Journal of Posthumanism
2025
Volume: 5, No: 11, pp. 88–104
ISSN: 2634-3576 (Print) | ISSN 2634-3584 (Online)
posthumanism.co.uk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i11.3639

The Impact of Health Informatics Tools on Reducing Nursing Errors: A Comprehensive Sociotechnical Analysis

Atyaf Hassan Sowid[1], Bashaer Yahya Kaabi[2], Amirah Ali Nasser Abduljabbar[3], Fai Khalid Alamri[4], Bayan Awaji Hakami[5], Rania Abbas Qumayri[6], Naif Muhammad Al-Qahtani[7]

Abstract

Nursing errors represent a significant and persistent threat to patient safety, contributing to adverse events, increased morbidity, and substantial healthcare costs. In response, modern healthcare systems have increasingly relied upon health informatics as a primary strategy to mitigate these risks. The integration of information technology into clinical practice, a field known as nursing informatics, has become critical to improving healthcare quality and safety. This paper aims to critically examine the evidence for how key health informatics tools—including Electronic Health Records (EHRs), Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE), Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS), Barcode Medication Administration (BCMA), and smart infusion pumps—contribute to the reduction of nursing errors and the enhancement of patient safety. This analysis reveals that while informatics tools demonstrably reduce the rates of specific error types, such as medication administration and prescribing errors, their overall effectiveness in reducing actual patient harm is often moderated. The effectiveness of these tools is consistently challenged by significant sociotechnical barriers, including poor system usability, workflow misalignments, and the emergence of unintended safety-degrading consequences such as user workarounds and pervasive alert fatigue. This review reinforces that the successful implementation of informatics as a durable safety strategy is not merely a technical challenge, but a sociotechnical one, requiring a holistic approach that integrates technology, human factors, organizational leadership, and continuous workflow optimization.

Keywords: *Health informatics, Nursing errors, Patient safety, Clinical decision support, Electronic health records, Medication safety, Nursing informatics.*

Background

Health informatics is not merely a set of tools but a fundamental redesign of clinical practice. To understand its impact on nursing errors, one must first establish the historical, theoretical, and practical context in which this digital transformation is occurring. This rationale is built upon three pillars: the evolution of nursing informatics as a discipline, the scale of the nursing error problem it seeks to solve, and the theoretical frameworks required to analyze its complex

[1] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[2] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[3] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[4] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[5] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[6] Ministry of health - Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[7] Ministry of health - Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia

implementation.

The Historical Trajectory of Nursing Informatics

The conceptual origins of nursing informatics can be traced to the 19th century, with Florence Nightingale's pioneering use of health statistics and data visualization to analyze mortality data and advocate for healthcare reform [1]. However, the formalization of nursing informatics as a distinct specialty began in the 1980s, coinciding with the increased accessibility of computers in healthcare settings [2]. During this period, the American Nurses Association (ANA) first defined the field as an integration of nursing science, computer science, and information science. This definition established the specialty's core mission: to identify, collect, and manage data and information to support all aspects of nursing, including practice, administration, education, and research [3].

Over the subsequent decades, the focus of nursing informatics has evolved significantly. Initially concerned with data management and the development of foundational theories, the field has matured into an independent and influential research area [4]. A textual analysis of nursing informatics literature reveals a distinct pivot in recent years, with keywords such as "patient safety" and "quality" emerging as dominant research themes [5]. This shift signifies a strategic reorientation for the field, moving beyond simple data digitization toward the explicit goal of using technology to improve clinical outcomes and safeguard patients. Today, nursing informatics competency is considered critical to healthcare improvement and is central to global strategies for strengthening healthcare systems.

The Scale of the Problem

Health informatics tools are implemented to solve a problem of critical magnitude: the prevalence of nursing errors. These errors are multifaceted and pervasive, often stemming from systemic pressures rather than individual negligence. Research has identified "Rationing of Nursing Care" (RONC) as a common problem in healthcare institutions. RONC, defined as the omission of or failure to complete necessary nursing activities due to constrained resources (e.g., high workload, low staffing levels), is directly correlated with a higher incidence of adverse patient outcomes, including falls, medication errors, pressure ulcers, and infections [6].

This phenomenon of "missed nursing care" highlights that many nursing errors are not active *commissions* (i.e., performing an action incorrectly) but rather passive *omissions* (i.e., failing to perform a necessary action) [7]. Medication errors, in particular, are a focal point due to their frequency and high potential for harm, especially in complex environments like the intensive care unit. These errors occur at all stages of the medication process, including preparation, administration, and documentation [8]. Furthermore, a poor organizational safety culture, characterized by a fear of reporting and ineffective teamwork, exacerbates these issues

and is linked to a higher rate of adverse events [9].

This understanding of nursing errors as a systemic problem, rooted in cognitive overload, high workload, and communication failures, establishes the fundamental *rationale* for health informatics. The primary value of these tools is not simply to "catch" the final, active error, but to provide a systemic solution: to reduce cognitive and administrative load, standardize complex workflows, improve data accessibility, and mitigate the "missed care" and rationing that represent the root causes of many adverse events.

Theoretical Frameworks for HIT Adoption

The history of Health Information Technology (HIT) implementation is fraught with challenges, largely because technology is often deployed as a purely technical solution to what is, in reality, a complex human and organizational problem. To critically analyze the impact of informatics on nursing errors, this paper is grounded in two key theoretical frameworks: socio-technical theory and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).

Socio-technical theory posits that any organization, especially a hospital, is a joint system of social and technical components that are interdependent. For a HIT implementation to succeed, it must optimize not only the technology but also its interaction with the people and processes. The 8-dimensional socio-technical model, as described by Sittig and Singh, provides a robust framework for this analysis [10]. It specifies that success or failure is contingent on the alignment and harmony of eight dimensions: (1) hardware and software computing infrastructure, (2) clinical content (the data and knowledge base), (3) the human-computer interface, (4) the people (users, patients), (5) workflow and communication, (6) internal organizational policies and culture, (7) external rules and regulations, and (8) measurement and monitoring [11]. Failure in one dimension, such as a mismatch between the technology's rigid logic and the flexibility required for clinical *workflow*, can cascade and nullify gains in all other dimensions.

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provides the lens for understanding adoption at the individual nurse's level. TAM posits that a user's *behavioral intention* to use a new technology is determined primarily by two factors: **Perceived Usefulness (PU)** (the belief that the tool will enhance job performance) and **Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)** (the belief that the tool is free of effort). Systematic reviews of TAM in healthcare have confirmed that PU and PEOU are the most influential factors for adoption among nurses and physicians [12].

These two frameworks are not independent; they are causally linked. The eight dimensions of the socio-technical model are the system-level *inputs* that create the *user experience*. The nurse's subjective evaluation of this experience is then *measured* by the constructs of the TAM [13]. For example, if a hospital implements a new BCMA system that fails on the "human-computer interface" and "workflow" dimensions (e.g., scanners are slow, barcodes are poorly placed),

nurses will perceive it as having low PEOU. According to the TAM, this low PEOU will lead to low technology acceptance, user frustration, and—most critically—the development of workarounds [14]. Therefore, a failure to achieve sociotechnical balance *directly causes* the user-level rejection predicted by the TAM, which in turn leads to the safety-jeopardizing behaviors that undermine the technology's entire purpose.

2. An Anatomy of Health Informatics: Key Tools in the Nursing Safety Arsenal

To analyze their impact, it is essential to first define the primary informatics tools used by nurses to target errors. Each tool serves a distinct function within the clinical workflow, collectively aiming to create a "closed-loop" system of safety.

Electronic Health Records (EHRs)

Electronic Health Records (EHRs) are the digital foundation of modern health informatics. They serve as centralized, longitudinal digital repositories of patient information. Their primary function is to replace fragmented, inaccessible, and often illegible paper charts with a single, comprehensive, and legible source of truth. For nurses, this means immediate access to a patient's complete medical history, previous diagnoses, known allergies, laboratory results, and current medications. The principal purpose of the EHR is to reduce errors that arise from incomplete, unavailable, or incorrect information. From a sociotechnical perspective, the EHR is the primary manifestation of the "Clinical Content" and "Hardware/Software Infrastructure" dimensions [15].

Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE)

Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE) systems allow providers to enter and transmit medical orders (including medications, labs, and diagnostic tests) electronically rather than via handwritten prescriptions. The function of CPOE is to replace ambiguous, error-prone handwritten orders with standardized, legible, and complete electronic data. Its primary purpose is to eliminate a major source of medication errors at the *ordering* stage, specifically errors of interpretation due to illegible handwriting or non-standard abbreviations. CPOE also serves as the trigger for CDSS alerts and is the foundational order against which BCMA systems verify administration. It is an intervention in the "Workflow and Communication" dimension, though studies show it has a double-edged effect, improving legibility while often introducing new workflow rigidities and time burdens [16].

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS)

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) are software tools designed to be a "direct aid to clinical-decision making". Their function is to leverage the data within the EHR ("Clinical Content") and apply a computerized knowledge base to provide "patient-specific assessments or

recommendations" to the nurse or provider at the point of care. These can range from simple alerts (e.g., drug-allergy or drug-drug interaction warnings), reminders for guideline-based care, and, increasingly, sophisticated predictive analytics that use machine learning to identify patients at risk of clinical deterioration. The purpose of CDSS is to augment clinical cognition, preventing errors of omission (e.g., failing to adhere to a protocol) and commission (e.g., prescribing a harmful medication). CDSS also supports complex, nursing-specific decisions, such as using algorithms to determine optimal and equitable nurse-patient assignments [17].

Barcode Medication Administration (BCMA)

Barcode Medication Administration (BCMA) technology serves as a critical safety check at the patient's bedside. Its function requires the nurse to scan the barcode on the patient's identification band and the barcode on the medication package before administration. The system then automatically compares this information against the active CPOE-generated order in the EHR. Its purpose is to automate and enforce the "five rights of medicines administration" (right patient, right drug, right time, right dose, right route). BCMA is designed to be the final "closed-loop" safeguard, intended to intercept and prevent a medication error from reaching the patient. It directly addresses the "Workflow" and "Human-Computer Interface" dimensions [18].

Smart Infusion Devices (IVSPs)

Intravenous Smart Pumps (IVSPs) are infusion devices that contain "drug libraries" with organization-defined "soft and hard limits" for medication concentrations and infusion rates. When a nurse programs an infusion, the pump cross-references the entry with its internal drug library. If the programmed dose or rate exceeds a "hard limit" (a dose considered unequivocally dangerous), the pump will not operate, preventing the infusion. If it exceeds a "soft limit" (a dose that is unusual but potentially permissible), the pump will generate an alert requiring confirmation. The purpose of IVSPs is to prevent life-threatening programming errors, particularly order-of-magnitude mistakes, in the administration of high-alert IV medications [19].

These tools do not function in isolation but are designed to create a layered system of defense. This system is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Key Health Informatics Tools and Their Primary Error-Reduction Function

Health Informatics Tool	Core Function	Specific Nursing Error Targeted
Electronic Health Record (EHR)	Centralized, legible, and shareable patient data repository.	Errors from fragmented, illegible, or incomplete data; documentation errors.

Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE)	Electronic entry, standardization, and transmittal of medical orders.	Errors from illegible handwriting, ambiguous orders, and non-standard abbreviations.
Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS)	Point-of-care alerts, reminders, and predictive analytics based on EHR data.	Medication interactions, guideline non-adherence, errors of omission, and "Failure to Rescue".
Barcode Medication Administration (BCMA)	Barcode scanning of patient and medication; electronic verification against EHR order.	Violations of the "five rights" of medication administration at the bedside.
Smart Infusion Pumps (IVSPs)	Internal drug library with pre-set "soft" and "hard" dose and rate limits.	IV medication programming errors (e.g., incorrect rate, dose) for high-alert medications.

3. Impact of Health Informatics Tools on Reducing Nursing Errors

The implementation of the tools described in Section 3 has generated a substantial body of evidence regarding their effectiveness. This section critically evaluates this evidence, presenting both the quantitative successes and the significant, nuanced challenges that have emerged from practice-based research.

Reduction in Medication Administration Errors: The Quantitative Evidence

On measures of process improvement, the quantitative evidence for the effectiveness of health informatics is strong, particularly in the domain of medication errors. Multiple systematic reviews and meta-analyses demonstrate significant reductions in error rates following the implementation of informatics tools.

- **EHRs:** A meta-analysis on the impact of EHR implementation found a 54% reduction in medication errors (Risk Ratio = 0.46) [20].

- **CPOE with CDSS:** The integration of clinical decision support with CPOE has been shown to be particularly effective. A meta-analysis of this combination found a significant reduction in medication errors (RR = 0.46) and a corresponding reduction in adverse drug reactions (RR = 0.47) [20].

- **Electronic Medication Systems (EMS):** A broader systematic review of EMS (encompassing prescribing, supply, and administration) found a significant reduction in *administration* errors (RR = 0.77). The same review noted that 9 out of 10 studies examining *prescribing* errors reported a reduction [21].

- **Closed-Loop Systems:** Studies on the stepwise implementation of a "closed-loop" medication system (involving Automated Dispensing Cabinets, BCMA, and Smart Dispensing Counters) demonstrate a dramatic and cumulative effect. One before-and-after study found that this multi-stage implementation resulted in a cumulative reduction in dispensing errors of 77.78% [22].

- **Smart Pumps:** In the specific domain of IV administration, smart pumps have demonstrated a powerful preventive capability, with some studies indicating they could prevent 80% of infusion-related errors [23].

This body of evidence, summarized in Table 2, provides a clear, quantitative validation for the adoption of these tools as a primary strategy for reducing *process errors*.

Table 2: Summary of Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review Findings on HIT Impact on Error Rates

HIT Tool(s)	Finding	Metric (95% Confidence Interval)
Electronic Health Records (EHR)	54% reduction in medication errors	*RR*=0.46 (0.38 to 0.55)
CPOE with CDSS	Significant reduction in medication errors	*RR*=0.46 (0.31 to 0.71)
Electronic Medication Systems (EMS)	Significant reduction in administration errors	*RR*=0.77 (0.72 to 0.83)
Electronic Medication Systems (EMS)	9 of 10 studies reported reduction in prescribing errors	Meta-analysis precluded by heterogeneity
Closed-Loop System (ADC/BCMA/SDC)	77.78% cumulative reduction in dispensing errors	N/A (Pre/Post Intervention Study)

The Critical Nuance: Differentiating Error Reduction from Harm Reduction

The data in Table 2 appears to present an unambiguous success story. However, a more critical analysis of the literature reveals a profound and troubling paradox. The central critique of the current state of health informatics is this: **a demonstrated reduction in error *rates* has not consistently translated into a demonstrated reduction in *actual patient harm*.**

The most compelling evidence for this "Error-Harm" paradox comes from the very systematic review that confirmed a reduction in administration errors. That same meta-analysis, when pooling 5 studies that reported on *actual harm*, found **no reduced risk for patient harm** (RR: 1.22, 95% CI: 0.18-8.38) [21]. This finding is a critical counterpoint to the "magical thinking" that equates process compliance with patient safety.

This paradox suggests a *substitution effect*. Informatics tools are highly effective at eliminating high-volume, low-harm *process* errors (e.g., wrong time, documentation gaps, illegibility). However, the implementation of these complex systems can simultaneously *create new, "system-related" error risks*. These new risks, such as errors stemming from a poorly designed user interface, a copy-paste mistake that transfers incorrect patient data, or the override of a critical alert, may be less frequent but carry a much higher potential for significant harm. The net effect on "actual harm" is therefore nullified, as the technology, as implemented, is successfully targeting the *volume* of errors but failing to mitigate (and in some cases, contributing to) the *severity* of harm.

Improved Documentation Accuracy and Decision-Making

Beyond medication safety, informatics tools have a direct impact on nursing documentation and decision-making. The transition from paper to EHRs has demonstrably improved the quality, comprehensiveness, and, most importantly, the readability of nursing documentation [24]. This legible, digital data stream is a prerequisite for effective clinical decision-making, as it allows nurses and other providers to easily review "trends in patient health and treatment over time" [25].

However, this benefit is tempered by a significant and well-documented sociotechnical trade-off: the impact on nurses' time. The evidence on time efficiency is mixed. Some studies, particularly those evaluating bedside terminal use, found that EHRs could *save* nurses documentation time. Conversely, other systematic reviews have found that HIT, including EHRs, *increases* nursing documentation time. More concerningly, qualitative studies report that nurses are spending more time on EHR use and *less time interacting directly with clients*. This creates a tension between the need for high-quality data and the fundamental nursing value of direct patient care, highlighting a core workflow challenge [25].

Early Detection and Prevention of Clinical Deterioration

A more advanced impact of informatics is the shift from reactive safety (catching errors at the point of commission) to proactive safety (predicting and preventing adverse events). This is most evident in the use of CDSS to combat "Failure to Rescue" (FTR). FTR is defined as the inability to prevent a patient's death after the development of a complication, and it is often rooted in a failure of one of the "3Rs": failure to **Recognize** the deterioration, failure to **Relay** the information, and failure to **React** in a timely manner [26].

CDSS tools, specifically in the form of electronic Early Warning Systems (EWS), are designed to directly augment the nurse's ability to "Recognize." By using machine learning (ML) models, these systems can continuously analyze vital signs and laboratory data trends from the EHR to predict clinical deterioration *hours* before it may be apparent to a human observer [27]. This

represents a qualitative shift in informatics. While tools like BCMA and smart pumps are *reactive* safety nets that stop an *active error* (a "wrong action"), an EWS is a *proactive* tool. It detects patterns over time to prevent an *error of omission* (a "wrong inaction," such as failing to recognize deterioration). This directly addresses the systemic problem of "missed care" [28] by providing a cognitive augmentation tool, helping nurses manage high-acuity, high-workload environments.

Enhanced Communication and Data Sharing Between Teams

In theory, a unified EHR should vastly improve communication and collaboration by creating a "single source of truth" and replacing error-prone verbal and telephone orders. The reality, however, is far more complex. Systematic reviews investigating the impact of EHRs on interprofessional practice have found the evidence to be deeply "mixed" [29].

One comprehensive review delivered a striking finding: the implementation of the EHR *alone* had "mostly negative or no effects" on interprofessional practice, particularly on teamwork and collaboration. It was only EHR *enhancements*—tools explicitly designed for communication and care coordination (e.g., secure messaging, shared electronic care plans)—that demonstrated positive effects [29]. This is a powerful reinforcement of the sociotechnical thesis. Simply creating a central data repository (a technical solution) does *not* improve communication (a human/workflow process). In fact, it may degrade it by replacing rich, synchronous, verbal communication with asynchronous, fragmented text. To be effective, informatics tools must be explicitly designed to support the "Workflow and Communication" and "People" dimensions, not just the "Clinical Content" dimension [30].

5. Barriers and Challenges in Implementing Health Informatics in Nursing

The "Error-Harm" paradox and the "mixed" results for communication are not technical failures; they are sociotechnical failures. The gap between the *potential* of health informatics and its *real-world impact* is explained by a set of persistent barriers that arise from a mismatch between technology, people, and process.

1. **Technical Limitations and System Usability Issues**

Despite decades of development, poor system usability remains a primary concern for frontline nurses. Nurses often report ambivalent or mixed assessments of EHRs, citing frustrations with time-consuming interfaces, concerns about data accuracy, and systems that do not "speak" to one another. This leads to the "magical thinking" fallacy: the belief that adopting HIT will *automatically* improve safety. The research shows the opposite: a poorly designed, misaligned system *jeopardizes* safety by forcing nurses to develop adaptations just to complete their work. User satisfaction has been shown to correlate most strongly with a system's ability to

perform tasks in a "straightforward" manner —a standard many current systems fail to meet [31].

2. Training Deficiencies and Resistance to Change

Among the most frequently identified barriers to HIT adoption are "poor/insufficient training" and a lack of "technical/educational support". Often, training is focused on a one-time "go-live" event, with little to no ongoing support, leading to knowledge decay and the adoption of inefficient practices.

This lack of training and support directly contributes to what is often mislabeled as "resistance to change." This "resistance" is not an inherent trait of nurses; it is a predictable and rational *outcome* of sociotechnical failure. As the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) predicts, if a system is clunky and difficult to use (low PEOU) and nurses are not trained adequately (low self-efficacy), their *behavioral intention to use* the system will be low [13]. This "resistance" is a logical response to a tool that is perceived to *increase* cognitive load and documentation time rather than decrease it.

3. Financial Cost and Infrastructure Challenges

The implementation of comprehensive informatics systems is a massive capital undertaking. The high cost of acquisition, implementation, and ongoing maintenance remains a significant barrier, particularly for smaller, rural, or non-profit healthcare organizations [32]. This financial barrier is a key reason that major policy bodies, such as the National Academies, have recommended new federal financial incentives to support HIT adoption, especially in settings like nursing homes that were excluded from initial programs [33].

4. Data Security, Privacy, and Cybersecurity Risks

The digitization of all patient data creates a high-stakes, high-accountability environment for nurses. Nurses are bound by the ethical duty of confidentiality and the legal mandates of regulations like the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) [34]. The threat landscape is twofold: (1) external threats from cybercriminals (e.g., ransomware) and (2) internal threats from insiders or, most commonly, simple human error leading to an accidental data breach [35]. This reality, coupled with aging privacy legislation, creates a "fortress" mentality that, while necessary for security, can perversely inhibit the legitimate and necessary sharing of data between providers for care coordination.

The Paradox of Safety (I): Nursing Workarounds as a Threat to Intended Safeguards

The most significant challenge to emerge from HIT implementation is the phenomenon of the nursing workaround. A workaround is the *bypassing* of a process step or safety feature that is

embedded in the technology's design. Examples are myriad and include documenting medication administration before it is given, "towing" a scanner to scan all a patient's barcodes at the nursing station instead of the bedside, or finding ways to bypass a non-functional BCMA scanner [14].

Workarounds are not a *failure of the nurse*; they are an *adaptation to a failing system*. They are a direct symptom of sociotechnical misalignment. Studies of BCMA implementation note that the technology *created new problems* for nurses—a barcode is torn, a scanner battery dies, a patient is in a location without a scanner—that the system's rigid logic cannot solve [18]. The nurse is then caught in an impossible conflict: follow the rigid, non-negotiable logic of the machine, or meet the immediate, non-negotiable need of the patient. The nurse will, and must, always choose the patient. The workaround is an *intelligent, goal-driven adaptation* to a "brittle" technology [36]. In doing so, however, it completely subverts the "five rights" safety check and re-introduces the very risks the system was designed to prevent.

The Paradox of Safety (II): Alert Fatigue as a Primary Driver of Error

The second critical unintended consequence is alert fatigue. This is a state of desensitization that occurs when clinicians are overwhelmed by a high volume of alerts, alarms, and reminders, many of which are clinically inconsequential. This is the digital "crying wolf" problem: the *vast majority* of alerts generated by CPOE, CDSS, and smart pumps are overridden *because they should be* [37].

The data is alarming. One study of smart pumps found that while 28.7% of all infusions had at least one operational *alarm* (e.g., "occlusion"), only 2.1% had a programming *alert* (e.g., "dose limit") [38]. Furthermore, a small number of infusions generated a disproportionate alert burden, with 17% of infusions generating between 4 and 34 alerts each [39]. When nurses are bombarded with this many non-actionable or low-specificity warnings, they become desensitized and learn to ignore or override *all* alerts, including the small fraction that are warning of a truly critical, life-threatening error [23]. In this way, a poorly designed safety tool, through its sheer "noise," *trains the nurse* to bypass its own safety feature, turning a potential safeguard into an active source of risk.

5. Strategies to Enhance the Effectiveness of Informatics Tools in Reducing Nursing Errors

The barriers identified in Section 5 are not insurmountable. They are, however, sociotechnical problems that demand sociotechnical solutions. Enhancing the effectiveness of informatics requires moving beyond a "go-live" implementation mentality to a strategy of continuous optimization, human-centered design, and organizational leadership. These strategies, summarized in Table 3, directly target the root causes of technology failure.

Table 3: Classification of Sociotechnical Barriers and Evidence-Based Mitigation Strategies

Sociotechnical Barrier	Root Cause (from Section 5)	Evidence-Based Mitigation Strategy
Alert Fatigue	High volume of false/non-actionable alerts; "Crying Wolf" phenomenon.	**Multimodal Alert Governance:** Systematically manage the alert population. Reduce false alarms. Optimize and personalize alarm thresholds. Involve clinical pharmacists to curate high-value medication alerts.
Nurse Workarounds	**Misaligned Design & Workflow:** Rigid technology conflicting with flexible clinical reality.	**Workflow Optimization & User-Centered Design:** Redesign and standardize protocols *before* and *during* implementation. Use "digital nurse champions" and "visible" nurse leaders to analyze workarounds and advocate for system redesign.
Low Technology Acceptance	Poor PEOU (usability); insufficient training and support.	**Leadership & Continuous Education:** Provide *continuous* education, not just "go-live" support. Leadership must "connect the digital and clinical worlds", demonstrate the tool's value (PU), and provide adequate resources.
Data Silos / Poor Communication	Lack of *semantic* interoperability; systems are not designed for collaborative workflow.	**Adopt Interoperability Standards:** Implement technical standards like HL7 FHIR for data *transport*. Embed *semantic* standards (Standardized Nursing Terminologies - SNTs) *within* FHIR to make nursing data *visible* and *computable*.

Continuous Education, Standardized Protocols, and Workflow Optimization

To combat low acceptance and user workarounds, training must be seen as a continuous process, not a singular event [40]. This involves ongoing support to ensure nurses develop and maintain informatics competencies [41]. More importantly, workflow must be redesigned *prior* to implementation. For smart pumps, this includes standardizing drug concentrations and medication limits *before* the pumps are deployed; the technology cannot be safe if the underlying clinical processes are not standardized [19]. This process of workflow optimization requires frontline nurses to be involved in the design and testing phases to ensure the final product aligns with clinical reality.

Integration of Interoperable Systems: The Role of FHIR and SNTs

The "mixed" results for communication reveal that technical data repositories are insufficient. The next frontier for nursing informatics is *semantic* interoperability—ensuring that data is not only *movable* but also *understandable* across different systems. The Health Level 7 (HL7) Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard is the technical solution for this data exchange, providing a modern "truck" for health data [42].

However, for nursing, this "truck" must carry "standardized cargo." This is the role of Standardized Nursing Terminologies (SNTs). SNTs provide the shared, computable language for nursing assessments, interventions, and outcomes. As argued in, without SNTs, nursing's "voice and perspective" are *invisible* in the healthcare data ecosystem [43]. The true synergy lies in embedding SNTs *within* the FHIR standard. This would make nursing's contribution to care explicit, measurable, and analyzable, providing the high-quality "big data" needed to fuel the next generation of AI-driven EWS, CDSS, and nursing-sensitive quality metrics.

Strengthening Data Governance and the Role of Nursing Informatics Leadership

The final and most critical strategy is human. The "People" and "Organization" dimensions of the sociotechnical model are the domain of nursing leadership. This includes the formal role of the Nursing Informatics Specialist (NIS), who leverages technology to improve patient care and support data-driven decisions, and the role of all nurse leaders [2].

The role of leadership is not simply to enforce compliance with new technology. It is to act as a *bi-directional translator*, "connecting the digital and clinical worlds". This requires leaders to be "visible in clinical practice," listen to nurses' concerns about usability and workarounds, and then *advocate* to administration and IT for system redesigns. By "facilitating digital practice development" (e.g., ensuring adequate training and resources) and "empowering nurses" in the digital space, leaders become the primary actors in achieving the sociotechnical balance required for these tools to be truly effective [44].

6. Conclusion

This analysis confirms that health informatics tools are a foundational and indispensable component of modern patient safety strategy. The quantitative evidence is clear and compelling: tools such as EHRs, CPOE with CDSS, BCMA, and smart pumps *do* significantly reduce the *rate* of specific nursing errors, particularly in the complex domain of medication administration. They have demonstrably improved the legibility and accessibility of clinical data and are evolving to proactively identify patient deterioration, moving safety from a reactive to a predictive paradigm.

However, this paper's central thesis is that this success is critically undermined by the "Error-

Harm" paradox: the significant, documented reduction in *process errors* has not yet translated into a clear and consistent reduction in *actual patient harm*. This gap is not a failure of technology, but a profound failure of *implementation*. It is explained by a persistent disregard for the sociotechnical nature of healthcare. The deployment of "brittle," poorly designed systems that conflict with established clinical workflows has led to the widespread emergence of safety-degrading unintended consequences, chief among them *nurse workarounds* and pervasive *alert fatigue*. These adaptations are not a failure of nurses; they are a rational response to a technology that fails to account for the complex, adaptive reality of human-centered care.

The solution is not to abandon these powerful tools but to invest in them more intelligently. The focus of healthcare organizations must shift from *technical implementation* ("go-live") to continuous *sociotechnical optimization*. This means investing in the human and organizational components of the system as much as, or more than, the hardware and software. It requires a commitment to human-centered design, workflow optimization, and continuous quality improvement, such as multimodal alert governance, to manage the "noise" these systems create.

References

Betts HJ, Wright G. 200 years since the birth of nursing informatics? Studies in Health Technology and Informatics [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: https://doi.org/10.3233/shti200485

Nashwan AJ, Cabrega JA, Othman MI, Khedr MA, Osman YM, El-Ashry AM, et al. The evolving role of nursing informatics in the era of artificial intelligence. International Nursing Review [Internet]. 2025 Jan 10;72(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.13084

Staggers N, Thompson CB. The Evolution of Definitions for Nursing Informatics: A Critical Analysis and Revised Definition. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. 2002 May 1;9(3):255–61. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.m0946

Vošner HB, Carter-Templeton H, Završnik J, Kokol P. Nursing Informatics. CIN Computers Informatics Nursing [Internet]. 2020 May 13;38(7):331–7. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/cin.0000000000000624

Park J, Park J. Identifying the knowledge structure and trends of nursing informatics. CIN Computers Informatics Nursing [Internet]. 2022 Jun 15;41(1):8–17. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/cin.0000000000000919

Uchmanowicz I, Lisiak M, Wleklik M, Pawlak AM, Zborowska A, Stańczykiewicz B, et al. The Impact of rationing nursing care on patient Safety: A Systematic review. Medical Science Monitor [Internet]. 2023 Nov 16;29. Available from: https://doi.org/10.12659/msm.942031

Phillips J, Malliaris AP, Bakerjian D. Nursing and Patient Safety [Internet]. PSNet; 2021. Available from: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primer/nursing-and-patient-safety

Coelho F, Furtado L, Mendonça N, Soares H, Duarte H, Costeira C, et al. Predisposing factors to medication errors by nurses and prevention Strategies: A scoping review of recent literature. Nursing Reports [Internet]. 2024 Jun 26;14(3):1553–69. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep14030117

Alanazi FK, Sim J, Lapkin S. Systematic review: Nurses' safety attitudes and their impact on

patient outcomes in acute-care hospitals. Nursing Open [Internet]. 2021 Sep 19;9(1):30–43. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1063

Irizarry T, Barton AJ. A sociotechnical approach to successful electronic health record implementation. Clinical Nurse Specialist [Internet]. 2013 Oct 8;27(6):283–5. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/nur.0b013e3182a872e3

Sittig DF, Singh H. A new sociotechnical model for studying health information technology in complex adaptive healthcare systems. BMJ Quality & Safety [Internet]. 2010 Oct 1;19(Suppl 3):i68–74. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2010.042085

Ibrahim R, Leng NS, Yusoff RCM, Samy GN, Masrom S, Rizman ZI. E-learning acceptance based on technology acceptance model (TAM). Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences [Internet]. 2018 Jan 23;9(4S):871. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v9i4s.50

Rahimi B, Nadri H, Afshar HL, Timpka T. A Systematic review of the technology acceptance model in health Informatics. Applied Clinical Informatics [Internet]. 2018 Jul 1;09(03):604–34. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1668091

Fraczkowski D, Matson J, Lopez KD. Nurse workarounds in the electronic health record: An integrative review. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. 2020 Apr 6;27(7):1149–65. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa050

Albagmi S. The effectiveness of EMR implementation regarding reducing documentation errors and waiting time for patients in outpatient clinics: a systematic review. F1000Research [Internet]. 2021 Oct 11;10:514. Available from: https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.45039.2

Niazkhani Z, Pirnejad H, Berg M, Aarts J. The Impact of computerized provider order entry systems on inpatient clinical workflow: a literature review. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. 2009 Apr 24;16(4):539–49. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.m2419

Kwon H, Lee D. Clinical decision support system for clinical nurses' decision-making on nurse-to-patient assignment: a scoping review protocol. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2024 Jan 1;14(1):e080208. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-080208

Williams R, Aldakhil R, Blandford A, Jani Y. Interdisciplinary systematic review: does alignment between system and design shape adoption and use of barcode medication administration technology? BMJ Open [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1;11(7):e044419. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044419

Davis S, Blanchard C, Lewis J. Implementing smart pumps to enhance patient safety. Hospital Pharmacy [Internet]. 2018 Oct 26;54(4):217–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0018578718809252

Alotaibi YK, Federico F. The impact of health information technology on patient safety. Saudi Medical Journal [Internet]. 2017 Dec 1;38(12):1173–80. Available from: https://doi.org/10.15537/smj.2017.12.20631

Gates PJ, Hardie RA, Raban MZ, Li L, Westbrook JI. How effective are electronic medication systems in reducing medication error rates and associated harm among hospital inpatients? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. 2020 Sep 7;28(1):167–76. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa230

Yu WN, Cheng YD, Hou YC, Hsieh YW. Implementation of Medication-related Technology and Its Impact on Pharmacy Workflow: A Real-World Evidence Study from 2017 to 2023

(Preprint). Journal of Medical Internet Research [Internet]. 2024 Apr 5; Available from: https://doi.org/10.2196/59220

Alamer F, Alanazi AT. The impact of smart pump technology in the healthcare System: A scope review. Cureus [Internet]. 2023 Mar 10; Available from: https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.36007

Torab-Miandoab A, Samad-Soltani T, Jodati A, Akbarzadeh F, Rezaei-Hachesu P. The impact of electronic medical records on clinical documentation: A case study. Journal of Education and Health Promotion [Internet]. 2025 Jun 1;14(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_320_24

Harris R, Machin J, Deo J, Sindhu L, Kambo N, Cremer N. Electronic Health Records: Qualitative Systematic review. Canadian Journal of Nursing Informatics [Internet]. 2023; Available from: https://cjni.net/journal/?p=12221

Tokareva I, Romano P. Failure to Rescue [Internet]. PSNet; 2025. Available from: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primer/failure-rescue

Muralitharan S, Nelson W, Di S, McGillion M, Devereaux P, Barr NG, et al. Machine Learning–Based Early Warning Systems for Clinical Deterioration: Systematic Scoping review. Journal of Medical Internet Research [Internet]. 2020 Dec 20;23(2):e25187. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2196/25187

Schwartz JM, George M, Rossetti SC, Dykes PC, Minshall SR, Lucas E, et al. Factors influencing clinician trust in predictive clinical decision support Systems for In-Hospital Deterioration: Qualitative Descriptive study. JMIR Human Factors [Internet]. 2022 May 12;9(2):e33960. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2196/33960

Robertson ST, Rosbergen ICM, Burton-Jones A, Grimley RS, Brauer SG. The Effect of the Electronic Health Record on interprofessional practice: A Systematic review. Applied Clinical Informatics [Internet]. 2022 May 1;13(03):541–59. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-1748855

Sittig DF, Singh H. A new sociotechnical model for studying health information technology in complex adaptive healthcare systems. BMJ Quality & Safety [Internet]. 2010 Oct 1;19(Suppl 3):i68–74. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2010.042085

Antor E, Owusu-Marfo J, Kissi J. Usability evaluation of electronic health records at the trauma and emergency directorates at the Komfo Anokye teaching hospital in the Ashanti region of Ghana. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making [Internet]. 2024 Aug 21;24(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-024-02636-7

Doebbeling BN, Chou AF, Tierney WM. Priorities and Strategies for the implementation of Integrated Informatics and Communications Technology to improve Evidence-Based Practice. Journal of General Internal Medicine [Internet]. 2006 Feb 1;21(S2):S50–7. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00363.x

Alexander GL, McMullen T. Probing into Federal Policies and National Academies' Recommendations to Adopt Health Information Technology in All U.S. Nursing Homes. Public Policy & Aging Report [Internet]. 2023 Feb 1;33(Supplement_1):S28–34. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ppar/prac026

Summary of the HIPAA Security Rule [Internet]. U.S. Department of Health And Human Services. Available from: https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/security/laws-regulations/index.html

Theodos K, Sittig S. Health Information Privacy Laws in the Digital Age: HIPAA Doesn't Apply. Perspect Health Inf Manag. 2020;18(Winter):1l. Published 2020 Dec 7.

Lichtner V, Dowding D. Mindful workarounds in bar code medication administration. Studies in Health Technology and Informatics [Internet]. 2022 May 25; Available from: https://doi.org/10.3233/shti220575

Alert Fatigue [Internet]. PSNet; 2019. Available from: https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primer/alert-fatigue

Yu D, Obuseh M, DeLaurentis P. Quantifying the impact of infusion alerts and alarms on nursing workflows: A Retrospective analysis. Applied Clinical Informatics [Internet]. 2021 May 1;12(03):528–38. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1730031

Melton KR, Timmons K, Walsh KE, Meinzen-Derr JK, Kirkendall E. Smart pumps improve medication safety but increase alert burden in neonatal care. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making [Internet]. 2019 Nov 7;19(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-019-0945-2

Williams KS, Shah GH, Leider J, Gupta A. Overcoming Barriers to experience benefits: A qualitative analysis of electronic health records and health information exchange implementation in local health departments. eGEMs (Generating Evidence & Methods to Improve Patient Outcomes) [Internet]. 2017 Sep 4;5(1):18. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5334/egems.216

Cachata D, Costa M, Magalhães T, Lucas P, Gaspar F. Information Technology in Nursing Practice: A scoping review of assessment tools for evaluating nurses' competencies. Journal of Healthcare Leadership [Internet]. 2025 May 1;Volume 17:211–23. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2147/jhl.s509955

Vorisek CN, Lehne M, Klopfenstein SAI, Mayer PJ, Bartschke A, Haese T, et al. FaST Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) for Interoperability in Health Research: Systematic review. JMIR Medical Informatics [Internet]. 2022 May 18;10(7):e35724. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2196/35724

Monsen KA, Heermann L, Dunn-Lopez K. FHIR-up! Advancing knowledge from clinical data through application of standardized nursing terminologies within HL7® FHIR®. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. 2023 Jul 10;30(11):1858–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocad131

Burgess JM, Honey M. Nurse Leaders enabling nurses to adopt Digital health: Results of an Integrative literature review. Nursing Praxis in Aotearoa New Zealand [Internet]. 2022 Dec 22;38(3). Available from: https://www.nursingpraxis.org/article/40333-nurse-leaders-enabling-nurses-to-adopt-digital-health-results-of-an-integrative-literature-review.