medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

What has been the impact of Covid-19 on Safety Culture?

Wordcount (excluding tables and references): 2556

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Author info

1. Max Denning[1]
2. Ee Teng Goh[1]
3. Jonathan Clarke[1]
4. Melanie Almonte[1]
5. Swathikan Chidambaram[2]
6. Jan Przybylowicz[1]
7. Viknesh Sounderajah[1]
8. Kelsey Flott[1]
9. Benjamin Tan[3]
10. Seema Yalamanchili[1]
11. Jasmine Winter-Beatty[1]
12. Alasdair Scott[1]
13. Guy Martin[1]
14. Sheraz Markar[1]
15. Mary Wells[1]
16. Sanjay Purkayastha[1]
17. James Kinross[1]

Affiliations

1. Imperial College London
2. Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
3. Department of Medicine, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

Corresponding Author
Sanjay Purkayastha
s.purkayastha@imperial.ac.uk
Department of Surgery and Cancer
Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust
London
SW7 2AZ

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Covid-19 has placed an unprecedented demand on healthcare systems worldwide. A positive safety culture is associated with improved patient safety and in turn patient outcomes. To date, no study has evaluated the impact of Covid-19 on safety culture.

Methods

The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ) was used to investigate safety culture at a large UK teaching hospital during Covid-19. Findings were compared with baseline data from 2017. Incident reporting from the year preceding the pandemic was also examined.

Results

Significant increases were seen in SAQ score for doctors ($p<0.001$) and AHPs ($p<0.001$) from baseline. A decrease in SAQ was found in the nursing group. Largely due to 'perception of management' and 'safety climate' subscales. During Covid-19, on univariate regression analysis, female gender ($p<0.001$), age 40-49 years ($p<0.01$), non-white ethnicity ($p<0.001$), nursing job role ($p<0.001$) were all associated with lower SAQ scores. Training ($p<0.001$) and support ($p<0.001$) for redeployment were associated with higher SAQ scores. On multivariate analysis, non-disclosed gender (-0.13), non-disclosed ethnicity (-0.11), nursing role (-0.15), and support (0.29) persisted to significance. A significant decrease ($p<0.003$) was seen in error reporting after the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Discussion

Differences in reported safety culture may reflect perception of risk due to: occupational exposure, job function, or access to support services. Reductions in incident reporting may be due to increased workload, change in nature of work, or changing safety attitudes. Targeted high-quality support for redeployed staff may help improve safety during future pandemics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The provision of safe, high-quality care should always be an essential aim of a healthcare system, even during crises such as natural disasters, conflicts, or pandemics. To date, there has been no systematic evaluation of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on patient safety.

In addition to its effect on patients, Covid-19 has also placed a significant burden on healthcare systems, with drastic ramifications for the way healthcare is delivered. Rapid changes in models of care delivery were seen during the Covid-19 pandemic including increased workload, redeployment of staff to unfamiliar clinical environments, cancellation of routine services, and the requirement to treat patients suffering from a novel disease about which little was known. Working in these challenging conditions may impact on the ability of staff to deliver safe and effective care. Previous work has identified organizational breakdown, inadequate staffing, increased production pressures and provider fatigue as contributors to poor patient safety(1). Conceivably all these factors may have been present during the pandemic, and as such the effects of Covid-19 on the workforce and their impact on patient safety merit further investigation. A way of obtaining insight into the state of patient safety is via assessing safety culture and incident reporting.

Safety culture refers to “managerial and worker attitudes and values related to the management of risk and safety(2)” and is positively associated with both patient safety(3-5) and clinical outcomes(6, 7). Incident reporting is an important aspect of safety culture(8). Reporting systems do more than just measure harm at the organisational level; they identify system vulnerabilities, promote learning, and indicate willingness of staff to raise concerns.

Aim

This study aims to assess the impact of Covid-19 on safety culture using a large London teaching hospital as a case study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

METHODS

Setting

Local institutional ethical approval was obtained (ICREC Ref:20IC5890). Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust (ICHNT) is a group of 5 hospitals located in central London. The trust has over 1.2 million patient contacts per year. Over 12,000 staff work at the trust, of which 2,700 are doctors, 4,800 are nurses or midwives and 770 are allied health professionals. 52% are from BAME (black, Asian or minority ethnic) backgrounds.

In response to the escalating Covid-19 pandemic, changes included introduction of telemedicine outpatient clinics, mass usage of online off-site access for clinicians, cessation of elective surgical services, and expansion of adult critical care capacity by repurposing operating theatre recovery areas and paediatric intensive care beds. Additionally, significant changes were made to the workforce including redeployment to in-demand areas such as critical care or general medical wards. The nature and clinical characteristics of the Covid-19 caseload at ICHNT have been described elsewhere(9).

Data collection

Baseline data collection was conducted using Survey Monkey (SurveyMonkey LLC, USA) between 12th October 2016 and 10th January 2017. Data for the Covid-19 group were completed using Google forms (Google LLC, USA) between 22nd April 2020 and 22nd May 2020. In both instances, invitations were sent by email to all staff, regardless of job role. Two reminder emails were sent and 3 days of in-person convenience sampling was performed. Questionnaires were anonymous to encourage open responses.

Questionnaire items

Demographic questions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The baseline questionnaire included questions related to job role, type of contract, and department (Appendix A). During the Covid-19, questions related to personal characteristics were expanded to include: age, ethnicity, gender, and redeployment (Appendix B).

SAQ

The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ) was used to assess perceptions of safety across six domains: safety climate, teamwork, stress recognition, perception of management, working conditions and job satisfaction. The SAQ is a reliable psychometric instrument(10) and is one of the most commonly used tools for measuring safety climate. It has been validated in a variety of settings including operating theatres, emergency care, intensive care, as well as medical and surgical wards(7). The SAQ is widely utilized in different countries and has been adapted for multiple different languages(7, 11-15). The tool is effective at comparing across locations, staff groups, and time. On all scales, higher scores represent a more positive perception of safety(10), which have been associated with positive clinical outcomes(16).

SAQ scores were calculated based on the 33 questions common to both surveys (Appendix C). Each question is associated with a given subscale or the overall score and includes a statement followed by a 5-point Likert scale from "*strongly disagree*" to "*strongly agree*". Scores are expressed as the proportion of respondents that *"agree"* or "*strongly agree*" with a given statement. Vice versa for negatively worded questions. Questions left blank or answered "*not applicable*" are excluded from the analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Group characteristics were demonstrated with simple descriptive statistics using Pearson chi-square tests to compare the distribution of characteristics among groups. Data were analysed for normal distribution using the Shapiro-Wilk test. SAQ data were found to be non-parametric, so Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to compare SAQ across groups. Violin plots comparing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

SAQ scores among professions were created using RStudio v1.2 (Version 1.2.5042. 2020 RStudio, Inc).

For the Covid-19 cohort, univariate quantile regression was performed to identify which characteristics influence SAQ score and the direction of any effect. Factors statistically associated with SAQ score in the univariate analysis (ethnicity, role, training, support) were assessed further in the multivariate model using a backwards stepwise approach. The final multivariate model controlled for factors that were significant or deemed important to control for (age, gender, ethnicity, role, redeployment). Redeployed staff were analysed as a subgroup to identify the impact of training and support in relation to redeployment. Confidence intervals were obtained by using 20 bootstrap samples. Statistical significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$. Data were analysed using Stata v14 (StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. College Station. TX: StataCorp LP).

Incident reporting

Incident reporting is another important indicator of safety climate and willingness to learn safety lessons. There is extensive research demonstrating the benefits of reporting.

Incidents reported through the Datix reporting system (Datix Limited, UK) between 01/04/19 and 10/05/20 were examined. These were classified as resulting in “harm”, “no harm”, or “near misses(17)”. These were plotted using a statistical process control (SPC) XmR chart. SPC charts are a tool used to graphically depict and statistically analyse incident reporting, allowing users to identify whether changes are due to natural (common cause) variation, or special cause variation. A detailed explanation of the methodology for plotting SPC charts can be found elsewhere(18). The upper and lower confidence intervals were set at 3 standard deviations based on the first 20 observations in order to define inherent variation in the process(18). The process mean and control limits were then recalculated when 8 consecutive points fell above or below the control line(18).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

At baseline, there were 1,580 SAQ responses from 8,353 staff (19%). This included 166 doctors, 616 nurses, 374 AHPs. Nonclinical staff (424) and those that filled in none of the 33 SAQ questions (117) were excluded. The median overall SAQ score at baseline was 0.70.

During Covid-19, 455 responses were received, representing approximately 4% of staff working at the trust. This included 183 nurses, 105 doctors and 127 AHPs. 40 non-clinical staff responded, who were excluded from the analysis. Respondent characteristics for both groups are shown in Table 1. The median overall SAQ score was 0.73.

Table 1 Respondent Characteristics

	Baseline Survey	*Covid-19 Survey*	Chi-square p-value
Covariates	*n (%)*	*n (%)*	
Role			
AHP	325 (31)	127 (30)	<0.001
Doctor	157 (15)	105 (25)	
Nurse	557 (54)	183 (44)	
Division			
Medicine	536 (34)	188 (45)	<0.001
Surgery	445 (28)	112 (27)	
Other	599 (38)	115 (28)	
Age, years; mean [SD]		*36.8 [10.5]*	
18 - 29	Not available	142 (34)	
30 - 39	Not available	131 (32)	
40 - 49	Not available	96 (23)	
50+	Not available	46 (11)	
Gender			
Male	Not available	100 (26)	
Female	Not available	288 (73)	
Not stated	Not available	5 (1)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Ethnicity		
White	Not available	212 (51)
BAME	Not available	182 (44)
Not stated	Not available	21 (5)
Redeployed		
No	N/A	250 (60)
Yes	N/A	165 (40)
Redeployed to		
Not redeployed	N/A	249 (60)
Covid-19 ward medicine	N/A	50 (12)
ITU	N/A	70 (17)
Other	N/A	46 (11)
Symptoms of Covid-19		
Asymptomatic	N/A	367 (88)
Symptomatic	N/A	48 (12)
Covid-19 Testing		
Not tested	N/A	258 (62)
Tested	N/A	157 (38)
Training for redeployment*		
None/Very Poor/Poor	N/A	54 (32)
Neutral/Good/Very Good	N/A	113 (68)
Support during redeployment**		
None/Very Poor/Poor	N/A	40 (25)
Neutral/Good/Very Good	N/A	120 (75)
Total	1039 (100)	415 (100)

*n=167, **n=160

BAME: black, Asian and minority ethnic; AHP: allied health professional; ITU: intensive treatment unit

Comparison

Distribution of SAQ scores by professional group is demonstrated in Figure 1. The overall SAQ score improved for all respondents from 0.70 to 0.73 ($p<0.05$). Comparison of SAQ subscales

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

at baseline and during Covid-19 are shown in Table 2. Significant changes were seen in AHPs ($p<0.001$) and doctors ($p<0.001$). There was no significant change in score for the nursing group ($p>0.05$).

Table 2 Median SAQ Scores before and during Covid-19

	Doctor		**Nurse**		**AHP**	
	2017	*2020*	*2017*	*2020*	*2017*	*2020*
Teamwork Climate	0.80	1.00	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80
Safety Climate	0.71	0.86	0.86	0.67	0.86	0.86
Job Satisfaction	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.75	1.00
Stress Recognition	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Perception of Management	0.60	0.75	0.60	0.50	0.60	0.60
Working Conditions	0.50	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.75
Overall	**0.69**	**0.82*** **	**0.73**	**0.61**	**0.67**	**0.73*** **

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Regression Analysis

On univariate analysis of the responses from the Covid-19 cohort, age 40-49 years ($p<0.01$), non-disclosed gender ($p<0.001$), BAME ethnicity ($p<0.001$), nursing job role ($p<0.001$), AHP job role ($p<0.01$) were predictors of lower SAQ scores. On subgroup analysis of those redeployed, age 40-49 ($p<0.05$), BAME ethnicity ($p<0.01$), nursing job role ($p<0.01$) and having symptoms ($p<0.01$) predicted lower SAQ scores. Training for redeployment ($p<0.001$) and support during redeployment ($p<0.001$) predicted higher SAQ scores.

On multivariate analysis, controlling for all other covariates in the model, non-disclosed gender (-0.13, -0.26 - 0.00), non-disclosed ethnicity (-0.11, -0.22 - 0.00) and nursing role (-0.15, -0.24 - 0.06), remained significant predictors of low SAQ scores. In the redeployed subgroup (n=139), support (0.29, 0.14 - 0.44) and nursing role (-0.12, -0.23 - -0.01) persisted to significance. Detailed results of the quantile regression analysis are depicted in Table 3.

Table 3 Quantile regression of SAQ scores during the Covid-19 pandemic

	Median	Univariate Analysis (all respondents)			Multivariate Analysis (all respondents)			Univariate Analysis (redeployed subgroup) §			Multivariate Analysis (redeployed subgroup) §		
Covariate (baseline)	**SAQ Score**	**Coefficient**	**95% CI**		**Coefficient**	**95% CI**		**Coefficient**	**95% CI**		**Coefficient**	**95% CI**	
Age (18 - 29)	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30 - 39	0.70	-0.06	-0.14	0.02	-0.03	-0.14	0.08	-0.03	-0.28	0.22	-0.01	-0.16	0.14
40 - 49	0.64	-0.13**	-0.23	-0.03	-0.06	-0.13	0.01	-0.21*	-0.41	-0.01	-0.06	-0.23	0.11
50+	0.73	-0.03	-0.11	0.05	-0.04	-0.14	0.06	0.00	-0.14	0.14	-0.01	-0.16	0.14
Gender (Male)	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	0.73	-0.03	-0.11	0.05	0.00	-0.08	0.08	0.11	-0.04	0.26	0.01	-0.13	0.11
Not stated	0.42	-0.34***	-0.42	-0.26	-0.13*	-0.26	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity (White)	0.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BAME	0.61	-0.16***	-0.23	-0.09	-0.08	-0.18	0.02	-0.18**	-0.29	-0.07	-0.08	-0.21	0.05
Not stated	0.74	-0.03	-0.13	0.07	-0.11*	-0.22	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Role (Doctor)	0.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nurse	0.61	-0.21***	-0.32	-0.10	-0.15***	-0.24	-0.06	-0.15**	-0.27	-0.03	-0.12*	-0.23	-0.01
AHP	0.73	-0.09**	-0.16	-0.02	-0.05	-0.13	0.03	0.00	-0.07	0.07	-0.04	-0.16	0.08
Division (Medicine)	0.68	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgery	0.62	-0.08	-0.17	0.01	-	-	-	-0.15	-0.31	0.01	-	-	-
Other	0.69	-0.02	-0.09	0.05	-	-	-	0.03	-0.11	0.17	-	-	-
Redeployed (No)	0.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yes	0.70	-0.04	-0.11	0.03	-0.07	-0.14	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Redeployed to (Not redeployed)	0.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Covid-19 ward medicine	0.67	-0.07	-0.23	0.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ITU	0.73	-0.01	-0.07	0.05	-	-	-	0.09	-0.03	0.21	-	-	-
Other	0.65	-0.11	-0.25	0.03	-	-	-	-0.01	-0.20	0.18	-	-	-
Had symptoms (Asymptomatic)	0.73	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symptomatic	0.66	-0.09	-0.27	0.09	-	-	-	-0.26**	-0.46	-0.06	-0.10	-0.22	0.02
Tested (No)	0.73	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yes	0.67	-0.06	-0.15	0.03	-	-	-	-0.09	-0.27	0.09	-	-	-
Training (None/Very Poor/Poor) n=167	0.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neutral/Good/Very Good	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.21***	0.07	0.35	0.07	-0.04	0.18
Support (None/Very Poor/Poor) n=160	0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neutral/Good/Very Good	0.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.34***	0.22	0.46	0.29***	0.14	0.44

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001
§ n=139
BAME: black, Asian and minority ethnic; AHP: allied health professional; ITU: intensive treatment unit

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Error reporting

Weekly patient safety incidents are demonstrated as an XmR Control chart in figure 2. Following the arrival of the first Covid-19 case in the trust, error reporting significantly reduced. In the 8 weeks following the first Covid-19 patient arriving at the trust, the number of weekly error reports consistently fell below the 52-week mean. On 6 of the 8 weeks, the rate was more than 3 standard deviations below the weekly mean. When broken down by type, 'No Harm' and 'Near Miss' reports significantly reduced ($p<0.003$). However, the number of 'Harm' incidents reported did not significantly change.

DISCUSSION

To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study investigating the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on patient safety. This analysis has shown improvements in safety attitudes during Covid-19 compared with baseline in AHPs and doctors, but no change in nurses. During Covid-19, whilst controlling for other covariates, non-disclosure of gender, non-disclosure of ethnicity and the nursing job role were predictive of poor SAQ score. In contrast, provision of support was predictive of high SAQ score.

For both AHPs and doctors, working condition and job satisfaction scores saw an increase compared with baseline. This may reflect both national and local initiatives to support staff during the Covid-19 pandemic such as access to free food, staff counselling services, and transport allowances. Nationally, the 'clap for carers' campaign, commercial discounts, and social media initiatives may have also contributed. Other possible explanations include a sense of solidarity in which multiple staff came together to overcome the challenge of a novel disease. The lack of change in scores for working conditions and job satisfaction in the nursing staff group may suggest that not all staff had equal access to support initiatives or that such initiatives were not equally effective for all staff.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The finding that staff who did not disclose gender or ethnicity had lower SAQ scores, may reflect a wish to avoid being identified for negative views or responses on a survey, especially on questions relating to perceptions of management. That being said, this group of respondents were very few in number and as such the true significance of this finding is unclear.

Environmental factors, working conditions, cognitive load, stress, and fatigue are all factors that impact on individual performance and may have differentially affected staff during the Covid-19 pandemic. Safety climate and perception of management decreased in nurses, which may reflect experiences of topical issues such as provision of personal protective equipment provision or testing. Staff groups spend different amounts of time with Covid-19 patients and therefore may have differing requirements, concerns and experiences of such resources or initiatives. Interestingly, there was no significant association between staff testing and SAQ score.

Support during redeployment was associated with significantly higher SAQ scores. This suggests that in addition to improving staff wellbeing, support programmes may improve safety culture and promote the delivery of high quality, safe patient care. However, a prospective design would be needed to demonstrate causality. The specific aspects of support perceived positively by staff also warrant further investigation.

Incident reporting

There was a significant reduction in the overall rate of incident reporting following the onset of Covid-19. However, no statistically significant change was seen in the number of incidents reporting patient ‘harm’. Incident reporting is well recognised as an indicator of safety culture(19), however it is unclear if that association would persist under conditions of the pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

This reduction in reporting may be explained by: staff having less time to file incident reports due to increased workload, a change in the perceived relative importance of error reporting, or fewer patient safety incidents occurring due to changes in the nature of work, such as the cessation of routine services. Irrespective of aetiology, the reduction in incident reporting represents potential lost opportunities to learn and improve safety, which is of importance at such an unprecedented time for service delivery.

Recommendations for future pandemics

Further information is needed to understand why personal characteristics were associated with perceptions of safety. However, through well designed and targeted support, it may be possible to mitigate some of these differences.

Organisational factors such as shift patterns, redeployment opportunities, and occupational risk management may represent targets for interventions. Besides that, incident reporting is an area of particular importance during a change in service provision, as this provides opportunities to understand what is impacting on safety in a particular healthcare context. Initiatives should therefore be considered that facilitate staff to incident report even during pandemics.

Quality improvement and patient safety teams can support the pandemic response. Gurses et al(20) have described the importance and potential benefits of using human factors experts as part of a pandemic response. The group suggested that integration of human factors principles could help “design, adapt and reconfigure work systems, maximize individual and team performance under high-risk, high-stakes environments, while minimizing the introduction of new significant safety risks or unintended consequences into the work system”.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Staines et al have proposed a five-step strategy to support organisations responses during the Covid-19 Pandemic(21). Steps proposed place emphasis on clear communication, just-in-time guidelines and training, adequate support for patient and staff wellbeing, improving operational flow, and risk management. The strategy provides a framework for rapid implementation should further peaks of the Covid-19 pandemic occur and can be utilized in other pandemics or protracted major incidents. Such initiatives may contribute to improved safety culture.

Limitations

Both surveys had a limited response, introducing a possible response bias. This was more pronounced during the Covid-19 sample and may be explained by increased workload, time pressures, or 'survey fatigue'. In addition, staff changes have taken place during the time period between collection of baseline and Covid-19 cohort data. However, the sample was from a large teaching hospital with a diverse workforce, and our sample was representative of the underlying demographics. In the Covid-19 cohort, 73% of respondents were female. Whilst appearing skewed by gender, the NHS workforce is 77% female(22), therefore this response rate is representative of the wider workforce. To reduce potential response bias we supplemented emailed invitations with in-person sampling to capture responses from individuals that might not have otherwise participated.

The categories and rate of incident reporting have been described; however, the underlying incidents have not been analysed. It is therefore not possible to identify whether the decrease in incident reporting suggests changing safety culture, attitudes about reporting or a change in the underlying nature of work.

CONCLUSION

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

This is the first study to systematically investigate the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on safety culture and incident reporting. Using a cross-sectional survey-based design alongside incident data, we have identified significant changes following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. Compared to baseline scores, safety attitude scores of doctors and AHPs during the Covid-19 pandemic were significantly higher. No significant change was seen in the nursing group. Within the Covid-19 cohort, nursing role was associated with lower SAQ scores. Support was associated with better SAQ scores. The rate of incident reporting reduced following the onset of the pandemic. These findings underline the importance of targeted high-quality training and support during future pandemics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Patient Safety Translational Research Centre and Imperial College Healthcare NHS trust for the provision of baseline data.

Competing interests

No conflicts to declare

Funding

No funding was received in support of this paper. Johnson and Johnson have supported the activities of the Pansurg collaborative with an educational grant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Jha AK, Prasopa-Plaizier N, Larizgoitia I, et al. Patient safety research: an overview of the global evidence. *Quality and Safety in Health Care* 2010;19(1):42-7.
2. Flin R, Winter J, Sarac C, et al. Human Factors in Patient Safety: Review of Topics and Tools. Geneva: 2009.
3. Hofmann D, Mark B. An Investigation Of The Relationship Between Safety Climate And Medication Errors As Well As Other Nurse And Patient Outcomes. *Personnel Psychology* 2006;59(4):847-69.
4. Naveh E, Katz-Navon T, Stern Z. Treatment Errors in Healthcare: A Safety Climate Approach. *Management Science* 2005;51(6):948-60.
5. Zohar D, Livne Y, Tenne-Gazit O, et al. Healthcare climate: a framework for measuring and improving patient safety. *Critical care medicine* 2007;35(5):1312-7.
6. Murphy T. CCHSA Client/Patient Safety Culture Assessment Project: lessons learned. *Healthcare quarterly (Toronto, Ont)* 2006;9(2):52-4, 2.
7. The Evidence Centre. Evidence Scan: Measuring Safety Culture. The Health Foundation, 2011.
8. Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in A. In: Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, editors. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2000.
9. Perez Guzman P, Daunt A, Mukherjee S, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Predictors of Outcomes of Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 in a London NHS Trust: A Retrospective Cohort Study. London: Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, 2020 29 April. Report No.: 17.
10. Sexton JB, Helmreich RL, Neilands TB, et al. The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire: psychometric properties, benchmarking data, and emerging research. *BMC health services research* 2006;6:44.
11. Deilkås ET, Hofoss D. Psychometric properties of the Norwegian version of the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ), Generic version (Short Form 2006). *BMC health services research* 2008;8:191.
12. Kaya S, Barsbay S, Karabulut E. The Turkish version of the safety attitudes questionnaire: psychometric properties and baseline data. *Quality & safety in health care* 2010;19(6):572-7.
13. Lee WC, Wung HY, Liao HH, et al. Hospital safety culture in Taiwan: a nationwide survey using Chinese version Safety Attitude Questionnaire. *BMC health services research* 2010;10:234.
14. Nguyen G, Gambashidze N, Ilyas SA, et al. Validation of the safety attitudes questionnaire (short form 2006) in Italian in hospitals in the northeast of Italy. *BMC health services research* 2015;15:284.
15. Nordén-Hägg A, Sexton JB, Kälvemark-Sporrong S, et al. Assessing safety culture in pharmacies: the psychometric validation of the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ) in a national sample of community pharmacies in Sweden. *BMC clinical pharmacology* 2010;10:8.
16. Pronovost P, Sexton B. Assessing safety culture: guidelines and recommendations. *Quality and Safety in Health Care* 2005;14(4):231-3.
17. Vincent C, Burnett S, Carthey J. The Measurement and Monitoring of Safety. London: Centre for Patient Safety and Service Quality Imperial College London, 2013 April. Report No.
18. Benneyan JC, Lloyd RC, Plsek PE. Statistical process control as a tool for research and healthcare improvement. *Quality & safety in health care* 2003;12(6):458-64.
19. Kagan I, Barnoy S. Organizational safety culture and medical error reporting by Israeli nurses. *Journal of nursing scholarship : an official publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing* 2013;45(3):273-80.
20. Gurses AP, Tschudy MM, McGrath-Morrow S, et al. Overcoming COVID-19: What can human factors and ergonomics offer? *Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management* 2020;25(2):49-54.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

21. Staines A, Amalberti R, Berwick DM, et al. COVID-19: patient safety and quality improvement skills to deploy during the surge. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2020.

22. NHS Digital. Narrowing of NHS gender divide but men still the majority in senior roles Leeds: NHS Digital; 2018 [updated 29 June 2018; cited 2020 11 June]. Available from: https://digital.nhs.uk/news-and-events/latest-news/narrowing-of-nhs-gender-divide-but-men-still-the-majority-in-senior-roles.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1 Violin plot demonstrating SAQ scores at baseline and during Covid-19, grouped by profession. Width represents the proportion of respondents with a given score. Central line represents the median. Box represents interquartile range. Lines represent the range of scores. Dots represent outliers (more than 1.5 times the interquartile range)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20129080; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2 Incident Reporting Year to Date