

1 **A System Dynamics Model for Effects of Workplace Violence and Clinician Burnout on Agitation**  
2 **Management in the Emergency Department**

3  
4  
5  
6 Ambrose H. Wong, MD, MEd, MHS<sup>1</sup>; Nasim S. Sabouchi, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Hannah R. Roncallo, RN, MSN<sup>3</sup>;  
7 Jessica M. Ray, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Rebekah Heckmann, MD, MPH, MPA<sup>1</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

10 <sup>2</sup> Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York, New York, NY,  
11 USA

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Emergency Services, Yale New-Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT, USA

13  
14  
15  
16 Corresponding Author:

17  
18 Ambrose H. Wong, MD, MEd, MHS  
19 Department of Emergency Medicine  
20 Yale School of Medicine  
21 464 Congress Ave Suite 260  
22 New Haven, CT USA 06519

## **A Qualitative System Dynamics Model for Effects of Workplace Violence and Clinician Burnout on Agitation Management in the Emergency Department**

### **ABSTRACT**

#### **Background**

Over 1.7 million episodes of agitation occur annually across the United States in emergency departments (EDs), some of which lead to workplace assaults on clinicians and require invasive methods like physical restraints to maintain staff and patient safety. Recent studies demonstrated that experiences of workplace violence lead to symptoms of burnout, which may impact future decisions regarding use of physical restraints on agitated patients. To capture the dynamic interactions between clinicians and agitated patients under their care, we applied qualitative system dynamics methods to develop a model that describes causal feedback mechanisms of clinician burnout and the use of physical restraints to manage agitation.

#### **Methods**

We convened an interprofessional panel of clinician stakeholders and agitation experts for a series of model building sessions to develop the current model. The panel derived the final version of our model over ten sessions of iterative refinement and modification, each lasting approximately three to four hours. We incorporated findings from prior studies on agitation and burnout as a result of workplace violence, identifying interpersonal and psychological factors likely to influence our outcomes of interest to form the basis of our model.

#### **Results**

The final model resulted in five main sets of feedback loops that describe key narratives regarding the relationship between clinician burnout and agitated patients becoming physically restrained: (1) use of restraints decreases agitation and risk of assault, leading to increased perceptions of safety and decreasing use of restraints in a balancing feedback loop which stabilizes the system; (2) clinician stress leads to a perception of decreased safety and lower threshold to restrain, causing more stress in a negatively reinforcing loop; (3) clinician burnout leads to a decreased perception of colleague support which leads to more burnout in a negatively reinforcing loop; (4) clinician burnout leads to negative perceptions of patient intent during agitation, thus lowering threshold to restrain and leading to higher task load, more likelihood of workplace assaults, and higher burnout in a negatively reinforcing loop; and (5) mutual trust between clinicians causes increased perceptions of safety and improved team control, leading to decreased clinician stress and further increased mutual trust in a positively reinforcing loop.

58

59 **Conclusions**

60 Our system dynamics approach led to the development of a robust qualitative model that illustrates a number  
61 of important feedback cycles that underly the relationships between clinician experiences of workplace  
62 violence, stress and burnout, and impact on decisions to physically restrain agitated patients. This work  
63 identifies potential opportunities at multiple targets to break negatively reinforcing cycles and support  
64 positive influences on safety for both clinicians and patients in the face of physical danger.

65

66

67 **BACKGROUND**

68

69 Behavioral health conditions increasingly present to the emergency department (ED). In the United States,  
70 there has been an estimated 53% increase in number of mental health-related ED visits over the past decade,  
71 while overall visits only rose by 8.6%.<sup>1</sup> Agitation, defined as excessive psychomotor activity leading to  
72 aggressive and violent behavior,<sup>2</sup> is often part of these patient encounters, with 1.7 million episodes treated  
73 annually in EDs<sup>3</sup> nationwide. Once agitation has occurred, clinicians are required to rapidly diagnose  
74 potential causes and intervene to minimize harm. However, treatment of these agitation episodes poses  
75 significant threats to safety for both patients themselves and ED clinicians caring for them. As such, physical  
76 restraints may be indicated and necessary if imminent danger for patients and staff are present. Although  
77 physical restraints are commonly used in the ED, physical trauma, significant respiratory depression, and  
78 asphyxiation leading to cardiac arrest can develop from restraint use.<sup>4-6</sup> Concurrently, healthcare workers are  
79 increasingly at risk for workplace violence (WPV) while caring for agitated patients, with the ED identified  
80 as one of the highest risk environments.<sup>7</sup> In a survey-based study, 78% of emergency physicians reported  
81 being targets of verbal and physical assaults at the workplace in the previous 12 months<sup>8</sup> while >80% of  
82 Emergency Nurses Association members reported being victims of physical and verbal abuse while on shift.<sup>9</sup>  
83 Studies have demonstrated missed workdays as high as 135 episodes per 10,000 workers each year from ED  
84 WPV incidents.<sup>10</sup>

85

86 Expert consensus panels have created separate recommendations regarding minimizing use of restraints  
87 during management of agitation<sup>3</sup> and prevention of WPV.<sup>11</sup> However, translation of these recommendations  
88 into pragmatic interventions that improve safety in an evidence-based manner has been limited by challenges  
89 at the bedside.<sup>7</sup> Multiple factors during the interaction between clinicians and patients influence development  
90 of agitation and workplace violence events. Hence, implementing individual solutions (e.g. improving de-  
91 escalation techniques, increasing event reporting) in isolation may be impeded by time, resource, and  
92 logistical constraints in the busy and unpredictable environment of emergency care.<sup>12,13</sup> In addition, our  
93 previous work has demonstrated that agitation management and WPV are complex, interlinked issues that  
94 require a comprehensive and systematic approach to help policymakers develop strategies that lead to  
95 meaningful change at the bedside.<sup>14</sup> Most importantly, we found that WPV and agitation management need  
96 to be considered together as one and the same issue to balance patient safety with prevention of staff assaults  
97 for any potential interventions to be effective.<sup>15</sup>

98

99 Recent studies demonstrated strong associations between ED clinicians' experiences of WPV and symptoms  
100 of burnout.<sup>16,17</sup> ED clinicians are particularly affected due to increased treatment of mental health conditions  
101 in emergency care and growing systems-level challenges, such as overcrowding and boarding of admitted  
102 patients.<sup>18,19</sup> As a result, increasing reports of burnout are appearing in the literature, ranging from 60 to 71%  
103 of respondents in survey-based studies with emergency physicians.<sup>20,21</sup> Given that clinicians have reported  
104 both suboptimal patient care due to burnout<sup>22</sup> and feelings of frustration and negative attitudes towards  
105 agitated patients,<sup>23,24</sup> potential relationships between clinician burnout and agitation management deserve  
106 further investigation.

107  
108 In this work, we applied qualitative system dynamics (SD) methods to develop a model that captures the  
109 dynamic interactions between ED clinicians and agitated patients, specifically focusing on how workplace  
110 violence affects decisions to use physical restraints during agitation care as mediated through symptoms of  
111 clinician burnout. SD modeling has been extensively used for healthcare and public health applications to  
112 study the dynamic behavior of healthcare issues in a complex system and provide a framework to develop  
113 insights into policies and potential interventions.<sup>25</sup> It is a rigorous methodology that studies the dynamic  
114 behavior of a complex system by identifying its causal structure and feedback loops.<sup>26</sup> It can be used to  
115 tackle the complexity of healthcare issues and test different policies to make better decisions for the future.<sup>27</sup>  
116 SD models can integrate the key social, behavioral, and biological factors of interest into a single testable  
117 framework. They are therefore broad in scope and often include time delays, non-linearities, and behavioral  
118 feedback loops not included in typical statistical models.<sup>28</sup> We hypothesize that SD modeling techniques can  
119 assimilate the growing body of knowledge regarding workplace assaults, clinician burnout, and use of  
120 physical restraints to determine potential strategies to optimize outcomes during agitation and workplace  
121 violence events in the ED.

## 122 123 **METHODS**

### 124 125 **Study Design**

126  
127 In developing our qualitative SD model, we started by defining the scope and context of the problem to be  
128 studied and the goals of the modeling project. Our key initial planning discussions focused on balancing  
129 robust representation of the true complexities of agitation management with pragmatic development of an  
130 initial model that contains some acceptable limitations as a foundation for future work. Since our primary  
131 goal was to examine interactions between ED clinicians and patients during episodes of agitation, we

132 bounded the clinical domain of our model by the context of an ED visit once a patient enters the physical  
133 space of an ED. We also selected the physician and nursing professions to represent the clinicians in this first  
134 iteration of our model since they often exert the strongest influence on key decisions around use of restraints.  
135

136 To identify the overall goals of our SD modeling process, we next sought to define our problem in the form  
137 of a reference mode, indicated by a time-series graph that represents an abstraction of the most important  
138 variables that change over time in our model. We chose two key variables as primary outcomes of equal  
139 value, with rates of physical restraint representing patient safety and rates of clinician burnout representing  
140 staff safety. Although the literature has not clearly established temporal trends regarding rates of restraint use  
141 or clinician burnout in the ED, recent studies have demonstrated increasing numbers of ED visits for  
142 behavioral and mental health-related conditions over the past decade.<sup>1,29,30</sup> Thus, we postulated that the  
143 number of agitation events is likely rising as well, leading to increasing rates of both restraint use and ED  
144 clinician burnout due to episodes of workplace violence. The corresponding graph for our reference modes is  
145 presented in **Figure 1**. Our feared trend within the reference mode would demonstrate increasing rates of  
146 restraint use and clinical burnout over time, while our hope is that potential interventions would flatten or  
147 even decrease rates of our outcomes over time.  
148

149 In the next step, we created the qualitative causal loop diagram<sup>31</sup> for our model, depicting the networks of  
150 causal factors and feedback loops relevant to the problem at hand. The resulting diagram of our model aims  
151 to summarize the mechanisms and alternative ideas for explaining the dynamics of interest within the context  
152 of the reference mode for the rates of restraint use and clinician burnout. This diagrammatic model serves as  
153 the first step of our overall SD modeling process and creates the foundation for mathematical simulations in  
154 future work.  
155

156 Our model includes variable names and arrows with positive (+) and negative (–) signs consistent with  
157 standard SD practices. The arrows refer to our hypothesized causal relationships between individual  
158 variables over time. Positive signs indicate that two variables change in the same direction. Negative signs  
159 indicate that two variables change in opposite directions. A closed sequence of arrows (i.e., complete circles)  
160 form two kinds of feedback loops. The first type of feedback loops are *balancing loops* that serve to stabilize  
161 the system, bringing variables into steady states. A balancing loop has an odd number of negative links. The  
162 second type of feedback loops, *reinforcing loops*, can lead to exponential growth and build-ups in the  
163 system. A reinforcing loop has an even number of negative links in the model. These cycles can be positively  
164 reinforcing, or it can be negatively reinforcing, where a problem worsens over time, often at an increasing

165 rate of speed.<sup>32</sup>

## 168 **Model Derivation and Data Analysis**

169  
170 To create a robust SD model for the management of agitation and clinician burnout, our team implemented a  
171 series of iterative modeling sessions with our interprofessional team of clinical stakeholders (nurses,  
172 physicians, hospital administrators) and researchers in agitation and workplace violence. Each structured  
173 session consisted of variable elicitation, derivation of behavior-over-time graphs, and illustration of variable  
174 connections via closed-loop diagrams. We incorporated two datasets from our previously published findings  
175 on systems approaches to agitation and workplace violence<sup>14,15,33</sup> as well as current literature regarding  
176 burnout as a result of workplace violence,<sup>9,17,34,35</sup> identifying interpersonal and psychological factors like  
177 mutual trust, perceptions of safety, and perceptions of team leadership that are likely to influence our  
178 outcomes of interest in measurable ways. We analyzed and interpreted data using principles of grounded  
179 theory in qualitative research.<sup>36,37</sup> Three members of the research team (AHW, JMR, RH) started with a  
180 systematic, inductive approach to data analysis through an initial round of open coding to generate concepts  
181 “grounded” in participant views collected via field notes and still photographs of cognitive artifacts such as  
182 care timelines and diagrams. We then achieved consensus on major themes, model factors, and relationships  
183 through an iterative analytic process as more information was added after each modeling session using the  
184 constant comparative method.<sup>38</sup> We collectively derived the final version of our model over ten sessions of  
185 iterative refinement and modification, each lasting approximately three to four hours. Our work received  
186 approval from our institutional review board as an exempt study.

## 188 **RESULTS**

189  
190 Our final SD model describes factors and relationships related to patient agitation, clinician burnout, and use  
191 of restraints that are known to contribute to the quality of patient care in the ED but that are infrequently  
192 mapped or explicitly described together. This model illustrates both the physical flow of patients through the  
193 ED and the actions of clinicians within the ED, in addition to demonstrating how factors influence outcomes  
194 for both groups. A simplified, high-level representation of the system is shown in **Figure 2** with four key  
195 sections of the model visually depicted with distinguishing colors. Subsequent **Figures 3 and 4** highlight a  
196 number of feedback loops that illustrate five key model narratives that describe groups of interdependent  
197 factors contributing to patient restraint and clinician burnout. We first discuss the overall model structure and

198 its four key sections (A-D) and then focus on the five feedback loops as the main model narratives (1-5) in  
199 detail below. The model is depicted in a simplified version in Figures 2-4 so that relevant feedback loops and  
200 key insights can be more easily understood and described within this work. Please refer to the appendix for  
201 detailed versions of the full model that captures more detailed relationships and represents the synthesis of  
202 results from the modeling sessions.

## 204 **Model System and Structure (Figure 2)**

206 **Section A** consists of the portion of the model addressing the movement of agitated patients through the ED  
207 and the corresponding effects on clinician task load. It illustrates how patients in an agitated state may  
208 become restrained. Importantly, both agitated patients and restraining patients add to clinician task load in  
209 different ways and at different time points of an encounter (e.g., bedside reassessment of patient condition  
210 and level of agitation). **Section B** depicts clinicians who may have varying experiences of being assaulted  
211 and/or be in varying stages of burnout. For simplification purposes, this cohort of clinicians is depicted as  
212 one group within the model. An increased number of either agitated patients or patients that are restrained  
213 may lead to increased likelihood of burnout or assault. We recognize that there may be a complex array of  
214 varying experiences and clinician profiles within that cohort (please refer to appendix for a more detailed  
215 depiction of this section of the model). We also recognize that clinicians may experience burnout for other  
216 reasons other than their interface with agitation events which will not be directly addressed within this  
217 model.

219 In **Section C**, the acute stress level of clinicians will contribute to a change in how each clinician views the  
220 safety of the current clinical encounter relative to the agitated patient. Similar perceptions of clinical safety  
221 between physicians and nurses will lead to increased mutual trust, while discrepancies in clinical perception  
222 of safety will lead to decreased mutual trust during and after a shift in the ED. **Section D** illustrates how each  
223 team will have varying perceptions regarding the physician's control as the team leader. While different team  
224 structures are present at different hospitals and the concept of an ideal team structure may be a matter of  
225 debate, the physician with the most clinical experience is frequently in the role of team leader who is  
226 responsible for making final decisions regarding critically ill and agitated patients in many EDs throughout  
227 the country.<sup>39,40</sup> In the model, the team's overall perception that the physician is in control is shown to  
228 influence the acute stress level of clinicians and perceptions of feeling supported by colleagues.

## 230 **Model Narratives**



231

232 One of the primary goals of model building was to identify balancing loops that stabilize the current system  
233 and contribute to the maintenance of clinical status quo, as well as reinforcing loops that magnify (positive or  
234 negative) effects on the system. The process of model building allowed us to identify five clinical narratives  
235 that illustrate how the presence of a given group of factors can lead to cycles of influence on each other in  
236 the form of one balancing loop and four reinforcing loops (**Figure 3**). We highlight these five main model  
237 narratives that describe our particular feedback loops of interest below. **Figure 4** displays pertinent factors  
238 and relationships for each narrative within individual subpanels (4a-4e) and sequentially adds more factors  
239 and relationships relevant to each subsequent narrative, building out the entire model in the fifth and final  
240 subpanel.

241

242 *Narrative 1—Use of Restraints, Assaults, and Safety (Balancing Loop: **Figure 4a**)*

243

244 This first narrative describes a balancing loop that serves to stabilize the system and likely reflects the  
245 instinctive and immediate reactions clinicians may have to protect themselves when faced with immediate  
246 threats to personal safety during agitation events. Loop B1 describes how a prior experience of assault is  
247 likely to increase a clinician's perception that a given clinical agitation situation is unsafe, which, in turn, is  
248 likely to positively influence that clinician's decision to place restraints during the clinical encounter. This  
249 increased likelihood to restrain then positively impacts the likelihood that an agitated patient becomes  
250 restrained, acutely decreasing the number of agitated patients as described in Section A of Figure 2. This, in  
251 turn, decreases the likelihood of clinician assault and burnout. Although this balancing loop through use of  
252 restraints to decrease assaults and increase perceptions of safety reflects a protective mechanism within the  
253 system to maintain restraint use and clinician burnout at steady states, the following narratives highlight  
254 negatively reinforcing loops that counteract the effects of this balancing loop to cause harm and explain why  
255 this balancing loop may not be sufficient.

256

257 *Narrative 2—Clinician Stress, Safety, and Use of Restraints (Negatively Reinforcing Loop: **Figure 4b**)*

258

259 In our model, clinicians develop increased acute stress as their task loads increase. These increased task  
260 loads decrease the perception of safety in the clinical environment. In turn, decreases in perception of safety  
261 lower the thresholds regarding decisions made by clinicians to restrain agitated patients, which then increase  
262 task load and acute stress. The notation R1 refers to the reinforcing loop that describe the relationship

263 between clinician stress, perceptions of clinical safety, and use of restraints. Thus, increased clinician stress  
264 level leads to a perception of decreased safety and a lower threshold to restrain, causing more stress.

265  
266 *Narrative 3—Clinician Burnout and Support (Negatively Reinforcing Loop: **Figure 4c**)*

267  
268 The narrative embodied by the R2 reinforcing loop illustrate how both professions can become caught in  
269 negatively reinforcing cycles of burnout and decreased perception of colleague support. An increased  
270 number of clinicians who are assaulted and burnt out will contribute to a decreased perception of feeling  
271 supported by colleagues, which, in turn, will lead to an increased rate of burnout. Thus, clinician burnout  
272 leads to a decreased perception of colleague support which leads to more burnout.

273  
274 *Narrative 4—Burnout & Perception of Patient Intent (Negatively Reinforcing Loop: **Figure 4d**)*

275  
276 The narrative illustrated by the R3 reinforcing loop links clinician burnout to perceptions of patient intent. If  
277 clinicians have increased perceptions that agitated patients are “in control” of their aggressive behavior,  
278 referring to a perceived notion that the patient is displaying symptoms of agitation on purpose (e.g., to  
279 promote self-gain or malignant intent),<sup>41</sup> perceptions that they are problematic could also rise as a result. The  
280 labeling of a patient as “problematic,” defined as an attribute of causing trouble projected onto a patient by a  
281 clinician, lowers a clinician’s threshold for decision to restrain, which, in turn, leads to an increased number  
282 of restrained patients. An increased number of restrained patients leads to increased clinician task load (e.g.,  
283 during placement of restraints and subsequent reassessment and monitoring), which in turn contributes to an  
284 increased likelihood that nurses or physicians will be assaulted.<sup>33</sup> As described in Section B of the model,  
285 clinicians can progress through different states of assault and burnout. An increased likelihood of assault  
286 ultimately leads to an increased number of clinicians who have been assaulted and who are burnt out.  
287 Finally, an increased number of clinicians with a history of assault and burnout will contribute positively to  
288 the perception that patients are in control of their agitated behavior.<sup>23</sup> Thus, clinician burnout leads to  
289 negative perceptions of patient intent during agitation, lowering the threshold to restrain and leading to  
290 higher task load, more likelihood of workplace assaults, and higher burnout.

291  
292 *Narrative 5—Development of Trust and Control (Positively Reinforcing Loops: **Figure 4e**)*

293  
294 The narrative described by R4 refers to the positively reinforcing loop that illustrates the relationship  
295 between the different perceptions that nurses and physicians may have about clinical safety and the process

296 of building trust. As the quantity of mutual trust builds between nurses and physicians, these clinicians are  
297 likely to have smaller differences in their perceptions of safety within a given clinical environment. A  
298 smaller discrepancy in perceptions of safety allows for the development of an increased amount of mutual  
299 trust, leading to a cycle of trust building. In addition, the narrative depicted by R5 illustrates that, in clinical  
300 environments where mutual trust between nurses and physicians increases, the team's overall perception that  
301 the physician is effectively in control of the team rises as a result. This perception decreases the acute stress  
302 level of physicians and contributes to changes in physician perceptions about the safety of the clinical  
303 environment. As a result, the differences of safety perceptions between nurses and physicians decreases and  
304 feeds into mutual trust building as described by the R4 narrative. Thus, mutual trust between clinicians  
305 causes decreased discrepancy in perceptions of safety and increased perceived control of the team, leading to  
306 decreased clinician stress levels and further increased mutual trust.

## 307 308 **DISCUSSION**

309  
310 We developed a qualitative system dynamics model describing the complex interactions of ED workplace  
311 violence, clinician stress and burnout, mutual trust, and team orientation on physical restraint use in the  
312 management of patient agitation. Our model demonstrated the influence of individual clinician perceptions  
313 of work and safety, as well as team dynamics on decisions to restrain agitated patients. Recent surveys  
314 indicate that ED clinicians experience high rates of workplace violence and burnout.<sup>8,42</sup> Direct threat of  
315 violence to staff can lead to heightened arousal and decreased productivity including changes in cognition  
316 and workload management.<sup>43</sup> This work led to a dynamic framework for understanding and describing the  
317 conscious and unintended influences that prior experiences with workplace violence, burnout, team support,  
318 and mutual trust can have on management decisions during agitation.

319  
320 While the decision to restrain an agitated patient occurs quickly, the factors influencing that decision may  
321 have developed over the course of a clinician's shift, work week, year, or lifelong career. SD modeling  
322 allowed us to explore the change in clinicians' management decisions over time as a factor of both near-term  
323 and long-term system changes. By uncovering key balancing and reinforcing loops within our model, we  
324 were able to identify points of interest for potential intervention that may otherwise have been hidden or  
325 buried within the complex interconnected factors of the system. One set of balancing loops reflect the  
326 instinctive reaction to restraint use that acts to stabilize the system and increase perceptions of safety. Three  
327 sets of negatively reinforcing loops act to accelerate restraint use and clinician burnout from unintended  
328 negatively reinforcing cycles present in the system. Meanwhile, a set of positively reinforcing loops mitigate

329 harm through cycles of mutual trust and control. These narratives are emergent relationships within the  
330 complex system produced from individual system components and their interactive relationships. As such,  
331 this initial model and these narratives act as hypothesis generation for future testing.

332  
333 The emergence of the first two narratives highlight the fact that use of restraints may simultaneously cause  
334 both protective and harmful consequences for clinicians. Narrative 1 describes the balancing loop that  
335 provides the immediate sense of safety at the bedside, where use of restraints acutely decreases the number  
336 of agitated patients, which decreases likelihood of being assaulted, increasing perceptions of safety, and thus  
337 then decreasing subsequent use of restraint to stabilize the system. This narrative likely occurs quickly over  
338 minutes to hours within a shift during agitation encounters. At the same time, however, narrative 2 describes  
339 the process that drives a negatively reinforcing cycle of increasing task load and stress due to use of  
340 restraints that contributes to a perception of being unsafe over a more gradual period of time. Narrative 2's  
341 influence of restraint use on a clinician's task load may be more subtle and less immediate, as the urgent need  
342 to control symptoms during an agitation event may outweigh or overshadow the added work and stress  
343 involved with the placement of restraints and subsequent tasks associated with a restrained patient (e.g.,  
344 clinical reassessment, documentation). However, this negatively reinforcing loop can gradually add strain to  
345 clinicians operating within the system that ultimately manifests as burnout over the course of months or  
346 years of exposure to placing restraints on patients. We found references to this tension between these two  
347 narratives from our previous qualitative data from staff members who describe a "patient care paradox"<sup>23</sup> that  
348 creates a sense of moral injury and resulting stress when clinicians attempt to balance their own personal  
349 safety (narrative 1) and the desire to respect the safety and autonomy of patients (narrative 2).

350  
351 Similarly, the negatively reinforcing loop of decreased support by colleagues and burnout in narrative 3  
352 likely occurs over multiple episodes of agitation encounters amongst clinicians and develops gradually over  
353 time. Our prior work supports this narrative, as ED staff described lack of psychological safety and disparate  
354 goals regarding management decisions as key drivers for frustration and tension during agitation  
355 encounters.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, the positively reinforcing loop in narrative 5 appears to counteract these  
356 challenges through synergistic build-up of mutual trust, aligned perceptions of a physician's control of the  
357 team, decreased physician stress, and resulting aligned perception of safety between nurses and physicians.  
358 Experts have called for better methods to support team-based care as means to reduce clinician burnout,<sup>44</sup>  
359 and interprofessional care models show promise as potential methods to prevent long-term adverse effects on  
360 frontline clinicians at the highest risk of burnout and emotional exhaustion.<sup>44</sup>

362 Narrative 4 describes the negatively reinforcing loops of burnout and negative perceptions of patient intent  
363 that influence decisions on physical restraint use. Agitated patients often have substance use disorders,  
364 serious mental illnesses, and disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, representing the most marginalized  
365 populations presenting to the ED.<sup>45-47</sup> Unfortunately, these patients can be challenging to properly diagnose  
366 and treat due to difficulties in obtaining accurate histories and physical exams and establishing therapeutic  
367 rapport during decompensation of their underlying conditions. In addition, implicit bias and stigma against  
368 mental illness and substance use can further impede objective and patient-centered management  
369 decisions,<sup>24,48,49</sup> and these clinician sentiments may heighten in the face of learned helplessness and  
370 emotional exhaustion from repeated exposure to workplace violence.<sup>50</sup> Recent studies have shown that  
371 patients are able to perceive differences in bedside manner due to clinician burnout,<sup>51</sup> and more work is  
372 needed to support the empathy and emotional bond necessary for de-escalation and behavioral techniques to  
373 be successful during agitation encounters.<sup>52</sup>

## 375 **LIMITATIONS**

377 This study has some limitations that may affect generalizability. First, we included only the nursing and  
378 physician professions in the model. We acknowledge that many other professions experience burnout and  
379 play critical roles in the management of agitation, with key roles performed by patient care technicians and  
380 security officers during placement of physical restraints. In addition, we limited care provision in this model  
381 to within the ED only, excluding prehospital factors and transitions of care into the ED. Given the  
382 complexity that exists in the relationships between agitation and healthcare workplace violence, we chose to  
383 methodically start our process with contexts and professional roles that may exert the strongest influence in  
384 the model and be most proximal to decisions around use of restraints. Future work will include expansion of  
385 the model to encompass a broader system of factors that contribute to agitation management and may be  
386 amenable to interventions related to burnout and safety.

388 Some of the factors included in the model may lack consistent definitions in the literature or lack  
389 standardized measurement instruments (e.g., perception that the patient is problematic). Although these  
390 limitations may add barriers to incorporating currently available quantitative data in the model, future studies  
391 can elucidate new methods or tools to define and standardize these important factors identified in our work.  
392 We truncated some flows and simplified relationships between factors in the diagrams depicting our model  
393 for ease of visual interpretation and improved focus on the most pertinent aspects of relationships in the  
394 model. In addition, different sets of factors and flows may represent different time scales. For example, a

395 clinical agitation encounter may occur over seconds to minutes, while mutual trust and burnout may change  
396 more gradually over months to years. To account for these considerations, we established significantly more  
397 detailed relationships, granular flows, and temporal factors for the analytic version of the model included in  
398 the Appendix to accurately incorporate quantitative data in future mathematical simulation studies. Finally,  
399 we incorporated expertise and previous data from two institutions only. We hope that our model offers a  
400 starting point to describe agitation and clinician burnout that incorporates a wider range of geopolitical and  
401 institutional experiences.

## 403 **CONCLUSIONS**

404  
405 Improving the management of agitated patients requires a balanced approach to clinician and patient safety.<sup>15</sup>  
406 Using qualitative systems dynamics methods, we developed a new model illustrating the complex  
407 relationships between clinician experiences of assault, stress and burnout, and team interactions including  
408 mutual trust and how they impact decisions to restrain agitated patients. Consensus recommendations  
409 suggest minimizing the use of restraints in agitated patients.<sup>3</sup> Yet, our model illustrates the importance of  
410 addressing clinician and system factors including workplace assault, burnout, stress, and team-based factors  
411 such as mutual support which each influence individual decisions to restrain an agitated patient. Our initial  
412 model serves as a first step in our SD modeling process. In future work, we will incorporate existing data, as  
413 well as prospective data collection, into a formal mathematical simulation of physical restraint use and  
414 clinical burnout over time in the system. We hope that our novel insights into the five clinical narratives  
415 identified in this current work will further support testing of potential interventions addressing both clinician  
416 burnout and reduction of restraint use.

## 418 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

419  
420 ED – emergency department

421 SD – system dynamics

422 WPV – workplace violence

423 **DECLARATIONS**

424

425 Ethics approval and consent to participate

426

427 The study received ethical approval from the Yale University human investigation committee as an exempt  
428 study (HIC# 2000028272, May 26, 2020). All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant  
429 guidelines and regulations.

430

431 Consent for publication

432

433 Not applicable.

434

435 Availability of data and materials

436

437 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on  
438 reasonable request.

439

440 Competing interests

441

442 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

443

444 Funding

445

446 Ambrose H Wong is supported by the Robert E. Leet and Clara Guthrie Patterson Trust Mentored Research  
447 Award and the KL2 TR001862 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Science (NCATS),  
448 components of the National Institutes of Health and the National Institutes of Health Roadmap for Medical  
449 Research. The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis,  
450 and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the  
451 manuscript for publication.

452

453 Author contributions

454

455 AHW, NSS, JMR, and RH conceived and designed the study; performed data extraction and synthesis;  
456 analyzed and interpreted the data. HRR performed external review and auditing of data collection and  
457 analysis. All authors drafted and contributed to critical revisions of the article. AHW takes responsibility for  
458 the paper as a whole.

459

460 Acknowledgements

461

462 We would like to acknowledge Dr. Joseph Ross (Yale School of Medicine) for his contributions to the  
463 framing of this manuscript.

464

465


466

467

468

469






470  
471

472 **Figure 1** – Reference Modes for our System Dynamics Model of Agitation Management. Key variables  
473 consist of rates of physical restraint use and rates of burnout. Feared trends indicate rising rates for both  
474 variables, while hope represents flattening or decreasing rates due to implementation of effective  
475 interventions over time.

476




477

478

479 **Figure 2** – Qualitative System Dynamics Model for Agitation Management, Clinician Burnout, and  
 480 Decisions for Physical Restraint Use. Sub-sections include A) Agitated Patients and Effects on Task Load;  
 481 B) Clinicians Affected by Burnout and Assaults; C) Perceptions of Safety, Patients, and Development of  
 482 Trust Between Members of the Team; and D) Perceptions of Control and Team Support.

483



484

485

486 **Figure 3** – Highlighted Balancing and Reinforcing Loops.

487 B1: Balancing Loop Involving Use of Restraints, Assaults, and Perceptions of Safety.

488 R1: Negatively Reinforcing Loop Involving Clinician Stress, Safety, and Use of Restraints.

489 R2: Negatively Reinforcing Loop Involving Clinician Burnout and Support.

490 R3: Negatively Reinforcing Loop Involving Burnout & Perception of Patient Intent.


491 R4: Positively Reinforcing Loop for Mutual Trust.

492 R5: Positively Reinforcing Loop for Physician Control and Trust.


493

494 **Figure 4 – Individual Narratives (4a-4e).**

495  
496




4a. Narrative 1— Balancing Loop B1 for Use of Restraints, Assaults, and Perceptions of Safety




4b. Narrative 2—Negatively Reinforcing Loop R1 for Clinician Stress, Safety, and Use of Restraints

498  
499




4c. Narrative 3— Negatively Reinforcing Loop R2 for Clinician Burnout and Support



4d. Narrative 4— Negatively Reinforcing Loop R3 for Burnout & Perception of Patient Intent

500  
501  
502

SD model for burnout and agitation management in the ED



4e. Narrative 5—Positively Reinforcing Loop R4 for Mutual Trust and R5 for Physician Control and Trust

## REFERENCES


1. Capp R, Hardy R, Lindrooth R, Wiler J. National Trends in Emergency Department Visits by Adults With Mental Health Disorders. *J Emerg Med* 2016;51:131-5 e1.
2. Nordstrom K, Zun LS, Wilson MP, et al. Medical evaluation and triage of the agitated patient: consensus statement of the american association for emergency psychiatry project Beta medical evaluation workgroup. *West J Emerg Med* 2012;13:3-10.
3. Holloman GH, Jr., Zeller SL. Overview of Project BETA: Best practices in Evaluation and Treatment of Agitation. *West J Emerg Med* 2012;13:1-2.
4. Mohr WK, Petti TA, Mohr BD. Adverse effects associated with physical restraint. *Can J Psychiatry* 2003;48:330-7.
5. Zun LS. A prospective study of the complication rate of use of patient restraint in the emergency department. *J Emerg Med* 2003;24:119-24.
6. Karger B, Fracasso T, Pfeiffer H. Fatalities related to medical restraint devices-asphyxia is a common finding. *Forensic Sci Int* 2008;178:178-84.
7. Phillips JP. Workplace violence against health care workers in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374:1661-9.
8. Kowalenko T, Gates D, Gillespie GL, Succop P, Mentzel TK. Prospective study of violence against ED workers. *Am J Emerg Med* 2013;31:197-205.
9. Taylor JL, Rew L. A systematic review of the literature: workplace violence in the emergency department. *J Clin Nurs* 2011;20:1072-85.
10. Taylor JL, Rew L. A systematic review of the literature: workplace violence in the emergency department. *J Clin Nurs* 2011;20:1072-85.
11. Kowalenko T, Cunningham R, Sachs CJ, et al. Workplace violence in emergency medicine: current knowledge and future directions. *J Emerg Med* 2012;43:523-31.
12. Pati D, Pati S, Harvey TE, Jr. Security Implications of Physical Design Attributes in the Emergency Department. *HERD* 2016;9:50-63.
13. Wong AH, Crispino L, Parker JB, et al. Characteristics and Severity of Agitation Associated With Use of Sedatives and Restraints in the Emergency Department. *J Emerg Med* 2019;57:611-9.
14. Wong AH, Ruppel H, Crispino LJ, Rosenberg A, Iennaco JD, Vaca FE. Deriving a Framework for a Systems Approach to Agitated Patient Care in the Emergency Department. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2018;44:279-92.

15. Wong AH, Ray JM, Iennaco JD. Workplace Violence in Health Care and Agitation Management: Safety for Patients and Health Care Professionals Are Two Sides of the Same Coin. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2019;45:71-3.
16. Laeeque SH, Bilal A, Babar S, Khan Z, Ul Rahman S. How Patient-Perpetrated Workplace Violence Leads to Turnover Intention Among Nurses: The Mediating Mechanism of Occupational Stress and Burnout. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 2017;27:96-118.
17. Vrablik MC, Chipman AK, Rosenman ED, et al. Identification of processes that mediate the impact of workplace violence on emergency department healthcare workers in the USA: results from a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2019;9.
18. Nordstrom K, Berlin JS, Nash SS, Shah SB, Schmelzer NA, Worley LLM. Boarding of Mentally Ill Patients in Emergency Departments: American Psychiatric Association Resource Document. *West J Emerg Med* 2019;20:690-5.
19. Widmer MA, Swanson RC, Zink BJ, Pines JM. Complex systems thinking in emergency medicine: A novel paradigm for a rapidly changing and interconnected health care landscape. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2018;24:629-34.
20. Arora M, Asha S, Chinnappa J, Diwan AD. Review article: Burnout in emergency medicine physicians. *Emerg Med Australas* 2013;25:491-5.
21. Lin M, Battaglioli N, Melamed M, Mott SE, Chung AS, Robinson DW. High Prevalence of Burnout Among US Emergency Medicine Residents: Results From the 2017 National Emergency Medicine Wellness Survey. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019;74:682-90.
22. Shanafelt TD, Bradley KA, Wipf JE, Back AL. Burnout and self-reported patient care in an internal medicine residency program. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;136:358-67.
23. Wong AH, Combellick J, Wispelwey BA, Squires A, Gang M. The Patient Care Paradox: An Interprofessional Qualitative Study of Agitated Patient Care in the Emergency Department. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017;24:226-35.
24. Scott JY. Mitigating Nursing Biases in Management of Intoxicated and Suicidal Patients. *J Emerg Nurs* 2016;42:3.
25. Ip EH, Rahmandad H, Shoham DA, et al. Reconciling statistical and systems science approaches to public health. *Health Educ Behav* 2013;40:123S-31S.
26. Sterman JD. System Dynamics Modeling: Tools for Learning in a Complex World. *Calif Manage Rev* 2001;43:8-25.
27. Ghaffarzadegan N, Lyneis J, Richardson GP. How small system dynamics models can help the public policy process. *System Dynamics Review* 2010:n/a-n/a.


28. Sharareh N, N SS, Sayama H, MacDonald R. The Ebola Crisis and the Corresponding Public Behavior: A System Dynamics Approach. *PLoS Curr* 2016;8.
29. Hooker EA, Mallow PJ, Oglesby MM. Characteristics and Trends of Emergency Department Visits in the United States (2010–2014). *The Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2019;56:344-51.
30. Santillanes G, Axeen S, Lam CN, Menchine M. National trends in mental health-related emergency department visits by children and adults, 2009–2015. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2019.
31. Cavana RY, Mares ED. Integrating critical thinking and systems thinking: from premises to causal loops. *System Dynamics Review* 2004;20:223-35.
32. Richardson GP. Reflections on the foundations of system dynamics. *System Dynamics Review* 2011;27:219-43.
33. Vrablik MC, Lawrence M, Ray JM, Moore M, Wong AH. Addressing Workplace Safety in the Emergency Department: A Multi-Institutional Qualitative Investigation of Health Worker Assault Experiences. *J Occup Environ Med* 2020;62:1019-28.
34. Zafar W, Khan UR, Siddiqui SA, Jamali S, Razzak JA. Workplace Violence and Self-reported Psychological Health: Coping with Post-traumatic Stress, Mental Distress, and Burnout among Physicians Working in the Emergency Departments Compared to Other Specialties in Pakistan. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2016;50:167-77.e1.
35. Rozo JA, Olson DM, Thu H, Stutzman SE. Situational Factors Associated With Burnout Among Emergency Department Nurses. *Workplace Health Saf* 2017;65:262-5.
36. Corbin J, Strauss A. *Basics of Qualitative Research (4th ed.): Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2015.
37. Watling CJ, Lingard L. Grounded theory in medical education research: AMEE Guide No. 70. *Med Teach* 2012;34:850-61.
38. Boeije H. A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the Analysis of Qualitative Interviews. *Quality and Quantity* 2002;36:391-409.
39. Weiland TJ, Ivory S, Hutton J. Managing Acute Behavioural Disturbances in the Emergency Department Using the Environment, Policies and Practices: A Systematic Review. *West J Emerg Med* 2017;18:647-61.
40. Wong AH, Ray JM, Iennaco JD. Workplace Violence in Health Care and Agitation Management: Safety for Patients and Health Care Professionals Are Two Sides of the Same Coin. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 2019;45:71-3.



41. Richmond J, Berlin J, Fishkind A, et al. Verbal De-escalation of the Agitated Patient: Consensus Statement of the American Association for Emergency Psychiatry Project BETA De-escalation Workgroup. *West J Emerg Med* 2012;13:17-25.
42. Copeland D, Henry M. The relationship between workplace violence, perceptions of safety, and Professional Quality of Life among emergency department staff members in a Level 1 Trauma Centre. *Int Emerg Nurs* 2018;39:26-32.
43. Gates DM, Gillespie GL, Succop P. Violence against nurses and its impact on stress and productivity. *Nurs Econ* 2011;29:59-66, quiz 7.
44. Smith CD, Balatbat C, Corbridge S, et al. Implementing Optimal Team-Based Care to Reduce Clinician Burnout. *NAM Perspectives* 2018;8.
45. Oliver M, Adonopulos AA, Haber PS, et al. Impact of acutely behavioural disturbed patients in the emergency department: A prospective observational study. *Emerg Med Australas* 2019;31:387-92.
46. Wong AH, Taylor RA, Ray JM, Bernstein SL. Physical Restraint Use in Adult Patients Presenting to a General Emergency Department. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019;73:183-92.
47. Wong AH, Crispino L, Parker J, et al. Use of sedatives and restraints for treatment of agitation in the emergency department. *Am J Emerg Med* 2019;37:1376-9.
48. Henderson S, Stacey CL, Dohan D. Social stigma and the dilemmas of providing care to substance users in a safety-net emergency department. *J Health Care Poor Underserved* 2008;19:1336-49.
49. Wong AH, Ray JM, Rosenberg A, et al. Experiences of Individuals Who Were Physically Restrained in the Emergency Department. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3:e1919381.
50. Wolf LA, Delao AM, Perhats C. Nothing changes, nobody cares: understanding the experience of emergency nurses physically or verbally assaulted while providing care. *J Emerg Nurs* 2014;40:305-10.
51. Lafreniere JP, Rios R, Packer H, Ghazarian S, Wright SM, Levine RB. Burned Out at the Bedside: Patient Perceptions of Physician Burnout in an Internal Medicine Resident Continuity Clinic. *J Gen Intern Med* 2016;31:203-8.
52. Richmond JS, Berlin JS, Fishkind AB, et al. Verbal De-escalation of the Agitated Patient: Consensus Statement of the American Association for Emergency Psychiatry Project BETA De-escalation Workgroup. *West J Emerg Med* 2012;13:17-25.





**Appendix 1** – Detailed Qualitative System Dynamics Model for Agitation Management, Clinician Burnout, and Decisions for Physical Restraint Use. Identified sub-sections A) Patient Flow; B) RN (Registered Nurse) Flow; C) Physician Flow; D) Perceptions of Safety and Development of Trust, and E) Perceptions of Control.





**Appendix 2** – Highlighted Balancing and Reinforcing Loops within detailed qualitative model. The bolded black and brown loops (B1A/B1B) represent a pair of mirrored **balancing** loops, and other complementary colors represent four pairs of mirrored **reinforcing** loops. See Appendix 3 for details of each sets of loops.


SD model for burnout and agitation management in the ED



3a.



3c.



3e.

**Appendix 3** – Individual Narratives within Detailed Model.

3a. Narrative 1—Use of Restraints, Assaults, and Perceptions of Safety

(Balancing Loops B1A for Nurses and B2B for Physicians)

3b. Narrative 2—Clinician Stress, Safety, and Use of Restraints

(Negatively Reinforcing Loops R1A for Nurses and R1B for Physicians)

3c. Narrative 3—Clinician Burnout and Support

(Negatively Reinforcing Loops R2A for Nurses and R2B for Physicians)

3d. Narrative 4—Burnout & Perception of Patient Intent

(Negatively Reinforcing Loops R3A for Nurses and R3B for Physicians)

3e. Narrative 5—Development of Trust and Control

(Positively Reinforcing Loops R4 for Mutual Trust and R5 for Physician Control and Trust)