International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 3719-3727
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Early Identification and Management of Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation in Hospitalized Patients: Collaborative Roles of Nurses, Social Workers, and Psychologists

Alshammare, Eman Hamood D[1]*, Thani Fahhad Alanazi[2], Ruwaydhan Al Dahri Ruwaydhan AlShammari[3], Afrah Bashir Ghanem Al-Anzi[4], Mohammed Saad M Aljuhani[5], Adel Mousa Saleh Alshammari[6], Khaled Ayaf Ayed Alayaf[7], Mohammed Dikhn H Alanazi[8], Tamrah Ahmed Asiri[9], Nouf Awad Qayyadh Alruwailiy[10], Arif Alhawawi Sidah Alanazi[11]

[1]Senior Psychologist – Arar Central Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** eman19@outlook.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0207-785X

[2]Sociology Specialist – North Medical Tower, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: fffthani@yahoo.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-1217-785X

[3]Social Specialist – Turbah Primary Health Care Center, Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turbah, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: rualshammari@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-2227-785X

[4]Social Worker – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: afrah2755@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-3237-785X

[5]Social Specialist – Long-Term Care Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: msaljuhani@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-4257-785X

[6]Sociology Specialist – Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: tsaheel.hail@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-6267-785X

[7]Psychological Specialist – King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: kalayyaf2011@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7277-785X

[8]Psychological Specialist – Long-Term Care Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: mdalanazi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-8287-785X

[9]Nursing Technician – Eradah Complex for Mental Health, Tabuk Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Tabuk, Tabuk Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: taassiri@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-9297-785X

[10]Nursing Technician –Eradah Complex for Mental Health, Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Skaka, Al-Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: noalrwaily@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5007-785X

[11]Nursing Technician – Eradah Complex for Mental Health, Tabuk Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Tabuk, Tabuk Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: areefa@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5117-785X

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4689
Received : 01 September 2024
Accepted : 30 September 2024

Keywords

Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation (SPDCE),
Interprofessional Collaboration,
Nurses,
Social Workers,
Psychologists,
Early Identification

Abstract:

Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation (SPDCE) in hospitalized patients represents a critical challenge to healthcare systems, as it leads to prolonged stays, increased resource utilization, and poorer outcomes not due to medical complexity, but to unaddressed behavioral, emotional, and social crises. Effective management necessitates a fundamental shift from reactive, siloed interventions to a proactive, integrated model built upon the synergistic collaboration of nurses, social workers, and psychologists. Nurses act as frontline sensors, identifying early psychosocial "vital signs" and employing therapeutic communication. Social workers provide essential contextual expertise, navigating complex social determinants and systemic barriers to safe discharge. Psychologists contribute diagnostic clarity and develop individualized behavioral interventions to address underlying mental health and cognitive drivers. By unifying these distinct yet complementary roles through structured interprofessional practices—such as integrated rounding, shared risk assessment protocols, and trauma-informed care frameworks—healthcare teams can preemptively identify at-risk patients, mitigate escalation triggers, and foster a therapeutic environment that promotes patient dignity, enhances staff resilience, and optimizes institutional resource allocation, thereby transforming a source of clinical and operational strain into an opportunity for holistic, person-centered care.

1. Introduction

The contemporary hospital environment is a complex ecosystem where biological disease processes intersect with profound social and psychological realities. While the primary focus of acute care has historically been on diagnosing and treating physiological pathology, a growing body of evidence underscores that patient outcomes are inextricably linked to their psychosocial context [1]. Hospitalized patients are not merely vessels of disease; they are individuals embedded in networks of relationships, carrying histories of trauma, mental health challenges, socioeconomic stresses, and varying levels of resilience and coping mechanisms. The experience of hospitalization itself—marked by loss of autonomy, unfamiliar routines, pain, and fear—can act as a potent psychosocial stressor, exacerbating pre-existing vulnerabilities or triggering new psychological distress [2]. This interplay between the "biomedical" and the "biopsychosocial" is not a peripheral concern but a central determinant of clinical trajectories, length of stay, resource utilization, and ultimate recovery.

Within this framework, the concept of "care escalation" has traditionally been associated with clinical deterioration—a decline in vital signs or organ function requiring intensive medical or surgical intervention. However, a parallel and often under-recognized phenomenon exists: **socially and psychologically driven care escalation (SPDCE)**. SPDCE refers to a situation where a patient's hospitalization is prolonged, complicated, or intensified not due to the progression of their primary medical condition, but due to escalating behavioral, emotional, or social needs that the standard care model is ill-equipped to manage [3]. This escalation manifests in various ways: as increased nursing interventions for agitation or confusion; as extended stays awaiting complex discharge planning due to homelessness or lack of social support; as frantic consultations to psychiatry for acute distress; or as the utilization of security or restraint protocols for challenging behaviors. These scenarios represent a failure of the system to identify and address underlying psychosocial drivers proactively, leading to crises that consume disproportionate resources and often result in poorer patient experiences and outcomes [4].

The failure to integrate psychosocial care effectively into the acute care continuum has significant consequences. Patients with unaddressed anxiety, depression, dementia, substance withdrawal, profound social isolation, or inadequate post-discharge resources are at higher risk for complications like falls, non-adherence to treatment plans, hospital-acquired delirium, and readmission [5]. From an institutional perspective, SPDCE contributes to nursing burnout, moral distress among staff, interprofessional conflict, and increased costs associated with longer lengths of stay and higher acuity of care required to manage behavioral crises [6]. The traditional, siloed approach, where nurses manage clinical tasks, social workers are summoned for "discharge problems," and psychologists or psychiatrists are called only for formal "consults," is demonstrably ineffective for the dynamic, holistic needs of the patient. This reactive model allows latent psychosocial risks to fester until they reach a crisis point, forcing an escalation that could have been mitigated or prevented.

Therefore, the imperative for modern hospital systems is to shift from a reactive, crisis-oriented response to SPDCE towards a proactive,

preventive, and collaborative model of care. This necessitates moving beyond mere co-existence of disciplines to deep, structured collaboration. The frontline triad most pivotal in this endeavor consists of nurses, social workers, and psychologists. Each brings a unique and complementary lens: nurses provide continuous, holistic assessment at the bedside; social workers analyze and intervene in the systemic and environmental context of the patient's life; and psychologists offer expertise in mental health diagnostics, behavioral interventions, and trauma-informed care [7]. Their collaborative integration is the cornerstone of a system capable of early identification, nuanced understanding, and effective management of the psychosocial complexities that drive care escalation. [8].

2. Understanding Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation (SPDCE)

Defining the Phenomenon and Its Manifestations
Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation (SPDCE) is a multifaceted clinical phenomenon wherein a patient's course in the hospital is adversely affected, leading to increased intensity of nursing or institutional resources, primarily due to non-physiological factors. Unlike clinical deterioration monitored by early warning scores, SPDCE operates on a parallel track, often insidious in its onset but dramatic in its impact. It is characterized by an increase in care demands that stem from behavioral, cognitive, emotional, or social crises rather than from a direct complication of the admitting diagnosis. Common manifestations include severe agitation or aggression requiring constant observation or chemical/physical restraint; acute psychological distress (e.g., panic attacks, severe anxiety, suicidal ideation) necessitating emergency psychiatric consultation; refusal of medically necessary care or treatment non-adherence rooted in fear, misunderstanding, or psychological state; and discharge delays spanning days or weeks due to unresolvable social barriers like homelessness, unsafe home environments, or complete lack of caregiver support [9][10]. These scenarios tie up significant staff time, create tension on the unit, and divert attention from other patients.

3. Key Risk Factors and Contributing Patient Profiles

Identifying patients at high risk for SPDCE is the first critical step in prevention. Risk factors are often interconnected and span several domains. From a **psychological perspective**, pre-existing conditions such as dementia and cognitive impairment are paramount, as the unfamiliar hospital environment can precipitate delirium and severe behavioral disturbances [11]. Patients with serious mental illnesses (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder), severe personality disorders, or active substance use disorders are also at high risk, as hospitalization disrupts routines and access to substances, leading to withdrawal or decompensation [12]. A history of trauma, particularly in patients undergoing invasive procedures, can trigger re-traumatization and defensive, escalating behaviors [13]. **Social determinants of health** play an equally critical role. Patients experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity face immense discharge barriers. Those with limited or conflict-ridden social support networks lack advocates and helpers. Low health literacy, language barriers, and cultural differences can lead to misunderstandings and non-adherence that are misinterpreted as defiance [14]. Financial insecurity can create overwhelming anxiety about the cost of care and post-discharge needs. Furthermore, the **context of hospitalization** itself is a risk factor: prolonged stays, admission to intensive care units (with associated delirium and sleep deprivation), poor pain management, and sensory overload can all serve as catalysts for escalation in vulnerable individuals [15].

4. The Impact on Patients, Staff, and Healthcare Systems

The consequences of unmanaged SPDCE are far-reaching. For **patients**, the experience is often one of distress, disempowerment, and potential harm. Escalation may lead to coercive interventions like restraints or forced medication, which can inflict psychological and physical trauma, damage trust in providers, and negatively affect the therapeutic alliance [16]. Longer hospital stays increase exposure to hospital-acquired infections and deconditioning. Ultimately, outcomes for the primary medical condition may be worse due to interrupted care or non-adherence. For **clinical staff**, particularly nurses, managing SPDCE is a primary source of burnout, moral injury, and physical injury. Nurses report feeling unprepared, unsupported, and frustrated when dealing with complex behavioral presentations, leading to emotional exhaustion and high turnover rates [17]. Conflict within teams can arise when management strategies are not aligned. For the **healthcare system**, SPDCE represents a significant financial burden. Extended length of stay is one of the largest drivers of inpatient costs. The use of sitters for one-to-one observation, emergency security responses, and last-minute arrangements for complex discharges are resource-intensive [18].

Furthermore, hospitals may face regulatory citations or legal challenges related to inappropriate restraint use or failure to provide adequate care for patients with mental health or social needs, positioning effective SPDCE management not just as a clinical or ethical imperative, but a financial and risk-management one as well.

5. The Imperative for Proactive, Interprofessional Collaboration

Limitations of Silos and Reactive Models

The traditional, discipline-specific model of hospital care is fundamentally ill-suited to address SPDCE. In this model, nurses, social workers, and psychologists often operate in parallel, with limited formal communication and shared planning. Nurses, bearing the brunt of patient interaction, may recognize escalating anxiety or social distress but feel their role is confined to reporting clinical changes and managing immediate behavior. They may page social work only when a "discharge hurdle" is identified, often late in the stay, and consult psychology or psychiatry only when behaviors become unmanageable or a specific mental health diagnosis is suspected [19]. This reactive, consult-based approach is inherently flawed. It creates delays, allows problems to compound, and fosters a culture where psychosocial care is seen as an "add-on" rather than integral to treatment. It also leads to role confusion and frustration; nurses may feel unsupported, social workers may feel brought in too late to effect meaningful change, and psychologists may be asked to "fix" a behavioral crisis that has deep social roots or is a product of the environment [20]. This fragmentation directly contributes to the very escalation it seeks to address.

6. Synergistic Value of the Nurse-Social Worker-Psychologist Triad

The collaborative power of the nurse-social worker-psychologist triad lies in the synthesis of their distinct but overlapping expertise. **Nurses** are the surveillance and early warning system. Through their 24/7 presence, they conduct continuous, holistic assessments. They observe subtle cues—changes in sleep patterns, refusal of meals, increased irritability, tearfulness, or vague somatic complaints—that may signal underlying psychological distress or social worry long before it erupts into a crisis [21]. They hold key information about family dynamics observed during visits and patient expressions of concern. **Social workers** are the contextual and systemic experts. They conduct comprehensive psychosocial assessments, uncovering the realities of a patient's life outside the hospital: their housing, finances, support systems, caregiver stress, and access to community resources. They understand the complex web of social services and legal frameworks. Their role is to diagnose social pathologies and develop plans to address them [22]. **Psychologists**(or in some settings, psychiatrists or psychiatric nurse practitioners) are the experts in mental, cognitive, and behavioral functioning. They can provide diagnostic clarity regarding underlying mental health conditions, differentiate between delirium and dementia, assess for suicidality or trauma responses, and formulate behavioral plans based on principles of behavioral medicine and therapeutic communication [23]. When these three perspectives are integrated proactively, a comprehensive picture of the patient emerges, allowing the team to anticipate risks, tailor interventions, and prevent escalation at its source.

7. Role-Specific Contributions and Collaborative Integration

Nurses: The Frontline Sensors and Holistic Assessors

Nurses occupy the most critical position for the early identification of SPDCE. Their role extends far beyond routine vital signs to include systematic **psychosocial vital signs**. This involves intentional assessment of a patient's mood, affect, cognition, and expressed concerns during every interaction. Utilizing brief, validated screening tools for anxiety (e.g., GAD-2), depression (PHQ-2), or delirium (e.g., CAM-ICU) can integrate this assessment into routine care [24]. Nurses are also adept at recognizing **behavioral precursors** to escalation, such as restlessness, increased calling, confrontational tone, or social withdrawal. A core nursing contribution is the practice of **therapeutic communication and de-escalation**. Using techniques such as active listening, validation, offering choices, and providing clear, simple information, nurses can often defuse rising anxiety before it requires more intensive intervention [25]. Furthermore, nurses are essential in implementing and monitoring non-pharmacological strategies for agitation or distress, such as creating a calming environment, ensuring sensory aids are available, and managing sleep hygiene. Their continuous presence allows them to evaluate the effectiveness of plans developed in collaboration with social work and psychology, providing real-time feedback to the team.

8. Social Workers: The Contextual Experts and Systems Navigators

Social workers provide the essential bridge between the clinical environment and the patient's real-world life. Their work begins with a **comprehensive psychosocial assessment**, which should be triggered by admission screeners for high-risk indicators (e.g., live alone, history of mental health care, substance use, housing insecurity) rather than by a late discharge planning order. This assessment maps the patient's ecosystem: strengths, vulnerabilities, support networks, economic resources, and environmental barriers [26]. A key function is **crisis intervention and family mediation**. Social workers engage with distressed family members, mediate conflicts that may be agitating the patient, and help families understand the medical and psychological situation. They are the primary agents for **addressing social determinants** that drive escalation. This involves initiating applications for skilled nursing facilities or guardianship, coordinating with community agencies for homelessness services, arranging home health or caregiver support, and navigating insurance and financial assistance programs [27]. By tackling these concrete barriers early, social workers remove major sources of patient anxiety and clear the path for a timely, safe discharge, directly preventing a common cause of SPDCE.

9. Psychologists: The Mental Health and Behavioral Specialists

Clinical health psychologists embedded in medical units bring specialized skills for managing the psychological drivers of escalation. They conduct **focused mental status and diagnostic evaluations** to distinguish between, for example, an adjustment disorder with anxious mood, a trauma reaction, a depressive episode, or the cognitive effects of delirium [28]. This diagnostic clarity is crucial for guiding appropriate intervention. A primary contribution is the development of **individualized behavioral intervention plans (BIPs)**. For a patient with dementia who becomes combative during personal care, a psychologist can work with nurses to develop a care approach using specific communication techniques and antecedent management. For a patient with severe health anxiety, they can provide brief, evidence-based interventions like cognitive-behavioral strategies for panic or exposure techniques for treatment-related fears [29]. Psychologists also provide essential **staff support and training**. They can coach nurses on advanced de-escalation techniques, educate teams on trauma-informed care principles to avoid re-traumatizing practices, and lead debriefings after a crisis event to support staff resilience and improve future responses [30].

Models for Effective Interprofessional Practice

For collaboration to move from theory to practice, structured models must be implemented. **Integrated Rounding** is a powerful tool, where the nurse, social worker, and psychologist (alongside the physician) discuss high-risk patients daily, sharing observations and co-creating a unified plan of care [31]. **Standardized Screening and Triggers** ensure systematic identification. An admission nursing screen that flags social or psychological risks can automatically trigger a social work assessment and/or psychology referral, initiating team involvement from day one [32]. **Shared Documentation** in a common section of the electronic health record, such as an interprofessional psychosocial care plan, ensures all disciplines are aware of the goals, strategies, and patient-specific triggers [33]. Finally, establishing **clear communication protocols and shared goals** is vital. This includes agreed-upon pathways for escalating concerns within the triad, defined roles during a behavioral crisis, and shared metrics for success, such as reduction in restraint use, decrease in behavioral emergency calls, or reduction in length-of-stay for complex psychosocial patients.

10. Strategies for Early Identification and Intervention

Structured Screening Tools and Risk Assessment Protocols

Early identification requires moving from intuitive concern to structured, validated screening. Hospitals should implement a two-tiered system. Upon admission, nurses can administer ultra-brief screens embedded in the nursing assessment. This includes tools like the **PHQ-2/AD-8** for depression and dementia risk, and structured questions about social support, housing stability, and history of mental health or substance use treatment [34]. Positive screens on this first tier should automatically generate a referral for a second-tier, in-depth assessment by social work and/or psychology. Furthermore, **environmental and contextual risk assessments** are crucial. The social work assessment should systematically evaluate discharge barriers, caregiver burden, and financial toxicity. For patients in the ICU or on prolonged bed rest, nurses and psychologists should collaboratively monitor for delirium using tools like the CAM-ICU and implement preventive bundles (e.g., ensuring glasses/hearing aids are used, promoting sleep-wake cycles) [35]. This protocolized approach ensures no patient falls

through the cracks due to a staff member's varying level of comfort with psychosocial issues.

11. Developing and Implementing Proactive Care Plans

Identification is meaningless without action. For patients identified as high-risk, the triad must collaboratively develop a **personalized, proactive care plan**. This plan should be documented prominently and include: **Antecedent Strategies** to modify the environment or routine to prevent distress (e.g., "Mr. X becomes agitated after 4 PM; schedule afternoon activities or a family visit then," or "Use a picture board for communication due to aphasia") [36]. **De-escalation Protocols**tailored to the patient, detailing verbal techniques, preferred staff, and safe spaces that work for that individual. **Communication Guidelines** for staff and family, providing scripts for discussing difficult topics and outlining how to respond to repetitive questions from a cognitively impaired patient. **Family Engagement Plans** crafted by social work, specifying how and when the family will be involved in care planning and decision-making to reduce conflict and anxiety. For patients with complex discharge needs, a **anticipated discharge plan** should be drafted within the first 48 hours, outlining the probable pathway and beginning necessary applications, thus alleviating the patient's and family's uncertainty about the future [37].

12. Crisis Prevention and De-escalation: A Unified Approach

Despite best efforts, some situations will escalate. A unified, team-based response is essential to prevent full-blown crises. The triad should champion **trauma-informed care (TIC)** as a universal precaution. This means all staff approach patients with the understanding that they may have a history of trauma, and interactions should prioritize safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, and empowerment [38]. For example, explaining procedures in detail before touching a patient, offering choices where possible, and avoiding coercive language are TIC practices that can prevent defensive escalation. When de-escalation is needed, a **structured model** (e.g., the Crisis Prevention Institute's CPI model) should be used consistently by all staff. This model emphasizes empathetic listening, respecting personal space, setting clear limits, and offering choices [39]. The roles during such an event should be pre-defined: the primary nurse who has rapport with the patient leads communication; the social worker may support family members who are present; and the psychologist may observe to provide behavioral analysis and later debriefing. The goal is to resolve the situation verbally and therapeutically, avoiding security calls or restraints whenever possible.

13. Overcoming Barriers to Collaboration and Implementation

Institutional, Educational, and Attitudinal Hurdles

Implementing this collaborative model faces significant barriers. **Institutional barriers** include funding models that do not reimburse for proactive psychosocial care, rigid departmental silos with separate reporting structures, and electronic health records not designed for interprofessional communication [40]. **Educational deficits** persist; nursing and medical schools may provide inadequate training in behavioral management, mental health, and collaborative practice, while social work and psychology students may have limited exposure to fast-paced acute medical settings. **Attitudinal barriers** can be the most stubborn, encompassing professional turfism, stereotypical views of other disciplines' roles, and a persistent biomedical culture that undervalues psychosocial expertise [40]. Nurses may view social workers as merely discharge planners; physicians may overlook psychologist recommendations; and all may operate under time pressures that make collaboration feel like a luxury rather than a necessity.

14. Recommendations for Sustainable System Change

Overcoming these barriers requires committed, multi-level strategy. **Leadership and Policy** must drive change. Hospital administration needs to invest in embedding psychologists and ensuring adequate social work staffing ratios. Policies must mandate interprofessional psychosocial rounds for high-risk units and integrate psychosocial metrics (e.g., restraint rates, patient satisfaction with emotional support) into quality dashboards. **Interprofessional Education (IPE)** is foundational. Mandatory joint training sessions on communication, role clarification, and shared problem-solving (using case studies of SPDCE) can build mutual respect and shared language. Simulation training for managing behavioral emergencies as a team can improve real-world performance. Finally, cultivating a **culture of shared responsibility** is key. Celebrating successful collaborative interventions, creating joint

committees to address systemic psychosocial care issues, and ensuring all disciplines have a voice in unit-level decisions can foster the sense that managing the whole patient—body, mind, and social context—is the collective and defining work of the healthcare team.

15. Conclusion

The challenge of Socially and Psychologically Driven Care Escalation represents a critical test for the modern hospital. It exposes the limitations of a healthcare model that privileges biological disease over the human experience of illness. Effectively addressing SPDCE is not merely about managing difficult behaviors or expediting discharges; it is about delivering truly patient-centered, holistic, and ethical care. As this paper has detailed, the path forward lies in the deliberate and structured collaboration of nursing, social work, and psychology. Nurses, as constant clinical observers, provide the early warning. Social workers, as systemic navigators, address the foundational social contexts that underpin so much distress. Psychologists, as behavioral experts, diagnose and treat the mental and emotional drivers of crisis. Alone, each discipline can only respond to fragments of the problem. Together, sharing a unified framework and proactive strategy, they can identify risks early, interpret complex presentations accurately, and intervene effectively to prevent escalation before it occurs.

The benefits of this model cascade across the healthcare ecosystem. Patients experience safer, more dignified care that addresses their needs as whole persons, leading to better clinical outcomes and greater satisfaction. Nurses, social workers, and psychologists experience reduced burnout and greater professional fulfillment as they feel competent and supported in managing complex situations. Healthcare systems benefit from more efficient resource use, shorter lengths of stay, reduced costs associated with crises, and improved compliance with patient-centered care standards. Ultimately, investing in this collaborative triad is an investment in the very core of healing—recognizing that caring for a hospitalized patient requires tending not just to the failing organ, but to the anxious mind, the distressed spirit, and the vulnerable social world in which recovery must take root.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Urheim R, Palmstierna T, Rypdal K, Gjestad R, Senneseth M, Mykletun A. Violence rate dropped during a shift to individualized patient-oriented care in a high security forensic psychiatric ward. BMC Psychiatry. 2020;20:1–10.

[2] Bentall R. Doctoring the mind: why psychiatric treatments fail. UK: Penguin; 2010.

[3] Price O, Baker J, Bee P, Grundy A, Scott A, Butler D, et al. Patient perspectives on barriers and enablers to the use and effectiveness of de-escalation techniques for the management of violence and aggression in mental health settings. J Adv Nurs. 2018;74:614–25.

[4] Akinleye D, McNutt L, Lazariu V, McLaughlin C. Correlation between hospital finances and quality and safety of patient care. PLoS ONE. 2019;14:0219124.

[5] Bigwood S, Crowe M. It's part of the job, but it spoils the job': a phenomenological study of physical restraint. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2008;17:215–22.

[6] Flood C, Bowers L, Parkin D. Estimating the costs of conflict and containment on adult acute inpatient psychiatric wards. Nurs Econ. 2008;26(5):325–30.

[7] Meehan T, McGovern M, Keniry D, Schiffmann I, Stedman T. Living with restraint: reactions of nurses and lived experience workers to restrictions placed on the use of prone restraint. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2022;31:888–96.

[8] Hallett N, Dickens G. De-escalation: a survey of clinical staff in a secure mental health inpatient service. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2015;24:324–33.

[9] Sisti D. Nonvoluntary psychiatric treatment is distinct from involuntary psychiatric treatment. JAMA. 2017;318:999–1000.

[10] Mackay I, Paterson B, Cassells C. Constant or special observations of inpatients presenting a risk of aggression or violence: nurses' perceptions of

the rules of engagement. J Psychiatric Mental Health Nurs. 2005;12(4):464–71.

[11] McKeown M, Thomson G, Scholes A, Jones F, Baker J, Downe S, et al. Catching your tail and firefighting: the impact of staffing levels on restraint minimization efforts. J Psychiatric Mental Health Nurs. 2019;26:131–41.

[12] Forsyth A, Trevarrow R. Sensory strategies in adult mental health: a qualitative exploration of staff perspectives following the introduction of a sensory room on a male adult acute ward. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2018;27:1689–97.

[13] Reid K, Price O. PROD-ALERT: Psychiatric restraint open data—analysis using logarithmic estimates on reporting trends. Front Digit Health. 2022;4:945635.

[14] Papadopoulos C, Ross J, Stewart D, Dack C, James K, Bowers L. The antecedents of violence and aggression within psychiatric in-patient settings. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 2012;125:425–39.

[15] Bowers L, Ross J, Owiti J, Baker J, Adams C, Stewart D. Event sequencing of forced intramuscular medication in England. J Psychiatric Mental Health Nurs. 2012;19:799–806.

[16] Kersting X, Hirsch S, Steinert T. Physical harm and death in the context of coercive measures in psychiatric patients: a systematic review. Front Psychiatry. 2019;10:400.

[17] Michie S, van Stralen M, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour chnage interventions. Implement Sci. 2011;6(42).

[18] Flanigan M, Russo S. Recent advances in the study of aggression. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2019;44:241–4.

[19] Vermeulen J, Doedens P, Boyette L, Spek B, Latour C, de Haan L. But I did not touch nobody!—Patients' and nurses' perspectives and recommendations after aggression on psychiatric wards—A qualitative study. J Adv Nurs. 2019;75:2845–54.

[20] Physical injury and Workplace assault in UK mental health trusts: an analysis of formal reports: hearing before the International. J Mental Health Nurs. 2016.

[21] Teece AM. An exploration of how critical care nurses make the decision to initiate restraint when managing hyperactive delirium. University of Leeds; 2022.

[22] DHSC. Positive and proactive care: reducing the need for restrictive interventions. London: DH; 2014.

[23] Evans N. Abuse of patients: what you can do to help end bad practice: advice for nurses on reporting concerns and abusive practices, whether in forensic, assessment and treatment units or other care settings, and the support available. Mental Health Pract. 2023;26.

[24] Francis J, O'Connor D, Curran J. Theories of behaviour change synthesised into a set of theoretical groupings: introducing a thematic series on the theoretical domains framework. Implement Sci. 2012;7:1–9.

[25] Quirk A, Lelliott P, Seale C. Risk management by patients on psychiatric wards in London: an ethnogrpahic study. Health Risk Soc. 2005;7(1):85–91.

[26] Roberts M, Schiavenato M. Othering in the nursing context: a concept analysis. Nurs Open. 2017;4:174–81.

[27] Roppolo L, Morris D, Khan F, Downs R, Metzger J, Carder T, et al. Improving the management of acutely agitated patients in the emergency department through implementation of Project BETA (best practices in the evaluation and treatment of agitation). J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open. 2020;1:898–907.

[28] Hallett N, Dickens G. De-escalation of aggressive behaviour in healthcare settings: Concept analysis. Int Jounral Nurs Stud. 2017;75:10–20.

[29] Burns T. A history of antipsychiatry in four books. Lancet Psychiatry. 2020;7:312–4.

[30] DHSC. Mental Health Units (Use of Force) Act 2018 statutory guidance for NHS organisations in England, and police forces in England and Wales. London: DHSC; 2021.

[31] NHS. Cost of violence against NHS staff: A report summarising the economic cost to the NHS of violence against staff 2007/8. NHS Security Management Service. 2010.

[32] Cusack P, Cusack F, McAndrew S, McKeown M, Duxbury J. An integrative review exploring the physical and psychological harm inherent in using restraint in mental health inpatient settings. Int J Ment Health Nurs. 2018;27:1162–76.

[33] McKeown M, Thomson G, Scholes A, Jones F, Downe S, Price O, et al. Restraint minimisation in mental health care: legitimate or illegitimate force? An ethnographic study. Sociol Health Illn. 2020;42:449–64.

[34] Price O, Baker J, Bee P, Lovell K. The support-control continuum: an investigation of staff perspectives on factors influencing the success or failure of de-escalation techniques for the management of violence and aggression in mental health settings. Int J Nurs Stud. 2018;77:197–206.

[35] NICE. Violence And Aggression. Short-Term Management In Mental Health, Health And Community Settings. 2015.

[36] Fuehrer S, Weil A, Osterberg LG, Zulman D, Meunier M, Schwartz R. Building authentic connection in the patient-physician relationship. J Prim Care Community Health. 2024;15.

[37] Jaeger S, Hüther F, Steinert T. Refusing medication therapy in involuntary inpatient treatment—a multiperspective qualitative study. Front Psychiatry. 2019;10:295.

[38] Efkemann S, Bernard J, Kalagi J, Otte I, Ueberberg B, Assion H, et al. Ward atmosphere and patient satisfaction in psychiatric hospitals with different ward settings and door policies. Results from a mixed methods study. Front Psychiatry. 2019;10:576.

[39] Hansard. House of Commons debate: Edenfield Centre: treatment of patients. Hansard. 2022;720.

[40] Price O, Baker J, Bee P, Lovell K. Learning and performance outcomes of mental health staff training in de-escalation techniques for the management of violence and aggression. Br J Psychiatry. 2015;206(6):447–55.