

First insights into post-pandemic distress in a high secure hospital: Correlates among staff and patients

Journal:	<i>Journal of Forensic Practice</i>
Manuscript ID	JFP-08-2023-0041.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	COVID-19, Occupational distress, Forensic patients, Secure hospitals, Distress, PTSD

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

TITLE: First insights into post-pandemic distress in a high secure hospital: Correlates among staff and patients

ABSTRACT:

This preliminary study is designed to gauge the enduring psychological impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on both patients and staff in a high secure settings.

The study involved 31 patients and 34 staff from a high secure setting, who completed assessments to discern the link between COVID-19-related distress and various factors. These evaluations focused on coping strategies, resilience, emotional reactivity, ward atmosphere, and work-related aspects.

Results indicated that 31.2% of staff met the clinical cut-off for potential PTSD due to COVID-19-related distress. Emotional reactivity, staff shortages, secondary traumatic stress, and coping strategies were positively correlated with distress, while resilience showed a negative association, suggesting a mitigating role. Notably, distress among patients was comparatively lower, with only 3.2% experiencing significant levels.

CUST_RESEARCH_LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS__(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

The authors postulate that increased staff burdens during the pandemic may have led to long-term distress, while their efforts to maintain minimal service disruption potentially shielded patients from psychological impacts, possibly lead to staff 'problem-focused coping burnout'. This highlights the need for in-depth research on the enduring impacts of pandemics, focusing on mechanisms that intensify or alleviate distress. Future studies should focus on identifying effective coping strategies for crisis situations, such as staff shortages, and strategies for post-crisis staff support.

CUST_SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

Building on evidence of negative impacts on frontline workers and forensic inpatients during the pandemic, this study delved into the longer-term psychological repercussions that persisted post-pandemic. It sheds light on lasting distress levels and their correlates. These insights are crucial for formulating effective responses and strategies for future pandemics or analogous crises, highlighting the need for sustained support for staff grappling with long-term distress arising from such events.

1
2
3 First insights into post-pandemic distress in a high secure hospital: Correlates among staff
4
5 and patients
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Forensic Practice

Abstract

Purpose: This preliminary investigation aims to examine the psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients and staff within a high secure service.

Design/Methodology/Approach: To discern the connection between COVID-19-related distress and multiple factors, the study involved 31 patients and 34 staff who completed assessments evaluating coping strategies, resilience, emotional reactivity, ward atmosphere, and work-related aspects.

Findings: Results demonstrated that around a third of staff (31.2%) experienced COVID-19-related distress levels that met the clinical cut-off for possible Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Emotional reactivity, staff shortages, secondary traumatic stress and coping strategies were all positively correlated with COVID-19 related-distress. Resilience was negatively associated with distress, thus acting as a potential mitigating factor. In comparison, the prevalence of distress among patients was low (3.2%).

Originality/Value: The authors postulate that the added burdens on staff during the pandemic might have contributed to their distress. Nonetheless, staff might have inadvertently safeguarded patients from the pandemic's psychological ramifications by providing a 'service of little disruption,' potentially leading to 'problem-focused coping burnout.' These findings underscore the imperative for further research capturing the enduring impacts of pandemics, particularly scrutinizing factors that illuminate the mechanisms through which distress is either intensified or alleviated across different groups. An avenue worth exploring is identifying effective coping styles for pandemics.

Keywords: COVID-19; Distress and PTSD; Occupational distress; Forensic patients; Secure hospitals.

1
2
3
4
5
6 The COVID-19 pandemic created a plethora of challenges within the workplace, with a noted
7
8 impact on the role of psychiatric nurses and expectations of their role in the workplace (Negri
9
10 *et al.*, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2020). Rapid changes to the working conditions of staff in secure
11
12 healthcare settings, such as the mandatory use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE),
13
14 physical distancing, halting of visitor access, and cessation of group-based activities, were
15
16 implemented in response to the pandemic (Ardebili *et al.*, 2021; Negri *et al.*, 2023).
17
18 Additionally, healthcare workers based in psychiatric hospitals were managing a fear of
19
20 infection and transmission, limited availability of PPE, insufficient staffing levels, and
21
22 limited disease specific knowledge to guide transmission control (Swinkels *et al.*, 2022).
23
24
25

26
27 Public healthcare crises are well-accepted as conditions that induce negative impacts
28
29 on individuals who provide health related services (Tam *et al.*, 2004; Tzang 2004). These
30
31 impacts include increased psychological distress, (Stefanatou *et al.*, 2022), burnout (Deakin,
32
33 2022; Ghahramani *et al.*, 2021), development of PTSD symptoms (Xiong *et al.*, 2020) and
34
35 secondary traumatic stress (Aafjes-van Doorn, *et al.*, 2020). Forensic hospitals are also not
36
37 immune from these effects; Baker *et al.* (2022), for example, noted how forensic staff
38
39 reported increased anxiety, stress, and depression during the pandemic, thereby emphasising
40
41 the need for further research to explore the unique needs of staff working in secure settings.
42
43 Staff shortages are also recognised as a significant issue in healthcare (Totman *et al.*, 2011)
44
45 and secure settings, resulting in limited therapeutic engagement, affecting ward dynamic,
46
47 quality of patient care and overall job satisfaction (Oates *et al.*, 2021). The impact of such
48
49 shortages during a pandemic have not, however, been considered as a factor that could add to
50
51 distress. One potential mechanism influencing this dynamic is coping strategies. The reduced
52
53 staff numbers during the pandemic are likely to have increased the reliance on coping
54
55 mechanisms. Situations that overwhelm an individual's capacity to adapt and manage stress
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have been linked to the development of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or related
4 symptoms (Łaskawiec *et al.*, 2022). Indeed, there has been a noted rise in PTSD among front-
5 line healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic (Geng *et al.*, 2022).
6
7

8
9
10 Furthermore, staff well-being during challenging times, such as a pandemic, is
11 significantly influenced by the coping strategies they employ (López-Vazquez and Marvan,
12 2003). These strategies are commonly categorised into three types: problem-focused, which
13 involves efforts to alter aspects of a stressful situation; emotion-focused, centred on
14 managing emotional responses to stress; and avoidant, which includes tactics like denial or
15 behavioural disengagement (O'Connor and O'Connor, 2003). In relation to COVID-19,
16 findings have demonstrated that problem-focused coping mediates the relationship between
17 risk perception of COVID-19 infection and healthcare staff well-being (Krok *et al.*, 2020).
18 Increased psychological distress has also been linked with avoidant coping behaviours and
19 psychological inflexibility, with the latter inducing greater use of avoidant coping strategies
20 and poorer health outcomes (Dawson and Golijani-Moghaddam, 2020). Increased distress is
21 also noted to be associated with external factors in nurses, such as the presence of loss and
22 unresolved grief experiences, which are external to the workplace (Rahmani *et al.*, 2023).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In addition to factors elevating and/or associating with distress, previous research has
41 also explored the effects of protective factors in the context of COVID-19 pandemic, in terms
42 of what could assist in the management and/or reduction of distress. Studies focusing on
43 resilience and distress have showed that resilience is adaptive (Kalisch *et al.*, 2017) and was
44 negatively associated with COVID-19 related stress (Köhne *et al.*, 2023; Yıldırım and
45 Solmaz, 2022). Others have explored compassion satisfaction, which refers to the sense of
46 fulfilment derived from alleviating the suffering of others (Stamm, 2009). Such satisfaction
47 has been identified as a factor mitigating the impact of occupational distress and burnout
48 (Sukut *et al.*, 2021; Yıldırım *et al.*, 2021).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Research into the psychological effects of COVID-19 on secure forensic services has
4 been limited (Baker et al, 2022; Challinor *et al.*, 2021). This is surprising when it is accepted
5 that such environments are largely isolated with a need for raised levels of staff to maintain
6 safety and security. Any threat to staff levels is an area of noted concern. In addition, it is
7 expected that the impact of COVID could present with specific challenges to staff and
8 patients in secure settings, particularly in forensic hospital settings where patients are at an
9 elevated risk of negative COVID-19 impacts due to mental and related physical health needs.
10 This placed more emphasis on staff to prevent transmission since the only means of COVID-
11 19 entering the site is via those leaving it, namely the staff and not the patient group. It also
12 meant that staff members were in an enclosed setting during their entire working day, with
13 the management of transmission between staff and those they return to post working day a
14 challenge. Consequently, assessing the reported levels of distress during this period becomes
15 crucial, along with understanding the associated risk and protective factors. A recent review
16 suggests that the destabilizing effects of the pandemic may not become fully apparent
17 immediately afterward but rather emerge more clearly after the pandemic has subsided. This
18 delayed response might manifest as a condition termed post-pandemic stress disorder, a
19 potential long-term consequence highlighted by recent studies (Łaskawiec *et al.*, 2022).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 The implemented pandemic measures taken in psychiatric hospitals had several
43 implications for patients in high secure settings. This included a loss of external social
44 visitation and limited accessibility to meaningful activities (Royal College of Psychiatrists,
45 2020). It is likely that social movement and distancing rules induced feelings of isolation and
46 loneliness (Coffey and Coleman, 2001; Hwang *et al.*, 2020). Previous research has certainly
47 indicated that patients who perceived social distancing measures as restrictive and punishing
48 tended to be at an increased risk for developing symptoms of post-traumatic stress and an
49 overall decline in mental health (Hao *et al.*, 2020). Diminished contact with peers, caregivers,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 family, and friends, alongside disruptions to daily routines may have certainly caused distress
4 and exacerbated pre-existing psychiatric conditions (Cordellieri *et al.*, 2021; Wang *et al.*,
5
6 2018), as well as increased emotional reactivity and lack of impulse control (Janiri *et al.*,
7
8 2020). However, equally, some research in (non-forensic but residential) psychiatric patients
9
10 found such patients did not experience additional stress during the pandemic, suggesting that
11
12 assumptions cannot be automatically made (Burrai *et al.*, 2020).
13
14
15

16
17 Emotional reactivity is a variable of particular interest. This has been associated with
18
19 a raised likelihood of psychological distress following COVID-19 infection (Janiri *et al.*,
20
21 2020). This is supported by previous, non-pandemic, research that highlights how those with
22
23 heightened emotional reactivity might be at risk of adverse health outcomes during prolonged
24
25 periods of distress (Ripper *et al.*, 2018). This is, of course, of substantial relevance
26
27 considering the prolonged nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and accepted challenges in
28
29 emotional reactivity already noted in forensic populations. Given the uncertainties, changes
30
31 in care, and increased restrictions induced by the pandemic, it is likely that the well-being of
32
33 patients residing within forensic settings were negatively impacted, therefore highlighting the
34
35 current study as an important area of research (Tomlin *et al.*, 2020).
36
37
38
39

40 The current small-scale study aimed to explore the longer-term psychological impacts
41
42 of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients and staff in high secure forensic services. It aims to
43
44 assist with a preliminary understanding of experienced distress levels and the factors
45
46 exacerbating and/or mitigating against this. The psychological distress stemming from the
47
48 COVID-19 pandemic, particularly among frontline workers, is well documented. However,
49
50 the extent to which this distress has persisted post-pandemic remains unclear. This
51
52 preliminary study seeks to assess the long-term psychological impact of the pandemic on
53
54 staff and patients in a high secure setting. The goal is to provide insights that could guide the
55
56 management of residual distress and inform strategies for handling future pandemics or
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emergency situations, such as staff shortages or natural disasters, which similarly affect
4
5 inpatient care. The current study has the following hypotheses:

- 6
7 1. Distress will positively relate to isolation due to COVID-19 contact, testing positive
8
9 for COVID-19, in both patients and staff, noticing a change in staffing and/or losing a
10
11 close family member or friend due to COVID-19.
- 12
13 2. Emotional reactivity will positively relate to distress in staff and patients.
- 14
15 3. Avoidant coping and/or emotion-focused coping will positively relate to distress in
16
17 both staff and patients, whereas problem-focused coping will negatively associate.
- 18
19 4. Resilience will negatively relate to distress in staff and patients.
- 20
21
22
23

24 25 **Method**

26 27 **Participants**

28
29 Participants were sampled from a high secure hospital in the UK, which houses adult
30
31 men. A total of 31 out of 177 eligible secure service patients (age range: 23 to 64, $M = 36.04$,
32
33 $SD = 10.03$) consented to participate. Additionally, 34 staff members (36.1% male, 58.3%
34
35 female, 5.6% undisclosed gender; age range: 21 to 56, $M = 40.53$, $SD = 12.91$) from various
36
37 professional backgrounds, including consultants, nurses, psychologists, and ward assistants,
38
39 participated.
40
41

42 43 **Materials**

44
45 The following measures were completed, with reliabilities also indicated. Patients
46
47 completed the following measures:

48
49 *Impact of Events Scale-Revised* (IES-R; Creamer et al, 2003; Weiss, 2007), adapted to
50
51 COVID-19 is a 22-item measure assessing subjective distress caused by traumatic events.
52
53 The IES-R was adapted with participants being asked to think about the symptoms relating to
54
55 the COVID-19 pandemic ($\alpha = .89$). Items are rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4
56
57 (extremely) and included statements such as, “Any reminder brought back feelings about it”.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Higher scores on this measure reflect greater levels of psychological distress related to the
4
5 COVID-19 pandemic.
6

7
8 *Brief COPE* (Carver, 1997), a 28-item instrument of coping styles measuring emotional
9
10 support ($\alpha = .92$). Items are rated on a scale from 1 ('I haven't been doing this at all') to 4
11
12 ('I've been doing this a lot') and included items such as, "I've been criticising myself" and,
13
14 "I've been expressing my negative feelings".
15

16
17 *Essen Climate Evaluation Schema* (EssenCSE; Schalast *et al.*, 2008), a 17-item measure
18
19 of experiences of ward atmosphere ($\alpha = .76$). It comprises three domains (therapeutic hold,
20
21 experienced safety and patient cohesion), each with five items, rated from 1 (not at all) to 5
22
23 (very much). Items include statements such as, "This ward has a homely atmosphere".
24
25

26
27 *Brief Resiliency Scale* (Smith *et al.*, 2008), a six-item measure of resilience ($\alpha = .72$).
28
29 Items are rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), including statements such as,
30
31 "I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times" and, "It does not take me long to recover
32
33 from a stressful event".
34

35
36 *Emotional Reactivity Scale* (Nock *et al.*, 2008), a 21-item measure of emotional reactivity
37
38 ($\alpha = .95$), which is rated on a scale from 0 (not at all like me) to 4 (completely like me),
39
40 including items such as, "My feelings get hurt easily" and, "I experience emotions very
41
42 strongly".
43

44
45 Staff participants completed the same measures as patients, with an addition of the
46
47 *Professional Quality of Life Scale: Compassion Satisfaction and Compassion Fatigue*
48
49 (ProQOL v.5; Stamm, 2009). This 30-item measure of staff satisfaction and stress at work (α
50
51 = .72), asks for items to be rated on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The instrument
52
53 includes statements such as, "My work makes me feel satisfied" and captures three aspects of
54
55 professional quality of life: compassion satisfaction, burnout and secondary traumatic stress.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In addition, *questions capturing the impact of COVID-19* were also collected, all
4 answered as a yes/no, as follows: 1.) Have you tested positive for COVID-19? 2.) Has a
5 family member or close friend tested positive for COVID-19? 3.) Having to isolate due to
6 testing positive for COVID-19 or having symptoms of COVID-19? 4.) Having to isolate due
7 to coming into contact with someone who tested positive for COVID-19? 5.) Having a family
8 member or close friend who had to isolate? 6.) Suffering a loss of a family member or close
9 friend who tested positive for COVID-19? 7.) Have you noticed a change in the number of
10 staff on the ward during the COVID pandemic? (Yes/No) (followed by – if yes, more or less
11 staff?).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 24 **Procedure**

25
26 This study was approved by the NHS Health Research Authority in March 2022.
27 Responsible Clinicians were contacted to ensure that patients possessed the capacity to
28 participate. Data was collected between May 2022 and December 2022. Participants were
29 recruited on the wards of the HSS and provided with a printed questionnaire pack for
30 completion. Staff participants were recruited both online via internal mail and in-person at the
31 hospital, with the option to complete the questionnaires online utilising Qualtrics, or on
32 paper. Both staff and patients were provided with an informed consent when asked to
33 participate in the study.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Data Analysis Plan**

48
49 Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 28.0 software. Non-parametric tests were
50 utilised due to uneven distribution of participants across the COVID-19 impact questions.
51
52

53 **Evaluating potential PTSD prevalence:** The IES-R (Impact of Event Scale-Revised) was
54 employed with a cut-off score of 33 to assess the prevalence of potential PTSD related to the
55 COVID-19 pandemic.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Exploring distress and pandemic related factors:** The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized
4
5 to investigate how distress correlates with various factors, including isolation due to COVID-
6
7 19 contact and the loss of close family members or friends because of COVID-19.
8

9
10 **Mitigating and risk factors for distress:** Kendall's tau-b was applied to examine
11
12 correlations between distress and various measured factors, such as coping styles and ward
13
14 atmosphere. This analysis helped identify the strength and direction of these relationships.
15

16
17 **Comparing coping styles:** A Friedman two-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if
18
19 participants favoured certain coping styles over others when relating to COVID-19 pandemic.
20

21 For each analysis, effect sizes were calculated to assess the magnitude of observed effects.
22

23 Originally, regression analyses were planned to identify predictors of COVID-19 related
24
25 distress. However, this approach was revised due to the limited number of participants and
26
27 the broad range of predictors, which could compromise the analysis's power and reliability.
28

29 The adapted plan focuses on non-parametric methods which are more suitable for the data
30
31 and capable of providing initial insights into the factors associated with COVID-19 related
32
33 distress.
34
35
36

37 **Results**

38 **Data screening**

39
40
41
42 No univariate or multivariate outliers were detected in the patient sample. However,
43
44 in the staff sample, three univariate outliers were identified on the Impact of Events Scale.
45
46 These outliers were adjusted by reducing them to the second-to-last highest score plus one.
47
48 No multivariate outliers were observed.
49

50 **Prevalence of patient distress, impact of COVID-19 items, coping, resilience and** 51 52 **emotional reactivity.** 53

54
55
56 One patient out of 27 (3.1%) presented with a score above the cut-off of 33 on the
57
58 IES-R indicating a possible diagnosis of PTSD. The prevalence rates of COVID-19-related
59
60

1
2
3 issues were also examined, along with average presentation across the measures (see Tables 1
4
5 and 2).

6
7
8 <Insert Table 1>

9
10 <Insert Table 2>

11
12 A Mann-Whitney U test was also conducted to compare the level of COVID-19-
13
14 related distress between participants who reported experiencing a decrease in staff and those
15
16 who did not. Results revealed no significant difference in distress between those who noticed
17
18 a decrease in staff (*Mean Rank* = 14.07, *n* = 21) and those who did not (*Mean Rank* = 11.10,
19
20 *n* = 5), $U = 40.50$, $p = .45$. Similar results were obtained for the comparison between those
21
22 that had to isolate, due to a positive test and distress ($U = 2.00$, $p = .16$), as well as those that
23
24 had to isolate, due to a COVID contact and distress ($U = 80.00$, $p = 1.00$). Lastly, no
25
26 difference was observed between distress levels in those that tested positive for COVID-19
27
28 and those that did not ($U = 18.00$, $p = .18$), those whose family or friend(s) had COVID-19
29
30 and those that did not ($U = 50.00$, $p = .22$), those whose family had to isolate and those whose
31
32 family did not ($U = 61.50$, $p = .77$), or those that lost someone due to and those who did not
33
34 COVID-19 ($U = 39.00$, $p = .72$).

35
36 To assess the size and direction of the linear relationship between coping, emotional
37
38 reactivity, resilience, ward atmosphere and distress, Kendall's tau-b was performed.
39
40 Kendall's tau-b indicated a moderate positive correlation between emotional reactivity and
41
42 distress ($\tau = .42$, $p < .001$). Resilience, therapeutic hold, experienced safety, patient cohesion,
43
44 problem-focused coping, emotion-focused coping, and avoidant coping were not significantly
45
46 related to distress.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 To assess whether patients used one type of coping more frequently than the other, a
55
56 Friedman two-way ANOVA was conducted. This indicated significant variation in coping
57
58 rankings across the three coping styles ($\chi^2 F = 20.28$, $df = 2$, $N - \text{Ties} = 27$, $p = <.001$).

1
2
3 Follow-up pairwise comparisons using Wilcoxon Signed Rank test (Bonferroni adjusted
4 $\alpha=.017$) indicated a significant difference between avoidance coping and problem-focused
5 coping, ($Z = -3.55, p = <.001$, two-tailed). The test statistic was 7.63, indicating that problem-
6 focused coping scores were significantly higher than avoidance coping scores with $r = .78$,
7 indicating a large effect. A significant difference between avoidance and emotion-focused
8 coping was also observed ($Z = -2.93, p = .003$, two-tailed) with a large effect $r = .64$, . The
9 negative mean rank of 10.70 for avoidance coping indicated lower ratings compared to
10 emotion focused coping. The difference between emotion-focused and problem-focused
11 coping was also significant ($Z = -2.71, p = .007$, two tailed), problem focused coping had a
12 negative mean rank of 12.40 indicating that patients used it to a significantly higher level.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Prevalence of staff distress, impact of COVID-19 items, coping, resilience, emotional** 29 **reactivity and professional satisfaction** 30 31 32

33 Twelve staff out of 33 (31.2%) presented with a distress score above the cut-off of 33,
34 indicating a possible diagnosis of PTSD (Creamer *et al.*, 2003). Staff reported low (12.8%) to
35 moderate (38.5%) levels of compassion satisfaction, moderate (43.6%) to high (41.0%) levels
36 of burnout, and moderate (30.8%) to high (43.6%) levels of secondary trauma stress. The
37 prevalence rates of COVID-19-related issues were also examined, along with average
38 presentation across the measures (see Tables 3 to 5).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 <Insert Table 3 here>

48 <Insert Table 4 here>

49 <Insert Table 5 here>

50
51
52
53
54 A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to compare the level of distress between staff
55 who reported noticing a decrease in staff and those who did not. Staff that noticed reduced
56 staffing levels also reported higher distress levels ($Mean Rank = 17.61, n = 16$) compared to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 those that did not (*Mean Rank* = 10.41, *n* = 9: *U* = 30.50, *z* = -2.35, *p* = .02), with a medium
4 effect size (*r* = .47). Testing positive for COVID-19 and distress (*U* = 68.00, *p* = .43), family
5 or a friend having COVID-19 (*U* = 21.00, *p* = .61), family having to isolate (*U* = 62.50, *p* =
6 .06), were not significantly different. Similar results were obtained for the comparison
7
8 between those that had to isolate, due to a positive test and distress (*U* = 65.00, *p* = .35), as
9
10 well as those that had to isolate, due to a contact and distress (*U* = 64.50, *p* = .22). Staff that
11
12 lost someone due to COVID-19 reported higher distress levels (*Mean Rank* = 18.09, *n* = 17)
13
14 than those that did not (*Mean Rank* = 10.63, *n* = 12: *U* = 49.50, *z* = -2.33 *p* = .02), with a
15
16 medium effect size *r* = .47.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 To assess the size and direction of the linear relationship between coping, emotional
25 reactivity, resilience, professional quality of life, ward atmosphere and distress, Kendall's
26 tau-b was performed. A strong positive correlation between secondary trauma stress and
27
28 distress was found ($\tau = .54, p < .001$), as well as emotional reactivity and distress ($\tau = .60, p <$
29
30 $.001$), suggesting that higher levels of secondary traumatic stress and emotional reactivity are
31
32 associated with increased distress. A strong negative association between resilience and
33
34 distress was observed ($\tau = -.59, p < .001$), indicating that higher levels of resilience are
35
36 associated with lower distress. Additionally, there were moderate positive associations
37
38 between problem-focused coping and distress ($\tau = .29, p = .04$), emotion-focused coping and
39
40 distress ($\tau = .32, p = .046$), and avoidant coping and distress ($\tau = .32, p = .02$). Burnout,
41
42 compassion satisfaction and ward atmosphere variables were not significantly related to
43
44 distress.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Coping styles among staff members were examined using a Friedman two-way
52 ANOVA. Rankings of coping varied significantly across the three coping subscales ($\chi^2 F =$
53
54 $16.36, df = 2, N - Ties = 28, p = <.001$). Moderate effect size (0.292). Follow-up pairwise
55
56 comparisons with the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test and a Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha = .017$
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 indicated a significant difference between avoidance coping and problem-focused coping, (Z
4 = -3.86, $p = <.001$, two-tailed), with problem-focused coping scores significantly higher than
5 avoidance coping scores, with a large effect ($r = .73$). A significant difference between
6 avoidance and emotion-focused coping was also observed ($Z = -3.93$, $p <.001$, two-tailed),
7 with a large effect ($r = .74$). The negative mean rank of 13.35 for avoidance coping suggested
8 lower ratings compared to emotion focused coping. The difference between emotion-focused
9 and problem-focused coping was non-significant ($Z = -1.89$, $p = .059$, two tailed).

Discussion

21
22
23 A third of staff reported distress levels connected to COVID-19 that equated to a possible
24 diagnosis of PTSD, whereas this was not mirrored in the patient sample, where only one
25 patient presented with such distress. Findings also demonstrated a positive association
26 between COVID-19-related distress and secondary trauma stress in staff, with the latter well-
27 accepted in the literature as linked to mental health challenges in healthcare workers, before
28 and after the onset of the pandemic (e.g. Aafjes-van Doorn, *et al.*, 2020; Ariapooran, *et al.*,
29 2022). The only finding in relation to patient distress was an association between increased
30 distress and increased emotional reactivity, which is expected considering the nature of the
31 population (i.e. forensic). For staff, however, the distress levels were correlated with multiple
32 variables, suggesting a more complex picture had emerged and suggesting that staff were
33 experiencing COVID-related distress differently to patients, with marked levels in some,
34 corresponding to findings of previous research (Xiong *et al.*, 2020).

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 It could be speculated that these findings were a product of the staff environment
52 changing due to the pandemic, but not that of patients, certainly not to an appreciable level.
53 Forensic patients may have been more isolated from the pandemic changes, as a result of
54 their placement in a closed environment. The absence of raised distress in patients is also
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consistent with the findings of Burrai et al. (2020) in non-forensic residential psychiatric
4 patients. In that study, factors such as provision of COVID-19 related information, consistent
5 access to medication, treatment, and support from mental health professionals throughout the
6 pandemic were credited for this lack of *additional* stress. The current study did not assess
7 these variables but, nevertheless, a third of patients did not notice a change in staffing,
8 suggesting that a proportion of patients noted no staff impacts. Equally, it is possible that the
9 setting and timing of the current study contributed to lower patient distress levels. The high-
10 secure nature of the setting, which already imposes marked restrictions on freedom, might
11 have contributed to patient's ability to adapt to additional restrictive measures. Such
12 measures may not have been perceived as starkly by them, as a result of their adjustment
13 already to a closed restrictive setting. Diverging from prior research that focused on the
14 psychological impact during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, this study, conducted
15 after the pandemic's third wave, observed a lesser impact on patients, possibly due to greater
16 acclimatization to the new circumstances. Furthermore, the findings suggest that patients
17 generally did not perceive significant staff changes, and most did not experience personal loss
18 due to COVID-19, factors which might have contributed to their lower distress levels. This
19 context allows the study to emphasize an assessment of the residual, rather than immediate,
20 impacts in the post-pandemic period on patients.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 In addition, it is worth noting that staff members who had experienced loss of a close
46 friend or family member reported higher levels of distress. This supports prior research linking
47 unresolved grief to adverse health outcomes and increased distress among hospital nurses
48 (Rahmani *et al.*, 2023). It notes the impact of experiences external to the workplace. The current
49 study extends the findings of Rahmani (2023) by demonstrating how forensic psychiatric
50 nurses are similarly vulnerable to the adverse impact of complicated grief, with this associated
51 in this instance with COVID-19. It also points to a higher burden on staff to hide their emotional
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reactions from patients, which could be expected to further promote distress through the
4 process of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983), namely where the inner distress is managed
5 so not to reveal it to others, in the workplace.
6
7
8

9
10 There were several other factors contributing to distress levels among staff members.
11 Staff shortages have widely been acknowledged as a prevalent challenge in high secure services
12 (Oates, *et al.*, 2021), which were further exacerbated during COVID-19, resulting in additional
13 stressors, which echoes the findings of burnout (Deakin, *et al.*, 2022). Consistent with these
14 observations, higher distress was found among staff members who reported staff shortages.
15 Clearly this could represent both a perception and/or a reality, but both are essential to account
16 for and likely not captured sufficiently in the current study. For example, staff members may
17 perceive an impact, but it may be the absence of *specific* staff grades (e.g. qualified,
18 unqualified) that causes the challenges and ensures task burden falls on staff who are already
19 over-burdened. Interestingly, burnout per se was not associated with COVID-19-related
20 distress in this sample, suggesting other factors were important. Totman *et al.*'s (2011)
21 observations in general healthcare settings appear worthy to note here, namely that staff
22 shortages are a key factor influencing *staff morale*, leading to feelings of frustration, and
23 impacting their well-being. Thus, it could be features of morale that were important mitigating
24 and/or facilitating factors; if staff felt they were 'in this together' and morale was raised, this
25 may have had a protective effect. This is speculative but points again to the importance of
26 capturing the specifics of the sample and the uniqueness of having a shared prolonged
27 experience (i.e. a pandemic).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Connected to this, almost all staff in the current study reported noticing a *change* in
52 staff, suggesting staffing as a potential mechanism through which distress was increasing.
53 However, as noted, the specific change is not fully captured (e.g. less qualified staff? More
54 unqualified staff?). This would represent a useful avenue for future research, particularly in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relation to determining the additional mechanism through which distress was increasing. For
4
5 example, there is a possibility that despite reduced staff level, staff may have compensated by
6
7 exerting additional effort, which could have led to patients' needs being met despite staff
8
9 shortage, thus, not resulting in additional distress for patients. However, the burden would raise
10
11 for staff and could, arguable, lead to elevated distress being noted.
12
13

14
15 Similarly, ward atmosphere did not impact on distress levels, either for staff or patients.
16
17 This may suggest that, at the later stage of the pandemic when the study was conducted, the
18
19 subcategories of ward atmosphere (i.e., patient cohesion, experienced safety, and therapeutic
20
21 hold) were not significantly affected by the pandemic. Indeed, the scores obtained for patient
22
23 cohesion, experienced safety, and therapeutic hold (in the patient sample) were similar to those
24
25 reported in previous research conducted in secure settings, prior to the pandemic (Tomlin and
26
27 Tonkin, 2023). This finding suggests that the ward atmosphere in high secure services was not
28
29 adversely affected in the long term, despite assessments being conducted after the third wave
30
31 of the pandemic, rather than at its height. This could explain why the observed atmosphere was
32
33 comparably stable and consistent with pre-pandemic studies. Although local guidelines at the
34
35 high secure hospital continued to impact ward operations, they apparently did not significantly
36
37 diminish the overall ward atmosphere. This could represent another factor that could be
38
39 speculated as contributing to the absence of COVID related distress in patents – in essence, the
40
41 business of the ward and the factors relating to atmosphere had potentially remained unaltered.
42
43
44
45

46
47 Another interpretation may be that the high secure services implemented pandemic
48
49 restrictions in a manner that did not have a detrimental impact on the ward atmosphere. This
50
51 would concur with Tomlin et al. (2019) who noted how patients viewed restrictions more
52
53 favourably when they perceived them as reasonable and justified. Thus, it may be that the
54
55 service effectively conveyed the reasoning behind restrictions and established their legitimacy
56
57 to both patients and staff. As a result, this could have resulted to a relatively unchanged
58
59
60

1
2
3 perception of safety, patient cohesion, and therapeutic relationships. Thus, while the burden
4 had increased on staff, it could be speculated they were effective in presenting a ‘service of
5 little disruption’ to patients, thereby protecting their well-being. Importantly, it may be the
6 perception of little disruption that is important to convey and perhaps shifting the concept of
7 emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983) to emotional *organisational* labour, where a workplace
8 hides from their clients the challenges staff are facing and coping with for their benefit.
9

10
11
12 This study also offered some insights into coping styles utilised by staff and patients.
13
14 The most utilised styles for both were problem-focused coping, followed by emotion-focused
15 and avoidance coping. Problem-focused coping strategies are linked to adaptive health
16 behaviours and greater psychological well-being in healthcare professionals (Krok *et al.*,
17 2020). However, contrary to our expectations, staff who reported higher levels of COVID-19
18 related distress also tended to report utilising problem-focused coping more frequently. One
19 explanation behind this unexpected finding could be that patients and staff who felt heightened
20 level of distress simply employed more problem-focused strategies as a means to cope. During
21 a pandemic, the effectiveness of such coping may have actually had more limitations. We
22 propose this could have led to ‘problem-coping burnout’ where during a pandemic the utility
23 is reduced as autonomy to use several coping strategies and approaches is restricted. Put
24 simply, no amount of problem-focused coping can solve all challenges faced. This could have
25 increased burden on staff to ‘solve problems’ and ultimately engage in a futile and fatiguing
26 approach to cope. Indeed, research has yet to explore the impact of prolonged problem focusing
27 coping, with the current study highlighting this as a further factor to consider. As expected,
28 avoidant and emotion-focused coping were also associated with higher distress levels amongst
29 staff (but not among patients), therefore making the findings in relation to problem-focused
30 coping more intriguing and yet, equally, providing a drive to locate an effective ‘pandemic
31 coping style’, which is of yet not captured by research.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In addition, previous research has highlighted resilience as a protective factor against
4 distress (e.g. Kalisch *et al.*, 2017), which supports the findings from the current study where a
5 negative relationship between resilience and COVID-19-related distress among staff members
6 was indicated. This aligns further with longitudinal research that has demonstrated the
7 predictive value of resilience in mitigating pandemic-induced distress (Köhne *et al.*, 2023), and
8 further emphasising the importance of resilience as a protective factor, at least for staff. How
9 resilience can be fostered would be a useful avenue to consider since this is not always an
10 internally driven factor (i.e. attribute/character trait) but can be a taught skill (i.e. ability).
11 Exploring this in more detail, considering *how* it related to both distress and problem-solving
12 coping would be useful to consider; the latter can form part of resilience capability and could
13 assist the research journey towards identifying a pandemic coping style.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The study is not without limitations. Causality cannot be inferred regarding the cause
29 of distress in staff, and thus suggested mechanisms are speculative. In addition, the
30 generalisability of our findings is limited by the relatively small participation rate, especially
31 among staff members. It is further possible that those particularly affected by the pandemic
32 found it too distressing to participate in this study although, equally staff with elevated levels
33 of distress may have been motivated to engage to outline their experiences. Finally, data was
34 collected during the later stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, and thus limiting insights into the
35 impact in earlier periods. Nevertheless, our preliminary findings highlight that COVID-19-
36 related distress was in particular affecting staff, who had a raised burden of keeping services
37 working. This burden may have led to patients being safeguarded from the effects of the
38 pandemic as they were shielded from marked change and experienced a ‘service of little
39 disruption.’ This was also a likely impact of the nature of the closed setting, which is inherently
40 restrictive.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Implications for practice**

59
60

- Address and alleviate the heightened distress among frontline workers, emphasising the urgency of interventions due to the significant and ongoing burdens exacerbated by the pandemic (Ouyang *et al.*, 2022; Boitet *et al.*, 2023).
- Prioritise the development and implementation of interventions to mitigate the lasting psychological effects of COVID-19, especially targeting the well-being of frontline workers.
- Develop advanced data collection methods for future pandemics, or staff shortage crises, integrating strategies to explore effective coping mechanisms during such crises.
- Undertake and replicate comprehensive research in various secure facilities to understand the long-term consequences of the pandemic, focusing on its psychological and social impacts.

References

Aafjes-van Doorn, K., Békés, V., Prout, T. A., and Hoffman, L. (2020), "Psychotherapists' vicarious traumatization during the COVID-19 pandemic", *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice and policy*, Vol. 12 No. S1, pp. S148–S150, doi.org/10.1037/tra0000868.

Ardebili, M. E., Naserbakht, M., Bernstein, C., Alazmani-Noodeh, F., Hakimi, H., and Ranjbar, H. (2021), "Healthcare providers experience of working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study", *American journal of infection control*, Vol. 49 No. 5, pp. 547-554, doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.10.001.

Ariapooran, S., Ahadi, B., and Khezeli, M. (2022), "Depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation in nurses with and without symptoms of secondary traumatic stress during the COVID-19 outbreak", *Archives of psychiatric nursing*, Vol. 37, pp. 76–81, doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2021.05.005.

Burrai, J., Roma, P., Barchielli, B., Biondi, S., Cordellieri, P., Frascchetti, A., Pizzimenti, A., Mazza, C., Ferracuti, S. and Giannini, A.M. (2020), "Psychological and Emotional Impact of Patients Living in Psychiatric Treatment Communities during Covid-19 Lockdown in Italy", *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, Vol. 9 No. 11, pp. 3787.

Baker, H., Gill, S.S., Aboaja, A., Kole, S. and Perry, A.E. (2022), "Study of impact of COVID-19 on mental health and wellbeing of staff working in a forensic mental health service", *Psych*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp.695-705, doi.org/10.3390/psych4040051.

1
2
3 Carver, C.S. (1997), "You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: consider the
4 brief COPE", *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp.92–100,
5
6 doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01770.x.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Coffey, M. and Coleman, M. (2001), "The relationship between support and stress in forensic
13 community mental health nursing", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 397–
14
15 407, doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01770.x.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Cordellieri, P., Barchielli, B., Masci, V., Viani, F., de Pinto, I., Priori, A., Torricelli, F.D.,
23
24 Cosmo, C., Ferracuti, S., Giannini, A.M. and Burrari, J. (2021), "Psychological Health Status
25 of Psychiatric Patients Living in Treatment Communities before and during the COVID-19
26
27 Lockdown: A Brief Report", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
28
29 Health*, Vol. 18 No. 7, p. 3567, doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073567.
30
31
32
33

34
35 Creamer, M., Bell, R. and Failla, S. (2003), "Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event
36
37 Scale - Revised", *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, Vol. 41 No. 12, pp. 1489–1496,
38
39 doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2003.07.010.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Dawson, D.L. and Golijani-Moghaddam, N. (2020), "COVID-19: Psychological flexibility,
46
47 coping, mental health, and wellbeing in the UK during the pandemic", *Journal of Contextual
48
49 Behavioral Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 126–134, doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2020.07.010.
50
51
52
53

54
55 Deakin, M. (2022), "NHS workforce shortages and staff burnout are taking a toll", *BMJ*
56
57 (Clinical Research Ed.), Vol. 377, o945, doi.org/10.1136/bmj.o945.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hochschild, A. R. (2022), "The managed heart", Wharton A. (Ed.), *Working in America*,
4
5
6 *Routledge, New York*, pp. 40-48.
7
8
9

10 Janiri, D., Kotzalidis, G.D., Giuseppin, G., Molinaro, M., Modica, M., Montanari, S.,
11
12 Terenzi, B., Carfi, A., Landi, F., Sani, G. (2020), "Psychological distress after covid-19
13
14 recovery: Reciprocal effects with temperament and emotional dysregulation. An exploratory
15
16 study of patients over 60 years of age assessed in a post-acute care service", *Frontiers in*
17
18 *Psychiatry*, Vol. 11, p. 590135, doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.590135.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Kalisch, R., Baker, D.G., Basten, U., Boks, M.P., Bonanno, G.A., Brummelman, E.,
25
26 Chmitorz, A., Fernández, G., Fiebach, C.J., Galatzer-Levy, I., Geuze, E., Groppa, S.,
27
28 Helmreich, I., Hendler, T., Hermans, E.J., Jovanovic, T., Kubiak, T., Lieb, K., Lutz, B., ...
29
30 Wibrat, M. and Kleim, B. (2017), "The resilience framework as a strategy to combat stress-
31
32 related disorders", *Nature Human Behaviour*, Vol. 1 No. 11, pp. 784–790,
33
34 doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0200-8.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Köhne, S., Engert, V., and Rosendahl, J. (2023), "Stability of resilience in times of the
41
42 COVID-19 pandemic", *Personality and Mental Health*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 55–66,
43
44 doi.org/10.1002/pmh.1560.
45
46
47
48

49 Krok, D. and Zarzycka, B. (2020), "Risk Perception of COVID-19, Meaning-Based
50
51 Resources, and Psychological Well-Being amongst Healthcare Personnel: The Mediating
52
53 Role of Coping", *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, Vol. 9 No. 10, p. 3225,
54
55 doi.org/10.3390/jcm9103225.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 López-Vaquez, E. and Marván, M.L. (2003), "Risk perception, stress, and coping strategies
4 in two catastrophe risk situations", *Social Behavior and Personality: An International*
5 *Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 61–70, doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2003.31.1.61.
6
7

8
9
10
11
12 Hao, F., Tan, W., Jiang, L., Zhang, L., Zhao, X., Zou, Y., Hu, Y., Luo, X., Jiang, X.,
13 McIntyre, R.S., Tran, B., Sun, J., Zhang, Z., Ho, R., Ho, C., and Tam, W. (2020), "Do
14 psychiatric patients experience more psychiatric symptoms during COVID-19 pandemic and
15 lockdown? A case-control study with service and research implications for
16 immunopsychiatry", *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, Vol. 87, pp. 100–106,
17 doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.069.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 Hwang, T. J., Rabheru, K., Peisah, C., Reichman, W., and Ikeda, M. (2020), "Loneliness and
29 social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic", *International psychogeriatrics*, Vol. 32 No.
30 10, pp. 1217–1220, doi.org/10.1017/S1041610220000988.
31
32

33
34
35
36
37 Negri, A., Conte, F., Caldiroli, C. L., Neimeyer, R. A., and Castiglioni, M. (2023),
38 "Psychological Factors Explaining the COVID-19 Pandemic Impact on Mental Health: The
39 Role of Meaning, Beliefs, and Perceptions of Vulnerability and Mortality", *Behavioral*
40 *sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, Vol. 13 No. 2, p. 162, doi.org/10.3390/bs13020162.
41
42
43
44

45
46
47
48
49 Nock, M. K., Wedig, M. M., Holmberg, E. B., and Hooley, J. M. (2008), "The emotion
50 reactivity scale: development, evaluation, and relation to self-injurious thoughts and
51 behaviors", *Behavior Therapy*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 107–116,
52 doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2007.05.005.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Oates, J., Topping, A., Ezhova, I., Wadey, E., and Rafferty, A. M. (2021), “Factors affecting
4 high secure forensic mental health nursing workforce sustainability: Perspectives from
5 frontline nurses and stakeholders”, *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, Vol.
6
7 28 No. 6, pp. 1041–1051, doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12740.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Rahmani, F., Hosseinzadeh, M., and Gholizadeh, L. (2023), „Complicated grief and related
15 factors among nursing staff during the Covid-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study”, *BMC*
16
17 *Psychiatry*, Vol. 23 No. 1, p. 73, doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04562-w.
18
19
20

21
22
23
24 Ripper, C. A., Boyes, M. E., Clarke, P. J. F., and Hasking, P. A. (2018), “Emotional
25 reactivity, intensity, and perseveration: Independent dimensions of trait affect and
26
27 associations with depression, anxiety, and stress symptoms”, *Personality and Individual*
28
29 *Differences*, Vol. 121, pp. 93–99, doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.09.032.
30
31
32

33
34
35 Royal College of Psychiatrists. (April, 2020). *Responding to COVID-19 guidance for*
36
37 *clinicians: Secure hospital and criminal justice settings*, www.rcpsych.ac.uk/about-
38
39 us/responding-to-covid-19/responding-to-covid-19-guidance-for-clinicians/community-and-
40
41 inpatient-services/secure-hospital-and-criminal-justice-settings
42
43
44

45
46
47 Schalast, N., Redies, M., Collins, M., Stacey, J., and Howells, K. (2008), “EssenCES, a short
48
49 questionnaire for assessing the social climate of forensic psychiatric wards”, *Criminal*
50
51 *Behaviour and Mental Health*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 49-58.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., and Bernard, J. (2008),
4
5 “The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back”, *International Journal of*
6
7 *Behavioral Medicine*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 194–200, doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972.
8
9

10
11
12 Stamm, B. H. (2009), “Professional Quality of Life: Compassion Satisfaction and Fatigue
13
14 Version 5 (ProQOL)”, available at: www.isu.edu/~bhstamm or www.proqol.org
15
16
17

18
19 Stefanatou, P., Xenaki, L. A., Karagiorgas, I., Ntigrintaki, A. A., Giannouli, E., Malogiannis,
20
21 I. A., and Konstantakopoulos, G. (2022). “Fear of COVID-19 Impact on Professional Quality
22
23 of Life among Mental Health Workers”, *International Journal of Environmental Research*
24
25 *and Public Health*, Vol. 19 No. 16, p. 9949, doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19169949.
26
27
28

29
30 Sukut, O., Sahin-Bayindir, G., Ayhan-Balik, C. H., and Albal, E. (2021), “Professional
31
32 quality of life and psychological resilience among psychiatric nurses”, *Perspectives in*
33
34 *psychiatric care*, Vol. 58 No. 1, pp.330–338, doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12791.
35
36
37

38
39 Swinkles, L., Hendrix, C., van der Pol, T., Popma, A., ter Harmsel, A., Reef, J., and Dekker,
40
41 J., (2022), “The impact of COVID_19 restriction on social relationships of forensic psychiatric
42
43 outpatients with pre-existing social network-related problems: A mixed method study”,
44
45 *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice*, Vol. 4, pp. 385-400,
46
47 doi.org/10.1080/24732850.2022.2041689.
48
49
50

51
52
53 Tam, C. W. C., Pang, E. P. F., Lam, L. C. W., and Chiu, H. K. (2004), “Severe acute
54
55 respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hong Kong in 2003: stress and psychological impact among
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 frontline healthcare workers”, *Psychological Medicine*, Vol. 34, pp. 1197-1204,
4
5 doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704002247.
6
7
8
9

10 Tomlin, J., Völlm, B., Furtado, V., Egan, V., and Bartlett, P. (2019), “The Forensic
11 Restrictiveness Questionnaire: Development, Validation, and Revision”, *Frontiers in*
12 *psychiatry*, Vol. 10, p. 805, doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00805.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Tomlin, J., Dalglish-Warburton, B., and Lamph, G. (2020). Psychosocial Support for
20 Healthcare Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 11, p.
21 1960, doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01960.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Tomlin, J., and Tonkin, M. (2023), “The EssenCES Measure of Ward Atmosphere: Mokken
29 Scaling, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, and Investigating Patient-Level Characteristics”,
30 *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 199-209,
31 doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2022.2134946.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Totman, J., Hundt, G. L., Wearn, E., Paul, M., and Johnson, S. (2011), “Factors affecting
39 staff morale on inpatient mental health wards in England: a qualitative investigation”, *BMC*
40 *Psychiatry*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1-10, doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-11-68.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Tzang, H. M. (2004), “Nurses professional care obligation and their attitudes towards SARS
48 infection control measures in Taiwan during and after the 2003 epidemic”, *Nursing Ethics*,
49 Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 277-289.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., Ma, R., and Johnson, R. (2018), “Associations between
4 loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systemic
5 review”, *BMC Psychiatry*, Vol. 156 No. 18, pp. 1-16, doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1736-5.
6
7

8
9
10
11
12 Weiss, D. S. (2007). The Impact of Event Scale: Revised. In J. P. Wilson and C. S.-k. Tang
13 (Eds.), *Cross-cultural assessment of psychological trauma and PTSD* (pp. 219–238). Springer
14 Science + Business Media, doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-70990-1_10.
15
16

17
18
19
20
21 Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L. M. W., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci, M.,
22 Ho, R., Majeed, A., and McIntyre, R. S. (2020), “Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental
23 health in the general population: A systematic review”, *Journal of Affective Disorders*, Vol.
24 277, pp. 55–64, doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001.
25
26
27
28

29
30
31
32 Yıldırım, N., Coşkun, H., and Polat, Ş. (2021), “The relationship between psychological
33 capital and the occupational psychologic risks of nurses: The mediation role of compassion
34 satisfaction”, *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 115-125,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Forensic Practice

Table 1*COVID impact items: Patients*

	Yes	No	n/a
Isolate due to a positive COVID test	26 (81.3%)	1 (3.1%)	5 (15.7%)
Isolate due to contact	10 (31.3%)	17 (53.1%)	5 (15.7%)
Lost someone due to COVID	4 (12.5%)	23 (71.9%)	5 (15.7%)
Noticed fewer staff on the ward	22 (68.8%)	5 (15.6%)	5 (15.7%)

Table 2

Distress, ward atmosphere, coping, resilience and emotional reactivity levels reported by patients

	<i>n</i>	Mean (SD)	Min/Max attainable score
Distress	27	11.78 (12.09)	0-88
Ward atmosphere total	21	36.70 (8.39)	0-60
Therapeutic hold	27	12.89 (3.56)	0-20
Patient cohesion	27	10.56 (4.09)	0-20
Experienced safety	27	13.26 (4.63)	0-20
Coping			
Avoidance	30	10.90 (5.16)	8-32
Emotion focused	30	22.07 (10.83)	12-48
Problem focused	30	16.83 (9.24)	8-32
Resilience	27	20.77 (4.64)	6-36
Emotional reactivity	27	23.41 (18.17)	0-84

Note: Higher scores equate to higher levels on each construct.

Table 3*COVID impact items: Staff*

	Yes	No	Missing
Tested positive	23 (59 %)	8 (20.5%)	8 (20.5%)
Isolate due to a positive COVID test	23 (59%)	8 (20.5%)	8 (20.5%)
Isolate due to contact	20 (51.3%)	10 (25.6%)	9 (23.1%)
Lost someone due to COVID	19 (48.7%)	12 (30.8%)	8 (20.5%)
Noticed fewer staff on the ward	30 (76.9%)	1 (2.6%)	8 (20.5%)

Table 4

Distress, ward atmosphere, coping, resilience, emotional reactivity and work satisfaction levels reported by staff

Variable	<i>n</i>	Mean (SD)	Min/Max attainable score
Distress	33	29.18 (25.96)	0-88
Ward atmosphere total	21	32.90 (6.34)	0-60
Therapeutic hold	21	14.48 (4.09)	0-20
Patient cohesion	21	8.86 (3.64)	0-20
Experienced safety	21	9.57 (2.29)	0-20
Coping			
Avoidance	28	11.18 (2.92)	8-32
Emotion focused	28	22.11 (7.32)	12-48
Problem focused	28	16.71 (2.33)	8-32
Job satisfaction			
Compassion satisfaction	23	27.52 (9.31)	10-50
Secondary traumatic stress	23	22.26 (9.30)	10-50
Burnout	23	26.26 (6.17)	10-50
Resilience	27	11.81 (6.99)	6-36
Emotional reactivity	30	30.70 (23.13)	0-84

Table 5

Prevalence and severity of compassion satisfaction, burnout and secondary traumatic stress in staff

Dimension	<i>n</i>	Prevalence (%)
Compassion satisfaction (<37)	18	46.2%
Low	5	12.8%
Moderate	15	38.5%
High	7	5.1%
Burnout (>27)	21	53.8%
Low	6	15.4%
Moderate	17	43.6%
High	16	41.0%
Secondary traumatic stress (>17)	11	28.2%
Low	10	25.6%
Moderate	12	30.8%
High	17	43.6%