



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

This is a repository copy of *Safety and contagion in acute psychiatric wards: How the milieu is implicated in the occurrence of clustered safety incidents.* .

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/206922/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Carvin, K., Brierley-Jones, L., Ramsey, L. et al. (2 more authors) (Accepted: 2023) Safety and contagion in acute psychiatric wards: How the milieu is implicated in the occurrence of clustered safety incidents. *Theory and Psychology*. ISSN 0959-3543 (In Press)

---

This is an author produced version of an article accepted for publication in *Theory and Psychology*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**Safety and contagion in acute psychiatric wards: how the milieu is implicated in the occurrence of clusters of safety incidents**

Journal:	<i>Theory &amp; Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	TAP-21-0178.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	mechanisms of social influence, transmission, mutual/reciprocal influence, psychiatric milieu, contagion
Abstract:	In psychiatry, clustered safety incidents are often attributed to behavioural contagion. Drawing on Kindermann and Skinner's conceptual work in our analysis of staff accounts, we explored whether clustered safety incidents could be attributable to contagion and the role played by staff and the psychiatric milieu (as a physical, cultural and therapeutic space). Our analysis suggests that whether the clustered incidents identified by staff are attributable to contagion depends on how broadly the 'incident' is defined, with clear implications for the over- or under-identification of contagion. We also identified the role of staff and the milieu in what was often perceived as contagion. We argue that the pursuit of safety by creating a predictable milieu may paradoxically contribute to this clustering of safety incidents and staff' perception of them as contagious via the mechanisms of risk amplification, involuntary convergence (increased exposure to safety incidents) and depletion of the milieu's therapeutic potential.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **Safety and contagion in acute psychiatric wards:**  
9

10 **How the milieu is implicated in the occurrence of clustered safety incidents**  
11  
12

13 Krysia Canvin<sup>1,2</sup>, Research Fellow in Involvement and Engagement, [k.canvin@keele.ac.uk](mailto:k.canvin@keele.ac.uk), Orcid ID:  
14 0000-0001-6571-6411  
15

16  
17 Lyn Brierley-Jones<sup>3</sup>, Research Fellow, [lyn.Brierley-Jones@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:lyn.Brierley-Jones@nottingham.ac.uk)  
18

19 Lauren Ramsey<sup>1</sup>, Research Fellow, [l.ramsey@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:l.ramsey@leeds.ac.uk)  
20  
21

22 John Baker<sup>1</sup>, Professor, [j.baker@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:j.baker@leeds.ac.uk)  
23  
24

25 Kathryn Berzins<sup>4</sup>, Senior Research Fellow, [kberzins@uclan.ac.uk](mailto:kberzins@uclan.ac.uk)  
26  
27  
28

- 29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
1. School of Healthcare, Faculty of Medicine, University of Leeds
  2. School of Medicine, University of Keele
  3. School of Health Sciences, University of Nottingham
  4. NIHR ARC NW Coast, IMPaCT, Health Technology Assessment Group, Lancashire Applied Research Collaboration Hub, University of Central Lancashire

**Abstract**

In psychiatry, clustered safety incidents are often attributed to behavioural contagion. Drawing on Kindermann and Skinner's conceptual work in our analysis of staff accounts, we explored whether clustered safety incidents could be attributable to contagion and the role played by staff and the psychiatric milieu (as a physical, cultural, and therapeutic space). Our analysis suggests that whether the clustered incidents identified by staff are attributable to contagion depends on how broadly the "incident" is defined, with clear implications for the over or under identification of contagion. We also identified the role of staff and the milieu in what was often perceived as contagion. We argue that the pursuit of safety by creating a predictable milieu may paradoxically contribute to this clustering of safety incidents and staffs' perception of them as contagious via the mechanisms of risk amplification, involuntary convergence (increased exposure to safety incidents), and depletion of the milieu's therapeutic potential.

*Keywords:* mechanisms of social influence, mutual/reciprocal influence, psychiatric milieu, transmission

1  
2  
3 In psychiatry, there is wide acceptance that safety incidents involving violence and self-harm occur  
4  
5 in spatio-temporal clusters due to behavioural contagion (Beck et al., 2018; Haw et al., 2013), a  
6  
7 metaphor for the infectious disease-like spread of human behaviour. This paper draws on staff  
8  
9 accounts to consider whether clusters of safety incidents might be attributable to contagion and  
10  
11 how the milieu might be implicated. Three concepts are central to our analysis: the psychiatric  
12  
13 milieu, safety (safety incidents), and contagion. Each is briefly introduced below.  
14  
15

### 16 17 *Notions of safety in psychiatry*

18  
19  
20 Dominant notions of safety in psychiatry derive from organisational, service-oriented perspectives  
21  
22 that omit patients' definitions of safety (Berzins et al., 2018; Cutler et al., 2015), focusing instead on  
23  
24 identifying and managing risk of violence, aggression, self-harm, or suicide by patients (Crowe &  
25  
26 Carlyle, 2003; De Santis et al., 2015; Slemon et al. 2017). Consequently, incident reporting systems  
27  
28 fail to capture patients' safety concerns around bullying, intimidation, racism, aggression, drug and  
29  
30 alcohol use, or theft of personal property (J. Jones et al., 2010). Berzins et al. (2020) note that  
31  
32 safety incidents can also include iatrogenic harm, that is, harm caused by correctly following  
33  
34 procedures and observing best practice, yet the physical and psychological harm caused by  
35  
36 medication, restraint, and seclusion is obscured by dominant discourse (Berzins et al., 2020; Cusack  
37  
38 et al., 2018; Valenti et al., 2014). Competing discourses conceptualise safety as the prevention of  
39  
40 violence (including seclusion and restraint) and the psychological sequelae of violence (i.e., anger,  
41  
42 fear, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms) and harmful and ineffective  
43  
44 interventions which have, in turn, led to the introduction of trauma-informed approaches (Eldal et  
45  
46 al., 2019; Holmes et al., 2020).  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 *The concept of the psychiatric milieu*

52  
53  
54 The concept of milieu is used interchangeably to refer to physical, social, temporal, and  
55  
56 sociocultural settings but rarely defined with precision (Banks & Priebe, 2020). In psychiatry, the  
57  
58 milieu has become synonymous with ward atmosphere, a product of interactions between the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 psychological, physical, social, political, and spiritual components of hospitalization, treatment  
4 policies and practices, the patient's health status and functioning, and the social climate of the unit  
5  
6 (Moos, 1989; Thibeault et al., 2010).  
7  
8

9  
10 The related concept of the *therapeutic milieu* is the notion that the setting, beyond formal  
11 treatment, is beneficial to patients (M. Jones, 1953). Prerequisites for a therapeutic milieu are  
12 containment (provision of physical care and safety), support (kindness for fostering predictability  
13 and control), structure (having a predictable organization of roles and responsibilities), involvement  
14 (ensured the patient interacted with the social environment), and validation (affirming a patient's  
15 individuality; Gunderson, 1978). The notion of the therapeutic milieu lost currency in psychiatry  
16 with deinstitutionalisation, smaller inpatient units, shorter periods of hospitalisation, and the shift  
17 towards structure, limit setting, and safety (Delaney, 1997; Kahn & White, 1989; Thomas et al.,  
18 2002; Tuck & Keels, 1992). Nevertheless, the notion of milieu as a healing environment which is  
19 adaptive, responsive and provides a safe, caring environment for personal growth and  
20 development has endured and gained new relevance with the contemporary focus on patient  
21 safety and its systemic nature (Espinosa & Kovarik, 2015; Jonas & Chez, 2004). It has been proposed  
22 that the milieu contributes to the production of safety. For example, Holmes et al. (2020) suggest  
23 that the removal of physical barriers (and therefore psychological barriers) between patients and  
24 staff is integral to safety (i.e., preventing violence and the psychological sequelae of violence),  
25 while others argue that safety is produced through social interaction in the milieu (Banks & Priebe,  
26 2020; J. Jones et al., 2010).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 *Evolving definitions of contagion*

48  
49  
50  
51 Studies of self-harm, aggression, and assaults have claimed to have identified contagion (Beck et al.,  
52 2018; Cawthorpe et al., 2003; Ionno, 1983; Rosen & Walsh, 1989; Taiminen et al., 1998). Studies of  
53 contagion are often limited by the absence of a clear and consistent definition, however. In their  
54 systematic review of suicide contagion, Cheng et al. (2014) found that 20% of studies defined  
55 contagion as clustered behaviour, thus conflating the phenomenon being investigated with the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mechanism. Kindermann and Skinner (2019) argue that the overuse of contagion as a “loose  
4 metaphor” calls for the development of a “precise and empirically useful concept” (p. 739) and used  
5  
6 paradigm case formulation to discern the defining attributes of contagion and its developmental  
7  
8 signature, temporal pathway, and mechanisms. They proposed that to distinguish contagion from  
9  
10 other social processes, it must be: (a) the one-way transmission of an attribute (not its absence) to  
11  
12 another person, where (b) the attribute does not leave the original person due to the transmission  
13  
14 (this would be a transfer), and (c) the original person does not receive anything in return (this would  
15  
16 be an exchange; Kindermann & Skinner 2019, p. 743). In their model of the developmental pathway  
17  
18 of contagion, exposure to the attribute without contagion represents immunity, while transmission  
19  
20 of the attribute in the absence of exposure represents spontaneous infection. Kindermann and  
21  
22 Skinner (p. 746) also propose that contagion has a distinct temporal pathway from, for example, the  
23  
24 convergence model (where group norms encourage increased similarity between individuals), or  
25  
26 the Matthew effect or average alter model (where individuals gravitate to similar individuals leading  
27  
28 to amplification of the defining attribute). In contrast, they argue that contagion involves the  
29  
30 asymmetrical spread of an attribute across group members leading overall levels of the attribute to  
31  
32 increase, never decrease.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Finally, Kindermann and Skinner (2019) suggest that identification of the mechanisms of  
40  
41 transmission requires examination of influences which again must be distinguished from other  
42  
43 means of transmission (using their criteria). They propose consideration of the many existing  
44  
45 candidate theories. Studies of crowd behaviour have proposed emergent norm theory, the idea  
46  
47 that new norms emerge amongst crowds in response to a situation (Turner, 1964), contagion  
48  
49 theory, whereby individuals act irrationally under the influence of a crowd, and, conversely,  
50  
51 convergence theory, which posits that crowds are the product of the coming together of like-  
52  
53 minded individuals and their behaviour reflects their shared characteristics (Turner & Killian,  
54  
55 1972/1987). Others include social learning theory (Bandura, 1969), which specifies five steps  
56  
57 essential for learning (observation, attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation), the  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “chameleon effect” or unintentional mirroring (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999), imitation of group  
4 leaders (Offer & Barglow, 1960), group belonging and group cohesion (Rosen & Walsh, 1989;  
5 Taiminen et al., 1998), and the proposition that retaliatory behaviour occurs as an attempt to  
6 restore justice in response to unfair treatment (Lonno, 1983).  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 Although the psychiatric milieu is thought to play a role in contagion (Delaney, 1997), its  
13 precise contribution remains unclear and worthy of investigation (Dishion & Dodge, 2005). Given  
14 the potential for the psychiatric milieu to synchronise clusters of behaviours, it is possible that such  
15 clusters are not attributable to contagion and that the milieu amounts to a “contextual confound”  
16 (Gest & Kindermann, 2012).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 This paper addresses two related questions: (a) whether clustered safety incidents on  
25 psychiatric wards are attributable to contagion, and (b) whether the psychiatric milieu contributes  
26 to or confounds contagion (according to Kindermann & Sinner’s, 2019, definition).  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **Methods**

31  
32  
33 A purposive sample of mental health professionals with experience of working in UK inpatient  
34 psychiatric settings was invited to participate in an interview on safety on in acute psychiatric  
35 wards via social media (Twitter). Twenty-nine potential participants contacted one of the authors  
36 and received further details about the study and a consent form. The same author (a former  
37 mental health nurse) conducted semistructured interviews with 17 participants via telephone/MS  
38 Teams after taking verbal consent. A professional transcription company transcribed the audio-  
39 recorded interviews. The topic guide explored participants’ views about safety issues in inpatient  
40 services. The aim of the interviews was to understand what the concepts of safety, milieu, and  
41 contagion meant to participants in the context of their everyday practice on acute psychiatric  
42 wards. Participants were initially asked to describe their job role and experience in inpatient mental  
43 health services and were then prompted to discuss what they considered to be the features of  
44 (un)safe wards, their experience of sensing that an incident had occurred (or was about to), and  
45 their understanding of why safety incidents appear to be temporally clustered (known as  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 *contagion*). The interviewer probed for further explanation and reflection. The terms milieu and  
4  
5 contagion were expressly used in interviews, both by the interviewer and participants.  
6  
7 We conducted a reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019), following the six steps  
8  
9 described by Braun and Clarke (2006). Two of the authors (neither of whom conducted the  
10  
11 interviews) were involved in the first and second steps, familiarising themselves with the data by  
12  
13 reading all the transcripts and making annotations and notes and then generating initial codes. At  
14  
15 this point, just one of these authors continued with the hands-on analysis, systematically working  
16  
17 through all the transcripts inductively coding the data with mostly descriptive labels and  
18  
19 performing some deductive coding relating to the research questions and the topics covered in the  
20  
21 interview. Given the shortcomings of the concepts being investigated, our inductive approach  
22  
23 involved deploying loose definitions of safety, milieu, and contagion and approaching participants'  
24  
25 accounts reflexively. For example, when examining participants' accounts of safety, care was taken  
26  
27 to be mindful of the influence of organisation-, staff- and patient-centred perspectives on the way  
28  
29 safety (and harm) is defined and to avoid focusing on "safety incidents," incidents that qualified for  
30  
31 inclusion in incident reports, or to those only involving patients or physical injury. Instead, a set of  
32  
33 criteria associated with safety were inductively derived. The concept of contagion was  
34  
35 operationalised in a similar way, taking an open-ended approach that included any type of  
36  
37 behaviour by any person in the milieu (staff or patient).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The next steps involved generating, reviewing and defining, and naming themes that cut-  
44  
45 across the coded data. Multiple iterations of the various themes were constructed before arriving  
46  
47 at the final versions. This process led to the development of the major themes of predictability, and  
48  
49 the relationship between the milieu and contagion. The latter contained three subthemes that  
50  
51 were all potential mechanisms for the contagion of safety incidents in the milieu (risk amplification,  
52  
53 increased exposure to risk, and therapeutic depletion).  
54  
55

56 An abductive analysis was performed (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012) whereby potential  
57  
58 examples of contagion were differentiated from other social processes by examining the data  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 against Kindermann and Skinner's (2019) proposed definition, developmental signature, and  
4 temporal pathway, before returning to candidate theories to understand the mechanism by which  
5 contagion is occurring. Analyses were conducted by hand and using NVivo software.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 Findings

11  
12  
13 The findings presented here are based on the analysis of accounts from 17 participants, including 13  
14 nurses and a psychologist, psychiatrist, speech and language therapist, and social worker.  
15

16  
17 Participants occupied various roles mostly on inpatient psychiatric wards, although three  
18 participants worked across multiple settings and one participant worked in the community.  
19

20  
21 Below, we present staff's perceptions of safety and of safety incidents. We then draw on these  
22 perceptions to explore the relationship between the milieu and the contagion of safety incidents.  
23  
24  
25

### 26 *Perceptions of safety: A safe milieu is a predictable milieu*

27  
28  
29 All participants were working or had worked on acute wards, some for over 15 years. Their accounts  
30 relayed various norms and values around safety and risk. Participants described how attitudes to  
31 risk, safety, and the use of restrictive practices (e.g., physical restraint, as-needed medication) had  
32 shifted over the past decade. Participants recalled feeling safe when "we could all restrain people,  
33 and we had access to medications and that there were loads of staff" (Ward manager-1) and how  
34 the focus of postincident reviews or debriefs had shifted from explaining "why the incident occurred  
35 from our perspective" (Nurse-4) to considering patients' psychological safety. Participants' accounts  
36 often featured "typical" safety incidents such as aggression, violence, absconding, self-harm,  
37 suicidal behaviour, bullying, intimidation, substance use, property damage, and use of restrictive  
38 practices. Nevertheless, many participants acknowledged that individual patients and staff or even  
39 different professions might interpret the same policy differently, and that some incidents "never get  
40 recorded because it's not recognised as an incident by a clinician" (Social Worker, patient safety  
41 lead). It was significant then that participants also referred to other events as having implications  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 for safety, such as unexpected admissions or meetings, a chaotic patient, boredom, a fire alarm in  
4  
5 the night, missed patient leave, or staff being perceived (by patients) as acting unfairly.  
6

7  
8 The belief that safety was related to predictability was pervasive. Faced with the inherently  
9  
10 “unpredictable” (Ward manager-2) nature of acute wards, participants repeatedly demonstrated  
11  
12 their conviction that a safe milieu was a predictable milieu: “you need to know what’s going on in  
13  
14 order to have that safety and be able to practice safely” (Nurse-3). Participants proposed that  
15  
16 structure, stability, “predictability and knowing what’s coming next” (Ward manager-1) were  
17  
18 essential for staff and patients to feel safe. Safety could be embodied in “clear and consistent  
19  
20 leadership” (Nurse-2) and facilitated by the physical layout and visibility. Poor vision and blind spots  
21  
22 were considered “unnerving” (Nurse-9).  
23  
24

25  
26 Staff knowledge and experience of all aspects of the milieu informed planning and  
27  
28 preparedness for “what possible situations can arise” (Nurse-4), increasing incident predictability  
29  
30 and therefore preventability. Norms around how to respond to safety incidents came into play  
31  
32 here: staff were expected to have a “solid understanding” (Nurse-5) of formal procedures and  
33  
34 awareness of processes, policies, and guidelines, to perform regular activities (completing care  
35  
36 plans, handovers, meetings, training in de-escalation and restraint, safety huddles) including  
37  
38 structured risk assessments of patients to calculate “how risky they are to us, to our other patients”  
39  
40 (Ward manager-2). They were expected to be familiar with patients’ triggers and “calm down  
41  
42 methods” (Nurse-6), the whereabouts of ligature points and blind spots on the ward, be “trained in  
43  
44 conflict and violence management” (Ward manager-2), de-escalation, and “able to use physical  
45  
46 restraint” (Nurse-7). Nevertheless, “ground level work” (Ward manager-2) was also required: being  
47  
48 with patients, meeting needs, and providing meaningful activities were thought to help build  
49  
50 therapeutic relationships, better rapport, and ultimately, “you feel safe, they feel safe” (Social  
51  
52 Worker, patient safety lead). One ward manager described the tension between planning for  
53  
54 anticipated risks and spending time with patients:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [Staff] feel like they're going to get in trouble if they've not done a care plan, ... But don't  
4 realise that maybe if they'd sat out with the [patients] for a few hours that morning, you've  
5 probably managed about a million incidents ... that are not going to happen because you've  
6 spent that time and had a cuppa with someone. (Ward manager-1)  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Although this participant acknowledges the importance of planning and prevention, the  
12 implication is that staff might avoid safety incidents by spending more time with patients.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 *Perceptions of safety incidents: Safety incidents are predictable and causally related*  
18

19  
20 Participants expressed the belief that safety incidents were predictable, claiming that "there's  
21 always something like a precursor" (Nurse-4) and there were few safety incidents "we could never  
22 have predicted" (Psychologist). They strongly identified with the notion that staff could sense  
23 imminent or recent incidents, owing to an "all-knowing sense of what's going on" (Speech Language  
24 Therapist) and their "gut" or "animal" instinct. Participants described how their interpretation of  
25 what was expected in terms of safety led them to be in a constant state of "sensory awareness"  
26 (Social Worker, patient safety lead) or "hypervigilance" (Nurse-2) looking for anything that jarred  
27 with their notion of a safe, predictable milieu. Despite claims to identify with "that feeling when you  
28 come on the ward" (Nurse-1) or the ability to "sense tension in the air" (Nurse-7), participants were  
29 not describing intuition, or a "sixth sense" (Nurse-1), but "pattern recognition" (Trainee Advanced  
30 Clinical Practitioner) and nurses' sensitivity to these:  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 They must be really, sort of, microcues that we pick up on when we see that. Because I  
45 don't really believe that it's something that's in the air. But it's something about the  
46 situation that's not the same and I suppose people who work in mental health, and people  
47 who have mental health issues, they're more acutely attuned to those micro-changes in  
48 behaviour, in environment. (Nurse-1)  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The digressions or *microchanges* described by this participant could be conceptualised as  
56 disruptions in the milieu and might be manifested as something unexpected or out of the ordinary,  
57 ranging from shouting, alarms sounding, or police presence, to silence, an absent administrator, or  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 empty lounge. Disruptions were significant because participants interpreted them as cues: "it was  
4 like you knew something was going on" (Nurse-7). Claims about the "atmosphere" or "vibe" of the  
5 ward could be traced to disruptions in the milieu: visual and auditory "microcues" (Nurse-1),  
6 "subconscious stimuli," or "environmental signals" (Nurse-2) such as changes in behaviour, body  
7 language, or the presence or absence of people. For example, one participant believed that  
8 patients "set the tone for the ward" through their body language (relaxed or tense) and "what  
9 they're saying, how they're saying things, what they're doing" (Nurse-9), while another noticed  
10 "how hot or otherwise the ward is" (Psychiatrist) based on patient behaviour (e.g., pacing, clenched  
11 fists).

22  
23 Staff also perceived safety incidents and other behaviours that occurred over the course of  
24 one or more days as causally related, "suddenly there's three [incidents] in a day, that's just not  
25 going to be chance" (Psychiatrist). Participants reported temporal clustering of incidents using  
26 terms such as "contagion," "ripple," "domino," "knock-on," and "butterfly" effect. Their accounts  
27 included clustering of similar incidents and behaviours, such as aggression in one patient leading to  
28 aggression in another patient:

36  
37 If a patient is very violent and aggressive on a ward you may see a contagion for other  
38 violence and aggression both in a reaction back to that violence and aggression, but you  
39 may also see an incidence of increasing self-harm because people are distressed. (Social  
40 Worker, patient safety lead)

45 Participants also referred to clustering of dissimilar incidents and behaviours:

48 If you ever get a violent incident, you always end up with knock-on events after that or  
49 people requiring more one-to-one input or people that normally require a moderate  
50 amount of one-to-one input, they can't get it because the staff are redeployed somewhere  
51 else so that ... it has a massive effect on the ward. And it's traumatic, isn't it, if you see  
52 something like that and people really struggle. (Ward manager-2)

1  
2  
3 They might sit for a couple of hours longer in the bedroom and then something that might  
4  
5 have been quite easily resolved earlier on becomes another incident, whether it be self-  
6  
7 harm or whether they go AWOL [absent without leave] or it could be anything. (Nurse-5)  
8  
9

10 All three examples above show how incidents of one type (violence, shouting) might have  
11  
12 consequences of another type (patient traumatisation, staff redeployment, patients need support,  
13  
14 patients' needs go unmet, patient withdrawal) that lead to incidents of another type (self-harm,  
15  
16 leaving the ward without permission).  
17  
18

### 19 *The relationship between the milieu and (perceived) contagion*

20  
21  
22 From participants' accounts we discerned three processes via which the milieu might contribute to  
23  
24 contagion: through the amplification of risk, by increasing exposure to safety incidents, and by  
25  
26 diminishing the therapeutic milieu.  
27  
28

29 **A predictable milieu amplifies risk.** Participants hinted at how constructions of safety  
30  
31 played out in the milieu by affecting (perceived) incidents of contagion. They revealed how  
32  
33 qualities they associated with "a safe milieu" could produce harm and clusters of behaviours they  
34  
35 interpreted as "contagion." For example, being "risk averse" or performing well-intentioned efforts  
36  
37 to intervene and resolve anticipated safety incidents could increase risk and safety incidents: "the  
38  
39 more restrictions we put on people, the more chance we've got of violence" (Ward manager-2).  
40  
41 Participants also described information sharing among staff as an integral part of constructing and  
42  
43 maintaining the predictable, safe milieu, and indicative of a good team. Handovers between shifts  
44  
45 provided an opportunity for outgoing staff to update incoming staff, but a difficult shift had the  
46  
47 potential to "set off a chain of reaction with [staff]" (Nurse-6). One participant described arriving  
48  
49 on shift:  
50  
51  
52

53 You get people going, "Oh you might as well go home, you're going to have a terrible shift,  
54  
55 it's been a bloody horrible day, so-and-so's been awful." You just think, for God's sake, I  
56  
57 don't need this, this is not going to help me. (Ward manager-2)  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In this instance, being briefed about “awful” behaviour was considered unhelpful, although  
4 patient information had the potential to help the team feel prepared and safe because they have  
5 “a good understanding of how they’ve presented previously and what works for that patient”  
6 (Nurse-5). Participants, however, described how patient information could increase anxiety and  
7 tension:  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Oh, Hannah’s been on this ward before and she’s really violent and then suddenly the next  
15 four people get this narrative of this person. And then ... maybe you’re scared or you’re  
16 unsure of what to do or your experiences inform how you interact with Hannah. (Ward  
17 manager-1)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 As illustrated here, this information could lead staff to make negative assumptions and  
24 impact on how they interpret and respond to that patient, especially, as another participant  
25 commented, if that patient had been involved in a safety incident, “you might expect that’s going  
26 to happen again”(Nurse-4).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Through their hypervigilance and information sharing, participants were primed to interpret  
33 cues based on their experience of previous “similar instances,” information about patients,  
34 patients’ diagnoses, and unconscious biases. Participants reflected that consequently, their  
35 preparedness could be almost self-fulfilling: “when you’re expecting that situation, it can almost  
36 create that situation” (Social Worker, patient safety lead). They described how “preempting issues  
37 that might happen before they’ve actually had a chance to actually develop and happen” (Nurse-2)  
38 and thinking about “scenarios that might arise, and how you’re going to manage them” (Nurse-4)  
39 drove feelings of tension and anxiety which affected “how you are with the patients, how you are  
40 with your team” (Nurse-2) and could produce a “never-ending kind of spiral round of frustration,  
41 agitation, and aggression” (Social Worker, patient safety lead). Participants also described how they  
42 might arrive for a shift “already on the defensive” (Nurse-2) and full of “dread,” and this influenced  
43 how they processed information. Participants observed that patients were similarly “very  
44 perceptive as to what’s going on” (Nurse-8 manager) and inevitably affected by disruptions to the  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “balance” of the ward, such as patient departures and arrivals and staff changeovers. While staff  
4  
5 hypervigilance was a marker of skill and expertise, participants associated patients’ hypervigilance  
6  
7 with hyper-sensitivity and impaired perceptions, judgements, and abilities attributable to, for  
8  
9 example, paranoia, poor emotional regulation, sensory issues, and substance use.

11  
12 **The predictable milieu increases exposure to safety incidents.** The very nature of an acute  
13  
14 psychiatric ward brings unwell people into close proximity and their interaction has consequences  
15  
16 as described by this participant:

17  
18  
19 When we have a lot of people with bipolar and everybody’s a little bit manic then what’s  
20  
21 happening is everybody’s looking at somebody and saying are you having a go at me, are  
22  
23 you looking at me. You’re looking at me strange. And being very high in their activity, more  
24  
25 reactive to just normal cues or more reactive to other people being unwell. And getting  
26  
27 involved in each other’s care. (Nurse-1)

28  
29  
30 As suggested above, participants thought that some services (e.g., child and adolescent  
31  
32 services), particular conditions or symptoms (e.g., mania, learning disability, personality disorder,  
33  
34 autism) and patient mix affected safety by increasing the likelihood of aggressive, competitive, and  
35  
36 “unpredictable” behaviours. While “patients really want to help each other out,” whether by  
37  
38 “trying to soothe someone” or “someone else is upset about something and they go, ‘oh yes and  
39  
40 me’” (Ward manager-2) this could lead them to become distressed or create additional challenges  
41  
42 for staff. The milieu as a physical place brings patients who might “rub each other up the wrong  
43  
44 way” (Psychologist) into proximity, where even one person “can completely change the dynamics  
45  
46 of the ward” (Psychiatrist). One participant described the benefits of patient communities and  
47  
48 friendships akin to “a buddy system” (Nurse-9), but went on to say that “cliques” could facilitate  
49  
50 the development of shared behaviours and goals:

51  
52  
53  
54 If one [patient] would become difficult or challenging or if one would become upset for  
55  
56 whatever reason, it would spread to the other two [patients], or the other two would be  
57  
58 quite obstructive or they would become quite difficult to engage. (Nurse-9)  
59  
60



1  
2  
3           These shared behaviours and goals were in turn interpreted as evidence of contagion. The  
4 physical layout of the milieu, specifically designs that facilitate visibility, made both intentional and  
5 inadvertent witnessing of incidents and staff and patient behaviours possible. Participants  
6 suggested that patients could be “distressed by witnessing” (Social Worker, patient safety lead)  
7 and/or hearing incidents. This reportedly could affect patients’ “emotional wellbeing” (Nurse-4),  
8 make “other patients feel more dangerous” (Psychologist), and facilitate the spread of fear,  
9 anxiety, and distress, “like an infection” (Nurse-1).

10  
11           [A patient] said he’d, “Smash the ward up worse than the guy next door to me if you don’t  
12 let me out.” It was then that ripple effect of he’d seen or heard what happened next door  
13 and thought, “Well, I want to leave, and maybe the only way I can leave is by doing what  
14 he’s done.” (Nurse-6)

15  
16           Attempts to “detract from the stimulus” (Nurse-5) and minimise the impact of witnessing an  
17 incident by dispersing patients could have their own negative implications. Patients encouraged to  
18 stay in their rooms may “feel more and more frustrated and concerned” (Nurse-8 manager), while  
19 one-to-one observation might be experienced by patients as “unhelpful” (Ward manager-2) or  
20 “unsafe” (Speech Language Therapist). Similarly, the use of alarms to signal for assistance caused  
21 stress in both staff and patients across “the entire service” (Nurse-8 manager).

22  
23           **The predictable milieu depletes therapeutic potential of the milieu.** Participants viewed  
24 the therapeutic potential of the milieu as another fundamental component of safety, suggesting  
25 that without it, “everything starts to fall to pieces” (Nurse-8 manager) and the ward becomes  
26 merely a “holding pen” (Speech Language Therapist). Some even suggested that the absence of a  
27 therapeutic milieu was harmful because “you’re leaving people just in their own distress or  
28 disturbance” (Ward manager-1) and creating an opportunity for aggression and unrest to develop.

29  
30           If you’re not allowing people to have access to leave, access to activities, access to things  
31 that make them feel well, you’re going to find that it’s going to be more unsafe because

1  
2  
3 people are going to be more aggressive, people ... there's going to be a lot of unrest, people  
4  
5 are going to be unsettled. (Ward manager-2)  
6

7 Safety could be considered therapeutic in itself: "a vital thing for somebody to feel well"

8  
9 (Nurse-1). The therapeutic potential of the milieu could be diminished via exposure to an incident,  
10  
11 or due to staff (un)availability, because of redeployment to an incident or retreat to their offices.

12  
13 There was enormous potential to damage trust, "it ruptures the patient–staff relationship hugely"

14  
15 (Psychologist) and for patients to feel "pissed off" (Nurse-8 manager), "rejected" (Nurse-7) and

16  
17 unsafe, which may lead them to "self-harm or to try and abscond" (Nurse-7) or to try to elicit care

18  
19 by using "verbal aggression" (Nurse-5) and "competing for volume" (Ward manager-2).  
20  
21

22  
23 All the staff, kind of, run away into an office and say, are you alright, is everyone alright, and

24  
25 we're all checking with each other. But we forget that we've got 20 guys either on the ward

26  
27 or in the bedrooms that are probably just as terrified or unsure of what's happened, but

28  
29 we've left them to dwell in it. And then they don't know what to do with it so then they ...

30  
31 we get that ripple effect of incidents (Nurse-2)  
32  
33

### 34 **Discussion**

35  
36 This study explored staff explanations for spatio-temporal clusters of safety incidents on psychiatric

37  
38 wards. In this paper, we drew on staff accounts, and using Kindermann and Skinner's (2019)

39  
40 definition of contagion, we explored firstly, whether clustered safety incidents on psychiatric wards

41  
42 might be attributable to contagion, and secondly, whether the psychiatric milieu contributes to or

43  
44 confounds these apparent instances of contagion.  
45  
46

47  
48 The milieu was conceptualised as norms and values around safety conveyed through policy,

49  
50 training, and practice, culture and staff/patient interaction, and staff and patient characteristics

51  
52 and perceptions. Dominant safety ideologies shaped the perceptions and interpretations of

53  
54 individuals (staff), the consequences of which were played out in staff–patient relations,

55  
56 particularly how staff interpreted and responded to patients' characteristics and behaviours and

57  
58 how they sought to prevent and manage safety incidents. The data presented here suggest that it is  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 not only patients' exposure to "safety incidents" that triggers further incidents. Instead,  
4  
5 participants' accounts indicate that any kind of disruption detected in the milieu could act as a cue  
6  
7 for staff or patient behaviours that may subsequently be interpreted as a safety incident and/or  
8  
9 contagion. Moreover, their accounts illuminate the role that staff and the psychiatric milieu play in  
10  
11 relation to contagion: by amplifying risk, increasing exposure to safety incidents, and by depleting  
12  
13 the therapeutic potential of the milieu.  
14  
15

#### 16 *Safety incidents: Contagion or cluster?*

17  
18 Although participants described spatio-temporal clusters of safety incidents (i.e., behaviours  
19  
20 happening in the same space at the same time or soon afterwards) as causally related, perceiving  
21  
22 them as a manifestation of contagion, it is unclear whether such clusters were attributable to  
23  
24 contagion. Here we turn to Kindermann and Skinner's (2019) criteria for distinguishing contagion  
25  
26 from other social processes to help us ascertain whether these incidents might have been  
27  
28 attributable to contagion. According to Kindermann and Skinner, contagion is distinguishable from  
29  
30 other social processes by three criteria: (a) the one-way transmission of an attribute to another  
31  
32 person, where the attribute does not leave the original person, and the original person does not  
33  
34 receive anything in return (p. 743); (b) the asymmetrical spread of an attribute across group  
35  
36 members leading overall levels of the attribute to increase, never decrease (p. 746); and (c) its  
37  
38 mechanisms of transmission can be distinguished from other means of transmission and contextual  
39  
40 confounds. Below, we consider each in turn in relation to the data presented here.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Based on our data, it is difficult to say whether the clustered behaviours described by  
47  
48 participants constitute contagion because satisfaction of the transmission criteria depends on how  
49  
50 the attribute being transmitted is defined. For example, the aggression expressed by one patient  
51  
52 that seems to be transmitted to another patient does not leave the original patient nor does the  
53  
54 original patient receive anything in return appears to be attributable to contagion. Whether  
55  
56 incidents of self-harm that occurred around the same time could be attributed to contagion might  
57  
58 be a matter of classification: both aggression and self-harm could be considered a form of violence  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 or more broadly still, an expression of harm, in which case it could be said that contagion has  
4  
5 occurred. If aggression towards others and self-harm are considered to be distinct attributes,  
6  
7 however, then this would not constitute contagion.  
8  
9

10           Kindermann and Skinner (2019) further require that an attribute must spread in an  
11  
12 asymmetrical pathway in which the overall levels of the attribute increase. One example of an  
13  
14 attribute that spread in this way, and that therefore might qualify as attributable to contagion, was  
15  
16 anxiety. Participants described how anxiety was not limited to transmission amongst patients but  
17  
18 could also be transmitted between staff and between patients and staff leading to an overall  
19  
20 increase in anxiety across the ward. For example, in the data presented here, participants  
21  
22 described staff “cross-contaminating” staff on adjacent wards with tension and anxiety after  
23  
24 dealing with a safety incident.  
25  
26

27           Kindermann and Skinner’s (2019) third criterion requires that mechanisms of transmission  
28  
29 be distinguished from other means of transmission and contextual confounds. A contextual  
30  
31 confound would be any external stimuli that synchronises staff and patients’ behaviour, such as the  
32  
33 sounding of an alarm (seen in our data). We considered whether safety incidents themselves  
34  
35 qualify as such a synchronising event, but would suggest that they do not, as the resulting  
36  
37 behaviour is not synchronous and spreads beyond witnesses and those directly involved. Indeed,  
38  
39 participants believed that contagion from some incidents could spread both beyond the physical  
40  
41 setting of the ward (to other wards) and over hours or even days.  
42  
43  
44

45           Regarding other mechanisms of transmission, candidate mechanisms of contagion, such as  
46  
47 mirroring, group cohesion, or retaliation (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Ionno, 1983; Taiminen et al.,  
48  
49 1998) are usually centred on the patient and we did find evidence of these in our data, such as  
50  
51 where patients formed friendships and developed shared goals and behaviours (challenging staff)  
52  
53 and copied threatening and destructive behaviours. In our analysis, however, we shifted our gaze  
54  
55 from patients to staff and the milieu, the role of which we consider in more detail below.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *The role of staff and the milieu*

Our findings suggest the milieu (including staff) is implicated in producing clusters of behaviour by amplifying perceptions of risk, increasing exposure to incidents, and by underperforming its therapeutic role. It is less clear whether by doing so the milieu is contributing to contagion or constitutes a contextual confound (meaning the clusters are not evidence of contagion). Below, we consider the relationships we identified in the data between the milieu and (perceived) contagion and whether these amount to contextual confounds.

### *The role of the physical milieu in involuntary convergence and increasing exposure to safety incidents*

As a physical space, the milieu creates the impression that patients' behaviour is clustered or contagious because it occurs in broadly the same spatio-temporal context but it could also indicate a contextual confound that synchronises behaviour. Firstly, the milieu holds people in close proximity with others with whom they likely share an identity (i.e., patient) and some characteristics (e.g., diagnosis, symptomology). Although participants interpreted this as increasing the likelihood of patients upsetting each other and their vulnerability to behavioural contagion, it is perhaps more suggestive of convergence theory where like-minded people come together and group norms encourage similarity in the characteristics and behaviour of individuals (Turner & Killian, 1987), except patients in the milieu have been brought together by external forces in a form of involuntary convergence. Additionally, the emphasis on visibility in the physical ward design (intended to facilitate staff surveillance of patients in the pursuit of safety), might increase the likelihood of patients' increased exposure to and potential to be affected by the behaviour of staff and other patients. The physical milieu, by virtue of the physical design of the ward plus the close proximity of patients, suggests involuntary convergence and is likely a contextual confound.

### *The role of staff and the milieu in risk amplification and therapeutic depletion*

Similar to the physical milieu, the pervasive risk culture of the psychiatric milieu might create the impression of behavioural contagion by amplifying perceptions of risk. As suggested by the data

1  
2  
3 presented here, risk culture facilitates the anticipation and prevention of future incidents,  
4 encouraging the retrospective attribution of linear cause and effect, and reinforcing staff's  
5 perceptions of incidents as predictable, preventable, and contagious. Risk culture drives staff to  
6 seek to engage in practices that examine patient characteristics and past and recent incidents and  
7 individualise safety incidents such as risk assessment, care planning, debriefing and postincident  
8 review. This culture affected staff's attitudes, behaviours, and interpretations of patients'  
9 behaviours, as seen in risk amplification processes such as handovers between shifts or sharing  
10 information with other staff about patients could negatively prime staff's expectations and  
11 interpretations of patients' behaviour.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Risk culture and its associated activities might also contribute to the depletion of the  
24 therapeutic nature of the ward, which in turn contributes to the impression of contagion.  
25 According to participants, by prioritising specific types of risk and safety, staff are diverted away  
26 from therapeutic work, leading to a cycle of unmet needs and attempts at care elicitation amongst  
27 patients.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Our finding that ward staff are implicated in these clustered events, regardless of whether  
35 they are attributable to contagion, is significant because safety discourse in psychiatry often  
36 focuses on individual-level patient risk (e.g., reducing incidents of violence or self-harm) rather than  
37 on ward culture and staff characteristics and behaviours (Crowe & Carlyle, 2003; De Santis et al.,  
38 2015; Slemon et al., 2017). Our findings resonate with Berzins et al.'s (2018) who describe patients'  
39 conceptualisations of safety risks as including "not being listened to," "not feeling psychologically  
40 safe," understaffing and diminished therapeutic relationships and observations by Kang et al.  
41 (2020) that lack of support and emotional distress preceded "behaviours of concern." Like staff,  
42 patients are "attuned" to the atmosphere of the ward (J. Jones et al., 2010; Kanyeredzi et al., 2019)  
43 and value predictability and structure (Eldal et al., 2019; Katz & Kirkland, 1990). Seemingly  
44 innocuous staff practices such as the constant process of looking for and responding to disruptions  
45 in the milieu could therefore contribute to further disruption and "provoke" patients (Hamilton &  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Manias, 2007; Thomson et al., 2019) with potential implications for patients' psychological safety  
4 and perception of the milieu as a therapeutic space.  
5  
6

### 7 **Conclusion**

8  
9  
10 This paper examines the commonly held belief that safety incidents on psychiatric wards spread  
11 due to contagion. Although participants were confident in their interpretation of clustered safety  
12 incidents as contagion, our examination of our data against Kindermann and Skinner's (2019)  
13 criteria call their interpretation into question. Notwithstanding the limitations of relying on  
14 interview data from a single (staff) perspective, according to this data, we did not find evidence of  
15 contagion of safety incidents. Whether safety incidents are attributable to contagion appears to  
16 depend on how the attribute or incident is defined and what behaviours are included under that  
17 definition. We found that the spread of a broadly defined attribute such as anxiety had potential to  
18 be considered as contagion, but Kindermann and Skinner's (2019) proposed criteria were limited by  
19 the lack of direction regarding how to define the attribute being transmitted. This has clear  
20 implications for the over or under identification of contagion. Our analysis illuminates the hitherto  
21 unexplored influence of staff and the psychiatric milieu on the (perceived) contagion of safety  
22 incidents via risk amplification, involuntary convergence, and therapeutic depletion. Paradoxically,  
23 the pursuit of safety and predictability by staff contributes to the clustering of safety incidents and  
24 their perception of them as contagious.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the people who participated in interviews.

This project NIHR128070 - Developing a service user centred co-designed patient safety intervention for acute mental health wards: A mixed methods process evaluation is funded by the NIHR HS&DR. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. It was supported by the National Institute for Health Research Yorkshire and Humber Patient Safety Translational Research Centre (NIHR Yorkshire and Humber PSTRC).

## Ethics statement

This study received ethical approval from by South Central Berkshire B REC ref: 20/SC/0360

## References

- Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning of moral judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 11(3), 275–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026998>
- Banks, C., & Priebe, S. (2020). Scales for assessing the therapeutic milieu in psychiatric inpatient settings: A systematic review. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 66, 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2020.06.014>
- Beck, N. C., Tubbesing, T., Lewey, J. H., Menditto, A. A., & Robbins, S. B. (2018). Contagion of violence and self-harm behaviors on a psychiatric ward. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 29(6), 989–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2018.1516230>
- Berzins, K., Baker, J., Brown, M., & Lawton, R. (2018). A cross-sectional survey of mental health service users', carers' and professionals' priorities for patient safety in the United Kingdom. *Health Expectations*, 21(6), 1085–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12805>
- Berzins, K., Baker, J., Louch, G., & Albutt, A. (2020). A qualitative exploration of mental health service user and carer perspectives on safety issues in UK mental health services. *Health Expectations*, 23(3), 549–561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13025>



- 1  
2  
3 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
4  
5 *Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>  
6  
7  
8 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in*  
9  
10 *Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597.  
11  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>  
13  
14 Cawthorpe, D., Somers, D., Wilkes, T., & Phil, M. (2003). Behavioural contagion: Self-harm among  
15  
16 adolescent psychiatric inpatients: A five year study. *The Canadian Child and Adolescent*  
17  
18 *Psychiatry Review*, 12(4), 103–106.  
19  
20 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2533827/>  
21  
22  
23 Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception–behavior link and  
24  
25 social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(6), 893–910.  
26  
27 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.6.893>  
28  
29  
30 Cheng, Q., Li, H., Silenzio, V., & Caine, E. D. (2014). Suicide contagion: A systematic review of  
31  
32 definitions and research utility. *PLOS ONE*, 26(9), Article e108724.  
33  
34 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0108724>  
35  
36  
37 Crowe, M., & Carlyle, D. (2003). Deconstructing risk assessment and management in mental health  
38  
39 nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 43(1), 19–27. [https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02669.x)  
40  
41 [2648.2003.02669.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02669.x)  
42  
43  
44 Cusack, P., Cusack, F. P., McAndrew, S., McKeown, M., & Duxbury, J. (2018). An integrative review  
45  
46 exploring the physical and psychological harm inherent in using restraint in mental health  
47  
48 inpatient settings. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 27(3), 1162–1176.  
49  
50 <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12432>  
51  
52  
53 Cutler, N., Moxham, L., & Stephens, M. (2015). The meaning of safety in an acute mental health  
54  
55 inpatient services. *Australian Nursing and Midwifery Journal*, 22(8).  
56  
57 <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.968383965400116>  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Delaney, K. (1997). Milieu therapy: A therapeutic loophole. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 33(2),  
4 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6163.1997.tb00537.x>  
5  
6  
7 De Santis, M. L., Myrick, H., Lamis, D. A., Pelic, C. P., Rhue, C., & York, J. (2015) Suicide-specific  
8 safety in the inpatient psychiatric unit. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 36(3), 190–199.  
9  
10 <https://doi.org/10.3109/01612840.2014.961625>  
11  
12  
13 Dishion, T. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2005). Peer contagion for children and adolescents: Moving towards  
14 an understanding of the ecology and dynamics of change. *Journal of Abnormal Child*  
15 *Psychology*, 33(3), 395–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-005-3579-z>  
16  
17  
18 Eldal, K., Natvik, E., Veseth, M., Davidson, L., Skjølberg, Å., Gytri, D., & Moltu, C. (2019). Being  
19 recognised as a whole person: A qualitative study of inpatient experience in mental health.  
20 *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 40(2), 88–  
21 96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2018.1524532>  
22  
23  
24 Espinosa, M. P., & Kovarik, J. (2015). Prosocial behaviour and gender. *Frontiers in Behavioral*  
25 *Neuroscience*, 9, Article 88. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00088>  
26  
27  
28 Gest, S. D., & Kindermann, T. A. (2012). Analysis of static social networks and their developmental  
29 effects. In B. Laursen, T. D. Little, & N. A. Card (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental research*  
30 *methods* (pp. 577–597). The Guilford Press.  
31  
32  
33 Gunderson, J. G. (1978). Defining the therapeutic process in psychiatric milieus. *Psychiatry: Journal*  
34 *for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 41, 327–335.  
35  
36 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1978.11023992>  
37  
38  
39 Hamilton, B., & Manias, E. (2007). Rethinking nurses' observations: Psychiatric nursing skills and  
40 invisibility in an acute inpatient setting. *Social Science and Medicine*, 65(2), 331–343.  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.03.025>  
43  
44  
45 Haw, C., Hawton, K., Niedzwiedz, C., & Platt, S. (2013). Suicide clusters: A review of risk factors and  
46 mechanisms. *Suicide Life Threatening Behavior*, 43(1), 97–108.  
47  
48 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.2012.00130.x>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Holmes, E. A., Espinosa, L., Visser, R. M., Bonsall, M., & Singh, L. (2020). Psychological interventions  
4 as they relate to intrusive thinking: The example of intrusive, emotional mental imagery  
5 after traumatic and negative events. In P. W. Kalivas & M. P. Paulus (Eds.), *Strüngmann*  
6 *forum reports: Vol. 30. Intrusive thinking across neuropsychiatric disorders: From molecules*  
7 *to free will* (pp. 287–313). MIT Press.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Ionno, J. A. (1983). A prospective study of assaultive behavior in female psychiatric inpatients. In J.  
15 R. Lion & W. H. Reid (Eds.), *Assaults within psychiatric facilities* (pp. 72–79). Grune &  
16 Stratton.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Jonas, W. B., & Chez, R. J. (2004). Toward optimal healing environments in health care. *The*  
22 *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine*, *10*(Supp.1), S1–S6.  
23  
24 <https://doi.org/10.1089/1075553042245818>  
25  
26  
27  
28 Jones, J., Nolan, P., Bowers, L., Simpson, A., Whittington, R., Hackney, D., & Bhui, K. (2010).  
29 Psychiatric wards: Places of safety? *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, *17*(2),  
30 124–130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2009.01482.x>  
31  
32  
33  
34 Jones, M. (1953). *The therapeutic community: A new treatment method in psychiatry*. Basic  
35 Books.  
36  
37  
38  
39 Kahn, E. M., & White, E. M. (1989). Adapting milieu approaches to acute inpatient care for  
40 schizophrenic patients. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, *40*(6), 609–614.  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.40.6.609>  
43  
44  
45  
46 Kang, M., Bushell, H., Lee, S., Berry, C., Hollander, Y., Rauchberger, I., & Whitecross, F. (2020).  
47 Exploring behaviours of concern including aggression, self-harm, sexual harm and  
48 absconding within an Australian inpatient mental health service. *Australasian Psychiatry*,  
49 *28*(4), 394–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856220926940>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Kanyeredzi, A., Brown, S. D., McGrath, L., Reavey, P., & Tucker, I. (2019) The atmosphere of the  
55 ward: Attunements and attachments of everyday life for patients on a medium-secure  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

forensic psychiatric unit. *The Sociological Review*, 67(2), 444–466.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/003802611982975>

Katz, P., & Kirkland, F. R. (1990). Violence and social structure on mental hospital wards. *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*, 53(3), 262–277.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1990.11024508>

Kindermann, T. A., & Skinner, E. A. (2019). Is psychology suffering from an epidemic of “contagion”? Moving from metaphors to theoretically derived concepts and methods in the study of social influences. *Theory & Psychology*, 29(6), 739–756.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/0959354319857154>

Moos, R. H. (1989). *Ward atmosphere scale manual* (2nd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Offer, D., & Barglow, P. (1960). Adolescent and young adult self-mutilation incidents in a general psychiatric hospital. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 3(2), 194–204.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1960.01710020078010>

Rosen, P. M., & Walsh, B. W. (1989). Patterns of contagion in self-mutilation epidemics. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 146(5), 656–658. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.146.5.656>

Slemon, E., Jenkins, E., & Bungay, V. (2017). Safety in psychiatric inpatient care: The impact of risk management culture on mental health nursing practice. *Nursing Inquiry*, 24(4), Article e12199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.12199>

Taiminen, T. J., Kallio-Soukainen, K., Nokso-Koivisto, H., Kaljonen, A., & Kelenius, H. (1998).

Contagion of deliberate self-harm among adolescent inpatients. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(2), 211–217.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199802000-00014>

Thibeault, C. A., Trudeau, K., d’Entremont, M., & Brown, T. (2010). Understanding the milieu experiences of patients on an acute inpatient psychiatric unit. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 24(4), 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2009.07.002>

- 1  
2  
3 Thomas, S. P., Shattell, M., & Martin, T. (2002). What's therapeutic about the therapeutic milieu?  
4  
5 *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 16(3), 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1053/apnu.2002.32945>  
6  
7  
8 Thomson, A., Racher, F., & Clements, K. (2019). Caring for the entire unit: Psychiatric nurses' use of  
9  
10 awareness. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, 57(9), 17–23.  
11  
12 <https://doi.org/10.3928/02793695-20190528-03>  
13  
14 Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded  
15  
16 theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), 167–186.  
17  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112457914>  
19  
20  
21 Tuck, I., & Keels, M. C. (1992). Milieu therapy: A review of development of this concept and its  
22  
23 implications for psychiatric nursing. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 13(1), 51–58.  
24  
25 <https://doi.org/10.3109/01612849209006885>  
26  
27  
28 Turner, R. (1964). Collective behavior. In R. E. L. Faris (Ed.), *Handbook of modern sociology* (pp.  
29  
30 382–425). Rand McNally.  
31  
32 Turner, R., & Killian, L. (1987). *Collective behavior*. Prentice-Hall. (Original work published 1972)  
33  
34 Valenti, E., Giacco, D., Katsakou, C., & Priebe, S. (2014). Which values are important for patients  
35  
36 during involuntary treatment? A qualitative study with psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of*  
37  
38 *Medical Ethics*, 40(12), 832–836. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2011-100370>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **Author biographies**

46  
47 Krysia Canvin, PhD, is a researcher for involvement and engagement in the School of Medicine at the  
48 University of Keele. Her research aims to document and improve understanding of the often  
49 unanticipated harms caused by health and social interventions with a focus on underserved and  
50 seldom heard populations, including people experiencing mental illness and people in prison. Recent  
51 publications include (with L. Sheard, S. Bellass, K. McLintock, & R. Foy), "Understanding the  
52 Organisational Influences on the Quality of and Access to Primary care in English Prisons: A  
53 Qualitative Interview Study," in *British Journal of General Practice* (2023) and (with J. A. Baker & K.  
54 Berzins), "The Relationship Between Workforce Characteristics and Perception of Quality of Care in  
55 Mental Health: A Qualitative Study," in *International Journal of Nursing Studies* (2019).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Lyn Brierley-Jones, PhD is Research Fellow in the Department of Health Sciences at the University of  
4 Nottingham. Her research interests include stillbirth, alcohol consumption, cancer and mental  
5 health. Recent publications include (with J. Ling), "I Would Never Dream of Drinking on a Lunch  
6 Hour, But...': A Bourdieusian Analysis of the Intergenerational Reproduction of Alcohol Consumption  
7 Practices," In *Alcohol, Age, Generation and the Life Course* (pp. 75-100; Springer International  
8 Publishing, 2022) and (with L. Ramsey, K. Canvin, S. Kendal, & J. Baker), "To What Extent are Patients  
9 Involved in Researching Safety in Acute Mental Healthcare?" in *Research Involvement and*  
10 *Engagement* (2022).  
11  
12

13 Lauren Ramsay, PhD, is a Senior Research Fellow working within the "safer systems, cultures and  
14 practices" theme of the Yorkshire and Humber Patient Safety Research Collaboration. Her research  
15 interests include safety culture, patient involvement in patient safety, digital approaches to patient  
16 safety, and safety inequities. Recent publications include (with J. O'Hara, R. Lawton, & L. Sheard), "A  
17 Glimpse Behind the Organisational Curtain: A Dramaturgical Analysis Exploring the Ways Healthcare  
18 Staff Engage With Online Patient Feedback 'Front' and 'Backstage' at Three Hospital Trusts in  
19 England," in *Sociology of Health & Illness* (2023) and (with A. Albutt, K. Perfetto, N. Quinton, J. Baker,  
20 G. Louch, & J. O'Hara), "Systemic Safety Inequities for People With Learning Disabilities: A  
21 Qualitative Integrative Analysis of the Experiences of English Health and Social Care," in *International*  
22 *Journal for Equity in Health* (2022).  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 John Baker, PhD, is chair of mental health nursing in the School of Healthcare at the University of  
28 Leeds. His research focuses on reducing coercion and restrictive practices, patient and professional  
29 safety in mental health services and effective and therapeutic mental healthcare. Recent  
30 publications include (with S. Kendal, K. Berzins, K. Canvin, S. Branthonne-Foster, T. McDougall, B.  
31 Goldson, I. Kellar, J. Wright, & J. Duxbury), "Mapping Review of Interventions to Reduce the use of  
32 Restrictive Practices in Children and Young People's Institutional Settings: The CONTRAST Study,"  
33 in *Children and Society: The International Journal of Childhood and Children's Services* (2022) and  
34 (with N. Clibbens, A. Booth, K. Berzins, M. Ashman, L. Sharda, J. Thompson, S. Kendal, & S. Weich),  
35 "Explanation of Context, Mechanisms and Outcomes in Adult Community Mental Health Crisis Care:  
36 The MH-CREST Realist Evidence Synthesis," in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (2023).  
37  
38  
39

40 Kathryn Berzins, PhD, is a senior research fellow with the Applied Research Collaboration based at  
41 the University of Central Lancashire. Her research interests include patient safety in mental health  
42 hospital settings, professionals' perceptions of safe staffing and access to services in a crisis for  
43 service users and their carers and families. Recent publications include (with J. Baker, G. Louch, & A.  
44 Albutt), "A Qualitative Exploration of Mental Health Service User and Carer Perspectives on Safety  
45 Issues in UK Mental Health Services," in *Health Expectations* (2020) and (with A. Albutt, G. Louch, &  
46 J. Baker), "Health Professionals' Perspectives of Safety Issues in Mental Health Services: A Qualitative  
47 Study," in *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* (2021).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60