

Mental Health Practitioners' Immediate Practical Response during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Shannon E Reilly, Katherine L Zane, William T McCuddy, Zachary A Soulliard,
David M Scarisbrick, Liv E Miller, James J Mahoney III

Submitted to: JMIR Mental Health
on: June 22, 2020

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5
Supplementary Files..... 40
 Multimedia Appendixes 41
 Multimedia Appendix 0..... 41



Mental Health Practitioners' Immediate Practical Response during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Shannon E Reilly¹ PhD; Katherine L Zane¹ PhD; William T McCuddy¹ PhD; Zachary A Soullard¹ PhD; David M Scarisbrick^{1, 2, 3} PhD; Liv E Miller^{1, 2, 3} PsyD; James J Mahoney III^{1, 2, 3} PhD

¹Department of Behavioral Medicine and Psychiatry West Virginia University Morgantown US

²Department of Neuroscience West Virginia University Morgantown US

³Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute West Virginia University Morgantown US

Corresponding Author:

Shannon E Reilly PhD
Department of Behavioral Medicine and Psychiatry
West Virginia University
930 Chestnut Ridge Road
Morgantown
US

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic has been associated with increased psychological distress, signaling the need for increased mental health services in the context of stay-at-home policies.

Objective: The present study aimed to characterize how mental health practitioners have changed their practices during the pandemic. The authors hypothesized that mental health practitioners would increase tele-mental health services and that certain provider types would be better able to adapt to tele-mental health than others.

Methods: The study surveyed 903 practitioners, primarily psychologists/doctoral-level providers, social workers/master's-level providers, and neuropsychologists employed in academic medical centers or private practices. Differences among providers were examined using Bonferroni-adjusted chi-square tests and one-way Bonferroni-adjusted ANCOVAs.

Results: Mental health practitioners were able to rapidly adjust their practices, predominantly by shifting to tele-mental health services (80.8%) and providing therapeutic services to treat COVID-19-related concerns (67.1%). Neuropsychologists were less likely, and psychologists/doctoral-level providers and social workers/master's-level providers were more likely than expected to transition to tele-mental health ($p < .001$). Trainees tended to be relatively "protected," seeing fewer patients ($p = .012$) and working remotely more than licensed providers ($p = .026$). Despite lower rates of easy access to IT services ($p < .001$), private practice providers reported lower tele-mental health implementation difficulty than providers in other settings ($p < .001$). Despite differences in tele-mental health uptake based on provider type, level, and setting, 59.6% of respondents were interested in continuing to provide such services in the future.

Conclusions: The context of COVID-19 has led to widespread change in the mental health field, with all but 2% of providers in this study making practice adjustments, the most prominent of which was a transition from in-person to remote/virtual appointments (i.e., from 20% prior to the pandemic to 80% of providers early in the pandemic). This highlights the continued need for coordinated efforts among various stakeholders (e.g., clinicians, insurance companies, legislators) to permit continued mental health services during social distancing. Although the majority of practitioners reported providing additional services related to COVID-19, only a small subset endorsed offering such services to medical providers. This offers an implication for future practical directions, as frontline workers seek treatment for the psychological impact of the pandemic. Finally, despite differences in tele-mental health uptake based on provider type, level, and setting, the majority of providers were interested in continuing to provide such services in the future. This offers a potential avenue by which to expand clinical services to those in need via tele-mental health even beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.

(JMIR Preprints 22/06/2020:21237)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.21237>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/>



Original Manuscript



Running head: MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Abstract

Background. The COVID-19 pandemic has been associated with increased psychological distress, signaling the need for increased mental health services in the context of stay-at-home policies.

Objectives. The present study aimed to characterize how mental health practitioners have changed their practices during the pandemic. The authors hypothesized that mental health practitioners would increase tele-mental health services and that certain provider types would be better able to adapt to tele-mental health than others.

Methods. The study surveyed 903 practitioners, primarily psychologists/doctoral-level (Psych/DL) providers, social workers/master's-level (SW/ML) providers, and neuropsychologists employed in academic medical centers or private practices. Differences among providers were examined using Bonferroni-adjusted chi-square tests and one-way Bonferroni-adjusted ANCOVAs.

Results. Mental health practitioners rapidly adjusted their practices, predominantly by shifting to tele-mental health appointments (80.80%). Whereas 80.44% were not using tele-mental health in December 2019, only 22.07% were not by late March/early April 2020. Only 2.11% reported no COVID-19-related practice adjustments. Two-thirds (67.10%) reported providing additional therapeutic services specifically to treat COVID-19-related concerns. Neuropsychologists were less likely, and Psych/DL providers and SW/ML providers were more likely than expected to transition to tele-mental health ($p < .001$). Trainees saw fewer patients ($p = .012$) and worked remotely more than licensed providers ($p = .026$). Despite lower rates of IT service access ($p < .001$), private practice providers reported less difficulty implementing tele-

mental health than providers in other settings ($p < .001$). Overall, the majority (59.6%) were interested in continuing to provide tele-mental health services in the future.

Conclusions. The vast majority of mental health providers in this study made practice adjustments in response to COVID-19, predominantly by rapidly transitioning to tele-mental health services. Although the majority reported providing additional therapeutic services specifically to treat COVID-19-related concerns, only a small subset endorsed offering such services to medical providers. This has implications for future practical directions, as frontline workers may begin to seek mental health treatment related to the pandemic. Despite differences in tele-mental health uptake based on provider characteristics, the majority was interested in continuing to provide such services in the future. This may help to expand clinical services to those in need via tele-mental health beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: COVID-19; clinical practice; tele-mental health; mental health; survey

Mental Health Practitioners' Immediate Practical Response during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Introduction

In December 2019, *severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2* (SARS-CoV-2) – more commonly referred to as “Coronavirus Disease 2019” (COVID-19 [1]) – was identified in Wuhan, China. The WHO formally declared COVID-19 a global pandemic on March 11, 2020, with approximately 6.3 million cases and over 181,000 virus-related deaths in the United States as of September 8, 2020 [2,3]. Unsurprisingly, there have been calls to understand COVID-19’s psychological impact and how providers are responding [4,5].

In a recent large-scale study conducted in China, the majority of respondents endorsed moderate or severe psychological impact (e.g., increased depressive symptoms, anxiety, and stress) related to COVID-19 [6]. In the United States, nearly half of respondents in a nationally representative survey endorsed anxiety about contracting COVID-19, and 40% worried about serious illness or death [7]. These findings are consistent with the psychiatric and emotional sequelae of prior pandemics, including SARS in 2002-2003 [8,9], H1N1 influenza in 2009-2010 [10,11], and Ebola in 2013-2016 [12,13]. Evidence from these and other pandemics has indicated that longer quarantine duration is associated with higher levels of psychological distress, including depression, irritability, and post-traumatic stress symptoms [14]. Notably, adverse mental health symptoms long surpassed physical symptoms during prior pandemics [15,16,17]. Consistent with recommendations from prior pandemics [18,19], guidelines in countries such as China and Singapore have emphasized using tele-based platforms to understand psychological impacts, disseminate accurate health information, and provide counseling services to treat COVID-19-related distress, particularly to at-risk populations (e.g., healthcare workers) [20, 21,22].

Tele-mental health services (e.g., via video or phone) have become more common in recent years (2% in a 2007 review [23] to around 20% recently [24,25]), offering a potential avenue for U.S. practitioners to continue providing mental health services remotely during quarantine. Although practitioners largely agree that tele-mental health is promising [26] and effective, there remains apprehension that it is not as effective as in-person services [24,27], despite research indicating comparable effectiveness [28,29] and patient satisfaction [30,31]. Another perceived barrier is the perception of inadequate tele-mental health education and training [23,27,32,33]). Despite concerns, it is likely that more mental health practitioners may turn to tele-mental health to provide clinical services during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly given expanded reimbursement for such services [34].

It is likely that adoption and implementation of tele-mental health may be easier for some mental health practitioners than others based on characteristics such as provider career stage, services/treatment offered, and/or provider setting. For example, prior work has found that trainees and early career psychologists were less confident about implementing tele-mental health than experienced providers [32], that mental health practitioners providing testing and evaluation services used tele-mental health at a lower rate than those providing other services [25], and that providers working in VAs and private practices were more likely to use tele-mental health than those in other settings [25].

As yet, there is limited information about how U.S. mental health practitioners are adjusting their practices to respond to COVID-19. The present study sought to characterize practitioners' immediate practical response, as well as how practice adjustments may differ across various types of providers and settings. The authors hypothesized that 1) mental health providers overall would increase services provided via tele-mental health, and 2) certain

providers would be better able to adapt to tele-mental health services than others. Analyses were exploratory, with the intention that these findings may provide a foundation for future research examining professionals' response to increased psychological needs during pandemics.

Methods

Recruitment

This study was determined to be exempt from research ethics review by the Institutional Review Board affiliated with the co-authors' university. Eligible participants included adults (i.e., 18 years of age or older) fluent in reading English who were currently working in a behavioral/mental health field. Participants were recruited via a Qualtrics survey link disseminated to relevant professional listservs (e.g., American Psychological Association, National Academy of Neuropsychology, state psychology boards), departmental listservs, mental health practitioner colleagues, and social media platforms (e.g., Facebook). The recruitment email included a request for participants to forward the email to colleagues if willing (i.e., snowball sampling). All questions were optional, and participants were informed that they could discontinue participation at any time. Eligible individuals consented to participate by submitting their responses.

Data Collection

Online survey data were collected from 3/30/2020 to 04/10/2020. In the Qualtrics survey (see Appendix), participants were asked to provide information about their demographics, patient populations, practice adjustments in response to COVID-19, perceptions of their employer's response, and their emotional response to and perceptions about the COVID-19 pandemic. For some questions, participants were asked about their practices months before the pandemic (i.e., December 2019), directly before the pandemic (i.e., late February 2020), and "currently" during

the pandemic (i.e., whenever they completed their survey between late March and early April 2020). Of the 1220 individuals who initiated the survey, the final sample consisted of 903 participants. Data were excluded based on the following criteria: completion of less than 66 percent of the survey (i.e., did not provide information on variables of interest in this study; $n = 306$); age younger than 18 ($n = 1$); not currently working in the behavioral/mental health field (e.g., gym owner, retired; $n = 4$); and responding from outside the United States ($n = 6$), given the extremely small number and the aim to examine practices within the specific U.S. sociopolitical context. Compared to those who completed less than 66 percent of the survey, those in the final sample were on average younger, $t(1129) = 3.53$, $p < .001$; more likely to be a neuropsychologist, $\chi^2(1, n = 991) = 9.98$, $p = .002$; and less likely to be unemployed, $\chi^2(1, n = 991) = 12.42$, $p < .001$, a bachelor's-level provider, $\chi^2(1, n = 991) = 16.46$, $p < .001$, support staff, $\chi^2(1, n = 991) = 14.11$, $p < .001$, a different type of provider, $\chi^2(1, n = 991) = 14.20$, $p < .001$, and to be employed at a law firm, $\chi^2(1, n = 989) = 10.38$, $p = .001$.

Data Preparation

Fewer than 5 percent of data were missing for each variable of interest, with a few exceptions: number of patients seen remotely in December 2019 (14.0%) and February 2020 (14.7%), number of patients seen currently in person (8.3%) and remotely (5.7%), and percent of the week spent working remotely (11.6%). Missing data were addressed using pairwise deletion. Twelve respondents who identified as marriage and family therapists were recoded as therapists/counselors due to the small n (12; 10 = master's-level therapist/counselor, 2 = doctoral-level therapist/counselor). A medical provider category was created to encompass non-psychiatrist physicians, psychiatric nurse practitioners or physician assistants, and registered nurses. When there was a discrepancy between respondents' reported highest education level and reported

provider type (e.g., individuals with a master's degree who self-identified as a psychologist/doctoral-level therapist/counselor, individuals with a bachelor's degree who self-identified as a master's level therapist/counselor), provider type was recoded to reflect education level ($n = 7$), so that for instance individuals with a master's degree would be described as a master's-level provider and not a doctoral-level provider.

Data Analysis

Analyses were conducted in SPSS Version 26 and Stata Version 14.2. Outcome variables were compared across three sets of predictors: provider level (trainee vs. licensed practitioner), provider type (social worker/master's-level provider vs. psychologist/doctoral-level provider vs. neuropsychologist), and setting (academic medical center vs. private practice vs. VA vs. community mental health setting). The trainee category comprised graduate-level practicum students, pre-doctoral interns, and postdoctoral fellows. Board-certified practitioners were combined with licensed practitioners (including resident physicians) because the authors did not have specific hypotheses associated with this distinction. Social workers/master's-level (SW/ML) providers, psychologists/doctoral-level (Psych/DL) providers, and neuropsychologists were compared because these three groups comprised the vast majority of the sample. The same justification was employed for comparing the four aforementioned settings.

Chi-square tests with Bonferroni corrections (for 11 comparisons, $p < .005$) were used to compare across groups on binary variables (yes = 1), including whether participants worked in a setting with easy access to information technology (IT) staff/services; whether they were *not* implementing tele-mental health in December 2019, late February 2020, and currently; and whether they endorsed making various practice adjustments. Practice adjustments were as follows: N/A, no change in practice; cancelling patient appointments; rescheduling/postponing

patient appointments; using tele-mental health/virtual appointments instead of in-person appointments; restricting the types of patients scheduled for appointments (e.g., by age, medical comorbidities); or other adjustment to practice. Over 5 percent of the sample specified using precautionary measures (e.g., personal protective equipment, social distancing) as an “other” practice adjustment; as such, this was added as a category. Selecting “N/A, no change in practice” was mutually exclusive with other practice adjustments. Otherwise, practice adjustments were not mutually exclusive. Standardized residuals were examined to assess which groups significantly contributed ($z > |1.96|$) to overall chi-square differences.

One-way analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) with Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc tests were used to compare continuous variables across groups. Continuous variables included the number of in-person, remote, and total weekly patient visits during late February 2020 and currently (i.e., late March/early April 2020); the percent of time per week currently working remotely; difficulty of tele-mental health implementation (1 = *easy/not at all difficult* to 5 = *very difficult*); the extent to which respondents thought that their institution/employer/practice offered adequate information/training about providing tele-mental health (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*); and the likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health in the future (1 = *very unlikely* to 5 = *very likely*). Percent of time working remotely was only calculated for those who reported > 0% ($n = 785$). Respondent age was included in ANCOVA analyses as a covariate because it was significantly correlated with all continuous outcome variables except for percent of time working remotely. For each predictor variable, there were significant differences among groups in the number of patients seen in December 2019. These were considered baseline differences, so the relevant number of December 2019 patients (total, in-person, or remote) was included as a covariate when outcomes involved the number of patients seen weekly in late

February 2020 or currently. As such, group differences in these analyses can be understood as differences related to COVID-19. Square-root transformations were conducted on continuous variables to address concerns with normality and homogeneity of variance, as well as to reduce outliers. *F* statistics and *p* values were derived using analyses with square-root transformed variables. The original, untransformed data were reported descriptively (i.e., estimated marginal means [EMMs], standard errors [SEs]) for ease of interpretation. EMMs represent means adjusted for covariates included in the models; as such, EMMs may differ from raw means.

Results

Participants were recruited from listservs (40.10%), personal emails (32.30%), social media (26.5%), or a combination thereof (1.10%). The majority of the sample identified as heterosexual, White, non-Hispanic, and/or cisgender women (see Table 1). Respondents were predominantly licensed practitioners, with a smaller subset of trainees (see Table 2). Of non-trainees, most were social workers/master's-level (SW/ML) providers, psychologists/doctoral-level (Psych/DL) providers, or neuropsychologists.

The majority of the sample reported at least one practice adjustment (see Table 3), most commonly using tele-mental health rather than in-person appointments. Only 2.11% reported not changing their practice. Respondents saw similar numbers of patients weekly in December 2019 ($M = 18.00$) and February 2020 ($M = 17.68$), then saw fewer patients weekly in late March/early April ($M = 14.39$) compared to the two prior time points, $t(876) = 10.41$, $p < .001$, and $t(876) = 10.30$, $p < .001$. In December 2019, $t(775) = 36.99$, $p < .001$, and February 2020, $t(763) = 32.31$, $p < .001$, respondents saw more patients in person (Dec. $M = 17.05$; Feb. $M = 16.38$) than remotely (Dec. $M = 1.11$; Feb. $M = 1.62$). The opposite was true currently (in person $M = 4.92$, remote $M = 10.09$), $t(799) = 11.86$, $p < .001$. More respondents reported using tele-mental health

currently than in December 2019 or February 2020. Respondents working remotely did so for 79.05% of the week, on average. The majority reported working in a setting with easy access to IT staff/services. Over half (55.20%) *somewhat* or *strongly agreed* that their employer offered adequate tele-mental health information/training. Almost half (48.10%) of those implementing tele-mental health rated it as *somewhat* or *very difficult*. Over half (59.60%) were *somewhat* or *very likely* to continue providing tele-mental health services in the future.

Approximately two-thirds (67.10%) of respondents reported providing additional therapeutic services specifically to treat COVID-19-related concerns (results not shown but available upon request). The most common additional services included providing individual therapy to support new/current patients (47.30%), providing resources (e.g., pamphlets; 28.80%), crisis care (17.80%), and non-clinical support groups (e.g., social media page; 17.70%). Smaller percentages reported providing individual (14.30%), family (1.50%), or group (6.60%) therapy specifically to medical providers to support them during COVID-19.

Differences by Provider Level (Table 4)

Trainees (35.48%) were more likely to cancel appointments than licensed practitioners (LPs; 24.14%), $\chi^2(1, N = 822) = 8.36, p = .004$. Trainees saw fewer patients weekly than LPs in February 2020 (trainee $EMM = 10.22$, LP $EMM = 19.49$), $F(1, 805) = 3.92, p = .048, \eta_p^2 = .005$, and currently (trainee $EMM = 13.38$, LP $EMM = 14.73$), $F(1, 797) = 6.41, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = .008$.

Trainees (86.26%) reported working remotely for a larger percentage of the week than LPs (77.84%), $F(1, 626) = 5.00, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .008$. In both December 2019, $\chi^2(1, N = 713) = 22.31, p < .001$, and February 2020, $\chi^2(1, N = 705) = 8.81, p = .003$, trainees (Dec. 94.16%; Feb. 84.56%) were more likely than LPs (Dec. 76.04%; Feb. 72.23%) to *not* use tele-mental health. Of those using tele-mental health, trainees ($EMM = 3.28$) reported having more implementation

difficulty than LPs ($EMM = 3.00$), $F(1, 641) = 4.13$, $p = .043$, $\eta_p^2 = .006$.

Differences by Provider Type (Table 5)

Psychologists/doctoral-level (Psych/DL) providers (87.47%) were more likely and neuropsychologists (65.73%) were less likely than expected to use tele-mental health/virtual instead of in-person appointments, $\chi^2 (2, N = 663) = 36.43$, $p < .001$. Social workers/master's-level (SW/ML) providers (28.76%) were less likely and neuropsychologists (80.42%) were more likely than expected to reschedule/postpone appointments, $\chi^2 (2, N = 663) = 85.37$, $p < .001$. SW/ML providers (15.69%) were less likely and neuropsychologists (43.36%) were more likely than expected to cancel appointments, $\chi^2 (2, N = 663) = 36.28$, $p < .001$.

In both February 2020, $F(2, 648) = 11.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .033$, and currently, $F(2, 644) = 31.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .088$, neuropsychologists (Feb. $EMM = 17.34$, current $EMM = 12.07$) saw fewer patients weekly than Psych/DL providers (Feb. $EMM = 18.93$, current $EMM = 15.81$), who saw fewer than SW/ML providers (Feb. $EMM = 19.97$, current $EMM = 18.66$). In December 2019, $\chi^2 (2, N = 571) = 19.26$, $p < .001$, and February 2020, $\chi^2 (2, N = 566) = 21.73$, $p < .001$, Psych/DL providers (Dec. 70.86%; Feb. 65.64%) were less likely and neuropsychologists (Dec. 89.26%; Feb 88.03%) were more likely than expected to *not* use tele-mental health. Currently, SW/ML providers (9.66%) and Psych/DL providers (11.90%) were less likely and neuropsychologists (42.54%) were more likely than expected to *not* use tele-mental health, $\chi^2 (2, N = 632) = 70.77$, $p < .001$.

Differences by Setting (Table 6)

Providers in academic medical centers (AMCs; 65.12%) were more likely and those in private practice (38.78%) were less likely than expected to reschedule/postpone appointments, $\chi^2 (3, N = 528) = 28.05$, $p < .001$. AMC providers (35.47%) were more likely and community

mental health (CMH) providers (12.86%) were less likely than expected to cancel appointments, $\chi^2 (3, N = 528) = 16.40, p = .001$.

AMC providers ($EMM = 13.03$) were currently seeing fewer patients weekly than providers in CMH settings ($EMM = 15.42$) and private practice ($EMM = 17.79$), $F(3, 511) = 8.63, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .048$. In December 2019, AMC providers (87.84%) were more likely than expected to *not* use tele-mental health, $\chi^2 (3, N = 460) = 19.26, p < .001$. In February 2020, AMC providers (84.25%) were more likely and VA providers (53.95%) were less likely than expected to *not* use tele-mental health, $\chi^2 (3, N = 455) = 25.18, p < .001$. Providers in AMCs (93.02%) and VAs (81.11%) were more likely, and those in private practice (29.59%) were less likely than expected to have easy access to IT staff/services, $\chi^2 (3, N = 528) = 180.22, p < .001$. Of providers using tele-mental health, those in private practice ($EMM = 2.60$) reported less implementation difficulty than providers in all other settings (AMC $EMM = 3.21$, CMH $EMM = 3.26$, VA $EMM = 3.25$), $F(3, 438) = 9.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .064$.

Discussion

The current study highlights how U.S. mental health providers have changed their practices within the rapidly evolving context of COVID-19, during which there have been increased mental health needs [7] as well as large-scale technological availability enabling tele-adaptation of services [35]. The authors hypothesized that 1) mental health providers overall would increase the number of services provided via tele-mental health, and 2) certain providers would be better able to adapt to tele-mental health services than others. Exploratory results were provided to describe how this transition has differed across specific mental health service lines. The current findings may inform future mental health practices and policies as the outbreak continues to evolve worldwide.

Overall, the context of COVID-19 has led to widespread change in the mental health field, with all but 2.11% of providers in this study making practice adjustments. Unsurprisingly, the most prominent involved a transition from in-person to remote/virtual appointments. Consistent with prior research [24,25] this study found that tele-mental health was a relatively underutilized resource prior to this pandemic, even through late February 2020. Consistent with hypotheses, results indicated a rapid transition to tele-mental health services during the pandemic, with uptake of tele-mental health by approximately 80% of respondents by late March/early April 2020. The expediency and scope of this transition rate was striking compared to that of tele-mental health initiatives during previous U.S. emergency situations, such as the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks [36] and Hurricane Katrina in 2005 [37]. This may have resulted from the unique context of stay-at-home policies and the easing of logistical barriers during the pandemic (e.g., increased tele-mental health reimbursement) [34]. In addition, approximately 55% of providers in the current study perceived having adequate tele-mental health training, which was substantially higher than in previous reports (i.e., 21-28%; [27,38]. This may reflect an overall movement toward increased tele-mental health training over time and/or more recent training specifically in response to COVID-19.

In this study, providers' transition to tele-mental health appeared to be more than a stopgap measure limited to the pandemic context. The majority endorsed a desire to continue implementing tele-mental health services in the future, despite more than one-quarter reporting lack of easy access to IT services and nearly half endorsing implementation difficulty. Importantly, respondents overall saw fewer patients weekly in late March/early April 2020 than prior to the pandemic. This suggests that COVID-19-related disruptions have reduced treatment capacity (at least at the beginning of the pandemic) while mental health needs have surged [6].

Consistent with the second hypothesis, transition to tele-mental health services differed by provider type. Specifically, social workers/master's-level (SW/ML) providers transitioned to tele-mental health services at a higher rate than both psychologists/doctoral-level (Psych/DL) providers and neuropsychologists. This may be explained by varying scopes of practice. Psychologists – and particularly neuropsychologists – are more likely than SW/ML providers to conduct testing and evaluation services, which have been associated with lower tele-mental health uptake [25]. Interestingly, in this study this differential uptake did not seem to be associated with group differences in IT service access, perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training, or ease of implementation (for those using tele-mental health). Moreover, despite differential uptake, all provider types were equally likely to want to implement tele-mental health in the future. A speculative explanation for these findings may be providers' anticipation of future development of assessments that are more compatible with tele-based platforms.

Exploratory analyses helped to further characterize how COVID-19 may be differentially affecting mental health providers' practices. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, trainees were less likely than licensed practitioners (LPs) to implement tele-mental health, but by late March/early April 2020, there were no differences in tele-mental health uptake. This differential speed of transition may be due to implementation of new policies (e.g., perhaps LPs were prioritized in executing new technological advances). There were few differences in specific practice adjustments between trainees and LPs, which is logical given that trainees work under the supervision and license of LPs. A difference that did emerge, however, was that trainees appeared to be "protected" during COVID-19, such that they tended to work remotely more and saw fewer patients, above and beyond baseline differences.

With regard to practice setting, providers in academic medical centers (AMCs) were

more likely than expected to cancel or postpone appointments and to see fewer patients compared to providers in private practice or community mental health (CMH) settings. One possible explanation for this is that mental health providers in AMCs are often part of a larger system with many types of providers, so the temporary decrease in billable services may be more financially tolerable than in private practice or CMH settings. This could have decreased the incentive for AMC providers to transition to tele-mental health services rather than use temporary measures until the pandemic resolved. Notably, however, by late March/early April 2020, AMC providers were facilitating tele-mental health services at the same rate as other providers. VA providers appeared to be relatively early adopters of tele-mental health, with higher than expected tele-mental health implementation in late February 2020; this may relate to the VA's historical focus on telepsychology [25]. Despite lower rates of easy access to IT services, private practice providers had less implementation difficulty than those in all other settings explored in this study. It is possible that the relatively high autonomy and relatively low institutional oversight in private practice allowed for easier adoption of tele-mental health.

Consistent with previous recommendations [18,19,20], nearly 70% of practitioners in this study endorsed providing additional therapeutic services specifically to treat patients' COVID-19-related concerns; these services most commonly included individual therapy, resource distribution (e.g., pamphlets), crisis care, and non-clinical support groups (e.g., social media). Of note, only a small subset of practitioners endorsed offering additional mental health services specifically to medical providers. This is concerning given the importance of addressing the psychological impact among at-risk groups such as frontline healthcare workers [19]. One possibility is that medical providers may not have sought mental health treatment yet, given the recency of the pandemic relative to survey dissemination and data collection. It is probable that

the need for mental health services – particularly by healthcare workers – will increase over time as the physical symptoms of COVID-19 eventually remit and the psychological distress likely remains [15, 16].

Implications

Encouragingly, study results indicated that mental health practitioners demonstrated the ability to transition to tele-mental health services rapidly and at relatively high rates. Lower uptake by practitioners who are more likely to provide testing and evaluation services may be mitigated by working with companies to consider tele-mental health services when developing new cognitive/psychological tests and psychometric norms. This likely presented a barrier particularly for neuropsychologists, given that over 40% were not using tele-mental health by late March/early April 2020. Another key barrier to tele-mental health implementation described in previous literature has been a lack of training/education [23,32,33]. Although a higher percentage of respondents endorsed receiving adequate tele-mental health training relative to prior studies [27,38], almost half did not feel this way. This indicates an area for improvement in graduate programs and training experiences preparing individuals for mental health fields.

Given the very low percentage of mental health providers offering additional therapeutic services specifically to medical providers, it will be important to make a concerted effort to identify and develop targeted mental health treatments for individuals and groups at increased risk of psychological distress related to COVID-19. This may include frontline healthcare workers, individuals who became unemployed, those with personal experiences with the virus, and those in geographic hotspots.

More generally, consistent with prior work [27], results from this study indicate widespread interest in continuing tele-mental health services following the COVID-19 pandemic.

This could allow for increased accessibility for individuals with historically lower access to medical/mental health services (e.g., due to lack of transportation, funds, and/or health literacy), such as those in rural locations and/or with low socioeconomic status. Interdisciplinary work among providers, institutions, test development companies, legislators, and insurance companies will be necessary in this endeavor.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite the valuable information noted above, the present study has limitations that warrant disclosure. The sample consisted predominantly of individuals identifying as White, heterosexual, married, and/or cisgender women. Almost half were from the Southern region of the United States, and many were doctoral-level providers. Although the sample reflected demographic characteristics of other large-scale surveys of neuropsychologists [39] and psychologists [40], there are limits to generalizability given that this study's sample represents a very small proportion of the approximately 1.6 million U.S. mental health professionals (i.e., psychologists, counselors, social workers, and psychiatrists) as of May 2019 [41].

Other limitations included the timing of this study, which occurred relatively early in the pandemic, and the fact that analyses did not account for differential implementation of stay-at-home orders across states. However, data were collected within a relatively short time frame (i.e., 12 days from survey distribution to closure of data collection), and neither completion date nor region was consistently correlated with study variables. The survey asked respondents to compare their current workload to that of December 2019, when providers may have seen fewer patients because of the holiday season. However, this would have underestimated differences between patient volumes pre-COVID and during the pandemic. Future research should track COVID-19-related practice adjustments over time, as well as providers' perceptions of their

effectiveness in hindsight.

Finally, the present study focused on mental health providers' practical responses to COVID-19. It will also be important to characterize their emotional responses, given that mental health providers tend to generally have relatively high levels of job-related stress, which can impact their desire and ability to continue providing therapeutic services [42]. Recognizing that providers do not exist in a vacuum, contextualizing this within how institutions responded to the pandemic would enable a more comprehensive characterization of mental health providers' response during COVID-19.

Overall, in the context of the current pandemic, mental health providers were able to rapidly adjust their practice, predominantly by shifting to tele-mental health services. Despite differences in tele-mental health uptake based on provider characteristics, the majority were interested in continuing to provide such services in the future. This may offer an opportunity to expand therapeutic services to those in need even beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.

References

1. World Health Organization (2020). Q&A on coronaviruses (COVID-19). Retrieved April 17, 2020, from <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/q-a-coronaviruses>.
2. COVID Tracking Project. (2020). *Our data: Our most up-to-date data and annotations*. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from <https://covidtracking.com/data>
3. World Health Organization (2020b). WHO Timeline - COVID-19. Retrieved April 27, 2020, from <https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/27-04-2020-who-timeline---covid-19>.
4. Li, W., Yang, Y., Liu, Z.-H., Zhao, Y.-J., Zhang, Q., Zhang, L., . . . Xiang, Y.-T. (2020). Progression of mental health services during the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*, 16, 1732-1738. doi:10.7150/ijbs.45120
5. Xiang, Y. T., Yang, Y., Li, W., Zhang, L., Zhang, Q., Cheung, T., & Ng, C. H. (2020). Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, 228-229. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8
6. Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), 1729. doi:10.3390/ijerph17051729
7. American Psychological Association (2020a). New poll: COVID-19 impacting mental well-being: Americans feeling anxious, especially for loved ones; older adults are less anxious. Retrieved from <https://www.psychiatry.org/newsroom/news-releases/new-poll-covid-19-impacting-mental-well-being-americans-feeling-anxious-especially-for-loved-ones-older->

[adults-are-less-anxious.](#)

8. Cheng, C. (2004). To be paranoid is the standard? Panic responses to SARS outbreak in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. *Asian Perspective*, 28, 67-98.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/42704444>
9. Maunder, R., Hunter, J., Vincent, L., Bennett, J., Peladeau, N., Leszcz, M., . . . Mazzulli, T. (2003). The immediate psychological and occupational impact of the 2003 SARS outbreak in a teaching hospital. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 168, 1245-1251.
<https://www.cmaj.ca/content/168/10/1245.full>
10. Lau, J. T., Griffiths, S., Choi, K. C., & Tsui, H. Y. (2010). Avoidance behaviors and negative psychological responses in the general population in the initial stage of the H1N1 pandemic in Hong Kong. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 10, 139. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-10-139
11. Wheaton, M. G., Abramowitz, J. S., Berman, N. C., Fabricant, L. E., & Olatunji, B. O. (2012). Psychological predictors of anxiety in response to the H1N1 (swine flu) pandemic. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 36, 210-218. doi:10.1007/s10608-011-9353-3
12. Mohammed, A., Sheikh, T. L., Gidado, S., Poggensee, G., Nguku, P., Olayinka, A., . . . Adeyemi, J. (2015). An evaluation of psychological distress and social support of survivors and contacts of Ebola virus disease infection and their relatives in Lagos, Nigeria: A cross sectional study– 2014. *BMC Public Health*, 15, 824. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2167-6
13. Shultz, J. M., Cooper, J. L., Baingana, F., Oquendo, M. A., Espinel, Z., Althouse, B. M., . . . McCoy, C. B. (2016). The role of fear-related behaviors in the 2013–2016 West Africa Ebola virus disease outbreak. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 18, 104. doi:10.1007/s11920-016-0741-y
14. Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid

- review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395, 912-920. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8
15. Mak, I. W. C., Chu, C. M., Pan, P. C., Yiu, M. G. C., & Chan, V. L. (2009). Long-term psychiatric morbidities among SARS survivors. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 31, 318-326. doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2009.03.001
16. Maunder, R. G., Lancee, W. J., Balderson, K. E., Bennett, J. P., Borgundvaag, B., Evans, S., . . . Hunter, J. J. (2006). Long-term psychological and occupational effects of providing hospital healthcare during SARS outbreak. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 12, 1924-1932. doi:10.3201/eid1212.060584
17. Reardon, S. (2015). Ebola's mental-health wounds linger in Africa: health-care workers struggle to help people who have been traumatized by the epidemic. *Nature*, 519(7541), 13-15. doi:10.1038/519013a
18. Cénat, J. M., Mukunzi, J. N., Noorishad, P.-G., Rousseau, C., Derivois, D., & Bukaka, J. (2020). A systematic review of MHPSS programs among populations affected by the Ebola virus disease. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 131, 109966. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2020.109966
19. Pfefferbaum, B., Schonfeld, D., Flynn, B. W., Norwood, A. E., Dodgen, D., Kaul, R. E., . . . Reissman, D. B. (2012). The H1N1 crisis: A case study of the integration of mental and behavioral health in public health crises. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*, 6, 67-71. doi:10.1001/dmp.2012.2
20. Duan, L., & Zhu, G. (2020). Psychological interventions for people affected by the COVID-19 epidemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, 300-302. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30073-0
21. Liu, S., Yang, L., Zhang, C., Xiang, Y.-T., Liu, Z., Hu, S., & Zhang, B. (2020). Online mental health services in China during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, e17-e18.

doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30077-8

22. Ho, C. S., Chee, C. Y., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Mental health strategies to combat the psychological impact of COVID-19 beyond paranoia and panic. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*, 49, 1-3.
23. Wells, M., Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., & Becker-Blease, K. A. (2007). Online mental health treatment: Concerns and considerations. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10, 453-459. doi:10.1089/cpb.2006.9933
24. Perle, J. G., Burt, J., & Higgins, W. J. (2014). Psychologist and physician interest in telehealth training and referral for mental health services: An exploratory study. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 32, 158-185. doi:10.1080/15228835.2014.894488
25. Pierce, B. S., Perrin, P. B., & McDonald, S. D. (2020). Demographic, organizational, and clinical practice predictors of U.S. psychologists' use of telepsychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 51, 184–193. doi:10.1037/pro0000267
26. Connolly, S. L., Miller, C. J., Lindsay, J. A., & Bauer, M. S. (2020). A systematic review of providers' attitudes toward tele-mental health via videoconferencing. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, e12311. doi:10.1111/cpsp.12311
27. Perle, J. G., Langsam, L. C., Randel, A., Lutchman, S., Levine, A. B., Odland, A. P., . . . Marker, C. D. (2013). Attitudes toward psychological telehealth: Current and future clinical psychologists' opinions of Internet-based interventions. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69, 100-113. doi:10.1002/jclp.21912
28. Barak, A., Hen, L., Boniel-Nissim, M., & Shapira, N. A. (2008). A comprehensive review and a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of internet-based psychotherapeutic interventions. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 26, 109-160. doi:10.1080/15228830802094429

29. Varker, T., Brand, R. M., Ward, J., Terhaag, S., & Phelps, A. (2019). Efficacy of synchronous telepsychology interventions for people with anxiety, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, and adjustment disorder: A rapid evidence assessment. *Psychological Services*, 16, 621-635. doi:10.1037/ser0000239
30. Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A., Pruitt, L. D., Luxton, D. D., & Johnson, K. (2015). Patient perceptions of tele-mental health: Systematic review of direct comparisons to in-person psychotherapeutic treatments. *Telemedicine and e-Health*, 21, 652-660. doi:10.1089/tmj.2014.0165
31. Pruitt, L. D., Luxton, D. D., & Shore, P. (2014). Additional clinical benefits of home-based tele-mental health treatments. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 45, 340-346. doi:10.1037/a0035461
32. Glueckauf, R. L., Maheu, M. M., Drude, K. P., Wells, B. A., Wang, Y., Gustafson, D. J., & Nelson, E.-L. (2018). Survey of psychologists' telebehavioral health practices: Technology use, ethical issues, and training needs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 49, 205-219. doi:10.1037/pro0000188
33. Perry, K., Gold, S., & Shearer, E. M. (2019). Identifying and addressing mental health providers' perceived barriers to clinical video telehealth utilization. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. doi:10.1002/jclp.22770
34. American Psychological Association (2020b). Temporary changes to federal Medicare telehealth policies. Retrieved April 28, 2020, from <https://www.apaservices.org/practice/reimbursement/government/medicare-telehealth-temporary-changes>.
35. Federal Communications Commission (2018). *FCC broadband report finds significant*

- progress in broadband deployment, but important gaps remain (PDF)*. Retrieved April 8, 2020, from <https://www.fcc.gov/reports-research/reports/broadband-progress-reports/2018-broadband-deployment-report>.
36. Wunsch-Hitzig, R., Plapinger, J., Draper, J., & Del Campo, E. (2002). Calls for help after September 11: a community mental health hot line. *Journal of Urban Health*, 79, 417-428. doi:10.1093/jurban/79.3.417
37. Combs, D. C. (2007). Mental health interventions by telephone with Katrina survivors. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 18, 271-276. doi:10.1353/hpu.2007.0027
38. Simms, D. C., Gibson, K., & O'Donnell, S. (2011). To use or not to use: Clinicians' perceptions of tele-mental health. *Canadian Psychology*, 52, 41-51. doi:10.1037/a0022275
39. Sweet, J. J., Benson, L. M., Nelson, N. W., & Moberg, P. J. (2015). The American Academy of Clinical Neuropsychology, National Academy of Neuropsychology, and Society for Clinical Neuropsychology (APA Division 40) 2015 TCN professional practice and 'salary survey': Professional practices, beliefs, and incomes of U.S. neuropsychologists. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 29, 1069-1162. doi:10.1080/13854046.2016.1140228
40. Hamp, A., Stamm, K., Lin, L., & Christidis, P. (2016). *2015 APA survey of psychology health service providers*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/15-health-service-providers/report.pdf>.
41. **U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (March, 2020). Occupational and employment statistics: May 2019 national occupational employment and wage estimates: United States. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm.**
42. Acker, G. M. (2012). Burnout among mental health care providers. *Journal of Social*

Work, 12, 475-490. doi: 10.1177/1468017310392418



MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Full Sample (N = 903)

Characteristic		M	SD
Age		39.50	11.50
		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender	Man	149	16.50%
	Woman	749	82.95%
	Transgender Man	2	0.22%
	Genderqueer/non-conforming	3	0.33%
Race	American Indian/Alaska Native	1	0.11%
	Asian/Asian American	29	3.22%
	Black/African American	29	3.22%
	Hispanic/Latinx	33	3.67%
	White	781	86.78%
	Multi-racial	25	2.78%
	Different racial identity (i.e., Arab, Jewish, Mestiza)	2	0.22%
Sexual Orientation	Bisexual	57	6.34%
	Gay	24	2.67%
	Heterosexual	762	84.39%
	Lesbian	23	2.56%
	Queer	20	2.22%
	Different sexual orientation (i.e., asexual, fluid, pansexual, questioning)	13	1.44%
Region	Midwest	175	19.44%
	Northeast	129	14.33%
	South	425	47.22%
	West	171	19.00%
Work Status	Full-time	671	74.31%
	Part-time	71	7.86%
	Trainee	155	17.17%
	Not currently employed (N/A)	1	0.11%
	Other (i.e., as needed, independent contractor, self-employed)	5	0.55%

Notes. M = mean, SD = standard deviation. The number of respondents who did not provide information about demographic characteristics were as follows: gender $n = 1$, race $n = 3$, sexual orientation $n = 4$, region $n = 3$.

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

27

Table 2.

Professional Characteristics of the Full Sample (N = 903)

Characteristic	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Provider Type		
Bachelor's level therapist/counselor	10	1.11%
Social worker/master's-level therapist/counselor	153	16.94%
Psychologist/doctoral-level therapist/counselor	367	40.64%
Neuropsychologist	144	15.95%
Trainee (i.e., graduate-level practicum student, pre-doctoral intern, postdoctoral fellow)	155	17.17%
Psychiatrist	23	2.55%
Other medical provider (e.g., other physician, psychiatric nurse practitioner/physician assistant)	12	1.33%
Support staff (e.g., case manager, medical assistant, psychometrist)	34	3.77%
Other (e.g., mental health specialist, peer recovery, research project manager)	5	0.55%
Provider Level		
Graduate-level practicum student	58	6.42%
Pre-doctoral intern	38	4.25%
Postdoctoral fellow	59	6.59%
Unlicensed practitioner	38	4.25%
Licensed practitioner	551	61.56%
Licensed practitioner and board-certified in specialty area	117	13.07%
Not Applicable (e.g., support staff)	34	3.80%
Current Practice Setting		
Private Practice	196	21.73%
Academic Medical Center	172	19.07%
Veterans Hospital or Military Hospital/Clinic (VA)	90	9.97%
Community Mental Health Setting	70	7.76%
Psychiatric Hospital or Facility	50	5.54%
General Hospital	46	5.10%
Rehabilitation Hospital or Setting	35	3.88%
University Counseling Center	23	2.55%
Department/Graduate Training Clinic	20	2.22%
Outpatient Clinic	15	1.66%
School	9	1.00%
Primary Care	7	0.78%
Prison	5	0.55%
Other (e.g., cancer center, employee assistance program, non-profit organization, intensive outpatient/partial hospitalization program)	16	1.77%
Multiple practice settings	148	16.41%
Age Specialty		
Pediatric only (i.e., younger than 18)	85	9.42%
Adults only (i.e., 18 and older)	472	52.33%

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

28

Lifespan (i.e., pediatrics and adults)	345	38.25%
--	-----	--------

Notes. The number of respondents who did not provide information about professional characteristics were as follows: provider level $n = 8$, practice setting $n = 1$, age specialty $n = 1$.



MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

29

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics of Practice Adjustments, Patients Seen, and Tele-mental Health Factors during COVID-19 for the Full Sample (N = 903)

Variables	<i>n (%) / M (SD)</i>	Range
Practice Adjustments		
Tele-mental health/virtual appts (vs. in-person)	729 (80.82%)	--
Rescheduling/postponing appts	435 (48.23%)	--
Cancelling appts	240 (26.61%)	--
Restrictions on appts (e.g., by patient age, medical comorbidity, recent travel)	155 (17.18%)	--
Precautionary measures (e.g., personal protective equipment and social distancing)	53 (5.88%)	--
Other adjustment (e.g., expanding therapeutic services and education/training-related restrictions)	38 (4.21%)	--
N/A (no change in practice)	19 (2.11%)	--
Patients Seen Weekly (Dec. 2019)		
In person	17.05 (12.00)	0-50
Remote/tele-mental health	1.11 (4.66)	0-50
Total	18.00 (13.25)	0-100
Patients Seen Weekly (Feb. 2020)		
In person	16.38 (12.02)	0-50
Remote/tele-mental health	1.62 (5.51)	0-50
Total	17.68 (13.26)	0-100
Patients Seen Weekly (Current)		
In person	4.92 (9.01)	0-50
Remote/tele-mental health	10.09 (10.75)	0-50
Total	14.39 (14.41)	0-85
Percent of Week Working Remotely		
	79.05 (32.01)	1-100
Tele-mental Health		
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in Dec. 2019*	625 (80.44%)	--
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in late Feb. 2020**	580 (75.32%)	--
Reported not implementing tele-mental health currently	188 (22.07%)	--
Reported easy access to IT services	657 (72.84%)	--
Perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training	3.46 (1.32)	1-5
Difficulty with tele-mental health implementation	3.07 (1.20)	1-5
Likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health services	3.57 (1.36)	1-5

Notes. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Dec. = December. Feb. = February. * = The valid percent is presented in the table; including missingness (14.0%), the raw value was 69.21%. ** = The valid percent is presented in the table; including missingness (14.7%), the raw value was 64.23%. Five-point Likert-scaled questions included perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*), difficulty with tele-mental health implementation (1 = *easy/not at all difficult* to 5 = *very difficult*), and likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health services (1 = *very unlikely* to 5 = *very likely*).

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

30

Table 4.

Results of Chi-Squares for Practice Adjustments and ANCOVAs for Patients Seen and Tele-mental Health Factors during COVID-19 by Provider Level

Variables	Trainee (n = 155)	Licensed Practitioner (n = 668)	
Practice Adjustments	n (%) / EMM (SE)	n (%) / EMM (SE)	Sig.
Tele-mental health/virtual appts (vs. in-person)	127 (81.94%)	546 (81.86%)	
Rescheduling/postponing appts	77 (49.68%)	320 (47.98%)	
Cancelling appts	55 (35.48%)	161 (24.14%)	+
Restrictions on appts (e.g., by patient age, medical comorbidity, recent travel)	22 (14.19%)	118 (17.69%)	
Precautionary measures (e.g., personal protective equipment and social distancing)	8 (5.16%)	40 (6.00%)	
Other adjustment (e.g., expanding therapeutic services and education/training-related restrictions)	6 (3.87%)	29 (4.35%)	
N/A (no change in practice)	3 (1.94%)	11 (1.65%)	
Patients Seen Weekly (Dec. 2019)			
In person	11.36 (0.99)	18.49 (0.45)	***
Remote/tele-mental health	0.55 (0.41)	1.23 (0.19)	*
Total	11.85 (1.07)	19.53 (0.49)	***
Patients Seen Weekly (Feb. 2020)			
In person	15.95 (0.43)	16.62 (0.19)	*
Remote/tele-mental health	1.49 (0.31)	1.47 (0.14)	
Total	10.22 (8.86)	19.49 (12.91)	*
Patients Seen Weekly (Current)			
In person	3.98 (0.75)	5.00 (0.33)	
Remote/tele-mental health	6.77 (0.91)	10.87 (0.42)	***
Total	13.38 (0.87)	14.73 (0.39)	*
Percent of Week Working Remotely	86.26 (2.87)	77.84 (1.46)	*
Tele-mental Health			
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in Dec. 2019	129 (94.16%)	438 (76.04%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in late Feb. 2020	115 (84.56%)	411 (72.23%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health currently	40 (27.03%)	115 (17.24%)	
Easy access to IT services	123 (79.35%)	475 (71.21%)	
Perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training	3.50 (0.12)	3.48 (0.05)	
Difficulty with tele-mental health implementation	3.28 (0.12)	3.00 (0.05)	*
Likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health services	3.47 (0.12)	3.63 (0.05)	

Notes. Trainee = graduate-level practicum students, pre-doctoral interns, and postdoctoral fellows, EMM = estimated marginal mean, SE = standard error, sig. = statistical significance. Dec. = December. Feb. = February.

⁺ $p < .005$ (based on Bonferroni adjustment for chi-square tests), * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Table 5.

Results of Chi-Squares for Practice Adjustments and ANCOVAs for Patients Seen and Tele-mental Health Factors during COVID-19 by Provider Type

Variables	Social workers/ master's therapists (n = 153) ¹	Psychologists/ doctoral therapists (n = 367) ²	Neuro- psychologists (n = 144) ³	Sig.
Practice Adjustments	<i>n (%) / EMM (SE)</i>	<i>n (%) / EMM (SE)</i>	<i>n (%) / EMM (SE)</i>	
Tele-mental health/virtual appts (vs. in-person)	133 (86.93%)	321 (87.47%)	94 (65.73%)	+
Rescheduling/postponing appts	44 (28.76%)	161 (43.90%)	115 (80.42%)	+
Cancelling appts	24 (15.69%)	77 (20.98%)	62 (43.36%)	+
Restrictions on appts (e.g., by patient age, medical comorbidity, recent travel)	21 (13.73%)	55 (14.91%)	37 (25.87%)	
Precautionary measures (e.g., personal protective equipment and social distancing)	14 (9.15%)	18 (4.88%)	5 (3.42%)	
Other adjustment (e.g., expanding therapeutic services and education/training-related restrictions)	6 (3.92%)	17 (4.61%)	7 (4.79%)	
N/A (no change in practice)	2 (1.31%)	6 (1.63%)	3 (2.05%)	
Patients Seen Weekly (Dec. 2019)				
In person	22.09 (0.86)	19.64 (0.56)	9.89 (0.89)	***, b,
Remote/tele-mental health	1.25 (0.30)	1.08 (0.18)	0.46 (0.30)	**, b
Total	23.12 (0.90)	20.61 (0.58)	10.28 (0.93)	***, b,
Patients Seen Weekly (Feb. 2020)				
In person	17.96 (0.42)	17.70 (0.27)	16.73 (0.46)	*, c
Remote/tele-mental health	2.01 (0.34)	1.53 (0.21)	0.75 (0.34)	*, b
Total	19.97 (0.44)	18.93 (0.28)	17.34 (0.48)	***, b,
Patients Seen Weekly (Current)				
In person	6.76 (0.72)	4.69 (0.45)	4.83 (0.77)	*, a
Remote/tele-mental health	14.71 (0.84)	12.20 (0.52)	3.45 (0.85)	***, a, b
Total	18.66 (0.83)	15.81 (0.53)	12.07 (0.91)	***, a, b
Percent of Week Working Remotely	80.17 (3.06)	80.03 (1.89)	70.84 (3.22)	
Tele-mental Health				
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in Dec. 2019	102 (82.26%)	231 (70.86%)	108 (89.26%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in late Feb. 2020	91 (73.98%)	214 (65.64%)	103 (88.03%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health currently	14 (9.66%)	42 (11.90%)	57 (42.54%)	+
Easy access to IT services	102 (66.67%)	253 (68.94%)	111 (77.62%)	
Perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training	3.35 (0.11)	3.59 (0.07)	3.48 (0.12)	
Difficulty with tele-mental health implementation	2.99 (0.10)	2.97 (0.07)	3.26	

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health services	3.69 (0.11)	3.70 (0.07)	(0.14) 3.43 (0.12)
---	-------------	-------------	--------------------------

Notes. *EMM* = estimated marginal mean, *SE* = standard error, sig. = statistical significance. Dec. = December. Feb. = February.

⁺ $p < .005$ (based on Bonferroni adjustment for chi-square tests), * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

^a = significant difference between 1 and 2, ^b = significant difference between 2 and 3, ^c = significant difference between 1 and 3.

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

33

Table 6.

Results of Chi-Squares for Practice Adjustments and ANCOVAs for Patients Seen and Tele-mental Health Factors during COVID-19 by Setting

Variables	AMC (n = 172) ¹	CMH (n = 70) ²	PP (n = 196) ³	VA (n = 90) ⁴	
Practice Adjustments	n (%) / EMM (SE)	n (%) / EMM (SE)	n (%) / EMM (SE)	n (%) / EMM (SE)	Sig.
Tele-mental health/virtual appts (vs. in-person)	152 (88.37%)	63 (90.00%)	169 (86.22%)	78 (86.67%)	
Rescheduling/postponing appts	112 (65.12%)	29 (41.43%)	76 (38.78%)	48 (53.33%)	+
Cancelling appts	61 (35.47%)	9 (12.86%)	44 (22.45%)	20 (22.22%)	+
Restrictions on appts (e.g., by patient age, medical comorbidity, recent travel)	35 (20.35%)	14 (20.00%)	25 (12.76%)	11 (12.22%)	
Precautionary measures (e.g., personal protective equipment and social distancing)	4 (2.33%)	4 (5.71%)	9 (4.59%)	3 (3.33%)	
Other adjustment (e.g., expanding therapeutic services and education/training-related restrictions)	6 (3.49%)	1 (1.43%)	8 (4.08%)	6 (6.67%)	
N/A (no change in practice)	1 (0.58%)	1 (1.43%)	1 (0.51%)	1 (1.11%)	
Patients Seen Weekly (Dec. 2019)					
In person	15.52 (0.88)	23.71 (1.36)	17.33 (0.83)	15.99 (1.21)	***, a, b, f
Remote/tele-mental health	1.14 (0.37)	2.06 (0.60)	0.68 (0.34)	1.69 (0.51)	
Total	16.41 (0.98)	25.35 (1.53)	17.96 (0.93)	17.47 (1.36)	***, a, b, f
Patients Seen Weekly (Feb. 2020)					
In person	16.13 (0.38)	16.71 (0.60)	17.53 (0.36)	16.70 (0.52)	
Remote/tele-mental health	1.42 (0.29)	1.86 (0.47)	1.46 (0.27)	1.60 (0.40)	
Total	17.21 (0.42)	19.00 (0.67)	18.77 (0.40)	17.86 (0.58)	
Patients Seen Weekly (Current)					

MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS' RESPONSE TO COVID-19

34


In person	4.09 (0.61)	3.23 (0.99)	4.92 (0.57)	3.90 (0.85)	
Remote/tele-mental health	8.31 (0.84)	16.10 (1.36)	13.25 (0.78)	10.28 (1.16)	***, a, d
Total	13.03 (0.76)	15.42 (1.20)	17.79 (0.71)	14.19 (1.05)	***, a, d
Percent of Week Working Remotely	84.33 (2.56)	75.07 (4.20)	81.60 (2.41)	82.05 (4.33)	
Tele-mental Health					
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in Dec. 2019	130 (87.84%)	42 (75.00%)	125 (70.22%)	51 (65.38%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health in late Feb. 2020	123 (84.25%)	43 (72.88%)	115 (66.09%)	41 (53.95%)	+
Reported not implementing tele-mental health currently	36 (21.95%)	7 (10.14%)	21 (10.94%)	10 (11.63%)	
Easy access to IT services	160 (93.02%)	52 (74.29%)	58 (29.59%)	73 (81.11%)	+
Perceived adequacy of tele-mental health training	3.59 (0.10)	3.40 (0.16)	3.70 (0.10)	3.90 (0.13)	
Difficulty with tele-mental health implementation	3.21 (0.10)	3.26 (0.15)	2.60 (0.09)	3.25 (0.13)	***, b, c, d
Likelihood of continuing to provide tele-mental health services	3.55 (0.10)	3.66 (0.16)	3.56 (0.10)	3.89 (0.14)	

Notes. AMC = academic medical center, CMH = community mental health, PP = private practice, VA = Veterans Affairs, EMM = estimated marginal mean, SE = standard error, sig. = statistical significance. Dec. = December. Feb. = February.

⁺ $p < .005$ (based on Bonferroni adjustment for chi-square tests), * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

^a = significant difference between 1 and 2, ^b = significant difference between 2 and 3, ^c = significant difference between 3 and 4, ^d = significant difference between 1 and 3, ^e = significant difference between 1 and 4, ^f = significant difference between 2 and 4

Supplementary Files



Multimedia Appendixes

Survey Questions.

URL: <https://asset.jmir.pub/assets/3ba68460c0f9ad1da9e0a92818769d5e.docx>