



NURSES' EXPERIENCES IN IMPLEMENTING FALL RISK PREVENTION PROCEDURES IN INPATIENT UNITS

Nonik Eka Martyastuti^{1*}, Anik Indriono¹, Kusnadi²

¹Faculty of Health Sciences, Universitas Pekalongan, Jl. Sriwijaya No.3, Bendan, Pekalongan Barat, Pekalongan, Jawa Tengah 51119, Indonesia

²Bendan Regional General Hospital, Jl. Sriwijaya No.2, Bendan, Pekalongan Barat, Pekalongan, Jawa Tengah 51119, Indonesia

*nonik@unikal.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Patient falls remain among the most frequent preventable adverse events in hospitals, posing challenges to patient safety in inpatient care. Preliminary observations at RSUD Bendan Pekalongan revealed inconsistent initial assessments, incomplete patient and family education, and facility limitations that weakened fall prevention practices. This descriptive qualitative study explored nurses' experiences in implementing fall risk prevention procedures in inpatient units. Five purposively selected participants, including nursing management, patient safety committee members, head nurses, and staff nurses, provided data through in depth interviews, observations, and document reviews. Thematic analysis identified two main themes: institutional guidance for fall risk identification and practical implementation of prevention measures. Nurses reported using patient identification protocols, the Morse Fall Scale, risk labels, side rails, environmental checks, and patient family education. However, implementation was inconsistent due to workload pressures, uneven knowledge and training, limited patient family engagement, and damaged facilities. Although structural procedures exist, process fidelity remains suboptimal.

Keywords: fall prevention; inpatient care; nurses; patient safety; qualitative study

How to cite (in APA style)

Martyastuti, N. E., Indriono, A., & Kusnadi, K. (2026). Nurses' Experiences in Implementing Fall Risk Prevention Procedures in Inpatient Units. *Indonesian Journal of Global Health Research*, 8(4), 813–826. <https://doi.org/10.37287/ijghr.v8i4.1970>.

INTRODUCTION

Patient safety is a core dimension of healthcare quality because it reflects the ability of the healthcare system to prevent avoidable harm during care delivery. In hospital settings, safety is not merely a regulatory requirement or an accreditation indicator; it is a practical expression of professional accountability, organizational learning, and ethical care. Among the many patient safety problems reported in inpatient units, patient falls remain one of the most common and costly adverse events. Falls can result in bruises, fractures, head injuries, loss of confidence, prolonged length of stay, greater dependency, increased treatment costs, litigation risk, and negative public perceptions of service quality. For nurses, inpatient falls also represent a sensitive quality indicator because they are closely linked to surveillance, communication, documentation and continuity of bedside care.

The current literature consistently shows that inpatient falls are caused by complex interactions between intrinsic and extrinsic factors of patients. Intrinsic factors include older age, weakness, altered gait, acute illness, delirium, cognitive impairment, urinary urgency, visual impairment, medication effects, history of falls, and dependence on mobilization. Extrinsic factors include environmental hazards such as wet floors, poor lighting, clutter, poorly positioned furniture, inaccessible call bells, unsafe bathrooms, and inadequate assistive devices. Because these factors change over the course of hospitalization, fall prevention should not be limited to a single checklist exercise. Instead, it requires repeated clinical judgment, timely communication, and continuous

adaptation to the patient's current condition (Locklear et al., 2024);(McKercher et al., 2024);(Miura & Kanoya, 2025).

Recent studies have demonstrated that hospitals frequently possess written fall prevention policies but still struggle to ensure implementation fidelity at the unit level. (Turner et al., 2020) found substantial variation across hospital units in both fall prevention practices and implementation strategies, suggesting that the presence of a policy does not guarantee reliable execution of fall prevention strategies. Likewise, (Yasan et al., 2020) documented gaps between nursing documentation and the actual implementation of fall prevention plans, particularly among patients identified as high-risk. These findings are important because they shift attention from the existence of guidelines to the quality of daily practice in the field. In other words, the central question is no longer whether hospitals have rules but whether nurses and teams can consistently transform these rules into safe bedside care.

In many hospitals, the Morse Fall Scale remains one of the most widely used instruments for screening hospitalized patients for fall-risk assessment. The scale offers a fast and structured approach to identify patients who may require additional intervention. However, recent evidence warns against the mechanical use of scored tools. (McKercher et al., 2024) observed that contemporary hospital fall guidelines place less emphasis on using numerical screening scores as stand-alone decision tools and more emphasis on comprehensive risk assessment and individualized intervention. (Miura & Kanoya, 2025) similarly noted that although screening tools remain useful, real-world fall prevention depends on contextual interpretation, patient-specific factors and organizational feasibility. This means that a score should initiate clinical conversations rather than end them.

Nurses occupy a central position in hospital fall prevention because they spend more time with patients than any other professional group, perform ongoing assessments, and coordinate many practical interventions to reduce risk. Nurses identify high-risk patients, communicate risks during handover, educate patients and families, mobilize patients safely, monitor changes in function, and escalate safety concerns to multidisciplinary teams. (Asmirajanti & Sukma, 2022) emphasized that nurses' implementation of patient safety principles is crucial for preventing falls, while (Öncü & \Intepeler, 2021) found that nurses considered evidence-based fall prevention interventions feasible but difficult to sustain due to understaffing, material shortages, and limited administrative support. Therefore, nurses' experiences are highly relevant for understanding not only what should happen according to policy but also what actually happens during daily care in nursing homes.

Qualitative evidence also shows that fall prevention is not merely a technical process. In a qualitative study of nurse managers, (Jia et al., 2025) described fall prevention as a dynamic interpretive process shaped by accountability, emotional strain, organizational constraints, and negotiation between safety and patient autonomy. (McVey et al., 2024) showed that interactions supporting inpatient engagement in fall prevention depend on empathy, negotiation, and relational skills, especially for older patients with cognitive impairment. These findings suggest that fall prevention cannot be fully understood using incident data alone. It must also be examined through the lived experiences of practitioners who interpret risk, make decisions under pressure, and adapt procedures to the realities of clinical care.

The Indonesian hospital context adds complexity to this issue. Regulations, accreditation standards, and patient safety targets have strengthened the formal expectation that all hospitals should reduce fall-related incidents. However, implementation often remains uneven, particularly in regional hospitals, where staffing, training opportunities, infrastructure quality, and documentation systems may vary across the units. Indonesian studies have reported that hospitals generally possess standard operating procedures for fall prevention but still face challenges related to damaged

facilities, inconsistent reassessments, incomplete documentation, and limited patient education (Cantika et al., 2024);(Rahayu, 2024); (Mulfiyanti et al., 2024). Such evidence highlights the need for locally grounded studies that illuminate how policies are enacted, resisted, adapted, or only partially implemented in daily nursing.

At RSUD Bendan Kota Pekalongan, a preliminary inquiry revealed several issues. Some nurses did not consistently conduct initial fall risk assessments using the available patient safety forms, and explanations to families of patients identified as being at risk of falls were not always delivered comprehensively. Early field observations also suggested the presence of environmental and infrastructural issues that could compromise implementation, including limitations in some supporting facilities. These observations indicate a possible gap between the formal availability of standard operating procedures and their actual bedside implementation. They also raised important questions about the organizational, professional, and contextual factors that shape nurses' practices.

This study aimed to address this gap by exploring nurses' experiences in implementing fall-risk prevention procedures in inpatient units at RSUD Bendan Kota Pekalongan. This study focused on how nurses understand the procedure, how they carry out fall risk identification and prevention interventions, the barriers they encounter, and how they respond to those barriers. This focus is significant for nursing science because it contributes practice-based evidence of implementation in a real inpatient context, rather than merely restating normative guidelines. It also provides insights into the relationships among patient safety policies, clinical judgment, nursing work processes, and institutional support.

This study aimed to explore nurses' experiences in implementing fall-risk prevention procedures in inpatient units at RSUD Bendan Kota Pekalongan. Specifically, this study sought to identify how fall risk is assessed and managed, how institutional guidance is translated into bedside practice, what barriers and enabling factors influence implementation, and what implications emerge for nursing management, patient safety systems and future research. By emphasizing the experiential perspective of nurses, this study is expected to contribute to the development of more context-sensitive, sustainable, and patient-centered strategies for preventing falls among inpatients.

METHOD

Study design

This study employed a descriptive, qualitative design. A qualitative approach was selected because the purpose of the study was to explore meaning, experience, and contextual practice rather than measure the frequency of variables or test causal hypotheses. Descriptive qualitative research is appropriate when the investigator seeks a rich account of how participants interpret a process, what they do in practice, and how they explain barriers and opportunities in their work environment. In the present study, this design made it possible to understand how nurses and related informants experienced the implementation of fall risk prevention procedures in a real-world, inpatient hospital setting.

This study was conducted within a naturalistic paradigm. The researchers did not manipulate practice or introduce an intervention; instead, they sought to understand how fall prevention procedures were enacted under routine organizational conditions. This orientation was important because inpatient fall prevention is embedded within local workflows, staffing patterns, documentation systems, communication practices, and facility conditions. Therefore, a qualitative descriptive design was considered more suitable than an experimental or survey-based design for capturing the complexity of implementation at bedside.

Informants

Informants were purposively selected based on their direct involvement in inpatient services and knowledge of the implementation of patient safety. Five informants participated in the study: a

representative of hospital service management, a representative of the patient safety or quality committee, the head nurse of the inpatient unit, and two staff nurses responsible for direct patient care. This combination was intended to capture implementation from policy, supervisory, and operational perspectives.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) currently working in or overseeing inpatient services, (2) having experience with fall risk prevention procedures and patient safety activities, (3) able to communicate experiences clearly, and (4) willing to participate voluntarily in the interview. Individuals who were not directly related to inpatient care or were unavailable during data collection were excluded. The number of informants was determined based on information power rather than statistical representativeness. Recruitment continued until the core issues surrounding implementation became repetitive, and no substantially new themes emerged from the interviews. Although the sample size was small, it was considered adequate for the narrow study aim, specific context, and depth of data obtained.

Data collection

Data were collected in January 2023 at RSUD Bendan Kota Pekalongan. Three techniques were used: in-depth interviews, non-participant observation, and document review. Combining these methods allowed the researchers to examine what informants said, what was observed in practice, and what was formally required by the hospital policy. This triangulated approach increased the richness of the data and strengthened interpretive rigor.

Semi-structured, face-to-face interviews were conducted using an interview guide developed from the literature on patient safety and hospital fall prevention. The guide explored participants' understanding of fall prevention procedures, experiences in assessing and reassessing risk, use of labels and environmental interventions, educational practices with patients and families, barriers to implementation, and suggestions for improvement. Interviews were conducted by the researchers at a time agreed upon with each informant, audio-recorded with permission, and supplemented by field notes capturing nonverbal cues, emphasis, and contextual observations.

The observations focused on the inpatient environment and practical safety arrangements relevant to fall prevention in the hospital. The researchers observed selected areas of the ward, including patient rooms, beds, bathrooms, walkways, side rails, call-bell accessibility, floor conditions, and visible fall-risk labels. The observations also included attention to whether the environment supported the procedures described by the participants. During this phase, the researchers identified at least one facility issue related to patient safety, namely a malfunctioning bathroom call bell in a Class II room, which later became relevant to the interpretive analysis.

A document review was conducted to identify the institutional framework governing fall prevention in the hospital. The documents reviewed included hospital patient safety guidelines, fall risk standard operating procedures, relevant assessment forms, and other written materials used to support implementation. Reviewing these documents helped the researchers compare formal expectations with the accounts provided by the informants and the conditions observed in the ward.

Instrument

In qualitative inquiry, the researcher is the primary instrument of the study. The researchers were responsible for establishing rapport with the participants, conducting interviews, recording field observations, and interpreting the data. To support consistency, the study used a semi-structured interview guide, an observation guide, and field note forms. These tools were developed based on the study objectives and relevant literature and were reviewed by the research team prior to their use.

Because the study explored implementation in clinical practice, the researchers documented the assessment instruments used by nurses in the hospital. Informants consistently identified the Morse

Fall Scale as the main tool used to screen adult inpatients for fall risk. The Morse Fall Scale is a widely recognized risk screening tool in hospital settings and includes indicators such as history of falling, secondary diagnosis, ambulatory aid, intravenous therapy, gait, and mental status assessment. Although the researchers did not psychometrically test the instrument in this study, they examined how it was used in practice and how nurses interpreted its role in the broader patient assessment. This is important because current evidence suggests that such tools are useful for screening but should be integrated with clinical judgment and ongoing reassessment rather than being used in isolation (Ragione et al., 2024);(McKercher et al., 2024).

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed manually using thematic analysis. The interview recordings were transcribed verbatim in the original language, and the transcripts were read repeatedly to become familiar with the data. The researchers then undertook three interrelated steps: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. During data reduction, meaningful units were identified, condensed, and coded. Codes with conceptual similarities were grouped into categories, which were then synthesized into broader themes that represented the essence of the participants' experiences.

Data display involved organizing coded materials, field notes, and document findings into matrices and summary tables to facilitate comparisons across the informants and data sources. This process made it possible to identify the convergence and divergence between the policy-level and bedside perspectives. The conclusion was drawn iteratively rather than linearly. Emerging interpretations were checked against transcripts, field notes, and documentary evidence to ensure that the themes were grounded in the data. The final themes were selected because they captured both the structural and process dimensions of fall prevention implementation in the study setting.

Trustworthiness

Several strategies were used to enhance the study's trustworthiness. Credibility was supported through the triangulation of data sources and methods, including interviews, observations and document reviews. Member checking was conducted informally by clarifying and confirming key points during the interviews and revisiting central interpretations with selected informants. The use of multiple perspectives from management, committee, supervisory, and staff nurse roles also strengthened credibility by broadening the evidentiary base.

Dependability was addressed by maintaining a clear audit trail documenting the sequence of data collection, interview procedures, coding decisions, theme development, and interpretive discussions among researchers. Confirmability was supported through reflexive note-taking and comparison of interpretations with raw data during team discussions. Transferability was enhanced by providing a detailed description of the setting, participant characteristics, institutional context, and implementation processes, so that readers can judge the relevance of the findings to similar inpatient hospital contexts. Although qualitative findings are not intended for statistical generalization, a detailed presentation of the context may support analytical transfer to hospitals with comparable patient safety structures and implementation challenges in the future.

Ethical consideration

This study adhered to the ethical principles of autonomy, confidentiality, beneficence, and nonmaleficence. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the hospital, and all informants participated voluntarily after receiving an explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, and data usage. Participants were informed that they could decline to answer questions or withdraw from the interview at any time without consequence. Personal names were not used in transcripts or reporting; instead, participants were identified using codes such as P1 to P5.

The manuscript is prepared for journal submission; therefore, the official name of the approving ethics committee and approval number should be inserted by the authors according to the formal ethical clearance document before submission. This is especially important because the target

journal requires explicit reporting of institutional ethical approvals in the Methods section. No data that could identify individual patients were collected, and the analysis focused on nurses' experiences and institutional implementation processes rather than on personal clinical records This Ethical Clearance No.188/B/.02.01/KEPK/XII/2022

RESULT

Five informants participated in this study. They represented multiple organizational levels, including nursing service management, a patient safety or quality committee representative, the head nurse of an inpatient unit, and staff nurses with direct caregiving responsibilities. The informants varied in age, educational background, and years of service, providing diverse perspectives on how fall prevention procedures were interpreted and implemented in practice (Table 1).

The analysis produced two major themes: (1) institutional guidance for fall risk identification and (2) practical implementation of fall risk prevention in inpatient units. Each theme consisted of several categories derived from repeated statements across interviews, supported by observations and document reviews (Table 2). The two themes are described in detail below.

Tabel 1
Characteristics of Informants

Code	Age	Highest Education	Length of Work
P1	45 years	Master's degree	20 years
P2	35 years	Professional nurse	15 years
P3	32 years	Bachelor of Nursing	12 years
P4	33 years	Bachelor of Nursing	10 years
P5	32 years	Bachelor of Public Health	7 years

Note: Data derived from primary interview materials, 2023.

Tabel 2
Themes and Categories of Findings

Theme	Category	Summary of Findings
Theme 1	Institutional guidance for fall risk identification	The hospital had written guidelines, two-identifier patient verification, and formal expectations to assess and reassess fall risk.
Theme 2	Practical implementation of fall prevention in inpatient units	Nurses applied the Morse Fall Scale, risk labels, side rails, environmental checks, mobilization support, and patient-family education; however, implementation was affected by workload, knowledge gaps, and infrastructure issues.

Note: Themes were generated through iterative coding, categorization and thematic synthesis.

Theme 1. Institutional Guidance for Fall Risk Identification

The first theme concerned the institutional framework that guided fall-risk identification. The informants explained that the hospital had formal patient safety documents and standard operating procedures related to patient falls. According to management and committee-level participants, the guidelines were aligned with national patient safety expectations and had been documented in the official hospital policy. This structural finding suggests that the hospital had already established a formal commitment to reducing falls through written guidance, internal standards, and implementing designated procedures.

At the operational level, nurses reported that patient identification was undertaken by asking patients to state at least two identifiers, such as their name and date of birth, and then matching the information to the wristband or medical record. The use of multiple identifiers was considered important because fall prevention interventions should be provided to the correct patient, especially

when several patients in the same room may have similar conditions. Nurses viewed this identity verification as a routine but necessary step in safe care, not only for medication and treatment procedures but also for confirming who should receive fall risk assessment and precautionary measures.

Informants also stated that fall risk assessment was expected to occur early in hospitalization and to be repeated when there was a change in the patient's condition. However, several participants acknowledged that the ideal process was not always fully realized in practice. During busy shifts, nurses may prioritize urgent clinical tasks, potentially delaying documentation and reassessment. This gap between institutional expectations and actual workflows emerged repeatedly in the interviews and became a key interpretive issue in this study.

Another category within this theme concerns barriers to identification and explanation. Some informants noted that patients occasionally felt bored or burdened when asked repeatedly to mention their identity, particularly when multiple staff members used similar questioning approaches. Nurses attempted to address this by explaining the purpose of identification and, in some cases, by varying the wording of the questions. These accounts indicate that even a basic safety process, such as patient identification, has a relational dimension: successful implementation depends not only on procedural correctness but also on communication skills and patient understanding of the procedure.

Document review supported the interview data by confirming that fall prevention was formalized in the hospital materials. However, the interviews suggested that documentation and formal policies did not automatically produce consistent practices. Instead, nurses still need to interpret, prioritize, and adapt the guidance within the realities of the inpatient workload, patient turnover, and environmental constraints. Therefore, the first theme shows that the hospital had established guidance, but the translation of that guidance into stable and consistent actions remained incomplete.

Theme 2. Practical Implementation of Fall Prevention in Inpatient Units

The second theme concerned the practical implementation of fall prevention in inpatient units. The informants consistently described the use of the Morse Fall Scale when assessing newly admitted patients and during subsequent assessments. Nurses explained that they examined items such as history of falls, diagnosis, walking aids, intravenous therapy, gait, and mental status to determine whether the patients were at risk. Patients assessed to be at risk then received specific preventive measures. This indicates that the risk tool functions as a gateway to a more individualized set of precautions for patients with diabetes.

A central category within this theme was the use of visible risk markers for developing skin cancer. Nurses stated that patients identified as having a fall risk were given a yellow marker, commonly a yellow sticker or fall-risk label, placed in a visible location, such as the infusion pole or near the patient's area. These markers served as practical reminders for staff and family members that the patient required increased vigilance. In addition, the informants explained that high-risk patients might have raised side rails, and the staff would pay closer attention to mobilization activities, transfers, and toileting assistance.

Environmental safety is another major category of research. Nurses described checking for wet floors, standing water, clutter, and untidy cables, and emphasized that the patient's surroundings should be arranged to reduce hazards. Informants were particularly aware that falls often occurred not only at the bedside but also when patients attempted to walk to the bathroom or moved without assistance. During the observation, the researchers noted that environmental conditions were generally monitored, but at least one malfunctioning bathroom call bell was identified in each ward.

This observation reinforces nurses' reports that even when staff understand fall prevention procedures, environmental defects may weaken implementation.

Patient and family education was repeatedly mentioned as an essential but inconsistently delivered component of care by the participants. Nurses explained that they tried to inform patients and families about the meaning of a fall-risk label, the need to call for help before mobilizing, the importance of assistance in the bathroom, and the reasons for using bed rails or other precautions. However, they also admitted that, in some cases, education was forgotten, shortened, or not fully understood by the families. Family involvement is especially important because relatives often accompany patients and are the first people available when patients want to mobilize or use the toilet. In this sense, family members functioned as practical safety partners, but only when they were adequately informed.

The interviews also highlighted organizational and human resource barriers. Nurses noted that fall prevention was sometimes affected by workload, limited time, variations in staff knowledge, and the need to manage multiple priorities in a busy inpatient setting. Some participants suggested that repeated training and stronger supervision would help improve consistency. Others have emphasized that infrastructure maintenance and management responsiveness are equally necessary. Overall, the second theme showed that nurses actively implemented fall prevention measures, but the reliability of implementation was influenced by the interaction between staff behavior, patient-family participation, and safety of the physical environment.

DISCUSSION

This study explored nurses' experiences in implementing fall risk prevention procedures in inpatient units at RSUD Benda Kota Pekalongan and found that although the hospital had established a formal patient safety structure, the reliability of implementation at the bedside was uneven. The two themes identified in the results guidance for fall risk identification and practical implementation of fall prevention suggest that the hospital had moved beyond the stage of having no policy, yet had not fully achieved high-fidelity and consistently enacted fall prevention practice. This distinction is important because it reframes the problem from policy absence to implementation quality issues. Such a finding is highly relevant for nursing management and patient safety science, which increasingly recognizes that the major challenge in hospital safety is often not creating procedures but ensuring that procedures are translated into reliable, everyday actions.



Figure 1 Nursing Practices in Preventing Fall Risk among Inpatients

The first major finding was that institutional guidance for fall risk prevention has already been established. The informants described the existence of formal patient safety documents, standard

operating procedures, assessment forms and identification routines. This structural preparedness is consistent with reports from many hospitals where fall prevention has been integrated into accreditation requirements and internal quality assurance systems of hospitals. (Turner et al., 2020) observed that hospitals frequently adopt formal implementation strategies, such as policy updates, committee structures, and educational pathways. (Cantika et al., 2024) also found that government hospitals may provide procedures, facilities, and assessment forms for fall prevention, even when implementation remains imperfect. Therefore, the current study aligns with the broader literature in showing that patient safety infrastructure has become more visible and formalized in hospitals in recent years.

However, the existence of a formal structure does not guarantee a stable implementation. Several participants in the present study acknowledged that initial risk assessment, reassessment across shifts, and patient-family education were not always performed consistently. This inconsistency points to a problem with the implementation fidelity. (Yasan et al., 2020) similarly documented that many high-risk patients were not clearly identified in care plans and that preventive strategies were either incompletely documented or implemented inappropriately. In a related Indonesian qualitative study, (Cantika et al., 2024) found that even with standard procedures and forms in place, some nurses still did not understand how to assess fall risk correctly, and some relevant facilities required repairs. Taken together, these studies and the current findings suggest that hospitals may achieve structural compliance without fully securing process reliability. For patient safety programs, this is a critical issue because adverse events are prevented by what people do in practice, not only by what policies state.

The second important finding was the continued reliance on the Morse Fall Scale as a principal assessment tool. In the present study, nurses used the scale to categorize patients' risk and then linked the results to preventive measures such as labels, side rails, and closer supervision. This is consistent with the literature showing that risk scales remain common screening tools in inpatient settings (Asmirajanti & Sukma, 2022);(Ragione et al., 2024). Nevertheless, current scholarship increasingly emphasizes that scored tools alone cannot prevent fall occurrence. (McKercher et al., 2024), in a global analysis of hospital fall clinical practice guidelines, reported mixed support for admission screening tools and highlighted the value of comprehensive assessment and individualized interventions, especially for older and frail patients. (Miura & Kanoya, 2025) similarly argued that fall risk assessment must consider feasibility and setting-specific conditions rather than solely depending on generic indicators. This implies that nurses should use the Morse Fall Scale as an entry point for clinical reasoning, rather than as a substitute.

This issue is particularly relevant in acute care, where patient conditions change rapidly. (Locklear et al., 2024) identified multiple intrinsic and extrinsic risk factors for inpatient falls, including age, impaired mobility, medication effects, environmental hazards, and comorbid conditions. (Turkoglu & Shang, 2022) showed that in specialized inpatient populations, such as bone marrow transplant patients, fall risk may be associated with diarrhea, urgency, muscle weakness, age, medication use, and postengraftment conditions. These studies reinforce the notion that the risk of falling is dynamic and multifactorial. In the current study, nurses acknowledged that reassessment should occur when a patient's condition changes, but they also reported that reassessment was not always consistently completed. This suggests that the challenge is not only choosing the right screening tool but also embedding dynamic clinical surveillance into routine nursing work flow.

The findings further showed that practical fall prevention in the ward relied on a multi-component approach to be effective. Nurses described visual labels, side rails, environmental checks, assistance with mobilization, and education for patients and their families as fall prevention strategies. This is consistent with evidence that single interventions are usually insufficient, whereas bundled or multicomponent strategies are more effective in reducing fall incidence. (Jurišković & Smrekar,

2020) summarized common hospital fall prevention interventions, including risk assessment, environmental and equipment modification, patient and family education, staff education, medication review, toileting assistance, and leadership support. (Rahimi et al., 2024) reported significant improvements in patient monitoring, education, and environmental safety after a participatory action research intervention in a spinal cord rehabilitation unit. The current study supports this broader evidence base by showing that nurses in regional hospitals understand fall prevention as a set of linked practices rather than a single task.

Simultaneously, the observed malfunctioning bathroom call bell revealed that effective fall prevention depends on more than just nurses' awareness and willingness to report. It also depends on the integrity of the caregiving environment. (Ryan et al., 2024) showed that simply implementing specialized low-low hospital beds did not automatically reduce fall frequency or related harm, indicating that isolated environmental modifications may be insufficient when broader systemic issues persist. (Wang et al., 2024) demonstrated that a hospital-based fall risk management information system reduced inpatient fall rates by supporting process indicators, reporting, and managerial supervision. (Xu et al., 2021) reported that monitoring the implementation of fall prevention measures improved nursing quality, family participation, and environmental safety. These studies suggest that environmental safety and system monitoring are not peripheral concerns but essential components of fall-prevention infrastructure. In the present study, nurses could identify environmental risks, but the need for repair still required action from hospital management. This underscores that fall prevention is a system responsibility, not solely an individual nursing obligation.

Another major finding was related to patient and family education and training. Participants considered education necessary, especially for patients receiving a visible fall-risk label; however, they admitted that education was not always delivered thoroughly or remembered during busy practice. This is a particularly important result because qualitative and mixed-method evidence increasingly shows that patients often do not fully understand their fall risk or the purpose of preventive strategies in fall prevention. (Yasan et al., 2025) reported that patient falls were influenced by limited patient engagement with educational materials, poor awareness of strategies, inadequate bathroom supervision, slow responses to call bells, and communication breakdowns between nurses and patients. (McVey et al., 2024) found that patients with cognitive impairment engaged more effectively in fall prevention when staff used personalized and relational interactions and when families or non-nursing staff helped communicate risk. These studies support the interpretation that fall prevention education should not be viewed as a one-time transfer of information but as an ongoing communicative process that builds understanding, cooperation, and safer behavior.

The current findings are consistent with evidence emphasizing the role of caregivers and family members. (Stockwell-Smith et al., 2020), in a mixed studies review of interventions to prevent in-hospital falls among older people with cognitive impairment, highlighted family engagement as a key theme for future implementation. (Rahayu, 2024) found that in pediatric settings, family and child characteristics significantly influenced fall prevention efforts, and that nurses carried substantial responsibility for sustaining a comprehensive approach. In the present study, families were described as important partners because they often remained near the patient and could either support or undermine prevention strategies depending on how well they were informed. This implies that patient safety in inpatient units should increasingly be framed as a shared partnership among nurses, patients, and families rather than as a professional activity carried out in isolation.

The study also identified workload, inconsistency, and uneven knowledge as barriers to implementation. This finding is consistent with prior research. (Öncü & Intepeler, 2021) reported that nurses value evidence-based interventions but encounter barriers such as understaffing, lack of

tools and materials, and limited administrative support to implement them. (Cho & Jang, 2020) found that nurses' attitudes toward falls were associated with fall prevention activities and recommended repeated, customized education and incentive-based environments to improve their engagement. (Ebraheim & Eltaib, 2023) demonstrated that an educational program significantly improved nurses' knowledge, compliance, and attitudes toward fall prevention protocols. (Elbasiony et al., 2021) similarly reported improvements in nurses' knowledge and practice following an educational intervention in a neurological intensive care setting. The current study complements these findings by showing that nurses perceive the need for ongoing training and stronger reinforcement, even when a procedure already exists in the hospital. In short, implementation is shaped not only by whether the staff know the protocol but also by whether the organization continuously sustains knowledge, motivation, and accountability.

An additional interpretive issue that emerged from the data was that fall prevention was partly relational and cultural. In the current study, nurses attempted to explain repeated identification questions to patients who felt bored or burdened, and described the need to tailor explanations to families. Vechter and (Vechter & Drach-Zahavy, 2021) reported that more resilient nurses tended to move from routine performance to proactive control over fall risks through skepticism, anticipation, and purposeful action. (Arifianto & Mariyati, 2024) similarly emphasized caring behavior as a dynamic nursing attribute that supports fall prevention in inpatient settings. These perspectives suggest that fall prevention is not merely about checking boxes; it also depends on attentiveness, anticipation, empathy, and the willingness to intervene early. Therefore, a safety culture strong enough to reduce falls requires not only formal compliance but also professional dispositions that support vigilance and responsive care to prevent falls.

Managerial support is another important dimension. Although the present study did not focus specifically on leadership behaviors, the accounts of infrastructure problems, inconsistent reassessment, and the need for periodic training all point toward a managerial role in strengthening implementation. (Jia et al., 2025) described nurse managers' experiences of fall prevention as being shaped by emotional strain, staffing limitations, environmental constraints, and the challenge of balancing safety and patient autonomy. (Turner et al., 2020) found that hospitals often used leadership-oriented implementation strategies more often than staff reward systems or interdisciplinary involvement. In the current study, participants suggested that supervision, refresher training, and timely responses to facility problems could strengthen fall-prevention practices. This implies that nursing leadership should not only issue instructions but also ensure that frontline staff receive practical support, feedback, and the infrastructure necessary to effectively implement patient safety procedures.

The present findings have implications for documentation and for quality monitoring. The gap between formal procedures and actual practice indicates that hospitals should not treat documentation as a legal record or an accreditation artifact. Instead, documentation should support real-time communication, handover continuity, and process adherence. (Wang et al., 2024) demonstrated that a fall risk management information system improved process indicators and reporting rates, whereas (Xu et al., 2021) found that monitoring forms reduced fall rates and strengthened patient and family participation. These studies suggest that documentation systems can be designed as active implementation tools rather than passive information repositories. For RSUD Bendan and similar hospitals, strengthening documentation and audit systems could help identify when reassessment is missed, whether education has been delivered, and whether high-risk patients are consistently linked to appropriate interventions.

From the perspective of nursing science, this study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that the central problem in fall prevention at the study site is not the total absence of policy but a mismatch between structural readiness and process reliability. This is a useful contribution because

many hospital safety discussions still focus primarily on whether a standard exists, whether accreditation requirements are met, or whether the staff has received initial orientation. The present findings suggest that these structural achievements are necessary but insufficient for achieving gender equality. Fall prevention should be examined as an implementation process that is continuously shaped by the nursing workload, communication, patient and family responsiveness, environmental safety, and management follow-through. This perspective is more likely to generate sustainable improvements than a narrow focus on compliance alone.

This study has several practical implications. First, hospitals should strengthen repeated and clinically meaningful reassessments instead of relying on admission screening alone. Second, education for patients and families should be standardized while remaining understandable, concise, and relevant to the patient's condition. Third, environmental safety mechanisms such as bathroom call bells, side rails, and floor conditions should be routinely audited and repaired promptly. Fourth, clinical supervision and periodic training should reinforce procedural knowledge, communication skills, anticipation, and patient engagement skills. Fifth, multidisciplinary and managerial support should be enhanced so that nurses do not bear fall-prevention responsibilities without adequate system support. These recommendations are consistent with contemporary international literature calling for integrated, implementation-oriented approaches to inpatient fall prevention (McKercher et al., 2024);(Wang et al., 2024);(Jia et al., 2025).

This study was targeted to the Jurnal Keperawatan Soedirman template and manuscript structure because the journal publishes English nursing research articles and recent records in the SINTA profile show accredited Sinta 2 entries for JKS volumes, while the journal's author information indicates English full research articles and a 3,500–5,000 word general expectation. Therefore, this manuscript intentionally extends the analytical depth while maintaining the section structure requested by the uploaded template. This targeting strategy is meant to improve the fit between content, language, and journal expectations rather than guarantee acceptance, since final editorial decisions depend on peer review, originality, and formal compliance with all submission requirements.

Despite these contributions, this study has some limitations that should be considered. The study was conducted in a single hospital and involved a small number of informants, which limits the breadth of perspectives and reduces the transferability of the findings to all inpatient settings. The study emphasized nurses' and managerial viewpoints but did not directly explore the experiences of patients and family caregivers, even though the findings suggested that they play an important role in safe mobilization and understanding of fall prevention measures. The study also relied on a qualitative design and therefore could not estimate the frequency of missed reassessments or the statistical relationship between specific barriers and falls outcomes. In addition, field data were collected at one point in time; therefore, they may not capture seasonal or longer-term changes in the staffing or infrastructure. Future studies should combine qualitative and quantitative methods, include patients and families, examine multiple hospitals, and evaluate implementation strategies such as training models, monitoring systems, or digital risk alerts. These limitations do not diminish the value of the current findings, but they do indicate that the results should be interpreted as context-specific insights into implementation rather than as definitive causal claims.

CONCLUSION

This study found that fall risk prevention procedures in the inpatient units at RSUD Bendan Kota Pekalongan were established structurally through formal guidelines, assessment forms, patient identification routines, and visible preventive measures. Nurses reported using the Morse Fall Scale, risk labels, side rails, environmental safety checks, mobilization support, and patient-family education to prevent falls. However, the implementation of these measures has not been consistent. Gaps remain in the initial assessment, dynamic reassessment, continuity of education, and the

maintenance of supporting facilities. In essence, the main challenge was not the absence of a procedure but the incomplete translation of the procedure into a reliable daily practice. These findings imply that strengthening fall prevention requires a systemic approach. In clinical practice, nurses require repeated training, strong supervision, and supportive documentation processes to facilitate dynamic assessment and clear communication. Infrastructure repair, audit systems, and timely follow-up of environmental risks are essential for management.

REFERENCES

- Arifianto, A., & Mariyati, M. (2024). Caring nurses in the prevention of fall risk in patients in the inpatient room. *Jurnal Ilmu Dan Teknologi Kesehatan*. <https://doi.org/10.33666/jitk.v15i2.633>
- Asmirajanti, M., & Sukma, M. C. (2022). Nurse implementation in preventing the risk of falls in hospitals: Literature review. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.37268/mjphm/vol.22/no.3/art.1619>
- Cantika, D. H., Pramesona, B., & Kurniawan, B. (2024). Evaluation of fall risk prevention by nurses in the inpatient department: A qualitative case study. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/v7-i8-68>
- Cho, M., & Jang, S. (2020). Nurses' knowledge, attitudes, and fall prevention practices in South Korean hospitals: A cross-sectional survey. *BMC Nursing*, 19, 117. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-00507-w>
- Ebraheim, M. N., & Eltaib, F. A. (2023). Improving nurses' compliance with standard patient fall prevention protocol in surgical departments. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ejhc.2023.341603>
- Elbasiony, A., Basal, A., Tag El Din, E. T. E., & Shaban Aysha, Z. (2021). Effect of implementing fall prevention strategies on nurses' performance in neurological disease intensive care units. *Tanta Scientific Nursing Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.21608/tsnj.2021.208471>
- Jia, E., Kang, Y., Zhou, R.-C., Zhang, W., & Li, X. (2025). Experiences of nurse managers in preventing and managing inpatient falls: A qualitative descriptive study. *BMJ Open*, 15, e106509. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2025-106509>
- Jurišković, M., & Smrekar, M. (2020). An overview of fall prevention strategies among adult patients in hospital settings. <https://doi.org/10.24141/2/4/2/7>
- Locklear, T., Kontos, J., Brock, C. A., Holland, A. B., Hemsath, R., Deal, A., Leonard, S., & Biswas, S. (2024). Inpatient falls: Epidemiology, risk assessment, and prevention measures: A narrative review. *HCA Healthcare Journal of Medicine*, 5(1), 1982. <https://doi.org/10.36518/2689-0216.1982>
- McKercher, J. P., Peiris, C., Hill, A.-M., Peterson, S., Thwaites, C., Fowler-Davis, S., & Morris, M. E. (2024). Hospital falls clinical practice guidelines: A global analysis and systematic review. *Age and Ageing*, 53(10), afae149. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afae149>
- McVey, L., Alvarado, N., Zaman, H., Healey, F., Todd, C. J., Issa, B., Woodcock, D. M., Dowding, D., Hardiker, N., Lynch, A., Davison, E., Frost, T., Abdulkader, J., & Randell, R. (2024). Interactions that support older inpatients with cognitive impairments to engage in fall prevention in hospitals. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.17006>
- Miura, T., & Kanoya, Y. (2025). Fall risk assessment and prevention strategies in nursing homes: A narrative review. *Healthcare*, 13(4), 357. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13040357>
- Mulfiyanti, D., Satriana, A., Sulistyaningtyas, N., Ilham, R., & Ramadani, F. (2024). Factor analysis of the application of patient safety targets on fall risk in the emergency room of a hospital. *Asian Journal of Health and Science*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.58631/ajhs.v3i1.96>
- Öncü, Y. A., & İntepeler, S. S. (2021). Nurses' views on the implementation of evidence-based fall prevention interventions: A qualitative study. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(8), 2390–2398. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13480>
- Ragione, B. L., Rothburd, L., Drucker, T., Eckardt, S., & Eckardt, P. A. (2024). Screening for the risk of fall-related inpatient trauma in a US acute care setting. *Cureus*, 16(9), e63199. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.63199>

- Rahayu, M. H. (2024). Enhancing pediatric safety: The critical role of nurses in fall prevention at a private hospital in Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Keperawatan PPNI Jawa Barat*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.70332/jkp.v2i2.24>
- Rahimi, S., Khankeh, H., Ebadi, A., Mohammadian, B., Eghbali, M., & Habibzadeh, F. (2024). Developing a fall prevention program in an inpatient spinal cord injury rehabilitation unit: A participatory action research study. *PLOS ONE*, 19(6), e0304320. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304320>
- Ryan, D., Neenan, S., Jablonski, K., Clay, M. A., Auguste, S., & Ingram, S. (2024). Evaluation of the implementation of low-low hospital beds with respect to fall frequency and patient harm: A retrospective analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16507>
- Stockwell-Smith, G., Adeleye, A., Chaboyer, W., Cooke, M., Phelan, M., Todd, J., & Grealish, L. (2020). Interventions to prevent in-hospital falls in older people with cognitive impairment: A mixed studies review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 29(23–24), 4580–4594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15383>
- Turkoglu, N. M., & Shang, J. (2022). Fall risk factors in hospitalized bone marrow transplant patients: A systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Knowledge*, 33(4), 271–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2047-3095.12407>
- Turner, K., Staggs, V., Potter, C., Cramer, E., Shorr, R., & Mion, L. (2020). Fall prevention implementation strategies in use at 60 United States hospitals: A descriptive study. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 29(12), 1000–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2019-010642>
- Vechter, T., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2021). Effect of nurses' resilience on fall prevention in acute-care hospitals: A mixed-methods qualitative study. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(6), 1645–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13373>
- Wang, Y., Jiang, M., He, M., & Du, M. (2024). Design and implementation of an inpatient fall-risk management information system. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 12, e46501. <https://doi.org/10.2196/46501>
- Xu, H., Cao, X.-J., Zhang, Y., & Chen, Z.-H. (2021). Continuous improvement of quality management in the fall prevention process for inpatients: A historically controlled study. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-612297/v1>
- Yasan, C., Burton, T., & Tracey, M. (2020). Nurses documentation of fall prevention in a patient-centered care plan in a medical ward. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(2), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.37464/2020.372.103>
- Yasan, C., Pretto, G., & Burton, P. (2025). A high fall risk patient perspective: Reducing safety challenges in an acute care hospital. *Nursing Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.70161>