# Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International



**33(49B): 111-120, 2021; Article no.JPRI.76280 ISSN: 2456-9119** (Past name: British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, Past ISSN: 2231-2919, NLM ID: 101631759)

# "Prevalence and Source of Various Types of Workplace Violence among Healthcare Professionals in the Public Hospitals of Karachi" A Cross-Sectional Survey

Jai Dev Maheshwari<sup>1\*</sup>, Sidra Zaheer<sup>2</sup>, Greesh Kumar Maheshwari<sup>3</sup>, Kiran Khan<sup>4</sup>, Syeda Batool<sup>5</sup> and Syed Mohsin Turab<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto Medical University Lyari, Karachi, Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup>School of Public Health, Dow University of Health Sciences, Karachi, Pakistan.

 <sup>3</sup>Department of Community Medicine, APPNA Institute of Public Health, JSMU, Karachi, Pakistan.
<sup>4</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Iqra Medical and Dental College, Karachi, Pakistan.
<sup>5</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Peoples University of Medical and Health Sciences for Women, Nawabshah, Pakistan.

<sup>6</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Hamdard College of Medicine & Dentistry, Hamdard University, Karachi, Pakistan.

#### Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Authors JDM and SZ conceived of the presented idea. Authors JDM and GKM developed the theory and performed the computations. Authors KK and SB verified the analytical methods. Author SMT encouraged author JDM to investigate and supervised the findings of this work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JPRI/2021/v33i49B33347 <u>Editor(s):</u> (1) Aurora Martínez Romero, Juarez University, Mexico. <u>Reviewers:</u> (1) Sukhbir Singh, PGUIMS Rohtak, India. (2) Hemant Kumar, Pravara University, India. (3) Sara Shishehgar, University of Technology Sydney, Australia. Complete Peer review History: <u>https://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/76280</u>

> Received 03 September 2021 Accepted 08 November 2021 Published 12 November 2021

**Original Research Article** 

# ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To determine the prevalence of violence among medical doctors in public sector hospitals of Karachi relating to physical violence, psychological violence (verbal and bullying/mobbing), sexual harassment and racial harassment).

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: jaidevmaheshwari83@gmail.com;

**Methods:** A cross-sectional study was carried out in three public sector hospitals in Karachi (JPMC, Civil Hospital and Sindh Government Lyari General Hospital Karachi). Medical doctors of any age and gender who worked in outpatient departments, wards, and emergency departments were eligible to participate in the study. A validated WHO-designed questionnaire was used, with questions about exposure to violence, the source and types of violence, and socio-demographic information. In descriptive statistics, frequencies and percentages were reported for all categorical variables. The Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used to investigate the relationship between workplace violence and other types of violence.

**Results:** 350 questionnaires were distributed to qualified medical doctors in total. Only 300 of them responded, for an 85.7 percent response rate. The majority of respondents were under the age of 40, and male gender was slightly more exposed to violence. The majority of the doctors were subjected to verbal abuse as well as bullying and mobbing.

**Conclusion:** It was then concluded that any type of violence was common in doctors aged >35 years and male gender was more exposed to any violence as compare to female gander. The main type of violence was verbal violence in our study, whereas racial harassment and sexual harassment was also seen.

Keywords: Workplace violence; physical violence; verbal violence; sexual harassment and racial harassment.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Workplace violence (WPV) among healthcare professionals has now been indicated as a public health threat throughout the world, with a greater prevalence in developing countries where the quality of healthcare and service is deplorable [1] . The vocational health and safety threat of workplace violence (WPV) [2]. has become the focus of considerable global research [3,4]. Workplace violence (WPV) is defined by the World Health Organization as " incidents where staff are abused, threatened or assaulted in circumstances related to their work, including commuting to and from work, involving an explicit or implicit challenge to their safety, well-being or health" [5].

With the passage of time, this has become a growing source of concern, drawing the attention of different sectors, including the government and employers. This is because violence not only has a negative impact on an individual and his or her family, but it can also have a deleterious impact on an organization affecting teamwork and employee morale [6,7]. According to The National Institute for Occupational Safety and (NIOSH) and International Labor Health Organization (ILO) identified hospital is the public area where the most violence against employees can be witnessed; and healthcare workers are among the most vulnerable groups experiencing violence and aggressive behavior [8-10].

The rate of violence in healthcare institutions has been alarmingly rising. These events undermine doctors' self-esteem, impede the doctor-patient relationship, and also limit a responsible approach towards the services of the patient.

In Pakistan medical service is still developing furthermore, technical services [11] and in healthcare correspondence are 1000 comprehensive and far less proactive than in fully developed nations. At the moment, healthcare interactions are extremely volatile, and negative reporting has harmed hospitals' public credibility, resulting in practitioner's fear of facing patients and patients losing trust in medical practitioner [12] The majority of the challenge stems from patients' high expectations and the inappropriate behavior of emotionally loaded attendants, the spark is also fueled by a lack of qualified workforce, an unexpected run life-saving medications, out of and the interference of anti - social aspects in the hospital [13].

Healthcare Practitioners in both developing and developed countries have faced threats and assaults in hospitals and healthcare institutions. In Pakistan, the large percentage (73.4%) of healthcare practitioners have faced some form of violence, ranging from overcrowding in hospitals to an insufficient security measures, with verbal violence being the most commonly reported form [14]. A nationwide study in Pakistan's major tertiary care hospitals found that more than 70% of healthcare workers in hospital emergency rooms had encountered some sort of violence in the two months preceding the research with 12% of physicians reported physical violence and 65% reported verbal harassment [15].

Based on this, the present study sought to ascertain the prevalence of WPV against healthcare workers, as well as to investigate the nature and source of violence in various professional groups, and to ascertain which healthcare profession suffers more frequently from WPV in Karachi hospitals.

# 2. METHODOLOGY

It was a hospital-based cross-sectional study. After approval, data were collected from three public hospitals in Karachi (JPMC, Civil Hospital, and Sindh Government Lyari General Hospital Karachi) between December 2016 and March 2017. The OpenEpi calculator was used to calculate the sample size. According to estimates, 74% of healthcare professionals have experienced some form of violence. The total sample size was 296 individuals, with a 5% margin of error, an 80% power level, and a 95% confidence level. 300 practitioners were involved as the study sample. Healthcare practitioners of all ages and genders who were involved in patient care in OPDs, wards, and emergency rooms were included in the study using a convenient sampling technique in order to reach the targeted sample size.

#### 2.1 Inclusion Criteria

For data collection, both male and female healthcare professionals i.e. doctors of all ages were included in the sample.

#### 2.2 Exclusion Criteria

- Doctors working on locum basis were not included.
- Doctors working in collaboration with non-governmental organisations were excluded.
- Doctors who work in laboratories were excluded.

# 2.3 Research Instrument & Data Collection

For data collection, a validated modified WHO structured questionnaire (Organization, 2003) was used, which had previously been used to identify WPV among healthcare professionals in Pakistan [16,17]. It included questions about exposure to violence, different types of violence, and how the participant felt after being exposed to a violent situation. The questionnaire was translated from English into Urdu and distributed by the principal investigator and two trained data collectors. The questionnaire contained all of the responses, which were then entered into SPSS.Study Variables:

#### 2.3.1 Independent Variables

Gender, age, profession, years of experience, job status and working environment and type and source of workplace violence.

#### 2.3.2 Dependent Variables

Physical violence, verbal violence, bullying/mobbing, sexual abuse/harassment, racial abuse/harassment.

## 2.4 Statistical Analysis

SPSS version 21 was used to collect and analyse all data. Frequencies and percentages were reported for all categorical variables in descriptive statistics. To examine the relationship between workplace violence/any type of violence and all independent variables, the Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used. P-values less than 0.05 were considered significant.

# 3. RESULTS

Total 350 questionnaires were distributed to qualified medical doctors. Of them 300 responded to the questionnaire, the response rate was 85.7%.

#### 3.1 Characteristics of the Study's Participants

The majority of respondents were under 40 years old (range 22-60 years), with 158 females (52.7%) and 142 males (47.3%). Physicians made up 48 (16%) of the study sample, surgeons 63 (21%), PG (Postgraduate) residents 64 (21.3%), CMO (Chief Medical Officer) / MO (Medical Officer) 55 (18.3%), and HO (House Officer) 70 (23.3%).

Respondents with less than five years of work experience in public sector hospitals were 147 (49%); the majority of professionals were fulltime employees n = 283 (94%). Respondents worked in the adult ward (70.3%) and the Pediatric ward (29.7%).

Characteristics	Total numbers of participant		
Age (years)	n	Percentage	
22-30	118	39.3%	
31-40	120	40%	
40 and above	62	20.7%	
Sex			
Female	158	52.7%	
Male	142	47.3%	
Profession			
Physician	48	16%	
Surgeon	63	21%	
Postgraduate PG resident	64	21.3%	
CMO/MO	55	18.3%	
НО	70	23.3%	
Work experience			
≤ 5 years	147	49%	
> 5 years	153	51%	
Job status			
Part time/temporary	17	5.7%	
Full time	283	94.3%	
Working environment			
Pediatric	89	29.7%	
Adults	211	70.3%	

Table 1. Individual characteristic of total participant the study (n=300)

#### 3.2 Types of Violence among Healthcare Professionals

Table 2 shows various types of violence experienced by respondents in the previous 12 months. Among 300 participants, 221 (73.3%) experienced verbal violence, 132 (44.0%) experienced bullying/mobbing, 33 (11.0%) experienced racial violence, 28 (9.3%) experienced physical violence, and 15 (5.0%) experienced sexual violence. The most common type of violence observed in the study was verbal violence.

## 3.3 Demographic Characteristics of Health Professionals with Workplace Violence

Table 3 shows the demographic characteristics of respondents as well as their exposure to various types of workplace violence in the previous 12 months.

Table 2. Descriptive of workplace violence (n=300)

Type of violence	n	%	
Physical violence			
Yes	28	9.3%	
No	272	90.7%	
Verbal violence			
Yes	221	73.7%	
No	79	26.3%	
Bullying/Mobbing			
Yes	132	44.0%	
No	168	56.0%	
Sexual harassment			
Yes	15	5.0%	
No	285	95.0%	
Racial harassment			
Yes	33	11.0%	
No	267	89.0%	

According to the findings, younger professionals under the age of 35 reported a significantly higher percentage of verbal violence (58.4%) and bullying (52.3%), respectively, while professionals over the age of 35 reported a higher percentage of sexual violence (73.3%). Males reported a higher percentage of physical violence (75%) and bullying (56.8%) than females, who reported a higher percentage of sexual violence (100%).

Furthermore, physicians reported a high percentage of physical violence (28.6 %) and racial violence (27.3%). Whereas surgeons and CMOs had significantly higher percentages of verbal violence (23.1%) and bullying (29.5%), respectively. Female surgeons reported a higher rate of sexual assault (46.7%).

According to our findings, healthcare professionals with more than five years of experience and who work full-time reported a percentage hiaher of all violence. with significantly higher percentage of verbal (57.9%) and bullying (66.7%) violence (p-value 0.001). Additionally, those healthcare professionals who work in an adult work environment experienced a high percentage of all violence.

# 3.4 Type and Source of Workplace Violence of Health Professionals

Table 4 shows that patients' attendants were the most common source of each type of workplace violence, with health professional experiencing the most physical violence (96.4%). In our study, the incidents of sexual harassment/violence and racially harassment/violence (60.6%) occurred outside (on the way) the institute (100%) while incidents occurred inside the institute were verbal violence (99.1%), bullying / mobbing (98.5%), and physical violence (96.4%). Victims of physical violence (42.9%) reported such incidents to senior staff and the institute, whereas victims of verbal (50.2%), bullying (49.2%), and racial (30.3%) violence sought counselling as a response to violence.

# 4. DISCUSSION

The current study looked into the prevalence of violence against medical doctors in Karachi's public hospitals. The current study found that any type of violence is more common among doctors over the age of 35, whereas young doctors under the age of 35 were more likely to experience verbal and bullying/mobbing violence. Aside from

the male gender, practitioners who had direct contact with patients and their relatives and had more than five years of experience were autonomously linked to violence in the workplace. The family members as well as the friends of patients accompanying them to the hospitals were found to be mainly responsible for the violence.

According to our findings, younger doctors under the age of 35 reported a higher percentage of verbal violence, including bullying and mobbing and the increased risk may be due to a lack of work experience and opportunities to improve, which may result in some errors and mistakes. Moreover, they may have fewer healthy communication skills with patients due to lack of experience. These observations are consistent with the findings of another study conducted on nurses in the public sector of Karachi, which exhibited that those under the age of 36 are more likely to be victims of violence (of all types) than those over the age of 36 [18].

In this study, male participants were more likely than females to witness acts of violence. The scientific proof on whether a worker's gender puts him or her at risk of sexual assault is conflicting. Since some researchers revealed that men are far more likely than women to experience violent events [19-21]. whereas others found the opposite and confirmed that women, particularly nurses, are more likely to face violence and abusive behavior than male. In fact, according to some other authors, there's been indifference in the overall frequency of physical and verbal violent events among health staff based on their gender [22].

According to our findings, those professionals with more than five years of experience and who work full-time reported a higher percentage of all violence, which may be due to the fact that they are far more familiar to the locals than the new employees. This finding is consistent with the findings of another study conducted in Karachi [23].

The study also revealed that all of the participants professional medical were doctors/practitioners who reported beina subjected to various forms of workplace violence and identified verbal violence as the primary source of workplace violence in the public sector of Karachi hospitals. Consistent findings were obtained, which showed nearly identical results in other research conducted in Pakistan [24,25]. and other countries [26,27].

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Characteristics	Physical Violence	Verbal Violence	Bullying/Mobbing	Sexual Harassment	Racial Harassment
Age   is 35 years   13 (46.4)   129 (58.4)   69 (52.3)   4 (26.7)   18 (54.5)     > 35 years   15 (53.6)   92 (63 (47.7))   11 (73.3)   15 (45.5)     p-value   0.100   0.021   0.002   0.005   0.346     Sex   Female   7 (25.0)   110 (49.8)   57 (43.2)   15 (100.0)   13 (39.4)     Male   21 (75.0)   111 (75.2)   0.004   -   0.139     Professional   Professional   (17.2)   2 (13.3)   9 (27.3)     Surgeon   6 (21.4)   51 (23.1)   39 (29.5)   7 (46.7)   7 (21.2)     CMO/MO   6 (21.4)   51 (23.1)   39 (29.5)   1 (6.7)   6 (18.2)     p-value   -   0.001   33 (9 (9.5)   1 (6.7)   6 (18.2)     De-value   -   0.001   0.082   0.442     Work   25 years   10 (35.7)   93 (9.44 (33.3)   4 (26.7)   12 (36.4)     p-value   -   0.001   0.082   0.442     Work   25 years   18 (64.3)   128 (57.9)   11 (73.3)   21 (63.6)						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		13 (46.4)		69 (52.3)	4 (26.7)	18 (54.5)
p-value     0.100 $0.021$ 0.002     0.005     0.346       Sex     Female     7 (25.0)     110     57 (43.2)     15 (100.0)     13 (39.4)       Male     21 (75.0)     111     75 (56.8)     0 (00)     20 (60.6)       p-value     0.003     0.115     0.004     -     0.139       Professional     (17.2)     (17.2)     (21.3)     9 (27.3)       Surgeon     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     7 (46.7)     7 (21.2)       CMO/MO     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     1 (6.7)     6 (18.2)       p-value     -     (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)       PG resident     8 (28.6)     48     24 (18.2)     4 (26.7)     6 (18.2)       p-value     -     <0.001     0.082     0.442       Work     experience     (23.1)     9 (6.8)     1 (6.7)     5 (15.2)       p-value     -     <0.001     0.082     0.442       Work     experience     (42.1)     (42.1) <t< td=""><td>&gt; 35 years</td><td>15 (53.6)</td><td>92</td><td>63 (47.7)</td><td>11 (73.3)</td><td>15 (45.5)</td></t<>	> 35 years	15 (53.6)	92	63 (47.7)	11 (73.3)	15 (45.5)
Sex     Female     7 (25.0)     110     57 (43.2)     15 (100.0)     13 (39.4)       Male     21 (75.0)     111     75 (56.8)     0 (00)     20 (60.6)       p-value     0.003     0.115     0.004     -     0.139       Professional     (17.2)     2 (13.3)     9 (27.3)     (17.2)       Surgeon     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     7 (46.7)     7 (21.2)       (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)     (23.1)       PG resident     8 (28.6)     48     24 (18.2)     4 (26.7)     6 (18.2)       (21.7)     CMO/MO     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     1 (6.7)     5 (15.2)       Mol     0 (00)     33     9 (6.8)     1 (6.7)     6 (18.2)       p-value     -     <0.001	p-value	0 100		0.002	0.005	0.346
Female7 (25.0)110 (49.8) (50.2)57 (43.2)15 (100.0)13 (39.4) (49.8) (60.6)Male21 (75.0)111 (50.2)75 (56.8)0 (00)20 (60.6) (50.2)p-value0.0030.1150.004-0.139Professional-0.139Physician8 (28.6)3821 (15.9)2 (13.3)9 (27.3) (21.2)Surgeon6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)7 (46.7)7 (21.2) (23.1)PG resident8 (28.6)4824 (18.2)4 (26.7)6 (18.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (29.5)1 (6.7)5 (15.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2) (24.7)p-value-<0.001		01100	0.021	0.002	0.000	01010
Male21 (75.0)111 (50.2)75 (56.8) (50.2)0 (00)20 (60.6) (50.2)p-value0.0030.1150.004-0.139Professional Physician8 (28.6)3821 (15.9)2 (13.3)9 (27.3) (23.1)Surgeon6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)7 (46.7)7 (21.2) (23.1)PG resident8 (28.6)4824 (18.2)4 (26.7)6 (18.2) (23.1)PG resident8 (28.6)4824 (18.2)4 (26.7)5 (15.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (29.5)1 (6.7)5 (15.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2) (14.9)p-value-<0.001		7 (25.0)		57 (43.2)	15 (100.0)	13 (39.4)
p-value0.0030.1150.004-0.139Professional Physician8(28.6)3821 (15.9)2 (13.3)9 (27.3)Surgeon6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)7 (46.7)7 (21.2)(23.1)(21.7)24 (18.2)4 (26.7)6 (18.2)CMO/MO6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)1 (6.7)5 (15.2)(23.1)(23.1)9 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2)HO0 (00)339 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2)p-value-<0.001<0.0010.0820.442Work(42.1)44 (33.3)4 (26.7)12 (36.4) $5$ years18 (64.3)12888 (66.7)11 (73.3)21 (63.6)p-value0.166<0.001<0.0010.1100.142Job statusPart time28 (100.0)8 (3.6)2 (1.5)0 (00)1 (3.0)Full time28 (100.0)213130 (98.5)15 (100.0)32 (97.0)(96.4)p-value-0.0190.005-0.705WorkingenvironmentPediatric7 (25.0)6233 (25.0)0 (00)9 (27.3)Adults21 (75.0)15999 (75.0)15 (100.0)24 (72.7)	Male	21 (75.0)	111	75 (56.8)	0 (00)	20 (60.6)
Professional Physician     8 (28.6)     38     21 (15.9)     2 (13.3)     9 (27.3)       Surgeon     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     7 (46.7)     7 (21.2)       PG resident     8 (28.6)     48     24 (18.2)     4 (26.7)     6 (18.2)       CMO/MO     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     1 (6.7)     5 (15.2)       CMO/MO     6 (21.4)     51     39 (29.5)     1 (6.7)     6 (18.2)       (23.1)     HO     0 (00)     33     9 (6.8)     1 (6.7)     6 (18.2)       (14.9)     -     <0.001	p-value	0.003		0.004	-	0.139
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
Surgeon6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)7 (46.7)7 (21.2) (23.1)PG resident8 (28.6)4824 (18.2)4 (26.7)6 (18.2) (21.7)CMO/MO6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)1 (6.7)5 (15.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2) (14.9)p-value-<0.001		8 (28.6)		21 (15.9)	2 (13.3)	9 (27.3)
PG resident8 (28.6)4824 (18.2)4 (26.7)6 (18.2) (21.7)CMO/MO6 (21.4)5139 (29.5)1 (6.7)5 (15.2) (23.1)HO0 (00)339 (6.8)1 (6.7)6 (18.2) (14.9)p-value-<0.001	Surgeon	6 (21.4)	51	39 (29.5)	7 (46.7)	7 (21.2)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	PG resident	8 (28.6)	48	24 (18.2)	4 (26.7)	6 (18.2)
HO $0 (00)$ $33$ $9 (6.8)$ $1 (6.7)$ $6 (18.2)$ (14.9)p-value- $<0.001$ $<0.001$ $0.082$ $0.442$ Work experience $\leq 5 years10 (35.7)9344 (33.3)4 (26.7)12 (36.4)(42.1)> 5 years18 (64.3)128(57.9)88 (66.7)11 (73.3)21 (63.6)(57.9)p-value0.166<0.001<0.0010.1100.142Job statusPart time0 (00)8 (3.6)2 (1.5)0 (00)1 (3.0)Full time28 (100.0)213130 (98.5)15 (100.0)32 (97.0)(96.4)p-value-0.0190.005-0.705Workingenvironment(28.1)(28.1)(28.1)(28.1)(28.1)Adults21 (75.0)15999 (75.0)15 (100.0)24 (72.7)(71.9)$	CMO/MO	6 (21.4)	51	39 (29.5)	1 (6.7)	5 (15.2)
p-value-<0.001<0.0010.0820.442Work experience </td <td>HO</td> <td>0 (00)</td> <td>33</td> <td>9 (6.8)</td> <td>1 (6.7)</td> <td>6 (18.2)</td>	HO	0 (00)	33	9 (6.8)	1 (6.7)	6 (18.2)
Work experience $\leq 5$ years10 (35.7)9344 (33.3)4 (26.7)12 (36.4) (42.1)> 5 years18 (64.3)128 (57.9)88 (66.7)11 (73.3)21 (63.6) (57.9)p-value0.166<0.001	p-value	-		<0.001	0.082	0.442
experience $\leq 5 \text{ years}$ 10 (35.7)   93   44 (33.3)   4 (26.7)   12 (36.4)     > 5 years   18 (64.3)   128   88 (66.7)   11 (73.3)   21 (63.6)     p-value   0.166   <0.001						
≤ 5 years 10 (35.7) 93 (44 (33.3)) 4 (26.7) 12 (36.4) (42.1) 128 (36.4) (42.1) 128 (57.9) 11 (73.3) 21 (63.6) (57.9) 11 (73.3) 21 (63.6) (57.9) 11 (73.3) 21 (63.6) (57.9) 12 (36.4) 11 (73.3) 1						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	•	10 (35.7)		44 (33.3)	4 (26.7)	12 (36.4)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	> 5 years	18 (64.3)	128	88 (66.7)	11 (73.3)	21 (63.6)
Job statusPart time0 (00)8 (3.6)2 (1.5)0 (00)1 (3.0)Full time28 (100.0)213130 (98.5)15 (100.0)32 (97.0) $(96.4)$ 0.005-0.705Working environment Pediatric7 (25.0)6233 (25.0)0 (00)9 (27.3)(28.1) (71.9)99 (75.0)15 (100.0)24 (72.7)	p-value	0.166		<0.001	0.110	0.142
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		000			01110	0
Full time28 (100.0)213 (96.4)130 (98.5)15 (100.0)32 (97.0) (96.4)p-value-0.0190.005-0.705Working environment-0.2233 (25.0)0 (00)9 (27.3) (28.1)Adults21 (75.0)159 (71.9)99 (75.0)15 (100.0)24 (72.7) (71.9)		0 (00)	8 (3 6)	2 (1.5)	0 (00)	1 (3.0)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		· · ·			( )	
p-value     -     0.019     0.005     -     0.705       Working environment     -     0.705     -     0.705       Pediatric     7 (25.0)     62     33 (25.0)     0 (00)     9 (27.3)       Adults     21 (75.0)     159     99 (75.0)     15 (100.0)     24 (72.7)		20 (100.0)		100 (00.0)	10 (100.0)	02 (01.0)
Working environment Pediatric     62     33 (25.0)     0 (00)     9 (27.3)       Adults     21 (75.0)     159     99 (75.0)     15 (100.0)     24 (72.7)	p-value	-		0.005	-	0.705
environment     Pediatric     7 (25.0)     62     33 (25.0)     0 (00)     9 (27.3)       Adults     21 (75.0)     159     99 (75.0)     15 (100.0)     24 (72.7)						
Pediatric     7 (25.0)     62     33 (25.0)     0 (00)     9 (27.3)       Adults     21 (75.0)     159     99 (75.0)     15 (100.0)     24 (72.7)       (71.9)     (71.9)     (75.0)     15 (100.0)     24 (72.7)						
Adults 21 (75.0) 159 99 (75.0) 15 (100.0) 24 (72.7) (71.9)		7 (25.0)		33 (25.0)	0 (00)	9 (27.3)
	Adults	21 (75.0)	159	99 (75.0)	15 (100.0)	24 (72.7)
	p-value	0.668		0.128	-	0.842

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of health professionals with workplace violence (n=300)

This study found that 44% of employees were bullied or mobbed at work which in concordant with a study conducted in Turkey which showed the frequency of "mobbing" among those 48.6% is 1 to 3 times per year [28] however, another study conducted in Pakistan found that 63.8% of doctors were bullied or mobbed in the previous 12 months. This disparity in proportions may be due to the fact that the study only reported on one type of violence, and the study participants were all junior doctors. In the last year, 9.3% of workplaces experienced physical violence. In comparison, previous studies in Saudi Arabia found 12.0% [29] and another study done in Ethiopia found that the physical violence was prevalent in 60.2% of the nurses. The difference could be explained by the fact that the participants in these studies were all nurses. Moreover, because there is an imbalance between health care service need and health care delivery in resource-constrained country like Ethiopia, this issue can directly expose health care professionals to workplace violence [30]. The current study found that sexual harassment was low at work in the previous 12 months; this finding was consistent with other studies that found that the proportion of sexual harassment was lower when compared to other types of violence.

Furthermore, the current study determined that patients' family members were the primary perpetrators of all types of violence (physical, verbal, bullying/mobbing, sexual, and racial), which is consistent with other studies conducted in other regional studies [31].

Characteristics	Physical Violence	Verbal Violence	Bullying/Mobbing	Sexual violence	Racial violence
	n = 28	n = 221	n = 132	n = 15	n = 33
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Source of violence					
Patient	0 (00)	4 (1.8)	3 (1.5)	2 (13.3)	1 (3.2)
Relative of patient	27 (96.4)	197 (89.1)	126 (95.5)	13 (86.7)	24 (77.4)
Management	1 (3.6)	20 (9.0)	4 (3.0)	0 (00)	6 (19.4)
Incident take place					
Inside institute	27 (96.4)	219 (99.1)	130 (98.5)	0 (00)	10 (30.3)
Patient's home	0 (00)	0 (00)	2 (1.5)	0 (00)	3 (9.0)
Outside (on way)	1 (3.6)	2 (0.9)	0 (00)	15 (100)	20 (60.6)
Respond to incident					
Took no action	2 (7.1)	51 (23.1)	10 (7.6)	0 (00)	2 (6.1)
Tried to it never	3 (10.7)	3 (1.4)	0 (00)	0 (00)	1 (3.0)
happened					
Told to any person	0 (00)	5 (2.3)	3 (2.3)	10 (66.7)	3 (9.1)
Tried to defend my self	9 (32.1)	-	-	-	-
Sought counseling	1 (3.6)	111(50.2)	65 (49.2)	0 (00)	10 (30.3
Reported it to senior staff/association	12 (42.9)	38 (17.2)	42 (31.8)	3 (20.0)	8 (24.2)
Transferred to another position	1 (3.6)	13 (5.9)	12 (9.1)	2 (13.3)	9 (27.3)
Routine direct physical co	ontact with				
patients					
Yes	17 (60.7)	150 (67.9)	78 (59.1)	12 (80.0)	26 (78.8
No	11 (39.3)	71 (32.1)	54 (40.9)	3 (20.0)	7 (21.2)
<i>p</i> -value	0.182	0.003	<0.001	0.767	0.536
Sex of the patients most f	requently				
work	- ((				
Female	5 (17.9)	48 (21.7)	30 (22.7)	11 (73.3)	3 (9.1)
Both (Male & Female)	23 (82.1)	173 (78.3)	102 (77.3)	4 (26.7)	30 (90.9)
<i>p</i> -value	0.810	1.00	0.778	<0.001	0.073
Encouragement to report violence	work place				
	07 (06 A)	217 (00 2)	120 (09 F)	15 (100)	22 (07 0)
Yes No	27 (96.4) 1 (2.6)	217 (98.2)	130 (98.5) 2 (1 5)	15 (100)	32 (97.0)
	1 (3.6) 0.389	4 (1.8) 1 00	2 (1.5) 1.00	0 (00) 1.00	1 (3.0) 0.444
<i>p</i> -value	0.369	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.444

Table 4. Type and source of workplace violence of health professionals (n=300)

Besides that, across the studies reviewed, the majority of perpetrators against health workers included patients, patients' relatives, visitors, doctors and supervisors at varying rates, with patient relatives ranging from (18.2% –100%) [32-34].

The study revealed some shortfalls in the responses after being exposed to WPV. The majority of healthcare professionals stated that they soughed counselling or reported to their seniors if they were subjected to physical, verbal, or sexual assault. As a result of these findings, it appears that WPV is being reported, victims are being compensated, counselled, or given medical attention, and, more importantly, perpetrators are not free to repeat WPV actions without accountability.

No existing institutional guideline on dealing with WPV was reported in most of the studies examined [35-37]. In Ethiopia, 31.6% of the health workers surveyed stated that there was no guideline or reporting procedure on violence [38]. The lack of a guideline on violence in Gambia was reported as a result of the WPV's lack of an adequate reporting system [39]. However, according to Boafo et al. [40]. 72.9% of respondents reported the presence of a process for reporting violence, with 18% reporting that management teams acted quickly to further investigate it [40]. Across the country's numerous health institutions, there is a lack of a policy on violence. As a result, critical steps must be taken to establish policy and strategies for violence management in order to save health workers and encourage them to work harder to improve the situation.

# 5. CONCLUSION

Violence against HCPs is a multifaceted, complex issue and a serious public health problem with a high prevalence. This may have an impact on their well-being and lead to low job motivation, putting healthcare provision at risk in an already strained healthcare system in a developing country like Pakistan. As a result, the safety of the injured and sick, healthcare personnel, healthcare facilities, and healthcare vehicles is critical for the provision of necessary services. Moreover, across the country's numerous health institutions, there is a lack of a policy on violence. As a result, critical steps must be taken to establish policy and strategies for violence management in order to save health workers and encourage them to work harder to improve the situation.

#### 6. FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Create more comprehensive studies (qualitative, interventional, and correlational) to investigate the WPV procedure and current prevention models. Establish standard instruments in the clinical setting for assessing and measuring WPV. Create predictive tools for assessing WPV risks. Examine the causes of WPV against healthcare professionals from the perspective of the perpetrators of violence.

# 7. LIMITATION

The study's limitations include convenience sampling that decreases the overall generalization; however, the study's primary focus was on obtaining an in-depth understanding of the problem.

## CONSENT AND ETHICAL APPROVAL

Before the study began, the institutes conducted an ethical review and granted approval. After that the data collection procedure was started, which initially included obtaining informed consent from the participant. Participants were asked and informed about the study, and if they agreed to participate, a valid consent was obtained.

## **COMPETING INTERESTS**

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Abdellah RF, Salama, KM. Prevalence and risk factors of workplace violence against health care workers in emergency department in Ismailia, Egypt. Pan African medical journal, 2017; 26:1-8.
- 2. Chappell D, Di Martino V. Violence at work, International Labour Organization; 2006.
- Hahn S, Müller, M., Needham, I., Dassen, T., Kok, G, Halfens, RJ. Factors associated with patient and visitor violence experienced by nurses in general hospitals in Switzerland: a cross-sectional survey. Journal of clinical nursing, 2010;19:3535-3546.
- 4. Bentley TA , Catley, B, Forsyth D, Tappin D. Understanding workplace violence: The value of a systems perspective. Applied ergonomics, 2014;45: 839-848.

- Mento, C, Silvestri, MC, Bruno, A., Muscatello, MRA, Cedro C., Pandolfo G, Zoccali RA. Workplace violence against healthcare professionals: A systematic review. Aggression and violent behavior. 2020;51:101381.
- 6. Hinson J, Shapiro M. Violence in the workplace: awareness and prevention. Australian Health Review, 2003;26:84-91.
- Einarsen S, Hoel H, Notelaers G. Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. Work & stress. 2009;23:24-44.
- Shea T, Sheehan C, Donohue, R, Cooper, B, De Cieri H. Occupational violence and aggression experienced by nursing and caring professionals. Journal of nursing scholarship. 2017;49:236-243.
- 9. Waters E, Doyle J. Systematic reviews of public health in developing countries are in train. Bmj, 2004;328:585.
- 10. Di Martino, V. Workplace violence in the health sector. Country case studies Brazil, Bulgaria, Lebanon, Portugal, South Africa, Thailand and an additional Australian study. Ginebra: Organización Internacional del Trabajo. 2002;3-42.
- Bingley H, Lowe N, Mehdi, R, Haq, ZU, Zaman M. Developing health service delivery in a poor and marginalised community in North West Pakistan. Pakistan journal of medical sciences, 2018;34:757.
- 12. Franz, S, Zeh A., Schablon A, Kuhnert S, Nienhaus, A. Aggression and violence against health care workers in Germany-a cross sectional retrospective survey. BMC health services research, 2010;10:1-8.
- 13. Rasul CH. Violence towards doctors. Bangladesh Medical Journal Khulna, 2012;45:1-2.
- 14. Imran, N, Jawaid, M, Haider, I, Masood Z. Bullying of junior doctors in Pakistan: a cross-sectional survey. Singapore Med J, 2010;51:592-5.
- 15. Mirza NM., Amjad, A. I., Bhatti, ABH., Shaikh, KS., Kiani, J., Yusuf, MM., Khan, MU., Nazir, ME., Assad, Q, Humayun, A. Violence and abuse faced by junior physicians in the emergency department from patients and their caretakers: a nationwide study from Pakistan. The Journal of Emergency Medicine, 2012;42: 727-733.

- Jafree SR. Workplace violence against women nurses working in two public sector hospitals of Lahore, Pakistan. Nursing outlook, 2017;65:420-427.
- 17. Khan MN, Haq ZU, Khan M, Wali S, Baddia F, Rasul, S., Khan, S., Polkowski, M, Ramirez-Mendoza, JY. Prevalence and determinants of violence against health care in the metropolitan city of Peshawar: a cross sectional study. BMC public health, 2021;21:1-11.
- Maaari, KH, Amjad, CM, Ansari MI. Workplace violence towards nurses of intensive care areas and emergencies at civil hospital Karachi. Journal of University Medical & Dental College, 2017;8:36-45.
- Gillespie, GL, Gates DM., Miller, M, Howard PK. Workplace violence in healthcare settings: risk factors and protective strategies. Rehabilitation nursing, 2010;35:177-184.
- 20. Miedema, B., Easley, J., Fortin P, Hamilton R, Tatemichi S. Disrespect, harassment, and abuse: All in a day's work for family physicians. Canadian Family Physician, 2009;55:279-285.
- Thomas, NI., Brown, ND., Hodges, LC., Gandy J., Lawson, L., Lord JE, Williams, DK. Risk profiles for four types of workrelated injury among hospital employees: a case-control study. AAOHN journal, 2006;54:61-68.
- 22. Tolhurst, H., Baker, L., Murray, G., Bell, P, Sutton A, Dean, S. 2003. Rural general practitioner experience of work-related violence in Australia. Australian Journal of Rural Health, 2003;11:231-236.
- Baig, L. A., Shaikh, S., Polkowski, M., Ali, SK., Jamali, S., Mazharullah, L., Soomro, M., Kumari, B., Memon, SM Maheshwari, G. Violence against health care providers: a mixed-methods study from Karachi, Pakistan. The Journal of emergency medicine, 2018;54:558-566. e2.
- 24. Imran, N, Pervez, MH., Farooq, R, Asghar AR. Aggression and violence towards medical doctors and nurses in a public health care facility in Lahore, Pakistan: A preliminary investigation. Khyber medical university Journal, 2013;5:179-184.
- 25. Zubairi AJ, Ali M, Sheikh S, Ahmad, T. Workplace violence against doctors involved in clinical care at a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan. J Pak Med Assoc, 2019;69:1355-9.
- 26. Aksakal, FNB, Karaşahin EF, Dikmen AU, Avci E, Özkan S. Workplace physical

violence, verbal violence, and mobbing experiencedby nurses at a university hospital. Turkish journal of medical sciences, 2015;45:1360-1368.

- 27. Alsaleem SA, Alsabaani A, Alamri RS, Hadi RA., Alkhayri, MH., Badawi, KK, Badawi AG, Alshehri AA, Al-Bishi, AM. Violence towards healthcare workers: A study conducted in Abha City, Saudi Arabia. Journal of family & community medicine, 2018;25:188.
- 28. Picakciefe M, Acar G, Colak Z, Kilic I. The relationship between sociodemographic characteristics, work conditions, and level of "mobbing" of health workers in primary health care. Journal of interpersonal violence, 2017;32:373-398.
- 29. Algwaiz, WM, Alghanim S. Violence exposure among health care professionals in Saudi public hospitals. Saudi medical journal, 2012;33:76-82.
- Tiruneh, BT, Bifftu BB, Tumebo AA, Kelkay MM, Anlay DZ, Dachew BA. Prevalence of workplace violence in Northwest Ethiopia: a multivariate analysis. BMC nursing. 2016;15:1-6.
- 31. Hamdan M. Workplace violence towards workers in the emergency departments of Palestinian hospitals: a cross-sectional study. Human resources for health, 2015;13:1-9.
- 32. Kennedy, M, Julie H. Nurses' experiences and understanding of workplace violence in a trauma and emergency department in South Africa. Health SA Gesondheid, 2013;18.
- Abou-Elwafa, HS, El-Gilany, A-H, Abd-El-Raouf SE., Abd-Elmouty, SM, EL-Sayed Hassan EL-Sayed R. Workplace violence against emergency versus non-emergency nurses in Mansoura university hospitals,

Egypt. Journal of interpersonal violence, 2015;30:857-872.

- 34. Azodo CC, Ezeja E, Ehikhamenor E. Occupational violence against dental professionals in southern Nigeria. African health sciences. 2011;11.
- Abodunrin O, Adeoye O, Adeomi AA, Akande TM. Prevalence and forms of violence against health care professionals in a South-Western city, Nigeria; 2014.
- Samir N., Mohamed, R., Moustafa, E, Abou Saif H. Nurses' attitudes and reactions to workplace violence in obstetrics and gynaecology departments in Cairo hospitals. EMHJ-Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal, 2012;18 (3):198-204.
- 37. Natan MB, Hanukayev A, Fares S. Factors affecting Israeli nurses' reports of violence perpetrated against them in the workplace: A test of the theory of planned behaviour. International Journal of Nursing Practice, 2011;17:141-150.
- Yenealem DG, Woldegebriel MK, Olana, AT, Mekonnen TH. Violence at work: determinants & prevalence among health care workers, northwest Ethiopia: an institutional based cross sectional study. Annals of occupational and environmental medicine, 2019;31:1-7.
- Sisawo EJ, Ouédraogo SYYA, Huang S-L. Workplace violence against nurses in the Gambia: mixed methods design. BMC health services research, 2017;17:1-11.
- 40. Boafo IM, HANCOCK P, GRINGART E. Sources, incidence and effects of non-physical workplace violence against nurses in Ghana. Nursing open, 2016;3:99-109.

© 2021 Maheshwari et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

> Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: https://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/76280