

Addressing racial bias in wards

Jennifer Tsai¹
Katherine Brooks²
Samantha DeAndrade²
Laura Ucik³
Stacy Bartlett¹
Oyinkansola Osobamiro¹
Jamila Wynter²
Gopika Krishna⁴
Steven Rougas¹
Paul George¹

¹Department of Medicine, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA;

²Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA; ³Department of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY, USA; ⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

Correspondence: Jennifer Tsai
Department of Medicine, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, 222 Richmond Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA
Tel +1 401 863 9609
Email Jennifer_Tsai@brown.edu

Abstract: Health disparities fall along racial lines, in part, due to structural inequalities limiting health care access. The concept of race is often taught in health professions education with a clear biologic underpinning despite the significant debate in the literature as to whether race is a social or biologic construct. The teaching of race as a biologic construct, however, allows for the simplification of race as a risk factor for disease. As health care providers, it is part of our professional responsibility and duty to patients to think and talk about race in a way that is cognizant of broader historical, political, and cultural literature and context. Openly discussing the topic of race in medicine is not only uncomfortable but also difficult given its controversies and complicated context. In response, we provide several evidence-based steps to guide discussions around race in clinical settings, while also hopefully limiting the use of bias and racism in the practice of medicine.

Keywords: racism, racial bias, inequality, health justice

Introduction

Concerns over racial inequity have struck a chord for many across the country ranging from police violence¹ to suboptimal care² to the education of future health care providers.³ Community members of medical institutions have gathered to share their thoughts, fears, and responses, including the ways in which racism can be combated within our hospital systems and training programs.⁴ The well-being of our patients requires that we take a stronger stance against legal and social discrimination.⁵ Though many professionals in and outside of health care may opine that politicization of the clinic may complicate delivery of health care, we believe and seek to demonstrate that our hospitals are already politicized by nature of historical influences on institutional practices and processes. To help the medical community become advocates against all forms of discrimination in our medical schools, hospitals, and clinics, in this paper, we propose a conceptual framework. This framework is based on a careful review and synthesis of the available literature, using a modified Delphi method in its construction. This framework represents what the authors believe is an evidence-based approach to address racial bias in clinical settings.

Reinforce that race has limited genetic explanation while engaging learners and health professionals in addressing patient barriers to health

Health disparities fall along racial lines due to structural inequalities. These foundational inequities inform persistent biases and racist ideas that in turn influence

systems and policies, limit health care access, and permeate the delivery of medical care.⁶ Despite the importance race plays in the health of patients, learners historically receive minimal training on how to understand and discuss race within the context of medical practice.⁷ In this paper, we refer to non-white, racial and ethnic groups as people (or communities) of color, and use “black” to denote individuals with black skin phenotype. The need for these definitions reflects the fluidity of these terms internationally. This further illustrates the need for researchers to be clear and explicit in their understanding and use of race, which is often lacking in biomedical research.⁸

While the American Anthropological Association has recognized race as a dynamic, evolving construct influenced by sociocultural, political, and historical context for decades, biomedical research continues to use race as a static biologic variable.^{9,10} One recent study showed that a significant percentage of medical students still believe in biologic differences between races, such as that black skin is thicker and has fewer nerve endings leading to increased pain tolerance.¹¹ In addition, race corrections, such as those utilized in spirometry, are routinely performed without question, despite evidence that these practices perpetuate and are rooted in belief of essential differences between races born during eras of plantation slavery.¹² Such use of “race” rhetorically neglects the structural inequities underlying the racial and ethnic disparities apparent in nearly every aspect of health care, from prevention and prevalence to mortality.¹³

To illustrate this point, the demonstrated higher asthma prevalence among non-Hispanic blacks¹⁴ should not lead health care providers to assume black patients are innately more likely to have asthma than white patients in neighboring examination rooms. Conceptualizing race as a biologic and “inherent risk factor” for clinical diseases pathologizes race and implies that racial health disparities are due to biologic difference and/or inborn predisposition to disease. This perspective fails to consider the vast socio-structural powers that intersect to marginalize populations of color, increase adjacency toward risk and disease, and produce health inequity.¹⁵ Thus, evidence of asthma disparities might urge consideration that ongoing residential segregation leads to differential exposure to environmental pollutants, community stress, and reduced resources which disadvantage neighborhoods of color and lead to heightened disease burden.¹³ Discussion of race in the context of racial health disparities should include engagement with inequality, rather than reducing it to an aspect of internal constitution.

It is important for physicians and educators to familiarize themselves with the controversies around employing race as a genetic factor and embed lectures, discussions, and the use of race-based medicine and guidelines within historical context. For example, Bidil became the first US FDA-approved race-based pharmaceutical in 2005, though evidence that supported its use failed to compare its efficacy between racial populations and did not fully correct for social determinants of health.¹⁶ Acquainting faculty and students to the limitations of race-based medicine can be introduced using case studies discussing the history of race corrections in lung and renal function, and the use of race in the atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk calculator¹⁷ and Joint National Committee (JNC) 8 treatment guidelines¹⁸ for hypertension. Broadening our comprehension of “race” within the complexities of citizenship, social inequality, and law helps us develop critical perspectives in interpreting medical studies who employ labels such as “white”, or “black” which are ill-defined, region- and generation-specific, and thereby variable, despite their mobilization as scientifically technical terms. In this way, clinicians can become better equipped to evaluate the implications of race-based research in clinical decision-making.

Engage colleagues in conversations about bias

Most physicians would not willingly endorse racist practices and do not believe they provide unequal care. However, several studies illustrate that physicians, like most Americans, harbor implicit biases, defined as “attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner”, that lead to disparities in communication, counseling, and interventions.^{19,20} Simulations studies have shown that providers are less likely to offer aggressive interventions, such as cardiac catheterization or systemic thrombolysis, to patients of color, when all other clinical circumstances are identical.²¹ These biases have impact at a national level. A nationwide study from 2014 found that within the same hospitals, patients of different race received different treatments for myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and pneumonia.²²

Evidence of implicit bias (and its negative impact on quality of care) among health care professionals has been widely documented in literature in the USA,^{23,24} thus, addressing bias should be actively pursued to improve the quality of medical delivery systems. As with any behavior change, individuals need to become aware of their undesirable behaviors in order to address them. van Ryn et al found that having completed

the Black-White Implicit Association Test was associated with decreased levels of implicit bias in medical students over time.²⁵ Clinical departments should encourage dialogue surrounding racism, bias, and stereotyping among trainers and trainees. There are many resources that document histories of medical racism that could be referenced or read in order for trainees to gain understanding and empathy for the legacies of medical abuse.^{26–28} Forums such as Grand Rounds provide opportunity to invite experts to help lead discussions that elucidate physician roles in disparities. Department-wide mortality and morbidity conferences can challenge how bias negatively impacts patient care. In addition, hospitals could institute Implicit Bias Rounds or Ethics Rounds for providers to focus on cases in which bias may have affected the care of a patient. Beyond isolated special sessions, however, sustainable improvement requires longitudinal discussions on racial health disparities to be embedded across broad arenas of institutional practice and culture.

Evidence demonstrates that system-wide interventions that increase literacy and engagement on bias can effectively change behaviors, culture, and commitment toward equity in academic institutions.²⁹ In addition to formal modules and workshops, exploring and addressing bias must also occur in the wards. There is evidence that two provider actions – individuating (conscious removal of data points not relevant to patient care, such as race, when determining a diagnosis and treatment) and perspective taking (putting yourself in your patient’s shoes) – can diminish racial disparity in patient care.²³ Physicians should openly discuss with their team how racial identifiers can lead to hasty generalizations and negatively influence the clinical encounter. This allows for integrated learning that can teach providers to become more thoughtful and intentional in how they perceive – and ultimately care for – their patients. These actions represent tangible change and build the foundation for broader institutional advancement toward equity.²⁹

Address your language (and the language of others)

Negative patient talk is often pervasive among physicians and reinforces what is known as the hidden curriculum – a learning environment in which derogatory language is normalized and stereotypes are reinforced for trainees.³⁰ For example, patients of color are often more likely to be discussed in diminutive, objectifying, or presumptive terms.^{30–33} In addition, physicians often perceive black patients as at increased risk for nonadherence, substance abuse, and inadequate social support, as well as possessing lower intelligence.⁶

These preconceptions can shape physician communication and treatment decisions. For example, persons considered noncompliant receive less follow-up care.³³

One way to address these harmful preconceptions and barriers to effective patient communication is to consider language choices. Providers should refrain from attributing disparities to the individual behaviors or attributes of patients who belong to racial or ethnic minority groups. Conversations about health disparities should be contextualized within larger structural inequalities of our health care system, with recognition that many of these stereotypes were born out of historically discriminatory policies that concentrated poverty among marginalized populations.³⁴ Taking this a step further, a concrete step practitioner can take (and teach learners) is to strike “noncompliance” from their medical terminology. Ultimately, this encourages more contextualized and precise history-taking and documentation. The recognition that unequal systems create realities that impact a patient’s ability to be adherent or non-adherent with their medical plan in turn can reduce the negative effects of racism or bias.

Develop teaching service policies around informed consent and pain management

The informed consent process is a fundamental part of medical care that positions patients to participate actively in their medical treatment plan, promoting stronger doctor–patient relationships. The USA has a history of conducting research and performing procedures on communities of color without written or verbal consent.^{35,36} Furthermore, studies demonstrate that patients with limited English proficiency are less likely to have documentation of informed consent.³⁷ In teaching hospitals, students and residents may be more likely to practice unfamiliar procedures on disadvantaged groups who do not understand medical training structures, face language barriers, and/or have a reduced ability to self-advocate for their wishes and needs.

To prevent a patient’s education, race, or economic background from influencing the decision to allow a trainee to practice a procedure, health care providers should pre-determine which procedures are appropriate for medical student- and resident-level participation, and ensure that when a learner partakes, this information is included in the informed consent discussion. Providers can also ensure that in all non-emergent situations, professional interpretation is used for any patient with limited English proficiency regardless of whether a patient defers the service, recognizing that embarrassment, shame, or desire not to inconvenience may impact a patient’s willingness to request an interpreter.

In addition to informed consent, teaching service policies around pain management should be amplified, given that it is an area associated with significant disparities. For example, when compared to white Americans, people of color are significantly more likely to receive inadequate or ineffective pain management.^{38–42} A recent study found that medical students with higher implicit bias scores felt more unease in treating a Hispanic patient's pain complaints and were more likely to refuse to prescribe an opioid analgesic to a Hispanic patient.⁴³

Pain management is an integral part of all medical specialties and provides a concrete access point to initiate discussions on racial biases that can be applied to other clinical situations. Educators can introduce curricula that require learners to confront their biases and consider how these perceptions are influenced by both media and historical representations of minorities and pain. Such curricula should include common clinical stereotypes of minority groups (i.e., the perception that black people feel less pain, exaggerate pain, or are more likely to abuse drugs) as well as the negative consequences of provider bias on pain management. Furthermore, efforts should be made by educators to model physician–patient interactions that emphasize collaborative, rather than paternalistic, approaches to pain.

Strive for cultural humility, not competence

Culture is ever-changing and can be understood as learned belief structures shared among groups of people.⁴⁴ Individuals are fluent only in their own cultures, and for that reason, physicians may explain away gaps in knowledge or miscommunication by citing cultural differences that are deemed “abnormal” or “incompatible” with routinized practice. This conceptualization pathologizes culture and renders it a barrier to care.^{45,46} Cultural competency curricula often assume that providers may learn patients' cultures the same way they amass medical knowledge, assuming that culture can be deconstructed to “dos and dont's”.⁴⁶ This is reductive, given the nature of culture as a dynamic and deeply individual process. It is crucial to shift goals away from cultural competence, toward cultural humility – a framework that relies on self-critique and recognition of power dynamics – in order to recognize the limits our own experiential backgrounds have on our understanding of our patients'.⁴⁷

Patients traverse and enter our places of work in moments of great pain and grief, and as such, hospitals must exemplify not only a professional commitment toward safety and well-being but also a visible and physical one. Verbal confirmation

and physical signage that indicate explicit support of marginalized identities and communities are important. These may include having printed information in languages reflective of the surrounding community, and/or explicit confirmation that medical care does not involve law enforcement or immigration affairs. It is crucial that we uplift and support community activists and public health workers, as embodying respect toward a diversity of professions, disciplines, and their respective expertise ensures a practical application of continued cultural humility. Lastly, improving racial diversity of medical professionals will be essential to reducing the cultural barriers between patients and their doctors, reducing bias, and in changing the perception of “whiteness” as the dominant culture of medicine.

Conclusion

Openly discussing the topic of race in medicine is difficult and uncomfortable given its controversies and complicated context. We believe, however, that navigating these conversations can be eased through the continued practice of critical dialogue, normalizing the process of accepting responsibility and learning how to rectify errors that may occur. As health care providers, it is part of our professional duty to patients to talk about race and inequality in a way that is cognizant of the broader historical, political, and cultural context. We must use our power to advocate against inequity and for safety and well-being in and out of the hospital, and in doing so, practice due diligence in elevating and listening to the complicated narratives that constitute our patients' lives. It is our hope that these steps will aid in opening the door to such discussion as we believe thoughtful dialogue represents the first step toward improving racial bias in clinical settings.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Nell Baldwin, Abass Noor, and Ronald Magee for their thoughtful contribution in the writing of this manuscript.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, in this work.

References

1. Wear D, Zarconi J, Aultman JM, Chyatte MR, Kumagai AK. Remembering Freddie Gray: medical education for social justice. *Acad Med.* 2017;92(3):312–317.
2. Ayanian JZ, Landon BE, Newhouse JP, Zaslavsky AM. Racial and ethnic disparities among enrollees in Medicare Advantage plans. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371:2288–2297.

3. Ansell DA, McDonald EK. Bias, black lives, and academic medicine. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(12):1087–1089.
4. Charles D, Himmelstein K, Keenan W, Barcelo N; White Coats for Black Lives National Working Group. White coats for black lives: medical students responding to racism and police brutality. *J Urban Health*. 2015;92(6):1007–1010.
5. Bassett MT. #BlackLivesMatter—a challenge to the medical and public health communities. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(12):1085–1087.
6. Van Ryn M, Burke J. The effect of patient race and socio-economic status on physicians' perceptions of patients. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000;50(6):813–828.
7. Tsai J, Ucik L, Baldwin N, Hasslinger C, George P. Race matters? Examining and rethinking race portrayal in preclinical medical education. *Acad Med*. 2016;91(7):916–920.
8. Lee C. “Race” and “ethnicity” in biomedical research: how do scientists construct and explain differences in health? *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;68(6):1183–1190.
9. Sankar P, Cho MK, Condit CM, et al. Genetic research and health disparities. *JAMA*. 2004;291(24):2985–2989.
10. Yudell M, Roberts D, DeSalle R, Tishkoff S. Taking race out of human genetics: engaging a century-long debate about the role of race in science. *Science*. 2016;351(6273):564–565.
11. Hoffman KM, Trawalter S, Axt JR, Oliver MN. Racial bias in pain assessment and treatment recommendations, and false beliefs about biological differences between blacks and whites. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2016;113(16):4296–4301.
12. Braun L. *Breathing Race into the Machine: The Surprising Career of the Spirometer from Plantation to Genetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; 2014.
13. Smedley BD, Stith AY, Nelson AR. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2003.
14. Akinbami LJ, Moorman JE, Simon AE, Schoendorf KC. Trends in racial disparities for asthma outcomes among children 0-17 years, 2001-2010. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014;134(3):547–553.e5.
15. Kahn J. Getting the numbers right: statistical mischief and racial profiling in heart failure research. *Perspect Biol Med*. 2003;46(4):473–483.
16. Roberts DE. *Fatal Invention: How Science, Politics, and Big Business Re-create Race in the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: New Press; 2011.
17. Robinson JG. Overview of the 2013 ACC/AHA guideline on the treatment of blood cholesterol to reduce atherosclerotic cardiovascular risk in adults. *Future Cardiol*. 2014;10(2):149–152.
18. James PA, Oparil S, Cater BL, et al. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eight Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *JAMA*. 2014;311(5):507–520.
19. Staats C, Capatosto K, Wright RA, Contractor D. State of the science: implicit bias review 2015. Vol. 3. Columbus, OH: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, The Ohio State University; 2015.
20. Capps L. Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in healthcare. *JAMA*. 2003;290(18).
21. Green AR, Carney DR, Pallin DJ, et al. Implicit bias among physicians and its prediction of thrombolysis decisions for black and white patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;22(9):1231–1238.
22. Trivedi AN, Nsa W, Hausmann LRM, et al. Quality and equity of care in US hospitals. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371:2298–2308.
23. Chapman EN, Kaatz A, Carnes M. Physicians and implicit bias: how doctors may unwittingly perpetuate health care disparities. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2013;28(11):1504–1510.
24. Paradies Y, Truong M, Priest N. A systematic review of the extent and measurement of healthcare provider racism. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2014;29(2):364–387.
25. van Ryn M, Hardeman R, Phelan SM, et al. Medical school experiences associated with change in implicit racial bias among 3547 students: a medical student CHANGES study report. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2015;30(12):1748–1756.
26. Owens DC. *Medical Bondage: Race, Gender, and the Origins of American Gynecology*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press; 2017.
27. Reverby S. *Examining Tuskegee: The Infamous Syphilis Study and Its Legacy*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press; 2009.
28. Hoberman J. *Black and Blue: The Origins and Consequences of Medical Racism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2012.
29. Carnes M, Devine PG, Isaac C, et al. Promoting institutional change through bias literacy. *J Divers High Educ*. 2012;5(2):63–77.
30. Brooks KC. A piece of my mind. A silent curriculum. *JAMA*. 2015;313(19):1909–1910.
31. Goldman B. *The Secret Language of Doctors: Cracking the Code of Hospital Culture*. Chicago, IL: Triumph; 2014.
32. Mizrahi T. Getting rid of patients: contradictions in the socialisation of internists to the doctor-patient relationship. *Sociol Health Illn*. 1985;7(2):214–235.
33. Johnson RL, Roter D, Powe NR, Cooper LA. Patient race/ethnicity and quality of patient-physician communication during medical visits. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(12):2084–2090.
34. Williams DR. Race, socioeconomic status, and health. The added effects of racism and discrimination. *Ann NY Acad Sci*. 1999;896:173–188.
35. Savitt TL. *Medicine and Slavery: The Diseases and Health Care of Blacks in Antebellum Virginia*. Vol. 82. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press; 2002.
36. Washington HA. *Medical Apartheid: The Dark History of Medical Experimentation on Black Americans from Colonial Times to the Present*. New York, NY: Doubleday Books; 2006.
37. Schenker Y, Wang F, Selig SJ, Ng R, Fernandez A. The impact of language barriers on documentation of informed consent at a hospital with on-site interpreter services. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;22(Suppl 2):294–299.
38. Shavers VL, Bakos A, Sheppard VB. Race, ethnicity, and pain among the U.S. adult population. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2010;21(1):177–220.
39. Pletcher MJ, Kertesz SG, Kohn MA, Gonzales R. Trends in opioid prescribing by race/ethnicity for patients seeking care in US emergency departments. *JAMA*. 2008;299(1):70–78.
40. Goyal MK, Kuppermann N, Cleary SD, Teach SJ, Chamberlain JM. Racial disparities in pain management of children with appendicitis in emergency departments. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169(11):996–1002.
41. Rust G, Nembhard WN, Nichols M, et al. Racial and ethnic disparities in the provision of epidural analgesia to Georgia Medicaid beneficiaries during labor and delivery. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2004;191(2):456–462.
42. Payne R, Medina E, Hampton JW. Quality of life concerns in patients with breast cancer: evidence for disparity of outcomes and experiences in pain management and palliative care among African-American women. *Cancer*. 2003;97(1 Suppl):311–317.
43. Hollingshead N, Ashburn-Nardo L, Stewart J, Maupomé G, Hirsh A. Examining the influence of Hispanic ethnicity and ethnic bias on medical students' pain management decisions. *J Pain*. 2016;17(4):S99.
44. Betancourt JR. Cultural competence—marginal or mainstream movement? *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351(10):953–955.
45. Pachter LM. Culture and clinical care. Folk illness beliefs and behaviors and their implications for health care delivery. *JAMA*. 1994;271(9):690–694.
46. Cross T, Bazron B, Dennis K, Isaacs M. *Towards a Culturally Competent System of Care*. Washington, DC: CASSP Technical Assistance Center, Georgetown University Child Development Center; 1989.
47. Tervalon M, Murray-Garcia J. Cultural humility versus cultural competence: a critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 1998;9(2):117–125.

Advances in Medical Education and Practice

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Advances in Medical Education and Practice is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal that aims to present and publish research on Medical Education covering medical, dental, nursing and allied health care professional education. The journal covers undergraduate education, postgraduate training and continuing medical education

including emerging trends and innovative models linking education, research, and health care services. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <http://www.dovepress.com/advances-in-medical-education-and-practice-journal>