



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Unlock the doors

Aggressive behaviour and seclusion on closed psychiatric wards

Doedens, P.

Publication date

2021

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Doedens, P. (2021). *Unlock the doors: Aggressive behaviour and seclusion on closed psychiatric wards*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

CHAPTER 2

“But I did not touch nobody!”
- Patients’ and nurses’ perspectives
and recommendations after
aggression on psychiatric wards -

A qualitative study

Jentien Vermeulen*, Paul Doedens*, Lindy-Lou Boyette,
Bea Spek, Corine Latour, Lieuwe de Haan

*Joint first author

Journal of Advanced Nursing, 2019;75(11):2845-2854 doi: 10.1111/jan.14107

**UNLOCK
THE
DOORS**

Abstract

AIMS To gain a deeper understanding of the differences in patients and staff perspectives in response to aggression and to explore recommendations on prevention.

DESIGN Qualitative, grounded theory study.

METHODS We conducted semi-structured interviews with patients and nurses involved in an aggressive incident. Data collection was performed from May 2016 to March 2017.

RESULTS Thirty-one interviews were conducted concerning fifteen aggressive incidents. Patients and nurses generally showed agreement on the factual course of events, there was variation in agreement on the perceived severity. Patients' recommendations on prevention were mostly personally focussed, while nurses suggested general improvements.

CONCLUSION Patients are often capable to evaluate aggression and give recommendations on prevention shortly after the incident. Patients and nurses differ in the perceived severity of aggression. Recommendations on prevention of patients and nurses are complementary.

IMPACT What problem did the study address? Perspectives of patients and nurses differ with respect to aggression, but how is unclear. What were the main findings? Patients and nurses generally described a similar factual course of events concerning the incident; patients often perceive the severity less than nurses do. Patients are capable to give recommendations on prevention of aggressive incidents, shortly after the incident. Where and on whom will the research have impact? Factual course of events can be a common ground to start evaluating aggressive incidents and post-incident review should address the severity of incidents. Asking recommendations from patients on how to improve safety and de-escalation can lead to innovative and personal de-escalation strategies and supports patients autonomy.

Introduction

Aggressive behaviour is a worldwide problem in healthcare (1, 2). Nurses working in closed psychiatric units are at high risk for experiencing physical violence at work (3). The danger of aggression is the main reason for professionals on psychiatric wards to apply coercive measures, such as seclusion and restraint (4, 5). Coercive measures may threaten the therapeutic alliance between patients and professionals (6). The international mental health community aims to ban coercive measures from practice (7). To prevent the use of coercive measures, it is important to gain insight in perspectives of patients and staff on aggressive incidents and tailored recommendations concerning prevention are needed.

Background

Several studies evaluated the perspectives of patients after aggressive incidents (8-10). Other studies reported on perspectives and attitudes of staff members towards aggression (11). Several studies investigated experiences and perspectives of patients and staff members on aggressive incidents in general (12-17). Some found considerable consensus between patients and nurses in their perspectives (12, 13, 17). Others found major differences, especially concerning perspectives on the nature and cause of aggressive incidents (14, 15, 18). These studies lacked triangulation of different perspectives on the same incident. To our knowledge, two studies did triangulate the perspectives of patients and staff members. Omérov, Edman (19) used a questionnaire for staff members and Ilkiw-Lavalle and Grenyer (20) tested differences in categories from questionnaires, to compare the experiences of patients and staff of a specific aggressive incident. Both found several differences in perspectives concerning causes (i.e. patients perceived environmental factors important as cause for aggression, while staff focussed on the patient's illness) and potential prevention of the incident (i.e. inability of staff to identify patients' provocations for aggression). These differences are believed to influence patient-staff interaction (12-14) and may affect recommendations to prevent aggression (16). The existing literature described overall differences in perspectives and recommendations, but the nature of these differences in perspectives of the persons involved remains unclear. To use the knowledge on these differences for prevention of aggression, a more thorough understanding of the differences in perspective is crucial. Additionally, further insight into similarities and

differences between patients and nurses concerning recommendations is essential to use these recommendations effectively in the prevention of patient violence.

The study

Aims

The aim of this study is to gain deeper understanding in the differences in perspective between patients and nurses concerning a specific aggressive incident. We addressed the following research questions: 1. What is the underlying theory on the differences and similarities of patients' and nurses' view on aggressive incidents? 2. Which recommendations are provided to prevent aggressive incidents in the future?

Design

We used a grounded theory design to identify the underlying concepts to provide a theoretical explanation based on narrative data (21). This study is reported according to the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Studies (COREQ) (22).

Sample/Participants

A convenience sample of nurses and patients who were involved in an aggressive incident was recruited. An aggressive incident was defined as "any verbal, nonverbal or physical behaviour that was threatening (to self, others, or property), or physical behaviour that actually did harm (to self, others, or property)" (23).

Recruitment started with a presentation at the ward about the aims and procedures of our study. We aimed at including both more and less severe incidents, in order to collect data that is as rich as possible. Nurses were asked to report aggressive incidents to the researchers through email. Immediately after receiving a report, one of the authors (JV) came to the ward to approach the nurse and patient for study participation. Inclusion criteria for patients and nurses were being a participant in an aggressive incident and willing to participate in an interview. Exclusion criteria for patients were a severe language barrier, current stay in seclusion or previous participation in the current study.

The setting was a twelve-bed closed psychiatric ward for adults of a university hospital in The Netherlands that admits approximately 150 patients annually. The closed admission ward provides acute psychiatric care for patients with various diagnoses, mostly psychotic disorders and mood disorders. Reasons for admission always include (potential) danger due to the psychiatric disorder. Most of the patients (>80%) are admitted involuntary in the context of the Dutch civil Mental Health Act (24).

The ward's team consists of twenty-five registered nurses, educated on European Qualifications Framework level four (secondary vocational education) or six (bachelors' degree). Additional training in verbal de-escalation and physical restraint is part of the ward's routine training program. Verbal de-escalation is an intervention that consists of calmly managing an agitated client to prevent (further) violence (25).

During the study period, twenty-two aggressive incidents were reported. This is an underestimation of the number of aggressive incidents on the ward, probably due to under-reporting. Under-reporting of aggressive incidents is a well-known problem in healthcare (26). The authors assume that nurses only reported more severe aggressive incidents, because a relatively high number of patients in our study were secluded after the incident.

Seven eligible patients declined to participate, mostly because of lack of interest or distrust regarding audiotaping their comments. No patients were excluded because of their psychiatric condition or language barrier. None of the nurses declined to participate. This resulted in a sample of fifteen unique patients and thirteen nurses representing fifteen unique aggressive incidents, with a total of thirty-one interviews. One incident had two nurses involved who were both interviewed and three nurses were involved in more than one aggressive incident.

Data collection

Data collection was performed from May 2016 to March 2017. Semi-structured interviews were conducted in a private room at the ward to enhance confidentiality. One of the first authors (JV) performed the interviews because she was not part of the ward's treatment team. The interviews were planned short after the incident aiming to capture vivid memories from the patient while being in comparable psychiatric state as during the

incident. In case of seclusion, patients were approached shortly after termination of the seclusion episode. Planned duration of the interviews was approximately fifteen minutes, to diminish potential burden for patients. Patients who were not included or declined participation were approached by nursing staff for post-incident review, in line with regular practice.

During the interviews, a topic list was used with questions that had been developed with an experienced qualitative researcher, tested for face validity with an expert by experience and pilot tested in three interviews. The following questions were asked: *1) Can you describe the aggressive incident that you have recently been through? 2) Can you describe the response of the staff and your opinion about this response? 3) Can you give any suggestion that could have prevented the aggressive incident and/or improved the care at that time?*

The interviewer stimulated participants to give in-depth information about the factual course of events during the incident, the acts of nurses during the incident and their recommendations on prevention. Interviews were digitally audiotaped. We decided not to make field notes, because the participating patients often suffered from paranoia and making notes could induce suspicion and agitation.

Ethical considerations

This study was reviewed by the Medical Ethics Review Board of our institution, which decided that formal approval was not necessary. The Dutch Medical Research (Human Subjects) Act (WMO) states that formal ethical approval is necessary when the study meets two criteria: 1) It concerns medical/scientific research; and 2) participants are subject to procedures or are required to follow rules of behaviour (27). The primary reason that the Medical Ethics Review Board decided that our study was not considered as a study within the influence of the WMO is that we only investigated usual patient care. Debriefing aggressive incidents is considered regular clinical practice. Therefore, in our study subjects were not required to follow rules of behaviour beyond normal clinical practice. The WMO is based on international quality standards for medical research, such as the declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice.

The researchers approached eligible patients and explained the objective of the study, the goal and duration of the interview and the right to refuse and to withdraw consent at any time. Even severely unwell inpatients in mental health care can be capable of decision-making for research (28). We gave considerable attention to informing patients on the nature of the study and their rights to refuse or withdraw consent, as recommended in earlier research on obtaining informed consent from inpatients in mental health care (29). We obtained written or audiotaped informed consent from all participating patients. Information from the interview was not discussed with the patients' treatment team. Thereby, the researchers had no influence on clinical decisions. The participation of staff members was not discussed with the departments' management team or with their co-workers. The privacy of all participants was protected according to the Dutch privacy protection legislation.

Data analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim in MAXQDA version 12. The two first authors of this study (both PhD-students) independently analysed all transcripts after receiving additional training in performing qualitative research. This started after the first interview and was performed alongside with the data-collection. First, we carefully read the transcripts to become familiar with the data. Subsequently, during re-reading, the content was coded in-vivo and afterwards codes were clustered into concepts (coding tree available upon request). Quotes for this manuscript were selected during consensus meetings.

Regarding the perspective of patient and nurse, incidents were analysed in patient-nurse dyads. We carefully read the codes again and independently rated whether overlap of perspectives between nurse and patient was found. The first authors held several consensus meetings with the last author to discuss the concepts that were identified and the core category in the data (30). During analysis, the authors went back and forth to the data to verify emerging concepts.

Because there is a substantial body of evidence regarding recommendations on prevention of aggression (8-10, 15, 16, 31), we followed a slightly different procedure analysing this research question. Recommendations were analysed independently of specific incidents. After reading, coding and clustering the codes into concepts, three researchers (JV, PD &

LdH) discussed the content of the interviews after every 2 or 3 incidents and decided if new concepts or recommendations emerged.

Transcripts and results were not returned to the participants, because of the vulnerable patient population. For publication, Dutch quotes were translated to English by one of the authors (LLB) who was raised bilingually. Translation was as literal as possible in order to stay close to the words used by participants. This results in some grammatically incorrect sentences and in some cases in a choice of words that is somewhat erratic.

Findings

Sociodemographic variables of patients are presented in **Table 2.1**. Nurses who participated in this study were all registered nurses, six were male and seven female.

The interviews lasted from eight to twenty-five minutes and were conducted a median of three days after the incident.

Concepts

Two concepts emerged from our data regarding the perspective of patients and nurses on aggressive incidents, namely *facts* (the factual course of events of the provocation, escalation and solution of the aggressive incident) and *subjective experience*. The major difference between patients and nurses is found in the latter, particularly in the *perceived severity* of the incident. We identified perceived severity as our core category of the difference in perspectives.

The core category that emerged from our data regarding recommendations was that there were distinct *patients' recommendations* and *nurses' recommendations*. Patients gave recommendations on their own treatment, while nurses tended to give recommendations on the de-escalation of aggressive incidents in general. Furthermore, there were five subthemes emerging from patients' recommendations, namely 1) humane treatment & freedom, 2) ward routine, 3) interpersonal contact, 4) personalised de-escalation interventions and 5) shared decision making during a coercive measure. Subthemes that emerged from the nurses' recommendations were 1) pharmacological interventions, 2) timing of interventions and 3) facility related factors.

Table 2.1: Sociodemographics of the included patient sample (n=15)

Variables	n (%)
Types of aggression	
Verbal aggression	3 (20)
Physical aggression to others	3 (20)
Physical aggression to objects	9 (60)
Gender male/female	10 (67) / 5 (33)
Age, median (IQR)	28 (26-37)
Primary diagnosis	
Psychotic disorder [†]	10 (67)
Bipolar I disorder	4 (27)
Other [‡]	1 (6)
Compulsory admission	15 (100)
Concluding of incident	
Seclusion	12 (80)
Time out	3 (20)
Incidents concluding with restraint	0
Length of admission, days, median (IQR)	75 (52-180)
Number of days between incident and interview, median (range)	3 (2-13)

[†] Psychotic disorder: schizophrenia, schizoaffective, due to medical disorder. [‡] Personality disorder.

IQR=interquartile range; SD=standard deviation.

Perspectives

Factual course of events

We observed high similarity in the factual course of the aggressive incident between patients and nurses. Both described similar facts (such as place of the incident and length of the intervention) of the incident. The facts prior to the incident and in the last phase of the incident (i.e. intervention) showed most resemblance. A brief description of patients and nurses for each incident can be found in **Table 2.2**.

Table 2.2: Description of involved patients and nurses

Incident	Involved patient	Sex, native language (interview language¶)	Involved nurse(s)	Sex, native language (interview language¶)
I1	P1	Male, Dutch	N1	Male, Dutch
I2	P2	Male, Dutch	N2	Female, Dutch
I3	P3	Male, Dutch	N3	Male, Dutch
			N4	Female, Dutch
I4	P4	Male, Dutch	N5	Male, Dutch
I5	P5	Male, Italian (English)	N6	Female, Dutch
I6	P6	Male, Dutch	N7	Female, Dutch
I7	P7	Male, German (English)	N8	Female, Dutch
I8	P8	Male, Dutch	N4	Female, Dutch
I9	P9	Female, Dutch	N9	Female, Dutch
I10	P10	Male, Dutch	N10	Female, Dutch
I11	P11	Female, Surinam (Dutch)	N11	Male, Dutch
I12	P12	Female, Italian (English)	N12	Male, Dutch
I13	P13	Female, Antillean (Dutch)	N13	Female, Dutch
I14	P14	Female, Dutch	N2	Male, Dutch
I15	P15	Male, Dutch	N10	Female, Dutch

¶ Interview language is mentioned for the non-Dutch native speakers. With native speakers, interview language was Dutch

P13

<On that moment? I get angry and start screaming: I want help needed. Bring me my doctor. I want to see my doctor! >

N13

<Then we offered paracetamol and other things for the pain, ehm, she was actually really agitated and demanding and "A doctor must come now!">

Strikingly, patients remembered the course of events in a detailed manner, despite having severe psychiatric symptoms. They sometimes even remembered events in more detail than

the involved nurse did. For example, the following patient stayed in the seclusion room from Monday until Thursday.

P1

<I come inside, the police arrives, they take me in there. I went crazy, they give me an injection. Another injection, without without any ... give me an injection, I stay in there from Monday to Thursday>

N1

<And sir was taken into the seclusion room under coercion, there he is administered an intramuscular antipsychotic and a new medication policy was dictated. And sir stayed, I think, about a week in the seclusion room>

Subjective experience

The subjective experience of patients and nurses regarding the aggressive incident differed in most cases.

P12

<So, I spit on the, like I do tuff. But not on him, on the ground. And I also clean this; it is not a problem you know. Like a spit and say: 'what the, stuff like that. But I did not touch nobody.>

N12

<At that moment she started to clear her throat, seriously, I saw the spittle on her tongue, so she could spit at me. And the only thing I could do was: push her away.>

We interpreted differences in subjective experience as a difference in perceived severity of the aggressive incident. We defined perceived severity (PS) as “the subjective severity of aggressive behaviour perceived by the aggressor, victim or witness of an aggressive incident”. PS is a construct described in literature around school bullying (32), but was never included in literature on aggression in mental health care. In general, patients perceived the severity of the aggressive incident as lower than nurses did.

P5

<Yeah, they tell me that I am sexual aggressive with the people but if I took you by arm and say: 'Come on let's go'. I guess that, yeah, we are two adults and we can have some fun together without any other problems. But of course, if you say: 'No, I don't want it', and I respect you.>

N6

<It came out of nowhere actually. I entered the corridor and that gentleman comes out of his room and he rushes at me and grabs me and fondles me like this and then he said 'you are coming with me now', in English. So he wants to take me, like, to his room. So I said: 'no, you have to let go of me now. ... He says: 'yes, I am just going to have sex with you now'.>

We found several patients that challenged the appropriateness of the response of nurses to the aggressive incident. This is not surprising, based on the difference in PS. We perceived this for instance in the following two examples:

P5

<Of course my point of view is very disappointing because I don't make nothing bad and the separation room, I can tell you it is something that is truly terrible>

N6

<But yeah, still, if you inject him, you still have that the danger. ... So, you have to choose for safety so it was decided to bring him to the seclusion room for a continuous stay>

P3

< I was already tired. I was in my room, getting ready to sleep. I heard extremely loud TV, and washing-up and this and that. At half past two the TV was on, someone was doing the dishes and whatever. Yes, and then I did not snap, but I said: 'come on, I want to sleep'. And then all day he came, that tall bald guy, he came all night with his flashlight and: is he sleeping, is he sleeping. Yeah and then I woke up again.... Well and then I went crazy, and they came with

30. ... Yes, no, but yes no but they came to the seclusion room. I sat there for a while, three, four hours and then I could go back. But the way it happened, that is just ridiculous.>

N3

<I suggested....: go to sleep and, as for us, take medication when necessary. That will help you, it is really hard on you to be here like this right now. He refused that, over time. He was insulting in his reactions, threatening: 'well, you can go get some of those big Ajax [well-known Dutch football team] guys, they'll just smash the door', those were the kind of things that were said. Towards [female nurse], he was sexually disinhibited, openly horny, to put it like that. He did go to his room for a while, and then he woke up again. ... And, over time, when he started to bang on the door more, I pressed the alarm. Of course, others had already been notified about the situation. Security again, who also responded to the alarm, at that moment no less than three security guards, so six people on staff. At that moment in time, we had already umm decided to go give an injection in the seclusion room.>

Recommendations

Patients' recommendations

Patients often mentioned personal de-escalation techniques that were only suitable for themselves, such as music (P6 "Playing the cello calms me down") and sports (P6 "I need sports, I need some activities, and if I have my activities I am relaxed"). This concept is referred to as "meaningful daily activities". Some patients mentioned personal de-escalation interventions that were not realistic on the ward, but also gave usable alternatives (P13 "I would like them to build a pool there. You know why? If you are aggressive, you are warm. You must cold water there. If I am aggressive, I go straight to my room and shower. With that cold water I stand like tsjoeh"). Some patients gave recommendations that seem to be highly affected by psychiatric symptoms, especially when patients suffer from paranoia and anxiety, such as a patient that assumed (wrongly) the staff had "paralyzers" (P4 "You have paralyzers. You could have used them when he had Anthrax. You could have paralyzed him instead of inject him"). Patients frequently expressed their wish for more humanity (P12 "Be humane. Think and think one moment, maybe she is angry for this so let's solve her problem") and freedom (P1 "I want to have my freedom, even a bit. That is what I want to

have”) during involuntary admission. This subtheme emerged especially with patients by who the incident resulted in coercive measures (P5 “*You can’t give medicine if I don’t want it, it is a truly big violence and it’s also against my human rights*”). Another subtheme was interpersonal contact as a method for de-escalation. Some patients felt like nurses used coercion too fast and believed that talking would have helped to de-escalate the incident (P12 “*When I say something, say something back to me. But don’t grab me*”).

Some aggressive incidents ended with staff using coercive measures. During these measures, the patient’s autonomy is diminished. Patients advised to respect their autonomy as much as possible, even in the context of coercive measures. Patients expressed the need to take part in the decision of using coercive measure, for example how it is conducted and how long it must last (P9 “*The main thing is that you have to take someone out of seclusion as soon as possible, when that person has calmed down again and has come to his senses*”) or the use of own clothes for more privacy during seclusion (P13 “*And if maybe I don’t want to wear that dress. Everybody is looking because you have that mirror, and behind those people are standing there to look at you and there is a camera too*”).

Ward routine can be described by the daily practice which patients encounter, which is a result of the organisational structure of the hospital. Examples like ward rules and changes in surroundings were mentioned as influential for aggressive incidents. Patients also gave recommendations on how to change ward routines (P14 “*I think I went to several rooms, which made me even more confused*”).

During the interviews, it was clear that patients were able to give usable recommendations for the prevention of aggressive incidents. However, it seemed important that the interviewer took time to listen and ask comprehensive questions to patients. Due to (sometimes) highly incoherent language of patients, time was needed to gain valuable recommendations. Two patients could not provide coherent or feasible recommendations, from the perspective of the authors.

Nurses’ recommendations

Nurses frequently advised the use of medication to prevent aggressive incidents. The rationale is that pharmacological intervention, even pro re nata (PRN) or forced medication,

is less coercive than seclusion or restraint. Adequate timing of interventions is critical for de-escalating aggressive incidents (N10 *"So, I don't know if the shift before me, the evening shift, might have noticed and could have given medication earlier or something"*).

The recommendations of nurses around the timing of interventions is mostly to start earlier with PRN-medication or to make contact before the situations escalates. Most nurses who give recommendations on timing are not sure whether this could have de-escalated the aggressive incident (N9 *"To get her out of the garden earlier. Yes. But I don't think it would have caused less aggression"*).

Some nurses gave the recommendation related to the facility, such as availability of secured rooms on the ward (other than the seclusion room) and new development of a high intensive care unit (HIC) (33), in which the ward will contain separate rooms for one-on-one patient care (N5 *"...in a future HIC we can go into a separate room, then your social contribution will increase. You can offer more"*).

Discussion

Our main finding is that most patients and nurses described similar facts of aggressive incidents, but differences in the perceived severity. An intervention to respond to aggressive incidents is chosen based on several aspects, among which the severity of the incident. Differences in the interpretation of the severity are likely to result into differences in the interpretation of the appropriateness of the response of nursing staff to the incident. This finding answers our first research question and adds to the literature that patients were more likely to find interventions used after aggressive incidents excessive (34, 35).

Severity is found to be a subjective construct, which can highly differ between patients and staff. Most patients perceived a lower severity of aggression than nurses did. This finding is new in comparison to previous studies that triangulated around the same incident (19, 20). A study into the perception of the social environment at acute psychiatric inpatients wards explained observed differences by contradictory opinions of patients and nurses concerning high staff control and high autonomy (36). The authors explained the difference in staff control by suggesting that staff tend to underestimate the extent to which they use limiting and controlling measures towards patients. Differences in perception of the severity of an

incident might have implications for future therapeutic alliance between patient and nurse (6). For example, patients could experience the nurses' intervention as disproportionate as they wish to maintain their autonomy.

Although many studies have been performed to reduce the use of coercive measures in psychiatric wards (37), coercive measures still occur. Our study shows that exploring the perceived severity of coercive measures might be a starting point to restore the contact with the patient. Subsequently, discussing differences in perspective may improve the therapeutic alliance after an aggressive incident.

Regarding recommendations, one new concept emerged namely personalised de-escalation interventions. This study adds an in-depth evaluation of the exact difference in perspectives of patients and nurses after aggressive incidents. Furthermore, it suggests that it is valuable to explore differences in perspectives, in particular perceived severity, after aggressive incidents and ask both parties for recommendations on improvement of care. We found that most inpatients on a closed psychiatric ward were capable and willing to give recommendations regarding safety and de-escalation. Examples of types of recommendations are *meaningful daily activities, humane treatment and involvement of patients in decision-making around coercive measures*. These findings are in line with previous studies (8-10, 15, 20, 31). Similar to previous research, substantial difference between patients and nurses in concepts of recommendations emerged (16). Earlier research showed that evaluation of an aggressive incident is possible within two to seven days after the incident (10). Our study is in line with the finding that it is useful to interview both patients and nurses shortly after an incident (20). The benefits of interviewing shortly after an incident are that complementary recommendations are yielded and can be applied directly. Most of the recommendations of patients were highly personal and not covered by nurses. It is plausible that the validity of patients' recommendations obtained in our study is substantial, because patients were asked while they were in a comparable psychopathological state as during the incident.

Limitations

This is, to our knowledge, the first qualitative study that evaluated perspectives about a specific aggressive incident shortly after the incident by comparing perspectives of patients

and nurses. Behaviourally disturbed patients who are involuntarily admitted are generally difficult to include in research. They often refuse consent or a lack of decisional capacity to give informed consent is assumed (38, 39). Our results show that, although suffering from a severe mental condition, the majority of such patients are willing and able to participate in a qualitative study.

Some limitations need to be considered while interpreting the results. Since it was a mono-centre study, unique characteristics may have influenced perspectives of participants. The interviews were performed a median of three days after the incident, but two of the interviews were performed substantially later (nine and thirteen days after the incident). All patients were admitted when the interviews were conducted. Therefore, social desirability influencing their answers or recommendations should be considered as a potential limitation.

During the study, preparations were performed to adapt to a high intensive care model (33) and this may have influenced perception of nurses. Further, because this study evaluated mostly severe incidents, it is possible that this influenced the participants in their perspective and recommendations. Evaluation of minor incidents needs further research.

Conclusion

The perspective of patients is essential for improving quality and safety of care (40). However, providing care that is respectful and responsive to individual patient preferences can be challenging in case of involuntary admission (40). This study shows that incorporating perspectives of psychiatric inpatients who act aggressively, seems feasible and may be useful to improve quality and safety. A previous study reported that staff had more opportunities to debrief than patients (20). We recommend, in line with previous research, to evaluate aggressive incidents at closed psychiatric wards with patients and staff (15, 20, 41, 42). Our findings of a common ground in all incidents (factual course of events), could serve as a starting point for debriefing. We argue that perceived severity of aggression and the decision-making process leading to interventions are important concepts to discuss with patients and staff.

To compare different views, we recommend that debriefing should be held by independent staff members. Since the recommendations of patients and nurses are repeatedly found to be complementary, it is advisable to debrief both (16). Regarding the theoretical method of debriefing, previous studies in other settings showed that technical debriefing (i.e. not focussing on feelings but on facts) improve the outcome of patients after psychological trauma (43). Rapid quality cycles can be used to enhance and evaluate implementation of debriefing into practice (44). Patients and staff members should collaborate in identifying strategies to prevent dangerous situations in the future, to reduce the chance of using coercive measures (45). An example is to capture patients' personal crisis management strategies in a shared crisis management plan. Patient safety plans might provide a framework to put this into practice (46). When debriefing takes place shortly after an incident, a sense of control and autonomy could be restored.

Ultimately, the evaluation of past aggression might prevent new aggressive incidents, thereby prevent the use of coercive measures and contribute to making the psychiatric inpatient unit a safe place for everyone.

Acknowledgements

We thank the patients and nurses of the High Care Clinic of the department of Psychiatry for their time, effort and openness during the interviews.

Conflict of interest & funding

No conflict of interest has been declared by the authors. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

1. Gaynes BN, Brown CL, Lux LJ, Brownley KA, Van Dorn RA, Edlund MJ, et al. Preventing and de-escalating aggressive behavior among adult psychiatric patients: a systematic review of the evidence. *Psychiatric Services*. 2017;68(8):819-31.
2. Rubio-Valera M, Luciano JV, Ortiz JM, Salvador-Carulla L, Gracia A, Serrano-Blanco A. Health service use and costs associated with aggressiveness or agitation and containment in adult psychiatric care: a systematic review of the evidence. *Bmc Psychiatry*. 2015;15:35.
3. Campbell JC, Messing JT, Kub J, Agnew J, Fitzgerald S, Fowler B, et al. Workplace violence: prevalence and risk factors in the safe at work study. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2011;53(1):82-9.
4. Cullen AE, Bowers L, Khondoker M, Pettit S, Achilla E, Koeser L, et al. Factors associated with use of psychiatric intensive care and seclusion in adult inpatient mental health services. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. 2018;27(1):51-61.
5. Kallert TW, Glöckner M, Onchev G, Raboch J, Karastergiou A, Solomon Z, et al. The EUNOMIA project on coercion in psychiatry: study design and preliminary data. *World Psychiatry*. 2005;4(3):168-72.
6. Höfer FX, Habermeyer E, Mokros A, Lau S, Gairing SK. The impact of legal coercion on the therapeutic relationship in adult schizophrenia patients. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0124043.
7. Vruwink FJ, Mulder CL, Noorthoorn EO, Uitenbroek D, Nijman HL. The effects of a nationwide program to reduce seclusion in the Netherlands. *Bmc Psychiatry*. 2012;12:231.
8. Gudde CB, Olso TM, Whittington R, Vatne S. Service users' experiences and views of aggressive situations in mental health care: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2015;8:449-62.
9. Kontio R, Anttila M, Lantta T, Kauppi K, Joffe G, Valimaki M. Toward a safer working environment on psychiatric wards: service users' delayed perspectives of aggression and violence-related situations and development ideas. *Perspect Psychiatr Care*. 2014;50(4):271-9.
10. Kontio R, Joffe G, Putkonen H, Kuosmanen L, Hane K, Holi M, et al. Seclusion and restraint in psychiatry: patients' experiences and practical suggestions on how to improve practices and use alternatives. *Perspect Psychiatr Care*. 2012;48(1):16-24.
11. Jansen GJ, Dassen TW, Groot Jebbink G. Staff attitudes towards aggression in health care: a review of the literature. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2005;12(1):3-13.
12. Dickens G, Piccirillo M, Alderman N. Causes and management of aggression and violence in a forensic mental health service: perspectives of nurses and patients. *Int J Ment Health Nurs*. 2013;22(6):532-44.
13. Duxbury J. An evaluation of staff and patient views of and strategies employed to manage inpatient aggression and violence on one mental health unit: a pluralistic design. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2002;9(3):325-37.
14. Duxbury J, Whittington R. Causes and management of patient aggression and violence: staff and patient perspectives. *J Adv Nurs*. 2005;50(5):469-78.
15. Gillig PM, Markert R, Barron J, Coleman F. A comparison of staff and patient perceptions of the causes and cures of physical aggression on a psychiatric unit. *Psychiatr Q*. 1998;69(1):45-60.
16. Hallett N, Huber JW, Dickens GL. Violence prevention in inpatient psychiatric settings: Systematic review of studies about the perceptions of care staff and patients. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2014;19(5):502-14.
17. Pulsford D, Crumpton A, Baker A, Wilkins T, Wright K, Duxbury J. Aggression in a high secure hospital: staff and patient attitudes. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2013;20(4):296-304.
18. Lamanna D, Ninkovic D, Vijayaratnam V, Balderson K, Spivak H, Brook S, et al. Aggression in psychiatric hospitalizations: a qualitative study of patient and provider perspectives. *J Ment Health*. 2016;25(6):536-42.
19. Omérov M, Edman G, Wistedt B. Violence and threats of violence within psychiatric care--a comparison of staff and patient experience of the same incident. *Nord J Psychiatry*. 2004;58(5):363-9.
20. Ilkiw-Lavalle O, Grenyer BF. Differences between patient and staff perceptions of aggression in mental health units. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2003;54(3):389-93.

21. Corbin JM, Strauss A. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*. 1990;13(1):3-21.
22. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2007;19(6):349-57.
23. Morrison EF. Violent psychiatric inpatients in a public hospital. *Sch Inq Nurs Pract*. 1990;4(1):65-86.
24. Wet Bijzondere Opnemingen in Psychiatrische Ziekenhuizen, (1992).
25. Mavandadi V, Bieling PJ, Madsen V. Effective ingredients of verbal de-escalation: validating an English modified version of the "De-Escalating Aggressive Behaviour Scale". *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2016;23(6-7):357-68.
26. Taylor JL, Rew L. A systematic review of the literature: workplace violence in the emergency department. *J Clin Nurs*. 2011;20(7-8):1072-85.
27. Medical Research Involving Human Subject Act, (1998).
28. Spencer BWJ, Gergel T, Hotopf M, Owen GS. Unwell in hospital but not incapable: cross-sectional study on the dissociation of decision-making capacity for treatment and research in in-patients with schizophrenia and related psychoses. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2018;213(2):484-9.
29. Carpenter WT, Gold JM, Lahti AC, Queern CA, Conley RR, Bartko JJ, et al. Decisional capacity for informed consent in schizophrenia research. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2000;57(6):533-8.
30. Heath H, Cowley S. Developing a grounded theory approach: a comparison of Glaser and Strauss. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2004;41(2):141-50.
31. Meehan T, McIntosh W, Bergen H. Aggressive behaviour in the high-secure forensic setting: the perceptions of patients. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2006;13(1):19-25.
32. Chen LM. Self-reported frequency and perceived severity of being bullied among elementary school students. *Journal of School Health*. 2015;85(9):587-94.
33. Bierbooms JJPA, Lorenz-Artz CAG, Pols E, Bongers IMB. [High and intensive care three years later; an evaluation of the experiences of patients and employees and the effect on coercive measures in psychiatry]. *Tijdschr Psychiatr*. 2017;59(7):427-32.
34. Frueh BC, Knapp RG, Cusack KJ, Grubaugh AL, Sauvageot JA, Cousins VC, et al. Patients' reports of traumatic or harmful experiences within the psychiatric setting. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2005;56(9):1123-33.
35. Whittington R, Wykes T. Aversive stimulation by staff and violence by psychiatric patients. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1996;35:11-20.
36. Schjodt T, Middelboe T, Mortensen EL, Gjerris A. Ward atmosphere in acute psychiatric inpatient care: Differences and similarities between patient and staff perceptions. *Nord J Psychiatry*. 2003;57(3):215-20.
37. Bowers L, James K, Quirk A, Simpson A, Stewart D, Hodsoll J. Reducing conflict and containment rates on acute psychiatric wards: The Safewards cluster randomised controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2015;52(9):1412-22.
38. Lopez-Jaramillo C, Tobler CA, Gomez CO, Triana JE. Correlation between insight and capacity to consent to research in subjects with bipolar disorder type I and schizophrenia. *Rev Colomb Psiquiatr*. 2016;45(3):194-200.
39. Parmigiani G, Mandarelli G, Dacquino C, Pompili P, Lelli Chiesa G, Ferracuti S. Decisional capacity to consent to clinical research involving placebo in psychiatric patients. *J Forensic Sci*. 2016;61(2):388-93.
40. Pincus HA, Page AE, Druss B, Appelbaum PS, Gottlieb G, England MJ. Can psychiatry cross the quality chasm? Improving the quality of health care for mental and substance use conditions. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2007;164(5):712-9.
41. Bensley L, Nelson N, Kaufman J, Silverstein B, Shields JW. Patient and staff views of factors influencing assaults on psychiatric hospital employees. *Issues Ment Health Nurs*. 1995;16(5):433-46.
42. Bonner G, Lowe T, Rawcliffe D, Wellman N. Trauma for all: a pilot study of the subjective experience of physical restraint for mental health inpatients and staff in the UK. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2002;9(4):465-73.
43. Sijbrandij M, Olff M, Reitsma JB, Carlier IV, Gersons BP. Emotional or educational debriefing after psychological trauma. Randomised controlled trial. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2006;189:150-5.
44. Etchells E, Ho M, Shojania KG. Value of small sample sizes in rapid-cycle quality

- improvement projects. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2015;25(3):202-6.
45. Stewart D, Van der Merwe M, Bowers L, Simpson A, Jones J. A review of interventions to reduce mechanical restraint and seclusion among adult psychiatric inpatients. *Issues Ment Health Nurs.* 2010;31(6):413-24.
46. Jonikas JA, Cook JA, Rosen C, Laris A, Kim JB. A program to reduce use of physical restraint in psychiatric inpatient facilities. *Psychiatric Services.* 2004;55(7):818-20.