Journal of Posthumanism
2024
Volume: 4, No: 3, pp. 2083–2096
ISSN: 2634-3576 (Print) | ISSN 2634-3584 (Online)
posthumanism.co.uk

DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.63332/joph.v4i3.3498

Ethical Decision-Making in Healthcare: The Combined Role of Nurses and Physicians

Areej Yousef Kateb[1], Fahad Atallah ALSahli[2], Turki Abid Alharbi[3], Rehab Taher Albarnawi[4], Abrar Obeid Alluqmani[5]

Abstract

Ethical decision-making is essential in healthcare, necessitating a collaborative approach to navigate complex moral dilemmas. This paper analyzes the roles of nurses and physicians, establishing foundational principles of biomedical ethics: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. It contrasts the medical focus on "cure" with nursing's "care," illustrating how this divergence can foster a holistic ethical framework. Nurses advocate for patients' experiences, while physicians manage diagnosis and treatment. The report highlights the benefits of interprofessional collaboration, including improved patient safety and satisfaction, while addressing barriers like power hierarchies and communication failures. It proposes strategies for a cohesive ethical environment through interprofessional education and ethics committees, asserting that collaboration in ethical deliberation is crucial for patient safety and healthcare equity.

Keywords: *Ethics, Nurse–Physician Collaboration, Patient Care, Shared Decision-Making, Healthcare Teams, Interprofessional Practice*

Introduction

The practice of modern healthcare is intrinsically a moral enterprise. At every turn, clinicians, patients, and families are confronted with decisions that carry profound and often irreversible consequences [1]. From the intensive care unit to the outpatient clinic, questions of life and death, quality of life, and the allocation of finite resources demand not only clinical expertise but also deep ethical reflection [2]. The rapid advancement of medical technology, the increasing complexity of chronic diseases, and the growing diversity of patient values have further magnified the ethical stakes. In this high-stakes environment, ethical practice is the foundation upon which patient trust and professional integrity are built [3]. Navigating this intricate moral landscape is no longer the purview of a single practitioner but requires the collective wisdom and diverse perspectives of an integrated healthcare team.

Ethical decision-making in the context of clinical practice is a structured, systematic process that enables healthcare professionals to navigate complex situations where moral principles, patient rights, and clinical responsibilities intersect [4]. It is a logical process that involves making the best moral decision through systematic reasoning when faced with a dilemma [5]. This process extends beyond a simplistic choice between a clear "right" and "wrong." More often, it involves

[1] Ministry of health- Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[2] Ministry of health- Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[3] Ministry of health- Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[4] Ministry of health- Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[5] Ministry of health Al-medina Al-Monawara Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia

adjudicating between competing ethical principles or values, such as the duty to promote a patient's well-being (beneficence) versus the duty to respect their right to refuse treatment (autonomy) [3]. This structured approach ensures that care is delivered with integrity, fairness, and profound respect for individual dignity, grounding clinical judgments in established moral values and professional standards [6].

At the heart of the clinical team are nurses and physicians, two professions whose collaboration is essential for optimal patient outcomes. While both are bound by a shared commitment to the patient, they approach ethical dilemmas from distinct professional and philosophical standpoints. Historically and functionally, medicine has been oriented around a paradigm of "cure," focusing on the diagnosis, treatment, and defeat of disease [7]. Nursing, in contrast, has developed from a paradigm of "care," emphasizing a holistic, relational approach that compassionately aids individuals in adapting to illness and preserving their well-being. This paper posits that these two paradigms are not mutually exclusive or inherently conflictual. Instead, when effectively integrated, they create a powerful synergy. The physician's diagnostic acumen and therapeutic expertise, combined with the nurse's holistic understanding of the patient's lived experience and values, form a more complete and robust foundation for ethical deliberation. This collaborative synergy is indispensable for achieving truly patient-centered care, where decisions are not only clinically sound but also deeply aligned with the unique needs and wishes of the individual patient [8].

Literature Review

Foundational Principles of Biomedical Ethics: A Unified Framework

Modern healthcare ethics is built upon a widely accepted framework of principles that provides a common moral language for clinicians, patients, and policymakers. This framework, often referred to as principlism, is typically grouped under four main categories that guide ethical analysis and decision-making in clinical practice [9].

- **Respect for Autonomy:** This principle requires respect for the decision-making capacities of autonomous persons. Rooted in the liberal tradition of individual freedom, autonomy refers to personal self-governance, free from both controlling interferences by others and personal limitations that prevent meaningful choice. In practice, respecting autonomy obligates healthcare professionals to engage in a process of informed consent, which involves disclosing relevant information, ensuring the patient understands the nature of their condition and the risks and benefits of all options, and honoring their voluntary decisions. It is a positive duty that may involve actively building a patient's capacity for autonomous choice by allaying fears and providing clear, accessible information. The right of a competent patient to refuse a recommended medical intervention is a direct application of this principle.
- **Non-maleficence:** This principle is captured by the ancient maxim, *primum non nocere*: "Above all, do no harm". It asserts the fundamental obligation of a healthcare professional not to cause needless harm or injury to a patient. This duty requires clinicians to observe due care, weighing the potential benefits of any intervention against its risks and burdens, and to avoid treatments that are inappropriately burdensome. The principle underpins moral rules such as "do not kill," "do not cause pain or suffering," and "do not incapacitate". Historically, this principle was sometimes invoked to justify a

paternalistic approach, where a physician might withhold a grim diagnosis to prevent psychological harm, even at the expense of the patient's autonomy.

- **Beneficence:** In contrast to the negative duty of non-maleficence, beneficence is a positive requirement to act for the benefit of others. This principle obligates healthcare professionals to actively promote the welfare of their patients. It encompasses a group of duties, including preventing and removing harm, providing benefits, and balancing those benefits against risks and costs. Actions such as providing timely pain medication, implementing fall precautions, or assisting a patient with tasks they cannot perform are all examples of beneficence in action. This principle is inherent in the provider-patient relationship and is a core tenet of both the Hippocratic tradition and modern professional codes.
- **Justice:** The principle of justice concerns the fair and appropriate distribution of benefits, risks, and costs within society. In healthcare, this most often relates to distributive justice—the fair allocation of scarce health resources, such as ICU beds, donor organs, or novel treatments. It requires that similar cases be treated in a similar fashion, and that patients are treated equitably regardless of factors like race, socioeconomic status, or religion. This principle challenges healthcare systems to address inequalities in access to care and to ensure that all individuals have a fair opportunity to receive the services they need.

Historical Divergence of Medical and Nursing Ethics

While nurses and physicians share the common language of principlism, the historical and philosophical evolution of their respective professions has led to distinct ethical orientations. These different paradigms, one centered on "cure" and the other on "care," shape how each profession interprets and applies these shared principles in clinical practice. This divergence is not merely an academic distinction; it is a critical factor in understanding the dynamics of interprofessional collaboration and conflict at the bedside.

The "Cure" Paradigm in Medicine

The ethical tradition in Western medicine is ancient, tracing its roots to the Hippocratic Oath of the fifth century BCE, which established core duties of altruism and the protection of patient rights. The modern discourse of medical ethics began to take a more formal shape in the 18th and 19th centuries. In 1803, English physician Thomas Percival published his *Code of Medical Ethics*, which heavily influenced the first code adopted by the newly formed American Medical Association (AMA) in 1847 [10]. This tradition developed in parallel with the rise of scientific medicine, which emphasized the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease through increasingly complex technical and biochemical interventions.

The ethos of medicine became one of combating illness, often employing warlike metaphors of "fighting" or "defeating" a disease. The physician's role evolved into that of an expert authority, and the physician-patient relationship was often episodic and consultative, centered on the goal of cure. This orientation fostered a paternalistic model of decision-making, where the physician's primary duty was beneficence—acting in what they believed to be the patient's best interest—which could sometimes supersede the patient's autonomy. While this model has shifted dramatically toward patient-centeredness and shared decision-making in recent decades, the historical legacy of the "cure" paradigm and physician authority continues to influence the

profession's culture and its approach to ethical dilemmas [9].

The "Care" Paradigm in Nursing

Nursing ethics developed along a separate trajectory, with a rich body of literature emerging in the late 19th century, well before the rise of modern bioethics in the 1960s [2]. From its inception, nursing ethics was fundamentally relational and nurse-centric, focusing on the moral character of the nurse and the development of a healing relationship with the patient [11]. The term "nursing" itself derives from the Latin *nutrio*, meaning "to nurture," highlighting its focus on fostering growth, providing protection, and compassionately aiding individuals [12].

Unlike medicine's focus on defeating disease, nursing developed as a health-oriented profession that emphasizes the preservation and restoration of health, helping patients adapt to chronic illness and incapacity. This is the "care" paradigm. The nature of nursing work, characterized by continuous presence at the bedside, provides an in-depth and personal interaction with the patient, focusing on their values and adaptive processes. This "ever-presence" positions the nurse as a natural patient advocate, a role that is an intrinsic element of nursing ethics and is central to the ANA's Code of Ethics for Nurses. The primary virtues in this tradition are compassion and support, in contrast to the authority and risk-taking often associated with medicine [13].

The existence of these two distinct paradigms means that while a nurse and a physician may both speak of "beneficence," their understanding of what constitutes a "benefit" can differ significantly. A physician, operating from a "cure" framework, might see a high-risk surgery as the most beneficent action, while a nurse, from a "care" framework, might view the same surgery's impact on the patient's quality of life and comfort as a greater harm than the potential for cure. This fundamental difference in perspective, rooted in the professions' divergent histories, can lead to profound ethical disagreements even when both parties are using the same ethical terminology and are genuinely committed to the patient's well-being.

Common Ethical Dilemmas in Interprofessional Practice

The intersection of these distinct professional paradigms, combined with the inherent complexities of clinical care, gives rise to a set of recurring ethical dilemmas that demand robust interprofessional collaboration for their resolution.

- **End-of-Life Care:** Decisions surrounding the end of life are among the most frequent and emotionally charged ethical challenges. These include dilemmas about initiating, withholding, or withdrawing life-sustaining treatments, such as mechanical ventilation or artificial nutrition. Conflicts often arise when a patient's advance directive or expressed wishes conflict with the family's desires or the clinical team's judgment about medical futility [14]. Balancing the principles of patient autonomy, beneficence (prolonging life versus ensuring a peaceful death), and non-maleficence (avoiding suffering) requires sensitive and coordinated communication among the patient, family, nurse, and physician.
- **Informed Consent:** While the principle of informed consent is fundamental, its application is fraught with complexity. A significant ethical challenge is ensuring that a patient's consent is truly informed and voluntary, especially for individuals with cognitive impairments, language barriers, or severe emotional distress. Nurses, who spend more time with patients, are often in a better position to assess a patient's true

understanding and to identify subtle forms of coercion from family members or even well-intentioned clinicians. The physician has the primary responsibility to explain the proposed treatment, but the entire team shares the ethical duty to ensure the patient's decision is autonomous [15].

- **Confidentiality and Privacy:** Protecting patient confidentiality is a foundational duty for both nurses and physicians, enshrined in professional codes and laws like the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). However, dilemmas arise when this duty conflicts with the safety of the patient or others [16]. For example, a nurse may learn that a patient with a contagious disease does not intend to inform their partners, creating a conflict between confidentiality and the duty to protect the public. In the age of electronic health records, maintaining privacy while ensuring necessary information is shared among a large care team presents an ongoing logistical and ethical challenge.
- **Resource Allocation:** In an era of rising healthcare costs and finite resources, clinicians frequently face dilemmas of distributive justice. This can occur at the macro level (e.g., public health policy) or at the micro level, such as deciding which of two equally needy patients receives the last available ICU bed or ventilator during a pandemic. These decisions force a difficult balance between care quality and efficiency and require transparent, objective criteria to ensure fairness and avoid discrimination. Such high-stakes decisions are best made through a collaborative process that includes input from multiple team members to mitigate individual bias and ensure institutional guidelines are followed [17].

Frameworks and Models for Shared Ethical Decision-Making

To navigate these dilemmas effectively, healthcare has moved away from paternalistic models toward collaborative approaches that actively involve the patient. Shared Decision-Making (SDM) has emerged as the pinnacle of patient-centered care and provides a structured process for integrating clinical evidence with patient values [18]. SDM is a process in which clinicians and patients work together, contributing to the decision-making process and agreeing on a course of action that best aligns with the patient's preferences and beliefs. This approach enhances patient commitment, improves understanding of risks and benefits, and strengthens the provider-patient relationship [19].

One of the most evidence-based frameworks for implementing SDM in clinical practice is the **Three-Talk Model** [20]. This model structures the clinical conversation into three distinct but overlapping stages:

- **Team Talk:** This initial phase focuses on establishing a collaborative partnership. The clinician introduces the need for a decision and explicitly states that the patient's preferences are a key component of the process. The goal is to create a supportive environment where the patient feels empowered to share their goals and concerns, effectively making them a member of the decision-making team.
- **Option Talk:** In this stage, the clinician presents the available treatment options, including the option of no treatment. The risks, benefits, and consequences of each alternative are compared in a balanced and unbiased manner. To facilitate understanding, this stage often employs patient decision aids—evidence-based tools like pamphlets, videos, or interactive websites that present complex information clearly. Best practices

include using absolute numbers rather than relative risk, framing data both positively and negatively, and using techniques like "chunk and check" (providing small pieces of information and confirming understanding) to avoid overwhelming the patient.

- **Decision Talk:** The final phase involves integrating the patient's informed preferences and values with the clinical evidence to arrive at a joint decision. The clinician helps the patient explore what matters most to them and supports them in making a choice. The conversation concludes with a clear statement of the agreed-upon plan, the next steps, and a timeline for review, with the understanding that the patient can revisit the decision at any time.

While the Three-Talk Model is a powerful tool, its successful implementation relies on the entire interprofessional team. It requires a team-based approach involving nurses, health coaches, and physicians to ensure that the principles of SDM are upheld in all patient interactions.

The Role of Nurses in Ethical Decision-Making

Nurses occupy a unique and central position in the ethical ecosystem of healthcare. Guided by the American Nurses Association (ANA) Code of Ethics for Nurses, their role extends far beyond the technical execution of medical orders to encompass profound responsibilities as patient advocates, holistic assessors, and crucial contributors to moral deliberation.

The Nurse as Patient Advocate

The cornerstone of nursing ethics is the principle that the nurse's primary commitment is to the patient. This commitment is operationalized through the role of patient advocacy. Provision 3 of the ANA Code explicitly states that "The nurse promotes, advocates for, and protects the rights, health, and safety of the patient". This involves ensuring that patients receive all the necessary information to make informed decisions (autonomy), supporting those decisions even when they conflict with the nurse's own beliefs or medical advice, and actively intervening when a patient's best interests or rights are in jeopardy [13]. As advocates, nurses are ethically bound to question physician orders that they believe are in error or contrary to the patient's well-being, a responsibility that requires significant moral courage.

A Holistic Perspective

The nurse's capacity for effective advocacy is rooted in their unique, holistic perspective on the patient. Unlike the often-episodic nature of physician encounters, nurses provide continuous care at the bedside, allowing them to develop a deep, contextual understanding of the patient as a person [14]. This sustained proximity is not merely a functional aspect of their work; it is a distinct ethical tool. It allows the nurse to gather nuanced, longitudinal data on a patient's values, fears, family dynamics, and response to illness—information that is often inaccessible during a brief clinical consultation [21]. This "ever-presence" enables the nurse to become the primary sensor and interpreter of the patient's lived experience of suffering and well-being. By observing subtle changes in mood, listening to informal conversations, and building trust over time, the nurse can provide the ethical deliberation with a rich dataset that contextualizes the clinical facts. Excluding or minimizing this perspective is not just a failure of teamwork; it is a failure to incorporate critical evidence, leading to a potentially incomplete and ethically flawed decision-making process.

Contributions to Ethical Discourse

In practice, nurses contribute to ethical discussions in several key roles. They act as information brokers, translating complex medical information for the patient and family while also conveying the patient's preferences, emotional state, and holistic condition back to the physician and the rest of the team. They serve as supporters, building trusting relationships with patients and families, providing emotional support, and helping them navigate the difficult process of decision-making. Crucially, they are advocates who actively participate in the moral discourse. This can range from subtly "planting seeds" by raising questions that encourage deeper reflection, to directly challenging a plan of care in team meetings or through an ethics consultation when they believe a patient's wishes are being overlooked or their safety is compromised. In this capacity, nurses are tasked with bringing the "human spirit" into what can otherwise become an overly technical or disease-focused conversation, ensuring that the person at the center of the dilemma is never forgotten [22].

The Role of Physicians in Ethical Decision-Making

Physicians, guided by the AMA Code of Medical Ethics, bear a distinct and profound set of ethical responsibilities that are central to patient care. Their role is defined by their unique expertise in diagnosis and treatment, their duty to act with compassion and professionalism, and the complex task of navigating the inherent tensions between promoting health and respecting patient choice.

Diagnostic Responsibility and Therapeutic Prerogative

The physician's primary ethical obligation is to provide competent medical care, with the patient's well-being as the foremost consideration [23]. This responsibility is grounded in their extensive scientific training and clinical experience, which grants them the primary role in establishing a diagnosis, determining a prognosis, and recommending a course of treatment [24]. The AMA Code stipulates that physician must "practise the science and art of medicine to the best of [their] ability" and "continue lifelong self-education to improve [their] standard of medical care" [25]. This includes the duty to obtain informed consent, a process where the physician presents relevant information about the diagnosis, the nature and purpose of recommended interventions, and the burdens, risks, and benefits of all options, including forgoing treatment.

Balancing Beneficence and Autonomy

A central and recurring ethical challenge for physicians is balancing the principle of beneficence with the principle of respect for autonomy. The duty of beneficence compels the physician to act in the patient's best interest, recommending treatments they believe will lead to the best possible health outcome. However, the principle of autonomy requires them to respect a competent patient's right to make their own decisions, even if that decision is to refuse a life-saving intervention [26]. This tension is particularly acute in end-of-life care or situations where a patient's choice appears to conflict with evidence-based medical advice. Historically, a more paternalistic model prevailed, were beneficence often trumped autonomy [27]. The modern ethical standard, however, requires a collaborative partnership where the physician provides expert guidance, but the ultimate authority rests with the informed patient [28]. Navigating this balance requires exceptional communication skills, empathy, and a humble recognition that the physician's definition of "best interest" may not align with the patient's own values and life goals.

The Physician's Role in Navigating Prognostic Uncertainty

Many of the most difficult ethical dilemmas are triggered by the communication of a serious diagnosis or a poor prognosis. The physician is central to this process. How they frame information—balancing hope with realism, explaining uncertainty, and assessing the patient's and family's understanding—profoundly influences the subsequent ethical deliberation. In cases of prognostic uncertainty, a physician's unwavering belief in the possibility of recovery can lead them to advocate for aggressive treatment, sometimes pressing their hopes onto a family and overriding a patient previously expressed wishes to discontinue life-sustaining measures [28]. This highlights the immense responsibility physicians carry not only to be clinically accurate but also to be self-aware of their own biases and values, ensuring their communication facilitates, rather than dictates, the patient's autonomous decision-making process. Their role is to guide the patient through the uncertainty, not to resolve it for them based on their own hopes or fears.

Collaborative Nurse–Physician Ethical Decision-Making

When the distinct ethical paradigms of nursing and medicine are effectively integrated, the result is a process of ethical deliberation that is more comprehensive, compassionate, and patient-centered than either profession could achieve alone. This synergy, however, is not automatic; it requires overcoming significant historical and cultural barriers to achieve a state of true interprofessional collaboration.

Improving Patient-Centered Care Through Interprofessional Deliberation

True patient-centered care is an emergent property of effective interprofessional collaboration. It arises when the healthcare team can successfully synthesize the physician's diagnostic and therapeutic expertise with the nurse's deep, holistic understanding of the patient's context, values, and lived experience of illness. In a collaborative ethical deliberation, the physician might provide the clinical facts about a treatment's probability of success and its physiological side effects, while the nurse provides the crucial context of how those side effects might impact this specific patient's ability to achieve their stated goal of attending a grandchild's wedding. This integration allows the team, in partnership with the patient, to craft a plan of care that is not only clinically sound but also authentically aligned with what matters most to the individual [8]. This active partnership among professionals allows for the inclusion of all relevant voices and perspectives, which is paramount for ensuring the highest quality of care, especially in complex situations like end-of-life decision-making [29].

The Benefits of a Unified Ethical Front

Research has consistently demonstrated that effective nurse-physician collaboration yields tangible benefits for patients, providers, and the healthcare system as a whole.

- **Enhanced Patient Safety and Reduced Errors:** Poor communication is a leading cause of medical errors. Effective collaboration, characterized by open communication, shared decision-making, and mutual respect, directly mitigates this risk. Studies have shown a significant correlation between higher levels of collaboration and improved patient safety metrics, including reduced medication errors, lower rates of adverse events, and fewer hospital readmissions. When nurses feel empowered to voice concerns and physicians are receptive to their input, potential errors can be caught before they reach the patient [30].

- **Increased Patient and Family Satisfaction and Trust:** Patients can perceive the quality of their care team's interactions. When they witness a cohesive, respectful team working together, their satisfaction and trust in the healthcare system increase significantly. Effective collaboration is associated with improved patient-reported outcomes, a better overall care experience, and higher levels of trust in providers [31].
- **Mitigation of Moral Distress:** Ethical dilemmas are a significant source of stress for clinicians. Moral distress occurs when a clinician knows the ethically appropriate action to take but is constrained from doing so by institutional or interpersonal barriers. A cooperative and supportive relationship between nurses and physicians has been shown to reduce the frequency and intensity of moral distress. When clinicians feel they are part of a functional team that shares the burden of difficult decisions, they experience greater job satisfaction and are less prone to burnout [32].

Barriers to Effective Collaboration

Despite the clear benefits, achieving effective collaboration is often hindered by deep-seated historical, cultural, and systemic barriers.

- **The Legacy of Hierarchy and Power Imbalance:** The most significant barrier is the historical power differential between medicine and nursing. The traditional "captain of the ship" model, in which the physician held absolute authority and nurses were expected to be deferential subordinates, has created a persistent and often unspoken hierarchy. This legacy manifests in behaviors that stifle collaboration: physicians who may not expect or accept nurses' role as advocates, and nurses who may fear speaking up or feel their input will be dismissed. This power gradient can lead to situations where a nurse's critical observations about a patient's deteriorating condition or changing wishes are "brushed off" by a physician, with potentially devastating consequences [33].
- **Communication Challenges and Disparate Professional Cultures:** Beyond overt hierarchy, collaboration is undermined by more subtle communication failures and cultural divides. These include a perceived lack of respect, physicians interrupting nurses or appearing rushed and uninterested, and logistical challenges like a lack of time or a quiet place to talk. Furthermore, the different values and motivations stemming from the "care" versus "cure" paradigms can lead to goal confusion and a lack of mutual trust. A critical and often overlooked barrier is the profound mismatch in perceptions of collaboration. Studies consistently show that physicians rate the quality of their collaboration with nurses significantly higher than nurses do [34]. This is not simply a difference of opinion; it is a symptom of the underlying power dynamic. A physician, conditioned by the historical hierarchy, may define "good collaboration" as a smooth process where their orders are followed efficiently. A nurse, guided by modern professional ethics, defines it as a partnership of mutual respect and shared decision-making. This perceptual chasm means that both parties can walk away from the same interaction with completely different assessments of its success, preventing any meaningful improvement until a shared definition of true collaboration is established.

Challenges and Opportunities

While the ideal of seamless interprofessional collaboration is compelling, achieving it requires a deliberate and sustained effort to overcome systemic obstacles and cultivate an environment

where teamwork can flourish. This necessitates a multi-pronged approach that addresses education, institutional structures, and organizational culture.

Identifying Systemic and Interpersonal Obstacles

The path to effective ethical collaboration is fraught with challenges that are both systemic and interpersonal. As previously discussed, persistent professional hierarchies create power imbalances that can silence crucial perspectives, particularly those of nurses [35]. Time constraints in fast-paced clinical environments often preclude the deep, reflective conversations necessary for complex ethical deliberation. Furthermore, a lack of mutual understanding of each other's roles and scopes of practice, often stemming from siloed educational experiences, can lead to misunderstandings and friction [36]. These interpersonal issues are frequently compounded by institutional cultures that fail to prioritize, model, or reward interprofessional teamwork, leaving clinicians to navigate these complex dynamics without adequate support or guidance [37].

Strategies for Fostering an Ethical Collaborative Culture

Overcoming these deep-seated challenges requires more than just good intentions; it demands a strategic, multi-level intervention that integrates education, structural support, and cultural change. A single initiative is unlikely to succeed. Instead, progress depends on the synergistic implementation of several key strategies.

- **The Role of Interprofessional Ethics Training and Education (IPE)**

  The foundation for future collaboration is laid during professional training. Interprofessional Education (IPE) is a pedagogical approach where students from two or more health professions learn "about, from, and with each other" to foster effective collaboration and improve health outcomes [38]. By bringing medical, nursing, pharmacy, and other students together early in their training, IPE programs aim to break down professional silos before they become rigid. Curricula in programs like those at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) and the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus are explicitly designed around core competencies, including values/ethics for interprofessional practice, interprofessional communication, and teams/teamwork [39]. This shared educational experience cultivates a foundation of mutual respect and a common understanding of each profession's unique contributions. It begins to dismantle the historical hierarchies and misconceptions at their root, preparing a future workforce that is "collaboration-ready [40]".

- **Leveraging Institutional Ethics Committees**

  For practicing clinicians, institutional ethics committees (IECs) can provide vital structural support for navigating ethical dilemmas. To be effective, these committees must be truly interdisciplinary, with robust representation from nursing, medicine, social work, spiritual care, and the community [21]. According to AMA guidance, the role of an IEC is not to be a decision-maker, but rather to serve as an advisory and educational resource. They facilitate sound decision-making by providing a neutral, confidential forum where all stakeholders—clinicians, patients, and families—can have their voices heard [41]. By moderating discussions, clarifying ethical principles, and offering expert guidance, IECs can help resolve conflicts that arise from differing values or professional

perspectives [24]. Their involvement can empower nurses who feel their concerns are being ignored, support physicians struggling with prognostic uncertainty, and ultimately guide the team toward a consensus that respects the patient's values and interests [42].

- **Implementing Structured Communication Models**

  Effective communication is the lifeblood of collaboration, yet it is often the first casualty of a high-pressure clinical environment. Implementing structured communication models can provide a crucial framework for ensuring that critical information is exchanged clearly, concisely, and respectfully. The SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) tool is a widely adopted model that provides a predictable format for communication, particularly between nurses and physicians [30]. By using SBAR, a nurse can organize their thoughts before calling a physician, ensuring they present a coherent and comprehensive picture of the situation. This structure can help flatten the perceived hierarchy in the moment of communication, as it frames the nurse's input not as a complaint or a challenge, but as a professional assessment and recommendation [37]. Fostering other communication skills, such as active listening and encouraging open dialogue, further strengthens the team's ability to engage in productive ethical discourse [43].

- **Institutional Policy and Leadership**

  Ultimately, education and structural tools can only be effective within a supportive organizational culture, and that culture is shaped by leadership and institutional policy. Leaders at all levels, from unit managers to hospital executives, must actively model and champion a culture of mutual respect, psychological safety, and interprofessional collaboration. This involves creating and enforcing policies that protect clinicians who speak up about ethical concerns, establishing clear and accessible processes for conflict resolution, and allocating the necessary resources—including time and funding—for teams to engage in ethics training and collaborative activities. Institutional policies should explicitly define expectations for collaborative practice and hold all team members accountable for upholding them [44]. When leadership demonstrates that interprofessional collaboration is a core institutional value, it creates the environment in which the seeds planted by IPE can grow and the tools provided by ethics committees and communication models can be used effectively.

Conclusion

The paper discusses the complex ethical landscape of modern healthcare, emphasizing the complementary nature of nursing and medicine. It highlights that while medicine focuses on scientific evidence and therapeutic interventions, nursing emphasizes holistic care and patient experience. Effective decision-making in healthcare requires an integration of both perspectives. Collaboration between nurses and physicians is not only beneficial but morally necessary for responsible medical practice in the 21st century, as it directly influences patient safety, reduces medical errors, and enhances care quality. The paper notes that strong interprofessional teamwork improves patient satisfaction by aligning treatment plans with individual patient needs and promotes healthcare equity by mitigating biases in decision-making. Overall, the dialogue between nursing and medicine is essential for the quality and safety of patient care.

References

Lsanchez. Ethical issues in healthcare [Internet]. Uttyler. 2023. Available from: https://online.uttyler.edu/degrees/business/mba/healthcare-management/ethical-issues-in-healthcare/

Haddad LM, Geiger RA. Nursing ethical considerations [Internet]. StatPearls - NCBI Bookshelf. 2023. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK526054/

Sarı D, Baysal E, Celik GG, Eşer I. Ethical decision making levels of nursing students. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences [Internet]. 2018 May 24;34(3). Available from: https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.343.14922

Erichardson. Chapter 2: Ethical Decision making [Internet]. Health 1010. Available from: https://nmoer.pressbooks.pub/health1010/chapter/chapter-2-ethical-decision-making/

How do nurses approach ethical Decision-Making? | NursingEducation [Internet]. NursingEducation. 2024. Available from: https://nursingeducation.org/insights/ethical-decision-making/

Harrington D. What is the nursing Code of Ethics and why does it matter? [Internet]. Post University. 2024. Available from: https://post.edu/blog/what-is-the-nursing-code-of-ethics/

Gregoriou PL, Charalambous A, Rousou E, Papastavrou E, Merkouris A. Attitudes of Physicians and Nurses Toward Interprofessional Collaboration: a Systematic Literature Review. Materia Socio Medica [Internet]. 2025 Jan 1;37(1):64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5455/msm.2025.37.64-73

Kim Y, Oh Y, Lee E, Kim SJ. Impact of Nurse–Physician Collaboration, Moral Distress, and Professional Autonomy on Job Satisfaction among Nurses Acting as Physician Assistants. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health [Internet]. 2022 Jan 7;19(2):661. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020661

Beauchamp TL. THE FOUR PRINCIPLES APPROACH TO HEALTH CARE ETHICS [Internet]. Standing on Principles : Collected Essays. Oxford University Press, Incorporated; 2010. Available from: https://bioethics.pitt.edu/sites/default/files/Stott%2C%20Chapter%203%20Beauchamp.pdf

Fowler M. Toward Reclaiming Our Ethical Heritage: Nursing Ethics before Bioethics. OJIN the Online Journal of Issues in Nursing [Internet]. 2020 May 31;25(2). Available from: https://doi.org/10.3912/ojin.vol25no02man04

Dnm. A Brief History of nursing care in Ireland - Migraine Association of Ireland [Internet]. Migraine Association of Ireland. 2024. Available from: https://migraine.ie/2024/05/brief-history-nursing-care-in-ireland/#:~:text=Origins,Roman%20Empire%20about%20300%20AD.

American Nurses Association. American Nurses Association Code of Ethics for Nurses [Internet]. Author; 2015. Available from: https://nursing.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ANA-Code-of-Ethics-for-Nurses.pdf

Adams JA, Bailey DE, Anderson RA, Docherty SL. Nursing Roles and Strategies in End-of-Life Decision Making in Acute Care: A Systematic Review of the literature. Nursing Research and Practice [Internet]. 2011 Jan 1;2011:1–15. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/527834

Shah P, Thornton I, Kopitnik NL, Hipskind JE. Informed consent [Internet]. StatPearls - NCBI Bookshelf. 2024. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK430827/

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) [Internet]. Public Health Law. 2024. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/phlp/php/resources/health-insurance-

portability-and-accountability-act-of-1996-hipaa.html

Putoto G, Pegoraro R, Padova Teaching Hospital, Fondazione Lanza. Resource allocation in health care. Bioethics in the 21st Century. p. 64–5.

AHRQ. The CAHPS Ambulatory Care Improvement Guide [Internet]. Section 6: Strategies for Improving Patient Experience With Ambulatory Care. 2017 Jul. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/cahps/quality-improvement/improvement-guide/6-strategies-for-improving/communication/cahps-strategy-section-6-i.pdf

Resnicow K, Catley D, Goggin K, Hawley S, Williams GC. Shared decision making in health care: theoretical perspectives for why it works and for whom. Medical Decision Making [Internet]. 2021 Nov 16;42(6):755–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989x211058068

NHS England and NHS Improvement. Personalised Care Shared Decision Making Summary guide [Internet]. 2019. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/shared-decision-making-summary-guide-v1.pdf

Alshawish E, Benbenishty J. Global Nurse Involvement in ethical decision-making during pandemics: a concept analysis. Journal of Research in Nursing [Internet]. 2023 Mar 1;28(2):92–101. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/17449871231159612

AMA. AMA Code of Ethics - 2004. 2004.

American Medical Association. AMA CODE OF MEDICAL ETHICS [Internet]. 2001 Jun. Available from: https://www.ttuhsc.edu/medicine/continuing-medical-education/documents/resources/principles-of-medical-ethics.pdf

American Medical Association. AMA Code of Medical Ethics. American Medical Association [Internet]. Available from: https://code-medical-ethics.ama-assn.org/sites/amacoedb/files/2022-08/2.1.1.pdf

Rushton CH. The voices of nurses on ethics committees. *Bioeth Forum*. 1994;Fall:30-5.

Varkey B. Principles of clinical ethics and their application to practice. Medical Principles and Practice [Internet]. 2020 Jun 4;30(1):17–28. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1159/000509119

Jpiersol. Ethics in Health Care: Improving patient outcomes [Internet]. School of Public Health. 2023. Available from: https://publichealth.tulane.edu/blog/ethics-in-healthcare/

Hamric AB. Moral distress and Nurse-Physician relationships [Internet]. Vol. 12, Virtual Mentor. 2010 Jan p. 6–11. Report No.: 1. Available from: https://www.virtualmentor.org

Soto R, Oye E, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology. The impact of Nurse-Physician collaboration on patient safety and satisfaction. The Impact of Nurse-Physician Collaboration on Patient Safety and Satisfaction [Internet]. 2025; Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395398098

O'Daniel M, Rosenstein AH. Professional communication and team collaboration [Internet]. Patient Safety and Quality - NCBI Bookshelf. 2008. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK2637/

Karam M, Brault I, Van Durme T, Macq J. Comparing interprofessional and interorganizational collaboration in healthcare: A systematic review of the qualitative research. International Journal of Nursing Studies [Internet]. 2017 Nov 12;79:70–83. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.11.002

Aljabery M, Coetzee-Prinsloo I, Van Der Wath A, Al-Hmaimat N. Characteristics of Moral Distress from Nurses' Perspectives: An Integrative Review. International Journal of Nursing

Sciences [Internet]. 2024 Oct 13;11(5):578–85. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2024.10.005

Looman N, Van Woezik T, Van Asselt D, Haan NS, Fluit C, De Graaf J. Exploring power dynamics and their impact on intraprofessional learning. Medical Education [Internet]. 2021 Nov 29;56(4):444–55. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14706

Shepherd SM, Willis-Esqueda C, Newton D, Sivasubramaniam D, Paradies Y. The challenge of cultural competence in the workplace: perspectives of healthcare providers. BMC Health Services Research [Internet]. 2019 Feb 26;19(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-3959-7

OUPblog. On nurses and doctors [Internet]. OUPblog. 2012. Available from: https://blog.oup.com/2010/02/nurse/

Kurtz MJ, Starbird LE. Interprofessional Clinical Ethics Education: The promise of Cross-Disciplinary Problem-Based learning. The AMA Journal of Ethic [Internet]. 2016 Sep 1;18(9):917–24. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2016.18.9.nlit1-1609

Talking it out: Improving Nurse-Physician Communication - Rivier Academics [Internet]. Rivier Academics. 2025. Available from: https://www.rivier.edu/academics/blog-posts/talking-it-out-improving-nurse-physician-communication/

Interprofessional Education | OHSU [Internet]. Available from: https://www.ohsu.edu/education/interprofessional-education

Young J. AMA Code of Medical Ethics' opinions related to interprofessional collaboration. The AMA Journal of Ethic [Internet]. 2023 May 1;25(5):E361-364. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2023.361

Interprofessional Healthcare Ethics (IPHE 6000) [Internet]. Available from: https://www.cuanschutz.edu/centers/ipe/ipe-curriculum/interprofessional-healthcare-health-equity

Cne KBP Rn,, Nursing ORF. 6.4 Ethics committees [Internet]. Leadership and Management of Nursing Care. Available from: https://pressbooks.txst.edu/nursinglm/chapter/6-4-ethics-committees/

Scherer A, Alt-Epping B, Nauck F, Marx G. Team members perspectives on conflicts in clinical ethics committees. Nursing Ethics [Internet]. 2019 Apr 1;26(7–8):2098–112. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733019829857

Alu. Effective communication in health care [Internet]. School of Public Health. 2024. Available from: https://publichealth.tulane.edu/blog/communication-in-healthcare/

AONE. AONE guiding principles [Internet]. Available from: https://www.aonl.org/sites/default/files/aone/excellence-nurse-physician-relationships.pdf

McLaney E, Morassaei S, Hughes L, Davies R, Campbell M, Di Prospero L. A framework for interprofessional team collaboration in a hospital setting: Advancing team competencies and behaviours. Healthcare Management Forum [Internet]. 2022 Jan 20;35(2):112–7. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/08404704211063584