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ABSTRACT

Rescue workers are liable for responding to natural and man-made emergencies in the day-to-day routine. Operational rescue workers have to face extended duty hours, harsh behavior of crowds at the incident places, and less leisure time for themselves and their family members. In contrast, non-operational workers do not directly respond to emergencies. So, this study aimed to determine how operational and non-operational rescue workers cope with daily stressors. Furthermore, the study also aimed to test the correlation between different coping strategies among rescuers. For this purpose, a cross-sectional survey was conducted using cluster sampling techniques among 199 rescuers from nine districts in Punjab, Pakistan. Data was collected using the Brief COPE scale (Carver, 1997) and analyzed using correlation and t-test. Results of this study show that the mean scores of non-operational and operational rescue workers are significantly different from each other on "Problem-focused Coping," "Emotional Coping," and "Avoidance Coping." Likewise, "Problem-focused Coping" is negatively correlated to "Emotional Coping" and "Avoidance Coping." The study concludes that rescue workers who have "Problem-focused Coping" strategies are less likely to use "Emotional Coping" and "Avoidance Coping" strategies. Moreover, operational rescuers are less likely to use "Problem-focused Coping" and more likely to use "Emotional Coping" and "Avoidance Coping" strategies; however, non-operational rescue workers use coping strategies in vice versa.
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1. Introduction

Rescue workers have to face day-to-day stressors related to their job. They are liable to respond to different kind of emergencies in their routine duties (Khrisnanda and Theresia Indira
The survival of rescue workers depends on understanding the workplace stressors that may cause stress and how they cope with those stressors. This study aimed to test the association between operational and non-operational rescue workers on coping strategies: "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping." Likewise, the other aim of this study was to analyze the orientation and magnitude of the association among "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping."

A stressed-out person will endure several unpleasant emotional and physical ailments. When under stress, a person feels as though their socio-physical wellbeing is in danger yet is unaware of how to cope with it (Khrisnanda and Theresia Indira Shanti, 2022). Daily stressors affect both individuals and organizations. It negatively affects a person’s behaviour at the workplace, demotivating them and making them always exhausted (Jamal, 2017). Stress impacts happiness since stress-related behaviours frequently result in missed workdays (Nowicki et al., 2013).

Since they constantly deal with emergencies, rescue workers experience many stressors at work. Researchers examined the daily stressors in the workplace: employee disputes, a lack of workers, and an overwhelming workload (Stuhimiller, 1994). Many names, including occupational and professional life stressors, refer to workplace stress. Professional life stressors is the term used to describe events or actions that occur at work and are intended to test an employee’s resolve and contentment (Ogińska-Bulik and Zadworna-Cieślak, 2018).

Coping behavior refers to adopting particular ways of thinking and behaving in reaction to stressful experiences. How people view their responsibilities and their capacity to fulfil them affects how stressed they feel (Lazarus and Folkman, 2010). When evaluating stress, one must consider how individuals cope with it. When workers try to manage the obligations, commitments, and other pressures that come with their occupations yet run into obstacles, dread, anxiety, and worries while trying to accomplish their goals, workplace stress grows (Boulos, 2014).

A dysfunctional behavior causes poor mental state and workplace stress. It results from a mismatch between the job requirements and the necessary skills to cope with the job stressors (Ogińska-Bulik, 2014). "Problem-focused Coping" and "Emotion-focused Coping" are two categories into which coping strategies are typically divided (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). The actions that are a part of problem-oriented strategies include taking action and developing a plan. On the other hand, emotionally driven strategies involve expectation modification and emotional presentation. Problem-solving strategies can lead to benefits like better management and fewer unpleasant events as daily stressors (Prati et al., 2011). However, emotion-focused strategies, particularly avoidance strategies, have been linked to unfavorable outcomes like poor socio-physical wellbeing and unfavorable perceptions (Kovacs et al., 2017). Acceptance and positive reframing are two emotion-focused strategies, however, that have been linked to greater happiness (Cogan and MacDonald, 2021).

Researchers investigated the relationship between stress and potential remedies (Huang et al., 2022). Hudson investigated coping strategies for occupational stress in aviation research. He discovered that stress levels were lower who utilized problem-focused coping strategies. This study, however, found a clear positive relationship between stress and avoidant coping (2016). A damaging association between negative stress perception and coping strategies (Lischetzke et al., 2021).

A set of personality attributes known as hardiness facilitates a person’s capacity to endure
trying circumstances (Maddi et al., 2002). The three fundamental components of hardiness are commitment, control, and challenge. Realistic stress reduction tactics can also make a stressful situation more manageable or reinterpret a terrible event to make it less upsetting (Chykhantsova, 2018). Thus, hardiness and optimism can reduce negative emotions like hatred and despair and transform trying circumstances into training moments (Nayyeri and Aubi, 2011). Comparatively to low levels of hardiness, high levels of hardiness lead to an increase in the use of adaptive coping strategies and a decrease in the use of maladaptive coping strategies (Nas, 2020).

Personal characteristics such as personality type, contingency planning, coping strategies, and exercise regimens impact a person's response to occupational stressors when determining stress and coping levels (Zhou et al., 2014). Furthermore, psychological characteristics like resilience impact how stress and coping strategies function. Studies on resilience and stress show that resilient persons often experience less stress. When under pressure, they may act in a way that suits them (Pizeta et al., 2016).

The current study is built on the stress model of Carver (1997). He claims that interactions between people and environments that are too much for them to bear and constitute a risk to their mental wellbeing are what causes stress. According to this idea, a person's unique traits, qualities, or resources are exploited to help them cope with stress. A person's fortitude is an example of an internal resource. External resources are those that originate from outside the organization. This theory focuses on the cognitive assessment of situational demands and a person's coping mechanisms and resources. Consequently, he developed a scale to measure coping strategies with its fourteen subscales using these propositions.

So, current research is significant for a variety of reasons. First, more research needs to be done on the effects of workplace stressors and coping with those stressors among Pakistani rescue workers. Consequently, this study would deepen our understanding of coping strategies with occupational stressors. Second, the significance of the study is that it would increase rescue workers' perception of how to appraise the daily stressors and how to cope with them. Third, this study would help the policy makers and administration to design the mechanism of enhancing coping abilities for their employees.

This study aimed to compare operational and non-operational rescue workers on "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping" strategies. Likewise, the other aim of this study was to analyze the orientation and magnitude of the association among "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping."

2. Hypotheses of the Study

- The higher the "Problem-focused Coping", the lower the Emotional and Avoidance Coping among rescue workers
- There are higher mean scores on "Problem-focused Coping" strategies among non-operational rescue workers as compared to operational rescue workers
- Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on "Emotional Coping" strategies than non-operational rescue workers
- Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on "Avoidance Coping" strategies than non-operational rescue workers
3. Material and Method

The target population of the study was rescue workers of nine selected districts in Punjab, Pakistan. The current study was a cross-sectional survey carried out in 2022. The sample of the study was determined through a cluster sampling technique because the target population was geographically scattered and internally heterogeneous. First, nine districts (Rawalpindi, Lahore, Multan, Dera Ghazi Khan, Bahawalpur, Faisalabad, Sargodha, Sahiwal, and Gujranwala) were chosen as the sample. Then, rescue workers of Rescue 1122 were selected randomly from sampled districts. A sample size of 199 respondents was selected for the current study.

Brief COPE, "Coping Orientation to Problem Experienced", was used for data collection. This inventory was developed by Carver (1997) and is available on the official website of “University of MIAMI”. The original version of this inventory can be copied and used without permission through the link “https://local.psy.miami.edu/people/faculty/ccarver/availbale-self-report-instruments”. It consists of 28 questions. Scoring is ranged from 1 to 4 on a four-point rating scale as “I usually don’t do this at all” (1) to “I usually do this a lot” (4). This inventory has 14 subscales to analyze different domains of coping. These subscales are: “Active Coping” (2 and 7), “Use of Instrumental Support” (10 and 23), “Positive Reframing” (12 and 17) “Planning” (14 and 25), “Emotional Support” (5 and 15), “Venting” (9 and 21), “Humour” (18 and 28), “Acceptance” (20 and 24), “Religion” (22 and 27), “Self-blame” (13 and 26), “Self-distraction” (1 and 19), “Denial” (3 and 8), “Substance Use” (4 and 11) and “Behavioural Disengagement” (6 and 16). The items of this inventory were also categorised as "Problem-focused Coping" with eight items (item Nos. 2, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 23 and 25), “Emotional Coping” with twelve items (item Nos. 5, 9, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27 and 28) and “Avoidance Coping” with eight items (item Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 16 and 19).

Demographic was also collected regarding gender (male, female), duty wing (ambulance, motorbike, other vehicles, control room, or general wing, which included managerial staff, repair and maintenance staff, public relation staff, safety-related staff, clerical staff, office attendants and cleaning staff) employment type (contract, permanent) and age.

Informed consent was taken from each participant before completing the questionnaire, and voluntary participation in the research was also ensured. Participants were briefed on their information privacy and confidentiality rights. Those who agreed to participate in the study were given a booklet with survey instructions. Participants were given the instructions and encouraged to ask any questions regarding the questionnaire. The entire questionnaires were to be completed in approximately 15 minutes.

Data were analyzed using SPSS software version 21. A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to determine demographic variables' frequencies, percentages, and mean scores. Inferential statistical analysis was conducted to determine the correlation among "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", "Avoidance Coping", service length, respondents' ages, and monthly income. Hypothesis, "The higher the problem-focused coping, the lower the emotional and avoidance coping", was analyzed through the Pearson Correlation Coefficient test. Other hypotheses, "There are higher mean scores on problem-focused coping strategy among non-operational rescue workers as compared to operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on emotional coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on avoidance coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers", were tested through a t-test.
4. Results

Table. 1 Frequency and percentage distribution of demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Rescue Workers</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operational Rescue Workers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service in Years</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages of the study participants ranged from 23 years to 45 years, while mean scores were 33.58 with a standard deviation = 4.64. Likewise, the length of service ranged from 01 years to 16 years with $M = 10.44$ and $SD = 5.01$ (see Table. 1). Most participants were operational rescue workers ($N = 148$, % = 74.4), and female rescue workers as compared to male were less in numbers (13 out of 199, % = 6.5) who participated in this study. Most rescue workers who participated in the study were permanent employees, married and graduates (see Table. 01).

Table. 2 Correlation of Study Variables among Rescue Workers (N = 199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.856**</td>
<td>-.443**</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.279**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.805**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** PFC = "Problem-focused Coping", EC = "Emotional Coping" AC = "Avoidance Coping" 
**$p<.01$, *$p<.05$**

The hypothesis of the study, "The higher the problem-focused coping, the lower the emotional and avoidance coping", was accepted. The values of the Table. 2 illuminate that "Problem-focused Coping" is negatively correlated with "Emotional Coping" ($r = -.856, p<.01$) and "Avoidance Coping" ($r = -.443**, p<.01$). All variables of hypothesis No. 1 are correlated in expected
orientation. "Problem-focused Coping" is strongly correlated with "Emotional Coping" and moderately correlated with "Avoidance Coping." Besides the magnitude of the correlation, all variables are precisely correlated in the expected orientation, which increases confidence in the importance of the study.

On the other side, Table 2 shows that other than the hypothesis variable, age and length of service are not significantly correlated with "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional-focused Coping" and "Avoidance Coping". Both the magnitude and the orientation of the relationship among these variables are not statistically significant. In contrast, Age, length of service and monthly income are positively correlated. The values of the Table 2 also elaborate that statistically significant is found among the length of service, age and monthly income; values are mentioned respectively ($r = .805, p < 0.01; r = .328, p < 0.01; r = .230, p < 0.01$).

Hence, it is concluded that the rescue workers with "Problem-focused Coping" do not or are less involved in "Emotional and Avoidance Coping". Likewise, there is no relationship between age, length and monthly income, and coping strategies among rescue workers in Punjab, Pakistan.

Table 3 Independent sample t Test for the mean difference between operational and non-operational rescue workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-operational</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>t-Test</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem-focused Coping</td>
<td>2.91 .891</td>
<td>2.30 .972</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Coping</td>
<td>2.56 .538</td>
<td>2.79 .504</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Coping</td>
<td>2.41 .758</td>
<td>2.77 .793</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 199

Table 3 shows the results mean, standard deviation, value of t-test, degree of freedom about the hypotheses "There are higher mean scores on problem-focused coping strategy among non-operational rescue workers as compared to operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on emotional coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on avoidance coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers". Job categories had been indicated as operational and non-operational rescue workers. Job category was independent variable with two groups. Dependent variables were "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping" at continuous level.

The mean scores of non-operational and operational rescue workers are different to each other on "Problem-focused Coping" and this difference is statistically significant ($t = 4.10, p < 0.01$). The mean scores of non-operational ($M = 2.91$) are higher than the mean score of operational rescue workers ($M = 2.30$). Whereas "Emotional Coping" scores of operational rescue workers ($M = 2.8$) are higher than non-operational rescue workers ($M = 2.38$) and this association is statistically significance ($t = 2.8, df = 197, p = 0.06$). Likewise, operational rescue workers are more likely to use "Avoidance Coping" than non-operational rescue workers ($M = 2.8$ & $M = 2.4$ respectively) and this association is also statistically significance ($t = 3.2, df = 19, p < 0.01$).
The values of the significance of “Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances” (P > 0.05) showed the equal variance, so researcher analysed the t-test on “equal variance assumed.” All the hypotheses of the study were selected on the behalf of t-test results. "Problem-focused Coping" consisted of t-test values (t (199) = 4.10, p < 0.01), "Emotional Coping" composed of t-test values (t (199) = 2.80, p < 0.01) and "Avoidance Coping" had t-test values (t (199) = 3.20, p < 0.01). Thus, it is concluded that operational rescue workers are more likely to use emotional and avoidance coping strategies whereas non-operational rescue workers are more likely to use "Problem-focused Coping" strategies (active/functional/rational coping).

5. Discussion

The study was designed to identify the difference between operational and non-operational rescue workers of emergency service regarding "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping." Furthermore, this study was conducted to analyze the correlation among "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping." The hypotheses of the study were, "There are higher mean scores on problem-focused coping strategy among non-operational rescue workers as compared to operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on emotional coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers; Operational rescue workers have higher mean scores on avoidance coping strategy than non-operational rescue workers", and "The higher the problem-focused coping, the lower the emotional and avoidance coping." The results of the study provided evidence in support of the hypotheses that there is a negative correlation between "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping." Likewise, there is a significant difference between operational and non-operational emergency rescue workers' mean scores of "Problem-focused Coping", "Emotional Coping", and "Avoidance Coping."

This demonstrates that non-operational emergency rescue workers with a more ability of active (Problem-focused) coping with stressors. In addition, prior research has shown that resiliency and stressors are incompatible with one another among rescue workers (Ogińska-Bulik & Zadworna-Cieślak, 2018). As a result, the findings of this study could be implemented into training for emergency rescue workers. It is possible that giving rescue workers coping training as part of their training would help them cope with the daily stressors (challenges) already possessed by these individuals, making it more straightforward for them to deal with daily stressors. When emergency rescue workers have greater resilience, they experience less stress as a direct result (Mikutta et al., 2022). The second hypothesis of the study, which stated that "Problem-focused Coping" and "Emotional and Avoidance Coping" are negatively associated with one another, was likewise validated by the results of the study (Ogińska-Bulik, 2014). This leads one to believe rescue workers who experienced fewer stressors in the workplace developed "Problem-focused Coping" strategies. The results of this inquiry are in line with those obtained from earlier examinations (Vulpe & Dafinoiu, 2012; Nowicki et al., 2013; NOVARA et al., 2015; Vagni et al., 2020). Consider the various components of "Problem-focused Coping" strategies, such as reframing, the use of instrumental, social support, active coping, religion, restraint, suppression of competing activities, and planning. This would help to understand why stressors and "Problem-focused Coping" strategies do not amalgamate well. Using these traits produces a realistic method of coping with life, which contributes to the effective management of stressors (Litman, 2006).

Emergency rescue workers who performed well on the "Problem-focused Coping" approach reported having lower levels of stress (Chao, 2011). The findings also supported the ultimate premise
of the research but in inverse form, which suggested a significant association between stressors and "Avoidant Coping" strategies among emergency nurses (Kular, 2010). Therefore, rescue workers would experience higher levels of stress if they relied more on avoidant coping methods to get through their duty shifts. These findings are also consistent with those of earlier research (Kular, 2010; Tehreem Arshad & Kausar, 2015; Abid et al., 2019; Riaz & abid, 2020; Fonseca et al., 2021). In addition, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) state that persons who engage in "Avoidance Coping" strategies might temporarily reduce their stress levels if they do so. In addition to this, they asserted that there was an association between stress and other avoidance strategies.

Because it has previously been related to stressors, burnout, and unhappiness with one's employment, unresolved stress among rescue workers could become a significant issue if it is not addressed (Prati et al., 2011). The findings also imply that strategies for "Emotional Coping" with stressors are positively related to stress in and of itself. These results were often predicted in light of the notion that rescue workers who successfully cope with workplace stressors become less reliant on coping strategies that are "Emotion-focused" (Gärtner et al., 2019).

There was a significant relationship between "Problem-focused Coping" and "Emotional Coping" among rescue workers. According to the findings of this study, rescue workers' levels of job and challenge resistance significantly predicted their levels of active coping (Vassillière et al., 2016). This research provides further evidence that a person's ability to bounce back from adversity strongly indicates how they use coping strategies (Vassillière et al., 2016; Tuasikal & Retnowati, 2019; Eriksen, 2019). People more able to cope with its effects may be less likely to suffer. Numerous studies point to the fact that people have ability of active coping appraise lower appraisal stressors (Shimazu & Kosugi, 2003; Young et al., 2014; Ostafin & Proulx, 2020; Eisma et al., 2021). People with a higher active coping level are better equipped to handle the adverse effects of stressors. Less tendency to "Avoidance Coping" lead to active (problem-focused) coping (Tuasikal & Retnowati, 2019). For rescue workers to feel less stress and appraise to fewer daily stressors (challenges), it is necessary to strengthen them "problem focusing coping" ability.

6. Conclusion

This study aimed to compare the operational and non-operational rescue workers regarding coping strategies: "Problem-focused Coping," "Emotional Coping," and "Avoidance Coping." The mean scores of non-operational and operational rescue workers differ significantly from each other on coping strategies. In addition, the study also aimed to analyze the orientation and strength of coping strategies among rescue workers. Results show that "Problem-focused Coping" is strongly correlated with "Emotional Coping," and moderately correlated with "Avoidance Coping" with statistical significance.

Thus, it is concluded that operational rescue workers are more likely to use "Emotional and Avoidance Coping" strategies. In contrast, non-operational rescue workers are more likely to use "Problem-focused Coping" strategies (active/functional/rational coping). Besides, rescue workers who have "Problem-focused Coping" strategies are less likely to use "Emotional Coping" and "Avoidance Coping" strategies. Consequently, it is recommended immensely to take action for counselling among rescue workers to increase their ability towards "Problem-focused Coping" strategies.
7. Limitations

The geographically bounded sample of this study makes it difficult to generalize the findings. In the future, such analysis can be conducted over Pakistan to generalize the finding broadly. The use of multiple-choice questions, which gave little possibility for original thought, was another problem that can be addressed using an in-depth interview method. Furthermore, since this research is cross-sectional, it is impossible to say what caused what. Experimental and longitudinal designs are the most effective ways to establish the direction of causal links between causes and consequences. So, this limitation guide that such a study should be conducted using an experimental or longitudinal method for versatile results.

8. Implications

The significance of coping strategies for rescue workers regarding their job categories (operational and non-operational personnel) was highlighted in this research. The research’s overall conclusions have several significant implications. It first raised our awareness of rescue workers' adaptability regarding daily stressors (challenges) management skills (coping). Second, because rescue workers are regularly called upon for responding to emergencies, the study emphasized the importance of workplace coping strategies in relation to job categories. One of the main factors contributing to upset among rescue workers is workplace stressors. They can reduce its detrimental effects by handling stressors well via building their coping ability. As a result, the present corpus of research provides a strong foundation for lowering workplace stressors. The findings of this study also have theoretical ramifications because they advance our understanding of Pakistani rescuers’ coping strategies on a scientific level. The results of the study implications will have substantial research on how rescue workers are taught, practiced, and researched in the future and how policy is developed.

9. Suggestions

Rescue workers must receive coping training. This scientific investigation also suggests the administration of emergency rescue workers. They should apply the findings to cope with their personnel’s day-to-day stressors (stressors) and take notice of how to be more adaptable regarding Problem-focused Coping. Finally, Pakistani rescue workers are more likely to experience stressors because of their daily working circumstances. Rescue workers should cope more effectively with daily stressors by enhancing their coping ability, and daily stressors should be compared with coping ability.
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