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Who is most vulnerable to psychological distress following working from home? A national survey in U.S. employees during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Timothy Matthews1, Jian Li2

1 University of California, Los Angeles, Environmental Health Sciences, Los Angeles, United States Of America, 2 University of California, Los Angeles, Environmental Health Sciences, School of Nursing, Los Angeles, United States Of America

Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic has precipitated broad and extensive changes in the way people live and work, especially regarding working from home rather than commuting to a public workplace. While the general subject of working from home has recently drawn increased attention as a research focus, few studies have assessed which demographic subgroups may be more vulnerable to the potential mental health effects of working from home.

Material and Methods: Data were from the Health, Ethnicity, and Pandemic Study (HEAP), a national survey conducted in the U.S. during the COVID-19 pandemic in October 2020. The effects of working from home on psychological distress in 1,577 workers were examined via logistic regression, and stratified analyses were conducted to identify vulnerable subgroups. This analytic research project was reviewed and approved for exemption by the University of California, Los Angeles Institutional Review Board.

Results: After adjustment for covariates, compared to workers who were not working from home, those who were working from home had higher odds of psychological distress (OR and 95% CI = 2.74 [1.49, 5.04]). Two subgroups, i.e., younger workers (<45 years) and women were identified to be associated with elevated psychological distress (ORs and 95% CIs were 3.23 [1.82, 5.76] and 3.70 [1.64, 8.34], respectively), respectively.

Conclusions: Working from home is associated with psychological distress, and these associations are stronger in younger workers and in women. These results have implications for workers’ mental health in the overall transition towards working from home in the COVID-19 pandemic era.
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Business Continuity and Covid 19 Pandemic: A Case Study of resilient framework of multidimensional interventions undertaken at large petrochemical sector in South East Asia Region

Dr Paren Shah

Reliance Industries Limited, HSEF, Bharuch, India

Introduction: Covid19 pandemic and related multidimensional novel challenges including lockdowns, local diseases spreads, managing supply chain of medicines, oxygen cylinders, consumables like PPEs as well as managing treatment for affected people in scarce resource settings had compelled the leading organizations to think resiliently and innovatively to take proactive measures to protect their people, plants along with profit in terms of business continuity. The author hereby sharing their people centered business continuity plan and their impact as a case study.

Materials and Methodology: A detailed business continuity plan including identifying all the risks proactively, implementing risk mitigating guidelines, defining roles and responsibilities from organizational top leadership to down the line field level executive and their family members, vendors and visitors, surveillance of ongoing interventions, taking decisions in highly ambiguous work scenarios were highlighted. The global, country, state, and district level Covid19 pandemic’s disease trend and epidemiological indicators were constantly monitored and compared with organization specific trends and indicators.

Results: The epidemiological indicators like total cases per ten thousand population for our site were low that is 45.28 as compared to national (India) level, state level and district level cases per 10k populations were India-238.24, Gujarat-121.41 and Bharuch-69.87 respectively.

Conclusion: The proactive planning and implementation of multidimensional interventions resulted in containing Covid19 disease and kept our business running.
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Oil and Gas Employees’ Experiences on the Workplace Adjustment in the Time of COVID-19 : Experience from Indonesia

Nuri Purwito Adi, Levina Chandra Khoe, Dewi Sumaryani Soemardjo, Aria Kekalih
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Introduction: The pandemic has significantly changed the way people work in all industries. However, the oil and gas employees are uniquely impacted due to their specific nature of work. This study aims to describe the workplace adjustment in the oil and gas companies and how the workers perceived these adjustments.

Material and Methods: Cross-sectional data were collected via an online survey from oil and gas employees from November 9th to 23rd 2020. We asked the employees on their knowledge, attitude, practice, risk assessment in the workplace, and their perception on the new protocol. All analysis was conducted using SPSS.

Results and Conclusions: A total of 4,895 respondents was participated in the survey with the mean age ± SD was 39.88 ± 8.56 years, and the mean ± SD length of work was 12.37 ± 8.05 years. The majority of respondents were male, permanent workers, and work in the operation division. Respondents had a high level of knowledge and well attitude towards COVID-19, but they had some obstacles in complying to health protocols, such as lack of soap and clean water, unable to avoid contacts with other workers and families. These variables were found to be significant in increasing the risk of COVID-19 as perceived by the workers, i.e., unable to avoid meeting with coworkers, often checking the news related to COVID-19, unable to keep at least 1-metre distance, unable to wash hands regularly, and to wear masks all the time (p < 0.05).
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COVID-19 as an Occupational Illness: An International Comparison of Recognition Regulation in Selected Countries

Chung-Yen Chen, Ping-Hui Chen
Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the practices of occupational health in many aspects. Due to heavy caseloads, the traditional approach of contact tracing may not be implemented comprehensively, impeding the determination of causality of workplace exposure on COVID-19. The current study examines measures adopted by selected countries for recognizing work-related COVID-19.

Material and Methods: Regulation and rules of recognition of work-related COVID-19 in various countries were obtained through a systematic review of published literature and official government websites. The US, France, Germany, South Korea, Taiwan were among the fifty countries included in the comparative analysis. Data on approved and total claims cases were obtained through open data of national Workers’ Compensation systems and analyzed by types of regulation.

Results: Some countries stuck to the case-by-case investigation of causality, while others introduced unique measures, including the rebuttable presumption of compensability. In the latter cases, the work-relatedness of patients from certain high-risk occupations automatically recognized unless the dominant evidence proved the contrary. As with traditional understandings, health care professionals and first responders were defined as high-risk in most presumption rules. However, in the context of substantial community transmission, occupations with frequent public contact, like aircrews, customs personnel, and store clerks, were also included in some countries.

Conclusions: The presumption rules had an active role in facilitating the compensation of work-related COVID-19.
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**Oil and Gas Industry in the Era of COVID-19: Work Culture Adjustment and Its Challenges**

Levina Khoe¹, Dewi Sumaryani Soemaruko¹, Aria Kekalih¹, Nuri Purwito Adi¹, Grace Wangge²
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Introduction: The global pandemic COVID-19 has greatly affected all industries, including oil and gas. This study aims to provide lessons learned from oil and gas industry on how the pandemic COVID-19 has changed the work culture and how the employers faced the challenges from these adjustments.

Material and Methods: The study used qualitative approach using online focus group discussions (FGDs) with employer's representatives from Health, Safety, and Environmental division. The groups were categorized based on the characteristics of the companies, e.g., number of employees, type of ownership.

Results and Conclusions: Six online FGDs with 20 companies were conducted. All companies abide the protocols as regulated from the Government. Nevertheless, there were variation in setting up screening and quarantine protocols for workers. The following areas were identified as common issues: authority of COVID-19 task force team, communication, risk assessment for workers, quarantine protocols, work environment management, and contact tracing in workers' families. Several companies had innovation by adjusting routine health seminars for workers and their families, providing health information related to COVID-19 from and to workers, and giving rewards for those who need to work on the site.

This study provides insights into the multiple ways that employers can adjust in their work culture in the era of COVID-19.
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**Can we monitor and contain health professionals' work-related stress in an emergency? The experience acquired during the COVID-19 pandemic at the Local Health Unit Cuneo1 (Northern Italy)**
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Introduction: COVID-19 pandemic has a big impact on health professionals' work load, at organizational/psychological level. The Local Health Unit Cuneo1 adopted a strategy to monitor its staff on work-related stress and to return specific alerts.

Material and Methods: A survey was approved by the Direction as an institutional task of personnel’s risk assessment.

Step1-sept2020: a validated questionnaire to detect requests/resources imbalance. Data analysis assessed distress in specific groups (at 5% significance level), by an Analysis of Variance model with distress as outcome (>value, >pressure) and sex, age, profession as predictors.

Step2-ongoing: structured interviews to managers of COVID-19 front-line structures, then descriptively analyzed.

Results: Respondents were 1/3 of staff (1373/4155). General distress (range: -40; +92) reached a mean of 1.2, that was adverse being a positive value but slight. The model highlighted significant alerts. Women had more worries than men (mean: -3.0 vs -6.8; p=0.006). Older staff showed higher distress than 21-30yrs (-10.8); 41-50yrs (-3.1; p=0.006); 51-60yrs (-4.1; p=0.024); >60yrs (-1.5; p=0.004). Nurses had high distress (1.8); 7 points higher (p=0.006) than physicians’ (-5.1); administrative staff (-2.0) and technicians (-3.0). Nurses had moderate distress; psychologists had the minor one (-12.6).

A total of 9 interviews were done in step2: all showed a medium pressure level.

Conclusions: These data allowed implementing focus groups and training to overcome organizational and psychological matters related to COVID-19 and to building robust readiness to face possible future health emergencies.
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**One year facing Covid. Systematic evaluation of factors associated with mental distress among hospital workers in Italy**
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Introduction: COVID-19 pandemic has a big impact on health professionals’ work load, at organizational/psychological level. The Local Health Unit Cuneo1 adopted a strategy to monitor its staff on work-related stress and to return specific alerts.

Material and Methods: A survey was approved by the Direction as an institutional task of personnel’s risk assessment.

Step1-sept2020: a validated questionnaire to detect requests/resources imbalance. Data analysis assessed distress in specific groups (at 5% significance level), by an Analysis of Variance model with distress as outcome (>value, >pressure) and sex, age, profession as predictors.

Step2-ongoing: structured interviews to managers of COVID-19 front-line structures, then descriptively analyzed.

Results: Respondents were 1/3 of staff (1373/4155). General distress (range: -40; +92) reached a mean of 1.2, that was adverse being a positive value but slight. The model highlighted significant alerts. Women had more worries than men (mean: -3.0 vs -6.8; p=0.006). Older staff showed higher distress than 21-30yrs (-10.8); 41-50yrs (-3.1; p=0.006); 51-60yrs (-4.1; p=0.024); >60yrs (-1.5; p=0.004). Nurses had high distress (1.8); 7 points higher (p=0.006) than physicians’ (-5.1); administrative staff (-2.0) and technicians (-3.0). Nurses had moderate distress; psychologists had the minor one (-12.6).

A total of 9 interviews were done in step2: all showed a medium pressure level.

Conclusions: These data allowed implementing focus groups and training to overcome organizational and psychological matters related to COVID-19 and to building robust readiness to face possible future health emergencies.