
Constructing Trust

in acute inpatient mental healthcare facilities:

the role of physical, social and symbolic

environments of care in supporting therapeutic safety

“Architecture, of the all the arts,

works most slowly, but most surely, on the soul.”

Ernest Dimnet: *What We Live By* (1932)

Mary Therese Potter Forbes

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the field.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature are indicated in the thesis.

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship

Signature of Student: 

Date: 27 June 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Heartfelt thanks to my long suffering family who have long waited for me to hang up my mortarboard. In particular, I must thank my husband Ian for his Love, Patience and Support over the years as he kept the home fires burning while I was focused elsewhere, and also my loving son Alexander, who has lived with a half distracted woman for half his life. Ian must also be thanked for bringing his architectural expertise to the project and effectively leading the construction and design team involved in the environmental interventions implemented at the Case Study D site (*Happy Shores*).

A great thank you must go to my PhD supervisor Professor Jane Stein-Parbury for her patience and support. Professor Stein-Parbury took me on at a time of change and late in the process. She gently, charmingly and decisively shepherded me over the line. It was solely through her influence that access to the Case Study D site was made possible and without her advice that research may not have been completed.

I must also acknowledge my original PhD supervisors, Professors Julie Johnston and Paul Barach, who guided the early framing of the research and advised on data collection for Case Studies A, B and C. Professor Johnston stayed on as a co-supervisor on her return to the United States when primary supervision was transferred to Professor Stein-Parbury. Her thoughtful insights helped see the thesis to completion. I must also thank Professor Barach for making access to Case

Study sites A, B and C possible and for his insistence on an onerously rigorous quality assessment of the literature.

Finally, the work would not have been completed without the support of the CEO of NSW Health Infrastructure Mr Robert Rust, who knew there had to be a better way. As did so many of those interviewed for the project who were keenly interested in ensuring that the best, most appropriate environments for consumers would be created in the future. South East Sydney Local Health District must also be thanked for funding the interventions described in Case Study D.

Dedications

This work is dedicated to the many people who have had the fear and suffering arising from an acute episode of mental illness compounded by the places in which they have sought help. My hope is that it goes some way toward preventing vulnerable people experiencing *sanctuary trauma*, surely the most insidious and unrecognised of adverse medical events.

It is also dedicated to Alan Hodgkinson, former Deputy Head of the School of Public Health and Community Medicine at UNSW, who died prematurely and unexpectedly on 2 June 2011. Alan was a psychiatric nurse by training and took a special interest in this research. I will be forever grateful to Alan and thoughts of him always inspired me when I began to flag.

PREFACE

On 31 August 2015 amendments to the New South Wales (NSW) *Mental Health Act 2007* came into effect. The objects of the Act are no longer to provide for the “...care, treatment and control” of people who are mentally ill or mentally disordered but to provide for their care, treatment and “recovery”, which has been defined elsewhere as: “the development of new meaning and purpose in one’s life as one grows beyond the catastrophic effects of psychiatric disability” (Commonwealth of Australia 2010).

The legislative change reflects changing perspectives of, and attitudes towards, mental illness but whether the change will affect the planning and design of acute inpatient mental healthcare units is uncertain.

Current practices and facilities fall well short of creating the physical, social and symbolic environments of care conducive to recovery. The risk management paradigm, with its focus on controlling perceived hazards and uncertain futures, has come to dominate approaches to the built environment in acute inpatient mental healthcare. Safety, from this perspective is approached in very narrow and concrete ways, through overt security, surveillance and external controls, making tangible Jeremy Bentham’s ideal of the ‘panopticon carceral’ (Curtis et al. 2013; Foucault 1975). Even the Australian National Standards for Mental Health Services defines ‘safety’ merely as “freedom from hazard” (Commonwealth of Australia 2010) and this definition is applied in the relevant safety standard (Standard 2) to the activities and environment of the mental health service for the protection of consumers, carers, families, visitors, staff and community .

Such a narrow approach has the potential of privileging controls aimed at protecting people from consumers over implementation of the United Nation's (UN) principles for the protection and improvement of those with mental illness, which are incorporated into the NSW Charter of the Rights of People with Mental Illness (*Mental Health Drug & Alcohol Office 2011*), including Principle 9 that:

"..every patient shall have the right to be treated in the least restrictive environment and with the least restrictive or intrusive treatment.." (United Nations 1991)

The British *Royal College of Psychiatrists* (the College) rejects the view that safety in acute inpatient mental healthcare is produced by controlling access to external concrete hazards, rather the College argues that safety is created by:

"good relationships and interactions and the trust that is built up between those individuals" (*Royal College of Psychiatrists 2011*).

Trust is understood from this perspective as fundamental to a therapeutic relationship and the essence of the recovery model of care wherein risk taking is required. It involves a mutual willingness to take risks in the therapeutic relationship where both the consumer and clinician are vulnerable to the acts of the other. When concerns about hazard reduction dominate institutional ideas about safety and the material/built environment is devised to address perceived hazards, the development of entrusting social milieus enabling the growth of self-efficacy and the reclaiming of identity are likely to be disrupted.

This perspective made me - a nursing academic and lawyer who taught risk management, patient safety, leadership and organisational change, and who had

once worked in health facility planning, curious as to how acute inpatient mental healthcare environments are made safe without the use of oppressive architectural responses to perceived risk. The perspective of the Royal College of Psychiatrists presumes that an over-emphasis on surveillance and control in a building impedes the construction of therapeutic relationships, thereby compromising safety and leading to consumer and care provider harms. The perspective equates the concept of a trusting therapeutic relationship with therapeutic safety.

I set out to understand how the physical habitat/material environment of these places supported or hindered the creation of trust and thus therapeutic safety, and not simply the technical safety of hazard reduction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification of Original Authorship	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	
Acknowledgements and Dedications	i
Preface	iii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	xvi
List of Figures	xvii
List of Images	xviii
List of Appendices	xxii
Acronyms	xxiii
Definitions	xxv
Notes on Style and Language	xxviii
Abstract	xxix
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Developing the Question	2
1.2 Organisational Accidents in the Socio-technical System	2
1.1.2 Organisational Accidents and Mental Healthcare	8
1.2 Research Questions	11
1.3 Study Overview	12
1.3.1 Significance and Benefit	16
1.3.2 Organisation of the Thesis	14
CHAPTER 2 – THE LITERATURE REVIEW	20

2.1	Introduction	21
2.1.1	Structure of the Review	23
2.2	Developing the Search Strategy	24
2.2.1	Narrowing the research question	25
2.2.2	Identifying relevant studies	25
2.2.3	Study Selection	27
2.2.3.1	Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	31
2.2.4	Charting the Data	32
2.2.4.1	Strength of evidence	33
2.2.5	Collating, summarising and reporting the results	34
2.3	Reviewing the Literature	35
2.3.1	Background	35
2.3.1.1	Evidence Based Design	35
2.3.1.2	Trust	37
2.3.1.3	Visions of Trust, Risk and Asylum	40
2.3.2	Effect of the Built Environment in Acute Inpatient Mental Healthcare	42
2.3.2.1	Sanctuary Trauma	43
2.3.2.2	Violence	44
2.3.2.3	Trust	46
2.3.3	The Environmental Determinants of Care	48
2.3.3.1	Physical environments of care	51
2.3.3.2	Social environments of care	55
2.3.3.3	Symbolic environment of care	58

2.4	Effects of improving mental healthcare built environments	62
2.4.1	Impact on consumers	62
2.4.2	Impact on care providers	66
2.4.3	Interpersonal interactions and therapeutic environments	67
2.5	Risk Management versus Trust Development	69
2.5.1	Risk Management Safety Paradigm	69
2.5.2	Trust Development Safety Paradigm	72
2.6	Quality of the Evidence	74
2.7	Summarising the Literature - Emergent Models	77
2.8	Conclusion	80
	CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY	82
3.1	Introduction	83
3.1.2	Restatement of study	83
3.1.3	Positioning of the Researcher	84
3.2	Theoretical Framework	86
3.3	Case Study Methodology	87
3.4	Case Selection	91
3.5	Participant Recruitment	94
3.5.1	<i>Blue Waters, Greenslopes, The Farm</i>	94
3.5.2	<i>Happy Shores</i>	95
3.6	Approaches to Data Collection	95
3.6.1	Key Informant Interviews	95
3.6.2	Walkthroughs and Talkthroughs	99

3.6.3	Document analysis	100
3.6.4	Artefact analysis	101
3.6.5	Focus Groups (at <i>Happy Shores</i> only)	102
3.6.6	Social Climate Survey (at <i>Happy Shores</i> only)	103
3.7	Analytic Methods	104
3.7.1	Thematic Analysis	107
3.7.2	Narrative Analysis	107
3.7.3	Document and artefact analysis	109
3.7.4	Social Climate Survey	109
3.7.5	Utilisation, seclusion and incident data	110
3.8	Ethics Approval and Regulatory Compliance	110
3.8.1	Values and Principles of Ethical Conduct	111
3.8.2	Risk Assessment	114
3.8.3	Letters of Support	116
	CHAPTER 4 - BLUE WATERS CASE STUDY	117
4.1	Introduction	118
4.2	Background to the Setting	118
4.3	General Description	120
4.3.1	Documentation Reviewed	120
4.3.2	Description of Participants	121
4.4	Planning & Design of <i>Blue Waters</i>	122
4.4.1	Clinical Leadership	123
4.4.2	Organisational Trust	125

4.5	Change Management	127
4.6	Safety and Security	128
4.7	Built model of care	131
4.8	The Outcome: fitness-for-purpose	132
4.9	Walkthrough/Talkthrough Evaluation	133
4.9.1	Physical Environment	133
4.9.2	Social Environment	138
4.9.3	Symbolic Environment	139
4.10	Issues Emerging	142
	CHAPTER 5 - GREENSLOPES CASE STUDY	143
5.1	Background to the Setting	144
5.2	General Description	145
5.2.1	Documentation Reviewed	146
5.2.2	Description of Participants	146
5.3	Planning & Design of <i>Greenslopes</i>	147
5.3.1	Clinical Leadership	149
5.3.2	Organisational Trust	151
5.4	Change Management	153
5.5	Safety and Security	154
5.6	Built Model of Care	159
5.7	The Outcome: fitness-for-purpose	161
5.8	Walkthrough/Talkthrough Evaluation	162
5.8.1	Physical Environment	163

5.8.2. Social Environments	167
5.8.3 Symbolic Environments	170
5.9 Issues Emerging	172
CHAPTER 6 - THE FARM CASE STUDY	174
6.1 Background to the Setting	175
6.2 General Description	176
6.2.1 Documentation Reviewed	177
6.2.2 Description of Participants	178
6.3 Planning & Design of <i>The Farm</i>	178
6.3.1 Clinical Leadership	180
6.3.2 Organisational Trust	180
6.4 Change Management	181
6.5 Safety and Security	182
6.6 Built Model of Care	182
6.7 The Outcome: fitness-for-purpose	184
6.8 Walkthrough/Talkthrough Evaluation	185
6.8.1 Physical Environment	186
6.8.2 Social Environments	191
6.8.3 Symbolic Environments	191
6.9 Issues Emerging	194
CHAPTER 7 – HAPPY SHORES	195
7.0 Introduction	196
7.1 Background to the Setting	196

7.2	General Description	199
7.2.1	Documentation Reviewed	200
7.2.2	Description of Participants	201
7.3	The problems at <i>Happy Shores</i>	202
7.4	Planning & Design of <i>Happy Shores</i>	213
7.4.1	Clinical leadership	216
7.4.2	Organisational Trust	221
7.5	Change Management Strategy	225
7.6	Safety and Security	226
7.7	Built model of care	233
7.8	The Outcome: fitness-for-purpose	233
7.9	Walkthrough/Talkthrough Evaluation	234
7.9.1	Physical Environment	234
7.9.2	Social Environment	237
7.9.3	Symbolic Environment	238
7.10	Interventions	239
7.11	Evaluation of the interventions	243
7.12	Issues Emerging	256
	CHAPTER 8 – DISCUSSION	257
8.1	Overview of the study	258
8.1.1	Structure of the Chapter	258
8.1.2	Background	259
8.1.3	The research problem	259

8.1.4	The theoretical propositions	262
8.2	Summary of cross-case analysis	263
8.2.1	Consistent findings across cases	266
8.2.2	Emergent findings in three cases	269
8.2.3	Summary of Thematic Analysis	270
8.3	Discussion of themes	274
8.3.1	Conflicting conceptions of risk	274
8.3.2	Planning and design not informed by models of care	276
8.3.3	Local action without systems thinking	279
8.3.4	Collocation on general hospital sites	282
8.3.5	Inadequate clinical input	283
8.3.6	The dignity of mental healthcare consumers at the discretion of the Executive	285
8.3.7	Those with quite different care needs bundled together	286
8.3.8	Total Institutions	287
8.3.9	Not fit for purpose	289
8.3.10	Where's the research?	291
8.4	Results of the Narrative Analysis	295
8.5	Impact on Incidents and Use of Seclusion	298
8.6	Current trends in inpatient mental healthcare facility design	298
8.7	Limitations of the Study	301
8.8	Future Research	304
8.9	Conclusion	305
	Bibliography	319

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Sources of Literature	26
Table 2.2	Literature Categories	33
Table 3.1	Characteristics of Cases	93
Table 3.2	Roles and Professions of Participants	94
Table 7.1	Comparative Floor Areas at <i>Happy Shores</i>	211
Table 7.2	<i>Happy Shores</i> Essen CES benchmark comparators	229
Table 7.3	<i>Happy Shores</i> Essen CES comparison bar chart	229
Table 8.1	Cross Case Emergent Findings	264
Table 8.2	Consistent findings across cases	265
Table 8.3	Site-Risk Element Matrix	269
Table 8.4	Summary of Thematic Cross-Case Analysis	270
Table 8.5	Sense Making by Site	295

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	The Systems Model in Healthcare	3
Figure 1.2	James Reason's Swiss Cheese Model (1995)	4
Figure 1.3	James Reason's Model of Organisational Accident Causation (1990a)	5
Figure 1.4	Conflicting Conceptions of Safety	10
Figure 2.1	Evidence Based Design Keywords and Search Pathways	28
Figure 2.2	Trust Keywords and Search Pathways	30
Figure 2.3	PRISMA Four Phase Flow Diagram (2009)	32
Figure 2.4	Environmental Determinants of Care	50
Figure 2.5	Trajectory to harm in acute inpatient mental healthcare	78
Figure 2.6	Constructing Trust Model	79
Figure 3.1	NSW government procurement methods (2005)	92
Figure 7.1	Plan of <i>Happy Shores</i> Mental Healthcare Unit	204
Figure 8.1	Constructing Trust Model	261
Figure 8.2	Trajectory to harm in acute inpatient mental healthcare	281

LIST OF IMAGES

Image 2.1	Interior of the lounge at <i>The Retreat</i>	40
Image 2.2	Typical Seclusion Room	43
Image 2.3	Norwegian Seclusion Room	65
Image 4.1	Enclosed Nurse Station with CCTV Bank	124
Image 4.2	Seclusion Courtyard	129
Image 4.3	Courtyard Wall	131
Image 4.4	Gymnasium	134
Image 4.5	Clerestory	135
Image 4.6	Internal Corridor	137
Image 4.7	External Seating Area	137
Image 4.8	External Seating Area	137
Image 4.9	Secure Entry from Outpatients	140
Image 4.10	View from Seclusion Room	141
Image 5.1	Corridors - Adult acute units	160
Image 5.2	Adolescent Dining Room	164
Image 5.3	Bathroom Interior	165
Image 5.4	Visitor Lounge	166

Image 5.5	Outdoor Courtyard & Hoop	166
Image 5.6	Outdoor Courtyard Outlook	166
Image 5.7	Basketball Hoop in Garden	168
Image 5.8	Consumer Lounge and Passive Recreation Area	169
Image 5.9	Colourful Corridor and Art Work	171
Image 5.10	Open Nurse Station with Domestic Phone	171
Image 6.1	Nurse Station Forensic Ward	184
Image 6.2	Nurse Station Forensic Ward	184
Image 6.3	New Consumer Bedroom	185
Image 6.4	Garage admission with gun safe	187
Image 6.5	Staff Corridor	188
Image 6.6	General Courtyard	188
Image 6.7	Garden Courtyard	189
Image 6.8	Secure Courtyard	189
Image 6.9	Consumer Garden	189
Image 6.10	CAMHU Decorative Wall Element	190
Image 6.11	CAMHU 1 st Floor Courtyard	192
Image 6.12	1CAMHU 1 st Floor Courtyard 2	192

Image 6.13	CAMHU Lounge	193
Image 6.14	CAMHU Bedroom Corridor	193
Image 7.1	The Driveway	205
Image 7.2	Main Entrance	205
Image 7.3	Acute Ward Dining Room	212
Image 7.4	Staff and Visitor Entrance to General Ward (post admission)	228
Image 7.5	Staff Lockers outside by bins	235
Image 7.6	Lounge in corridor with discordant colours	235
Image 7.7	Multi-Purpose Room with discordant colour	236
Image 7.8	Acute Ward Courtyard	236
Image 7.9	General Ward Courtyard	236
Image 7.10	Worn, hazard controlled bathroom /shower detail	238
Image 7.11a	Nurse Station looking out along corridor	239
Image 7.11b	Nurse Station looking in from corridor	239
Image 7.12	Acoustic Ceiling Tiles	240
Image 7.13	Replanted General Ward Courtyard	240
Image 7.14	Parkside scene mural in Acute Courtyard 1	241

Image 7.15	Seascape scene mural in Acute Courtyard 2	242
Image 7.16	Colour Board for <i>Happy Shores'</i> alterations	242
Image 7.17	Consumer art works on new yellow wall	255

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 2.1	Quantitative Research Evaluation Tool	307
Appendix 2.2	Qualitative Research Evaluation Tool	308
Appendix 3.1	Table of Methods	309
Appendix 3.2	Essen Climate Evaluation Schema (EssenCES)	311
Appendix 3.3	Standard Essen CES Scoring Key (staff)	312
Appendix 3.4	UNSW HREC Advisory Panel Approval (Ref 2013-7-12)	313
Appendix 3.5	SESLHD HREC Executive Committee Approval (Ref 13/083)	314
Appendix 3.6	SESLHD Site Specific Approval (Ref 13/G/095)	316
Appendix 3.7:	Letter of Support External Organisation - Eastern Suburbs Mental Health Service	317
Appendix 3.8:	Letter of Support External Organisation - NSW Health Infrastructure	318

ACRONYMS

AHS	Area Health Service
AMHU	Acute Mental Health Unit
CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service
CSP	Clinical Services Plan
DD&C	Design Development & Construct procurement methodology
D&C	Design & Construct procurement methodology
DH	Department of Health (UK)
EssenCES	Essen Climate Evaluation Schema
EOI	Expression of Interest
FF&E	Fixtures, Fittings & Equipment
GMHIU	General Mental Health Inpatient Unit
HERD	Health Environments Research and Design Journal
HFBG	Australasian Health Facility Building Guideline
HI	Health Infrastructure
HDU	High Dependency Unit
IADH	International Academy for Design & Health
IIMS	Incident Information Management System
MH-CoPES	Mental Health Consumer Perceptions and Experiences of Services
MHDAO	Mental Health and Drug & Alcohol Office
MHICU	Mental Health Intensive Care Unit
MHPC	Mental Health Planning Council

MHU	Mental Health Unit
MOH	Ministry of Health
NHS	National Health Service
NSIH	National Health Service Institute for Innovation and Improvement
PI	Project implementation (Stage 3 POFP)
PFI	Private Financing Initiative
PPF	Private Financed Project
PICU	Psychiatric Intensive Care Unit
POFP	NSW Health Process of Facility Planning
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
RCPsych	Royal College of Psychiatrists (UK)
SSP	Services Procurement Plan
SSDB	State-wide Services Development Branch
VPU	Vulnerable Persons Unit

DEFINITIONS

Biophilia	An hypothesis proposed by E.O. Wilson that human beings have a genetic propensity to respond to other living organisms which design properties should harness.
Cartesian Analysis	Modernist paradigm which sees the world as objects, sets of objects, and objects acting and reacting upon one another.
Ethnography	The study and systematic recording of what people do in their daily life using qualitative research techniques.
Evaluation	Systematic examination of a policy, program or project aimed at assessing its merit, value, worth, relevance or contribution.
Grey Literature	The term used for information or research output produced by organisations outside of academic publishing and distribution channels, which is generally not peer reviewed, including: government reports and policy documents, non-peer reviewed commercial studies and proprietary knowledge.
Haptic	Any form of interaction involving touch.
Hapticity	A system (not limited to touch) that yields information about solid objects in three dimensions. Used by

	neuroscientists to refer to the emotive and multisensory experience of architecture, not limited to the ocular.
Index Admission	An admission with a principal diagnosis of a specified condition which is the starting point for analysing repeat hospital visits for that condition (denominator).
Inpatient	Denotes consumers who have been admitted to an acute mental healthcare facility located on a general hospital site.
Patient Safety	A whole system approach to minimizing harm affecting patients; it extends the idea of 'clinical risk management'.
Phenomenology	The study of subjective experience with its roots in the philosophical work of Edmund Husserl. It involves the systematic study of the structures of consciousness and the phenomena that appear in acts of consciousness. Ontologically differentiated from Cartesian analysis.
Photo-elicitation	Where photographic images are used as an interview tool to extract attitudes, opinions and views.
Repertory Grid Technique	A technique to elicit underlying semantic constructs held by individuals about people, places and spaces.

Salutogenesis	A construct conceived by Aaron Antonovsky focusing on human health and the factors underlying physical, social and emotional well-being, rather than pathogenesis.
Somatic	Of or relating to the body, especially as opposed to the mind.
Somatosensory	Sensory receptors. The somatosensory system is the part of the sensory system concerned with the conscious perception of touch, pressure, pain, temperature, position, movement, and vibration, which arise from the muscles, joints, skin, and fascia.
Therapeutic Milieu	A therapeutic milieu is a supportive environment in which clinical staff work with clients to provide safety and structure while assessing the patient's relationships and behavior. A consistent routine is maintained, which fosters predictability and trust. A milieu is considered therapeutic when the program's community provides a sense of civility, membership, belonging, care and accountability.
Triangulation	A multi-method research or evaluation design that draws from pluralist sources to illuminate a phenomenon.

Vulnerable Persons

A protective environment for patients who are

Unit

susceptible to physical or emotional injury or attack.

NOTES ON STYLE AND LANGUAGE

The terms **consumer** and **service user** are used interchangeably to refer to the **acute mental healthcare inpatient**. They are preferred as they remind us that these people should be in control of their recovery and should be accorded the respect to do so. The word **patient** is used on occasion to retain the authenticity of the speaker's voice and where the context makes it appropriate to do so.

The terms **participant** and **key informant** are also used interchangeably for although it is usual in qualitative research to refer to subjects as 'participants' that term is also used when referring to members of health facility planning teams. To avoid confusion, key informant is generally used for those study participants who were interviewed.

The term **general hospital** and **non-mental healthcare facility** are used to distinguish those facilities from acute inpatient mental healthcare facilities/units.

Square brackets [...] denote an insertion by me to make sense of a quoted passage.

ABSTRACT

This multi-method, multi-case study was a philosophically pragmatic and realist inquiry into how the physical habitat/material environment supports or hinders the creation of therapeutic safety in acute inpatient mental healthcare facilities.

The literature review indicated that trust is integral to therapeutic relationships but acts of trust were unlikely without manifest organisers and signifiers of trustworthiness. The *Constructing Trust Model* that emerged from the review postulated that the *Environmental Determinants of Care*, comprised of physical, social and symbolic elements, moderated therapeutic trust in the development of safety. The *Determinants* were incorporated into James Reason's (1995) *Swiss Cheese Model of Accident Causation* to illustrate how environments emphasizing surveillance and technical safety do not create therapeutically safe environments but introduce latent error, leading to patient harms such as violence, seclusion and sanctuary harm.

Four sites were purposively selected for participation in the study. Initial site visits were made to three newly commissioned facilities and data were collected using key informant interviews, document and artefact analysis. Alterations were made at the fourth site, including: acoustic dampening, wall murals, gardens, increased circulation space, new colour scheme, and new outdoor furniture. Data collection also included focus groups, a safety climate survey, spatial data, incident data and seclusion data. The frequency and duration of seclusion was reduced during renovations. Staff reported consumers found the work a welcome distraction, providing hope that a poor environment would be much improved. On completion

staff reported reduced patient agitation, increased patient satisfaction, and fewer incidents of vandalism. Seclusion practices, however, soon reverted. Funding was not provided for changes to address environmental problems known to be linked to seclusion use, that is, overcrowding and social density.

Three major findings emerged in the cross-case analysis. Firstly, participants held dichotomous beliefs about safety. I labelled those who viewed safety as arising from the control of concrete hazards requiring custodial environmental designs, '*Risk Warriors*', and those who considered trusting relationships the precursor to safety, requiring environments signifying care, trustworthiness and refuge, '*Trust Advocates*'. Secondly, at all four facilities decision-makers did not follow the advice of *Trust Advocates* and introduced unintended risk into the care system, creating the latent conditions for iatrogenic harm. Thirdly, collocation of acute inpatient mental healthcare facilities on general hospital sites encouraged the cultural dominance of *Risk Warriors*, leading to an over-emphasis on surveillance and the control of risks, to the detriment of trust development strategies and therapeutic safety.