

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316110669>

A systematic mixed-methods review of interventions, outcomes and experiences for midwives and student midwives in work-related psychological distress

Article in *Midwifery* · April 2017

DOI: 10.1016/j.midw.2017.04.003

CITATIONS

20

READS

67

3 authors, including:



Sally Pezaro

Coventry University

34 PUBLICATIONS 94 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Wendy Clyne

University of Plymouth

47 PUBLICATIONS 1,547 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome and Hypermobility Spectrum Disorders during pregnancy, birth and beyond [View project](#)



Asthma adherence [View project](#)



A systematic mixed-methods review of interventions, outcomes and experiences for midwives and student midwives in work-related psychological distress



Sally Pezaro, RM, BA (Hons), MSc, DipMid*, Wendy Clyne, PhD, Emily A. Fulton, PhD

Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Richard Crossman Building (4th Floor) Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry CV1 5FB, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Midwives
Job satisfaction
Employee assistance programs
Burnout, Professional
Systematic review
Stress, Occupational

ABSTRACT

Background: within challenging work environments, midwives and student midwives can experience both organisational and occupational sources of work-related psychological distress. As the wellbeing of healthcare staff directly correlates with the quality of maternity care, this distress must be met with adequate support provision. As such, the identification and appraisal of interventions designed to support midwives and student midwives in work-related psychological distress will be important in the pursuit of excellence in maternity care. **Objectives:** to identify interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress, and explore any outcomes and experiences associated with their use.

Data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions This systematic mixed-methods review examined 6 articles which identified interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress, and reports both the outcomes and experiences associated with their use. All relevant papers published internationally from the year 2000 to 2016, which evaluated and identified targeted interventions were included.

Study appraisal and synthesis methods: the reporting of this review adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The quality of each study has been appraised using a scoring system designed for appraising mixed-methods research, and concomitantly appraising qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods primary studies in mixed reviews. Bias has been assessed using an assessment of methodological rigor tool. Whilst taking a segregated systematic mixed-methods review approach, findings have been synthesised narratively.

Findings: this review identified mindfulness interventions, work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme and the provision of clinical supervision, each reported to provide a variety of both personal and professional positive outcomes and experiences for midwives and/or student midwives. However, some midwives and/or student midwives reported less favourable experiences, and some were unable to participate in the interventions as provided for practical reasons.

Limitations: eligible studies were few, were not of high quality and were limited to international findings within first world countries. Additionally, two of the papers included related to the same intervention. Due to a paucity of studies, this review could not perform sensitivity analyses, subgroup analyses, meta-analysis or meta-regression.

Conclusions and implications of key findings: there is a lack of evidence based interventions available to support both midwives and student midwives in work-related psychological distress. Available studies reported positive outcomes and experiences for the majority of participants. However, future intervention studies will need to ensure that they are flexible enough for midwives and student midwives to engage with. Future intervention research has the opportunity to progress towards more rigorous studies, particularly ones which include midwives and student midwives as solitary population samples

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: pezaros@uni.coventry.ac.uk, Sally@Pezaro.co.uk (S. Pezaro).

Introduction

Midwives and student midwives experience both organisational and occupational sources of work-related psychological distress (Pezaro et al., 2015). Negative working cultures, a lack of staff support, bullying, burnout, uncaring behaviours, compassion fatigue and high staff turnovers have been observed in the midwifery profession (Begley, 2002; Douglas, 2011; Farrell and Shafiei, 2012; Chokwe and Wright, 2013; Hall et al., 2016). This set of circumstances may hinder excellence in maternity care (The Royal College of Physicians, 2015; West et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2016).

The latest review of maternity services within the United Kingdom draws attention to the fact that midwives are more likely to report work-related stress than other healthcare professionals (Cumberlege, 2016). As such, it is becoming ever more pressing for research to identify and evaluate support interventions for the benefit of service users, the public and the midwifery profession as a whole.

Many have cited the need to identify efficacious interventions to support midwives (Curtis et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2011; Sullivan et al., 2011; Kalicińska et al., 2012). However, it is not yet known what interventions are available, how effective they are, and how users experience them. Towards achieving this, a systematic mixed-methods review was performed with the main objectives being to identify interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress, and explore any outcomes and experiences associated with their use.

Rationale

A more comprehensive understanding of the quality and outcomes of the literature on interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress is required to establish a strong foundation for further research and understand the best evidence for the most effective interventions. Previous reviews of this type have not included either midwives and/or student midwives as an isolated study population sample (Awa et al., 2010; Regehr et al., 2014; Ruotsalainen et al., 2015; Guillaumie et al., 2016; Murray et al., 2016; Romppanen and Häggman-Laitila, 2016). Therefore, this review adhered to methodological standards to examine the literature on interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress.

Objectives

The objectives of this review were to identify interventions that have been designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress and to explore any outcomes and/or experiences associated with their use. Meeting these objectives did not require control groups or any particular study type or study comparators, enabling a larger number of potential studies to be included.

The research questions addressed within this review are: (1) What interventions have been developed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress? and (2) What are the outcomes and experiences associated with the use of these interventions?

Methods

The segregated systematic mixed-methods review design, as described by Sandelowski, has been employed (Sandelowski et al., 2006). This methodology is described as 'the design of choice' where a synthesis presents qualitative and quantitative findings separately. This method also allows the researcher to subsequently organise findings into a short line of argument synthesis, which provides a contemporary 'picture of the whole' (Noblit and Hare, 1988; Barnett-Page and Thomas, 2009).

Protocol and registration

The protocol for this review has been registered within PROSPERO, at http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42016036978. This review has been reported in compliance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009). A detailed PRISMA checklist can be found in Appendix one.

Protocol registration number: CRD42016036978.

Eligibility Criteria

All independent, peer reviewed studies published in English between 2000 and 2016 were considered to reflect a more contemporary workplace.

All types of interventions and length of follow up were considered. Selected papers had to identify at least one intervention designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress. Any studies that met these criteria also had to report at least one outcome measure.

Participants/ population

This review defined the 'midwife' in line with the definition given by the International confederation of midwives' definition that a midwife is a person who has acquired the requisite qualifications to be registered and/or legally licensed to practice midwifery and use the title 'midwife' (ICM International Confederation of Midwives, 2011). Student midwives were included due to the fact that they perform midwifery work, experience similar work-related episodes and are the successors of the profession (Davies and Coldridge, 2015; Coldridge and Davies, 2017). Although it was recognised that student midwives effectively practise within a different role and may encounter different manifestations of work-related psychological distress, they were also considered by the research team to form a part of the midwifery workforce.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

To be included, studies had to evaluate an intervention designed to support midwives and/or student midwives experiencing work-related psychological distress.

Psychological distress refers to a unique, discomfoting, emotional state experienced by an individual in response to a specific stressor or demand that results in harm, either temporary or permanent, to the person (Ridner, 2004). Therefore, in line with this description, we defined work-related psychological distress as a unique, discomfoting, emotional state experienced by an individual in response to a specific work-related stressor or demand that results in harm, either temporary or permanent, to the person.

Comparator(s)/ control

So that a larger number of potential studies could be included, studies were not required to include either a comparator or control group.

Outcome(s)

Primary outcomes

The identification of interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress.

Secondary outcomes

Any quantitative and/or qualitative outcomes and/or experiences relating to intervention use were considered to be secondary outcomes.

Information sources

Searching was conducted between March 31 and May 24, 2016, using 6 electronic databases; namely PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, MEDLINE, Academic Search Complete, Scopus and CINAHL. The use of these multiple databases is recommended for conducting a more comprehensive search (Abdulla et al., 2016). In addition, the reference lists of identified studies were manually searched in an attempt to identify additional publications. The authors of papers identified for inclusion were also contacted to enquire about any further papers relevant for inclusion. Paper retrievals concluded on June 6, 2016.

Search

This search strategy was formulated subsequent to a broad scoping review of the literature in relation to intervention research, the midwifery workforce and work-related psychological distress. During this scoping review, the abstracts and key words of significant papers were scanned and identified. Recurring phrases and key words were then taken and applied to this search. This search strategy was designed in line with contemporary best practices to be broad in nature, and capture as many studies relating to the research questions as possible (Machi and McEvoy, 2016).

Initially, terms relating to the identification of the midwifery profession were employed. Secondly, terms available which broadly related to any of the outcomes that were considered to be generally associated with 'work-related psychological distress' were used. Lastly, terms relating to work, employment, occupation and professional health were used in conjunction with terms associated with the management of general wellbeing, interventions, treatments, therapies and coping behaviours.

This search strategy was modified to suit the various syntax, subject headings, MeSH headings and thesauruses utilised by the 6 databases used to conduct the search. Table 1 details our CINAHL with Full Text search, the complete search strategy used for all databases is included in our registered protocol.

Study selection

All retrieved articles were exported into a RefWorks database and duplicate articles were removed. Firstly, the primary review author performed an initial assessment of the retrieved articles to identify potentially eligible studies. Titles and abstracts were screened for relevance. The secondary reviewer then cross checked and assessed 10% of the screened articles for accuracy of selection. Any discrepancies in opinion were resolved through discussion. The full texts of eligible articles were assessed against the inclusion criteria. Articles which did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded.

Data Collection process

Data was extracted from selected studies using the MASTARI data extraction instrument from JBI-NOTARI (Pearson, 2004). This tool is presented within Appendix two. Any discrepancies at this stage were again resolved through discussion. Any anecdotal findings were omitted from the data collected.

Data items

Study population information, study methods and outcomes of significance to both the primary and secondary outcomes of this review were extracted from the data.

Quality Appraisal

Both the primary and secondary reviewer assessed the methodological quality of all eligible articles identified. This was done using the scoring system for appraising mixed-methods research, and concomi-

tantly appraising qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods primary studies in mixed reviews, as published by Pluye and colleagues (Pluye et al., 2009). Overall quality scores are presented in Table 2.

Risk of bias in individual studies

The assessment of methodological rigor tool devised by Hawker et al. (2002) was applied at study level.

Summary measures

Cohen's *d*, and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using pre-and post-intervention data where possible. CI for the effect size between pre-and post-intervention data were calculated for the quantitative results reported by both Wallbank, and Foureur and colleagues (Wallbank, 2010; Foureur et al., 2013). For the study presented by Warriner and colleagues (Warriner et al., 2016), 95% CI for the proportion that reported positive impact were calculated using the Wilson procedure with corrections for continuity (Wilson, 1927). These are presented in Table 4.

Synthesis of results

Results were presented in line with the segregated systematic mixed-methods review approach (Sandelowski et al., 2006). Here, the qualitative and quantitative results of each study were presented separately.

Risk of bias across studies

Publication, time lag, selective outcome reporting and language biases were considered throughout the process of review.

Findings

Study selection

The search strategy identified 524 articles. Sixty-one duplicate articles were removed to reveal 463 articles for further screening. Subsequently, 429 articles were excluded as they fell outside the scope of this review. This left 34 articles to screen for eligibility, 6 of which were selected for inclusion. Articles were excluded because they either did not test a targeted intervention ($n=13$), did not focus on psychological distress ($n=8$) or presented themselves as a literature review ($n=7$). The study selection process was outlined in Fig. 1. Table 2 presented the papers selected for inclusion.

Study characteristics

Six papers were selected for inclusion, resulting in a total of 144 participants being included in this review (assuming the same 14 participants were included within 2 papers relating to the same study) (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013). All studies included population samples of either midwives and/or student midwives. However, some also included nurses, doctors, maternity support workers and lecturers in their study samples (Wallbank, 2010; McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013; Warriner et al., 2016).

Interventions delivered

In total, $n=100$ (69%) participants were delivered mindfulness interventions, $n=14$ (10%) participants were delivered work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme, and $n=30$ (21%) participants were either randomly allocated to a control group or delivered the intervention of clinical supervision.

Intervention delivery periods varied from 7–8 weeks (Foureur et al., 2013; van et al., 2015; Warriner et al., 2016) to 6 months (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013). One study did not

Table 1
CINAHL with Full Text Search.

Interface - EBSCOhost Research Databases		
Search Screen - Advanced Search		
Database: CINAHL with Full Text		
Search		
Limiters - Published Date: 20000101–20161231; Scholarly (Peer Reviewed) Journals		
Search modes - Find all my search terms		
#	Query	Results
S14	S5 AND S9 AND S13	211
S13	S10 OR S11 OR S12	673,083
S12	AB (work* OR job OR occupation* OR employment OR Profession*) AND AB ('Employee Assistance Programs' OR MM 'Workplace Intervention' OR 'Resilience (Psychological)' OR 'Coping Behavior' OR 'Coping behaviour' OR 'Psychological Endurance' OR 'Stress and Coping Measures')	105
S11	TI (work* OR job OR occupation* OR employment OR Profession*) AND TI ('Employee Assistance Programs' OR MM 'Workplace Intervention' OR 'Resilience (Psychological)' OR DE 'Coping Behavior' OR 'Coping behaviour' OR 'Psychological Endurance' OR 'Stress and Coping Measures')	37
S10	(MH 'Coping+') OR (MH 'Help Seeking Behavior') OR (MH 'Employee Assistance Programs') OR 'Employee Assistance Programs' OR (MH 'Occupational Health Services') OR (MH 'Peer Assistance Programs') OR (MH 'Self Care') OR (MH 'Stress Management') OR 'Workplace Intervention' OR 'anxiety management' OR 'Cognitive Techniques' OR (MM 'Disciplines, Tests, Therapy, Services+') OR (MH 'Relaxation Techniques') OR (MH 'Behavior Therapy') OR (MM 'Therapeutics+') OR (MH 'Mind Body Techniques+') OR (MH 'Alternative Therapies+') OR 'coping measures' OR 'resilience'	672,917
S9	S6 OR S7 OR S8	150,853
S8	AB ((work* OR job* OR occupation* OR employ* OR Profession*)) AND AB ((stress* OR burnout OR pressure* OR compassion fatigue OR wellbeing OR well being OR well-being OR psychosomatic health OR cognitive wellbeing OR cognitive well being OR cognitive well-being OR professional wellbeing OR professional well being OR professional well-being))	29,758
S7	TI ((work* OR job* OR occupation* OR employ* OR Profession*)) AND TI ((stress* OR burnout OR pressure* OR compassion fatigue OR wellbeing OR well being OR well-being OR psychosomatic health OR cognitive wellbeing OR cognitive well being OR cognitive well-being OR professional wellbeing OR professional well being OR professional well-being))	4,254
S6	(MM 'Stress, Occupational') OR (MH 'Job Satisfaction') OR (MH 'Impairment, Health Professional') OR (MM 'Stress, Psychological+') OR (MM 'Burnout, Professional') OR (MH 'Depersonalization') OR (MH 'Mental Fatigue') OR 'compassion fatigue' OR (MH 'Anxiety+') OR (MH 'Depression') OR (MM 'Stress Disorders, Post-Traumatic+') OR (MH 'Organizational Culture+') OR (MM 'Quality of Working Life') OR (MM 'Occupational Health') OR (MH 'Psychophysiology Disorders+') OR (MH 'Substance Use Disorders')	128,314
S5	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4	23,998
S4	AB midwif* OR midwives	10,886
S3	TI midwif* OR midwives	11,964
S2	(MM 'Midwifery+')	9,183
S1	(MM 'Midwives+')	4,565

specify the period of evaluation (Wallbank, 2010). Of those that did, follow up periods varied between 2 weeks (van et al., 2015) and 6 months (McDonald et al., 2013; Warriner et al., 2016).

Study design

Some of these studies were described as either pilot or feasibility studies, yet only two (Wallbank, 2010; Foureur et al., 2013) were found to conform to the standardised definitions of either a pilot or a feasibility study (Arain et al., 2010; Abbott, 2014). As such, some studies were redefined as cohort studies (van et al., 2015; Warriner et al., 2016), where both a comparison and/or control group are not a necessary feature (Dekkers et al., 2012), as they each analysed either repeated outcome measures and/or observed a cohort of participants distinguished by some variable (Doll, 2004; Hellems et al., 2006; DiPietro, 2010). Two of the papers retrieved (McDonald et al., 2012, 2013) each fittingly reported themselves to be one part of a larger collective case study in which midwifery cohorts were included (Gerring, 2004).

Outcomes

Data within the study by Foureur and colleagues (Foureur et al., 2013) was extracted via log book entries, qualitative interviews and a focus group, the GHQ-12 questionnaire, the SOC – Orientation to Life scale, and the DASS scale. The study by Wallbank used the PANAS scale, the ProQol scale and the IES scale to extract data (Wallbank, 2010). Other studies used a research journal and field notes, 'evaluations' and qualitative interviews (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013), qualitative focus group interviews (van et al., 2015) and evaluation questionnaires (Warriner et al., 2016).

All studies reported evidence for positive outcomes. These positive outcomes related to an improved sense of wellbeing (Warriner et al., 2016), reduced stress (Wallbank, 2010; Warriner et al., 2016), enhanced confidence, self-awareness, assertiveness and self-care (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013). Improvements were also noted in general health, sense of coherence (Foureur et al., 2013), and compassion satisfaction scores (Wallbank, 2010). Sustained positive impacts on anxiety, resilience, self-compassion mindfulness (Warriner et al., 2016), and concentration were also reported (van et al., 2015). Increased clarity of thought and a reduction in negative cognitions (van et al., 2015), compassion fatigue and burnout were also observed (Wallbank, 2010).

Risk of bias assessments for the individual studies were presented in Table 3 using the assessment of methodological rigor tool devised by Hawker and colleagues (Hawker et al., 2002).

Results of individual studies

Findings from mindfulness based interventions were reported by 3 of the studies included (Foureur et al., 2013; van et al., 2015; Warriner et al., 2016). Another two papers report the effects of work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013), and one study examined the effectiveness of clinical supervision (Wallbank, 2010). All interventions were delivered face-to-face. Interventions were facilitated by experienced psychologists, the Oxford Mindfulness Centre and books (Warriner et al., 2016), a workshop facilitator (Foureur et al., 2013), counsellors (van et al., 2015), a clinical psychologist (Wallbank, 2010) and invited 'expert presenters' (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013).

Table 2
Study overviews and characteristics.

Paper Retrieved	Sample Number	Period of Study	Sample Type	Study Design	Intervention	Measurement Tools	Country of Study	Quality Score *
Fourneur et al. (2013)	40	8 weeks and 1 day intervention period 4–8-week follow up period	Nurses (50%) and midwives (50%)	Mixed-methods pilot study (No comparison group)	Mindfulness based stress reduction programme (MBSR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Log books – GHQ-12 – SOC – Orientation to Life scale – The DASS scale – Qualitative interviews – Qualitative focus group – Qualitative semi-structured focus group interviews 	Australia	67%
van et al. (2015)	14	7-week intervention period 2-week follow up period	First year nursing and midwifery students	Cohort study	7-week stress management and mindfulness course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS) scale – Professional Quality of Life scale (ProQol) – Impact of Event Scale (IES) 	Australia	50%
Wallbank (2010)	30	6 ‘sessions of supervision’	Midwives and Doctors working in obstetrics and gynaecology	Pilot study (2 randomised samples)	6 sessions of clinical supervision given by a clinical psychologist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Immediate post follow-up quantitative questionnaire – 4–6-month follow-up quantitative questionnaires – Qualitative interviews – Participant evaluations – Field notes 	United Kingdom	67%
Warriner et al. (2016)	46	8 weeks and 6 days intervention period 4–6-month follow up period	Hospital (30%), community (30%) and research midwives (9%), maternity support workers (18%), student midwives (9%), doctors (2%) and lecturers (2%)	Cohort study	Mindfulness Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Immediate post follow-up quantitative questionnaire – 4–6-month follow-up quantitative questionnaires – Qualitative interviews – Participant evaluations – Field notes 	United Kingdom	33%
McDonald et al. (2013)	14	6-month intervention period 6-month follow up period	Nurses and midwives	Qualitative case study	Work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Qualitative interviews – Field notes – Research journal 	Australia	67%
McDonald et al. (2012)	14	6-month intervention period Immediate post-intervention data collection	Nurses and midwives	Qualitative case study	Work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Qualitative interviews – Field notes – Research journal 	Australia	33%

* Quality score: [(number of ‘quality criteria presence’ responses divided by the number of ‘relevant criteria’) × 100].




Fig. 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram.

Quantitative study findings

Foureur and colleagues presented a pilot study in which 20 nurses and 20 midwives from two metropolitan teaching hospitals in New South Wales, Australia took part in a mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) programme (Foureur et al., 2013). This intervention was designed to increase the of coherence and improve the health of midwifery and nursing populations and also to decrease depression and anxiety. The workshop facilitator delivered this one day workshop, introduced the research, then went on to discuss the impact of stress on being in the present moment, introduce the concept of mindfulness, describe grounding and diffusion strategies and report how participants might form 'effective habits' (Foureur et al., 2013).

Participants also received a copy of a 'mindfulness practice CD', and were asked to complete three questionnaires prior to workshop attendance and again 4–8 weeks after participation. Of those who participated in follow up surveys, $N=14$ (50%) provided log books of their experiences, $N=28$ (70%) of participants returned the post-intervention surveys, and $N=10$ (35.7%) of those participants contributed their experiences within either a focus group or individual interview (Foureur et al., 2013). Participants reported that they practised their newly learnt techniques over 44.4% of the available daily practice periods. A reduction in stress levels for some participants was also reported (Foureur et al., 2013). Here, statistically significant differences were found on scores for the GHQ12 measure, the SOC-

Orientation to life scale and the stress subscale of the DASS, where improvements were seen in the general health of midwives, their sense of coherence and orientation to life.

An evaluation of the 'Mindfulness: Finding Peace in a Frantic World' course recruited 38 midwives out of a cohort of 43 healthcare staff to participate in an 8-week course (Warriner et al., 2016). This study reveals a set of practices that can help break the cycle of unhappiness, stress, anxiety and mental exhaustion. The course runs for 60–90 minutes weekly, and participants are invited to commit to 30 minutes of home practice daily for 6 days a week. For this study, 46 participants were recruited, with 43 completing the course. Of these participants, 78% ($n=36$) were identified as midwives. Course attendance averaged 87% for available sessions.

Immediate post-intervention evaluation questionnaires indicated that 97% of participants found the course helpful, useful and would recommend it to others. Ongoing benefits were observed via a 4–6-month post-intervention questionnaire, where participants reported a sustained positive impact on stress (83%, $n=19$), anxiety (68%, $n=15$), resilience (70%, $n=16$), self-compassion (74%, $n=17$) and mindfulness (91%, $n=21$) (Warriner et al., 2016). At the end of the 4–6 month follow up period, 50% ($n=6$) of the participants who reported that depression was relevant to them, also reported a positive impact on their mood. Overall, this study reports significant and ongoing positive impacts for staff, as respondents reported benefit in home life (87%, $n=20$) work life (91%, $n=21$) and the culture of their workplace (59%, $n=13$) (Warriner et al., 2016).

Table 3
Risk of bias within studies using the assessment of methodological rigor tool.

Item of assessment	Foureur et al. (2013)	van et al. (2015)	Wallbank (2010)	Warriner et al. (2016)	McDonald et al. (2013)	McDonald et al. (2012)
Abstract and title	Fair No structured abstract	Good Structured abstract with full information and clear title	Fair Abstract with most of the information	Poor Inadequate abstract	Fair Abstract with most of the information	Poor Inadequate abstract
Introduction and aims	Poor Some background but no objectives or research questions	Poor Some background but no specific research questions	Poor Some background but no specific aim	Poor Some background but no aim/objectives/questions	Poor No research questions outlined	Poor Some background but no aim/objectives/questions
Methods and data	Fair Method appropriate, description could be better	Good Clear details of the data collection and recording	Fair Method appropriate, description could be better	Good Method is appropriate and described clearly	Good Clear details of the data collection and recording	Poor Method described inadequately
Sampling	Poor Sampling mentioned but few descriptive details	Good Response rates shown and explained (small sample size)	Fair Most information given, but some missing	Fair Most information given, but some missing	Fair Most information given, but some missing	Fair Most information given, but some missing
Data analysis	Fair Descriptive discussion of analysis	Good Description of how themes derived	Fair Descriptive discussion of analysis	Fair Quantitative	Fair Descriptive discussion of analysis	Poor Minimal details about analysis
Ethics and bias	Fair Lip service was paid	Fair Lip service was paid	Very poor No mention of issues	Very poor No mention of issues	Good Ethical issues addressed (no mention of bias)	Poor Brief mention of issues
Findings/results	Good Sufficient data are presented to support findings	Poor Data presented haphazardly	Fair Data presented relate directly to results	Good Results relate directly to aims	Good Findings explicit, easy to understand	Poor Findings presented haphazardly
Transferability/generalizability	Fair Some context and setting described	Poor Minimal description of context/setting	Fair Some context and setting described	Good Sufficient data are presented to support findings	Fair More information needed to replicate	Fair Some context and setting described
Implications and usefulness	Fair No implications for policy considered	Poor No suggested implications	Fair Did not suggest ideas for further research	Fair No suggestions for further research	Good Contributes something new	Fair Does not suggest ideas for further research

In the delivery of clinical supervision, Wallbank reports a significant reduction in subjective stress levels, burnout and compassion fatigue for midwives in distress (Wallbank, 2010). The clinical supervision being delivered here was 'restorative' in nature, and applied the Solihull approach (Douglas, 2006). Thirty midwives and doctors participated in this study, and were allocated (presumably equally) to either a control ($n=15$) or treatment ($n=15$) group. The treatment group received 6, one-hour clinical supervision sessions delivered by a clinical psychologist.

Within the treatment group, there was a significant difference in the amount of subjective stress scores ($p < 0.0001$), with average scores decreasing from 29 to 7. There was also a significant difference found in compassion satisfaction scores, as average scores increased from 37 to 41 ($p = .001$). Additionally, average burnout scores decreased from 27 to 14 ($p < 0.0001$) and compassion fatigue/secondary trauma average scores decreased from 16 to 12 ($p = .004$). For the control group, follow up results showed no statistically significant differences between post-study scores and earlier scores, apart from those relating to compassion fatigue, where scores slightly increased, yet were still not significant ($p = 0.846$).

Interpretation of confidence intervals and effect sizes

Of the 6 papers retrieved, 3 provided enough statistical data to calculate CI and/or effect sizes for the outcomes measured (Wallbank, 2010; Foureur et al., 2013; Warriner et al., 2016). As shown in Table 4, only two studies were suitable to calculate effect sizes via Cohen's d (Wallbank, 2010; Foureur et al., 2013). Raw data were not available for these calculations.

In line with more recent classifications (Sawilowsky, 2009), the study by Wallbank has demonstrated a 'large' effect size in measurements of compassion satisfaction and a 'medium' effect size in measurements of compassion fatigue for the intervention group (Wallbank, 2010). 'Huge' size effects were also noted for this group in measurements of burnout and the composite scores associated with the total stress impact of events. However, for the control group, all size effects were calculated to be either 'small' or 'very small'.

In the study by Foureur and colleagues (Foureur et al., 2013), 'medium' size effects were calculated in scores relating to participants' orientation to life, stress, comprehensibility and general health based on dichotomous scoring. 'Large' size effects were calculated for scores relating to general health based on the sum of likert ratings, and scores relating to manageability, meaning, depression and anxiety were calculated to be 'small'. A positive or negative Cohen's d represents the direction of the effect. For example, a negative effect size indicates an increase between the mean values, and a positive effect size indicates a decrease between the mean values.

In line with more recent classifications, none of the CI presented in Table 4 can be defined as narrow (Schünemann et al., 2008). The wider intervals calculated demonstrate uncertainty in the estimated range within which one can be reasonably sure that the true effect or result actually lies.

Qualitative Study Findings

In Foureur and colleague's qualitative analysis, 8 participants described feelings of being relaxed, calmer and more focused. Participants also described a new-found realisation of the importance of self-care, an increased capacity to be more aware of people, a tendency to seek help more freely, and be able to control thoughts and stress more effectively (Foureur et al., 2013). However, for a small minority of participants, there was a view that their participation had done little to ameliorate workplace stress. Overall, this study reports that the majority of participants experienced short term insights into the impact of stress on cognition, emotions and behaviour, and developed strategies for being in the present moment (Foureur et al., 2013).

Van der Riet and colleagues piloted another 7-week stress management and mindfulness intervention (van et al., 2015). Here, 14 nursing

and midwifery students were invited to participate in seven, weekly 1-hour sessions. Each session involved a didactic component and an experiential component. During these sessions, the practice of sitting mindfulness was taught. Participants were trained to scan their bodies and focus upon various physical sensations. Students were then encouraged to practise exercises regularly in-between sessions (van et al., 2015).

Two weeks after the concluding session, 10 participants joined in a 60-minute semi-structured, focus group interview. Many reported that they could not wholly engage with this intervention, and only 1 student attended all seven sessions. However, others reported becoming more attentive towards themselves and others and better able to care for themselves and others in conjunction with an increased self-awareness (van et al., 2015). Overall, this study reported that participants experienced increased concentration and clarity of thought, in conjunction with increased awareness and a reduction in negative cognitions (van et al., 2015).

McDonald and colleagues explored the efficacy of an intervention consisting of 6 work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme delivered over a 6-month period (McDonald et al., 2013). At three phases of study: pre-intervention; immediately post-intervention; and at 6 months' post-intervention, 14 nurses and midwives were invited to participate in face-to-face, semi-structured interviews.

This intervention encouraged participants to use art, music, journaling and creative movement as learning tools. Creative expression was used to explore constructs and emotional responses that were difficult to express by words alone. During workshops, hand massage, relaxation techniques and aromatherapy were introduced to promote work-related stress relieving strategies. Explicitly, this workshop series explored the topics of mentoring, establishing positive nurturing relationships and networks, building hardiness, maintaining a positive outlook, intellectual flexibility and emotional intelligence, achieving work/life balance, enabling spirituality, reflective and critical thinking, and moving forward and planning for the future with participants.

Participants included a combination of enrolled nurses, registered nurses and registered midwives, some holding dual qualifications. Following participation, both personal and professional gains were described as experiential learning opportunities, creative self-expression, exposure to new ideas and strategies, increased assertiveness at work, improved workplace relationships and communication, increased collaborative capital, and an increased understanding of self-care practices (McDonald et al., 2013). In another paper, referring to the same intervention, the 14 nurses and midwives reported an improved sense of wellbeing and a reduction in stress when interviewed following its delivery (McDonald et al., 2012). Participants also reported being able to communicate better with staff whom they feel may be hostile or manipulative towards them.

Those who engaged reported that they were able to develop self-care strategies and adopt a more self-caring attitude (McDonald et al., 2013). Through creative activities, participants also reported that they were better able to develop an internal dialogue, drawing attention to their individual strengths and the hostile aspects of working healthcare (McDonald et al., 2013). Participants also reported a willingness and improved ability to monitor and maintain resilience strategies for both themselves and their colleagues (McDonald et al., 2012). Professionally, colleagues noted a closer group dynamic, more supportive communication, assertiveness and confidence at work. Overall, these two papers reporting on the same intervention, stated that work-based, educational interventions that focus on personal resilience have significant potential to empower, improve wellbeing and reduce stress.

Line of argument synthesis

For these samples, participating in these interventions can have a positive effect on a variety of outcomes in relation to work-related psychological distress. However, the experiences of a small minority

Table 4
Outcomes considered, summary findings, effect estimates and confidence intervals.

Study	Outcome	95% Confidence Interval for effect size	Cohen's d	Summary of findings
Wallbank (2010)	Treatment Group			
	Total stress impact of events (IES) and (PANAS)	(-3.64 to -1.67)	2.66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reduction in staff stress, burnout and compassion fatigue - Increase in compassion satisfaction - No statistically significant difference in the scores of the control group compared with their earlier scores.
	Compassion fatigue (ProQol)	(-1.50 to -0.01)	0.76	
	Compassion satisfaction (ProQol)	(0.15 to 1.65)	-0.90	
	Burnout (ProQol)	(-2.95 to -1.17)	2.06	
	Control Group			
	Total stress impact of events (IES) and (PANAS)	(-0.63 to 0.80)	-0.09	
	Compassion fatigue (ProQol)	(-0.60 to 0.82)	-0.10	
	Compassion satisfaction (ProQol)	(-0.84 to 0.58)	0.13	
	Burnout (ProQol)	(-0.33 to 1.11)	-0.39	
Foureur et al. (2013)	Orientation to life (SOC)	(0.23 to 1.23)	-0.75	
	Comprehensibility (SOC)	(0.12 to 1.11)	-0.62	
	Manageability (SOC)	(-0.11 to 0.84)	-0.37	
	Meaning (SOC)	(-0.29 to 0.66)	-0.18	
	Depression (DASS)	(-0.82 to 0.14)	0.33	
	Anxiety (DASS)	(-0.72 to 0.24)	0.29	
	Stress (DASS)	(-1.16 to -0.18)	0.67	
	General health (based on sum of Likert ratings) (GHQ12)	(0.38 to 1.38)	-0.88	
	General health (based on dichotomous scoring) (GHQ12)	(-1.10 to -0.11)	0.61	
	van et al. (2015)	Attending to self	- No statistical data available	
Attending to others				
Cognitive function				
Stress				
Self-awareness				
Study	Outcome	95% confidence interval for proportion positive	Cohen's d	Summary of findings
Warriner et al. (2016)	Stress (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.60 to 0.94)	No mean differences available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustained positive impact on stress, anxiety, resilience, self-compassion and mindfulness - Positive impact on depression - Benefit in home life, work life and workplace culture
	Depression (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.12 to 0.52)		
	Resilience (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.47 to 0.85)		
	Self-Compassion (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.51 to 0.88)		
	Anxiety (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.45 to 0.85)		
	Mindfulness (based on Positive impact n (%) Likert ratings)	(0.70 to 0.98)		
	Benefit to home life (based on dichotomous scoring)	(0.65 to 0.96)		
	Benefit to work life (based on dichotomous scoring)	(0.70 to 0.98)		
	Benefit to workplace culture (based on dichotomous scoring)	(0.36 to 0.78)		
McDonald et al. (2013)	Confidence	- No statistical data available		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced experience of stress - Increased assertiveness at work, collaborative capital and understanding self-care practices - Improved relationships, communication and wellbeing
	Self-awareness			
	Self-care			
	Assertiveness			
McDonald et al. (2012)	Workplace culture	- No statistical data available		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A closer group dynamic, more supportive communication, assertiveness and confidence - Growth in knowledge of personal resilience - Increased conflict resolution skills

are less favourable, and others are unable to engage wholly in these interventions as provided. Clinical supervision may produce short-term positive benefits, yet those who practice newly learnt mindfulness techniques regularly, and participate in resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme may experience positive effects over a longer period of time.

Midwives and student midwives who engage with interventions designed to support them can experience increased cognitive function,

improved working relationships with colleagues and a greater appreciation of self-care practices. Feelings of being relaxed and facing the present moment with a sense of clarity can also be experienced. Additionally, as midwives and student midwives develop strategies to manage their own psychological and workplace experiences, they can also develop assertiveness, improved communication skills and workplace resilience. The consensus of these studies was that interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in

work-related psychological distress can provide a range of both personal and professional benefits for users. However, given the lack of data for comparison, small sample sizes and a lack of high quality studies, this line of argument synthesis is tentative.

Risk of bias across studies

As the studies within this review reported either significant or favourable results, they may have been at risk of publication bias. Time lag and selective outcome reporting biases may also have been present within the studies selected, however, due to lack of relevant information, these could not be explored.

Discussion

This review found that clinical supervision, the formal provision by senior/qualified health practitioners of intensive, relationship-based education and training, that is case-focused and which supports, directs and guides the work of colleagues (supervisees) (Milne, 2007), can result in a marked reduction in subjective stress levels (Wallbank, 2010). Here, medium, large and huge effect sizes were noted for the treatment group, whereas either small or very small effect sizes were calculated for the control group.

Work-based resilience workshops partnered with a mentoring programme evaluations were found to enhance confidence levels, increased self-awareness, improved assertiveness and an increased focus upon self-care in midwifery populations (McDonald et al., 2012; McDonald et al., 2013). The delivery of this intervention was also found to produce a sustained positive effect upon stress, anxiety, resilience and self-compassion (McDonald et al., 2013).

Participation in a mindfulness intervention was associated with short term insights into the impact of stress on cognition, emotions and behaviour, an increased sense of wellbeing, increased self-awareness and a reduction in negative cognitions for midwives in distress (van et al., 2015). Mindfulness can be highly acceptable to midwives, who reported ongoing and significant benefits in both their home and work life, and upon the culture of their workplace (Warriner et al., 2016). Mindfulness practice was also seen to result in better general health; a more positive orientation to life; improved comprehensibility; and lower stress levels (Foureur et al., 2013). For these outcomes, 'medium' and 'Large' size effects were calculated, yet effect sizes relating to manageability, meaning, depression and anxiety were calculated to be 'small'.

However, these studies were too few in number to form a recommendation that providers of health care services should implement these interventions to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress. Here, some participants also found it challenging to attend sessions and complete any 'homework' given (Foureur et al., 2013; van et al., 2015; Warriner et al., 2016). As such, any future research would only be feasible if midwives are offered more flexible interventions to use.

None of the studies within this review solely related to either qualified midwives or student midwives. Given that there are interventions designed exclusively to support the wellbeing of other groups of healthcare professionals at work, future intervention research could usefully account for the fact that the midwifery profession is a separate profession, which may also require targeted support.

Additionally, none of the interventions identified focussed upon either the organisational or the societal aspects of supporting staff in work-related psychological distress. This paucity of attention may lead to the conceptualisation that the management of work-related psychological distress is primarily an individualised responsibility, rather than a corporate or societal responsibility. This may enhance levels of work-related stress, rather than ameliorate them. Future intervention studies may be improved by recruiting larger samples to focus upon longer-term outcomes for midwifery populations. It will also be important for any new or ongoing pilot studies to progress towards undertaking

adequately powered randomised controlled trials (RCT's).

Limitations

This review was limited to international findings captured within first world countries, although studies conducted in low-and middle-income countries were not excluded from selection. Other studies may have been evaded, as this search strategy was conducted using only the English language. Owing to a paucity of information, it has not been possible to conduct additional analysis such as sensitivity, subgroup analyses, meta-analysis or meta-regression.

Two of the papers retrieved provided case studies in relation to one single intervention. This may have altered the weight of evidence in this regard. This has also meant that the same 14 participants have been studied within 2 of the papers retrieved.

There is no clear understanding of how these particular interventions lead to the outcomes they produce, some baseline data is absent and it is unclear whether treatment fidelity measures have been used to assess delivery. Interventions are also not described in such a way that these studies could be accurately replicated (Craig et al., 2008). Moreover, workplace distress, and any change in the experience of or response to workplace distress, was not directly measured.

Sample sizes were small. Additionally, the heterogeneity of these samples made some findings difficult to extrapolate solely to midwifery populations. The retrieved studies are not of high quality, and only one study included a control group. Therefore, some of the outcomes apparent may be due to other factors such as social desirability effects or the therapeutic alliance with those administering the intervention rather than the type of intervention or mode of delivery per se.

Conclusion

This was the first mixed-methods systematic review to report the outcomes and experiences associated with the use of interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress. All selected studies reported a variety of both personal and professional benefits for midwives.

Similar reviews of interventions designed to support the psychological wellbeing of healthcare professionals in the workplace report encouraging results (Regehr et al., 2014; Ruotsalainen et al., 2015; Guillaumie et al., 2016; Murray et al., 2016; Romppanen and Häggman-Laitila, 2016). Yet likewise, these other reviews do not identify high quality studies in relation to interventions designed to support midwives and/or student midwives in work-related psychological distress. Targeting midwifery populations for future intervention research may permit more concrete conclusions about the most effective design and delivery of such interventions.

One other review in relation to preventing stress in the healthcare workforce has included midwifery populations, and found that a variety of mindfulness interventions were beneficial to a variety of healthcare professionals (Burton et al., 2016). In line with the current review, this review also suggests that future intervention studies may wish to explore the provision of more flexible and accessible interventions. Yet in relation to midwifery populations, this review was restricted to the findings presented by Foureur and colleagues (Foureur et al., 2013).

Additional research is needed to build on this early foundation of evidence, and clarify which interventions or combinations of interventions might be most effective in addressing the pervasive problem of work-related psychological distress in midwifery populations. More flexible interventions, which provide a larger number of midwifery populations with wider access to support, perhaps online or away from scheduled sessions may secure greater adherence rates and isolate effects to determine which elements are affecting which outcome measures. To secure excellence in maternity care, more rigorous, well-designed and generalisable studies in this area of intervention research are required.

Acknowledgements

This systematic review has been funded by a full time PhD scholarship awarded by Coventry University.

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.midw.2017.04.003.

References

- Abbott, J.H., 2014. The distinction between randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and preliminary feasibility and pilot studies: what they are and are not. *Journal of Orthopaedic Sports Physical Therapy* 44, 555–558.
- Abdulla, A., Abdulla, A., Krishnamurthy, M., Krishnamurthy, M., 2016. Comparing retrieval of systematic review searches in health sciences areas using two major databases. *Reference Reviews* 30, 1–5.
- Arain, M., Campbell, M.J., Cooper, C.L., Lancaster, G.A., 2010. What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 10, (2288-10-67).
- Awa, W.L., Plaumann, M., Walter, U., 2010. Burnout prevention: a review of intervention programs. *Patient Education and Counselling* 78, 184–190.
- Barnett-Page, E., Thomas, J., 2009. Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: a critical review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 9, 59.
- Begley, C.M., 2002. 'Great fleas have little fleas': Irish student midwives' views of the hierarchy in midwifery. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 38, 310–317.
- Burton, A., Burgess, C., Dean, S., Koutsopoulou, G.Z., Hugh-Jones, S., 2016. How effective are mindfulness-based interventions for reducing stress among healthcare professionals? a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Stress and Health* 33, 3–13.
- Cameron, J., Roxburgh, M., Taylor, J., Lauder, W., 2011. An integrative literature review of student retention in programmes of nursing and midwifery education: why do students stay? *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 20, 1372–1382.
- Chokwe, M.E., Wright, S.C., 2013. Caring during clinical practice: midwives' perspective. *Curatationis* 36, 1–7.
- Coldridge, L., Davies, S., 2017. "Am I too emotional for this job?" An exploration of student midwives' experiences of coping with traumatic events in the labour ward. *Midwifery* 45, 1–6.
- Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I., Petticrew, M., Medical Research Council Guidance, 2008. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 337, a1655, (Clinical research ed.).
- Cumberlege, J., 2016. Better births improving outcomes of maternity services in England: a five year forward view for maternity care. *The National Maternity Review*.
- Curtis, P., Ball, L., Kirkham, M., 2006. Why do midwives leave? (Not) being the kind of midwife you want to be. *British Journal of Midwifery* 14 (1), 27–31.
- Davies, S., Coldridge, L., 2015. 'No Man's Land': an exploration of the traumatic experiences of student midwives in practice. *Midwifery* 31, 858–864.
- Dekkers, O.M., Egger, M., Altman, D.G., Vandenbroucke, J.P., 2012. Distinguishing case series from cohort studies. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 156, 37–40.
- DiPietro, N.A., 2010. Methods in epidemiology: observational study designs. *Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy* 30, 973–984.
- Doll, R., 2004. Cohort studies: history of the method. In: Morabia, Alfredo (Ed.), *Anonymous A History of Epidemiologic Methods and Concepts*. Springer, Birkhäuser Basel, 243–274.
- Douglas, H., 2006. *The Solihull Approach Under-fives Practitioner's Manual (revised)*. CAMHS, Solihull Care Trust, Solihull.
- Douglas, M.R., 2011. Opportunities and challenges facing the future global nursing and midwifery workforce. *Journal of Nursing Management* 19, 695–699.
- Farrell, G.A., Shafiei, T., 2012. Workplace aggression, including bullying in nursing and midwifery: a descriptive survey (the SWAB study). *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 49, 1423–1431.
- Foureur, M., Besley, K., Burton, G., Yu, N., Crisp, J., 2013. Enhancing the resilience of nurses and midwives: pilot of a mindfulness based program for increased health, sense of coherence and decreased depression, anxiety and stress. *Contemporary Nurse* 45, 114–125.
- Gerring, J., 2004. What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review* 98, 341–354.
- Guillaumie, L., Boiral, O., Champagne, J., 2016. A mixed-methods systematic review of the effects of mindfulness on nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 73, 1017–1034. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jan.13176>, (5 May 2017).
- Hall, L.H., Johnson, J., Watt, I., Tsipa, A., O'Connor, D.B., 2016. Healthcare staff wellbeing, burnout, and patient safety: a systematic review. *PLoS ONE* 11, e0159015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159015>.
- Hawker, S., Payne, S., Kerr, C., Hardey, M., Powell, J., 2002. Appraising the evidence: reviewing disparate data systematically. *Qualitative Health Research* 12, 1284–1299.
- Hellems, M.A., Kramer, M.S., Hayden, G.F., 2006. Case-control confusion. *Ambulatory Paediatrics* 6, 96–99.
- ICM International Confederation of Midwives, 2011. International definition of a midwife. Available from: (<http://internationalmidwives.org/who-we-are/policy-and-practice/icm-international-definition-of-the-midwife/>).
- Kalicińska, M., Chylińska, J., Wilczek-Różycka, E., 2012. Professional burnout and social support in the workplace among hospice nurses and midwives in Poland. *International Journal of Nursing Practice* 18, 595–603.
- Machi, L.A., McEvoy, B.T., 2016. *The Literature Review: Six Steps to Success*. Corwin Press, 24.
- McDonald, G., Jackson, D., Wilkes, L., Vickers, M.H., 2013. Personal resilience in nurses and midwives: effects of a work-based educational intervention. *Contemporary Nurse: A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession* 45, 134–143.
- McDonald, G., Jackson, D., Wilkes, L., Vickers, M.H., 2012. A work-based educational intervention to support the development of personal resilience in nurses and midwives. *Nurse Education Today* 32, 378–384.
- Milne, D., 2007. An empirical definition of clinical supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 46, 437–447.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 62, 1006–1012.
- Murray, M., Murray, L., Donnelly, M., 2016. Systematic review of interventions to improve the psychological well-being of general practitioners. *BMC Family Practice* 17 (36), 1–14.
- Noblit, G.W., Hare, R.D., 1988. *Meta-Ethnography: Synthesizing Qualitative Studies* 11. Sage.
- Pearson, A., 2004. *JBI-NOTARI User's Manual for version 4.0*. The Joanna Briggs Institute, Australia.
- Pezaro, S., Clyne, W., Turner, A., Fulton, E.A., Gerada, C., 2015. 'Midwives Overboard!' Inside their hearts are breaking, their makeup may be flaking but their smile still stays on. *Women and Birth: Journal of the Australian College of Midwives* 29, 59–66.
- Pluye, P., Gagnon, M., Griffiths, F., Johnson-Lafleur, J., 2009. A scoring system for appraising mixed methods research, and concomitantly appraising qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods primary studies in mixed studies reviews. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 46, 529–546.
- Regehr, C., Glancy, D., Pitts, A., LeBlanc, V.R., 2014. Interventions to reduce the consequences of stress in physicians: a review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 202, 353–359.
- Ridner, S.H., 2004. Psychological distress: concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 45, 536–545.
- Romppanen, J., Häggman-Laitila, A., 2016. Interventions for nurses' well-being at work: a quantitative systematic review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jan.13210>.
- Ruotsalainen, J.H., Verbeek, J.H., Mariné, A., Serra, C., 2015. *Preventing Occupational Stress in Healthcare Workers*. The Cochrane Library.
- Sandelowski, M., Voils, C.I., Barroso, J., 2006. Defining and designing mixed research synthesis studies. *Research in the Schools: A Nationally Refereed Journal Sponsored by the Mid-South Educational Research Association and the University of Alabama* 13, 29.
- Sawilowsky, S.S., 2009. New effect size rules of thumb. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods* 8, 597–599.
- Schünemann, H.J., Oxman, A.D., Vist, G.E., Higgins, J.P., Deeks, J.J., Glasziou, P., Guyatt, G.H., 2008. *Interpreting results and drawing conclusions*. *Cochrane Handbook For Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5*.
- Sullivan, K., Lock, L., Homer, C.S., 2011. Factors that contribute to midwives staying in midwifery: a study in one area health service in New South Wales, Australia. *Midwifery* 27, 331–335.
- The Royal College of Physicians, 2015. *Work and wellbeing in the NHS: why staff health matters to patient care*. Available from (<https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/guidelines-policy/work-and-wellbeing-nhs-why-staff-health-matters-patient-care>).
- van, dR., Rossiter, R., Kirby, D., Druzewska, T., Harmon, C., 2015. Piloting a stress management and mindfulness program for undergraduate nursing students: student feedback and lessons learned. *Nurse Education Today* 35, 44–49.
- Wallbank, S., 2010. Effectiveness of individual clinical supervision for midwives and doctors in stress reduction: findings from a pilot study. *Evidence Based Midwifery* 8, 65–70.
- Warriner, S., Hunter, L., Dymond, M., 2016. Mindfulness in maternity: evaluation of a course for midwives. *British Journal of Midwifery* 24, 188–195.
- West, M., Armit, K., Loewenthal, L., Eckert, R., West, T., Lee, A., 2015. *Leadership and Leadership Development in Healthcare: The Evidence Base*. The Kings Fund, London.
- Wilson, E.B., 1927. Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 22, 209–212.