Workplace violence in the healthcare industry and the prevention policies

Posted on March 6, 2018

Workplace violence is a major occupational hazard in the healthcare industry because nurses, physicians, technicians, reception staff, emergency personnel, and support workers interact with people who may be frightened, injured, intoxicated, cognitively impaired, grieving, or angry about delays and treatment decisions. The original discussion correctly identified patients and visitors as frequent sources of violence and emphasized the role of law, regulation, facility design, communication systems, and organizational policy. These concerns remain central, but workplace violence should be understood broadly (Krug et al., 2002). It includes physical assault, threats, verbal abuse, harassment, intimidation, sexual misconduct, stalking, and violence between employees as well as incidents involving patients or family members. OSHA states that healthcare and social-service workers face a substantial risk of workplace violence and recommends comprehensive prevention programs adapted to the hazards of each facility (Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 2016, 2024). Prevention is therefore not limited to teaching an individual nurse how to defend against an attack. It requires management commitment, worker participation, worksite analysis, hazard control, training, reporting, recordkeeping, and continuous evaluation.

Why Healthcare Workers Face an Elevated Risk

The conditions of healthcare work create several overlapping risks (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 2002). Staff may work alone, during the night, in emergency departments, psychiatric units, home-care settings, pharmacies, or facilities located in high-crime areas. They may care for people with a known history of violence, delirium, dementia, traumatic brain injury, acute psychiatric symptoms, substance intoxication, withdrawal, severe pain, or overwhelming emotional distress. Relatives may become aggressive when they misunderstand a diagnosis, disagree with a decision, fear that a loved one is deteriorating, or believe that care has been delayed. Overcrowded waiting areas, long queues, inadequate staffing, unrestricted movement, poor lighting, unsecured entrances, and the absence of rapid communication systems can intensify these dangers. Firearms and other weapons introduce additional risk, particularly when screening and security procedures are inconsistent. None of these factors means that a diagnosis, disability, substance-use problem, or emotional crisis automatically makes a person violent. Risk assessment must be based on behavior, history, immediate circumstances, and environmental conditions rather than stigma.

Forms and Sources of Workplace Violence

Healthcare violence is often classified according to the relationship between the aggressor and the workplace (International Labour Organization et al., 2002). The most visible category involves a patient, client, resident, or visitor who assaults or threatens a worker during care. A second category involves criminal activity by a person with no legitimate relationship to the facility, such as robbery or unauthorized entry. A third includes violence between current or former employees, including bullying, intimidation, and physical aggression. A fourth involves a personal relationship that enters the workplace, such as domestic abuse affecting an employee at work. The original essay focused mainly on patients, gang members, people with a history of drug use, and relatives of clients. Those sources are important, but a complete prevention policy must also address lateral violence, supervisor misconduct, harassment, and domestic-violence spillover. An organization that treats verbal abuse or threats as an unavoidable part of nursing can create a climate in which serious incidents are underreported and hazards remain hidden.

Legal and Regulatory Responsibilities

Healthcare is heavily regulated because institutions have duties to patients and employees. In the United States, the Occupational Safety and Health Act requires employers to provide a workplace free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious physical harm. Although federal OSHA has historically relied on the General Duty Clause, enforcement guidance, and industry-specific recommendations rather than one nationwide workplace-violence standard for all healthcare employers, facilities still have an obligation to identify foreseeable hazards and implement feasible controls. State requirements may be more specific. Some jurisdictions require workplace-violence plans, incident logs, employee training, security assessments, or committees that include frontline staff. Employers must therefore review federal guidance, state law, accreditation requirements, labor agreements, and professional standards rather than assuming that a general statement against violence is enough. Policies should also protect employees from retaliation when they report threats, injuries, near misses, or unsafe conditions.

OSHA’s Prevention Framework

The original article correctly identified OSHA as a leading source of workplace-violence guidance. OSHA recommends a comprehensive program built around several connected elements. First, management must demonstrate commitment by establishing a clear policy, assigning responsibility, providing resources, and responding consistently to reports. Second, employees must participate because direct-care workers often understand hazards that are invisible to senior management. Third, the organization should analyze the worksite by reviewing incident records, interviewing staff, observing workflow, and identifying high-risk locations and tasks. Fourth, hazards should be

prevented or controlled through engineering measures, administrative procedures, staffing decisions, and safe work practices. Fifth, workers need training suited to their roles. Finally, the facility must keep records and evaluate whether the program actually reduces threats and injuries. A written policy has little value when staff do not know how to activate an alarm, security does not respond promptly, or repeated incidents produce no corrective action.

Management Commitment and Employee Involvement

Management commitment is visible through decisions rather than slogans. Leaders should communicate that physical assault, threats, sexual harassment, bullying, and intimidation are not accepted as routine occupational experiences. They should establish a multidisciplinary committee that includes nurses, physicians, aides, receptionists, security staff, risk managers, human-resources personnel, behavioral-health specialists, and union representatives where applicable. Frontline participation is essential because employees can identify blind corners, unsafe home-visit procedures, repeated conflicts in waiting rooms, poorly located alarm buttons, and times when staffing becomes dangerously thin. Workers should be able to report concerns without blame, including near misses in which no injury occurred. Management should investigate reports promptly, provide feedback, and explain the controls adopted. When leaders minimize incidents or praise employees for tolerating abuse, underreporting becomes rational. A prevention culture instead treats reporting as a source of safety information and recognizes that violence affects patient care, morale, retention, absenteeism, and psychological health.

Worksite Analysis and Risk Assessment

A risk assessment should examine the specific facility rather than rely only on general statistics. The process may include mapping incidents by unit, time, location, type of aggressor, precipitating event, staffing level, and injury severity. Security logs, workers' compensation records, police reports, employee surveys, and patient complaints can reveal patterns. Interviews should ask whether staff experience threats that are never formally recorded and why they choose not to report. High-risk tasks may include triage, delivering unwelcome news, restricting access, collecting payment, administering medication, applying restraints, transporting patients, working in isolated rooms, and conducting home visits. The organization should assess entrances, parking areas, lighting, escape routes, furniture placement, alarm systems, camera coverage, communication devices, and the physical separation between staff and aggressive individuals. Analysis must be repeated after renovations, staffing changes, service expansion, a serious incident, or evidence that existing controls are ineffective.

Engineering and Environmental Controls

Poorly designed facilities can increase the likelihood or severity of violence, as the original essay observed. Engineering controls attempt to remove or reduce hazards through the physical environment. Depending on the setting, these may include controlled access, secure reception areas, adequate lighting, clear lines of sight, panic buttons, personal alarms, two-way communication devices, video surveillance, metal detection where justified, shatter-resistant barriers, safe interview rooms, and furniture arranged so that workers have an accessible exit. Waiting areas should be comfortable enough to reduce frustration and designed to prevent overcrowding and unrestricted access to treatment zones. Emergency departments may require rooms that protect patients while avoiding objects that can be used as weapons. Home-health organizations may use check-in systems, paired visits, or procedures for withdrawing from a dangerous location. Engineering controls should not create a prison-like atmosphere or interfere unnecessarily with therapeutic relationships, but safety cannot depend entirely on an employee's ability to calm every situation.

Administrative Controls and Staffing Practices

Administrative controls organize work to reduce exposure. They include clear procedures for flagging known behavioral risks, communicating concerns during handover, limiting lone work, coordinating with security, managing visitors, responding to weapons, and obtaining rapid clinical support for agitation or delirium. Adequate staffing matters because long waits, rushed interactions, and isolated workers can increase risk. Organizations should establish escalation pathways that allow staff to summon help before a situation becomes an emergency. Behavioral response teams, de-escalation specialists, and trained security personnel may be valuable in larger facilities. Policies must also define when law enforcement should be involved and how to preserve evidence after an assault. A zero-tolerance statement should not mean automatic criminalization of every patient behavior, especially where cognition or medical condition affects conduct. It should mean that all incidents are taken seriously, workers receive support, hazards are reviewed, and responses are proportionate to the circumstances.

Training and De-escalation

Training should begin during orientation and continue regularly for existing staff, security officers, supervisors, and managers. Content may include recognizing escalating behavior, maintaining safe distance, using calm and respectful communication, setting limits, avoiding provocative language, locating exits, activating alarms, and working as a team. Staff should understand that de-escalation is not a guarantee and that withdrawal may be the safest response. Training must be realistic and role-specific; a receptionist, home-health nurse, emergency physician, and security officer face different situations. Physical restraint or defensive techniques should be taught only within legal, clinical, and

organizational standards and should never substitute for adequate staffing or hazard control. Employees also need instruction on documentation, reporting, evidence preservation, and post-incident procedures. Drills can reveal whether alarms work, responders know their responsibilities, and communication failures remain. The aim is confident, coordinated action without blaming the person who was targeted.

The Role of the American Nurses Association

The original article also emphasized the American Nurses Association. Nursing ethics require respect for patients while recognizing that nurses have a right and responsibility to protect their own safety and the safety of colleagues. ANA advocacy has supported prevention programs, education, reporting, and organizational accountability (American Nurses Association, 2015). Nurses should intervene when safe and appropriate, but intervention does not mean physically entering every violent encounter. A nurse may activate an emergency response, remove vulnerable people, communicate observed risks, or provide information to trained responders. Professional obligations also extend to bullying and lateral violence. Incivility should not be dismissed as personality conflict when it creates fear, disrupts communication, or threatens patient safety. Nurses can participate in committees, report hazards, support colleagues after incidents, and advocate for staffing and environmental changes. Ethical practice requires institutions to avoid placing the full burden of prevention on individuals who have limited control over the workplace.

Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Program Evaluation

Many healthcare incidents are not reported because workers believe nothing will change, fear blame, consider abuse part of the job, or find reporting systems burdensome. A strong program makes reporting simple and includes threats and near misses as well as injuries. Records should capture what occurred, where and when it occurred, who was involved, contributing conditions, the response, and corrective action. Data should be reviewed for patterns rather than stored only for compliance. Evaluation may compare incident rates, injury severity, lost workdays, response times, staff perceptions, training completion, and recurrence in particular locations. A decline in reports is not automatically evidence of improvement; it may reflect reduced trust. Leaders should therefore combine quantitative data with employee feedback. After a serious event, the organization should conduct a non-punitive review, identify root causes, and revise controls. Continual assessment is necessary because patient populations, facility layouts, staffing patterns, and community risks change over time.

Support After an Incident

Prevention policies must include support for affected workers. Physical injuries require prompt

assessment and treatment, while psychological effects may include fear, sleep disturbance, guilt, anger, anxiety, or reluctance to return to the same unit. Employees should receive clear information about medical care, workers' compensation, leave, counseling, reporting options, and legal procedures. Supervisors should avoid implying that a more skilled worker would have prevented the incident. Peer support and structured follow-up can reduce isolation, but participation should be voluntary and confidential. The team may also need a debrief focused separately on operational learning and emotional support. Returning an employee immediately to the same unsafe conditions without corrective action can deepen harm. Organizational care after violence demonstrates that worker safety is a genuine value and can improve future reporting.

Conclusion

Workplace violence in healthcare cannot be explained only by individual patient behavior. It develops through interactions among clinical conditions, emotional distress, visitor conduct, staffing, facility design, communication, security, organizational culture, and legal responsibilities. The original essay correctly highlighted overcrowding, dangerous neighborhoods, inadequate emergency communication, weapon access, and the roles of OSHA and ANA. A stronger prevention approach connects those observations within a comprehensive program. Healthcare organizations should establish leadership accountability, include frontline workers, assess specific hazards, improve the environment, maintain adequate procedures and staffing, train employees, record incidents, evaluate outcomes, and support people who are harmed. Violence should never be treated as an inevitable price of caring for others. Safe care depends on protecting patients and workers together.

References

American Nurses Association. (2015). *Incivility, bullying, and workplace violence*. ANA.

International Labour Organization, International Council of Nurses, World Health Organization, & Public Services International. (2002). *Framework guidelines for addressing workplace violence in the health sector*.

Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence and health. *The Lancet, 360*(9339), 1083–1088.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2002). *Violence: Occupational hazards in hospitals*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2016). *Guidelines for preventing workplace violence for healthcare and social service workers* (OSHA Publication 3148).

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2024). *Workplace violence fact sheet* (OSHA

FS-3509).