

## EPV0420

**Results of the Voice Study: Stress and working conditions in the health system in a long-term comparison between occupational groups**

P.-S. Platzek<sup>1\*</sup>, L. Jerg-Bretzke<sup>1</sup>, Y. Erim<sup>2</sup>, F. Geiser<sup>3</sup> and P. Beschoner<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ulm University Medical Center, Department Of Psychosomatic Medicine And Psychotherapy, Ulm, Germany; <sup>2</sup>University Hospital of Erlangen, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Department Of Psychosomatic Medicine And Psychotherapy, Erlangen, Germany and <sup>3</sup>University Clinic of Bonn, Department Of Psychosomatic Medicine And Psychotherapy, Bonn, Germany

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.1278

**Introduction:** Epidemics such as the Covid 19 pandemic in 2020/2021 increase the psychological stress among health-care workers (HCW) (cf. Mulfinger et al. 2020, da Silva et al. 2020).

**Objectives:** The aim of this work is to investigate whether the stresses and working conditions have changed in the course of the pandemic and whether there are differences between different occupational groups in the health sector.

**Methods:** In the first (T1) and second wave (T2) of the Covid 19 pandemic, the pandemic-specific working conditions and stresses were surveyed and analysed (descriptive, T-test, ANOVA) using 15 self-generated items on n=1036 HCWs and presented in a comparison of occupational groups.

**Results:** Four occupational groups (doctors, nurses, medical-technical assistants, psychologists) were analysed: the highest stress was shown by the occupational group of nurses stress mean difference (MD) 0.453, p 0.000/working condition MD 0.993, p 0.000), the lowest by psychologists (stress MD 0.242, p 0.000/working condition MD 0.466, p 0.000). With regard to stress and working conditions, there was a significant difference between the two measurement points (p 0.000). However, no significant difference between T1 and T2 was found within the occupational groups.

**Conclusions:** In summary, stress and the working conditions have changed over the long-term. This applies to all occupational groups; no significant difference can be detected within the groups. The results are in line with the infection pattern. The increase in stress and the deterioration of working conditions during the pandemic indicate that there is an urgent need for action to keep healthcare workers stable and healthy.

**Disclosure:** No significant relationships.

**Keywords:** Stress; Covid-19; pandemic; working conditions

## EPV0421

**The psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare professionals: A cross-sectional study**

M. Vouros<sup>1\*</sup>, P. Koutoukoglou<sup>2</sup> and E. Jelastopulu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>424 General Military Training Hospital, Psychiatric Dept., Thessaloniki, Greece; <sup>2</sup>424 General Military Training Hospital, Oncology Dept., Thessaloniki, Greece and <sup>3</sup>University of Patras, School of Medicine, Dept. Of Public Health, Patras, Greece

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.1279

**Introduction:** The COVID-19 pandemic was immediately realized to pose a considerable threat both to the physical, and the mental health of people. For healthcare professionals, it marks frantic work rhythms, anxiety for their patients and exposure to an invisible enemy. Those who hold administrative positions are called upon to make unprecedented decisions, facing a high degree of uncertainty. Hence, hospital staff is expected to experience severe psychological distress.

**Objectives:** The aim of this study was to investigate the psychological distress and possible associations with demographic characteristics, professional duties, hierarchy and predisposing factors to severe COVID-19 disease.

**Methods:** Online questionnaires were distributed to all employees of two hospitals in Thessaloniki, Greece, from March until May 2021. The questionnaires comprised two sections, one concerning the aforementioned purported risk factors, and another involving three psychometric scales, i.e. Coronavirus Anxiety Scale, Coronavirus Reassurance-Seeking Behaviors Scale and Obsession with COVID-19 Scale.

**Results:** The psychological pressure experienced by healthcare professionals was low, compared to the literature. A history of COVID-19 disease, existence of predisposing factors to severe COVID-19 illness and frequent contact with infected patients were shown to significantly increase the likelihood of psychological distress. Furthermore, an age of 30-34 years, a higher level of education, existence of infected family members and non-vaccination were identified as possible risk factors.

**Conclusions:** Contrary to previous research results, our sample did not experience severe COVID-19-related psychological distress. Nevertheless, emphasis should be placed on initiatives to support the mental health of this professional group, as many of them do struggle with psychological difficulties.

**Disclosure:** No significant relationships.

**Keywords:** Healthcare professionals; Demographic characteristics; psychological distress; Covid-19

## EPV0422

**Dynamics of indicators of mental health and mental wellbeing among university students during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic**

L. Shaigerova\*, O. Almazova, A. Dolgikh and Y. Zinchenko

Lomonosov Moscow State University, Psychology, Moscow, Russian Federation

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.1280

**Introduction:** University students' lifestyle has changed dramatically due to the spread of COVID-19. They had to face adaptation to the online learning format, as well as strict and long-term restriction of social contacts.

**Objectives:** To trace the dynamics in the main indicators of mental health (depression, anxiety, and stress) and mental wellbeing among students during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Methods:** DASS (Lovibond, Lovibond, 1995) and WEMWBS (Tennant et al., 2007) were applied in the research. The study involved 733 students at Russian universities aged from 18 to 23 years (M=20.0; SD=3.23), of which 88.1% were girls. The same design was used in the spring (N=245), in the autumn of 2020 (N=270) and in the winter of 2021 (N=218).

**Results:** It was found that the indicators for all DASS scales significantly differ (p<0.05) across the three periods. With Post