

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/burns

Predictors of professional quality of life among nursing staff following the Taiwan Formosa Fun Coast explosion



Ming-Hsiu Lu^a, Ling-Tzu Weng^a, Ya-Lin Chen^{a,d}, Chin Lin^b, Chih-Hsin Wang^c, Hsueh-Hsing Pan^{a,d,*}

^a Department of Nursing, Tri-Service General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC

^b Graduate Institute of Life Sciences, National Defense Medical Center, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC

^c Division of Plastic Surgery, Tri-Service General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC

^d School of Nursing, National Defense Medical Center, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Accepted 7 February 2019

Keywords: Perceived stress Professional quality of life Compassion fatigue Compassion satisfaction Burn Disaster

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The Formosa Fun Coast Explosion was a major public disaster that caused international shock. Nursing staff made an all-out effort to care for patients injured in the explosion, and this may have caused a lot of stress among nurses. This study aimed to explore the predictors of professional quality of life among nursing staff experiencing major disaster events.

Material and Methods: This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted in a medical center in Northern Taiwan in 2016. A total of 165 nurses were enrolled using convenience sampling. Data were collected on the demographic- and work-related characteristics of nurses, and the Perceived Stress Scale and Professional Quality of Life Scale were administered. Analyses included descriptive statistics and regression. The threshold for statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

Results: The nurses' length of service in nursing ($\beta = -0.26$, p = 0.029) and perceived stress level ($\beta = 0.15$, p = 0.002) were important predictors of compassion satisfaction, while their age ($\beta = 0.42$, p = 0.033) and perceived stress level ($\beta = 0.20$, p = 0.020) were important predictors of compassion fatigue. Compassion fatigue was divided into burnout and secondary trauma. Nurses' age ($\beta = 0.18$, p = 0.044) and perceived stress level ($\beta = 0.14$, p < 0.001) were the key predictors of burnout. However, there were no significant predictors of secondary trauma among nurses.

Conclusions: Based on the present findings, it is proposed to reduce the level of stress among nurses to improve their professional quality of life.

© 2019 Elsevier Ltd and ISBI. All rights reserved.

E-mail address: pshing2001@gmail.com (H.-H. Pan).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2019.02.010

^{*} Corresponding author at: National Defense Medical Center, 4th Floor, No. 161, Sec. 6, Minquan East Road, Neihu Dist., Taipei City 11490, Taiwan, ROC.

^{0305-4179/© 2019} Elsevier Ltd and ISBI. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Formosa Fun Coast is a large water park in Northern Taiwan. On June 27, 2015, "Color Creative Company" rented this park to host "Color Play Asia," attracting more than 10,000 visitors. To create a grand stage effect, the host used colored dust created from self-developed food-grade toner. The dust was sprayed out to the audience to showcase a perfect end for everyone to enjoy. However, the dust suddenly caught fire and quickly spread to the entire dance floor. Tourists fled and sustained serious burns. This accident was called the Formosa Fun Coast explosion (FFCE), which resulted in 11 deaths and 488 injuries [1]. Following this major accident, most burn patients were treated in our medical center, of which about 85% patients had severe burns. During this period, apart from catering to the highest number of patients in Taiwan, we also achieved a zero mortality rate [2].

However, following the accident, several nursing staff members who were involved in caring for patients injured in the explosion reported experiencing substantial amounts of stress. This stress stemmed from different aspects, such as the burn wounds of the patients, difficult process of healing and rehabilitation, team members' actions, and expectations of patients' family members. Some of the nursing staff could deal with the stress positively and they could attain selfsatisfaction by transforming the process of helping others into positive feelings [3]. However, in some staff members, the persistent stress could have led to compassion fatigue. Physically, the nursing staff could have experienced headaches, chronic fatigue, insomnia, or digestive discomfort [4 -6]. Psychologically, the stress could have caused sadness, indifference, cynical attitude, excessive sensitivity, frustration, critical reactions, difficulty in concentrating, poor memory, self-isolation, loss of interest, anxiety, and other issues [6]. Spiritually, the nursing staff could have lost their spiritual consciousness, they would have started to doubt their original beliefs, and they could have questioned why such a horrible incident occurred with good people or why the patients and their families had to bear so much pain [5,6]. These series of impacts might have had negative effects on the nursing staff. It may have increased their rates of sick leave and turnover, reduced their efficiency, raised personnel costs, and intensified the interpersonal conflicts among nursing staff [6].

Professional quality of life pertains to the balance between compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction. When someone is overly dedicated to helping others, ignoring the level of his/her own stress and accumulation of persistent stress induces compassion fatigue, which has negative effects on his/her physical and mental health. Compassion satisfaction is the self-satisfaction derived from the positive feelings one attains from helping others [3]. Previous studies about the professional quality of life of nursing staff have investigated relevant factors of compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction, such as the nursing staff working in acute wards [7], intensive care units (ICUs) [3], and trauma units [8], as well as those with over one year of clinical experience [9]. Some studies have also explored the relationship of perceived stress with compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction in nursing staff working in neonatal special care units [10]. However, no study has examined the relationship of perceived stress with compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction in nursing staff caring for burn patients during major disasters. Therefore, in the present study were explored the predictors of professional quality of life, including compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction, among the nursing staff involved in this major event.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study design and participants

This descriptive study employed a cross-sectional design. Nurses were recruited using convenience sampling, from the burn ward, plastic surgical ward, general ward, surgical intensive care unit (SICU), and medical intensive care unit (MICU) of a medical center located in Northern Taiwan from August to December 2015. Nurses who met the inclusion criteria, such as being a registered nurse, being able to communicate in Mandarin, and agreeing to participate in the study, were recruited. This study was conducted after receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board of the medical center (2-104-05-145). A sample size of 103 was required to undertake a liner multiple regression analysis (determined using G^{*} power 3.1). A two-tailed p value was set at 0.05, effect size at 0.13, and power at 0.9. Considering a 70% response and completion rate, 165 subjects were recruited.

2.2. Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study included items about participants' demographic and work-related characteristics, the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) [11], and the Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL) [12]. Five experts were invited to evaluate the content validity index (CVI) of relevance, accuracy, and appropriateness of the content. The scores ranged from 1 to 5; 1 being extremely inappropriate and 5 being extremely appropriate. After calculating the scores, the CVI value of the questionnaire used in this study was 0.97.

Demographic characteristics included age, gender, educational level (undergraduate degree, or colleague degree or above), marital status (single or married), and religious beliefs (yes or no). Work-related characteristics included ward (burn ward, plastic surgical ward, SICU, MICU, or general ward), length of service in nursing, experience of participation in educational sessions related to burn care (yes or no), and experience of caring for burn patients from the FFCE (yes or no).

The PSS, which was developed [13] and translated into Taiwanese [11], was used to measure the subjective stress experienced in the past one month. It contains 14 items, with Item 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 13 being negatively worded. Each item is rated on a scale ranging from 0 to 4, with 0 being "never" and 4 being "always." The total score ranges from 0 to 56, with a higher score indicating higher perceived stress. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.76 in this study.

The ProQOL was developed and translated into Chinese [12]. The ProQOL is divided into three subscales, viz. compassion satisfaction, burnout, and secondary trauma. The

Variables N(%)/Mean±SD Demographic characteristics 45.3 Age (years) 28.3 45.3 Range 2156 36 Gender 97.0 36 Pemale 160 (97.0) Male 5 (30) Education level 7 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (83.0) Married status 5 (83.0) Single 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religous belief 76 (46.1) Vork-related characteristics 76 (53.9) Work-related characteristics 91 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 63 (36.4) No 105 (36.6) Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1-30 Yes 60 (36.4) <	Table 1 – Demographic characteristics, work-related characteristics, and perceived stress level of nursing staff (N=165).				
Demographic characteristics 46.3 Age (years) 28.8 46.3 Range 21–56 Gender 100 (97.0) Male 50 (3.0) Education level 27 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.6) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 100 (64.1) Yes 89 (53.9) No 66 (46.1) Ward 24 (17.0) SICU 34 (20.6) Morto 76 (46.1) No 43 (20.6) MICU 34 (20.6) MICU 43 (20.6) Mo 105 (37.7) Participation in educat	Variables	N(%)/Mean±SD			
Age (years) 28.8 ±6.3 Range 21-56 Gender 21-56 Female 160 (97.0) Male 5 (30) Education level 7 (16.4) Undergraduate degree or above 77 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 73 (83.6) Maritel status 7 (83.6) Marited Characteristics 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Platist surgery ward 15 (9.1) SIGU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 45.3 range 1-300 (36.4) No 105 (36.4) No 105 (36.4) No 105 (36.4) Mictu nursing (wert) 6.7 45.3 range 1-300 (36.4) No 105 (36.4)	Demographic characteristics				
Range 21–56 Gender 160 (97.0) Male 5 (3.0) Education level 7 (16.4) Undergraduate degree 27 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Single 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 7 (46.1) Yes 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) StCU 34 (26.6) MICU 49 (35.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 45.3 range 1-30 (36.4) No 6.7 (36.4) No 6.6 (36.4) No 6.6 (36.4) No 6.3 (32.1)	Age (years)	28.8	±6.3		
Gender 160 (97.0) Male 5 (3.0) Education level 7 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (35.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Marited istatus 137 (83.0) Marited istatus 28 (17.0) Religious belief 76 (46.1) Yes 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 15 (9.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 34 (26.1) Ungh of service in nursing (year) 6.7 45.3 range - - Participation in educational sessions related to burn care - Yes 60 (36.4) No 12 (67.9) No 53 (32.1)	Range		21–56		
Female 160 (97.0) Male 50 (30) Education level 7 (164) Undergraduate degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Marited 28 (17.0) Religious belief 76 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 76 (9.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 24 (26.1) Verks 43 (26.1) Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 100 (33.7) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 122 (67.9) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Parceived stress level 27.3 45.5	Gender				
Male 5 (3.0) Education level	Female	160	(97.0)		
Education level 27 (f.4) Undergraduate degree 27 (f.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Single 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 99 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 15 (9.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Burn ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1-30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1-30 Yes 60 (36.4) No (36.6) No 105 (36.2) (36.2) No 53	Male	5	(3.0)		
Undergraduate degree 27 (16.4) Colleague degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 7 (64.1) Yes 89.0 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 7 (14.5) Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (26.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 #6.3 range 1-30 (36.7) Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1-30 Yes 60 (36.6) No 105 (36.7) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 132 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Education level				
Colleague degree or above 138 (83.6) Marital status 137 (83.0) Single 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 76 (46.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 #6.3 range 1–30 7–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (36.5) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Undergraduate degree	27	(16.4)		
Marital status 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 70 (46.1) Yes 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 76 (9.1) Ward 15 (9.1) Burn ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) 32.1 No 32 32.1 32.1 Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Colleague degree or above	138	(83.6)		
Single 137 (83.0) Married 28 (17.0) Religious belief 7 (83.0) Yes 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics 76 (46.1) Ward 5 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 (36.4) Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 7 Yes 112 (67.9) No 32 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Marital status				
Married28(17.0)Religious belief	Single	137	(83.0)		
Religious belief89(53.9)Yes89(53.9)No76(46.1)Work-related characteristics76(46.1)Ward15(9.1)Plastic surgery ward24(14.5)SICU34(20.6)MICU49(39.7)Others43(26.1)Length of service in nursing (year)6.7±6.3range1-301-30Participation in educational sessions related to burn care1-30Yes60(36.4)No105(63.6)Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE112Yes112(67.9)No37.3±5.5	Married	28	(17.0)		
Yes 89 (53.9) No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics	Religious belief		. ,		
No 76 (46.1) Work-related characteristics Ward 1	Yes	89	(53.9)		
Work-related characteristics 9 Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	No	76	(46.1)		
Ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1 10 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1 10 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (36.7) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Work-related characteristics				
Burn ward 15 (9.1) Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Ward				
Plastic surgery ward 24 (14.5) SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Burn ward	15	(9.1)		
SICU 34 (20.6) MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Plastic surgery ward	24	(14.5)		
MICU 49 (39.7) Others 43 (26.1) Length of service in nursing (year) 6.7 ±6.3 range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care 1–30 Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	SICU	34	(20.6)		
Others43(26.1)Length of service in nursing (year)6.7±6.3range1–30Participation in educational sessions related to burn care60(36.4)No105(63.6)Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE112(67.9)Yes112(67.9)No53(32.1)Perceived stress level27.3±5.5	MICU	49	(39.7)		
Length of service in nursing (year)6.7±6.3range1–30Participation in educational sessions related to burn care60(36.4)No105(63.6)Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE112(67.9)Yes112(67.9)No53(32.1)Perceived stress level27.3±5.5	Others	43	(26.1)		
range 1–30 Participation in educational sessions related to burn care Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Length of service in nursing (year)	6.7	±6.3		
Participation in educational sessions related to burn care60(36.4)Yes60(63.6)Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE112(67.9)Yes112(67.9)No53(32.1)Perceived stress level27.3±5.5	range		1-30		
Yes 60 (36.4) No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Participation in educational sessions related to burn care				
No 105 (63.6) Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Yes	60	(36.4)		
Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE 112 (67.9) Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	No	105	(63.6)		
Yes 112 (67.9) No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE				
No 53 (32.1) Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	Yes	112	(67.9)		
Perceived stress level 27.3 ±5.5	No	53	(32.1)		
	Perceived stress level	27.3	±5.5		

SICU=surgical intensive care unit; MICU=medical intensive care unit; FFCE=Formosa Fun Coast Explosion; SD=standard deviation.

subscales of burnout and secondary trauma are also called compassion fatigue. Each subscale comprises ten items. Item 1, 4, 15, 17, and 29 are negatively worded. All items are rated on a scale ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 being "never," and 5 being "always." The total score on each subscale are transformed into Z scores, and T scores are calculated using the formula [T=10Z+50]. The level of score on each subscale is determined using T scores to compare with the normalization of 25% (T=43) and 75% (T=57).T scores <25%, 25%–75%, and >75% indicate low, moderate, and high severity, respectively. The Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was 0.86 and it was 0.76, 0.76, and 0.57 for the subscales of compassion satisfaction, burnout, and secondary trauma, respectively, in the present study.

2.3. Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 20.0 software for Windows (IBM, Corp, Armonk, NY). Means and standard deviations were used for the continuous variables, and frequencies and proportions for the categorical variables. In addition, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between the independent variables and the outcome variable of ProQOL score (including scores on compassion satisfaction, burnout, and secondary trauma). A p value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Demographic characteristics, work-related characteristics, and perceived stress level

The mean age of the participants was 28.8 years. Most of the subjects were females (97.0%), had a college degree or above (83.6%), were single (83.0%), and had religious beliefs (53.9%). The mean length of service in nursing was 6.7 years. The largest proportion of the participants worked in the medical intensive care unit (39.7%). Majority of the participants had never participated in educational sessions related to burn care (63.6%), but they were involved in caring for the burn patients from the FFCE (67.9%). Participants' perceived stress level was 27.3 points (SD=5.5) (Table 1).

3.2. Professional quality of life of nursing staff following the FFCE

The mean scores of compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue were 28.5 (SD=3.6) and 58.2 (SD=6.0), respectively. The

Table 2 – Professional quality of life (compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue) of nursing staff in FFCE (N=165).

Variables	N(%)/Mean±SD			
Professional quality of life				
Compassion satisfaction	28.5	±3.6		
Low	30	(18.2)		
Moderate	113	(68.5)		
High	22	(13.3)		
Compassion fatigue	58.2	±6.0		
Burnout	29.1	±2.7		
Low	30	(18.2)		
Moderate	97	(58.8)		
High	38	(23.0)		
Secondary trauma	29.1	±3.9		
Low	30	(18.2)		
Moderate	106	(64.2)		
High	29	(17.6)		
FFCE=Formosa Fun Coast Explosion; SD=standard deviation.				

largest proportion of nurses scored moderately on compassion satisfaction (68.5%). Compassion fatigue was divided into burnout and secondary trauma. The largest proportion of nurses scored moderately on burnout (58.8%) and secondary trauma (64.2%) (Table 2).

3.3. Predictors of professional quality of life of nursing staff following the FFCE

As shown in Table 3, the significant predictors of compassion satisfaction among the nurses were length of service in nursing and perceived stress level after adjusting for demographic characteristics, work-related characteristics, and perceived stress level. The level of compassion satisfaction among nursing staff decreased by 0.26 points for every additional year of service in nursing (95% confidence interval (CI)=-0.50 to -0.03, p=0.029) and increased by 0.15 points for every additional point scored on the PSS (95% CI=0.05-0.25, p=0.002). Age and perceived stress level had a significant influence on compassion fatigue. The level of compassion fatigue among nursing staff increased by 0.42 points for every additional year of age (95% CI=0.03-0.80, p=0.033), and it increased by 0.20 for every additional point scored on the PSS (95% CI=0.03-0.36, p=0.020).

Compassion fatigue was divided into burnout and secondary trauma. The significant predictors of burnout among the nurses were age and perceived stress level, after adjusting for demographic characteristics, work-related characteristics, and perceived stress level. The level of burnout among the nursing staff increased by 0.18 points for each increase of one year in age (95% CI=0.004–0.35, p=0.044), and it increased by 0.14 points for every additional point scored on the PSS (95% CI=0.07–0.22, p<0.001). However, there were no significant

Table 3 – Predictors of professional quality of life (compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue) of nursing staff in FFCE (N=165).

Variable	Professional quality of life						
	Com	Compassion satisfaction			Compassion fatigue		
	β	(95% CI)	р	β	(95%CI)	р	
Demographic characteristics							
Age (years)	0.21	(-0.02,0.44)	0.068	0.42	(0.03,0.80)	0.033	
Gender							
Female/Male	0.70	(-2.47,3.88)	0.663	2.61	(–2.75, 7.97)	0.340	
Education level							
Colleague degree or above/Undergraduate degree	0.20	(–1.25, 1.66)	0.782	-0.91	(–3.36, 1.54)	0.468	
Marital status							
Married/Single	1.17	(-0.46,2.81)	0.160	-0.21	(–2.98, 2.55)	0.879	
Religious belief							
Yes/No	0.66	(-0.43, 1.74)	0.235	0.28	(–1.55, 2.11)	0.762	
Work-related characteristics							
Ward							
Burn ward/Others	1.32	(–1.15, 3.79)	0.296	1.12	(-3.06, 5.29)	0.600	
PS ward/Others	1.06	(-0.97, 3.09)	0.307	2.28	(-1.16, 5.72)	0.194	
SICU/Others	1.33	(–0.68, 3.35)	0.195	2.97	(-0.44,6.38)	0.088	
MICU/Others	0.45	(–1.18, 2.07)	0.590	1.00	(–1.75, 3.76)	0.474	
Length of service in nursing (year)	-0.26	(-0.50,-0.03)	0.029	-0.23	(-0.63, 0.16)	0.249	
Participation in educational sessions related to burn care							
Yes/No	0.15	(-1.09,1.40)	0.810	0.98	(-1.13, 3.09)	0.362	
Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE							
Yes/No	0.19	(-1.36,1.74)	0.807	-0.58	(-3.20, 2.04)	0.664	
Perceived stress level	0.15	(0.05,0.25)	0.002	0.20	(0.03, 0.36)	0.020	

FFCE=Formosa Fun Coast Explosion; PS=plastic surgery; SICU=surgical intensive care unit; MICU=medical intensive care unit; CI=confidence interval.

Table 4 – Predictors of compassion fatigue (burnout and secondary trauma) of nursing staff in FFCE (N=165).							
Variable	Compassion fatigue						
		Burnout			Secondary trauma		
	β	(95% CI)	р	β	(95%CI)	р	
Demographic characteristics							
Age (years)	0.18	(0.004,0.35)	0.044	0.24	(-0.01, 0.50)	0.060	
Gender							
Female/Male	0.46	(-1.93,2.85)	0.708	2.15	(–1.37, 5.68)	0.231	
Education level							
Colleague degree or above/Undergraduate degree	0.17	(-1.26, 0.93)	0.767	-0.74	(-2.36, 0.87)	0.367	
Marital status							
Married/Single	0.05	(-1.19,1.28)	0.939	-0.26	(-2.08, 1.56)	0.777	
Religious belief							
Yes/No	0.26	(-0.55, 1.08)	0.531	0.02	(-1.18, 1.22)	0.972	
Work-related characteristics							
Ward							
Burn ward/Others	0.30	(-1.56,2.16)	0.749	0.81	(-1.93, 3.56)	0.562	
PS ward/Others	1.24	(-0.30,2.77)	0.114	1.04	(-1.22,3.30)	0.367	
SICU/Others	0.89	(-0.63,2.41)	0.251	2.08	(-0.17, 4.32)	0.070	
MICU/Others	0.34	(-0.89,1.56)	0.589	0.67	(-1.14, 2.48)	0.471	
Length of service in nursing (year)	-0.10	(-0.28,0.08)	0.264		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Participation in education related to burn care							
Yes/No	0.29	(-0.65,1.40-)	0.810	0.69	(-0.70, 2.08)	0.329	
Participation in caring with burn patients in FFCE							
Yes/No	0.06	(-1.22,1.22)	0.925	-0.53	(-2.25, 1.20)	0.550	
Perceived stress level	0.14	(0.07,0.22)	<0.001	0.05	(-0.06, 0.16)	0.360	
FFCE=Formosa Fun Goast Explosion: PS=plastic surgery: SICU=surgical intensive care unit: MICU=medical intensive care unit: CI=confidence							
interval.		0	,				

predictors of secondary trauma among the nurses after adjusting for demographic characteristics, work-related characteristics, and perceived stress level. The details of these findings have been presented in Table 4.

4. Discussion

The present findings indicated that the length of service in nursing and perceived stress level are significant predictors of compassion satisfaction. Numerous studies have revealed that of the duration of work experience is a significant predictor of compassion satisfaction [14-16]. Specifically, these studies found that, during the nurses' first ten years of work, their compassion satisfaction decreased with the increase in work experience. However, among nurses with an experience of more than 20 years, compassion satisfaction increased with the increase in work experience. Evidently, nurses who have been working for 16-20 years gain satisfaction from work more easily than do those who have been working only for 3-5 years [15,16]. Less experienced nurses are more stressed, but if they obtain positive feedback or support in the workplace or from their patients or patients' family members, they can still find happiness from their stressful work. With work experience, nursing staff adjust to the physical and mental stress more effectively, deriving a greater sense of identity and a higher level of satisfaction from their work. They also obtain a high level of compassion satisfaction

more easily [17]. The present results showed that the level of compassion satisfaction decreased with an increase in the length of service in nursing. This could be because several senior nurses may have experienced a disaster like the FFCE for the first time. Thus, caring for a large number of patients with severe burns, leading new nurses, and training supporting staff would have been stressful for them.

This study also found a higher level of compassion satisfaction among nursing staff who perceived higher levels of stress. The results of some studies on the relationship between stress and compassion satisfaction among nurses working in neonatal ICUs and critical care units indicate that stress and compassion satisfaction are negatively correlated [10,18], whereas other studies on the work stress of clinical nurses revealed no significant relationship between work stress and compassion satisfaction [19]. During the accident, our hospital treated the largest number of burn patients from the explosion and the nursing staffs were mobilized to care for these burn patients. Although the nursing staffs were under tremendous stress, they provided excellent care, with zero mortality. This may have resulted in a sense of recognition, self-worth, and achievement among nurses, which may explain the differences between the present results and those of other studies.

In the present study, age and perceived stress level were identified as significant predictors of compassion fatigue. However, in the previous study, compassion fatigue is less correlation with age. In the study by Hunsaker et al., only

manager support but not age significantly and negatively predicted the level of compassion fatigue [20]. Studies have shown that nurses working in high-pressure units such as ICUs, neonatal intensive care units, and oncology wards, are more likely to experience compassion fatigue. Stress is also an important predictor of compassion fatigue; a positive correlation exists between the two [10,21]. Compassion fatigue can be caused by various factors, including prolonged contact with injuries, excessive empathy, over-involvement, and exhaustion while caring for patients. At the same time, nurses may overlook the stress of caring for patients and the accumulated stress from the surroundings. When nurses are not able to relieve this stress, they will develop a high level of compassion fatigue. Young nurses feel more stressed at work and may fail to adapt to the stress. This causes negative emotions, such as job dissatisfaction and self-doubt. Eventually, they may come up with the idea of quitting their job [22,23].

In this study, age and perceived stress level were also identified as significant predictors of burnout. Numerous studies have pointed out that burnout is significantly associated with age [15,20,24-26]. Studies on the burnout of nursing staff in ICUs have indicated that nurses aged between 20 and 29 years are more likely to experience burnout [25], while those aged between 31 and 40 years have greater burnout than those aged between 51 and 60 years do [15]. However, this study showed that the level of burnout among the nursing staff increased by 0.18 points for every additional year of age. Burnout is a syndrome associated with physical, emotional, and cognitive failure resulting from long-term excessive work demands, which have either exceeded the emotional capacities of individuals or fallen short of individuals' expectations. Our hospital is a medical center; therefore, it has greater demand for comprehensive nursing services of high quality. This might have caused the differences in the research results. Many studies have also indicated a positive correlation between stress and burnout [15,21,27]. Stress is a sustained feeling and process. When one is under stress, initially one will handle it with a positive attitude. However, if one fails to adjust to and cope with stress, a state of frustration and confusion can set in. Continuation of this state will produce negative impacts on one's physical and psychological health. The transformation from a positive to a negative attitude depends on the individual's perception of stress. In general, an individual with a high level of perceived stress is persistently in a state of confusion and frustration. People who handle stress with a negative attitude are more likely to experience a higher level of compassion fatigue and burnout and a lower level of compassion satisfaction [7,10,14]. When the nursing staff adjust to physical and mental stress more effectively, they are more likely to gain a sense of identity and satisfaction from their work and obtain a high level of compassion satisfaction and a low level of compassion fatigue and burnout [7,22].

Only the nursing staff in one medical center were recruited for this study and adopted a cross-sectional descriptive design was used. Therefore, the study's generalizability is limited. Future research can continue to study nursing staff who participated in treating patients injured in the FFCE. Follow-up studies on the nursing staff at different points in time after the incident can also be conducted to increase the generalizability of the findings and to provide information on the changes in nurses' professional quality of life after participating in such major incidents. Accordingly, timely intervention measures, such as mindfulness-based stress reduction, exercise, massage, and so on, could be implemented to help nurses relieve their stress and improve their professional quality of life.

5. Conclusion

The FFCE was a serious accident that caused the largest number of injuries in Taiwan. Nursing staff with a shorter length of service in nursing and higher level of perceived stress were likely to experience a higher level of compassion satisfaction in caring for the burn patients injuring in the explosion. Further, more nurses who were older and perceived a higher level of stress tended to experience a higher level of compassion fatigue and burnout. The present findings suggest the relationship between perceived stress and professional quality of life among nurses involved in caring for victims of major disasters. These results may be a reference for clinical managers to help nurses cope with caring for patient from major incidents.

Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to the participant in the study. We also thank the staff of the Department of Nursing for their dedicated help and assistance with participant recruitment.

Funding

This study was supported by the Taiwan Nurses Association, Grant No. TWNA-1052028.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author contributions

Hsueh-Hsing Pan and Ya-Lin Chen conceived the study and designed the study. Ming-Hsiu Lu, Ling-Tzu Weng, Ya-Lin Chen and Chih-Hsin Wan were in charge of the data collection of the burn unit of Tri-Service General Hospital, Taipei. Hsueh-Hsing Pan and Chin Lin provided statistical advice on study design and analyzed the data. Hsueh-Hsing Pan and Ming-Hsiu Lu drafted the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to its revision. Hsueh-Hsing Pan takes responsibility for the paper as a whole.

REFERENCES

Ministry of Health and Welfare. 0627 Formosa fun coast explosion disaster. 2015 Retrieved from http://topics.mohw. gov.tw/0627ACCIDENT/cp-2750-7924-202.html.

- [2] Youth Daily News. Soldiers and people's health guardian. 2016 Retrieved from http://www.ydn.com.tw/News/68381? fontSize=S.
- [3] Sacco TL, Ciurzynski SM, Harvey ME, Ingersoll GL. Compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue among critical care nurses. Crit Care Nurse 2015;35:32–42.
- [4] Ledoux K. Understanding compassion fatigue: understanding compassion. J Adv Nurs 2015;71:2041–50.
- [5] Boyle DA. Compassion fatigue: the cost of caring. Nursing 2015;45:48–51.
- [6] Jenkins B, Warren NA. Concept analysis: compassion fatigue and effects upon critical care nurses. Crit Care Nurs Q 2012;35:388–95.
- [7] Kelly L, Runge J, Spencer C. Predictors of compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction in acute care nurses. J Nurs Scholarsh 2015;47:522–8.
- [8] Hinderer KA, VonRueden KT, Friedmann E, McQuillan KA, Gilmore R, Kramer B, et al. Burnout, compassion fatigue, compassion satisfaction, and secondary traumatic stress in trauma nurses. J Trauma Nurs 2014;21:160–9.
- [9] Hooper C, Craig J, Janvrin DR, Wetsel MA, Reimels E. Compassion satisfaction, burnout, and compassion fatigue among emergency nurses compared with nurses in other selected inpatient specialties. J Emerg Nurs 2010;36:420–7.
- [10] Amin AA, Vankar JR, Nimbalkar SM, Phatak AG. Perceived stress and professional quality of life in neonatal intensive care unit nurses in Gujarat, India. Indian J Pediatr 2015;82:1001 -5.
- [11] Chu LC, Kao HSR. The moderation of meditation experience and emotional intelligence on the relationship between perceived stress and negative mental health. Chinese J Psycho 2005;47:157–9.
- [12] Stamm BH. Professional quality of life: compassion satisfaction and fatigue version 5 (ProQOL). 2009 Retrieved from http://www.proqol.org/uploads/PROQOL_5_Chinese. pdf.
- [13] Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. J Health Soc Behav 1983;24:385–96.
- [14] Lee Y, Seomun G. Role of compassion competence among clinical nurses in professional quality of life. Int Nurs Rev 2016;63:381–7.
- [15] Hayes B, Douglas C, Bonner A. Work environment, job satisfaction, stress and burnout among haemodialysis nurses. J Nurs Manag 2015;23:588–98.

- [16] Dasan S, Gohil P, Cornelius V, Taylor C. Prevalence, causes and consequences of compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue in emergency care: a mixed-methods study of UK NHS Consultants. Emerg Med J 2015;32:588–94.
- [17] Drury V, Craigie M, Francis K, Aoun S, Hegney DG. Compassion satisfaction, compassion fatigue, anxiety, depression and stress in registered nurses in Australia: phase 2 results. J Nurs Manag 2014;22:519–31.
- [18] Losa Iglesias ME, Becerro de Bengoa Vallejo R. Prevalence and relationship between burnout, job satisfaction, stress, and clinical manifestations in Spanish critical care nurses. Dimens Crit Care Nurs 2013;32:130–7.
- [19] Lee JM, Yom YH. Effects of work stress, compassion fatigue, and compassion satisfaction on burnout in clinical nurses. J Korean Acad Nurs Admin 2013;19:689–97.
- [20] Hunsaker S, Chen HC, Maughan D, Heaston S. Factors that influence the development of compassion fatigue, burnout, and compassion satisfaction in emergency department nurses. J Nurs Scholarsh 2015;47:186–94.
- [21] Hegney DG, Craigie M, Hemsworth D, Osseiran-Moisson R, Aoun S, Francis K, et al. Compassion satisfaction, compassion fatigue, anxiety, depression and stress in registered nurses in Australia: study 1 results. J Nurs Manag 2014;22:506–18.
- [22] Yu H, Jiang A, Shen J. Prevalence and predictors of compassion fatigue, burnout and compassion satisfaction among oncology nurses: a cross-sectional survey. Int J Nurs Stud 2016;57:28–38.
- [23] Kelly L, Runge J, Spencer C. Predictors of Compassion Fatigue and Compassion Satisfaction in Acute Care Nurses. J Nurs Scholarsh 2015;47:522–8.
- [24] Queiros C, Carlotto MS, Kaiseler M, Dias S, Pereira AM. Predictors of burnout among nurses: an interactionist approach. Psicothema 2013;25:330–5.
- [25] Chen SM, McMurray A. Burnout in intensive care nurses. J Nurs Res 2001;9:152–64.
- [26] Xie Z, Wang A, Chen B. Nurse burnout and its association with occupational stress in a cross-sectional study in Shanghai. J Adv Nurs 2011;67:1537–46.
- [27] Choi JI, Koh MS. Relations of job stress, burnout, mindfulness and job satisfaction of clinical nurses. Int J Bio Sci Bio Technol 2015;7:121–8.