	124 (15.2)
\$40,000 – \$49,999	409 (10.2)	37 (8.6)	178 (10.1)	91 (11.1)
\$50,000 – \$59,999	412 (10.2)	32 (7.5)	170 (9.7)	110 (13.5)
\$60,000 – \$79,999	339 (8.4)	22 (5.1)	150 (8.5)	77 (9.4)
\$80,000 or above	575 (14.3)	55 (12.8)	242 (13.8)	145 (17.7)
<b>Income change</b>				
Increased/stable	2,906 (72.3)	334 (77.9)	1,307 (74.4)	600 (73.3)
Decreased	1,115 (27.7)	95 (22.1)	450 (25.6)	218 (26.7)

\* US\$ 1 ≈ HK\$7.80.

**Table 2:** *Descriptive statistics of the study variables by different levels of worry.*

	Not at all	Some	Quite a bit	Very much
Sample size	<i>N</i> = 429	<i>N</i> = 1,757	<i>N</i> = 818	<i>N</i> = 1,017
Mean score of GAD-7 ( <i>SD</i> )	1.83 (3.81)	2.93 (3.65)	5.57 (4.41)	7.73 (5.48)

Range of GAD-7	0 – 21	0 – 21	0 – 21	0 – 21
Prevalence of probable anxiety †	4.9%	6.2%	16.3%	35.4%
Mean resilient components ( <i>SD</i> )				
Ability to adapt to change	8.18 (2.10)	7.67 (1.69)	7.22 (1.70)	6.87 (2.10)
Propensity to bounce back	8.18 (2.22)	7.60 (1.69)	6.96 (1.78)	6.60 (2.18)
Regularity of primary routines	7.50 (2.61)	7.08 (2.19)	6.19 (2.33)	5.74 (2.66)
Regularity of secondary routines	6.83 (2.91)	5.90 (2.60)	5.08 (2.57)	4.27 (2.89)

Note. GAD-7, † Probable anxiety was defined as GAD-7  $\geq$  10.

**Table 3:** Multivariable logistic regression examining the associations of resilient components with probable anxiety in persons without worry.

	Probable anxiety † aOR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	1.0	
Female	0.65 (0.20–2.15)	0.479
<b>Age</b>		
15–24	1.0	
25–34	0.74 (0.08–6.67)	0.787
35–44	0.30 (0.03–2.91)	0.301
45–64	0.13 (0.02–1.01)	0.051
65 or above	0.29 (0.03–3.00)	0.302
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	1.0	
Unmarried/divorced/widowed	0.46 (0.11–1.85)	0.273
<b>Education level</b>		
Tertiary or above	1.0	
Secondary	1.04 (0.31–3.50)	0.953
Primary or below	0.38 (0.04–4.07)	0.427
<b>Employment status</b>		
Employed	1.0	
Dependent	0.59 (0.11–3.13)	0.538
Unemployed	0.46 (0.04–4.97)	0.525
<b>Monthly household income (HK\$)</b>		
\$80,000 or above	1.0	
\$60,000–\$79,999	1.57 (0.10–23.75)	0.743
\$40,000–\$59,999	1.04 (0.16–6.73)	0.966
\$20,000–\$39,999	0.42 (0.07–2.64)	0.353
\$19,999 or below	0.75 (0.11–5.09)	0.766
<b>Income change</b>		
Increased/stable	1.0	
Decreased	4.40 (1.34–14.39)	0.014
<b>Resilient components</b>		
Ability to adapt to change	0.78 (0.55–1.10)	0.157
Propensity to bounce back	1.22 (0.88–1.69)	0.243
Regularity of primary routines	0.85 (0.71–1.03)	0.098
Regularity of secondary routines	0.62 (0.50–0.77)	< 0.001



Note. † Probable anxiety was defined as GAD-7  $\geq 10$ . aOR, adjusted odds ratio. CI, confidence interval.

**Table 4:** Multivariable logistic regression examining the associations of resilient components with probable anxiety at different levels of worry.

	Probable anxiety † aOR (95% CI)	P
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	1.0	
Female	1.32 (1.07–1.64)	0.009
<b>Age</b>		
15–24	1.0	
25–34	1.37 (0.95–1.99)	0.094
35–44	1.51 (1.01–2.27)	0.047
45–64	0.97 (0.66–1.43)	0.893
65 or above	1.13 (0.73–1.76)	0.580
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	1.0	
Unmarried/divorced/widowed	1.27 (1.00–1.63)	0.051
<b>Education level</b>		
Tertiary or above	1.0	
Secondary	0.81 (0.64–1.03)	0.080
Primary or below	0.68 (0.43–1.09)	0.112
<b>Employment status</b>		
Employed	1.0	
Dependent	1.22 (0.93–1.60)	0.155
Unemployed	0.94 (0.58–1.52)	0.798
<b>Monthly household income (HK\$)</b>		
\$80,000 or above	1.0	
\$60,000–\$79,999	0.69 (0.44–1.08)	0.102
\$40,000–\$59,999	0.92 (0.65–1.30)	0.645
\$20,000–\$39,999	0.73 (0.52–1.02)	0.064
\$19,999 or below	0.58 (0.40–0.85)	0.005
<b>Income change</b>		
Stable/ Increase	1.0	
Decrease	1.36 (1.09–1.69)	0.007
<b>Some worry</b>		
Ability to adapt to change	0.92 (0.80–1.06)	0.265
Propensity to bounce back	0.74 (0.65–0.86)	< 0.001
Regularity of primary routines	0.83 (0.76–0.91)	< 0.001
Regularity of secondary routines	0.84 (0.77–0.92)	< 0.001
<b>Quite a bit worry</b>		
Ability to adapt to change	0.80 (0.70–0.93)	0.003
Propensity to bounce back	0.86 (0.75–0.98)	0.029
Regularity of primary routines	0.76 (0.69–0.84)	< 0.001
Regularity of secondary routines	0.90 (0.82–0.99)	0.024
<b>Very much worry</b>		

Ability to adapt to change	0.83 (0.77–0.91)	< 0.001
Propensity to bounce back	0.90 (0.83–0.98)	0.013
Regularity of primary routines	0.90 (0.85–0.96)	< 0.001
Regularity of secondary routines	0.89 (0.85–0.95)	< 0.001

Note. † Probable anxiety was defined as GAD-7  $\geq$  10. aOR, adjusted odds ratio. CI, confidence interval.

**Figure 1.** Cognitive and behavioral components of psychological resilience across respondents with different levels of worry about COVID-19 infection.

