



Does the delivery of diagnostic news affect the likelihood of whether or not patients ask questions about the results? A Conversation Analytical study

Journal:	<i>Health Expectations</i>
Manuscript ID	HEX-2017-2631.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Keywords:	Diagnostic news announcement, Patient Question Asking, Conversation Analysis, Oncology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Abstract

Background

Asymmetries in knowledge and competence in the medical encounter often mean that doctor-patient communication can be compromised. This paper **explores this issue and** examines whether the likelihood of patient question asking is increased following the delivery of diagnostic test results. It also examines if that likelihood is related to the way in which the test results are delivered.

Objective

To examine when and how patients initiate questions following diagnostic news announcements.

Methods

We audio recorded oncology consultations (n=47) consisting of both first consultations and follow up consultations with patients with different types of cancer, at a leading UK teaching hospital. From the primary sample, we identified 30 consultations based on a basic count of the frequency of patient questions and their positioning in relation to diagnostic announcements. This subset of 30 consultations consisted of a mix of first and follow up consultations.

Results

Our data demonstrates how the design and delivery of diagnostic news announcements can either discourage or provide the opportunity for a patient initiated question in the next turn of talk. We identified two types of announcement. Q+ generally provided for a patient initiated question as a relevant next turn following the news announcement, whereas Q- did not. Q+ was sometimes followed up with the explanation of test results which appeared to encourage further patient questions.

Conclusion

The design and delivery of diagnostic news announcements can make a patient-initiated question more or less appropriate, in the next turn of talk. In addition, showing and explaining test results can encourage further opportunities for patients' questions.

Keywords Diagnostic news announcements, patient question asking, conversation analysis, oncology

Introduction

Clinician-patient communication is an integral feature of the doctor-patient relationship. The character of that communication can, either indirectly or directly, influence health outcomes.^{1,2} When the communication leads to higher levels of patient involvement, patients assume a greater sense of control over their health and consequently are more likely to comply with treatment recommendations.^{2,3,4} However, patient involvement in the consultation can include different types of communication behaviours, all of which can be shaped by the setting and the activities within that setting.^{3,5}

Asking questions is one of the primary ways in which patients involve themselves in the consultation process.³ This simple verbal act is also linked directly to patients' information needs⁶ as well as improved information provision from clinicians^{3,7} and more recently has been demonstrated as a powerful intervention to shape physician behaviour.⁸ However, the opportunities for a patient to ask a question in the consultation, may not always be maximised. Even when patients have strong preferences for information, (to be provided) this does not always result in patients engaging in information seeking behaviours, like question asking.⁶ In part, this may be due to the specific structure of the medical encounter⁹ where typically doctors lead the sequence of activities (information gathering, history taking, differential diagnosis, treatment proposals etc.) to be accomplished within the consultation. This routinized structure is so embedded in conventional understandings of the doctor-patient relationship that typically patients intuitively comply with it.¹⁰ often surrendering the expression of communication behaviours like question asking. Frankel⁹ provides some telling

1
2
3 evidence on this issue. Using findings from early conversation analytical studies of doctor-
4 patient encounters, he argued that the turn taking system found in the medical interview
5 exhibits a much more restrictive interactive form when compared to ordinary interaction.
6
7 This form is shaped by the doctor's objectives and interests which typically imposes
8 constraints that deter, rather than encourage, patient involvement. The result is that 'routine
9 restrictions [are] placed upon speakers and the types of turn organisational formats they
10 conventionally employ'. Consequently, Frankel argues, patient initiated direct questions
11 rarely appear in the medical encounter. When they do appear, he suggests, they do so with
12 some form of subtle modification,
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Dr: Very good. (0.4) very good=lemme see yer ankle.

25
26 (2.2)

27
28 Dr: Pt. hhh VERY GOOD

29
30 Pt: I wanna ask yih som'n

31
32 Dr: What's that. (Frankel 1990: 241)

33
34
35
36
37 The sequence above demonstrates one of the devices patients employ, a sequentially
38 modified question, designed to manoeuvre the interactional restrictions of the medical
39 encounter. This operates, Frankel argues, (in contrast to ordinary interaction) to reduce the
40 force of asking a direct question by delaying the placement of that question in its initial
41 position by, in this case, using a prefatory utterance (I wanna ask yih som'n). Such utterances
42 are utilised by patients to seek permission to initiate the act of asking a question. They reflect
43 the 'deference structure' characteristic of the medical encounter. **They are also an indication**
44 **of the patient's uncertainty about asking a question, its placement in the ongoing**
45 **sequence of activities as well as how the doctor will respond.**
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Of course, since the twenty seven years following Frankel's work, this restrictive interactive
6
7 form has come under increasing scrutiny as the patient-centred approach, which is designed
8
9 to foreground the patient's knowledge and experience as part of the interaction to effect
10
11 active patient involvement, steadily gained more momentum. Despite this however, evidence
12
13 can still be provided of patients' dis-preference to ask questions in the consultation and this is
14
15 not only limited to primary care encounters. More recently, evidence of the constraining
16
17 effect of the structure of the medical encounter has been found in Oncology consultations. In
18
19 these settings patients' information needs are both varied and substantial¹¹, yet patients rarely
20
21 ask questions unless explicitly invited to do so.¹¹ Ford et al¹² have shown that oncologists'
22
23 lack of explicit invitations to explore the patient's psychosocial state, resulted in minimal
24
25 opportunity for patients to express information needs and initiate discussion. McJannett et
26
27 al¹³ report on recently diagnosed cancer patients feeling uncomfortable asking the surgeon
28
29 questions about their diagnosis and its implications, because they felt uncertainty as to when
30
31 ask questions during the consultation.
32
33
34
35
36

37 To help encourage patients to ask questions, Question Prompt Lists (QPL's) have been used
38
39 extensively in Oncology. QPL's are a list of questions that the patient can ask the doctor
40
41 during the consultation to target their information needs and encourage more dialogical
42
43 exchange between doctor and patient. A number of research studies have been conducted on
44
45 the use of QPLs in oncology consultations, which indicate some success regarding patient
46
47 question asking.^{14,15} In particular QPLs have been shown to have a positive influence
48
49 encouraging question asking about diagnosis and prognosis.^{16,17}
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **There are, however,** two fundamental issues that require further examination. Firstly, the
4 definitive impact of QPLs on improving patient question asking has yet to be established.¹⁸
5 Findings from studies of QPL's tell us if the activity (patient question asking) itself occurs
6 thus providing a measure of whether patient question asking was helped or hindered by the
7 QPL. However, they generally do not provide us with detailed insight into which specific
8 communication practices actually generate **or create** more interactional space for patient
9 initiated questions. Without insight into the situationally specific and sequentially distinctive
10 elements, which may have influenced the occurrence of patient questions in the first place,
11 we are not in a good position to capitalize on the efficacy of the QPL. Even in cases where
12 QPL's have been shown to increase patient question asking in relation to diagnosis¹⁷ we have
13 very little information on the precise nature of the doctor's communication behavior (or any
14 other communication factors) which may also have encouraged patient questions.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The second point is related to the first. Taking diagnosis as a case in point, evidence indicates
32 that patients rarely provide any substantive response following a diagnostic announcement
33 from the doctor.^{10, 19} This may in part be because patients typically orient to diagnosis as the
34 domain of clinical expertise.¹⁰ In relation to this, there is substantial evidence to suggest that
35 news announcement and patient response, are related and that the design of diagnostic news
36 announcement can effect and shape patient response.^{19, 20, 21, 22}
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 This paper aims to extend this work by reporting on findings from a study of the relation
47 between the announcement of diagnostic news and patient question asking in oncology
48 consultations. It utilizes Conversation Analysis (CA) to characterise the different ways in
49 which diagnostic news was announced to highlight the sequential implications of different
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 types of announcement on producing (or not producing) a patient question in the next turn of
4
5 talk.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Methods**

12 13 14 15 16 **Participants, Setting and Procedure**

17
18
19
20
21 The findings reported in this study are from the communication component of a larger study
22 designed to investigate patient involvement in Oncology consultations. Ethical approval for
23 that larger study was obtained from Nottingham Research Ethics Committee 2 (reference
24 number 09/H0408/34). Within that study 16 doctors were recruited (7 out of 9 potential
25 consultants and 9 out of 12 SPR's) of whom 6 were male and 10 were female. Patients who
26 were new referrals to the department and those in follow up and undergoing active
27 surveillance were recruited to explore their experiences of the consultation process. Patients
28 had to know their cancer diagnosis, be over 18 years of age, and be willing to participate in
29 the study. Our exclusion criteria included any patient unable to consent for themselves,
30 patients with a cognitive impairment or patients who did not speak fluent English. Patients
31 were sent a patient information sheet prior to their consultation, in the post inviting them to
32 participate in the study and those expressing an interest were seen by a member of the
33 research team who provided further clarification if needed. Written informed consent was
34 obtained from those doctors and patients willing to participate in the study.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 182 patients were approached; 77 agreed to participate, 105 declined. 7 of the 77 withdrew
55 consent and 3 cases were incomplete. Of the remaining 67, participants, 47 had their
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consultations audio recorded. In each consultation the audio recorder was placed on the desk
4
5 and was switched on by either the researcher or the doctor conducting the consultation prior
6
7 to commencing the consultation with the patient. From the primary sample of 47, we
8
9 identified 30 consultations based on a basic count of the frequency of patient questions and
10
11 their positioning in relation to diagnostic announcements of test results. This sub-collection
12
13 of 30 consultations were a mix of first and follow up consultations.
14
15

16 17 18 Analysis

19
20
21
22
23 All 30 consultations were analysed and transcribed (using transcription conventions from
24
25 CA) by GM. As a sociological method, CA's focus on the sequential organization of talk
26
27 enables the identification of distinctive sequential structures in different forms of interaction.
28
29 This method has been used widely in studies of doctor-patient interaction in both primary and
30
31 secondary care settings including oncology.^{23, 24, 25, 26} Each consultation was reviewed
32
33 individually by GM, LF and AT and notes were made. GM then compared observations to try
34
35 to establish patterns of communication around patient question asking. This led to the
36
37 identification of sub-collections of patient question asking occurring more frequently in
38
39 follow up consultations following the announcement of diagnostic news. However, in other
40
41 follow up consultations patient questions did not arise following the diagnostic
42
43 announcement. Closer examination of these sequences was made to examine the potential
44
45 relation between announcement and the occurrence of a patient initiated question in the next
46
47 turn. Any disagreement regarding the interpretation of the data was resolved through
48
49 continued discussion by all three authors. Extracts from eight of the follow up consultations
50
51 are discussed below as they represent a further sub-collection of the strongest examples of the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relation between diagnostic announcement and patient question asking. All drafts and
4
5 revision of the analysis was made by GM.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Results**

14
15
16
17
18 How diagnostic news was delivered is particularly important, as it seemed to create or close
19
20 down opportunities for patient questions. We counted patient initiated questions immediately
21
22 following the diagnostic announcement, as they could be directly attributable to the type of
23
24 diagnostic announcement. We identified two **ways in which diagnostic news was delivered,**
25
26 Q- and Q+ (see below).
27
28
29
30

31 **Typical features of the Q- delivery**

- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- **A ‘no problem’ general assessment/formulation (normal/fine etc).**
 - **No problem formulation provides the upshot of findings potentially closing down further discussion of topic.**
 - **Patient alignment (minimal response) with the ‘termination of topic’ implicativeness of the formulation/general assessment.**
 - **Minimal time allotted between patient response and doctor’s next utterance.**

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
- **Next utterance (the doctor's) consisting of a) further general assessment or b) topic change.**

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

We did not count patient initiated questions following the transition to another topic as these could not be directly connected to the type of diagnostic announcement. This type of diagnostic announcement occurred in 18 consultations of the sub collection of 30. In each instance, no patient questions followed the diagnostic announcement.

26 27 28 29 30 31 32

Typical features of the Q+ delivery

- 33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- **Announcement of the news almost immediately followed by a more detailed reporting or description of the news.**
 - **A short pause following the delivery.**
 - **Patient's response (typically a question).**
 - **Further elaboration sometimes with visual representation of results (scan/x-ray).**
 - **Patients sometimes proposing their own interpretation of diagnostic news sometimes leading to subsequent patient questions.**

1
2
3
4
5 As with Q- we did not count patient initiated questions following the transition to another
6
7 topic as these could not be directly connected to the type of diagnostic announcement.

8
9 However, in some instances of the Q+ cases the invocation of the scan or x-ray results
10
11 provides space for further patient questions. This type of diagnostic announcement occurred
12
13 in 12 consultations of the sub collection of 30.
14
15

16 17 18 The Frequency and Location of Patient Questions

19
20
21
22 The sub-collection of 30 consultations in total came to 451.30 min, just over 7.5 hours of
23
24 consultation time with the average length of the consultation at 15.04 min. In 7 of the 30
25
26 consultations (just under 60 min of consultation time) patients did not ask any questions. In
27
28 the remaining 23 consultations, there were 76 instances of patients asking questions (average
29
30 2.5 direct patient questions per consultation). However, patients' questions arose in different
31
32 ways. For example, in 5 of those 23 consultations (22%) patients' questions came at the end
33
34 (within 3–4 min of the end of the consultation) again following a prompt from the doctor. In
35
36 6 of the 23 consultations, (26%) there is evidence of indirect or embedded questions arising at
37
38 different junctures of the consultation following a prompt from the doctor. In 12 of the 23
39
40 consultations (follow up consultations) (52%), patient-initiated direct questions occur
41
42 following a diagnostic announcement. In 7 of these 12 consultations (58%), patient-initiated
43
44 assertive questions occur following a careful explanation of test results and diagnostic
45
46 evidence. In only two consultations did the patient decline to ask a question following an
47
48 invitation to do so from the doctor.
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Extracts
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Extracts **1-4 contain characteristics of the Q- format** 1 and 2 represent typical instances of
6
7 the Q- format. In extract 1 there are no patient questions following the announcement of
8
9 diagnostic results. At line 1, the doctor announces the scan result providing a general
10
11 evaluation ('fine') which is followed at line 2 by the patient's response 'good'. The doctor
12
13 provides another general assessment of the condition of the patient's bones at line 3. The
14
15 patient aligns with this assessment at line 4. At line 5 the doctor changes topic to ask about
16
17 the pain the patient has been experiencing.
18
19
20
21

22 **At one level** extract 1 **could be viewed as** the patient deferring to clinical expertise with
23
24 regard to the receipt of test results^{10, 19}. **Within this sequence, there is minimal space for**
25
26 **the patient to respond with** no pause between the exchanges until line 6. **There is** some
27
28 indication that the patient is orienting to **upcoming news, as** the utterances at lines 2, 4 and 6
29
30 are continuers giving the doctor the 'go ahead signal'. Nevertheless, the form of news
31
32 announcement **and the minimal space between the patient's response and the next**
33
34 **doctor's utterance appears to** provide a **more restricted** sequential environment shaping
35
36 **minimal** patient responses.
37
38
39
40
41

42 **It is notable that the** news announcement **in extract 1 also** a 'no problem diagnosis'²² one in
43
44 so far as the announcement projects the clinical cogency of the general assessment as to what
45
46 the results mean. The absence of any specific detail in the doctor's delivery of results
47
48 presupposes a level of information the patient requires. This projects a paternalistic mode
49
50 where the patient is expected to rely on the authority of the medical interpretation.²¹
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **In addition, the form of the announcement emits a potentially limiting effect on the**
4 **patient's response. It shares a characteristic of a formulation,²⁷ a gloss for the practical**
5 **management of the description of the findings. In this, and in other cases, the**
6 **formulation 'provides a constraint on the production of some next utterance'²⁷ where in**
7 **typically the patient's response is a confirmation of the general evaluation of findings.**
8 **In effect, these general formulations of the findings perform 'double duty'²⁷ by**
9 **providing the upshot of the news, whilst also acting to 'close a topic down as a**
10 **mentionable.'**²⁷ Consequently, there is a marked degree of separation between doctor and
11 patient in relation to the entitlement to know, **potentially resulting in** a negative impact on
12 patient question asking.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In extract 2, the doctor begins by asking if the patient has any concerns. The patient's reply
27 ('No everything's fine' - line 3) may be a consequence of two things. Firstly, the lexical
28 choice of 'any' when asking about concerns has been shown to minimise the expression of
29 patient concerns.²⁸ Secondly, the sequential position of this question, close to the start of the
30 consultation, is quite telling **for two reasons**. At the start, the patient may be keen to progress
31 the consultation in anticipation of diagnostic news foregoing any discussion of concerns at
32 this point. **Conversely, for the doctor, the placing of the question ('er any concerns at**
33 **all') at the start of the consultation where there is no information at hand, has the**
34 **potential to mitigate the risk of subsequent patient questions following the 'no problem'**
35 **diagnosis. That is to say, once the patient reports they have no concerns they then may**
36 **then find it difficult to raise a question later on when information (albeit in general**
37 **form) is revealed.**
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The actual announcement of test results is given at line 4 and, similar to pattern to extract 1,
4 is accompanied with a general assessment/evaluation, ('absolutely fine'). Again the news
5 characteristic of a 'no problem diagnosis'²² where the announcement projects the force of the
6 general assessment concerning the meaning of the results. The patient accepts this ('oh good'
7 – overlapping talk) as the doctor continues with the delivery of results. Following this, the
8 doctor makes a transition to another topic asking about the patient's energy levels.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 In both extracts the patients can be seen as complicit in allowing the doctor to take the lead
16 and shape the direction of the consultation. However, how the results are delivered is not
17 incidental. The character of the news delivery in each case shapes the consultation so that
18 minimal interactional space is provided for patient question asking. This is even more
19 apparent in extract 3.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In extract 3 at lines 1-2 the CT scan result is announced with the evaluation 'basically
30 normal'. There is a suggestion of elaboration with the announcement of 'no new glands'
31 and 'some changes on your lungs'. However, no further details are provided by the
32 doctor, either on the status of the glands or the changes in the lungs, evidently a 'no problem'
33 diagnosis.²² The delivery of the results is terminated with 'so that's your CT scan'. The
34 doctor then makes a transition to another topic asking about the lung function tests.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Later in the consultation (at lines 38-44), the patient is told that the kidney and liver function
45 results are 'normal' and calcium and other markers are 'normal'. The doctor then (line 43)
46 asks about the patient's thyroid. Following a one second pause the patient responds and in so
47 doing demonstrates her understanding of the cause of the problem (pituitary gland is 'raging
48 high') and the need to adjust the medication to return the pituitary gland to normal. In this
49 response, the patient structures her involvement by attempting a move toward demonstrating
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 independent expertise²¹ by showing the doctor her understanding of the causes and treatment
4
5 of the thyroid problem. The patient's account demonstrates understanding by linking the
6
7 symptoms to the reported facts with (see the use of 'because'), characteristic of an overt
8
9 explanation.²⁹
10

11
12
13 However, this demonstration of experiential knowledge is soon closed down by the doctor at
14
15 line 55 with the clinical interpretation of the patient's condition, that there is nothing
16
17 alarming going on. **Indeed, throughout the patient's account, (lines 45-54), the doctor**
18
19 **provides minimal responses which could be read as 'go ahead signals' allowing the**
20
21 **patient to hold the floor. However, when the patient finishes (line 54), the doctor**
22
23 **immediately comes in to gloss the account and close down any continued discussion of**
24
25 **the patient's concerns regarding their current medication, ('I'm not uncovering I've**
26
27 **had a good look through your notes I'm not uncovering anything that has (.)**
28
29 **hit me as being alarming'). Notably, it was the doctor who opened up the topic, (line**
30
31 **42), which led to the patient's account, but the opportunities for the patient's speakership**
32
33 **rights appear heavily constrained. At line 60, there is a prompt from the doctor for the patient**
34
35 **to ask a question. Notably, this is declined as the patient expresses their discontent with**
36
37 **('going back and forth to the doctors and gettin no results').**
38
39
40
41
42

43 The 'Deviant Case'

44
45
46
47
48 Extract 4 presents a possible deviant case. At lines 1-2, the doctor announces the results of
49
50 the echocardiogram. Unusually, following this general assessment ('fine') the patient asks if
51
52 the results are okay (line 3). There is overlap here (lines 3-4) and consequently this question
53
54 is overridden as the doctor and patient try to establish when the test was done. Following this,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the doctor provides an evaluation of the results again ‘that’s all fine, no problems’.
4
5 Following the examination (line 10), the doctor provides a prompt creating interactional
6
7 space by inviting the patient to ask a question. This is the only extract where the patient is
8
9 invited to ask a question with the invitation occurring in **relatively** close proximity to the
10
11 delivery of test results and following physical examination. However, even when given a
12
13 clear opportunity to ask a question, the patient **orients to** the ‘deference structure’ by
14
15 producing a sequentially modified question.⁹ (‘I did want to ask about my heart
16
17 function’). The patient then targets back on the original evaluation of the results of the
18
19 echocardiogram function, producing two further questions on possible deterioration and
20
21 achiness and tiredness. In this case, although the ‘no problem’ diagnosis is delivered at the
22
23 start, the sequential positioning of the invitation for the patient to ask a question (in close
24
25 proximity to the announcement and the physical examination) provides a possible different
26
27 approach to encouraging patient questions.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Extracts 5-8 show characteristics of the Q+ format.** In extract 5 the sequence begins
34
35 almost like the Q- delivery with the general evaluation, ‘things are very much the
36
37 same’. However, the doctor follows this by describing the evidence ‘slightly bigger but
38
39 literally by 4mm both in the chest and bowel’. This reporting of the findings is
40
41 immediately followed (at line 4) with the patient, unusually, requesting to see the scan. In so
42
43 doing the patient makes a very definite move toward gaining independent expertise by
44
45 ‘actively pursuing information in accord with his own interests’.²¹ The doctor responds by
46
47 showing the scan which is then followed by a further six questions from the patient regarding
48
49 the tumour, its size and the location of the lymph gland. Each question follows on from a
50
51 piece of information delivered by the doctor regarding what the scan is showing. The critical
52
53 factor in this extract appears to be the description or reporting of the evidence when the news
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is announced at the beginning. This contrasts with extracts 1-4 where **the doctor's** clinical
4
5 assessment/**evaluation** (albeit general) of the findings is provided from the outset. The
6
7 announcement alongside the reporting of particular information appears to encourage
8
9 information seeking behaviour from the patient, which in this case was evident with the
10
11 patient's request to see the scan.
12
13

14
15 A similar thing occurs in extract 6. Here the delivery of diagnostic news opens with the
16
17 reporting of the findings 'so they've reported it as stable disease basically'. The
18
19 utterance 'stable' implies some assessment but in fact this is a feature of the report rather
20
21 than the doctor independently providing an assessment of the findings to the patient. The
22
23 doctor then goes on to report the fact that there 'are some lymph nodes' in the patient's
24
25 pelvis but 'nothing different from that'. This provides a space in the next turn for the
26
27 patient's question 'just where' exactly' (line 4) again demonstrating an interest in
28
29 gaining independent expertise.²¹ The doctor then asks the patient if they would like to look at
30
31 their scan. The patient's next question ('will I be able to tell from that?') at line 6
32
33 orients to the asymmetrical nature of the encounter (discussed above) and is responded to by
34
35 the doctor ('we can look at it together') inviting the patient to examine the scan
36
37 jointly. Again, the initial reporting of the findings, rather than the provision of a general
38
39 assessment of the findings, appears to be a factor in shaping the patient's response in the next
40
41 turn. Subsequently, a further three questions follow on from looking at the scan together
42
43 culminating in the patient proffering their own assessment at line 26 based on the information
44
45 they have received from the doctor.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Extract 7 shows that the doctor announces the results ('The scan is very much the
4 same') at line 1 but then follows this with an assessment, but with elaboration to explain the
5 result and provide particular detail. The doctor continues by informing the patient that there is
6 still fibrosis but that 'is to be expected'. At line 5, the patient responds by asking where
7 the fibrosis is. Because the audio data does not afford visual access, it is not clear from the
8 recording if the doctor shows the scan to the patient or not when explaining where the fibrosis
9 is (lines 5-8). The patient then asks if the fibrosis was present before (line 9). **The doctor**
10 **confirms that it was there before and explains what fibrosis (lines 12-15, 17-20) and**
11 **places this in the context of the patient's breast cancer history** is. After giving their
12 assessment of this (lines 25-26) the doctor refers specifically to the report (lines 26-
13 27 'They've said there's an increase in the volume of that fibrosis').
14 **Following this** the patient formulates²⁷ the news ('that's scar tissue is that what
15 you're saying'.) and **by doing so makes a** move toward gaining independent expertise²¹, **a**
16 **move also evident in extracts 5 and 6.**

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Finally, **extract 8 presents an interesting case as it consists of one patient question,**
37 **however it evidences features of both Q- and Q+ approaches, beginning first with Q-**
38 **and then leading into Q+. Consequently, an evident contrast between the two is made**
39 **immediately apparent. The Q- is delivery occurs at line 9** (Scan's (.) absolutely
40 great), producing an **immediate** minimal response from the patient (line 10). At line 11,
41 however, the doctor makes a transition to **Q+ by** reporting the **actual scan** results ('Er. .m
42 (2.0) it says') which is completed at line 19 **where the doctor repeats the initial**
43 **general assessment having just reported and explained the actual findings.** It is
44 immediately followed at line 19 with a question (So everything's just holdin
45 steady?), which as in extract 7, is also an attempt to formulate upshot of the news.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

The findings from this study potentially provide some direction in addressing the uncertainty patients may experience in relation to when to ask a question in Oncology consultations¹³ **and potentially other consultation encounters.** We have identified two ways in which diagnostic results are delivered, Q- and Q+. Each type of delivery appears to have different sequential implications for patient questing asking. The Q- delivery seems to produce a minimal response from the patient, whereas Q+ results in patient questions and generally more patient involvement subsequent to the announcement of the news. With the Q+ announcement, patients sometimes proposing their own assessment of the diagnostic news in a move to gain independent expertise²¹ and fuller understanding.

The difference between the two types is quite subtle but significant. In Q-, the announcement is encapsulated with a clinical (albeit general) assessment ('your scan is fine'). Typically, this results in a minimal patient response which may in part be due to the fact that implicit in Q- is the doctor's judgement about what constitutes sufficient information for the patient. Moreover, **formulating the upshot of the news in this way can potentially 'close a topic down as a mentionable.'**²⁷ In contrast, in Q+ the announcement consists of a description or reporting of the results sometimes without an explicit assessment. ('so they've reported it as stable'). This description or reading of the results without an evaluation 'cast [s] patients as likely or possibly or capable of interpreting the reading.'²¹ This appears to be responded to by patients as a relevant position in the consultation for information seeking which in the cases discussed results in patient question asking.

1
2
3
4
5 These differences in announcing the news of results hold implications for the use of question
6
7 prompt lists, which have been widely used and researched within Oncology. The issue
8
9 concerns the fact that the prompt itself may not be capitalised if patients do not feel an
10
11 appropriate interactional space has been created to ask a question. The QPL, may provide the
12
13 patient with an agreed platform for question asking but this does not always guarantee that
14
15 the patient will ask questions. These findings indicate that with some basic training (reporting
16
17 the findings with no independent assessment, showing the scan, explaining the findings),
18
19 doctors may be able to secure patient involvement by providing an interactional space for
20
21 patients to act on by asking questions in a way that is naturally occurring.
22
23
24
25

26 **Study Limitations**

27
28
29
30
31 The study is limited by its sole reliance on audio recordings of consultations. Consequently,
32
33 other aspects of social interaction, for example, eye contact, bodily comportment, etc. which
34
35 can also have a significant influence on the things like the provision of interactional space,
36
37 have not been included. Moreover, there may be various reasons why patients were
38
39 disinclined to ask questions following the Q- delivery. The character of patients' responses
40
41 may not actually be conditioned solely by the type of announcement of test results but may
42
43 have more to do with patient preferences or information needs at these particular moments.
44
45 Their responses could also be shaped by **differences in the social or cultural background**
46
47 **of the patients**, heir experience of the kind of cancer they have, their symptoms as well as
48
49 any knowledge of prognostic outcome they may have acquired. Finally, the sample size is a
50
51 relatively small one and a larger sample would perhaps give more in the way of
52
53 generalisability of results.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

How, when and under what circumstances patients are inclined/disinclined to ask questions, is a complex issue. In our data, even in consultations where patients were asking questions, they tended to allow the doctor to take the lead **with only one example of a patient asking a direct question without any pause or prefatory utterance following the doctor's utterance** (extract 7 line 4). **Q- approaches minimised the opportunities for patients to ask questions. Q+ approaches provided more scope for patient engagement, which on several occasions resulted in patients formulating the upshot of diagnostic news.**

Nevertheless, how patients respond to the delivery of news, may be shaped by other 'presuppositional grounds.'⁹ Therefore, it may be premature at this stage to suggest a direct relation between delivery and response. It would, therefore, seem sensible to test the claims made in this paper to see if they stand up to further investigation.

Informed consent and patient details

I confirm all patient/personal identifiers have been removed or disguised so the patient/person(s) described are not identifiable and cannot be identified through the details of the story.

Conflicts of interest: None

Appendix 1

Transcription symbols

- ◦ Talk marked by the degree sound indicates words that are softly spoken
- (.) A full stop in brackets indicates a micro pause
- (1.0), (0.5) Indicates silence in seconds and tenths of seconds
- [Okay
- [Yes Talk which is preceded by a square bracket indicates overlap in speech between two different speakers
- = Talk marked with the equals sign at the end of one line and the beginning of another indicates no pause between the end of one utterance and the start of another
- :: Indicates prolonged sound
- Indicates notable utterance
- . Indicates a falling, or final intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

? Indicates rising intonation not a question although in some instances the two occur together

, Indicates continuing intonation.

For Peer Review

References

1. Street RL Jr, How clinician–patient communication contributes to health improvement: Modelling pathways from talk to outcome. *Patient Education and Counselling* 2013; 92: 286-291.
2. Griffin SJ, Kinmonth AL, Veltman MW, Gillard S, Grant J, Stewart M. Effect on health-related outcomes of interventions to alter the interaction between patients and practitioners: a systematic review of trials. *Ann Fam Med* 2004; 2: 595–608.
3. Street RL Jr, Gordon HS, Ward MM, Krupat E, Kravitz RL. Patient participation in medical consultations: why some patients are more involved than others. *Medical Care* 2005; 43: 960–969.
4. Rao J, Anderson LA, Inui TS, Frankel RM. Communication interventions make a difference in conversations between physicians and patients. *Medical Care* 2007; 45: 340-348.
5. Kinnersley P, Edwards A, Hood K, Ryan R, Prout H, Cadbury N. et al. Interventions before consultations to help patients address their information needs by encouraging question asking: a systematic review. *BMJ* 2008; 337: a485.
6. Beisecker AE and Beisecker TD. Patient information seeking behaviours when communicating with doctors. *Medical Care* 1990; 28: 19-28.
7. Cegala D, Street RL, and Clinch RC. The impact of patient participation on physicians' information provision during a primary care medical interview. *Health Communication* Vol. 21, 2007; 2: 177-185.
8. Shepherd HL, Barratt A, Trvena LJ, McGeechan K, Carey K et al. Three questions that patients can ask to improve the quality of information physicians give about

- 1
2
3 treatment options: A cross over trial. *Patient Education and Counselling* 2011; 84:
4
5 379-385.
6
- 7 9. Frankel RM. Talking in interviews: A dispreference for patient initiated questions in
8
9 physician-patient encounters. In Psathas G. editor. *Interaction Competence: Studies in*
10
11 *ethnomethodology and conversational analysis*. Lanham, MD: University Press of
12
13 America 1990. p. 231-262.
14
- 15
16 10. Heath C. The delivery and reception of diagnosis in the general-practice consultation.
17
18 In Drew P, Heritage J. editors *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*.
19
20 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1991: 235-267.
21
- 22 11. Jenkins V, Fallowfield L and Saul J. Information needs of patients with cancer: results
23
24 from a large study in UK cancer centres. *British Journal of Cancer* 2001; 84: (1) 48-
25
26 51.
27
- 28
29 12. Ford S, Fallowfield L, and Lewis S. Doctor-patient interactions in oncology. *Social*
30
31 *Science and Medicine* 1996; 42: 1511-1519.
32
- 33 13. McJannett M, Butow P, Tattersall MHN and Thompson JF. Asking questions can
34
35 help: development of a question prompt list for cancer patients seeing a surgeon.
36
37 *European Journal of Cancer Prevention* 2003; 12: 397-405.
38
- 39
40 14. Butow PN, Devine R, Boyer M, Pendlebury S, Jackson M, Tattersall MHN. A cancer
41
42 consultation package: changing patients but not physicians is not enough. *J Clin*
43
44 *Oncol* 2004; 22: 4401-4409.
45
- 46 15. Clayton JM, Butow PN, Devine R, et al. Asking questions can help: a randomized
47
48 controlled trial of a patient/caregiver question prompt list for palliative care
49
50 consultations. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007; 25: 715-723.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 16. Brown R, Butow P, Dunn S, Tattersall M. Promoting patient participation and
4
5 shortening cancer consultations: a randomised trial. *Br J Cancer* 2001; 85: 1273–
6
7 1282.
- 8
9 17. Dimoska A, Tattersall MHN, Butow PN, Shepherd H, Kinnersley P. Can a “Prompt
10
11 List” empower cancer patients to ask relevant questions? *Cancer* 2008; 113: 225–37.
- 12
13 18. Parker PA, Joyce Davison B, Tishelman C, Brundage M. et al. What do we know
14
15 about facilitating communication in the cancer care setting? *Psycho-Oncology* 2005;
16
17 14: 848-858.
- 18
19 19. Perakyla A. (2006). Communicating and responding to diagnosis. In J. Heritage & D.
20
21 Maynard (Eds.) *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between primary care*
22
23 *physicians and patients.* (pp.214-247) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 24
25 20. Maynard D. (1992). On clinicians’ co-implicating recipients’ perspective in the
26
27 delivery of diagnostic news. In P. Drew & J. Heritage. (Ed.) *Talk at Work: Interaction*
28
29 *in institutional settings.* (pp. 331-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 30
31 21. Pomerantz, A, and Rintel E.S. Practices for reporting and responding to test results
32
33 during medical consultations: enacting the roles of paternalism and independent
34
35 expertise. *Discourse Studies*, 2004; 6 (1): 9-26.
- 36
37 22. Heritage J, Elliott MN, Stivers T, Richardson A and Mangione-Smith R. Reducing
38
39 inappropriate antibiotics prescribing: The role of online commentary on physical
40
41 examination findings. *Patient Education and Counselling* 2001; 81: 119-125.
- 42
43 23. Beach WA, Easter DW, Good JS, Pigeronc E. Disclosing and responding to cancer
44
45 “fears” during oncology interviews. *Social Science and Medicine* 2005; 60: 893-910.
- 46
47 24. Gill VT, Maynard D. Explaining illness: Patients’ proposals and physicians’
48
49 responses. In Heritage J, Maynard D. editors *Communication in Medical Care:*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Interaction between primary care physicians and patients. Cambridge: Cambridge
4
5 University Press 2006: 115-150.
6
- 7 25. Perakyla, A. 'Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts. In
8
9 Silverman, D., (ed.) Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice. 1997: 201-
10
11 220 London: Sage.
12
- 13 26. Robinson, J. (2003). An interactional structure of medical activities during acute visits
14
15 and its implications for patients' participation. *Health Communication*, 15, (1), 27-59.
16
17
- 18 27. Heritage J and Watson D.R. Formulations as Conversational Objects. *Semiotica* 3,
19
20 (4): 245-262.
21
- 22 28. Heritage J, Robinson JD, Elliott MN, Beckett M and Wilkes M. Reducing Patients'
23
24 Unmet Concerns in Primary Care: the Difference One Word Can Make. *Journal of*
25
26 *General Internal Medicine* 2007; 22 (10): 429-433.
27
- 28 29. Gill, V.T., Maynard, D. (2006). Explaining illness: Patients' proposals and
29
30 physicians' responses. In: Heritage J, Maynard D. editors *Communication in Medical*
31
32 *Care: Interaction between primary care physicians and patients.* (pp.115-150)
33
34
35 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Patient question asking following the delivery of results

 Extract 1 Follow up consultation - Female Oncologist 1, Female patient 1

0 patient initiated questions

1. **Doctor:** →Okay (.) um (1.0) scan result was fine=
 2. **Patient:** →=Good good((quiet))=
 3. **Doctor:** →='kay an everything's (stable)on the in the bo:nes?
 4. **Patient:** [Right ((quiet))
 5. **Doctor:** [Erm There's no new lesions=
 6. **Patient:** =No (0.5)
 7. **Doctor:** →Sorry you were telling me abou:t (.) getting (.) pa::in on
 8. thee:: every time you get tha infusion
-

Extract 2 Follow up consultation - Male Oncologist 1, Male Patient 1

0 patient initiated questions

1. **Doctor:** →Okay [er any concerns at all?
 2. **Patient:** [Ya
 3. **Patient:** No everything's fine (0.5)
 4. **Doctor:** →Okay erm: the bloods are absolutely fine (.)
 5. **Patient:**→oh good=
 6. **Doctor:** →=from last time around a:nd energy levels are good?
 7. **Patient:** Ya ya I just (1.0) keep fit and I've started a new
 8. basketball team
-

Extract 3 Follow up consultation – Female Oncologist 2, Female Patient accompanied by her Husband 1

0 patient initiated question

1. **Doctor:** →Thee:: CT scan result is here (0.5) and that was basically
2. normal erm nothing erm to suggest any new no new glands you
3. have got some changes on your erm (4.0) lungs from(.
4. previous radiotherapy(0.5)uhm (1.5) so that's your CT scan
5. and I'm just trying to find the(0.5) lung function
6. tests(1.0)when did you have those done (2.0)
7. **Patient:** Erm::
8. **Husband:** Two weeks ago ((quiet))
9. **Doctor:** How's your breathing at the moment
10. **Patient:** It's rubbish

Extract 3 continued

38. **Doctor:** → Kidney function normal (0.5) e..r. all your erm liver
 39. function tests are normal (.) calcium yer LBH and
 40. ECLP which are markers for ()are normal as well
 41. (0.5) a.nd. er (2.0) () levels are at the upper
 42. limit of normal (0.5) so we could probably do with
 43. repeating those I hear you've had some problems with
 44. the thyroid getting it right the right levels?
 45. **Patient:** →(1.0) Yeah becuz (.) uh las time I spoke to the
 46. doctor you've got your pituitary gland as well
 47. **Doctor:** Mm=
 48. **Patient:** →=that's raging high so that's raging high so that's
 49. why they've put my thyroxine up to try to try and
 50. level all that off
 51. **Doctor:** Mm
 52. **Patient:**→ So taking my thyroxine down would just make that [(.)
 53. **Doctor:** [Mm
 54. **Patient:** It's still not sort it=
 55. **Doctor:** →=I'm not uncovering I've had a good look through your
 56. notes I'm not uncovering anything that has (.) hit me
 57. as being alarming or any evidence that there's
 58. anything untoward going on I'm gonna get th thee lung
 59. function test come through and of course we'll
 60. discuss those er once we've got hold of them is there
 61. anything in particular that your concerned with and
 62. that wanted to ask me specifically toda.y
 63. **Patient:** Not unless there's anything I'm just (.) fed up of
 64. going back and forth to the doctors and gettin no
 65. results

Extract 4 Follow up consultation – Female Oncologist 2, Female Patient 3

3 patient questions

1. **Doctor:** → And you've had er echocardiogram of your heart an
 2. that's all fine=
 3. **Patient:**→=Is it [okay?
 4. **Doctor:** [you had that done on::?
 5. **Patient:** °Last Friday°(.)
 6. **Doctor:** → Last Friday that's all fine (.) no problems so that's good
 7. news could I er examine you
 8. **Patient:** [yes course you can
 9. **Doctor:** [make sure everything's ok

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION TAKES PLACE

10. **Doctor:** → Is there anything you wanted to ask at all
 11. **Patient:**→ I did want to ask about my heart function I know [you
 12. said
 13. **Doctor:**
 14. [Ya
 15. sure

1
2
3 16. **Patient:** the echocardiograms are oka:y=
4 17. **Doctor:** =Yes
5 18. **Patient:** → but has it (.) erm deteriorated at all=
6 19. **Doctor:** =no
7 20. **Patient:**→ throughout the course of things or is everything
8 21. exactly [as
9 22. **Doctor:** [not at all ...h
10 23. **Patient:** it was=
11 24. **Doctor:** =Everything is exactly as it was
12 25. **Patient:** Right
13 26. **Doctor:** → there's nothing untoward at all (.) erm generally if
14 27. it's going to cause a problem (.) it does and it's
15 28. usually in people who have with pre-existing problems
16 29. [()
17 30. **Patient:** [Right okay
18 31. **Doctor:** so (.) it hasn't caused a problem at all with your
19 32. heart but we can see
20 33. **Patient:**→ and sort of achiness and tiredness will [that go
21 34. **Doctor:** [That's very
22 35. common with ()but it will go but it can take
23 36. probably from stopping it can take a minimum of six
24 37. weeks sometimes sort of two months(.) but it should
25 38. be getting better=
26 39. **Patient:** =Right

Extract 5 – Follow up consultation - Female Oncologist 3, Male Patient 2

6 patient initiated questions

1. **Doctor:** → Your scan shows that things are very much the
2. same, maybe slightly bigger but literally by 4mm both in
3. the chest and in the bowel(0.5)
4. **Patient:**→ Is it possible for me to see the scan?=
5. **Doctor:** =Yes, (1.0) these are your lungs, that's your heart
6. **Patient:**→ Where's the tumor?
7. **Doctor:** That's it
8. **Patient:**→ It's there? So when I saw it previously it was
9. about that size?=
10. **Doctor:** =It's only a couple of centimetres most=
11. **Patient:**→ =As small as that? In fact it's smaller
12. than when I first came about walnut size
13. **Doctor:** It doesn't really say how big it was initially
14. **Patient:**→ So it would be about like that wouldn't it?
15. **Doctor:** Yeah
16. **Patient:**→ It was on the lymph gland, is that the lymph gland?
17. **Doctor:** No that's your bowel that's the tumor and that's your
18. bowel there and that's your aneurism they've measured
19. it for you 55 mm

Extract 6 – Follow up consultation – Female Oncologist 3, Male Patient 4

5 patient initiated questions

1. **Doctor:** → So they've reported it as stable disease basically
 2. nothing new to find there are some lymph nodes in your
 3. pelvis but there's nothing different from that (0.5)
 4. **Patient:**→ Just where exactly?=
 5. **Doctor:** =Did you want to look at your scan you [scan
 6. **Patient:**→ [Will I be able to
 7. tell from that?=
 8. **Doctor:** =Well we can look at it together
 9. **Patient:** Yeah
 10. **Doctor:** (3.0) So this is your pelvis
 11. **Patient:** (1.0)Right
 12. **Doctor:** This is your right hip and that is your left hip=
 13. **Patient:** =Mhm
 14. **Doctor:** And then you've got some lymph nodes that are
 15. predominantly on the on the right hand side
 16. **Patient:** →Yes right so the other side is what they should look
 17. like is it?
 18. **Doctor:** Yeah you've got some tiny lymph nodes there
 19. they're normally a centimeter and a half is as big as
 20. you'd expect them to be normally
 21. **Patient:** Right
 22. **Doctor:** You have got some higher up as well
 23. **Patient:**→ So that's more into the tummy?
 24. **Doctor:** Yeah
 25. **Patient:**→ Dya think it is possible that thee enlarged (.) lymph
 26. nodes could be (0.5) pressing on a ne::rve [or
 27. **Doctor:** [Sometimes
 28. they can do ya ya

Extract 7 – Follow up consultation – Male Oncologist 3, Male Patient 3

3 patient initiated questions

1. **Doctor:** → The scan is very much the same erm there hasn't been um any
 2. obvious problems there is quite a lot of fibrosis still but
 3. that's to be expected so fibrosis is healing and scarring=
 4. **Patient:**→ =Where's that
 5. **Doctor:** → Umm both in the air in the central areas you know where all
 6. the problems originally were with the swallowing so in the
 7. central area and in the tummy um (2.0)°let me tell you
 8. exa[ctly°
 9. **Patient:**→ [Was that there before
 10. **Doctor:** →Yeah they were there before they're just a bit more
 11. obvious and it just makes you think that there's a
 12. bit more matting (.) you know like when you get (.)
 13. have an operation an(.) sometimes people go into
 14. bowel obstruction because they got stuck together (.)
 15. and there called adhesions?
 16. **Patient:** Yes
 17. **Doctor:** things like that (.) it's the same (1.5) erm
 18. pathology (.)erm that there is (.) healing and there

1
2
3 19. is where you've been operated on before and there's
4 20. some sticking together ..h erm but obviously because
5 21. of your breast cancer history
6 22. **Patient:** Yeah
7 23. **Doctor:** we have to just (1.0)
8 24. **Patient:** Yeah
9 25. **Doctor:** watch that a bit more carefully (1.0) ..h I'm really
10 26. not concerned about any of this they've said there's
11 27. an increase in (.) the (.) volume of that fibrosis or
12 28. thickening
13 29. **Patient:** -So basically that's scar tissue, is that what you're
14 30. Saying
15 31. **Doctor:** Yeah...

16
17
18 Extract 8 – Follow up consultation – Male Oncologist 5, Male Patient 4

19
20 1 patient initiated questions

21
22
23 1. **Doctor:** So how are things=
24 2. **Patient:** =Yeah fine thank you=
25 3. **Doctor:** =No new symptoms or problem..s=
26 4. **Patient:** =Nope everythin's fine
27 5. **Doctor:** I gather thee bloods all fell to pieces this time or
28 6. something
29 7. **Patient:** @@ yes the bloods seem to have gone astray this time but (.)
30 8. first time so no problem=
31 9. **Doctor:** =Scan's (.) absolutely great=
32 10. **Patient:** =Yeah=
33 11. **Doctor:** =Er..m (2.0) it says (1.0) its very brief cuz it's so
34 12. simple
35 13. **Patient:** ((laughter))
36 14. **Doctor:** Comparisons made with the previous CT scans (2.0) low
37 15. attenuation lesion (.) which just means (0.5) a small
38 16. area of abnormality (.) again seen in the liver (.)
39 17. unchanged compared with previous examination no new
40 18. abnormalities (.) no evidence of any other disease ()
41 19. clear [so it's great
42 20. **Patient:** [So everythin's just holdin steady?

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60