

The Therapeutic Threat of Injection: A Behavioral Response Pattern in Workers' Compensation and Occupational Medicine

Advance Research in Psychology and Behavioural Sciences (ARPBS)

ISSN: 3069-2059

Volume 3 Issue 4, 2026

Article Information

Received date: April 14, 2026

Published date: April 23, 2026

*Corresponding author

Douglas Wayne Martin, CNOS
Occupational Medicine, SD, USA

DOI: 10.65070/ARPBS.2026.236

Keywords

Workers' compensation; Illness behavior; Secondary gain; Placebo effect; Nocebo effect; Musculoskeletal pain; Occupational medicine

Distributed under:

Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

Douglas W Martin*

CNOS Occupational Medicine, SD, USA

Abstract

Persistent subjective symptom reporting in the absence of concordant objective findings remains a significant challenge in occupational and workers' compensation medicine. This paper introduces and elaborates upon a proposed clinical phenomenon termed the therapeutic threat of injection (TTI), defined as the rapid resolution or marked improvement of symptoms following the recommendation—rather than administration—of an invasive intervention such as an injection. We situate TTI within established frameworks including secondary gain, illness behavior, expectancy theory, and the placebo–nocebo spectrum. We further explore its relevance to disability determination, clinical ethics, and healthcare utilization. Through synthesis of existing literature and clinical reasoning, TTI is proposed as a recognizable behavioral response pattern that may assist clinicians in distinguishing persistent pathology from non-organic symptom maintenance. Recognition of this phenomenon has implications for reducing unnecessary procedures, improving communication strategies, and refining impairment evaluation. Future empirical research is needed to validate its prevalence, mechanisms, and clinical utility.

Introduction

Musculoskeletal complaints in occupational health frequently present with a discordance between subjective symptom severity and objective clinical findings. This discordance is particularly evident in workers' compensation systems, where prolonged disability, financial incentives, and psychosocial variables may influence illness behavior [1-3]. The evaluation of such patients requires careful integration of biomedical, psychological, and contextual factors.

Clinicians have long recognized that symptom reporting is not solely a reflection of tissue pathology but is influenced by cognitive and behavioral processes [4,5]. Within this context, a recurring but under-described observation is that some patients demonstrate rapid improvement in symptoms when escalation to invasive treatments such as corticosteroid injection, is proposed. This improvement often precedes any intervention and may result in abrupt normalization of function.

We propose the term therapeutic threat of injection (TTI) to describe this phenomenon and explore its conceptual basis, clinical implications, and relationship to established literature.

Conceptual Definition

The therapeutic threat of injection is defined as a behavioral response pattern characterized by:

- a) Persistent subjective symptoms reported over time



- b) Minimal or stable objective findings inconsistent with reported severity
- c) Sudden and substantial symptom improvement upon recommendation of an invasive procedure, prior to its execution

TTI is not intended as a diagnostic label but rather as a descriptive clinical construct that may assist in understanding patient behavior within specific contexts, particularly medicolegal environments.

Integration

Secondary Gain and Reinforcement Mechanisms

The concept of secondary gain has long been recognized in disability and compensation systems [6]. Patients may derive external benefits from illness, including wage replacement, reduced occupational demands, or psychosocial validation. These factors may reinforce symptom persistence through operant conditioning mechanisms [7].

The introduction of an invasive intervention may alter this reinforcement structure. When the perceived cost of continued illness (e.g., undergoing a painful injection) exceeds its benefits, symptom reporting may rapidly diminish. This aligns with behavioral economic models in which individuals adjust responses based on shifting incentive structures.

Illness Behavior and the Sick Role

Mechanic's framework of illness behavior emphasizes that symptom expression is shaped by social and cultural expectations [8]. Similarly, Parsons' concept of the "sick role" highlights the negotiated nature of illness legitimacy [9]. In workers' compensation contexts, patients may occupy a prolonged sick role that becomes destabilized when treatment escalation implies recovery expectations or increased personal burden.

TTI may represent a transition point at which the costs of maintaining the sick role outweigh its perceived benefits.

Expectancy, Placebo, and Nocebo Effects

Expectancy theory provides a critical lens for understanding TTI. Placebo effects demonstrate that positive expectations can produce real symptom improvement, mediated by neurobiological pathways involving endogenous opioids and dopaminergic systems [10]. Conversely, nocebo effects arise from negative expectations, leading to increased symptom perception or adverse experiences [11].

TTI may be conceptualized as a hybrid phenomenon: the anticipation of an undesirable intervention (a nocebo-like expectation) leads paradoxically to symptom improvement, potentially through cognitive reappraisal and altered attentional focus. This reflects the broader principle that symptom perception is highly modifiable by expectation and context.

Fear-Avoidance and Cognitive Appraisal

The fear-avoidance model of chronic pain posits that individuals who catastrophize pain may develop persistent disability through avoidance behaviors [12]. In TTI, however, the introduction of an injection may shift cognitive appraisal from avoidance of activity to avoidance of intervention, thereby reducing symptom expression. This suggests a dynamic interplay between competing aversive stimuli.

Non-Organic Signs and Symptom Validity

Non-organic signs, such as those described by Waddell, are commonly used to identify incongruent physical findings in low back pain [13]. While these signs focus on examination findings, TTI represents a temporally defined behavioral response to treatment recommendation. It may therefore complement, rather than replace, existing tools for assessing symptom validity.

Clinical Implications

Diagnostic Clarification

Recognition of TTI may assist clinicians in distinguishing between refractory pathology and behaviorally mediated symptom persistence. In cases where objective findings remain stable and symptoms resolve abruptly upon treatment escalation, the likelihood of ongoing structural pathology may be reduced.

Reduction of Unnecessary Interventions

Overutilization of injections and other invasive procedures is a well-documented concern in musculoskeletal medicine [14]. Identifying TTI may help avoid procedures that carry risks without clear benefit, including infection, bleeding, and procedural complications.

Communication Strategies

The way in which treatment options are presented can significantly influence patient responses. Transparent, balanced discussions of risks and benefits—without coercion—are essential. Clinicians should avoid using invasive procedures as implicit threats, while still accurately conveying the natural progression of care.



Medicolegal and Disability Considerations

In workers' compensation systems, TTI may have implications for determining maximum medical improvement (MMI), impairment ratings, and case closure. Sudden symptom resolution in response to proposed intervention may indicate that functional capacity is greater than previously reported. However, such interpretations must be made cautiously and within the context of comprehensive evaluation.

Ethical Considerations

Labeling symptoms as behaviorally mediated carries ethical risks, including stigmatization and erosion of trust [15]. Clinicians must maintain a nonjudgmental approach, recognizing that symptom perception is influenced by complex and often unconscious processes.

Discussion

The therapeutic threat of injection highlights the importance of integrating behavioral science into clinical practice. It underscores the limitations of a purely biomedical model in explaining symptom persistence and recovery.

From a systems perspective, TTI may reflect the unintended consequences of compensation structures that inadvertently reinforce illness behavior [16]. At the same time, it illustrates the powerful role of expectation and context in shaping clinical outcomes.

Importantly, TTI should not be interpreted as evidence of malingering or intentional deception. Rather, it may represent an adaptive response to changing perceived costs and benefits, mediated by cognitive and emotional processes.

Future research should aim to operationalize TTI and assess its prevalence in occupational health populations. Potential study designs include prospective cohort studies examining symptom trajectories before and after treatment recommendations, as well as qualitative studies exploring patient perceptions of invasive interventions.

Limitations

This concept is currently based on clinical observation and theoretical integration rather than empirical validation. There is a risk of confirmation bias in identifying TTI, and its boundaries with related constructs remain to be clearly defined. Additionally, variability in cultural and healthcare contexts may influence its expression.

Conclusion

The therapeutic threat of injection is a proposed behavioral phenomenon in which the recommendation of an invasive intervention leads to rapid symptom resolution in the absence of treatment. Situated within established frameworks of secondary gain, illness behavior, and expectancy effects, TTI offers a useful lens for understanding discordant symptom presentations in workers' compensation settings. Recognition of this pattern may improve clinical decision-making, reduce unnecessary interventions, and enhance the evaluation of functional impairment. Further research is needed to validate and refine this concept.

References

1. Hadler NM (2005) Occupational musculoskeletal disorders. In: (3rd edn.), Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
2. Gatchel RJ, Polatin PB, Mayer TG (1995) The dominant role of psychosocial risk factors in the development of chronic low back pain disability. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 20(24): 2702-2709.
3. Loisel P, Buchbinder R, Hazard R, Keller R, Scheel I, et al. (2005) Prevention of work disability due to musculoskeletal disorders. *J Occup Rehabil* 15(4): 507-524.
4. Engel GL (1977) The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. *Science* 196(4286): 129-136.
5. Waddell G (2004) *The Back Pain Revolution*. In: (2nd edn.), Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.
6. Fishbain DA, Rosomoff HL, Cutler RB, Rosomoff RS (1995) Secondary gain concept: a review of the scientific evidence. *Clin J Pain* 11(1): 6-21.
7. Fordyce WE (1976) *Behavioral Methods for Chronic Pain and Illness*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
8. Mechanic D (1962) The concept of illness behavior. *J Chronic Dis* 15(2): 189-194.
9. Parsons T (1951) *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
10. Benedetti F (2009) *Placebo Effects: Understanding the Mechanisms in Health and Disease*. In: Oxford University Press.
11. Colloca L, Barsky AJ (2020) Placebo and nocebo effects. *N Engl J Med* 382(6): 554-561.



12. Vlaeyen JW, Linton SJ (2000) Fear-avoidance model of chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Pain* 85(3): 317-332.
13. Waddell G, McCulloch JA, Kummel E, Venner RM (1980) Nonorganic physical signs in low-back pain. *Spine* 5(2): 117-125.
14. Friedly JL, Bresnahan BW, Comstock BA, et al. (2014) Study of epidural steroid injections. *N Engl J Med* 371(1): 11-21.
15. Deyo RA, Dworkin SF, Amtmann D, Andersson G, Borenstein D, et al. (2014) Report of the NIH Task Force on Research Standards for Chronic Low Back Pain. *Pain Med* 15(8): 1249-1267.
16. Atlas SJ, Tosteson TD, Blood EA, Skinner JS, Pransky GS, et al. (2010) The impact of workers' compensation on outcomes of surgical and nonoperative therapy. *Spine* 35(1): 89-97.