



To 'Get By' or 'Get Help'? Physician Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2013-004613 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 03-Dec-2013 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Parsons, Janet; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute; University of Toronto, Dept. of Physical Therapy Baker, Natalie; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute Smith-Gorvie, Telisha; University Health Network, Dept. of Emergency Medicine; University of Toronto, Dept. of Medicine Hudak, Pamela; The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Health services research |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Qualitative research, Communication |
| Keywords: | INTERNAL MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **To ‘Get By’ or ‘Get Help’? Physician Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients**
4 **Have Limited English Proficiency**
5

6 Janet A Parsons ^{1,2}, Natalie A Baker ¹, Telisha Smith-Gorvie ^{3,4}, Pamela L Hudak ⁵
7
8
9

10 ¹ *Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s*
11 *Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 1W8*
12

13 ² *Department of Physical Therapy and Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Science,*
14 *University of Toronto, 160 -500 University Ave., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 1V7*
15
16

17 ³ *Department of Emergency Medicine, University Health Network (Toronto General*
18 *Hospital), RFE GS-480 Emergency Department, 200 Elizabeth St., Toronto, Ontario*
19 *Canada M5G 2C4*
20
21

22 ⁴ *Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Suite RFE 3-805, 200 Elizabeth St.,*
23 *Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2C4*
24
25
26

27 ⁵ *The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, 700 King St. W (Suite 713), Toronto,*
28 *Ontario, Canada, M5V 2Y6*
29
30

31 **Corresponding author:** Dr. Janet A. Parsons, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka
32 Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON, Canada
33 M5B 1W8; e-mail: parsonsj@smh.ca; Tel: +1-416-864-6060 ext. 7111; fax: +1-416-864-
34 3016.
35
36

37 **Key words:** language discordance, physician practice, Limited English Proficiency,
38 qualitative methods
39
40

41 **Word count:** 3,523
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

ABSTRACT

Objective: Encounters between patients and physicians who do not speak the same language are relatively common in Canada, particularly in urban settings; this trend is increasing worldwide. Language discordance has important effects on health outcomes, including mortality. This study sought to explore physicians' experiences of care provision in situations of language discordance in depth.

Design: Qualitative study based on in-depth individual interviews. Interview guides elicited physicians' perspectives on how they determined whether communication could proceed unaided. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted, entailing inductive thematic analysis.

Participants: 22 physicians experienced in treating patients in situations of language discordance were recruited from the emergency and internal medicine departments of an urban tertiary-care hospital.

Setting: Large, inner-city teaching hospital in Toronto, Canada, one of the most linguistically diverse cities internationally.

Results: Determining when to 'get by' or 'get help' in order to facilitate communication was described as a fluid and variable process. Deciding which strategy to use depended on three inter-related factors: *time/time constraints*, *acuity of situation*, and *ease of use/availability of translation aids*. Participants reported feeling conflicted about their decisions, portraying these clinical encounters as a 'troubling space' in which they

1
2
3 experienced one or more *dilemmas* related to *real vs. ideal practice, responsibility, and*
4
5
6 *informed consent*.
7

8
9 *Conclusions:* In situations of language discordance, a physician's decision to 'get by'
10
11 (versus 'get help') rests on a judgment of whether communication can be considered
12
13 'good enough' to proceed. We propose that this represents a pragmatic response in less-
14
15 than-ideal circumstances, rather than a 'failure'. However, the tension set up between
16
17 what is 'ideal' and what is practically possible can be experienced as a dilemma by
18
19 physicians. The study's findings have important implications for practice and policy not
20
21 only in Canada but in other multilingual settings, and indicate that physicians require
22
23 greater support.
24
25
26
27

28 29 **Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 30
31
32 • There are few in-depth studies documenting physicians' experiences of language
33
34 discordance in Canada or elsewhere
- 35
36
37 • Qualitative methodology is well-suited to exploring physicians' experiences of
38
39 communication and care provision
- 40
41
42 • The study deepens our understanding of how physicians decide whether to "get
43
44 by" or "get help" in situations of language discordance, and the dilemmas
45
46 experienced by physicians
- 47
48
49 • A limitation is that this was a single-site study; nevertheless, the concepts
50
51 generated are transferrable to other practice settings
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Clear communication has long been recognized as integral to high-quality medical care. However, physicians frequently encounter situations where effective communication is difficult. One such situation is when physicians and patients do not speak the same language – referred to as language discordance.⁽¹⁾ Increasing globalization, human migration⁽²⁾ and travel mean that many countries are becoming more and more multi-lingual, and this is especially true of urban centres.⁽³⁾ Although Canada has two official languages (English and French), it is by definition a nation of immigrants representing many linguistic traditions. New immigrants may not speak either official language. Major cities are popular settlement areas for new immigrants, thus physicians are extremely likely to encounter patients who do not speak the dominant language. Language barriers can be a source of health disparity, including differential mortality rates.⁽¹⁾ In a Canadian study on tuberculosis, mortality risk was significantly higher (HR = 2.32;95% CI:1.39-3.88, p<0.001) in situations of language discordance.⁽¹⁾ Language barriers have also been shown to: impair patient comprehension⁽⁴⁾; act as a barrier to accessing care⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾; negatively affect treatment adherence⁽⁸⁾ (9); and affect satisfaction with care⁽¹⁰⁻¹²⁾. Language barriers are also associated with increased hospital length-of-stay⁽¹³⁾, and decreased self-reported health status.⁽¹⁴⁾

In addition to patients and physicians not sharing a language, social structural features of medical practice can further compound the situation. The fast pace of modern clinical practice has been identified as a challenge to effective communication because decisions

1
2
3 must be made quickly and are often history-dependent. Although there is literature
4
5 documenting outcomes associated with language discordance, there is relatively little
6
7 comprehensive research into physicians' experiences of language discordance generally.
8
9 Moreover, there is a paucity of research eliciting Canadian physicians' perspectives on
10
11 the topic. One survey-based study of Montreal family physicians focused on their
12
13 attitudes towards caring for immigrant patients, with 77% reporting that communication
14
15 was the greatest barrier to patient management.(15) Another recent study surveyed
16
17 physicians from Manitoba, Canada, on factors affecting communication with patients of
18
19 different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, with an emphasis on process errors
20
21 and their relationship not only to language discordance, but a host of other factors, such
22
23 as patient age, gender and trust.(16) Neither of these studies offer in-depth explorations
24
25 of physicians' experiences of caring for patients in situations of language discordance.
26
27 This gap can only be addressed by speaking to physicians directly, using qualitative
28
29 methods. Understanding physicians' experiences is vital, given that language barriers are
30
31 known to translate into negative outcomes for patients (including increased mortality).(1,
32
33 8, 9)

34
35 Our study explores physicians' experiences of interacting with patients for whom
36
37 language proficiency (in this case, Limited English Proficiency or LEP)(17, 18)ⁱ
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 ⁱ Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term to describe individuals who do not speak English as their
54 primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English^{13 14}. We use
55 'LEP' interchangeably with 'language discordance'.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 was perceived to hinder effective communication. In this paper, we highlight conditions
8
9 and strategies associated with circumstances in which physicians ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ in
10
11 these encounters.
12

13 14 15 **METHODS**

16
17
18 This study focuses on physicians’ practice experiences where LEP was perceived to be
19
20 the main factor hindering effective communication with patients. These accounts
21
22 encompassed an array of situations, including those in which physician and patient had
23
24 any of the following: no shared language, some shared language, comprehension issues
25
26 related to accents, situations where no translation aids were used, or those where different
27
28 types of translation aids were used. We did not consider situations where communication
29
30 was influenced by a patient’s inability to speak as a result of aphasia or some other
31
32 cognitive or mechanical issue.
33
34
35
36
37

38 39 **Setting**

40
41
42 The study was conducted in Toronto, Canada’s most multicultural city, with over 160
43
44 languages spoken.(19) English is the dominant language. The study institution, a tertiary-
45
46 care teaching hospital, serves patients diverse in language and culture, and its physicians
47
48 are likely to have significant clinical experience with LEP patients. The study was
49
50 approved by the institution’s Research Ethics Board and written informed consent was
51
52 obtained from all participants.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sample

All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal Medicine and Emergency Medicine were eligible for inclusion. Participants were invited to share their experiences 'when challenges to communication secondary to language discordance are encountered in routine clinical practice'. Twenty-two physicians agreed to participate, including both men (17) and women (5), with a wide range of years of clinical experience (Mean: 10.7; Range: 1-28).

Data Collection

Semi-structured audiotaped interviews were conducted, lasting one hour on average. The interview guide was developed by researchers with practice and methodological expertise, and pilot tested.(20) Questions focused on how physicians determine whether communication is adequate to proceed unaided. They were asked to recall clinical encounters where a) they did not share a language with the patient/family member; and b) they shared a language but not at the same proficiency. Details were probed concerning: a) conditions under which physicians feel they need to get help; b) strategies employed to facilitate communication; c) what they say they usually do when working with LEP patients; and d) how they feel about what they do. All interviews occurred in summer and fall of 2009.

Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed and analysed using an approach of qualitative descriptive analysis (as described by Sandelowski), in order to inductively identify, code and

1
2
3 categorize patterns in the data.(21-25) The senior investigator began by reading the
4
5 interviews closely, identifying key themes and patterns, reviewing the data multiple times
6
7 and developing codes as new topics and relationships were identified.(26, 27) At this
8
9 early stage, an experienced qualitative researcher who was not part of the research team
10
11 also reviewed several transcripts and made independent observations. A preliminary
12
13 coding scheme was developed and applied to all transcripts.(24, 25) Analytic rigour was
14
15 aided by continual re-examination of the data by all authors throughout the research
16
17 process.(28, 29)
18
19
20
21
22

23 RESULTS

24
25
26
27 A key early insight was that participants' accounts could be viewed as describing the
28
29 conditions under which physicians 'get by' in a clinical encounter even when language
30
31 proficiency is not shared, in contrast to when they decide that they must 'get help' to
32
33 proceed further. *Getting by* means proceeding with the interaction without seeking
34
35 assistance. *Getting help* entails pausing the interaction to seek translation/interpretation
36
37 services or tools. Deciding which strategy to employ was depicted as context-driven, and
38
39 primarily dependent on three factors: time constraints, patient acuity, and
40
41 ease/availability of translation assistance/aids. Decision-making was portrayed as
42
43 'troubling', a process characterized by three overlapping dilemmas, the *gap between real*
44
45 *vs. ideal practice*, the notion of *responsibility*, and the issue of *informed consent*. Table 1
46
47 includes quotes supporting the findings outlined below.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *To “get by” or “get help”?*
4
5

6
7 Participants encountered many different languages in their practice settings. Typically, another
8 member of the healthcare team informed physicians of a patient’s LEP status (verbally or in
9 writing), and whether a translator was available. Participants recounted that they then validated
10 the patient’s LEP status independently, using both verbal and non-verbal cues (e.g. gestures,
11 facial expressions) to gauge understanding (e.g. purposely asking open-ended questions). Upon
12 identifying a language barrier, they then described a process of weighing whether they could ‘get
13 by’ or whether they should ‘get help’.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In some cases, physicians would ‘get by’ with what they can glean from a patient without shared
27 language. These situations were described by one physician as the “grey zone” in which a
28 patient’s “level of English proficiency is good enough so that maybe you can feel that you can get
29 by but their comprehension may in fact be poor enough that they can get into trouble” (90615).
30
31
32
33
34

35 The tendency in these cases is to “follow the path of least resistance” i.e. getting by with any
36 resources readily available.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Choosing to ‘get by’ without additional assistance can include any of the following strategies:
45 speaking more slowly, enunciating more carefully, using plain language and requesting that the
46 patient paraphrase instructions to gauge understanding. Participants perceived situations of
47 limited/imperfect communication as ‘risky’. They compensated by proceeding with caution –
48 giving patients more time than usual, double checking test results, ordering more tests, or
49 keeping patients longer for observation. As a result, clinical assessments tended to privilege
50 objective findings over subjective reports.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Participants also described situations where they considered it too risky to proceed without
4 confidence in communication quality: e.g. attempting to determine medication side effects, or
5 discussing end-of-life care. ‘Getting help’ ranged from using professional translators/interpreters,
6 to having other staff or family members translate, to using the language line. (18) ⁱⁱ Overall
7 participants indicated that, when time permitted, their preference of use, in descending order,
8 was: professional interpreters (first choice), then the language line, and finally other hospital staff
9 or family members.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *Acuity/severity of illness, time constraints and ease/availability of translation aids*

21
22
23 Choosing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ hinged on several interlinked factors. The patient’s
24 clinical status and their relative acuity was commonly mentioned as a primary factor for
25 consideration. For example, a physician recounted a situation where a patient presented with
26 signs of stroke. He elected to ‘get by’ due to the urgency of the situation and the potential
27 consequences of delaying definitive care; the patient subsequently recovered. This participant
28 acknowledged that ‘getting by’ entailed proceeding with “imperfect information”, treating “more
29 of what they could see rather than the symptoms” (90706). Even though the physician considered
30 this less-than-ideal, ‘getting by’ often trumped ‘getting help’ in emergency situations.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Conversely, if a case involves for example providing discharge instructions to a stable patient,
41 participants said they felt they had ‘time on their side’ to await a translator. The interaction
42 between a less-acute situation and available time highlights the inter-relatedness of clinical status
43 with a second factor, time. However there was no simple equation for determining whether to ‘get
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 ⁱⁱ In our study, the term ‘language line’ is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual
53 handset phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing
54 real-time interpretation as the parties speak ²³ This has been referred to as “UN-style interpretation.”²³
55 (p.741)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by' or 'get help' vis-à-vis clinical status: *"it's a judgment call...it's more of an art than a science"*
4
5 (90901).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Time is another factor informing physicians' decision-making. Participants depicted choosing the
13 most pragmatic path of care when faced with time-related constraints. Many physicians described
14 the significant time and effort involved in obtaining relevant clinical information from LEP
15 patients. They told of "verifying, inferring, checking charts, checking with pharmacist, etc."
16 (90710). Time could be an issue even when a translator is available because this "doubles the
17 duration of the interaction so everything takes twice as long" (90728) -- which is suboptimal in
18 emergencies. Physicians also spoke of time pressures to manage their busy caseloads when
19 weighing what to do: allocating additional time to LEP patients may limit the time they have
20 available for others in need. Some participants spoke about translator availability (e.g. harder to
21 reach during night shifts). One participant described a situation where it took four days for a
22 translator to become available. Such delays influence not only quality of care, but also hold cost
23 implications if hospital length-of-stay is affected.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 A third factor influencing whether to 'get by' or 'get help' was the ease of use/availability of
40 translation aids/interpreters. Some physicians admitted resistance to using technology-based
41 interpretation. Though telephone-based language lines are designed to improve patient-physician
42 communication, in practice, our participants reported that they can be awkward. Participants drew
43 on a variety of experiences with language lines in different settings, indicating that all language
44 lines are not created equal.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced

Participants often expressed feeling conflicted over decisions to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’. While they recognized that ‘getting by’ was often less-than-ideal, it was sometimes all that they could do. They depicted such decision-making as a source of anxiety. A participant noted that some patients have “just enough proficiency for it to be dangerous” (90615). The language of ‘danger’ is significant, suggesting an unsettling and troubling experience for participants. A series of overlapping dilemmas constitute this troubling space, namely: *the gap between real vs. ideal practice*, notions of *responsibility*, and issues of *informed consent*.

The dilemma of ‘real world’ vs. ‘ideal world’ practice

Physicians told of taking shortcuts and making judgment calls that, in some instances, could be considered acceptable practice. One participant said, “the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing” (90728). For example, participants recognized that using other staff members in the immediate vicinity who spoke the same language was not ideal, yet they would often opt for this approach as most efficient. Despite these pragmatic considerations, most participants acknowledged that there is an optimal or “best” way of providing care in these situations.

There was a tension in many accounts between what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices in an ideal world) and what they ultimately *can* do at the bedside. They appear to use a sliding scale for decision-making, which is context-dependent, and allows them to gauge when ‘getting by’ can be justified.

1
2
3 *The dilemma of responsibility*
4

5
6 Participants expressed discomfort concerning who is ultimately *responsible* for ensuring adequate
7
8 communication. While they recognized that they have an ethical obligation to ensure
9
10 understanding, at the same time, some physicians appeared to put at least some of the onus on
11
12 patients. In some situations, participants said they left the decision of whether communication
13
14 was ‘good enough’ to the patient. They portrayed communication as a shared responsibility
15
16 between physician and patient. However they also depicted themselves as making their decisions
17
18 about whether to get help as something they did on their own – they spoke at length about the
19
20 information *they* deemed important, but said relatively little about what information *patients*
21
22 might see as important.
23
24

25
26
27 *The dilemma of informed consent*
28

29
30 Another dilemma characterized by participants surrounded *informed consent*. In LEP situations,
31
32 physicians may have to rely on professional translators or family members to secure consent.
33
34 Family members as translators were of particular concern to participants. Professional translators
35
36 were perceived to be impartial and accurate when relaying information. Physicians expressed
37
38 concern that family translators may change what is imparted due to personal biases or
39
40 misinterpretations. Participants described a number of these situations, such as when patients and
41
42 families appeared to differ in their wishes.
43
44

45
46
47 Participants acknowledged the issue of best practices with LEP patients as an important priority
48
49 for physicians. A few participants took this sentiment a step further, warning that: “*We could*
50
51 *even argue from an ethical or legal standpoint of course that we’re obligated to ensure that*
52
53 *there’s appropriate communication*” (090615). ‘Patient-centred care’ is espoused by both
54
55 hospitals and clinicians, and it is expected that treatment decisions will be made jointly between
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patient and provider. A principle of informed consent is that physicians provide the information
4
5 patients need in order to make informed decisions. But gauging whether LEP patients have *really*
6
7 understood information provided can be challenging.
8
9

10 11 **DISCUSSION**

12
13
14 This study examined experiences of physicians working with LEP patients. Participants described
15
16 two strategies for dealing with such situations: ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help.’ Based on their
17
18 accounts, we propose that a physician’s decision to ‘get by’ because he/she judges
19
20 communication to be ‘good enough’ to proceed represents not a failure or short-coming
21
22 but rather a realistic response in less-than-ideal circumstances. Participants characterized
23
24 clinical encounters with LEP patients as a ‘troubling’ social space, presenting professional
25
26 dilemmas. There was a tension between recognizing what they *should do* (based on ideal-world
27
28 best practices) and what they *can do* at the bedside (based on constraints of time and resources).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Our findings have important practice implications. For example, participants noted that in
38
39 situations where they elect to ‘get by’, they conduct more tests on LEP patients, to mitigate risk.
40
41 There were no hard-and-fast rules for managing such risk; physicians told of making decisions in-
42
43 the-moment, gauging the acuity/complexity of each patient’s condition, circumstances,
44
45 availability of translation aids/interpreters, and their own caseload/obligations to other patients.
46
47 The threshold at which a physician shifts from getting by to getting help is variable, fluid and
48
49 dependent upon the individual and context. The suggestion that adequate communication is a
50
51 shared responsibility presumes a team-based approach between physician and patient. However,
52
53 team-based care usually implies open lines of communication, which is not the case in LEP. This
54
55 may contribute to the sense of discomfort expressed by participants.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Discomfort may also stem partly from an underlying assumption that translation should be ‘value
4 neutral’ and as ‘objective’ as laboratory testing. Translation during a clinical encounter is a social
5 act, and as such is both complex and contingent. Wong and Poon (2010) argue for translation
6 being viewed “not (as) a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of
7 another”,(30)(p.152) but rather one imbued with meaning and interpretation on each side. Social
8 context and power relations cannot be ignored.(30) Rather than treating challenges presented by
9 LEP as an inconvenience, they should be given priority and clinicians offered greater support.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The implications for patients should not be underestimated. Rivadeneyra et al (2000) indicate that
24 situations of LEP negatively affect the provision of patient-centred primary care(4): even with
25 the aid of interpreters, US physicians were less likely to probe further into symptoms of non-
26 English-speaking patients.(4) Clinical consequences of LEP can range from problems accessing
27 care and treatment non-adherence, to higher mortality rates.(1, 8, 9). Opportunities for gaining
28 crucial insights may be missed (e.g. understanding additional variables underlying presenting
29 illness)(9) as may opportunities for developing rapport and trust, when physicians opt to ‘get by.’
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 The implications for patient safety and patient outcomes should not be underestimated. Moreover,
39 it has potential medico-legal consequences: how far should a physician go to ensure ‘adequate’
40 communication has been achieved in order to mitigate the potential of risk and harm? Participants
41 are warranted in their characterizations of language discordant situations as troubling spaces.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Our study builds on prior work conducted by Diamond and colleagues (2009). They also used
the phrase “getting by” to describe their study’s findings of medical residents’ experiences of
caring for patients in two US cities. (31) Similar to our study, Diamond and colleagues found

1
2
3 that factors such as time constraints and convenience were cited as influencing participants'
4 decisions to 'get by'. While our study confirms some of Diamond's findings and in another
5 country/setting (with a very different health care system, and among other specialists), it also
6 goes considerably further. Our study examined physicians' experiences with a variety of
7 translation options (not just the use of professional in-person interpreters), and explored a range
8 of perspectives that included those of experienced staff physicians as well as less experienced
9 medical residents. This indicates that the phenomenon of 'getting by' is experienced by clinician
10 trainees who are early in their professional lives, but also, more surprisingly, by seasoned senior
11 staff. The habits developed during residencies evidently persist over time, and although these
12 habits are characterized as unsettling they appear to be the status quo. This suggests that the issue
13 of LEP should be more firmly embedded not only in medical school curricula, but in continuing
14 education programs as well. Our study goes further and offers an in-depth exploration of the
15 dilemmas experienced that, according to participants, result from not being able to put the 'ideal'
16 into practice. Diamond's participants were frequently unaware of standards of practice for
17 interpretation in their settings, (31) while participants in our study were acutely aware of what
18 they *should* do, but frequently found this difficult to put into practice. Diamond's team did not
19 appear to probe participants explicitly about what might be lost when a lot of clinical information
20 is missing, while our participants seemed acutely aware of what might be missing and described
21 how they tried to off-set this by relying more heavily on diagnostic testing. Finally, our study
22 explored the decision-making process of 'getting by' versus 'getting help' in richer detail,
23 deepening our understanding of physicians' experiences.

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 Our study does have limitations. As a single-centre study, its sample size might be considered
54 small by quantitative standards. However qualitative studies are meant to generalize the *concepts*
55 generated, not to the population of physicians as a whole.(21, 32) As such the concepts of 'getting
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by' and 'getting help' are transferable to a wide range of practice settings. Another limitation is
4
5 its failure to address cultural differences. Language and culture are inextricably linked and can
6
7 result in differential access to care. (4, 33) Physician-patient miscommunication can also result
8
9 from different cultural norms and understandings(34). This should be a focus for future research.
10
11 Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of technological advances, wireless, telephone-based
12
13 translation services have become more available in medical facilities. It is conceivable that
14
15 previous obstacles to accessing timely professional translation services may be less of an issue.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This study begins to illuminate the difficult terrain of caring for LEP patients. In doing so, it
24
25 opens up an opportunity to break the silence that exists amongst clinicians on this issue, and
26
27 invites them to explore it. These doctors recognized that the shortcuts they are forced to take are
28
29 less than ideal, but they also outlined the real-world constraints that make these shortcuts
30
31 necessary in their current practice environment. And those environments are not conducive to
32
33 doctors reflecting upon the issue or even discussing it with their colleagues. We see our research
34
35 as a catalyst for beginning this conversation. The dilemmas described here are likely
36
37 encountered regularly by physicians practicing in large cities, in many jurisdictions, not
38
39 just in Canada. Although time constraints, patient acuity and ease/availability of translation aids
40
41 all play a role in physicians' decisions to 'get by' or 'get help', provision of more language lines
42
43 only partially addresses the issue. Improved support for physicians navigating this complex social
44
45 space should be prioritized.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Supportive Quotes for Key Findings

| 'Getting By' versus 'Getting Help' | |
|--|--|
| 'Getting by' | <p><i>"If the patient speaks some English and I speak some French and a little bit of Spanish, If the answers seem appropriate to me and the patient doesn't demonstrate obvious concern about the interaction and it's relatively simple and not high-risk, then I would accept that communication is adequate."</i> (90703)</p> <p><i>"I rely more heavily on my physical exam if I can't communicate with them, like I'd be more cautious with testing if I can't ask a specific question and be reassured"</i> (90708).</p> |
| 'Getting help' | <p><i>"But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke, [it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication"</i> (90901)</p> <p><i>" (I'll) look for an interpreter or some staff that can come over and help. You know somebody who speaks that language if they are stable you know and don't look like I need to do anything overly quickly for them and I really can't get a story out of them, then I'll ... get an interpreter first"</i> (90708)</p> <p><i>"So that's the problem you run into. You either try to strive to get a really good history through formal interpretation or you end up doing more testing of that person because you're worried about them more."</i> (90614)</p> |
| Acuity, time constraints and availability of translation aids | |
| Acuity of clinical situation | <p><i>"It all depends on the clinical situation...I could almost treat a patient who cut their finger without talking to them at all... I'd want to make sure that their tetanus status was up to date, like there's a couple of things that you'd want to sort out, but by and large you could pretty much treat them without talking to them. But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke,[it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication. "</i> (90901)</p> <p><i>"So if a patient was sick, for example, had low pressure and a fast heart rate and still spoke no English, I would go in anyway and then just do what I consider to be paediatric medicine. Kids can't talk to you. You know they're two years old and they're crying and they're in pain- I can't get a history from a child the same way I can't get a history from someone who doesn't speak English. "</i> (91118)</p> |
| Time constraints | <p><i>"When we have a whole bunch of patients and we've got a busy schedule and we're already twenty minutes behind and so forth, you know we're looking for ways to be as efficient as possible. And if it looks like this patient can give us a</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>few nods appropriately and say a few words that ... they should probably understand. We may be willing to just say okay well we've done our part."</i> (90616)</p> <p><i>"We sometimes take shortcuts and sometimes that's acceptable because the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing" (90728)</i></p> |
| <p>Ease of use and availability of translation aids/interpreters</p> | <p><i>"...if two people speak at the same time it can block out the sound and so it can become awkward but I would say that the two handset option is the best option followed by the speaker phone, followed lastly by the one handset option which is really, uh, it's enough to dissuade people from actually going to the language line. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"there's a tremendous amount of resistance to going to the one handset: you'd almost rather this person just spoke a few words of English. You might just be inclined to do your best try and see that they understand what 's actually taking place" (90728)</i></p> <p><i>"If you're gonna continue this encounter without getting a translator, so if I'm sharp enough to know what this person's language is and it doesn't take long, then I may do a quick search locally, literally around me physically... in a clinic, on a ward, in the Emergency Department to see if someone who works in that department can speak that language and offer translation and there's a fair chance in Toronto you'll get a person who can speak that language fairly (easily). And then that's the better route." (90710)</i></p> |
| <p>A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced in practice</p> | |
| <p>The 'grey zone'</p> | <p><i>"Well I leave that to the patient to decide whether we need some kind of facilitator or an interpreter. You know I usually don't make the decision to say "how well you are comprehending what I'm saying and how well are you able to communicate to me?" So I usually ask them "would you like to have an interpreter present?" And then they may say 'yes' or 'no'. The challenge is that in the real world we don't, we don't always end up having an interpreter readily available. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"... so I sort of assess whether I need, whether I actually have time to wait for the interpreter and then I'd call and ask for an interpreter. I do use family members which is a bit of a grey zone because if there's a se...sensitive information you're no, so you're supposed to have an objective interpreter there, so I will sometimes use family members..." (90828)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of 'real world' vs. ideal world' practice</p> | <p><i>"And they [patient] go 'um thank you'. And that's it, right. And so you kind of, you know clearly it's a suboptimal communication. There are a lot of things that you would really need to discuss to have this patient-centered care ideal. But</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p><i>you know the time that would be required to do that would be quite extensive and so we often take shortcuts that result in non-patient-centered care... It happens all the time frankly and I think well you know, we're probably less likely to do it in a situation where we really feel that it's critical."</i> (90728)</p> <p><i>"To be quite honest with you the ones I personally find the most helpful are family members. Because ... they can give you a little bit of the context, and then you can talk to them as well particularly if it's an elderly patient because not only do they translate for you but then they'll also say, "You know what? Grandma hasn't been doing very well for a few months now. She hasn't been preparing her meals properly, she's been losing weight ... I'm concerned about grandma." That's far more valuable to me in some respects than a translator who's just sticking to the letter of the law, and is saying exactly what they're supposed to, without kind of any context. It's just language right? I like the bigger picture"</i> (90702)</p> |
| <p>Dilemma of responsibility</p> | <p><i>" We've explained what's going on and they've nodded and kind of looked at me as though they're understanding - so now it's their responsibility, it's not mine any longer. I'm not suggesting that's the way that, you know I practice, but that's what can frequently happen in this grey zone. It's just enough English proficiency to be dangerous."</i> (90615)</p> <p><i>"They (patients/families with LEP) don't recognize that this is a ha-, a potential hazard...I think some of the responsibility lies with the patient."</i> (90706)</p> <p><i>" I don't think that's a responsibility that patient's necessarily carrying... That's not something I would expect of my families ... that's not a fair expectation I think."</i> (90708)</p> |
| <p>Dilemma of informed consent</p> | <p><i>"I can't get informed consent when I can't communicate"</i> (90930)</p> <p><i>" There have been circumstances in the past where we have been concerned as a group that families weren't accurately expressing our wishes to the patient or our statements to the patient and vice versa. And so there have been circumstances you know particularly in some of these [high] stakes circumstances where we will use professional translators regardless of the presence of the family to translate for just this reason."</i> (90707)</p> |
| <p>Making language discordance a priority</p> | <p><i>" You know, we really have to get over the language barrier business because it's not going away—it's been here for a while and I don't think we've done a particularly good job until very recently—we're starting to address it—we should be very aggressive about prioritizing this subject "</i> (90710)</p> |

1
2
3 **Contributors:** JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and analysis of the data,
4 as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript. NAB contributed
5 substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and participated in all phases of
6 writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception and design of the study,
7 assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in drafting the manuscript.
8 PLH was the principal investigator and took primary responsibility for the study's
9 conception and design, as well as the data analysis and interpretation, and contributed
10 importantly to the drafting of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final
11 version of the manuscript.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Funding statement:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in
27 the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
28
29
30

31 **Competing interest statement:** The authors have no competing interests to declare.
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

References

1. Gardam M, Verma G, Campbell A, Wang J, Khan K. Impact of the patient-provider relationship on the survival of foreign-born outpatients with tuberculosis. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2009;11:437-45.
2. Burnett A. Globalization, migration and health. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 2002. p. 34-43.
3. Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, Sarangi S, Jones R. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(5):465-75. Epub 2005/04/22.
4. Rivadeneyra R, Elderkin-Thompson V, Cohen Silver R, Waitzkin H. Patient-centeredness in clinical encounters requiring an interpreter. *American Journal of Medicine*. 2000;108:470-4.
5. Piette JD, Schillinger D, Potter MB, Heisler M. Dimensions of patient-provider communication and diabetes self-care in an ethnically diverse population. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003;18(8):624-33. Epub 2003/08/13.
6. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, Wang F, Wilson C, Daher C. Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low health literacy. *Arch Intern Med*. 2003;163:83-90.

- 1
2
3 7. Bonds DE, Camacho F, Bell RA, Duren-Winfield VT, Anderson RT, Goff DC.
4
5 The association of patient trust and self-care among patients with diabetes mellitus. BMC
6
7 Family Practice. 2004;5(26).
8
9
- 10
11 8. Schenker Y, Lo B, Ettinger KM, Fernandez A. Navigating language barriers
12
13 under difficult circumstances. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2008;149(4):264-9.
14
15
- 16
17 9. Morales LS, Cunningham WE, Brown JA, Liu H, Hays RD. Are Latinos Less
18
19 Satisfied with Communication by Health Care Providers? Journal of General Internal
20
21 Medicine. 1999;14(7):409-17.
22
23
- 24
25 10. Baker DW, Hayes R, Fortier JP. Interpreter use and satisfaction with interpersonal
26
27 aspects of care for Spanish-speaking patients. . Med Care. 1998;36:1461–70.
28
29
- 30
31 11. Carasquillo O, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Burstin HR. Impact of Language Barriers
32
33 on Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department. Journal of General Internal
34
35 Medicine. 1999.;14:82–7.
36
37
- 38
39 12. Wilson E, Chen A, Grumbach K, Wang F, Fernandez A. Effects of limited
40
41 English proficiency and physician language on health care comprehension. Journal of
42
43 General Internal Medicine. 2005;20(9):800-6.
44
45
- 46
47 13. John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, Alibhai SMH, Etchells E, Cheung A, et
48
49 al. The effect of English-language proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality.
50
51 Journal of General Internal Medicine. 2004;19:221-8.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 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
14. Perez-Stable EJ, Napoles-Springer A, Miramontes JM. The effects of ethnicity and language on medical outcomes of patients with hypertension or diabetes. *Medical Care*. 1997;35(12):1212-9.
 15. Papic O, Malak Z, Rosenberg E. Survey of family physicians' perspectives on management of immigrant patients: Attitudes, barriers, strategies, and training needs. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2012;86:205-9.
 16. Lovell BL, Lee RT, Brotheridge CM. Interpersonal factors affecting communication in clinical consultations: Canadian physicians' perspectives. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. 2012;25(6):467-82.
 17. Ku L, Flores G. Pay now or pay later: Providing interpreter services in health care. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(2):435-44.
 18. Masland MC, Lou C, Snowden L. Use of communication technologies to cost-effectively increase the availability of interpretation services in healthcare settings. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2010;16(6):739-45.
 19. Toronto Co. Backgrounder - Census 2011: Language. Statistics Canada. Toronto: City of Toronto; 2012. p. 1-22.
 20. Morse JM, Richards L. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2002.
 21. Kvale S. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 1996.

- 1
2
3 22. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in
4
5 Nursing and Health. 2000;23:334-40.
6
7
8
9 23. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. Research in
10
11 Nursing and Health. 2010;33(1):77-84.
12
13
14
15 24. Miles MB, Huberman AM. Qualitative Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks: Sage;
16
17 1994.
18
19
20
21 25. Crabtree BF, Miller WL. Using codes and code manuals. In: Crabtree BF, Miller
22
23 WL, editors. Doing Qualitative Research. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage
24
25 Publications; 1999. p. 163-77.
26
27
28
29 26. Miller WL, Crabtree BF. The dance of interpretation. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL,
30
31 editors. Doing Qualitative Research. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications;
32
33 1999. p. 127-43.
34
35
36
37 27. Pamphilon B. The Zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life
38
39 histories. Qualitative Inquiry. 1999;5(3):393-410.
40
41
42
43 28. Eakin JM, Mykhalovsky E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health
44
45 research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. Journal of
46
47 Evaluation of Clinical Practice. 2003;9(2):187-94.
48
49
50
51 29. Frankel RM. Standards of qualitative research. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL,
52
53 editors. Doing Qualitative Research. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications;
54
55 1999. p. 333-46.
56
57
58
59
60

- 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
30. Wong JP-H, Poon MK-L. Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*. 2010;21(2):151-8.
31. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, Bradley EH, Fernandez A. Getting by: Underuse of interpreters by resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
32. Butler-Kisber L. *Qualitative Inquiry*. London: Sage; 2010.
33. Taveras EM, Flores G. Why culture and language matter: The clinical consequences of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to children in the emergency department. *Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine*. 2004;5(2):76-84.
34. Lee SM. A review of language and other communication barriers in health care. In: US Department of Health and Human Services, Portland2003.

BMJ Open

To 'Get By' or 'Get Help'? Physician Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2013-004613.R1 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 07-Apr-2014 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Parsons, Janet; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute; University of Toronto, Dept. of Physical Therapy Baker, Natalie; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute Smith-Gorvie, Telisha; University Health Network, Dept. of Emergency Medicine; University of Toronto, Dept. of Medicine Hudak, Pamela; The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Health services research |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Qualitative research, Communication |
| Keywords: | INTERNAL MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **To ‘Get By’ or ‘Get Help’? A Qualitative Study of Physicians’ Challenges and**
4 **Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency**
5

6 Janet A Parsons ^{1,2}, Natalie A Baker ¹, Telisha Smith-Gorvie ^{3,4}, Pamela L Hudak ⁵
7
8

9
10 ¹ *Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s*
11 *Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 1W8*
12

13 ² *Department of Physical Therapy and Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences,*
14 *University of Toronto, 160 -500 University Ave., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 1V7*
15

16 ³ *Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, University Health Network*
17 *(Toronto General Hospital), RFE GS-480 Emergency Department, 200 Elizabeth St.,*
18 *Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2C4*
19
20

21 ⁴ *Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Suite RFE 3-805, 200 Elizabeth St.,*
22 *Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2C4*
23
24

25 ⁵ *The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, 700 King St. W (Suite 713), Toronto,*
26 *Ontario, Canada, M5V 2Y6*
27
28

29
30 **Corresponding author:** Dr. Janet A. Parsons, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka
31 Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON, Canada
32 M5B 1W8; e-mail: parsonsj@smh.ca; Tel: +1-416-864-6060 ext. 7111; fax: +1-416-864-
33 3016.
34
35

36
37 **Key words:** language discordance, physician practice, Limited English Proficiency,
38 qualitative methods
39
40

41
42 **Word count:** 4,420
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

ABSTRACT

Objective: Encounters between patients and physicians who do not speak the same language are relatively common in Canada, particularly in urban settings; this trend is increasing worldwide. Language discordance has important effects on health outcomes, including mortality. This study sought to explore physicians' experiences of care provision in situations of language discordance in depth.

Design: Qualitative study based on individual interviews. Interview guides elicited physicians' perspectives on how they determined whether communication could proceed unaided. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted, entailing inductive thematic analysis.

Participants: 22 physicians experienced in treating patients in situations of language discordance were recruited from the emergency and internal medicine departments of an urban tertiary-care hospital.

Setting: Large, inner-city teaching hospital in Toronto, Canada, one of the most linguistically diverse cities internationally.

Results: Determining when to 'get by' or 'get help' in order to facilitate communication was described as a fluid and variable process. Deciding which strategy to use depended on three inter-related factors: *time/time constraints*, *acuity of situation*, and *ease of use/availability of translation aids*. Participants reported at times feeling conflicted about their decisions, portraying some of these clinical encounters as a 'troubling space' in

1
2
3 which they experienced one or more *dilemmas* related to *real vs. ideal practice*,
4
5
6 *responsibility*, and *informed consent*.
7
8

9
10 *Conclusions:* In situations of language discordance, a physician's decision to 'get by'
11
12 (versus 'get help') rests on a judgment of whether communication can be considered
13
14 'good enough' to proceed, and depends on the circumstances of the specific encounter.
15
16 The tension set up between what is 'ideal' and what is practically possible can be
17
18 experienced as a dilemma by physicians. The study's findings have implications for
19
20 practice and policy not only in Canada but in other multilingual settings, and indicate that
21
22 physicians require greater support.
23
24

25 26 27 **Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study** 28

- 29 • There are few in-depth studies documenting physicians' experiences of language
30
31 discordance in Canada or elsewhere
32
33
- 34 • Qualitative methodology is well-suited to exploring physicians' experiences of
35
36 communication and care provision
37
38
- 39 • The study deepens our understanding of how physicians decide whether to "get
40
41 by" or "get help" in situations of language discordance, and the dilemmas that
42
43 physicians can experience.
44
- 45 • A limitation is that this was a single-site study with participants from only two
46
47 medical specialties; nevertheless, the concepts generated are transferrable to other
48
49 practice settings
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Clear communication has long been recognized as integral to high-quality medical care. However, physicians frequently encounter situations where effective communication is difficult. One such situation is when physicians and patients do not speak the same language – referred to as language discordance.(1) Increasing globalization, human migration(2) and travel mean that many countries are becoming more and more multi-lingual, and this is especially true of urban centres.(3) Although Canada has two official languages (English and French), it is a nation with many immigrants, representing an array of linguistic traditions. New immigrants may not speak either official language. Major cities are popular settlement areas for new immigrants, thus physicians are extremely likely to encounter patients who do not speak the dominant language. This matters because language barriers can be a source of health disparity, including differential mortality rates.(1) In a Canadian study on tuberculosis, mortality risk was significantly higher (HR = 2.32;95% CI: 1.39-3.88, p<0.001) in situations of language discordance.(1) Language barriers have been shown to: impair patient comprehension(4); act as a barrier to accessing care(5-7); negatively affect treatment adherence(8) (9); and affect satisfaction with care.(10-12) Language barriers are also associated with increased hospital length-of-stay(13), and decreased self-reported health status.(14)

In addition to patients and physicians not sharing a language, social structural features of medical practice can further compound the situation. The fast pace of modern clinical practice has been identified as a challenge to effective communication because decisions

1
2
3 must be made quickly and are often history-dependent. Although there is literature
4
5 documenting outcomes associated with language discordance, there is relatively little
6
7 comprehensive research into physicians' experiences of language discordance generally.
8
9 Moreover, there is a paucity of research eliciting Canadian physicians' perspectives on
10
11 the topic. One survey-based study of Montreal family physicians focused on their
12
13 attitudes towards caring for immigrant patients, with 77% reporting that communication
14
15 was the greatest barrier to patient management.(15) Another recent study surveyed
16
17 physicians from Manitoba, Canada, on factors affecting communication with patients of
18
19 different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, with an emphasis on process errors
20
21 and their relationship not only to language discordance, but a host of other factors, such
22
23 as patient age, gender and trust.(16) Neither of these studies offer in-depth explorations
24
25 of physicians' experiences of caring for patients in situations of language discordance.
26
27 This gap can only be addressed by speaking to physicians directly, using qualitative
28
29 methods. Understanding physicians' experiences is vital, given that language barriers are
30
31 known to translate into negative outcomes for patients (including increased mortality). (1,
32
33 8, 9) Such studies will yield important contextual information about patient care in
34
35 situations of language discordance, identifying opportunities for (and barriers to)
36
37 improvement, and informing practice renewal.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Our study explores physicians' experiences of interacting with patients for whom
52
53 language proficiency (in this case, Limited English Proficiency or LEP)(17, 18) was
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a
4 term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and
5 who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use
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

perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use 'LEP' interchangeably with 'language discordance'. In this paper, we highlight conditions and strategies associated with circumstances in which physicians 'get by' or 'get help' in these encounters.

METHODS

This study focuses on physicians' practice experiences where LEP was perceived to be the main factor hindering effective communication with patients. These accounts encompassed an array of situations, including those in which physician and patient had any of the following: no shared language, some shared language, comprehension issues related to accents, situations where no translation aids were used, or those where different types of translation aids were used. We did not consider situations where communication was influenced by a patient's inability to speak as a result of aphasia or some other cognitive or mechanical issue.

Setting

The study was conducted in Toronto, Canada's most multicultural city, with over 160 languages spoken.(19) English is the dominant language. The study institution, a tertiary-care teaching hospital, serves patients diverse in language and culture, and its physicians are likely to have significant clinical experience with LEP patients. The study was

1
2
3 approved by the institution's Research Ethics Board and written informed consent was
4
5
6 obtained from all participants.
7

8 9 **Sample**

10
11
12 All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
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
All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
Medicine and Emergency Medicine were eligible for inclusion. Participants were invited
to share their experiences 'when challenges to communication secondary to language
discordance are encountered in routine clinical practice'. Twenty-two physicians agreed
to participate, including both men (17) and women (5), with a wide range of years of
clinical experience (Mean: 10.7; Range: 1-28).

28 29 **Data Collection**

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
Semi-structured audiotaped interviews were conducted, lasting one hour on average. The
interview guide was developed by researchers with practice and methodological
expertise, and pilot tested with three participants.(20) Following pilot testing the wording
was modified to improve clarity of some questions, but no substantive changes to
content were required. Questions focused on how physicians determine whether
communication is adequate to proceed unaided. They were asked to recall clinical
encounters where a) they did not share a language with the patient/family member; and b)
they shared a language but not at the same proficiency. Details were probed concerning:
a) conditions under which physicians feel they need to get help; b) strategies employed to
facilitate communication; c) what they say they usually do when working with LEP

1
2
3 patients; and d) how they feel about what they do. A copy of the interview guide appears
4
5 in the appendix. All interviews occurred in summer and fall of 2009.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Data Analysis**

14
15
16 Interviews were transcribed and analysed using an approach of qualitative descriptive
17
18 analysis (as described by Sandelowski), in order to inductively identify, code and
19
20 categorize patterns in the data.(21-25) The senior investigator began by reading the
21
22 interviews closely, identifying key themes and patterns, reviewing the data multiple times
23
24 and developing codes as new topics and relationships were identified.(26, 27) At this
25
26 early stage, an experienced qualitative researcher who was not part of the research team
27
28 also reviewed several transcripts and made independent observations. A preliminary
29
30 coding scheme was developed and applied to all transcripts.(24, 25) Analytic rigour was
31
32 aided by continual re-examination of the data by all authors throughout the research
33
34 process.(28, 29)
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **RESULTS**

42
43
44 A key early insight was that participants' accounts could be viewed as describing the
45
46 conditions under which physicians 'get by' in a clinical encounter even when language
47
48 proficiency is not shared, in contrast to when they decide that they must 'get help' to
49
50 proceed further. *Getting by* means proceeding with the interaction without seeking
51
52 assistance. *Getting help* entails pausing the interaction to seek translation/interpretation
53
54 services or tools. Deciding which strategy to employ was depicted as context-driven, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 primarily dependent on three factors: time constraints, patient acuity, and
4
5 ease/availability of translation assistance/aids. Decision-making was sometimes portrayed
6
7 as ‘troubling’, a process characterized by three overlapping dilemmas, the *gap between*
8
9 *real vs. ideal practice*, the notion of *responsibility*, and the issue of *informed consent*.
10
11

12 Table 1 includes quotes supporting the findings outlined below.
13
14

15 16 **To “get by” or “get help”?** 17 18

19
20 Participants encountered many different languages in their practice settings. Typically, another
21
22 member of the healthcare team informed physicians of a patient’s LEP status (verbally or in
23
24 writing), and whether a translator was available. Participants recounted that they then validated
25
26 the patient’s LEP status independently, using both verbal and non-verbal cues (e.g. gestures,
27
28 facial expressions) to gauge understanding (e.g. purposely asking open-ended questions). Upon
29
30 identifying a language barrier, they then described a process of weighing whether they could ‘get
31
32 by’ or whether they should ‘get help’.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 In some cases, physicians would ‘get by’ with what they can glean from a patient without shared
41
42 language. These situations were described by one physician as the “grey zone” in which a
43
44 patient’s “level of English proficiency is good enough so that maybe you can feel that you can get
45
46 by but their comprehension may in fact be poor enough that they can get into trouble” (90615).
47

48 The tendency in these cases is to “follow the path of least resistance” i.e. getting by with any
49
50 resources readily available.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

Choosing to ‘get by’ without additional assistance can include any of the following strategies: speaking more slowly, enunciating more carefully, using plain language and requesting that the patient paraphrase instructions to gauge understanding. Participants perceived situations of limited/imperfect communication as ‘risky’. They compensated by proceeding with caution – giving patients more time than usual, double checking test results, ordering more tests, or keeping patients longer for observation. As a result, clinical assessments tended to privilege objective findings over subjective reports.

Participants also described situations where they considered it too risky to proceed without confidence in communication quality: e.g. attempting to determine medication side effects, or discussing end-of-life care. ‘Getting help’ ranged from using professional translators/interpreters, to having other staff or family members translate, to using the language line. (18) In our study, the term ‘language line’ is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual handset phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing real-time interpretation as the parties speak. (23) This has been referred to as “UN-style interpretation.”(23) (p.741) . Overall participants indicated that, when time permitted, their preference of use, in descending order, was: professional interpreters (first choice), then the language line, and finally other hospital staff or family members.

Acuity/severity of illness, time constraints and ease/availability of translation aids

Choosing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ hinged on several interlinked factors. The patient’s clinical status and their relative acuity was commonly mentioned as a primary factor for consideration. For example, a physician recounted a situation where a patient presented with signs of stroke. He elected to ‘get by’ due to the urgency of the situation and the potential consequences of delaying definitive care; the patient subsequently recovered. This participant acknowledged that ‘getting by’ entailed proceeding with “imperfect information”, treating “more

1
2
3 of what they could see rather than the symptoms” (90706). Even though the physician considered
4 this less-than-ideal, ‘getting by’ often trumped ‘getting help’ in emergency situations.
5
6
7
8 Conversely, if a case involves for example providing discharge instructions to a stable patient,
9
10 participants said they felt they had ‘time on their side’ to await a translator. The interaction
11
12 between a less-acute situation and available time highlights the inter-relatedness of clinical status
13
14 with a second factor, time. However there was no simple equation for determining whether to ‘get
15
16 by’ or ‘get help’ vis-à-vis clinical status: “it’s a judgment call...it’s more of an art than a science”
17
18 (90901).
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 Time is another factor informing physicians’ decision-making. Participants depicted choosing the
26
27 most pragmatic path of care when faced with time-related constraints. Many physicians described
28
29 the significant time and effort involved in obtaining relevant clinical information from LEP
30
31 patients. They told of “verifying, inferring, checking charts, checking with pharmacist, etc.”
32
33 (90710). Time could be an issue even when a translator is available because this “doubles the
34
35 duration of the interaction so everything takes twice as long” (90728) -- which is suboptimal in
36
37 emergencies. Physicians also spoke of time pressures to manage their busy caseloads when
38
39 weighing what to do: allocating additional time to LEP patients may limit the time they have
40
41 available for others in need. Some participants spoke about translator availability (e.g. harder to
42
43 reach during night shifts). One participant described a situation where it took four days for a
44
45 translator to become available. Such delays influence not only quality of care, but also hold cost
46
47 implications if hospital length-of-stay is affected.
48
49
50

51
52 A third factor influencing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ was the ease of use/availability of
53
54 translation aids/interpreters. Some physicians admitted resistance to using technology-based
55
56 interpretation. Though telephone-based language lines are designed to improve patient-physician
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communication, in practice, our participants reported that they can be awkward. Participants drew
4 on a variety of experiences with language lines in different settings, indicating that all language
5 lines are not created equal. For example, single handsets were seen as less preferable than the two
6 handset option, although even with two handsets, it could be awkward if two people speak at the
7 same time. Speaker phone was another option used.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 19 **A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced**

20
21
22 Participants expressed feeling conflicted at times over decisions to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’.
23 While they recognized that ‘getting by’ was often less-than-ideal, it was sometimes
24 perceived as all that they could do. Such decision-making could be a source of anxiety.
25
26
27
28

29 A participant noted that some patients have “just enough proficiency for it to be
30 dangerous” (90615). The language of ‘danger’ is significant, suggesting an unsettling and
31 troubling experience for participants. A series of overlapping dilemmas constitute this
32 troubling space, namely: *the gap between real vs. ideal practice*, notions of
33 *responsibility*, and issues of *informed consent*.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 42 *The dilemma of ‘real world’ vs. ‘ideal world’ practice*

43
44
45 Physicians told of taking shortcuts and making judgment calls that, in some instances, could be
46 considered acceptable practice. One participant said, “the time that you save by taking shortcuts
47 is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing”
48 (90728). For example, participants recognized that using other staff members in the immediate
49 vicinity who spoke the same language was not ideal, yet they would often opt for this approach as
50 most efficient. In a similar vein, most participants indicated that using family members was not a
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preferred option; however one commented on what they saw as potential benefits to using family
4 members – that, unlike professional interpreters, families were able to provide additional
5 contextual information as well as the relative’s perspective on the patient condition during
6 interpretation (90702). Despite these pragmatic considerations, most participants acknowledged
7 that there is an optimal or “best” way of providing care in these situations, namely the use of
8 professional interpreters or translation aids.
9

10
11
12 There was a tension in many accounts between what they *should do* (based on recognized best
13 practices in an ideal world) and what they ultimately *can do* at the bedside. They appear to use a
14 sliding scale for decision-making, which is context-dependent, and allows them to gauge when
15 ‘getting by’ can be justified.
16
17

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 *The dilemma of responsibility*

28
29
30 Participants expressed discomfort concerning who is ultimately *responsible* for ensuring adequate
31 communication. While they recognized that they have an ethical obligation to ensure
32 understanding, at the same time, some physicians appeared to put at least some of the onus on
33 patients. In some situations, participants said they left the decision of whether communication
34 was ‘good enough’ to the patient. They portrayed communication as a shared responsibility
35 between physician and patient. However they also depicted themselves as making their decisions
36 about whether to get help as something they did on their own – they spoke at length about the
37 information *they* deemed important, but said relatively little about what information *patients*
38 might see as important.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 52 *The dilemma of informed consent*

53
54
55 Another dilemma characterized by participants surrounded *informed consent*. In LEP situations,
56 physicians may have to rely on professional translators or family members to secure consent.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Family members as translators were of particular concern to participants. Professional translators
4
5 were perceived to be impartial and accurate when relaying information. Physicians expressed
6
7 concern that family translators may change what is imparted due to personal biases or
8
9 misinterpretations. Participants described a number of these situations, such as when patients and
10
11 families appeared to differ in their wishes.
12

13
14
15 Participants acknowledged the issue of best practices with LEP patients as an important priority
16
17 for physicians. A few participants took this sentiment a step further, warning that: “We could
18
19 even argue from an ethical or legal standpoint of course that we’re obligated to ensure that there’s
20
21 appropriate communication” (090615). ‘Patient-centred care’ is espoused by both hospitals and
22
23 clinicians, and it is expected that treatment decisions will be made jointly between patient and
24
25 provider. A principle of informed consent is that physicians provide the information patients need
26
27 in order to make informed decisions. But gauging whether LEP patients have *really* understood
28
29 information provided can be challenging.
30
31

32 33 34 **DISCUSSION**

35
36
37 This study examined experiences of physicians working with LEP patients. Participants described
38
39 two strategies for dealing with such situations: ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help.’ The
40
41 physicians in our study depicted their decisions to ‘get by’ as based on a judgment
42
43 regarding whether communication was ‘good enough’ to proceed unaided, and depended
44
45 on the specific circumstances.. Participants characterized clinical encounters with LEP
46
47 patients as a sometimes ‘troubling’ social space, presenting professional dilemmas. There was a
48
49 tension between recognizing what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices) and what
50
51 they *can do* at the bedside (based on constraints of time and resources).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our findings have important practice implications. For example, participants noted that in
4 situations where they elect to 'get by', they conduct more tests on LEP patients, to mitigate risk.
5
6 There were no hard-and-fast rules for managing such risk; physicians told of making decisions in-
7 the-moment, gauging the acuity/complexity of each patient's condition, circumstances,
8
9 availability of translation aids/interpreters, and their own caseload/obligations to other patients.
10
11 The threshold at which a physician shifts from getting by to getting help is variable, fluid and
12 dependent upon the individual and context. The suggestion that adequate communication is a
13 shared responsibility presumes a team-based approach between physician and patient. However,
14 team-based care usually implies open lines of communication, which is not the case in LEP. This
15 may contribute to the sense of discomfort expressed by participants.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Discomfort may also stem partly from an underlying assumption that translation should be 'value
31 neutral' and as 'objective' as laboratory testing. Translation during a clinical encounter is a social
32 act, and as such is both complex and contingent. Wong and Poon (2010) argue for translation
33 being viewed "not (as) a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of
34 another",⁽³⁰⁾(p.152) but rather one imbued with meaning and interpretation on each side. Social
35 context and power relations cannot be ignored.⁽³⁰⁾ Rather than treating challenges presented by
36 LEP as an inconvenience, they should be given priority and clinicians offered greater support.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 It should be noted that data collection for this study took place in 2009, when fewer supports were
51 available. At that time, little orientation to interpretation services was offered to medical residents
52 at the study facility, but now instruction regarding available interpretation services is being
53 offered routinely. Training in language barriers and cultural competence is now gaining attention
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 amongst medical educators. Telephone interpretation services continue to evolve and become
4 more user-friendly; however other supports are still needed to make it easier for physicians to ‘get
5 help’ when they need it. Busy caseloads and time constraints on clinical practice continue to be
6 an issue for most clinicians. For example, it can take some time for an interpreter to be found for
7 telephone interpretation (depending on the specific language required), which again takes time
8 away from caring for other patients. The use of a language line presumes that there is always a
9 telephone readily accessible at the bedside (e.g. handset-based language line), which is not always
10 the case, even in hospital settings. When using in-person interpreters, aligning the schedules of
11 physician, professional interpreter, and patient is frequently complex, with some physicians
12 commenting that it can range from several hours to days before these sessions occur. This is
13 confirmed by the findings from other researchers working with both physicians and other health
14 care practitioners. (31, 32) As a result, it is not surprising that in some circumstances, physicians
15 opt for the ‘path of least resistance’ (which may include using another health care professional or
16 a family member to interpret).

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 The implications for patients should not be underestimated. Rivadeneyra et al (2000) indicate that
36 situations of LEP negatively affect the provision of patient-centred primary care(4): even with
37 the aid of interpreters, US physicians were less likely to probe further into symptoms of non-
38 English-speaking patients.(4) Clinical consequences of LEP can range from problems accessing
39 care and treatment non-adherence, to higher mortality rates.(1, 8, 9). Opportunities for gaining
40 crucial insights may be missed (e.g. understanding additional variables underlying presenting
41 illness)(9) as may opportunities for developing rapport and trust, when physicians opt to ‘get
42 by.’(33) . Moreover, it has potential medico-legal consequences: how far should a physician go to
43 ensure ‘adequate’ communication has been achieved in order to mitigate the potential of risk and
44 harm? Participants are warranted in their characterizations of language discordant situations as
45 troubling spaces.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Our study builds on prior work conducted by Diamond and colleagues (2009). They also used
8 the phrase “getting by” to describe their study’s findings of medical residents’ experiences of
9 caring for patients in two US cities. (31) Similar to our study, Diamond and colleagues found
10 that factors such as time constraints and convenience were cited as influencing participants’
11 decisions to ‘get by’. While our study confirms some of Diamond’s findings and in another
12 country/setting (with a very different health care system, and among other specialists), it also
13 goes considerably further. Our study examined physicians’ experiences with a variety of
14 translation options (not just the use of professional in-person interpreters), and explored a range
15 of perspectives that included those of experienced staff physicians as well as less experienced
16 medical residents. This indicates that the phenomenon of ‘getting by’ is experienced by clinician
17 trainees who are early in their professional lives, but also, more surprisingly, by seasoned senior
18 staff. The habits developed during residencies evidently persist over time, and although these
19 habits are characterized as unsettling they appear to be the status quo. This suggests that the issue
20 of LEP should be more firmly embedded not only in medical school curricula, but in continuing
21 education programs as well. Our study goes further and offers an in-depth exploration of the
22 dilemmas experienced that, according to participants, result from not being able to put the ‘ideal’
23 into practice. Diamond’s participants were frequently unaware of standards of practice for
24 interpretation in their settings, (31) while participants in our study were acutely aware of what
25 they *should* do, but frequently found this difficult to put into practice. Diamond’s team did not
26 appear to probe participants explicitly about what might be lost when a lot of clinical information
27 is missing, while our participants seemed acutely aware of what might be missing and described
28 how they tried to off-set this by relying more heavily on diagnostic testing. Finally, our study
29 explored the decision-making process of ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help’ in richer detail,
30 deepening our understanding of physicians’ experiences.
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

1
2
3 While our study did not include the experiences of bilingual physicians, Maul and colleagues
4 (2012) and Regenstein et al (2013) have looked at physicians' willingness to 'get by' in situations
5 where physicians and patients may share a language, but where physicians are less than fully
6 fluent. (33, 34) Their findings indicate that even in these situations, physicians' non-English-
7 language skills are highly heterogeneous, and that there is considerable risk of
8 miscommunication. (34) Physician-patient communication is complex (and often less-than-ideal)
9 even when both parties share the same language. Our study illuminates how the addition of
10 language barriers into the communicative space adds further layers of complexity.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 There is a growing body of evidence indicating that employing the services of professional
23 interpreters has important positive implications not only for clinical outcomes, but more effective
24 health care utilization (e.g. improved preventive screening rates, reduced risk of hospitalizations).
25 (35, 36) There is less compelling evidence that the use of professional in-person interpreters has
26 negative impacts on duration of individual visits. (36) The participants in our study spoke at
27 length about time constraints, but this was often related to tracking down interpretation services
28 and scheduling difficulties, rather than the length of the clinical encounter itself. It is possible
29 that telephone interpretation may be able to off-set the difficulties of scheduling in-person
30 interpretation. Recent technological improvements in telephone interpretation/language lines and
31 a greater number of options available since the time of the study suggest that these may be the
32 most important solutions to invest in. Participants in our study indicated that physicians are most
33 likely to follow the 'path of least resistance' for securing interpretation services, therefore
34 implementation and testing of innovative, user-friendly telephone interpretation services should
35 be a focus for future research.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Our study has limitations. As a single-centre study, its sample size might be considered small by
54 quantitative standards. However qualitative studies are meant to generalize the *concepts*
55 generated, not to the population of physicians as a whole.(21, 37) As such the concepts of 'getting
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by' and 'getting help' are transferable to a wide range of practice settings. It might also be
4
5 argued that the experiences of the physician participants presented here were shaped by a site-
6
7 specific lack and/or inefficiency of resources. On the contrary, the study institution (a tertiary care
8
9 teaching hospital located in Canada's most diverse city) has systematically funded both in-person
10
11 and telephone-based translation services and has appropriate policies and procedures in place
12
13 related to interpretation that have continued to evolve over the past decade. If physicians found it
14
15 challenging to care for LEP patients in this setting, it is likely that those with access to fewer
16
17 resources struggle even more.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 Our study does not address cultural differences. Language and culture are inextricably linked and
26
27 can result in differential access to care. (4, 38) Physician-patient miscommunication can also
28
29 result from different cultural norms and understandings.(39) This should be a focus for future
30
31 research. Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of technological advances, wireless, telephone-based
32
33 translation services have become more available in medical facilities. It is conceivable that
34
35 previous obstacles to accessing timely professional translation services outlined here may be less
36
37 of an issue currently. Data collection took place in 2009 and the telephone translation option has
38
39 continued to evolve in the intervening period.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 This study begins to illuminate the difficult terrain of caring for LEP patients. In doing so, it
48
49 opens up an opportunity to break the silence that exists amongst clinicians on this issue, and
50
51 invites them to explore it. These doctors recognized that the shortcuts they are sometimes forced
52
53 to take are less than ideal, but they also outlined the real-world constraints that make these
54
55 shortcuts necessary in their current practice environment. And those environments are not
56
57
58
59
60

conducive to doctors reflecting upon the issue or even discussing it with their colleagues. We see our research as a catalyst for beginning this conversation. The dilemmas described here are likely encountered regularly by physicians practicing in large cities, in many jurisdictions, not just in Canada. Although time constraints, patient acuity and ease/availability of translation aids all play a role in physicians' decisions to 'get by' or 'get help', provision of more (and more user-friendly) language lines only partially addresses the issue. Improved support for physicians navigating this complex social space should be prioritized.

Contributors: JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and analysis of the data, as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript. NAB contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and participated in all phases of writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception and design of the study, assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in drafting the manuscript. PLH was the principal investigator and took primary responsibility for the study's conception and design, as well as the data analysis and interpretation, and contributed importantly to the drafting of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Table 1: Supportive Quotes for Key Findings

| 'Getting By' versus 'Getting Help' | |
|---|--|
| 'Getting by' | <i>"If the patient speaks some English and I speak some French and a little bit of Spanish, If the answers seem appropriate to me and the patient doesn't demonstrate obvious concern about the interaction and it's relatively simple and not high-risk, then I would accept that communication is adequate."</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>(90703)</p> <p><i>"I rely more heavily on my physical exam if I can't communicate with them, like I'd be more cautious with testing if I can't ask a specific question and be reassured" (90708).</i></p> |
| 'Getting help' | <p><i>"But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke, [it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication" (90901)</i></p> <p><i>" (I'll) look for an interpreter or some staff that can come over and help. You know somebody who speaks that language if they are stable you know and don't look like I need to do anything overly quickly for them and I really can't get a story out of them, then I'll ... get an interpreter first" (90708)</i></p> <p><i>"So that's the problem you run into. You either try to strive to get a really good history through formal interpretation or you end up doing more testing of that person because you're worried about them more." (90614)</i></p> |
| Acuity, time constraints and availability of translation aids | |
| Acuity of clinical situation | <p><i>"It all depends on the clinical situation...I could almost treat a patient who cut their finger without talking to them at all... I'd want to make sure that their tetanus status was up to date, like there's a couple of things that you'd want to sort out, but by and large you could pretty much treat them without talking to them. But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke,[it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication. " (90901)</i></p> <p><i>"So if a patient was sick, for example, had low pressure and a fast heart rate and still spoke no English, I would go in anyway and then just do what I consider to be paediatric medicine. Kids can't talk to you. You know they're two years old and they're crying and they're in pain- I can't get a history from a child the same way I can't get a history from someone who doesn't speak English. " (91118)</i></p> |
| Time constraints | <p><i>"When we have a whole bunch of patients and we've got a busy schedule and we're already twenty minutes behind and so forth, you know we're looking for ways to be as efficient as possible. And if it looks like this patient can give us a few nods appropriately and say a few words that ... they should probably understand. We may be willing to just say okay well we've done our part." (90616)</i></p> <p><i>"We sometimes take shortcuts and sometimes that's acceptable because the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing" (90728)</i></p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Ease of use and availability of translation aids/interpreters</p> | <p><i>"...if two people speak at the same time it can block out the sound and so it can become awkward but I would say that the two handset option is the best option followed by the speaker phone, followed lastly by the one handset option which is really, uh, it's enough to dissuade people from actually going to the language line. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"there's a tremendous amount of resistance to going to the one handset: you'd almost rather this person just spoke a few words of English. You might just be inclined to do your best try and see that they understand what 's actually taking place" (90728)</i></p> <p><i>"If you're gonna continue this encounter without getting a translator, so if I'm sharp enough to know what this person's language is and it doesn't take long, then I may do a quick search locally, literally around me physically... in a clinic, on a ward, in the Emergency Department to see if someone who works in that department can speak that language and offer translation and there's a fair chance in Toronto you'll get a person who can speak that language fairly (easily). And then that's the better route." (90710)</i></p> |
| <p align="center">A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced in practice</p> | |
| <p>The 'grey zone'</p> | <p><i>"Well I leave that to the patient to decide whether we need some kind of facilitator or an interpreter. You know I usually don't make the decision to say "how well you are comprehending what I'm saying and how well are you able to communicate to me?" So I usually ask them "would you like to have an interpreter present?" And then they may say ' yes' or 'no'. The challenge is that in the real world we don't, we don't always end up having an interpreter readily available. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"... so I sort of assess whether I need, whether I actually have time to wait for the interpreter and then I'd call and ask for an interpreter. I do use family members which is a bit of a grey zone because if there's a se...sensitive information you're no, so you're supposed to have an objective interpreter there, so I will sometimes use family members..." (90828)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of 'real world' vs. ideal world' practice</p> | <p><i>"And they [patient] go 'um thank you'. And that's it, right. And so you kind of, you know clearly it's a suboptimal communication. There are a lot of things that you would really need to discuss to have this patient-centered care ideal. But you know the time that would be required to do that would be quite extensive and so we often take shortcuts that result in non-patient-centered care... It happens all the time frankly and I think well you know, we're probably less likely to do it in a situation where we really feel that it's critical." (90728)</i></p> <p><i>"To be quite honest with you the ones I personally find the most helpful are family members. Because ... they can give you a little bit of the context, and</i></p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <i>then you can talk to them as well particularly if it's an elderly patient because not only do they translate for you but then they'll also say, "You know what? Grandma hasn't been doing very well for a few months now. She hasn't been preparing her meals properly, she's been losing weight ... I'm concerned about grandma." That's far more valuable to me in some respects than a translator who's just sticking to the letter of the law, and is saying exactly what they're supposed to, without kind of any context. It's just language right? I like the bigger picture" (90702)</i> |
| Dilemma of responsibility | <i>" We've explained what's going on and they've nodded and kind of looked at me as though they're understanding - so now it's their responsibility, it's not mine any longer. I'm not suggesting that's the way that, you know I practice, but that's what can frequently happen in this grey zone. It's just enough English proficiency to be dangerous." (90615)</i> <i>"They (patients/families with LEP) don't recognize that this is a ha-, a potential hazard...I think some of the responsibility lies with the patient." (90706)</i> <i>" I don't think that's a responsibility that patient's necessarily carrying... That's not something I would expect of my families ... that's not a fair expectation I think." (90708)</i> |
| Dilemma of informed consent | <i>"I can't get informed consent when I can't communicate" (90930)</i> <i>" There have been circumstances in the past where we have been concerned as a group that families weren't accurately expressing our wishes to the patient or our statements to the patient and vice versa. And so there have been circumstances you know particularly in some of these [high] stakes circumstances where we will use professional translators regardless of the presence of the family to translate for just this reason." (90707)</i> |
| Making language discordance a priority | <i>" You know, we really have to get over the language barrier business because it's not going away—it's been here for a while and I don't think we've done a particularly good job until very recently—we're starting to address it—we should be very aggressive about prioritizing this subject " (90710)</i> |

Acknowledgments: We wish to thank Caryl M. Patrick for her assistance with data collection.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

1
2
3 **Competing interest statement:** The authors have no competing interests to declare.
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 **References**

- 11 1. Gardam M, Verma G, Campbell A, et al. Impact of the patient-provider
12 relationship on the survival of foreign-born outpatients with tuberculosis. *Journal of*
13 *Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2009;11:437-45.
14
15
- 16 2. Burnett A. Globalization, migration and health. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*.
17 2002. p. 34-43.
18
19
- 20 3. Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, et al. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of
21 primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Med*
22 *Educ*. 2005;39(5):465-75.
23
24
- 25 4. Rivadeneyra R, Elderkin-Thompson V, Cohen Silver R, et al. Patient-
26 centeredness in clinical encounters requiring an interpreter. *American Journal of*
27 *Medicine*. 2000;108:470-4.
28
29
- 30 5. Piette JD, Schillinger D, Potter MB, et al. Dimensions of patient-provider
31 communication and diabetes self-care in an ethnically diverse population. *J Gen Intern*
32 *Med*. 2003;18(8):624-33.
33
34
- 35 6. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, et al. Closing the loop: physician
36 communication with diabetic patients who have low healthliteracy. *Arch Intern Med*.
37 2003;163:83-90.
38
39
- 40 7. Bonds DE, Camacho F, Bell RA, et al. The association of patient trust and self-
41 care among patients with diabetes mellitus. *BMC Family Practice*. 2004;5(26).
42
43
- 44 8. Schenker Y, Lo B, Ettinger KM, et al. Navigating language barriers under
45 difficult circumstances. . *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2008;149(4):264-9.
46
47
- 48 9. Morales LS, Cunningham WE, Brown JA, et al. Are Latinos Less Satisfied with
49 Communication by Health Care Providers? *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
50 1999;14(7):409-17.
51
52
- 53 10. Baker DW, Hayes R, Fortier JP. Interpreter use and satisfaction with interpersonal
54 aspects of care for Spanish-speaking patients. . *Med Care*. 1998;36:1461-70.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 11. Carasquillo O, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, et al. Impact of Language Barriers on
4 Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
5 1999.;14:82-7.
6
- 7
8 12. Wilson E, Chen A, Grumbach K, et al. Effects of limited English proficiency
9 and physician language on health care comprehension. *Journal of General Internal
10 Medicine*. 2005;20(9):800-6.
11
- 12
13 13. John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, et al. The effect of English-language
14 proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality. *Journal of General Internal
15 Medicine*. 2004;19:221-8.
16
- 17
18 14. Perez-Stable EJ, Napoles-Springer A, Miramontes JM. The effects of ethnicity
19 and language on medical outcomes of patients with hypertension or diabetes. *Medical
20 Care*. 1997;35(12):1212-9.
21
- 22
23 15. Papić O, Malak Z, Rosenberg E. Survey of family physicians' perspectives on
24 management of immigrant patients: Attitudes, barriers, strategies, and training needs.
25 *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2012;86:205-9.
26
- 27
28 16. Lovell BL, Lee RT, Brotheridge CM. Interpersonal factors affecting
29 communication in clinical consultations: Canadian physicians' perspectives. *International
30 Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. 2012;25(6):467-82.
31
- 32
33 17. Ku L, Flores G. Pay now or pay later: Providing interpreter services in health
34 care. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(2):435-44.
35
- 36
37 18. Masland MC, Lou C, Snowden L. Use of communication technologies to cost-
38 effectively increase the availability of interpretation services in healthcare settings.
39 *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2010;16(6):739-45.
40
- 41
42 19. City of Toronto. Backgrounder - Census 2011: Language. Statistics Canada.
43 Toronto: City of Toronto; 2012. p. 1-22.
44
- 45
46 20. Morse JM, Richards L. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*.
47 Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2002.
48
- 49
50 21. Kvale S. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*.
51 Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 1996.
52
- 53
54 22. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in
55 Nursing and Health*. 2000;23:334-40.
56
- 57
58 23. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in
59 Nursing and Health*. 2010;33(1):77-84.
60

- 1
2
3 24. Miles MB, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
4 Publications; 1994.
5
6
- 7 25. Crabtree BF, Miller WL. Using codes and code manuals. In: Crabtree BF, Miller
8 WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage
9 Publications; 1999. p. 163-77.
10
- 11 26. Miller WL, Crabtree BF. The dance of interpretation. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL,
12 editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications;
13 1999. p. 127-43.
14
- 15 27. Pamphilon B. The Zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life
16 histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1999;5(3):393-410.
17
18
- 19 28. Eakin JM, Mykhalovsky E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health
20 research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. *Journal of*
21 *Evaluation of Clinical Practice*. 2003;9(2):187-94.
22
23
- 24 29. Frankel RM. Standards of qualitative research. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL,
25 editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications;
26 1999. p. 333-46.
27
28
- 29 30. Wong JP-H, Poon MK-L. Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as
30 an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research. *Journal of*
31 *Transcultural Nursing*. 2010;21(2):151-8.
32
33
- 34 31. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, et al. Getting by: Underuse of interpreters by
35 resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
36
37
- 38 32. Taylor E, Jones F. Lost in translation: Exploring therapists' experiences of
39 providing stroke rehabilitation across a language barrier. *Disability and Rehabilitation*.
40 2014;early online:1-9.
41
42
- 43 33. Maul L, Regenstein M, Andres E, et al. Using a risk assessment approach to
44 determine which factors influence whether partially bilingual physicians rely on their
45 non-English language skills or call an interpreter. *The Joint Commission on Quality and*
46 *Patient Safety*. 2012;38(7):328-36.
47
48
- 49 34. Regenstein M, Andres E, Wynia MK. Appropriate use of non-English language
50 skills in clinical care. *JAMA*. 2013;309(2):145-6.
51
52
- 53 35. Flores G. The impact of medical services on the quality of healthcare: A systematic
54 review. *Medical Care Research and Review*. 2005;62(3):255-99.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 36. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen A, et al. Do professional interpreters improve
4 clinical care for patients with limited English proficiency? A systematic review. Health
5 Services Research. 2007;42(2):727-54.
6
7
8 37. Butler-Kisber L. Qualitative Inquiry. London: Sage; 2010.
9
10 38. Taveras EM, Flores G. Why culture and language matter: The clinical
11 consequences of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to children in
12 the emergency department. Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine. 2004;5(2):76-84.
13
14
15 39. Lee SM. A review of language and other communication barriers in health care.
16 In: US Department of Health and Human Services, editor. Portland: 2003.
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

Appendix: Interview Guide

1. Warm-up Questions

- a. Are you a staff physician or a resident?
- b. How many years have you been in (practice/residency)?
- c. In your opinion, do you feel able to communicate effectively in any languages other than English?
- d. In your clinical experience, which languages, other than English, have you most commonly encountered in your practice?

2. This might sound like a question that has an obvious answer, but I wonder if you could tell me how you usually come to realize that there could be differences in language between you and a patient?

Probes:

- How do you figure out whether the communication is 'good enough to proceed'?
- How do you proceed differently than you would if you shared a language?
- How do you determine whether they are understanding what you are saying?
- How do you determine whether you are understanding what they are saying?

3. Scenarios:

A. Can you think back to a recent encounter when communication was difficult or impossible because you and the patient did **not** share a language? Please describe it and how you handled the situation.

Probes:

- What precisely mattered about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- What did you think?
- Are you aware of any strategies you use to try to facilitate the communication?
- Does that work?
- What happened as a result?
- How does that make you feel?
- What are your reflections on this situation now?
- Did you notice the patient doing anything to try to facilitate your interaction?

B. Can you now think back to a recent encounter when communication was difficult because you and the patient **share** a language but *not* at the same level of proficiency?

Probes:

- What was the most pressing issue or concerned you most about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- What did you think?

- Are you aware of any strategies you use to try to facilitate communication?
- Does that work?
- What happened as a result?
- What are your reflections on the situation now?
- Did you notice the patient doing anything to try to facilitate your interaction?

4. I am now going to give you a hypothetical scenario to read to yourself and then I'm going to get your perspective on it: "You are rounding on a busy Friday afternoon when you receive a consultation from the Emergency Department. The consult is a 65 year-old man with possible transient ischemic attacks (TIAs). All of his investigations, including blood work, ECGs and his head CT are unremarkable. He is accompanied by his wife; they both possess limited English skills. They can answer simply yes/no questions, but you find you are unable to complete your history and physical examination to your satisfaction because of the patient's limited English."

Probes:

- Describe how you would feel in this situation?
- What precisely mattered about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- How would you approach this situation?
- What might you do differently in this situation compared to one in which there are no problems with shared language?
- What would you do?
- What would you not do?
- How do you think this might compare with what really happens?

5. In general, do you think patients with whom communication is difficult might be cared for or approached differently? If so, how?

6. This next question is about "patient-centered care" which is considered an ideal for best practices in medicine. It is defined as health care that establishes a **partnership** among practitioner, patient and family (where appropriate) to do 2 things. First, to ensure that decisions respect patients' wants, needs and preferences, and second, to solicit patients' input on the education and support they need to participate in their care.

Probes:

- Do you think the ability to be patient-centered is influenced by language proficiency? If so, how?
- Do you think patient-centered care is realistic when language is an issue?

7. Let's turn to the issue of translation aids.

- Which aids, if any, have you used in practice?
- Which do you find most helpful?
- Which do you find least helpful?
- What are some advantages and/or disadvantages of each?

1
2
3
4
5 Probes:

- 6 • How do you go about getting translation aids?
- 7 • Have you ever used means such as a patient's family member, or other
- 8 hospital staff to assist you in translation? Why or why not?
- 9 • How does the type of translation aid used affect your confidence in your
- 10 medical interview and decision-making?
- 11

12
13 8. Do you think any party in particular holds the weight of responsibility for

14 ensuring that effective communication is not hindered by language differences?

15
16 9. What are your thoughts on the issue of patient confidentiality in situations

17 when you need to use a family member as a translator (because they are the only or

18 best translation aid available)?

19
20 10. Do you have any final thoughts on the topic of language and effective

21 communication that we have not covered so far?

22
23 11. Do you have any thoughts or suggestions about how situations in which

24 communication is difficult because of language might be handled differently?

To 'Get By' or 'Get Help'? A Qualitative Study of Physicians' Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency

Janet A Parsons ^{1,2}, Natalie A Baker ¹, Telisha Smith-Gorvie ^{3,4}, Pamela L Hudak ⁵

¹ *Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 1W8*

² *Department of Physical Therapy and Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Toronto, 160 -500 University Ave., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 1V7*

³ *Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, University Health Network (Toronto General Hospital), RFE GS-480 Emergency Department, 200 Elizabeth St., Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2C4*

⁴ *Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Suite RFE 3-805, 200 Elizabeth St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2C4*

⁵ *The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, 700 King St. W (Suite 713), Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5V 2Y6*

Corresponding author: Dr. Janet A. Parsons, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON, Canada M5B 1W8; e-mail: parsonsj@smh.ca; Tel: +1-416-864-6060 ext. 7111; fax: +1-416-864-3016.

Key words: language discordance, physician practice, Limited English Proficiency, qualitative methods

Word count: ~~4,420~~^{3,523}

ABSTRACT

Objective: Encounters between patients and physicians who do not speak the same language are relatively common in Canada, particularly in urban settings; this trend is increasing worldwide. Language discordance has important effects on health outcomes, including mortality. This study sought to explore physicians' experiences of care provision in situations of language discordance in depth.

Design: Qualitative study based on ~~in-depth~~ individual interviews. Interview guides elicited physicians' perspectives on how they determined whether communication could proceed unaided. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted, entailing inductive thematic analysis.

Participants: 22 physicians experienced in treating patients in situations of language discordance were recruited from the emergency and internal medicine departments of an urban tertiary-care hospital.

Setting: Large, inner-city teaching hospital in Toronto, Canada, one of the most linguistically diverse cities internationally.

Results: Determining when to 'get by' or 'get help' in order to facilitate communication was described as a fluid and variable process. Deciding which strategy to use depended on three inter-related factors: *time/time constraints*, *acuity of situation*, and *ease of use/availability of translation aids*. Participants reported at times feeling conflicted about their decisions, portraying some of these clinical encounters as a 'troubling space' in

1
2
3 which they experienced one or more *dilemmas* related to *real vs. ideal practice*,
4
5 *responsibility*, and *informed consent*.
6
7

8
9 *Conclusions:* In situations of language discordance, a physician's decision to 'get by'
10
11 (versus 'get help') rests on a judgment of whether communication can be considered

12
13
14 'good enough' to proceed, and depends on the circumstances of the specific encounter.

15
16 ~~We propose that this represents a pragmatic response in less than ideal circumstances,~~

17
18 ~~rather than a 'failure'. However, T~~the tension set up between what is 'ideal' and what is

19
20
21 practically possible can be experienced as a dilemma by physicians. The study's findings

22
23
24 have important implications for practice and policy not only in Canada but in other

25
26 multilingual settings, and indicate that physicians require greater support.
27
28

29 30 **Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 31
- 32 • There are few in-depth studies documenting physicians' experiences of language
33 discordance in Canada or elsewhere
 - 34 • Qualitative methodology is well-suited to exploring physicians' experiences of
35 communication and care provision
 - 36 • The study deepens our understanding of how physicians decide whether to "get
37 by" or "get help" in situations of language discordance, and the dilemmas that
38
39 physicians can experience. ~~experienced by physicians~~
 - 40 • A limitation is that this was a single-site study with participants from only two
41
42 medical specialties; nevertheless, the concepts generated are transferrable to other
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 practice settings

INTRODUCTION

Clear communication has long been recognized as integral to high-quality medical care. However, physicians frequently encounter situations where effective communication is difficult. One such situation is when physicians and patients do not speak the same language – referred to as language discordance.(1) Increasing globalization, human migration(2) and travel mean that many countries are becoming more and more multi-lingual, and this is especially true of urban centres.(3) Although Canada has two official languages (English and French), it is ~~by definition~~ a nation with many of immigrants, representing an array of many linguistic traditions. New immigrants may not speak either official language. Major cities are popular settlement areas for new immigrants, thus physicians are extremely likely to encounter patients who do not speak the dominant language. This matters because ~~language~~ barriers can be a source of health disparity, including differential mortality rates.(1) In a Canadian study on tuberculosis, mortality risk was significantly higher (HR = 2.32;95% CI:1.39-3.88, p<0.001) in situations of language discordance.(1) Language barriers have ~~also~~ been shown to: impair patient comprehension(4); act as a barrier to accessing care(5-7); negatively affect treatment adherence(8) (9); and affect satisfaction with care.(10-12) Language barriers are also associated with increased hospital length-of-stay(13), and decreased self-reported health status.(14)

In addition to patients and physicians not sharing a language, social structural features of medical practice can further compound the situation. The fast pace of modern clinical

1
2
3 practice has been identified as a challenge to effective communication because decisions
4
5 must be made quickly and are often history-dependent. Although there is literature
6
7 documenting outcomes associated with language discordance, there is relatively little
8
9 comprehensive research into physicians' experiences of language discordance generally.
10
11 Moreover, there is a paucity of research eliciting Canadian physicians' perspectives on
12
13 the topic. One survey-based study of Montreal family physicians focused on their
14
15 attitudes towards caring for immigrant patients, with 77% reporting that communication
16
17 was the greatest barrier to patient management.(15) Another recent study surveyed
18
19 physicians from Manitoba, Canada, on factors affecting communication with patients of
20
21 different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, with an emphasis on process errors
22
23 and their relationship not only to language discordance, but a host of other factors, such
24
25 as patient age, gender and trust.(16) Neither of these studies offer in-depth explorations
26
27 of physicians' experiences of caring for patients in situations of language discordance.
28
29 This gap can only be addressed by speaking to physicians directly, using qualitative
30
31 methods. Understanding physicians' experiences is vital, given that language barriers are
32
33 known to translate into negative outcomes for patients (including increased mortality). (1,
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 8, 9) Such studies will yield important contextual information about patient care in
42
43 situations of language discordance, identifying opportunities for (and barriers to)
44
45 improvement, and informing practice renewal.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Our study explores physicians' experiences of interacting with patients for whom
54
55 language proficiency (in this case, Limited English Proficiency or LEP)(17, 18) was
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a
8
9 term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and
10
11 who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use
12
13 ‘LEP’ interchangeably with ‘language discordance’. In this paper, we highlight
14
15 conditions and strategies associated with circumstances in which physicians ‘get by’ or
16
17 ‘get help’ in these encounters.
18
19

20 21 22 **METHODS**

23
24
25 This study focuses on physicians’ practice experiences where LEP was perceived to be
26
27 the main factor hindering effective communication with patients. These accounts
28
29 encompassed an array of situations, including those in which physician and patient had
30
31 any of the following: no shared language, some shared language, comprehension issues
32
33 related to accents, situations where no translation aids were used, or those where different
34
35 types of translation aids were used. We did not consider situations where communication
36
37 was influenced by a patient’s inability to speak as a result of aphasia or some other
38
39 cognitive or mechanical issue.
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 **Setting**

47
48
49 The study was conducted in Toronto, Canada’s most multicultural city, with over 160
50
51 languages spoken.(19) English is the dominant language. The study institution, a tertiary-
52
53 care teaching hospital, serves patients diverse in language and culture, and its physicians
54
55 are likely to have significant clinical experience with LEP patients. The study was
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approved by the institution's Research Ethics Board and written informed consent was
4
5
6 obtained from all participants.
7

8 9 **Sample**

10
11
12 All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
13
14
15 Medicine and Emergency Medicine were eligible for inclusion. Participants were invited
16
17
18 to share their experiences 'when challenges to communication secondary to language
19
20
21 discordance are encountered in routine clinical practice'. Twenty-two physicians agreed
22
23
24 to participate, including both men (17) and women (5), with a wide range of years of
25
26
27 clinical experience (Mean: 10.7; Range: 1-28).

28 29 **Data Collection**

30
31
32 Semi-structured audiotaped interviews were conducted, lasting one hour on average. The
33
34
35 interview guide was developed by researchers with practice and methodological
36
37
38 expertise, and pilot tested with three participants.(20) Following pilot testing the wording
39
40
41 was modified to improve clarity of some questions, but no substantive changes to
42
43
44 content were required. Questions focused on how physicians determine whether
45
46
47 communication is adequate to proceed unaided. They were asked to recall clinical
48
49
50 encounters where a) they did not share a language with the patient/family member; and b)
51
52
53 they shared a language but not at the same proficiency. Details were probed concerning:
54
55
56 a) conditions under which physicians feel they need to get help; b) strategies employed to
57
58
59 facilitate communication; c) what they say they usually do when working with LEP
60

1
2
3 patients; and d) how they feel about what they do. [A copy of the interview guide appears](#)
4 [in the appendix.](#) All interviews occurred in summer and fall of 2009.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Data Analysis**

13
14
15 Interviews were transcribed and analysed using an approach of qualitative descriptive
16 analysis (as described by Sandelowski), in order to inductively identify, code and
17 categorize patterns in the data.(21-25) The senior investigator began by reading the
18 interviews closely, identifying key themes and patterns, reviewing the data multiple times
19 and developing codes as new topics and relationships were identified.(26, 27) At this
20 early stage, an experienced qualitative researcher who was not part of the research team
21 also reviewed several transcripts and made independent observations. A preliminary
22 coding scheme was developed and applied to all transcripts.(24, 25) Analytic rigour was
23 aided by continual re-examination of the data by all authors throughout the research
24 process.(28, 29)
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **RESULTS**

42
43
44 A key early insight was that participants' accounts could be viewed as describing the
45 conditions under which physicians 'get by' in a clinical encounter even when language
46 proficiency is not shared, in contrast to when they decide that they must 'get help' to
47 proceed further. *Getting by* means proceeding with the interaction without seeking
48 assistance. *Getting help* entails pausing the interaction to seek translation/interpretation
49 services or tools. Deciding which strategy to employ was depicted as context-driven, and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 primarily dependent on three factors: time constraints, patient acuity, and
4
5 ease/availability of translation assistance/aids. Decision-making was sometimes portrayed
6
7 as ‘troubling’, a process characterized by three overlapping dilemmas, the *gap between*
8
9 *real vs. ideal practice*, the notion of *responsibility*, and the issue of *informed consent*.
10
11

12 Table 1 includes quotes supporting the findings outlined below.
13

14 15 16 **To “get by” or “get help”?** 17

18
19 Participants encountered many different languages in their practice settings. Typically, another
20
21 member of the healthcare team informed physicians of a patient’s LEP status (verbally or in
22
23 writing), and whether a translator was available. Participants recounted that they then validated
24
25 the patient’s LEP status independently, using both verbal and non-verbal cues (e.g. gestures,
26
27 facial expressions) to gauge understanding (e.g. purposely asking open-ended questions). Upon
28
29 identifying a language barrier, they then described a process of weighing whether they could ‘get
30
31 by’ or whether they should ‘get help’.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In some cases, physicians would ‘get by’ with what they can glean from a patient without shared
40
41 language. These situations were described by one physician as the “grey zone” in which a
42
43 patient’s “level of English proficiency is good enough so that maybe you can feel that you can get
44
45 by but their comprehension may in fact be poor enough that they can get into trouble” (90615).
46
47

48 The tendency in these cases is to “follow the path of least resistance” i.e. getting by with any
49
50 resources readily available.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Choosing to 'get by' without additional assistance can include any of the following strategies:
4 speaking more slowly, enunciating more carefully, using plain language and requesting that the
5 patient paraphrase instructions to gauge understanding. Participants perceived situations of
6 limited/imperfect communication as 'risky'. They compensated by proceeding with caution –
7 giving patients more time than usual, double checking test results, ordering more tests, or
8 keeping patients longer for observation. As a result, clinical assessments tended to privilege
9 objective findings over subjective reports.
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

Participants also described situations where they considered it too risky to proceed without confidence in communication quality: e.g. attempting to determine medication side effects, or discussing end-of-life care. 'Getting help' ranged from using professional translators/interpreters, to having other staff or family members translate, to using the language line. (18) In our study, the term 'language line' is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual handset phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing real-time interpretation as the parties speak. (23) This has been referred to as "UN-style interpretation."(23) (p.741).ⁱ Overall participants indicated that, when time permitted, their preference of use, in descending order, was: professional interpreters (first choice), then the language line, and finally other hospital staff or family members.

Acuity/severity of illness, time constraints and ease/availability of translation aids

ⁱIn our study, the term 'language line' is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual handset phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing real-time interpretation as the parties speak.²³ This has been referred to as "UN-style interpretation."(p.741)

1
2
3 Choosing whether to 'get by' or 'get help' hinged on several interlinked factors. The patient's
4 clinical status and their relative acuity was commonly mentioned as a primary factor for
5 consideration. For example, a physician recounted a situation where a patient presented with
6 signs of stroke. He elected to 'get by' due to the urgency of the situation and the potential
7 consequences of delaying definitive care; the patient subsequently recovered. This participant
8 acknowledged that 'getting by' entailed proceeding with "imperfect information", treating "more
9 of what they could see rather than the symptoms" (90706). Even though the physician considered
10 this less-than-ideal, 'getting by' often trumped 'getting help' in emergency situations.
11
12 Conversely, if a case involves for example providing discharge instructions to a stable patient,
13 participants said they felt they had 'time on their side' to await a translator. The interaction
14 between a less-acute situation and available time highlights the inter-relatedness of clinical status
15 with a second factor, time. However there was no simple equation for determining whether to 'get
16 by' or 'get help' vis-à-vis clinical status: "it's a judgment call...it's more of an art than a science"
17 (90901).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Time is another factor informing physicians' decision-making. Participants depicted choosing the
39 most pragmatic path of care when faced with time-related constraints. Many physicians described
40 the significant time and effort involved in obtaining relevant clinical information from LEP
41 patients. They told of "verifying, inferring, checking charts, checking with pharmacist, etc."
42 (90710). Time could be an issue even when a translator is available because this "doubles the
43 duration of the interaction so everything takes twice as long" (90728) -- which is suboptimal in
44 emergencies. Physicians also spoke of time pressures to manage their busy caseloads when
45 weighing what to do: allocating additional time to LEP patients may limit the time they have
46 available for others in need. Some participants spoke about translator availability (e.g. harder to
47 reach during night shifts). One participant described a situation where it took four days for a
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 translator to become available. Such delays influence not only quality of care, but also hold cost
4
5 implications if hospital length-of-stay is affected.
6
7

8
9 A third factor influencing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ was the ease of use/availability of
10 translation aids/interpreters. Some physicians admitted resistance to using technology-based
11 interpretation. Though telephone-based language lines are designed to improve patient-physician
12 communication, in practice, our participants reported that they can be awkward. Participants drew
13 on a variety of experiences with language lines in different settings, indicating that all language
14 lines are not created equal. For example, single handsets were seen as less preferable than the two
15 handset option, although even with two handsets, it could be awkward if two people speak at the
16 same time. Speaker phone was another option used.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced**

32
33
34 Participants ~~often~~ expressed feeling conflicted at times over decisions to ‘get by’ or ‘get
35 help’. While they recognized that ‘getting by’ was often less-than-ideal, it was sometimes
36 perceived as all that they could do. ~~They depicted s~~Such decision-making could be a
37 source of anxiety. A participant noted that some patients have “just enough proficiency
38 for it to be dangerous” (90615). The language of ‘danger’ is significant, suggesting an
39 unsettling and troubling experience for participants. A series of overlapping dilemmas
40 constitute this troubling space, namely: *the gap between real vs. ideal practice*, notions of
41 *responsibility*, and issues of *informed consent*.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 *The dilemma of ‘real world’ vs. ‘ideal world’ practice*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Physicians told of taking shortcuts and making judgment calls that, in some instances, could be
4 considered acceptable practice. One participant said, “the time that you save by taking shortcuts
5 is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing”
6 (90728). For example, participants recognized that using other staff members in the immediate
7 vicinity who spoke the same language was not ideal, yet they would often opt for this approach as
8 most efficient. In a similar vein, most participants indicated that using family members was not a
9 preferred option; however one commented on what they saw as potential benefits to using family
10 members – that, unlike professional interpreters, families were able to provide additional
11 contextual information as well as the relative’s perspective on the patient condition during
12 interpretation (90702). Despite these pragmatic considerations, most participants acknowledged
13 that there is an optimal or “best” way of providing care in these situations, namely the use of
14 professional interpreters or translation aids.

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
There was a tension in many accounts between what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices in an ideal world) and what they ultimately *can* do at the bedside. They appear to use a sliding scale for decision-making, which is context-dependent, and allows them to gauge when ‘getting by’ can be justified.

The dilemma of responsibility

Participants expressed discomfort concerning who is ultimately *responsible* for ensuring adequate communication. While they recognized that they have an ethical obligation to ensure understanding, at the same time, some physicians appeared to put at least some of the onus on patients. In some situations, participants said they left the decision of whether communication was ‘good enough’ to the patient. They portrayed communication as a shared responsibility between physician and patient. However they also depicted themselves as making their decisions about whether to get help as something they did on their own – they spoke at length about the

1
2
3 information *they* deemed important, but said relatively little about what information *patients*
4 might see as important.
5
6

7 8 9 *The dilemma of informed consent*

10
11 Another dilemma characterized by participants surrounded *informed consent*. In LEP situations,
12 physicians may have to rely on professional translators or family members to secure consent.
13

14 Family members as translators were of particular concern to participants. Professional translators
15 were perceived to be impartial and accurate when relaying information. Physicians expressed
16 concern that family translators may change what is imparted due to personal biases or
17 misinterpretations. Participants described a number of these situations, such as when patients and
18 families appeared to differ in their wishes.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Participants acknowledged the issue of best practices with LEP patients as an important priority
29 for physicians. A few participants took this sentiment a step further, warning that: “We could
30 even argue from an ethical or legal standpoint of course that we’re obligated to ensure that there’s
31 appropriate communication” (090615). ‘Patient-centred care’ is espoused by both hospitals and
32 clinicians, and it is expected that treatment decisions will be made jointly between patient and
33 provider. A principle of informed consent is that physicians provide the information patients need
34 in order to make informed decisions. But gauging whether LEP patients have *really* understood
35 information provided can be challenging.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 47 **DISCUSSION**

48
49 This study examined experiences of physicians working with LEP patients. Participants described
50 two strategies for dealing with such situations: ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help.’ ~~Based on their~~
51 ~~accounts, we propose that~~ The a-physicians in our study depicted their decisions to ‘get
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 by’ as based on a judgment regarding whether ~~because he/she judges~~ communication

1
2
3 ~~waste be~~ 'good enough' to proceed unaided, and depended on the specific circumstances.
4
5 ~~to proceed represents not a failure or short-coming but rather a realistic response in less-~~
6
7 ~~than ideal circumstances.~~ Participants characterized clinical encounters with LEP patients as a
8
9 sometimes 'troubling' social space, presenting professional dilemmas. There was a tension
10
11 between recognizing what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices) and what they *can*
12
13 *do* at the bedside (based on constraints of time and resources).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 Our findings have important practice implications. For example, participants noted that in
23
24 situations where they elect to 'get by', they conduct more tests on LEP patients, to mitigate risk.
25
26 There were no hard-and-fast rules for managing such risk; physicians told of making decisions in-
27
28 the-moment, gauging the acuity/complexity of each patient's condition, circumstances,
29
30 availability of translation aids/interpreters, and their own caseload/obligations to other patients.
31
32 The threshold at which a physician shifts from getting by to getting help is variable, fluid and
33
34 dependent upon the individual and context. The suggestion that adequate communication is a
35
36 shared responsibility presumes a team-based approach between physician and patient. However,
37
38 team-based care usually implies open lines of communication, which is not the case in LEP. This
39
40 may contribute to the sense of discomfort expressed by participants.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discomfort may also stem partly from an underlying assumption that translation should be 'value neutral' and as 'objective' as laboratory testing. Translation during a clinical encounter is a social act, and as such is both complex and contingent. Wong and Poon (2010) argue for translation being viewed "not (as) a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of another", (30)(p.152) but rather one imbued with meaning and interpretation on each side. Social

1
2
3 context and power relations cannot be ignored.(30) Rather than treating challenges presented by
4
5 LEP as an inconvenience, they should be given priority and clinicians offered greater support.
6
7

8
9
10
11 It should be noted that data collection for this study took place in 2009, when fewer supports were
12 available. At that time, little orientation to interpretation services was offered to medical residents
13 at the study facility, but now instruction regarding available interpretation services is being
14 offered routinely. Training in language barriers and cultural competence is now gaining attention
15 amongst medical educators. Telephone interpretation services continue to evolve and become
16 more user-friendly; however other supports are still needed to make it easier for physicians to ‘get
17 help’ when they need it. Busy caseloads and time constraints on clinical practice continue to be
18 an issue for most clinicians. For example, it can take some time for an interpreter to be found for
19 telephone interpretation (depending on the specific language required), which again takes time
20 away from caring for other patients. The use of a language line presumes that there is always a
21 telephone readily accessible at the bedside (e.g. handset-based language line), which is not always
22 the case, even in hospital settings. When using in-person interpreters, aligning the schedules of
23 physician, professional interpreter, and patient is frequently complex, with some physicians
24 commenting that it can range from several hours to days before these sessions occur. This is
25 confirmed by the findings from other researchers working with both physicians and other health
26 care practitioners.(31, 32) As a result, it is not surprising that in some circumstances, physicians
27 opt for the ‘path of least resistance’ (which may include using another health care professional or
28 a family member to interpret).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The implications for patients should not be underestimated. Rivadeneyra et al (2000) indicate that
53
54 situations of LEP negatively affect the provision of patient-centred primary care(4): even with
55
56 the aid of interpreters, US physicians were less likely to probe further into symptoms of non-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 English-speaking patients.(4) Clinical consequences of LEP can range from problems accessing
4 care and treatment non-adherence, to higher mortality rates.(1, 8, 9). Opportunities for gaining
5 crucial insights may be missed (e.g. understanding additional variables underlying presenting
6 illness)(9) as may opportunities for developing rapport and trust, when physicians opt to ‘get
7 by.’(33) ~~The implications for patient safety and patient outcomes should not be underestimated.~~
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 Moreover, it has potential medico-legal consequences: how far should a physician go to ensure
15 ‘adequate’ communication has been achieved in order to mitigate the potential of risk and harm?
16
17
18 Participants are warranted in their characterizations of language discordant situations as troubling
19 spaces.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Our study builds on prior work conducted by Diamond and colleagues (2009). They also used
29 the phrase “getting by” to describe their study’s findings of medical residents’ experiences of
30 caring for patients in two US cities. (31) Similar to our study, Diamond and colleagues found
31 that factors such as time constraints and convenience were cited as influencing participants’
32 decisions to ‘get by’. While our study confirms some of Diamond’s findings and in another
33 country/setting (with a very different health care system, and among other specialists), it also
34 goes considerably further. Our study examined physicians’ experiences with a variety of
35 translation options (not just the use of professional in-person interpreters), and explored a range
36 of perspectives that included those of experienced staff physicians as well as less experienced
37 medical residents. This indicates that the phenomenon of ‘getting by’ is experienced by clinician
38 trainees who are early in their professional lives, but also, more surprisingly, by seasoned senior
39 staff. The habits developed during residencies evidently persist over time, and although these
40 habits are characterized as unsettling they appear to be the status quo. This suggests that the issue
41 of LEP should be more firmly embedded not only in medical school curricula, but in continuing
42 education programs as well. Our study goes further and offers an in-depth exploration of the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dilemmas experienced that, according to participants, result from not being able to put the ‘ideal’
4 into practice. Diamond’s participants were frequently unaware of standards of practice for
5 interpretation in their settings, (31) while participants in our study were acutely aware of what
6 they *should* do, but frequently found this difficult to put into practice. Diamond’s team did not
7 appear to probe participants explicitly about what might be lost when a lot of clinical information
8 is missing, while our participants seemed acutely aware of what might be missing and described
9 how they tried to off-set this by relying more heavily on diagnostic testing. Finally, our study
10 explored the decision-making process of ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help’ in richer detail,
11 deepening our understanding of physicians’ experiences.
12
13

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 While our study did not include the experiences of bilingual physicians, Maul and colleagues
25 (2012) and Regenstein et al (2013) have looked at physicians’ willingness to ‘get by’ in situations
26 where physicians and patients may share a language, but where physicians are less than fully
27 fluent. (33, 34). Their findings indicate that even in these situations, physicians’ non-English-
28 language skills are highly heterogeneous, and that there is considerable risk of
29 miscommunication. (34) Physician-patient communication is complex (and often less-than-ideal)
30 even when both parties share the same language. Our study illuminates how the addition of
31 language barriers into the communicative space adds further layers of complexity.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 There is a growing body of evidence indicating that employing the services of professional
47 interpreters has important positive implications not only for clinical outcomes, but more effective
48 health care utilization (e.g. improved preventive screening rates, reduced risk of hospitalizations).
49 (35, 36) There is less compelling evidence that the use of professional in-person interpreters has
50 negative impacts on duration of individual visits. (36) The participants in our study spoke at
51 length about time constraints, but this was often related to tracking down interpretation services
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and scheduling difficulties, rather than the length of the clinical encounter itself. It is possible
4 that telephone interpretation may be able to off-set the difficulties of scheduling in-person
5 interpretation. Recent technological improvements in telephone interpretation/language lines and
6 a greater number of options available since the time of the study suggest that these may be the
7 most important solutions to invest in. Participants in our study indicated that physicians are most
8 likely to follow the ‘path of least resistance’ for securing interpretation services, therefore
9 implementation and testing of innovative, user-friendly telephone interpretation services should
10 be a focus for future research.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Our study has limitations. As a single-centre study, its sample size might be considered small by
23 quantitative standards. However qualitative studies are meant to generalize the *concepts*
24 generated, not to the population of physicians as a whole.(21, 37) As such the concepts of ‘getting
25
26 by’ and ‘getting help’ are transferable to a wide range of practice settings. - It might also be
27 argued that the experiences of the physician participants presented here were shaped by a site-
28 specific lack and/or inefficiency of resources. On the contrary, the study institution (a tertiary care
29 teaching hospital located in Canada’s most diverse city) has systematically funded both in-person
30 and telephone-based translation services and has appropriate policies and procedures in place
31 related to interpretation that have continued to evolve over the past decade. If physicians found it
32 challenging to care for LEP patients in this setting, it is likely that those with access to fewer
33 resources struggle even more.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 Our study does not ~~Another limitation is its failure to~~ address cultural differences. Language and
51 culture are inextricably linked and can result in differential access to care. (4, 38) Physician-
52 patient miscommunication can also result from different cultural norms and understandings.(39)
53
54
55
56
57 This should be a focus for future research. Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of technological
58
59
60

1
2
3 advances, wireless, telephone-based translation services have become more available in medical
4 facilities. It is conceivable that previous obstacles to accessing timely professional translation
5 services outlined here may be less of an issue currently. Data collection took place in 2009 and
6 the telephone translation option has continued to evolve in the intervening period.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 This study begins to illuminate the difficult terrain of caring for LEP patients. In doing so, it
17 opens up an opportunity to break the silence that exists amongst clinicians on this issue, and
18 invites them to explore it. These doctors recognized that the shortcuts they are sometimes forced
19 to take are less than ideal, but they also outlined the real-world constraints that make these
20 shortcuts necessary in their current practice environment. And those environments are not
21 conducive to doctors reflecting upon the issue or even discussing it with their colleagues. We see
22 our research as a catalyst for beginning this conversation. The dilemmas described here are likely
23 encountered regularly by physicians practicing in large cities, in many jurisdictions, not just in
24 Canada. Although time constraints, patient acuity and ease/availability of translation aids all play
25 a role in physicians' decisions to 'get by' or 'get help', provision of more (and more user-
26 friendly) language lines only partially addresses the issue. Improved support for physicians
27 navigating this complex social space should be prioritized.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Contributors:** JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and analysis of the data,
48 as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript. NAB contributed
49 substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and participated in all phases of
50 writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception and design of the study,
51 assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in drafting the manuscript.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PLH was the principal investigator and took primary responsibility for the study's conception and design, as well as the data analysis and interpretation, and contributed importantly to the drafting of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Table 1: Supportive Quotes for Key Findings

| 'Getting By' versus 'Getting Help' | |
|--|---|
| 'Getting by' | <p><i>"If the patient speaks some English and I speak some French and a little bit of Spanish, if the answers seem appropriate to me and the patient doesn't demonstrate obvious concern about the interaction and it's relatively simple and not high-risk, then I would accept that communication is adequate."</i> (90703)</p> <p><i>"I rely more heavily on my physical exam if I can't communicate with them, like I'd be more cautious with testing if I can't ask a specific question and be reassured"</i> (90708).</p> |
| 'Getting help' | <p><i>"But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke, [it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication"</i> (90901)</p> <p><i>"... (I'll) look for an interpreter or some staff that can come over and help. You know somebody who speaks that language ... if they are stable you know and don't look like I need to do anything overly quickly for them and I really can't get a story out of them, then I'll ... get an interpreter first"</i> (90708)</p> <p><i>"So that's the problem you run into. You either try to strive to get a really good history through formal interpretation or you end up doing more testing of that person because you're worried about them more."</i> (90614)</p> |
| Acuity, time constraints and availability of translation aids | |
| Acuity of clinical situation | <p><i>"It all depends on the clinical situation...I could almost treat a patient who cut their finger without talking to them at all... I'd want to make sure that their tetanus status was up to date, like there's a couple of things that you'd want to sort out, but by and large you could pretty much treat them without talking to them. But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke,[it's] extremely difficult to treat without having</i></p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>a solid base of communication. “ (90901)</i></p> <p><i>“So if a patient was sick, for example, had low pressure and a fast heart rate and still spoke no English, I would go in anyway and then just do what I consider to be paediatric medicine. Kids can’t talk to you. You know they’re two years old and they’re crying and they’re in pain- I can’t get a history from a child the same way I can’t get a history from someone who doesn’t speak English. “ (91118)</i></p> |
| Time constraints | <p><i>“When we have a whole bunch of patients and we’ve got a busy schedule and we’re already twenty minutes behind and so forth, you know we’re looking for ways to be as efficient as possible. And if it looks like this patient can give us a few nods appropriately and say a few words that ... they should probably understand. We may be willing to just say okay well we’ve done our part.” (90616)</i></p> <p><i>“We sometimes take shortcuts and sometimes that’s acceptable because the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing” (90728)</i></p> |
| Ease of use and availability of translation aids/interpreters | <p><i>“...if two people speak at the same time it can block out the sound and so it can become awkward but I would say that the two handset option is the best option followed by the speaker phone, followed lastly by the one handset option which is really, uh, it’s enough to dissuade people from actually going to the language line. “ (90615)</i></p> <p><i>“there’s a tremendous amount of resistance to going to the one handset: you’d almost rather this person just spoke a few words of English. You might just be inclined to do your best try and see that they understand what ’s actually taking place” (90728)</i></p> <p><i>“If you’re gonna continue this encounter without getting a translator, so if I’m sharp enough to know what this person’s language is and it doesn’t take long, then I may do a quick search locally, literally around me physically... in a clinic, on a ward, in the Emergency Department to see if someone who works in that department can speak that language and offer translation and there’s a fair chance in Toronto you’ll get a person who can speak that language fairly (easily). And then that’s the better route.” (90710)</i></p> |
| A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced in practice | |
| The ‘grey zone’ | <p><i>“Well I leave that to the patient to decide whether we need some kind of facilitator or an interpreter. You know I usually don’t make the decision to say “how well you are comprehending what I’m saying and how well are you able to communicate to me?” So I usually ask them “would you like to have an interpreter present?” And then they may say ‘yes’ or ‘no’. The challenge is that in the real world we don’t, we don’t always end up having an interpreter readily</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>available. " (90615)</p> <p>"... so I sort of assess whether I need, whether I actually have time to wait for the interpreter and then I'd call and ask for an interpreter. I do use family members which is a bit of a grey zone because if there's a se...sensitive information you're no, so you're supposed to have an objective interpreter there, so I will sometimes use family members..." (90828)</p> |
| <p>Dilemma of 'real world' vs. ideal world' practice</p> | <p>"And they [patient] go 'um thank you'. And that's it, right. And so you kind of, you know clearly it's a suboptimal communication. There are a lot of things that you would really need to discuss to have this patient-centered care ideal. But you know the time that would be required to do that would be quite extensive and so we often take shortcuts that result in non-patient-centered care... It happens all the time frankly and I think well you know, we're probably less likely to do it in a situation where we really feel that it's critical." (90728)</p> <p>"To be quite honest with you the ones I personally find the most helpful are family members. Because ... they can give you a little bit of the context, and then you can talk to them as well particularly if it's an elderly patient because not only do they translate for you but then they'll also say, "You know what? Grandma hasn't been doing very well for a few months now. She hasn't been preparing her meals properly, she's been losing weight ... I'm concerned about grandma." That's far more valuable to me in some respects than a translator who's just sticking to the letter of the law, and is saying exactly what they're supposed to, without kind of any context. It's just language right? I like the bigger picture" (90702)</p> |
| <p>Dilemma of responsibility</p> | <p>" We've explained what's going on and they've nodded and kind of looked at me as though they're understanding - so now it's their responsibility, it's not mine any longer. I'm not suggesting that's the way that, you know I practice, but that's what can frequently happen in this grey zone. It's just enough English proficiency to be dangerous." (90615)</p> <p>"They (patients/families with LEP) don't recognize that this is a ha-, a potential hazard...I think some of the responsibility lies with the patient." (90706)</p> <p>" I don't think that's a responsibility that patient's necessarily carrying... That's not something I would expect of my families ... that's not a fair expectation I think." (90708)</p> |
| <p>Dilemma of informed consent</p> | <p>"I can't get informed consent when I can't communicate" (90930)</p> <p>" There have been circumstances in the past where we have been concerned as a group that families weren't accurately expressing our wishes to the patient or our statements to the patient and vice versa. And so there have been circumstances you know particularly in some of these [high] stakes circumstances where we will use professional translators regardless of the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <i>presence of the family to translate for just this reason.” (90707)</i> |
| Making language discordance a priority | <i>“ You know, we really have to get over the language barrier business because it’s not going away—it’s been here for a while and I don’t think we’ve done a particularly good job until very recently—we’re starting to address it—we should be very aggressive about prioritizing this subject “ (90710)</i> |

Acknowledgments: We wish to thank Caryl M. Patrick for her assistance with data collection.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interest statement: The authors have no competing interests to declare.

References

1. Gardam M, Verma G, Campbell A, Wang J, Khan K. Impact of the patient-provider relationship on the survival of foreign-born outpatients with tuberculosis. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2009;11:437-45.
2. Burnett A. Globalization, migration and health. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*. 2002. p. 34-43.
3. Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, Sarangi S, Jones R. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(5):465-75.
4. Rivadeneyra R, Elderkin-Thompson V, Cohen Silver R, Waitzkin H. Patient-centeredness in clinical encounters requiring an interpreter. *American Journal of Medicine*. 2000;108:470-4.

- 1
2
3 5. Piette JD, Schillinger D, Potter MB, Heisler M. Dimensions of patient-provider
4 communication and diabetes self-care in an ethnically diverse population. *J Gen Intern*
5 *Med.* 2003;18(8):624-33.
6
- 7
8 6. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, Wang F, Wilson C, Daher C. Closing the
9 loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low healthliteracy. *Arch*
10 *Intern Med.* 2003;163:83–90.
11
- 12
13 7. Bonds DE, Camacho F, Bell RA, Duren-Winfield VT, Anderson RT, Goff DC.
14 The association of patient trust and self-care among patients with diabetes mellitus. *BMC*
15 *Family Practice.* 2004;5(26).
16
- 17
18 8. Schenker Y, Lo B, Ettinger KM, Fernandez A. Navigating language barriers
19 under difficult circumstances. . *Annals of Internal Medicine.* 2008;149(4):264-9.
20
- 21
22 9. Morales LS, Cunningham WE, Brown JA, Liu H, Hays RD. Are Latinos Less
23 Satisfied with Communication by Health Care Providers? *Journal of General Internal*
24 *Medicine.* 1999;14(7):409-17.
25
- 26
27 10. Baker DW, Hayes R, Fortier JP. Interpreter use and satisfaction with interpersonal
28 aspects of care for Spanish-speaking patients. . *Med Care.* 1998;36:1461–70.
29
- 30
31 11. Carasquillo O, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Burstin HR. Impact of Language Barriers
32 on Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department. *Journal of General Internal*
33 *Medicine.* 1999.;14:82–7.
34
- 35
36 12. Wilson E, Chen A, Grumbach K, Wang F, Fernandez A. Effects of limited
37 English proficiency and physician language on a health care comprehension. *Journal of*
38 *General Internal Medicine.* 2005;20(9):800-6.
39
- 40
41 13. John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, Alibhai SMH, Etchells E, Cheung A, et
42 al. The effect of English-language proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality.
43 *Journal of General Internal Medicine.* 2004;19:221-8.
44
- 45
46 14. Perez-Stable EJ, Napoles-Springer A, Miramontes JM. The effects of ethnicity
47 and language on medical outcomes of patients with hypertension or diabetes. *Medical*
48 *Care.* 1997;35(12):1212-9.
49
- 50
51 15. Papic O, Malak Z, Rosenberg E. Survey of family physicians' perspectives on
52 management of immigrant patients: Attitudes, barriers, strategies, and training needs.
53 *Patient Education and Counseling.* 2012;86:205-9.
54
- 55
56 16. Lovell BL, Lee RT, Brotheridge CM. Interpersonal factors affecting
57 communication in clinical consultations: Canadian physicians' perspectives. *International*
58 *Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance.* 2012;25(6):467-82.
59
60

17. Ku L, Flores G. Pay now or pay later: Providing interpreter services in health care. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(2):435-44.
18. Masland MC, Lou C, Snowden L. Use of communication technologies to cost-effectively increase the availability of interpretation services in healthcare settings. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2010;16(6):739-45.
19. City of Toronto. Backgrounder - Census 2011: Language. Statistics Canada. Toronto: City of Toronto; 2012. p. 1-22.
20. Morse JM, Richards L. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2002.
21. Kvale S. "InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing." Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 1996.
22. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2000;23:334-40.
23. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2010;33(1):77-84.
24. Miles MB, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1994.
25. Crabtree BF, Miller WL. Using codes and code manuals. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 163-77.
26. Miller WL, Crabtree BF. The dance of interpretation. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 127-43.
27. Pamphilon B. The Zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1999;5(3):393-410.
28. Eakin JM, Mykhalovsky E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. *Journal of Evaluation of Clinical Practice*. 2003;9(2):187-94.
29. Frankel RM. Standards of qualitative research. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 333-46.

- 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
30. Wong JP-H, Poon MK-L. Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*. 2010;21(2):151-8.
31. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, Bradley EH, Fernandez A. Getting by: Underuse of interpreters by resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
32. Taylor E, Jones F. Lost in translation: Exploring therapists' experiences of providing stroke rehabilitation across a language barrier. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2014;early online:1-9.
33. Maul L, Regenstein M, Andres E, Wright R, Wunia MK. Using a risk assessment approach to determine which factors influence whether partially bilingual physicians rely on their non-English language skills or call an interpreter. *The Joint Commission on Quality and Patient Safety*. 2012;38(7):328-36.
34. Regenstein M, Andres E, Wynia MK. Appropriate use of non-English language skills in clinical care. *JAMA*. 2013;309(2):145-6.
35. Flores G. The impact of medical services on the quality of healthcare: A systematic review. *Medical Care Research and Review*. 2005;62(3):255-99.
36. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen A, Mutha S. Do professional interpreters improve clinical care for patients with limited English proficiency? A systematic review. *Health Services Research*. 2007;42(2):727-54.
37. Butler-Kisber L. *Qualitative Inquiry*. London: Sage; 2010.
38. Taveras EM, Flores G. Why culture and language matter: The clinical consequences of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to children in the emergency department. *Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine*. 2004;5(2):76-84.
39. Lee SM. A review of language and other communication barriers in health care. In: [US Department of Health and Human Services](#), editor. Portland: 2003.

BMJ Open

To 'Get By' or 'Get Help'? A Qualitative Study of Physicians' Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2013-004613.R2 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 25-Apr-2014 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Parsons, Janet; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute; University of Toronto, Dept. of Physical Therapy Baker, Natalie; St. Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute Smith-Gorvie, Telisha; University Health Network, Dept. of Emergency Medicine; University of Toronto, Dept. of Medicine Hudak, Pamela; The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Health services research |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Qualitative research, Communication |
| Keywords: | INTERNAL MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3 **To ‘Get By’ or ‘Get Help’? A Qualitative Study of Physicians’ Challenges and**
4 **Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency**
5

6 Janet A Parsons ^{1,2}, Natalie A Baker ¹, Telisha Smith-Gorvie ^{3,4}, Pamela L Hudak ⁵
7
8

9
10 ¹ *Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s*
11 *Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 1W8*
12

13 ² *Department of Physical Therapy and Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences,*
14 *University of Toronto, 160 -500 University Ave., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 1V7*
15

16 ³ *Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, University Health Network*
17 *(Toronto General Hospital), RFE GS-480 Emergency Department, 200 Elizabeth St.,*
18 *Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2C4*
19
20

21 ⁴ *Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Suite RFE 3-805, 200 Elizabeth St.,*
22 *Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2C4*
23
24

25 ⁵ *The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, 700 King St. W (Suite 713), Toronto,*
26 *Ontario, Canada, M5V 2Y6*
27
28

29
30 **Corresponding author:** Dr. Janet A. Parsons, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka
31 Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael’s Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON, Canada
32 M5B 1W8; e-mail: parsonsj@smh.ca; Tel: +1-416-864-6060 ext. 7111; fax: +1-416-864-
33 3016.
34
35

36
37 **Key words:** language discordance, physician practice, Limited English Proficiency,
38 qualitative methods
39
40

41
42 **Word count:** 4,685
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

ABSTRACT

Objective: Encounters between patients and physicians who do not speak the same language are relatively common in Canada, particularly in urban settings; this trend is increasing worldwide. Language discordance has important effects on health outcomes, including mortality. This study sought to explore physicians' experiences of care provision in situations of language discordance in depth.

Design: Qualitative study based on individual interviews. Interview guides elicited physicians' perspectives on how they determined whether communication could proceed unaided. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted, entailing inductive thematic analysis.

Participants: 22 physicians experienced in treating patients in situations of language discordance were recruited from the emergency and internal medicine departments of an urban tertiary-care hospital.

Setting: Large, inner-city teaching hospital in Toronto, Canada, one of the most linguistically diverse cities internationally.

Results: Determining when to 'get by' or 'get help' in order to facilitate communication was described as a fluid and variable process. Deciding which strategy to use depended on three inter-related factors: *time/time constraints*, *acuity of situation*, and *ease of use/availability of translation aids*. Participants reported at times feeling conflicted about their decisions, portraying some of these clinical encounters as a 'troubling space' in

1
2
3 which they experienced one or more *dilemmas* related to *real vs. ideal practice*,
4
5
6 *responsibility*, and *informed consent*.
7
8

9
10 *Conclusions:* In situations of language discordance, a physician's decision to 'get by'
11
12 (versus 'get help') rests on a judgment of whether communication can be considered
13
14 'good enough' to proceed, and depends on the circumstances of the specific encounter.
15
16 The tension set up between what is 'ideal' and what is practically possible can be
17
18 experienced as a dilemma by physicians. The study's findings have implications for
19
20 practice and policy not only in Canada but in other multilingual settings, and indicate that
21
22 physicians require greater support.
23
24

25 26 27 **Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study** 28

- 29 • There are few in-depth studies documenting physicians' experiences of language
30
31 discordance in Canada or elsewhere
32
- 33 • Qualitative methodology is well-suited to exploring physicians' experiences of
34
35 communication and care provision
36
37
- 38 • The study deepens our understanding of how physicians decide whether to "get
39
40 by" or "get help" in situations of language discordance, and the dilemmas that
41
42 physicians can experience.
43
44
- 45 • A limitation is that this was a single-site study with participants from only two
46
47 medical specialties; nevertheless, the concepts generated are transferrable to other
48
49 practice settings
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Clear communication has long been recognized as integral to high-quality medical care. However, physicians frequently encounter situations where effective communication is difficult. One such situation is when physicians and patients do not speak the same language – referred to as language discordance.⁽¹⁾ Increasing globalization, human migration⁽²⁾ and travel mean that many countries are becoming more and more multi-lingual, and this is especially true of urban centres.⁽³⁾ Although Canada has two official languages (English and French), it is a nation with many immigrants, representing an array of linguistic traditions. New immigrants may not speak either official language. Major cities are popular settlement areas for new immigrants, thus physicians are extremely likely to encounter patients who do not speak the dominant language. This matters because language barriers can be a source of health disparity, including differential mortality rates.⁽¹⁾ In a Canadian study on tuberculosis, mortality risk was significantly higher (HR = 2.32;95% CI: 1.39-3.88, p<0.001) in situations of language discordance.⁽¹⁾ Language barriers have been shown to: impair patient comprehension⁽⁴⁾; act as a barrier to accessing care⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾; negatively affect treatment adherence^{(8) (9)}; and affect satisfaction with care.⁽¹⁰⁻¹²⁾ Language barriers are also associated with increased hospital length-of-stay⁽¹³⁾, and decreased self-reported health status.⁽¹⁴⁾

In addition to patients and physicians not sharing a language, social structural features of medical practice can further compound the situation. The fast pace of modern clinical practice has been identified as a challenge to effective communication because decisions

1
2
3 must be made quickly and are often history-dependent. Although there is literature
4
5 documenting outcomes associated with language discordance, there is relatively little
6
7 comprehensive research into physicians' experiences of language discordance generally.
8
9 Moreover, there is a paucity of research eliciting Canadian physicians' perspectives on
10
11 the topic. One survey-based study of Montreal family physicians focused on their
12
13 attitudes towards caring for immigrant patients, with 77% reporting that communication
14
15 was the greatest barrier to patient management.(15) Another recent study surveyed
16
17 physicians from Manitoba, Canada, on factors affecting communication with patients of
18
19 different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, with an emphasis on process errors
20
21 and their relationship not only to language discordance, but a host of other factors, such
22
23 as patient age, gender and trust.(16) Neither of these studies offers in-depth exploration
24
25 of physicians' experiences of caring for patients in situations of language discordance.
26
27 This gap can only be addressed by speaking to physicians directly, using qualitative
28
29 methods. Understanding physicians' experiences is vital, given that language barriers are
30
31 known to translate into negative outcomes for patients (including increased mortality). (1,
32
33 8, 9) Such studies will yield important contextual information about patient care in
34
35 situations of language discordance, identifying opportunities for (and barriers to)
36
37 improvement, and informing practice renewal.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Our study explores physicians' experiences of interacting with patients for whom
52
53 language proficiency (in this case, Limited English Proficiency or LEP)(17, 18) was
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a
4 term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and
5 who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use
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

perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use 'LEP' interchangeably with 'language discordance'. In this paper, we highlight conditions and strategies associated with circumstances in which physicians 'get by' or 'get help' in these encounters.

METHODS

This study focuses on physicians' practice experiences where LEP was perceived to be the main factor hindering effective communication with patients. These accounts encompassed an array of situations, including those in which physician and patient had any of the following: no shared language, some shared language, comprehension issues related to accents, situations where no translation aids were used, or those where different types of translation aids were used. We did not consider situations where communication was influenced by a patient's inability to speak as a result of aphasia or some other cognitive or mechanical issue.

Setting

The study was conducted in Toronto, Canada's most multicultural city, with over 160 languages spoken.(19) English is the dominant language. The study institution, a tertiary-care teaching hospital, serves patients diverse in language and culture, and its physicians are likely to have significant clinical experience with LEP patients. The study was

1
2
3 approved by the institution's Research Ethics Board and written informed consent was
4
5
6 obtained from all participants.
7

8 9 **Sample**

10
11
12 All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
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
All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
Medicine and Emergency Medicine were eligible for inclusion. Participants were invited
to share their experiences 'when challenges to communication secondary to language
discordance are encountered in routine clinical practice'. Twenty-two physicians agreed
to participate, including both men (17) and women (5), with a wide range of years of
clinical experience (Mean: 10.7; Range: 1-28).

28 **Data Collection**

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
Semi-structured audiotaped interviews were conducted, lasting one hour on average. The
interview guide was developed by researchers with practice and methodological
expertise, and pilot tested with three participants.(20) Following pilot testing the wording
was modified to improve clarity of some questions, but no substantive changes to
content were required. Questions focused on how physicians determine whether
communication is adequate to proceed unaided. They were asked to recall clinical
encounters where a) they did not share a language with the patient/family member; and b)
they shared a language but not at the same proficiency. Details were probed concerning:
a) conditions under which physicians feel they need to get help; b) strategies employed to
facilitate communication; c) what they say they usually do when working with LEP

1
2
3 patients; and d) how they feel about what they do. A copy of the interview guide appears
4
5 in the appendix. All interviews occurred in summer and fall of 2009.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Data Analysis**

14
15
16 Interviews were transcribed and analysed using an approach of qualitative descriptive
17
18 analysis (as described by Sandelowski), in order to inductively identify, code and
19
20 categorize patterns in the data.(21-25) The senior investigator began by reading the
21
22 interviews closely, identifying key themes and patterns, reviewing the data multiple times
23
24 and developing codes as new topics and relationships were identified.(26, 27) At this
25
26 early stage, an experienced qualitative researcher who was not part of the research team
27
28 also reviewed several transcripts and made independent observations. A preliminary
29
30 coding scheme was developed and applied to all transcripts.(24, 25) Analytic rigour was
31
32 aided by continual re-examination of the data by all authors throughout the research
33
34 process.(28, 29)
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 **RESULTS**

42
43
44 A key early insight was that participants' accounts could be viewed as describing the
45
46 conditions under which physicians 'get by' in a clinical encounter even when language
47
48 proficiency is not shared, in contrast to when they decide that they must 'get help' to
49
50 proceed further. *Getting by* means proceeding with the interaction without seeking
51
52 assistance. *Getting help* entails pausing the interaction to seek translation/interpretation
53
54 services or tools. Deciding which strategy to employ was depicted as context-driven, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 primarily dependent on three factors: time constraints, patient acuity, and
4
5 ease/availability of translation assistance/aids. Decision-making was sometimes portrayed
6
7 as ‘troubling’, a process characterized by three overlapping dilemmas, the *gap between*
8
9 *real vs. ideal practice*, the notion of *responsibility*, and the issue of *informed consent*.
10
11

12 Table 1 includes quotes supporting the findings outlined below.
13

14 15 16 **To “get by” or “get help”?** 17

18
19 Participants encountered many different languages in their practice settings. Typically, another
20
21 member of the healthcare team informed physicians of a patient’s LEP status (verbally or in
22
23 writing), and whether a translator was available. Participants recounted that they then validated
24
25 the patient’s LEP status independently, using both verbal and non-verbal cues (e.g. gestures,
26
27 facial expressions) to gauge understanding (e.g. purposely asking open-ended questions). Upon
28
29 identifying a language barrier, they then described a process of weighing whether they could ‘get
30
31 by’ or whether they should ‘get help’.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In some cases, physicians would ‘get by’ with what they can glean from a patient without shared
40
41 language. These situations were described by one physician as the “grey zone” in which a
42
43 patient’s “level of English proficiency is good enough so that maybe you can feel that you can get
44
45 by but their comprehension may in fact be poor enough that they can get into trouble” (90615).
46
47

48 The tendency in these cases is to “follow the path of least resistance” i.e. getting by with any
49
50 resources readily available.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

Choosing to ‘get by’ without additional assistance can include any of the following strategies: speaking more slowly, enunciating more carefully, using plain language and requesting that the patient paraphrase instructions to gauge understanding. Participants perceived situations of limited/imperfect communication as ‘risky’. They compensated by proceeding with caution – giving patients more time than usual, double checking test results, ordering more tests, or keeping patients longer for observation. As a result, clinical assessments tended to privilege objective findings over subjective reports.

Participants also described situations where they considered it too risky to proceed without confidence in communication quality: e.g. attempting to determine medication side effects, or discussing end-of-life care. ‘Getting help’ ranged from using professional translators/interpreters, to having other staff or family members translate, to using the language line. (18) In our study, the term ‘language line’ is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual handset phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing real-time interpretation as the parties speak. (23) This has been referred to as “UN-style interpretation.”(23) (p.741). Overall participants indicated that, when time permitted, their preference of use, in descending order, was: professional interpreters (first choice), then the language line, and finally other hospital staff or family members.

Acuity/severity of illness, time constraints and ease/availability of translation aids

Choosing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ hinged on several interlinked factors. The patient’s clinical status and their relative acuity was commonly mentioned as a primary factor for consideration. For example, a physician recounted a situation where a patient presented with signs of stroke. He elected to ‘get by’ due to the urgency of the situation and the potential consequences of delaying definitive care; the patient subsequently recovered. This participant acknowledged that ‘getting by’ entailed proceeding with “imperfect information”, treating “more

1
2
3 of what they could see rather than the symptoms” (90706). Even though the physician considered
4 this less-than-ideal, ‘getting by’ often trumped ‘getting help’ in emergency situations.
5
6
7
8 Conversely, if a case involves for example providing discharge instructions to a stable patient,
9
10 participants said they felt they had ‘time on their side’ to await a translator. The interaction
11
12 between a less-acute situation and available time highlights the inter-relatedness of clinical status
13
14 with a second factor, time. However there was no simple equation for determining whether to ‘get
15
16 by’ or ‘get help’ vis-à-vis clinical status: “it’s a judgment call...it’s more of an art than a science”
17
18 (90901).
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 Time is another factor informing physicians’ decision-making. Participants depicted choosing the
26
27 most pragmatic path of care when faced with time-related constraints. Many physicians described
28
29 the significant time and effort involved in obtaining relevant clinical information from LEP
30
31 patients. They told of “verifying, inferring, checking charts, checking with pharmacist, etc.”
32
33 (90710). Time could be an issue even when a translator is available because this “doubles the
34
35 duration of the interaction so everything takes twice as long” (90728) -- which is suboptimal in
36
37 emergencies. Physicians also spoke of time pressures to manage their busy caseloads when
38
39 weighing what to do: allocating additional time to LEP patients may limit the time they have
40
41 available for others in need. Some participants spoke about translator availability (e.g. harder to
42
43 reach during night shifts). One participant described a situation where it took four days for a
44
45 translator to become available. Such delays influence not only quality of care, but also hold cost
46
47 implications if hospital length-of-stay is affected.
48
49
50

51
52 A third factor influencing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ was the ease of use/availability of
53
54 translation aids/interpreters. Some physicians admitted resistance to using technology-based
55
56 interpretation. Though telephone-based language lines are designed to improve patient-physician
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communication, in practice, our participants reported that they can be awkward. Participants drew
4 on a variety of experiences with language lines in different settings, indicating that all language
5 lines are not created equal. For example, single handsets were seen as less preferable than the two
6 handset option, although even with two handsets, it could be awkward if two people speak at the
7 same time. Speaker phone was another option used.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 **A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced**

20
21
22 Participants expressed feeling conflicted at times over decisions to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’.
23 While they recognized that ‘getting by’ was often less-than-ideal, it was sometimes
24 perceived as all that they could do. Such decision-making could be a source of anxiety.
25
26
27
28

29 A participant noted that some patients have “just enough proficiency for it to be
30 dangerous” (90615). The language of ‘danger’ is significant, suggesting an unsettling and
31 troubling experience for participants. A series of overlapping dilemmas constitute this
32 troubling space, namely: *the gap between real vs. ideal practice*, notions of
33 *responsibility*, and issues of *informed consent*.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 42 *The dilemma of ‘real world’ vs. ‘ideal world’ practice*

43
44
45 Physicians told of taking shortcuts and making judgment calls that, in some instances, could be
46 considered acceptable practice. One participant said, “the time that you save by taking shortcuts
47 is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing”
48 (90728). For example, participants recognized that using other staff members in the immediate
49 vicinity who spoke the same language was not ideal, yet they would often opt for this approach as
50 most efficient. In a similar vein, most participants indicated that using family members was not a
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preferred option; however one commented on what they saw as potential benefits to using family
4 members – that, unlike professional interpreters, families were able to provide additional
5 contextual information as well as the relative’s perspective on the patient condition during
6 interpretation (90702). Despite these pragmatic considerations, most participants acknowledged
7 that there is an optimal or “best” way of providing care in these situations, namely the use of
8 professional interpreters or translation aids.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 There was a tension in many accounts between what they *should do* (based on recognized best
19 practices in an ideal world) and what they ultimately *can* do at the bedside. They appear to use a
20 sliding scale for decision-making, which is context-dependent, and allows them to gauge when
21 ‘getting by’ can be justified.
22
23
24
25
26

27 *The dilemma of responsibility*

28
29
30 Participants expressed discomfort concerning who is ultimately *responsible* for ensuring adequate
31 communication. While they recognized that they have an ethical obligation to ensure
32 understanding, at the same time, some physicians appeared to put at least some of the onus on
33 patients. In some situations, participants said they left the decision of whether communication
34 was ‘good enough’ to the patient. They portrayed communication as a shared responsibility
35 between physician and patient. However they also depicted themselves as making their decisions
36 about whether to get help as something they did on their own – they spoke at length about the
37 information *they* deemed important, but said relatively little about what information *patients*
38 might see as important.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *The dilemma of informed consent*

51
52
53
54
55 Another dilemma characterized by participants surrounded *informed consent*. In LEP situations,
56 physicians may have to rely on professional translators or family members to secure consent.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Family members as translators were of particular concern to participants. Professional translators
4
5 were perceived to be impartial and accurate when relaying information. Physicians expressed
6
7 concern that family translators may change what is imparted due to personal biases or
8
9 misinterpretations. Participants described a number of these situations, such as when patients and
10
11 families appeared to differ in their wishes.
12

13
14
15 Participants acknowledged the issue of best practices with LEP patients as an important priority
16
17 for physicians. A few participants took this sentiment a step further, warning that: “We could
18
19 even argue from an ethical or legal standpoint of course that we’re obligated to ensure that there’s
20
21 appropriate communication” (090615). ‘Patient-centred care’ is espoused by both hospitals and
22
23 clinicians, and it is expected that treatment decisions will be made jointly between patient and
24
25 provider. A principle of informed consent is that physicians provide the information patients need
26
27 in order to make informed decisions. But gauging whether LEP patients have *really* understood
28
29 information provided can be challenging.
30
31

32 33 34 **DISCUSSION**

35
36
37 This study examined experiences of physicians working with LEP patients. Participants described
38
39 two strategies for dealing with such situations: ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help.’ The
40
41 physicians in our study depicted their decisions to ‘get by’ as based on a judgment
42
43 regarding whether communication was ‘good enough’ to proceed unaided, and depended
44
45 on the specific circumstances. Participants characterized clinical encounters with LEP patients
46
47 as a sometimes ‘troubling’ social space, presenting professional dilemmas. There was a tension
48
49 between recognizing what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices) and what they *can*
50
51 *do* at the bedside (based on constraints of time and resources).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our findings have important practice implications. For example, participants noted that in
4 situations where they elect to 'get by', they conduct more tests on LEP patients, to mitigate risk.
5
6 There were no hard-and-fast rules for managing such risk; physicians told of making decisions in-
7 the-moment, gauging the acuity/complexity of each patient's condition, circumstances,
8
9 availability of translation aids/interpreters, and their own caseload/obligations to other patients.
10
11 The threshold at which a physician shifts from getting by to getting help is variable, fluid and
12 dependent upon the individual and context. The suggestion that adequate communication is a
13 shared responsibility presumes a team-based approach between physician and patient. However,
14 team-based care usually implies open lines of communication, which is not the case in LEP. This
15 may contribute to the sense of discomfort expressed by participants.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Discomfort may also stem partly from an underlying assumption that translation should be 'value
31 neutral' and as 'objective' as laboratory testing. Translation during a clinical encounter is a social
32 act, and as such is both complex and contingent. Wong and Poon (2010) argue for translation
33 being viewed "not (as) a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of
34 another",⁽³⁰⁾(p.152) but rather one imbued with meaning and interpretation on each side. Social
35 context and power relations cannot be ignored.⁽³⁰⁾ Rather than treating challenges presented by
36 LEP as an inconvenience, they should be given priority and clinicians offered greater support.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 It should be noted that data collection for this study took place in 2009, when fewer supports were
51 available. At that time, relatively little orientation to interpretation services was offered to
52 medical residents at the study facility, but now instruction regarding available interpretation
53 services is being offered routinely. Training in language barriers and cultural competence is now
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 gaining attention amongst medical educators. Telephone interpretation services continue to
4
5 evolve and become more user-friendly; however other supports are still needed to make it easier
6
7 for physicians to 'get help' when they need it. The study site has had policies relating to the
8
9 provision of interpretation services for patients experiencing language barriers since at least the
10
11 year 2000. These policies are aligned with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as well
12
13 as the Ontario Human Rights Act. The institution's policy on interpreter services in place at the
14
15 time of the study (as well as the current one) refers to certain conditions where it is clear that
16
17 professional interpreters are required (e.g. signing of consent documents, provision of detailed
18
19 discharge instructions) and in which the participants indicated that they felt confident in 'getting
20
21 help' from professional interpretation services. All the physicians in our study expressed a desire
22
23 to 'do the right thing', but acknowledged that pragmatic considerations (including the availability
24
25 and ease-of-use of resources) might interfere with their ability to execute it to the level of the
26
27 ideal. It was these instances that they sometimes found troubling. Busy caseloads and time
28
29 constraints on clinical practice were and continue to be an issue for most clinicians. For example,
30
31 it can take some time for an interpreter to be found for telephone interpretation (depending on the
32
33 specific language required), which again takes time away from caring for other patients. The use
34
35 of a language line presumes that there is always a telephone readily accessible at the bedside (e.g.
36
37 handset-based language line), which is not always the case, even in hospital settings. In cases
38
39 where the language in question is relatively rare, there can be a waiting period to secure an
40
41 appropriate translator even by telephone. In the city of Toronto, many different languages are
42
43 spoken, which further adds to the complexity of the situation. When using in-person interpreters,
44
45 aligning the schedules of physician, professional interpreter, and patient is frequently complex,
46
47 with some physicians commenting that it can range from several hours to days before these
48
49 sessions occur. This is confirmed by the findings from other researchers working with both
50
51 physicians and other health care practitioners. (31, 32) As a result, it is not surprising that in some
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 circumstances, physicians opt for the 'path of least resistance' (which may include using another
4 health care professional or a family member to interpret).
5
6

7
8
9 The implications for patients should not be underestimated. Rivadeneyra et al (2000) indicate that
10 situations of LEP negatively affect the provision of patient-centred primary care(4): even with
11 the aid of interpreters, US physicians were less likely to probe further into symptoms of non-
12 English-speaking patients.(4) Clinical consequences of LEP can range from problems accessing
13 care and treatment non-adherence, to higher mortality rates.(1, 8, 9). Opportunities for gaining
14 crucial insights may be missed (e.g. understanding additional variables underlying presenting
15 illness)(9) as may opportunities for developing rapport and trust, when physicians opt to 'get
16 by.'(33) . Moreover, it has potential medico-legal consequences: how far should a physician go to
17 ensure 'adequate' communication has been achieved in order to mitigate the potential of risk and
18 harm? Participants are warranted in their characterizations of language discordant situations as
19 troubling spaces.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Our study builds on prior work conducted by Diamond and colleagues (2009). They also used
38 the phrase "getting by" to describe their study's findings of medical residents' experiences of
39 caring for patients in two US cities. (31) Similar to our study, Diamond and colleagues found
40 that factors such as time constraints and convenience were cited as influencing participants'
41 decisions to 'get by'. While our study confirms some of Diamond's findings and in another
42 country/setting (with a very different health care system, and among other specialists), it also
43 goes considerably further. Our study examined physicians' experiences with a variety of
44 translation options (not just the use of professional in-person interpreters), and explored a range
45 of perspectives that included those of experienced staff physicians as well as less experienced
46 medical residents. This indicates that the phenomenon of 'getting by' is experienced by clinician
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trainees who are early in their professional lives, but also, more surprisingly, by seasoned senior
4 staff. The habits developed during residencies evidently persist over time, and although these
5 habits are characterized as unsettling they appear to be the status quo. This suggests that the issue
6 of LEP should be more firmly embedded not only in medical school curricula, but in continuing
7 education programs as well. Our study goes further and offers an in-depth exploration of the
8 dilemmas experienced that, according to participants, result from not being able to put the 'ideal'
9 into practice. Diamond's participants were frequently unaware of standards of practice for
10 interpretation in their settings, (31) while participants in our study were acutely aware of what
11 they *should* do, but frequently found this difficult to put into practice. Diamond's team did not
12 appear to probe participants explicitly about what might be lost when a lot of clinical information
13 is missing, while our participants seemed acutely aware of what might be missing and described
14 how they tried to off-set this by relying more heavily on diagnostic testing. Finally, our study
15 explored the decision-making process of 'getting by' versus 'getting help' in richer detail,
16 deepening our understanding of physicians' experiences.

17
18 While our study did not include the experiences of bilingual physicians, Maul and colleagues
19 (2012) and Regenstein et al (2013) have looked at physicians' willingness to 'get by' in situations
20 where physicians and patients may share a language, but where physicians are less than fully
21 fluent. (33, 34) Their findings indicate that even in these situations, physicians' non-English-
22 language skills are highly heterogeneous, and that there is considerable risk of
23 miscommunication. (34) Physician-patient communication is complex (and often less-than-ideal)
24 even when both parties share the same language. Our study illuminates how the addition of
25 language barriers into the communicative space adds further layers of complexity.

26
27 There is a growing body of evidence indicating that employing the services of professional
28 interpreters has important positive implications not only for clinical outcomes, but more effective
29 health care utilization (e.g. improved preventive screening rates, reduced risk of hospitalizations).

1
2
3 (35, 36) There is less compelling evidence that the use of professional in-person interpreters has
4
5 negative impacts on duration of individual visits. (36) The participants in our study spoke at
6
7 length about time constraints, but this was often related to tracking down interpretation services
8
9 and scheduling difficulties, rather than the length of the clinical encounter itself. It is possible
10
11 that telephone interpretation may be able to off-set the difficulties of scheduling in-person
12
13 interpretation. Recent technological improvements in telephone interpretation/language lines and
14
15 a greater number of options available since the time of the study suggest that these may be the
16
17 most important solutions to invest in. Participants in our study indicated that physicians are most
18
19 likely to follow the 'path of least resistance' for securing interpretation services, therefore
20
21 implementation and testing of innovative, user-friendly telephone interpretation services should
22
23 be a focus for future research.
24
25
26

27
28 Our study has limitations. As a single-centre study, its sample size might be considered small by
29
30 quantitative standards. However qualitative studies are meant to generalize the *concepts*
31
32 generated, not to the population of physicians as a whole.(21, 37) As such the concepts of 'getting
33
34 by' and 'getting help' are transferable to a wide range of practice settings. It might also be
35
36 argued that the experiences of the physician participants presented here were shaped by a site-
37
38 specific lack and/or inefficiency of resources. On the contrary, the study institution (a tertiary care
39
40 teaching hospital located in Canada's most diverse city) has systematically funded both in-person
41
42 and telephone-based translation services and has appropriate policies and procedures in place
43
44 related to interpretation that have continued to evolve over the past decade. If physicians found it
45
46 challenging to care for LEP patients in this setting, it is likely that those with access to fewer
47
48 resources struggle even more.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our study does not address cultural differences. Language and culture are inextricably linked and
4 can result in differential access to care. (4, 38) Physician-patient miscommunication can also
5 result from different cultural norms and understandings.(39) This should be a focus for future
6 research. Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of technological advances, wireless, telephone-based
7 translation services have become more available in medical facilities. It is conceivable that
8 previous obstacles to accessing timely professional translation services outlined here may be less
9 of an issue currently. Data collection took place in 2009 and the telephone translation option has
10 continued to evolve in the intervening period. Finally, our study does not address financial
11 considerations. We understand that annual costs associated with in-person professional and
12 technology-mediated translation services are not inconsiderable. This may represent a further
13 constraint on putting the ideal of professional interpretation into practice. In a systematic review,
14 Flores (2005) indicates that there are few studies related to costs of interpretation services.(35)
15 This should be a topic for further research.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 This study begins to illuminate the difficult terrain of caring for LEP patients. In doing so, it
37 opens up an opportunity to break the silence that exists amongst clinicians on this issue, and
38 invites them to explore it. These doctors recognized that the shortcuts they are sometimes forced
39 to take are less than ideal, but they also outlined the real-world constraints that make these
40 shortcuts necessary in their current practice environment. And those environments are not
41 conducive to doctors reflecting upon the issue or even discussing it with their colleagues. We see
42 our research as a catalyst for beginning this conversation. The dilemmas described here are likely
43 encountered regularly by physicians practicing in large cities, in many jurisdictions, not just in
44 Canada. Although time constraints, patient acuity and ease/availability of translation aids all play
45 a role in physicians' decisions to 'get by' or 'get help', provision of more (and more user-
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

friendly) language lines only partially addresses the issue. Improved support for physicians navigating this complex social space should be prioritized.

Contributors: JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and analysis of the data, as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript. NAB contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and participated in all phases of writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception and design of the study, assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in drafting the manuscript. PLH was the principal investigator and took primary responsibility for the study's conception, design and data collection, and contributed importantly to data analyses, interpretation, and drafting of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Table 1: Supportive Quotes for Key Findings

| 'Getting By' versus 'Getting Help' | |
|---|---|
| 'Getting by' | <p><i>"If the patient speaks some English and I speak some French and a little bit of Spanish, if the answers seem appropriate to me and the patient doesn't demonstrate obvious concern about the interaction and it's relatively simple and not high-risk, then I would accept that communication is adequate." (90703)</i></p> <p><i>"I rely more heavily on my physical exam if I can't communicate with them, like I'd be more cautious with testing if I can't ask a specific question and be reassured" (90708).</i></p> |
| 'Getting help' | <p><i>"But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke, [it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication" (90901)</i></p> <p><i>" (I'll) look for an interpreter or some staff that can come over and help.</i></p> |

You know somebody who speaks that language if they are stable you know and don't look like I need to do anything overly quickly for them and I really can't get a story out of them, then I'll ... get an interpreter first" (90708)

"So that's the problem you run into. You either try to strive to get a really good history through formal interpretation or you end up doing more testing of that person because you're worried about them more." (90614)

Acuity, time constraints and availability of translation aids

Acuity of clinical situation

"It all depends on the clinical situation...I could almost treat a patient who cut their finger without talking to them at all... I'd want to make sure that their tetanus status was up to date, like there's a couple of things that you'd want to sort out, but by and large you could pretty much treat them without talking to them. But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke,[it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication. " (90901)

"So if a patient was sick, for example, had low pressure and a fast heart rate and still spoke no English, I would go in anyway and then just do what I consider to be paediatric medicine. Kids can't talk to you. You know they're two years old and they're crying and they're in pain- I can't get a history from a child the same way I can't get a history from someone who doesn't speak English. " (91118)

Time constraints

"When we have a whole bunch of patients and we've got a busy schedule and we're already twenty minutes behind and so forth, you know we're looking for ways to be as efficient as possible. And if it looks like this patient can give us a few nods appropriately and say a few words that ... they should probably understand. We may be willing to just say okay well we've done our part." (90616)

"We sometimes take shortcuts and sometimes that's acceptable because the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing" (90728)

Ease of use and availability of translation aids/interpreters

"...if two people speak at the same time it can block out the sound and so it can become awkward but I would say that the two handset option is the best option followed by the speaker phone, followed lastly by the one handset option which is really, uh, it's enough to dissuade people from actually going to the language line. " (90615)

"there's a tremendous amount of resistance to going to the one handset: you'd almost rather this person just spoke a few words of English. You might just be inclined to do your best try and see that they understand what 's actually taking place" (90728)

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>"If you're gonna continue this encounter without getting a translator, so if I'm sharp enough to know what this person's language is and it doesn't take long, then I may do a quick search locally, literally around me physically... in a clinic, on a ward, in the Emergency Department to see if someone who works in that department can speak that language and offer translation and there's a fair chance in Toronto you'll get a person who can speak that language fairly (easily). And then that's the better route." (90710)</i></p> |
| <p>A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced in practice</p> | |
| <p>The 'grey zone'</p> | <p><i>"Well I leave that to the patient to decide whether we need some kind of facilitator or an interpreter. You know I usually don't make the decision to say "how well you are comprehending what I'm saying and how well are you able to communicate to me?" So I usually ask them "would you like to have an interpreter present?" And then they may say 'yes' or 'no'. The challenge is that in the real world we don't, we don't always end up having an interpreter readily available. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"... so I sort of assess whether I need, whether I actually have time to wait for the interpreter and then I'd call and ask for an interpreter. I do use family members which is a bit of a grey zone because if there's a se...sensitive information you're no, so you're supposed to have an objective interpreter there, so I will sometimes use family members..." (90828)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of 'real world' vs. ideal world' practice</p> | <p><i>"And they [patient] go 'um thank you'. And that's it, right. And so you kind of, you know clearly it's a suboptimal communication. There are a lot of things that you would really need to discuss to have this patient-centered care ideal. But you know the time that would be required to do that would be quite extensive and so we often take shortcuts that result in non-patient-centered care... It happens all the time frankly and I think well you know, we're probably less likely to do it in a situation where we really feel that it's critical." (90728)</i></p> <p><i>"To be quite honest with you the ones I personally find the most helpful are family members. Because ... they can give you a little bit of the context, and then you can talk to them as well particularly if it's an elderly patient because not only do they translate for you but then they'll also say, "You know what? Grandma hasn't been doing very well for a few months now. She hasn't been preparing her meals properly, she's been losing weight ... I'm concerned about grandma." That's far more valuable to me in some respects than a translator who's just sticking to the letter of the law, and is saying exactly what they're supposed to, without kind of any context. It's just language right? I like the bigger picture" (90702)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of responsibility</p> | <p><i>" We've explained what's going on and they've nodded and kind of looked at me as though they're understanding - so now it's their responsibility, it's not mine any longer. I'm not suggesting that's the way that, you know I practice, but that's what can frequently happen in this grey zone. It's just enough English</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p><i>proficiency to be dangerous.” (90615)</i></p> <p><i>“They (patients/families with LEP) don’t recognize that this is a ha-, a potential hazard...I think some of the responsibility lies with the patient.” (90706)</i></p> <p><i>“ I don’t think that’s a responsibility that patient’s necessarily carrying... That’s not something I would expect of my families ... that’s not a fair expectation I think.” (90708)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of informed consent</p> | <p><i>“I can’t get informed consent when I can’t communicate” (90930)</i></p> <p><i>“ There have been circumstances in the past where we have been concerned as a group that families weren’t accurately expressing our wishes to the patient or our statements to the patient and vice versa. And so there have been circumstances you know particularly in some of these [high] stakes circumstances where we will use professional translators regardless of the presence of the family to translate for just this reason.” (90707)</i></p> |
| <p>Making language discordance a priority</p> | <p><i>“ You know, we really have to get over the language barrier business because it’s not going away—it’s been here for a while and I don’t think we’ve done a particularly good job until very recently—we’re starting to address it—we should be very aggressive about prioritizing this subject “ (90710)</i></p> |

1
2
3 **Acknowledgments:** We wish to thank Caryl M. Patrick for her assistance with data
4 collection.
5
6
7

8
9 **Funding statement:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in
10 the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
11
12

13
14 **Contributorship Statement:** JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and
15 analysis of the data, as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript.
16 NAB contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and
17 participated in all phases of writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception
18 and design of the study, assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in
19 drafting the manuscript. PLH was the principal investigator and took primary
20 responsibility for the study's conception, design and data collection, and contributed
21 importantly to data analyses, interpretation, and drafting of the manuscript. All authors
22 read and approved the final version of the manuscript.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Competing interest statement:** At the time that the study was conducted, all authors
38 were affiliated with the study institution (JAP, NAB, PLH were employees, and TSG was
39 a residency trainee). At time of publication, JAP and NAB continue to be employed by
40 the study institution, while TSG and PLH are employed elsewhere.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data Sharing Statement:** No additional data are available.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Gardam M, Verma G, Campbell A, et al. Impact of the patient-provider relationship on the survival of foreign-born outpatients with tuberculosis. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2009;11:437-45.
2. Burnett A. Globalization, migration and health. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*. 2002. p. 34-43.
3. Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, et al. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(5):465-75.
4. Rivadeneyra R, Elderkin-Thompson V, Cohen Silver R, et al. Patient-centeredness in clinical encounters requiring an interpreter. *American Journal of Medicine*. 2000;108:470-4.
5. Piette JD, Schillinger D, Potter MB, et al. Dimensions of patient-provider communication and diabetes self-care in an ethnically diverse population. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003;18(8):624-33.
6. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, et al. Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low healthliteracy. *Arch Intern Med*. 2003;163:83-90.
7. Bonds DE, Camacho F, Bell RA, et al. The association of patient trust and self-care among patients with diabetes mellitus. *BMC Family Practice*. 2004;5(26).
8. Schenker Y, Lo B, Ettinger KM, et al. Navigating language barriers under difficult circumstances. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2008;149(4):264-9.
9. Morales LS, Cunningham WE, Brown JA, et al. Are Latinos Less Satisfied with Communication by Health Care Providers? *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 1999;14(7):409-17.
10. Baker DW, Hayes R, Fortier JP. Interpreter use and satisfaction with interpersonal aspects of care for Spanish-speaking patients. *Med Care*. 1998;36:1461-70.
11. Carasquillo O, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, et al. Impact of Language Barriers on Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 1999.;14:82-7.

12. Wilson E, Chen A, Grumbach K, et al. Effects of limited English proficiency and physician language on health care comprehension. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2005;20(9):800-6.
13. John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, et al. The effect of English-language proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2004;19:221-8.
14. Perez-Stable EJ, Napoles-Springer A, Miramontes JM. The effects of ethnicity and language on medical outcomes of patients with hypertension or diabetes. *Medical Care*. 1997;35(12):1212-9.
15. Papic O, Malak Z, Rosenberg E. Survey of family physicians' perspectives on management of immigrant patients: Attitudes, barriers, strategies, and training needs. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2012;86:205-9.
16. Lovell BL, Lee RT, Brotheridge CM. Interpersonal factors affecting communication in clinical consultations: Canadian physicians' perspectives. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. 2012;25(6):467-82.
17. Ku L, Flores G. Pay now or pay later: Providing interpreter services in health care. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(2):435-44.
18. Masland MC, Lou C, Snowden L. Use of communication technologies to cost-effectively increase the availability of interpretation services in healthcare settings. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2010;16(6):739-45.
19. City of Toronto. Backgrounder - Census 2011: Language. Statistics Canada. Toronto: City of Toronto; 2012. p. 1-22.
20. Morse JM, Richards L. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2002.
21. Kvale S. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 1996.
22. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2000;23:334-40.
23. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2010;33(1):77-84.
24. Miles MB, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1994.

- 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
25. Crabtree BF, Miller WL. Using codes and code manuals. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 163-77.
 26. Miller WL, Crabtree BF. The dance of interpretation. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 127-43.
 27. Pamphilon B. The Zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1999;5(3):393-410.
 28. Eakin JM, Mykhalovsky E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. *Journal of Evaluation of Clinical Practice*. 2003;9(2):187-94.
 29. Frankel RM. Standards of qualitative research. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 333-46.
 30. Wong JP-H, Poon MK-L. Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*. 2010;21(2):151-8.
 31. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, et al. Getting by: Underuse of interpreters by resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
 32. Taylor E, Jones F. Lost in translation: Exploring therapists' experiences of providing stroke rehabilitation across a language barrier. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2014;early online:1-9.
 33. Maul L, Regenstein M, Andres E, et al. Using a risk assessment approach to determine which factors influence whether partially bilingual physicians rely on their non-English language skills or call an interpreter. *The Joint Commission on Quality and Patient Safety*. 2012;38(7):328-36.
 34. Regenstein M, Andres E, Wynia MK. Appropriate use of non-English language skills in clinical care. *JAMA*. 2013;309(2):145-6.
 35. Flores G. The impact of medical services on the quality of healthcare: A systematic review. *Medical Care Research and Review*. 2005;62(3):255-99.
 36. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen A, et al. Do professional interpreters improve clinical care for patients with limited English proficiency? A systematic review. *Health Services Research*. 2007;42(2):727-54.
 37. Butler-Kisber L. *Qualitative Inquiry*. London: Sage; 2010.

1
2
3 38. Taveras EM, Flores G. Why culture and language matter: The clinical
4 consequences of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to children in
5 the emergency department. *Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine*. 2004;5(2):76-84.
6
7

8 39. Lee SM. A review of language and other communication barriers in health care.
9 In: US Department of Health and Human Services, editor. Portland: 2003.
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

For peer review only

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

To 'Get By' or 'Get Help'? A Qualitative Study of Physicians' Challenges and Dilemmas When Patients Have Limited English Proficiency

Janet A Parsons ^{1,2}, Natalie A Baker ¹, Telisha Smith-Gorvie ^{3,4}, Pamela L Hudak ⁵

¹ *Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 1W8*

² *Department of Physical Therapy and Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Toronto, 160 -500 University Ave., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 1V7*

³ *Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, University Health Network (Toronto General Hospital), RFE GS-480 Emergency Department, 200 Elizabeth St., Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2C4*

⁴ *Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Suite RFE 3-805, 200 Elizabeth St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2C4*

⁵ *The Alternative Dispute Resolution Practice, 700 King St. W (Suite 713), Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5V 2Y6*

Corresponding author: Dr. Janet A. Parsons, Applied Health Research Centre, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON, Canada M5B 1W8; e-mail: parsonsj@smh.ca; Tel: +1-416-864-6060 ext. 7111; fax: +1-416-864-3016.

Key words: language discordance, physician practice, Limited English Proficiency, qualitative methods

Word count: 4,685,420

ABSTRACT

Objective: Encounters between patients and physicians who do not speak the same language are relatively common in Canada, particularly in urban settings; this trend is increasing worldwide. Language discordance has important effects on health outcomes, including mortality. This study sought to explore physicians' experiences of care provision in situations of language discordance in depth.

Design: Qualitative study based on individual interviews. Interview guides elicited physicians' perspectives on how they determined whether communication could proceed unaided. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted, entailing inductive thematic analysis.

Participants: 22 physicians experienced in treating patients in situations of language discordance were recruited from the emergency and internal medicine departments of an urban tertiary-care hospital.

Setting: Large, inner-city teaching hospital in Toronto, Canada, one of the most linguistically diverse cities internationally.

Results: Determining when to 'get by' or 'get help' in order to facilitate communication was described as a fluid and variable process. Deciding which strategy to use depended on three inter-related factors: *time/time constraints*, *acuity of situation*, and *ease of use/availability of translation aids*. Participants reported at times feeling conflicted about their decisions, portraying some of these clinical encounters as a 'troubling space' in

1
2
3 which they experienced one or more *dilemmas* related to *real vs. ideal practice*,
4
5
6 *responsibility*, and *informed consent*.
7
8

9
10 *Conclusions:* In situations of language discordance, a physician's decision to 'get by'
11
12 (versus 'get help') rests on a judgment of whether communication can be considered
13
14 'good enough' to proceed, and depends on the circumstances of the specific encounter.
15
16 The tension set up between what is 'ideal' and what is practically possible can be
17
18 experienced as a dilemma by physicians. The study's findings have implications for
19
20 practice and policy not only in Canada but in other multilingual settings, and indicate that
21
22 physicians require greater support.
23
24

25 26 27 **Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study** 28

- 29 • There are few in-depth studies documenting physicians' experiences of language
30
31 discordance in Canada or elsewhere
32
33
- 34 • Qualitative methodology is well-suited to exploring physicians' experiences of
35
36 communication and care provision
37
38
- 39 • The study deepens our understanding of how physicians decide whether to "get
40
41 by" or "get help" in situations of language discordance, and the dilemmas that
42
43 physicians can experience.
44
- 45 • A limitation is that this was a single-site study with participants from only two
46
47 medical specialties; nevertheless, the concepts generated are transferrable to other
48
49 practice settings
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Clear communication has long been recognized as integral to high-quality medical care. However, physicians frequently encounter situations where effective communication is difficult. One such situation is when physicians and patients do not speak the same language – referred to as language discordance.(1) Increasing globalization, human migration(2) and travel mean that many countries are becoming more and more multi-lingual, and this is especially true of urban centres.(3) Although Canada has two official languages (English and French), it is a nation with many immigrants, representing an array of linguistic traditions. New immigrants may not speak either official language. Major cities are popular settlement areas for new immigrants, thus physicians are extremely likely to encounter patients who do not speak the dominant language. This matters because language barriers can be a source of health disparity, including differential mortality rates.(1) In a Canadian study on tuberculosis, mortality risk was significantly higher (HR = 2.32;95% CI: 1.39-3.88, p<0.001) in situations of language discordance.(1) Language barriers have been shown to: impair patient comprehension(4); act as a barrier to accessing care(5-7); negatively affect treatment adherence(8) (9); and affect satisfaction with care.(10-12) Language barriers are also associated with increased hospital length-of-stay(13), and decreased self-reported health status.(14)

In addition to patients and physicians not sharing a language, social structural features of medical practice can further compound the situation. The fast pace of modern clinical practice has been identified as a challenge to effective communication because decisions

1
2
3 must be made quickly and are often history-dependent. Although there is literature
4
5 documenting outcomes associated with language discordance, there is relatively little
6
7 comprehensive research into physicians' experiences of language discordance generally.
8
9 Moreover, there is a paucity of research eliciting Canadian physicians' perspectives on
10
11 the topic. One survey-based study of Montreal family physicians focused on their
12
13 attitudes towards caring for immigrant patients, with 77% reporting that communication
14
15 was the greatest barrier to patient management.(15) Another recent study surveyed
16
17 physicians from Manitoba, Canada, on factors affecting communication with patients of
18
19 different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, with an emphasis on process errors
20
21 and their relationship not only to language discordance, but a host of other factors, such
22
23 as patient age, gender and trust.(16) Neither of these studies offers in-depth explorations
24
25 of physicians' experiences of caring for patients in situations of language discordance.
26
27 This gap can only be addressed by speaking to physicians directly, using qualitative
28
29 methods. Understanding physicians' experiences is vital, given that language barriers are
30
31 known to translate into negative outcomes for patients (including increased mortality). (1,
32
33 8, 9) Such studies will yield important contextual information about patient care in
34
35 situations of language discordance, identifying opportunities for (and barriers to)
36
37 improvement, and informing practice renewal.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Our study explores physicians' experiences of interacting with patients for whom
52
53 language proficiency (in this case, Limited English Proficiency or LEP)(17, 18) was
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a
4 term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and
5 who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use
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

perceived to hinder effective communication. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used to describe individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English. (13,14) We use 'LEP' interchangeably with 'language discordance'. In this paper, we highlight conditions and strategies associated with circumstances in which physicians 'get by' or 'get help' in these encounters.

METHODS

This study focuses on physicians' practice experiences where LEP was perceived to be the main factor hindering effective communication with patients. These accounts encompassed an array of situations, including those in which physician and patient had any of the following: no shared language, some shared language, comprehension issues related to accents, situations where no translation aids were used, or those where different types of translation aids were used. We did not consider situations where communication was influenced by a patient's inability to speak as a result of aphasia or some other cognitive or mechanical issue.

Setting

The study was conducted in Toronto, Canada's most multicultural city, with over 160 languages spoken.(19) English is the dominant language. The study institution, a tertiary-care teaching hospital, serves patients diverse in language and culture, and its physicians are likely to have significant clinical experience with LEP patients. The study was

1
2
3 approved by the institution's Research Ethics Board and written informed consent was
4
5
6 obtained from all participants.
7

8 9 **Sample**

10
11
12 All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
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
All staff physicians and senior residents in the hospital's departments of Internal
Medicine and Emergency Medicine were eligible for inclusion. Participants were invited
to share their experiences 'when challenges to communication secondary to language
discordance are encountered in routine clinical practice'. Twenty-two physicians agreed
to participate, including both men (17) and women (5), with a wide range of years of
clinical experience (Mean: 10.7; Range: 1-28).

28 **Data Collection**

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
Semi-structured audiotaped interviews were conducted, lasting one hour on average. The
interview guide was developed by researchers with practice and methodological
expertise, and pilot tested with three participants.(20) Following pilot testing the wording
was modified to improve clarity of some questions, but no substantive changes to
content were required. Questions focused on how physicians determine whether
communication is adequate to proceed unaided. They were asked to recall clinical
encounters where a) they did not share a language with the patient/family member; and b)
they shared a language but not at the same proficiency. Details were probed concerning:
a) conditions under which physicians feel they need to get help; b) strategies employed to
facilitate communication; c) what they say they usually do when working with LEP

1
2
3 patients; and d) how they feel about what they do. A copy of the interview guide appears
4
5 in the appendix. All interviews occurred in summer and fall of 2009.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Data Analysis**

13
14
15 Interviews were transcribed and analysed using an approach of qualitative descriptive
16
17 analysis (as described by Sandelowski), in order to inductively identify, code and
18
19 categorize patterns in the data.(21-25) The senior investigator began by reading the
20
21 interviews closely, identifying key themes and patterns, reviewing the data multiple times
22
23 and developing codes as new topics and relationships were identified.(26, 27) At this
24
25 early stage, an experienced qualitative researcher who was not part of the research team
26
27 also reviewed several transcripts and made independent observations. A preliminary
28
29 coding scheme was developed and applied to all transcripts.(24, 25) Analytic rigour was
30
31 aided by continual re-examination of the data by all authors throughout the research
32
33 process.(28, 29)
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **RESULTS**

42
43
44 A key early insight was that participants' accounts could be viewed as describing the
45
46 conditions under which physicians 'get by' in a clinical encounter even when language
47
48 proficiency is not shared, in contrast to when they decide that they must 'get help' to
49
50 proceed further. *Getting by* means proceeding with the interaction without seeking
51
52 assistance. *Getting help* entails pausing the interaction to seek translation/interpretation
53
54 services or tools. Deciding which strategy to employ was depicted as context-driven, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 primarily dependent on three factors: time constraints, patient acuity, and
4
5 ease/availability of translation assistance/aids. Decision-making was sometimes portrayed
6
7 as ‘troubling’, a process characterized by three overlapping dilemmas, the *gap between*
8
9 *real vs. ideal practice*, the notion of *responsibility*, and the issue of *informed consent*.
10
11

12 Table 1 includes quotes supporting the findings outlined below.
13

14 15 16 **To “get by” or “get help”?** 17

18
19 Participants encountered many different languages in their practice settings. Typically, another
20
21 member of the healthcare team informed physicians of a patient’s LEP status (verbally or in
22
23 writing), and whether a translator was available. Participants recounted that they then validated
24
25 the patient’s LEP status independently, using both verbal and non-verbal cues (e.g. gestures,
26
27 facial expressions) to gauge understanding (e.g. purposely asking open-ended questions). Upon
28
29 identifying a language barrier, they then described a process of weighing whether they could ‘get
30
31 by’ or whether they should ‘get help’.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In some cases, physicians would ‘get by’ with what they can glean from a patient without shared
40
41 language. These situations were described by one physician as the “grey zone” in which a
42
43 patient’s “level of English proficiency is good enough so that maybe you can feel that you can get
44
45 by but their comprehension may in fact be poor enough that they can get into trouble” (90615).
46
47

48 The tendency in these cases is to “follow the path of least resistance” i.e. getting by with any
49
50 resources readily available.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Choosing to 'get by' without additional assistance can include any of the following strategies:
4 speaking more slowly, enunciating more carefully, using plain language and requesting that the
5 patient paraphrase instructions to gauge understanding. Participants perceived situations of
6 limited/imperfect communication as 'risky'. They compensated by proceeding with caution –
7 giving patients more time than usual, double checking test results, ordering more tests, or
8 keeping patients longer for observation. As a result, clinical assessments tended to privilege
9 objective findings over subjective reports.
10

11
12 Participants also described situations where they considered it too risky to proceed without
13 confidence in communication quality: e.g. attempting to determine medication side effects, or
14 discussing end-of-life care. 'Getting help' ranged from using professional translators/interpreters,
15 to having other staff or family members translate, to using the language line. (18) In our study,
16 the term 'language line' is used to describe telephone interpretation via single or dual handset
17 phones whereby the interpreter is located outside of the immediate clinical setting, providing real-
18 time interpretation as the parties speak. (23) This has been referred to as "UN-style
19 interpretation."(23) (p.741) . Overall participants indicated that, when time permitted, their
20 preference of use, in descending order, was: professional interpreters (first choice), then the
21 language line, and finally other hospital staff or family members.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Acuity/severity of illness, time constraints and ease/availability of translation aids

43
44
45
46 Choosing whether to 'get by' or 'get help' hinged on several interlinked factors. The patient's
47 clinical status and their relative acuity was commonly mentioned as a primary factor for
48 consideration. For example, a physician recounted a situation where a patient presented with
49 signs of stroke. He elected to 'get by' due to the urgency of the situation and the potential
50 consequences of delaying definitive care; the patient subsequently recovered. This participant
51 acknowledged that 'getting by' entailed proceeding with "imperfect information", treating "more
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of what they could see rather than the symptoms” (90706). Even though the physician considered
4 this less-than-ideal, ‘getting by’ often trumped ‘getting help’ in emergency situations.
5

6
7 Conversely, if a case involves for example providing discharge instructions to a stable patient,
8 participants said they felt they had ‘time on their side’ to await a translator. The interaction
9 between a less-acute situation and available time highlights the inter-relatedness of clinical status
10 with a second factor, time. However there was no simple equation for determining whether to ‘get
11 by’ or ‘get help’ vis-à-vis clinical status: “it’s a judgment call...it’s more of an art than a science”
12 (90901).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 Time is another factor informing physicians’ decision-making. Participants depicted choosing the
26 most pragmatic path of care when faced with time-related constraints. Many physicians described
27 the significant time and effort involved in obtaining relevant clinical information from LEP
28 patients. They told of “verifying, inferring, checking charts, checking with pharmacist, etc.”
29 (90710). Time could be an issue even when a translator is available because this “doubles the
30 duration of the interaction so everything takes twice as long” (90728) -- which is suboptimal in
31 emergencies. Physicians also spoke of time pressures to manage their busy caseloads when
32 weighing what to do: allocating additional time to LEP patients may limit the time they have
33 available for others in need. Some participants spoke about translator availability (e.g. harder to
34 reach during night shifts). One participant described a situation where it took four days for a
35 translator to become available. Such delays influence not only quality of care, but also hold cost
36 implications if hospital length-of-stay is affected.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 A third factor influencing whether to ‘get by’ or ‘get help’ was the ease of use/availability of
53 translation aids/interpreters. Some physicians admitted resistance to using technology-based
54 interpretation. Though telephone-based language lines are designed to improve patient-physician
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communication, in practice, our participants reported that they can be awkward. Participants drew
4 on a variety of experiences with language lines in different settings, indicating that all language
5 lines are not created equal. For example, single handsets were seen as less preferable than the two
6 handset option, although even with two handsets, it could be awkward if two people speak at the
7 same time. Speaker phone was another option used.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 19 **A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced**

20
21
22 Participants expressed feeling conflicted at times over decisions to 'get by' or 'get help'.
23 While they recognized that 'getting by' was often less-than-ideal, it was sometimes
24 perceived as all that they could do. Such decision-making could be a source of anxiety.
25
26
27
28

29 A participant noted that some patients have "just enough proficiency for it to be
30 dangerous" (90615). The language of 'danger' is significant, suggesting an unsettling and
31 troubling experience for participants. A series of overlapping dilemmas constitute this
32 troubling space, namely: *the gap between real vs. ideal practice*, notions of
33 *responsibility*, and issues of *informed consent*.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *The dilemma of 'real world' vs. 'ideal world' practice*

43
44
45
46 Physicians told of taking shortcuts and making judgment calls that, in some instances, could be
47 considered acceptable practice. One participant said, "the time that you save by taking shortcuts
48 is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing"
49 (90728). For example, participants recognized that using other staff members in the immediate
50 vicinity who spoke the same language was not ideal, yet they would often opt for this approach as
51 most efficient. In a similar vein, most participants indicated that using family members was not a
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preferred option; however one commented on what they saw as potential benefits to using family
4 members – that, unlike professional interpreters, families were able to provide additional
5 contextual information as well as the relative’s perspective on the patient condition during
6 interpretation (90702). Despite these pragmatic considerations, most participants acknowledged
7 that there is an optimal or “best” way of providing care in these situations, namely the use of
8 professional interpreters or translation aids.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 There was a tension in many accounts between what they *should do* (based on recognized best
19 practices in an ideal world) and what they ultimately *can* do at the bedside. They appear to use a
20 sliding scale for decision-making, which is context-dependent, and allows them to gauge when
21 ‘getting by’ can be justified.
22
23
24
25
26

27 *The dilemma of responsibility*

28
29
30 Participants expressed discomfort concerning who is ultimately *responsible* for ensuring adequate
31 communication. While they recognized that they have an ethical obligation to ensure
32 understanding, at the same time, some physicians appeared to put at least some of the onus on
33 patients. In some situations, participants said they left the decision of whether communication
34 was ‘good enough’ to the patient. They portrayed communication as a shared responsibility
35 between physician and patient. However they also depicted themselves as making their decisions
36 about whether to get help as something they did on their own – they spoke at length about the
37 information *they* deemed important, but said relatively little about what information *patients*
38 might see as important.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *The dilemma of informed consent*

51
52
53
54
55 Another dilemma characterized by participants surrounded *informed consent*. In LEP situations,
56 physicians may have to rely on professional translators or family members to secure consent.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Family members as translators were of particular concern to participants. Professional translators
4
5 were perceived to be impartial and accurate when relaying information. Physicians expressed
6
7 concern that family translators may change what is imparted due to personal biases or
8
9 misinterpretations. Participants described a number of these situations, such as when patients and
10
11 families appeared to differ in their wishes.
12

13
14
15 Participants acknowledged the issue of best practices with LEP patients as an important priority
16
17 for physicians. A few participants took this sentiment a step further, warning that: “We could
18
19 even argue from an ethical or legal standpoint of course that we’re obligated to ensure that there’s
20
21 appropriate communication” (090615). ‘Patient-centred care’ is espoused by both hospitals and
22
23 clinicians, and it is expected that treatment decisions will be made jointly between patient and
24
25 provider. A principle of informed consent is that physicians provide the information patients need
26
27 in order to make informed decisions. But gauging whether LEP patients have *really* understood
28
29 information provided can be challenging.
30
31

32 33 34 **DISCUSSION**

35
36
37 This study examined experiences of physicians working with LEP patients. Participants described
38
39 two strategies for dealing with such situations: ‘getting by’ versus ‘getting help.’ The
40
41 physicians in our study depicted their decisions to ‘get by’ as based on a judgment
42
43 regarding whether communication was ‘good enough’ to proceed unaided, and depended
44
45 on the specific circumstances. Participants characterized clinical encounters with LEP patients
46
47 as a sometimes ‘troubling’ social space, presenting professional dilemmas. There was a tension
48
49 between recognizing what they *should do* (based on recognized best practices) and what they *can*
50
51 *do* at the bedside (based on constraints of time and resources).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our findings have important practice implications. For example, participants noted that in
4 situations where they elect to 'get by', they conduct more tests on LEP patients, to mitigate risk.
5
6 There were no hard-and-fast rules for managing such risk; physicians told of making decisions in-
7 the-moment, gauging the acuity/complexity of each patient's condition, circumstances,
8
9 availability of translation aids/interpreters, and their own caseload/obligations to other patients.
10
11 The threshold at which a physician shifts from getting by to getting help is variable, fluid and
12 dependent upon the individual and context. The suggestion that adequate communication is a
13 shared responsibility presumes a team-based approach between physician and patient. However,
14 team-based care usually implies open lines of communication, which is not the case in LEP. This
15 may contribute to the sense of discomfort expressed by participants.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Discomfort may also stem partly from an underlying assumption that translation should be 'value
31 neutral' and as 'objective' as laboratory testing. Translation during a clinical encounter is a social
32 act, and as such is both complex and contingent. Wong and Poon (2010) argue for translation
33 being viewed "not (as) a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of
34 another",⁽³⁰⁾(p.152) but rather one imbued with meaning and interpretation on each side. Social
35 context and power relations cannot be ignored.⁽³⁰⁾ Rather than treating challenges presented by
36 LEP as an inconvenience, they should be given priority and clinicians offered greater support.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 It should be noted that data collection for this study took place in 2009, when fewer supports were
51 available. At that time, relatively little orientation to interpretation services was offered to
52 medical residents at the study facility, but now instruction regarding available interpretation
53 services is being offered routinely. Training in language barriers and cultural competence is now
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

gaining attention amongst medical educators. Telephone interpretation services continue to evolve and become more user-friendly; however other supports are still needed to make it easier for physicians to 'get help' when they need it. [The study site has had policies relating to the provision of interpretation services for patients experiencing language barriers since at least the year 2000. These policies are aligned with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as well as the Ontario Human Rights Act. The institution's policy on interpreter services in place at the time of the study \(as well as the current one\) refers to certain conditions where it is clear that professional interpreters are required \(e.g. signing of consent documents, provision of detailed discharge instructions\) and in which the participants indicated that they felt confident in 'getting help' from professional interpretation services. All the physicians in our study expressed a desire to 'do the right thing', but acknowledged that pragmatic considerations \(including the availability and ease-of-use of resources\) might interfere with their ability to execute it to the level of the ideal. It was these instances that they sometimes found troubling.](#) Busy caseloads and time constraints on clinical practice [were and](#) continue to be an issue for most clinicians. For example, it can take some time for an interpreter to be found for telephone interpretation (depending on the specific language required), which again takes time away from caring for other patients. The use of a language line presumes that there is always a telephone readily accessible at the bedside (e.g. handset-based language line), which is not always the case, even in hospital settings. [In cases where the language in question is relatively rare, there can be a waiting period to secure an appropriate translator even by telephone. In the city of Toronto, many different languages are spoken, which further adds to the complexity of the situation.](#) When using in-person interpreters, aligning the schedules of physician, professional interpreter, and patient is frequently complex, with some physicians commenting that it can range from several hours to days before these sessions occur. This is confirmed by the findings from other researchers working with both physicians and other health care practitioners. (31, 32) As a result, it is not surprising that in some

1
2
3 circumstances, physicians opt for the ‘path of least resistance’ (which may include using another
4 health care professional or a family member to interpret).
5
6

7
8
9 The implications for patients should not be underestimated. Rivadeneyra et al (2000) indicate that
10 situations of LEP negatively affect the provision of patient-centred primary care(4): even with
11 the aid of interpreters, US physicians were less likely to probe further into symptoms of non-
12 English-speaking patients.(4) Clinical consequences of LEP can range from problems accessing
13 care and treatment non-adherence, to higher mortality rates.(1, 8, 9). Opportunities for gaining
14 crucial insights may be missed (e.g. understanding additional variables underlying presenting
15 illness)(9) as may opportunities for developing rapport and trust, when physicians opt to ‘get
16 by.’(33) . Moreover, it has potential medico-legal consequences: how far should a physician go to
17 ensure ‘adequate’ communication has been achieved in order to mitigate the potential of risk and
18 harm? Participants are warranted in their characterizations of language discordant situations as
19 troubling spaces.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Our study builds on prior work conducted by Diamond and colleagues (2009). They also used
38 the phrase “getting by” to describe their study’s findings of medical residents’ experiences of
39 caring for patients in two US cities. (31) Similar to our study, Diamond and colleagues found
40 that factors such as time constraints and convenience were cited as influencing participants’
41 decisions to ‘get by’. While our study confirms some of Diamond’s findings and in another
42 country/setting (with a very different health care system, and among other specialists), it also
43 goes considerably further. Our study examined physicians’ experiences with a variety of
44 translation options (not just the use of professional in-person interpreters), and explored a range
45 of perspectives that included those of experienced staff physicians as well as less experienced
46 medical residents. This indicates that the phenomenon of ‘getting by’ is experienced by clinician
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trainees who are early in their professional lives, but also, more surprisingly, by seasoned senior
4 staff. The habits developed during residencies evidently persist over time, and although these
5 habits are characterized as unsettling they appear to be the status quo. This suggests that the issue
6 of LEP should be more firmly embedded not only in medical school curricula, but in continuing
7 education programs as well. Our study goes further and offers an in-depth exploration of the
8 dilemmas experienced that, according to participants, result from not being able to put the 'ideal'
9 into practice. Diamond's participants were frequently unaware of standards of practice for
10 interpretation in their settings, (31) while participants in our study were acutely aware of what
11 they *should* do, but frequently found this difficult to put into practice. Diamond's team did not
12 appear to probe participants explicitly about what might be lost when a lot of clinical information
13 is missing, while our participants seemed acutely aware of what might be missing and described
14 how they tried to off-set this by relying more heavily on diagnostic testing. Finally, our study
15 explored the decision-making process of 'getting by' versus 'getting help' in richer detail,
16 deepening our understanding of physicians' experiences.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 While our study did not include the experiences of bilingual physicians, Maul and colleagues
36 (2012) and Regenstein et al (2013) have looked at physicians' willingness to 'get by' in situations
37 where physicians and patients may share a language, but where physicians are less than fully
38 fluent. (33, 34) Their findings indicate that even in these situations, physicians' non-English-
39 language skills are highly heterogeneous, and that there is considerable risk of
40 miscommunication. (34) Physician-patient communication is complex (and often less-than-ideal)
41 even when both parties share the same language. Our study illuminates how the addition of
42 language barriers into the communicative space adds further layers of complexity.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
There is a growing body of evidence indicating that employing the services of professional
interpreters has important positive implications not only for clinical outcomes, but more effective
health care utilization (e.g. improved preventive screening rates, reduced risk of hospitalizations).

1
2
3 (35, 36) There is less compelling evidence that the use of professional in-person interpreters has
4
5 negative impacts on duration of individual visits. (36) The participants in our study spoke at
6
7 length about time constraints, but this was often related to tracking down interpretation services
8
9 and scheduling difficulties, rather than the length of the clinical encounter itself. It is possible
10
11 that telephone interpretation may be able to off-set the difficulties of scheduling in-person
12
13 interpretation. Recent technological improvements in telephone interpretation/language lines and
14
15 a greater number of options available since the time of the study suggest that these may be the
16
17 most important solutions to invest in. Participants in our study indicated that physicians are most
18
19 likely to follow the 'path of least resistance' for securing interpretation services, therefore
20
21 implementation and testing of innovative, user-friendly telephone interpretation services should
22
23 be a focus for future research.
24
25
26

27
28 Our study has limitations. As a single-centre study, its sample size might be considered small by
29
30 quantitative standards. However qualitative studies are meant to generalize the *concepts*
31
32 generated, not to the population of physicians as a whole.(21, 37) As such the concepts of 'getting
33
34 by' and 'getting help' are transferable to a wide range of practice settings. It might also be
35
36 argued that the experiences of the physician participants presented here were shaped by a site-
37
38 specific lack and/or inefficiency of resources. On the contrary, the study institution (a tertiary care
39
40 teaching hospital located in Canada's most diverse city) has systematically funded both in-person
41
42 and telephone-based translation services and has appropriate policies and procedures in place
43
44 related to interpretation that have continued to evolve over the past decade. If physicians found it
45
46 challenging to care for LEP patients in this setting, it is likely that those with access to fewer
47
48 resources struggle even more.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our study does not address cultural differences. Language and culture are inextricably linked and
4 can result in differential access to care. (4, 38) Physician-patient miscommunication can also
5 result from different cultural norms and understandings.(39) This should be a focus for future
6 research. Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of technological advances, wireless, telephone-based
7 translation services have become more available in medical facilities. It is conceivable that
8 previous obstacles to accessing timely professional translation services outlined here may be less
9 of an issue currently. Data collection took place in 2009 and the telephone translation option has
10 continued to evolve in the intervening period. Finally, our study does not address financial
11 considerations. We understand that annual costs associated with in-person professional and
12 technology-mediated translation services are not inconsiderable. This may represent a further
13 constraint on putting the ideal of professional interpretation into practice. In a systematic review,
14 Flores (2005) indicates that there are few studies related to costs of interpretation services.(35)
15 This should be a topic for further research.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 This study begins to illuminate the difficult terrain of caring for LEP patients. In doing so, it
37 opens up an opportunity to break the silence that exists amongst clinicians on this issue, and
38 invites them to explore it. These doctors recognized that the shortcuts they are sometimes forced
39 to take are less than ideal, but they also outlined the real-world constraints that make these
40 shortcuts necessary in their current practice environment. And those environments are not
41 conducive to doctors reflecting upon the issue or even discussing it with their colleagues. We see
42 our research as a catalyst for beginning this conversation. The dilemmas described here are likely
43 encountered regularly by physicians practicing in large cities, in many jurisdictions, not just in
44 Canada. Although time constraints, patient acuity and ease/availability of translation aids all play
45 a role in physicians' decisions to 'get by' or 'get help', provision of more (and more user-
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

friendly) language lines only partially addresses the issue. Improved support for physicians navigating this complex social space should be prioritized.

Contributors: JAP contributed substantially to the interpretation and analysis of the data, as well as taking primary responsibility for drafting the manuscript. NAB contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of the data and participated in all phases of writing the manuscript. TSG contributed to the conception and design of the study, assisted in the analysis and interpretation of data, and assisted in drafting the manuscript. PLH was the principal investigator and took primary responsibility for the study's conception, design [and data collection](#), [and contributed importantly to](#) data analyses, interpretation, and drafting of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Table 1: Supportive Quotes for Key Findings

| 'Getting By' versus 'Getting Help' | |
|---|---|
| 'Getting by' | <p><i>"If the patient speaks some English and I speak some French and a little bit of Spanish, If the answers seem appropriate to me and the patient doesn't demonstrate obvious concern about the interaction and it's relatively simple and not high-risk, then I would accept that communication is adequate." (90703)</i></p> <p><i>"I rely more heavily on my physical exam if I can't communicate with them, like I'd be more cautious with testing if I can't ask a specific question and be reassured" (90708).</i></p> |
| 'Getting help' | <p><i>"But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke, [it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication" (90901)</i></p> <p><i>" (I'll) look for an interpreter or some staff that can come over and help.</i></p> |

You know somebody who speaks that language if they are stable you know and don't look like I need to do anything overly quickly for them and I really can't get a story out of them, then I'll ... get an interpreter first" (90708)

"So that's the problem you run into. You either try to strive to get a really good history through formal interpretation or you end up doing more testing of that person because you're worried about them more." (90614)

Acuity, time constraints and availability of translation aids

Acuity of clinical situation

"It all depends on the clinical situation...I could almost treat a patient who cut their finger without talking to them at all... I'd want to make sure that their tetanus status was up to date, like there's a couple of things that you'd want to sort out, but by and large you could pretty much treat them without talking to them. But somebody with chest pain or some funny neurologic symptom that you're worried could be a stroke,[it's] extremely difficult to treat without having a solid base of communication. " (90901)

"So if a patient was sick, for example, had low pressure and a fast heart rate and still spoke no English, I would go in anyway and then just do what I consider to be paediatric medicine. Kids can't talk to you. You know they're two years old and they're crying and they're in pain- I can't get a history from a child the same way I can't get a history from someone who doesn't speak English. " (91118)

Time constraints

"When we have a whole bunch of patients and we've got a busy schedule and we're already twenty minutes behind and so forth, you know we're looking for ways to be as efficient as possible. And if it looks like this patient can give us a few nods appropriately and say a few words that ... they should probably understand. We may be willing to just say okay well we've done our part." (90616)

"We sometimes take shortcuts and sometimes that's acceptable because the time that you save by taking shortcuts is justified because there are more important things that you need to spend your time doing" (90728)

Ease of use and availability of translation aids/interpreters

"...if two people speak at the same time it can block out the sound and so it can become awkward but I would say that the two handset option is the best option followed by the speaker phone, followed lastly by the one handset option which is really, uh, it's enough to dissuade people from actually going to the language line. " (90615)

"there's a tremendous amount of resistance to going to the one handset: you'd almost rather this person just spoke a few words of English. You might just be inclined to do your best try and see that they understand what 's actually taking place" (90728)

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>"If you're gonna continue this encounter without getting a translator, so if I'm sharp enough to know what this person's language is and it doesn't take long, then I may do a quick search locally, literally around me physically... in a clinic, on a ward, in the Emergency Department to see if someone who works in that department can speak that language and offer translation and there's a fair chance in Toronto you'll get a person who can speak that language fairly (easily). And then that's the better route." (90710)</i></p> |
| <p>A troubling space: Dilemmas experienced in practice</p> | |
| <p>The 'grey zone'</p> | <p><i>"Well I leave that to the patient to decide whether we need some kind of facilitator or an interpreter. You know I usually don't make the decision to say "how well you are comprehending what I'm saying and how well are you able to communicate to me?" So I usually ask them "would you like to have an interpreter present?" And then they may say 'yes' or 'no'. The challenge is that in the real world we don't, we don't always end up having an interpreter readily available. " (90615)</i></p> <p><i>"... so I sort of assess whether I need, whether I actually have time to wait for the interpreter and then I'd call and ask for an interpreter. I do use family members which is a bit of a grey zone because if there's a se...sensitive information you're no, so you're supposed to have an objective interpreter there, so I will sometimes use family members..." (90828)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of 'real world' vs. ideal world' practice</p> | <p><i>"And they [patient] go 'um thank you'. And that's it, right. And so you kind of, you know clearly it's a suboptimal communication. There are a lot of things that you would really need to discuss to have this patient-centered care ideal. But you know the time that would be required to do that would be quite extensive and so we often take shortcuts that result in non-patient-centered care... It happens all the time frankly and I think well you know, we're probably less likely to do it in a situation where we really feel that it's critical." (90728)</i></p> <p><i>"To be quite honest with you the ones I personally find the most helpful are family members. Because ... they can give you a little bit of the context, and then you can talk to them as well particularly if it's an elderly patient because not only do they translate for you but then they'll also say, "You know what? Grandma hasn't been doing very well for a few months now. She hasn't been preparing her meals properly, she's been losing weight ... I'm concerned about grandma." That's far more valuable to me in some respects than a translator who's just sticking to the letter of the law, and is saying exactly what they're supposed to, without kind of any context. It's just language right? I like the bigger picture" (90702)</i></p> |
| <p>Dilemma of responsibility</p> | <p><i>" We've explained what's going on and they've nodded and kind of looked at me as though they're understanding - so now it's their responsibility, it's not mine any longer. I'm not suggesting that's the way that, you know I practice, but that's what can frequently happen in this grey zone. It's just enough English</i></p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p><i>proficiency to be dangerous.” (90615)</i></p> <p><i>“They (patients/families with LEP) don’t recognize that this is a ha-, a potential hazard...I think some of the responsibility lies with the patient.” (90706)</i></p> <p><i>“ I don’t think that’s a responsibility that patient’s necessarily carrying... That’s not something I would expect of my families ... that’s not a fair expectation I think.” (90708)</i></p> |
| Dilemma of informed consent | <p><i>“I can’t get informed consent when I can’t communicate” (90930)</i></p> <p><i>“ There have been circumstances in the past where we have been concerned as a group that families weren’t accurately expressing our wishes to the patient or our statements to the patient and vice versa. And so there have been circumstances you know particularly in some of these [high] stakes circumstances where we will use professional translators regardless of the presence of the family to translate for just this reason.” (90707)</i></p> |
| Making language discordance a priority | <p><i>“ You know, we really have to get over the language barrier business because it’s not going away—it’s been here for a while and I don’t think we’ve done a particularly good job until very recently—we’re starting to address it—we should be very aggressive about prioritizing this subject “ (90710)</i></p> |

Acknowledgments: We wish to thank Caryl M. Patrick for her assistance with data collection.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interest statement: [At the time that the study was conducted, all authors were affiliated with the study institution \(JAP, NAB, PLH were employees, and TSG was a residency trainee\). At time of publication, JAP and NAB continue to be employed by the study institution, while TSG and PLH are employed elsewhere. The authors have no competing interests to declare.](#)

References

1. Gardam M, Verma G, Campbell A, Wang J, Khan K. Impact of the patient-provider relationship on the survival of foreign-born outpatients with tuberculosis. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2009;11:437-45.
2. Burnett A. Globalization, migration and health. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*. 2002. p. 34-43.
3. Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, Sarangi S, Jones R. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(5):465-75.
4. Rivadeneyra R, Elderkin-Thompson V, Cohen Silver R, Waitzkin H. Patient-centeredness in clinical encounters requiring an interpreter. *American Journal of Medicine*. 2000;108:470-4.
5. Piette JD, Schillinger D, Potter MB, Heisler M. Dimensions of patient-provider communication and diabetes self-care in an ethnically diverse population. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003;18(8):624-33.
6. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, Wang F, Wilson C, Daher C. Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low healthliteracy. *Arch Intern Med*. 2003;163:83-90.
7. Bonds DE, Camacho F, Bell RA, Duren-Winfield VT, Anderson RT, Goff DC. The association of patient trust and self-care among patients with diabetes mellitus. *BMC Family Practice*. 2004;5(26).
8. Schenker Y, Lo B, Ettinger KM, Fernandez A. Navigating language barriers under difficult circumstances. . *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2008;149(4):264-9.
9. Morales LS, Cunningham WE, Brown JA, Liu H, Hays RD. Are Latinos Less Satisfied with Communication by Health Care Providers? *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 1999;14(7):409-17.
10. Baker DW, Hayes R, Fortier JP. Interpreter use and satisfaction with interpersonal aspects of care for Spanish-speaking patients. . *Med Care*. 1998;36:1461-70.
11. Carasquillo O, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Burstin HR. Impact of Language Barriers on Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 1999.;14:82-7.

12. Wilson E, Chen A, Grumbach K, Wang F, Fernandez A. Effects of limited English proficiency and physician language on health care comprehension. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2005;20(9):800-6.
13. John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, Alibhai SMH, Etchells E, Cheung A, et al. The effect of English-language proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2004;19:221-8.
14. Perez-Stable EJ, Napoles-Springer A, Miramontes JM. The effects of ethnicity and language on medical outcomes of patients with hypertension or diabetes. *Medical Care*. 1997;35(12):1212-9.
15. Papic O, Malak Z, Rosenberg E. Survey of family physicians' perspectives on management of immigrant patients: Attitudes, barriers, strategies, and training needs. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2012;86:205-9.
16. Lovell BL, Lee RT, Brotheridge CM. Interpersonal factors affecting communication in clinical consultations: Canadian physicians' perspectives. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. 2012;25(6):467-82.
17. Ku L, Flores G. Pay now or pay later: Providing interpreter services in health care. *Health Affairs*. 2005;24(2):435-44.
18. Masland MC, Lou C, Snowden L. Use of communication technologies to cost-effectively increase the availability of interpretation services in healthcare settings. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2010;16(6):739-45.
19. City of Toronto. Backgrounder - Census 2011: Language. Statistics Canada. Toronto: City of Toronto; 2012. p. 1-22.
20. Morse JM, Richards L. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2002.
21. Kvale S. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 1996.
22. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2000;23:334-40.
23. Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2010;33(1):77-84.
24. Miles MB, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1994.

- 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
25. Crabtree BF, Miller WL. Using codes and code manuals. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 163-77.
 26. Miller WL, Crabtree BF. The dance of interpretation. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 127-43.
 27. Pamphilon B. The Zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1999;5(3):393-410.
 28. Eakin JM, Mykhalovsky E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. *Journal of Evaluation of Clinical Practice*. 2003;9(2):187-94.
 29. Frankel RM. Standards of qualitative research. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WL, editors. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 333-46.
 30. Wong JP-H, Poon MK-L. Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*. 2010;21(2):151-8.
 31. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, Bradley EH, Fernandez A. Getting by: Underuse of interpreters by resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
 32. Taylor E, Jones F. Lost in translation: Exploring therapists' experiences of providing stroke rehabilitation across a language barrier. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2014;early online:1-9.
 33. Maul L, Regenstein M, Andres E, Wright R, Wynia MK. Using a risk assessment approach to determine which factors influence whether partially bilingual physicians rely on their non-English language skills or call an interpreter. *The Joint Commission on Quality and Patient Safety*. 2012;38(7):328-36.
 34. Regenstein M, Andres E, Wynia MK. Appropriate use of non-English language skills in clinical care. *JAMA*. 2013;309(2):145-6.
 35. Flores G. The impact of medical services on the quality of healthcare: A systematic review. *Medical Care Research and Review*. 2005;62(3):255-99.
 36. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen A, Mutha S. Do professional interpreters improve clinical care for patients with limited English proficiency? A systematic review. *Health Services Research*. 2007;42(2):727-54.

- 1
2
3 37. Butler-Kisber L. Qualitative Inquiry. London: Sage; 2010.
4
5
6 38. Taveras EM, Flores G. Why culture and language matter: The clinical
7 consequences of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to children in
8 the emergency department. Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine. 2004;5(2):76-84.
9
10 39. Lee SM. A review of language and other communication barriers in health care.
11 In: US Department of Health and Human Services, editor. Portland: 2003.
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

For peer review only

Appendix: Interview Guide

1. Warm-up Questions

- a. Are you a staff physician or a resident?
- b. How many years have you been in (practice/residency)?
- c. In your opinion, do you feel able to communicate effectively in any languages other than English?
- d. In your clinical experience, which languages, other than English, have you most commonly encountered in your practice?

2. This might sound like a question that has an obvious answer, but I wonder if you could tell me how you usually come to realize that there could be differences in language between you and a patient?

Probes:

- How do you figure out whether the communication is ‘good enough to proceed?’
- How do you proceed differently than you would if you shared a language?
- How do you determine whether they are understanding what you are saying?
- How do you determine whether you are understanding what they are saying?

3. Scenarios:

A. Can you think back to a recent encounter when communication was difficult or impossible because you and the patient did **not** share a language? Please describe it and how you handled the situation.

Probes:

- What precisely mattered about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- What did you think?
- Are you aware of any strategies you use to try to facilitate the communication?
- Does that work?
- What happened as a result?
- How does that make you feel?
- What are your reflections on this situation now?
- Did you notice the patient doing anything to try to facilitate your interaction?

B. Can you now think back to a recent encounter when communication was difficult because you and the patient **share** a language but *not* at the same level of proficiency?

Probes:

- What was the most pressing issue or concerned you most about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- What did you think?

- Are you aware of any strategies you use to try to facilitate communication?
- Does that work?
- What happened as a result?
- What are your reflections on the situation now?
- Did you notice the patient doing anything to try to facilitate your interaction?

4. I am now going to give you a hypothetical scenario to read to yourself and then I'm going to get your perspective on it: "You are rounding on a busy Friday afternoon when you receive a consultation from the Emergency Department. The consult is a 65 year-old man with possible transient ischemic attacks (TIAs). All of his investigations, including blood work, ECGs and his head CT are unremarkable. He is accompanied by his wife; they both possess limited English skills. They can answer simply yes/no questions, but you find you are unable to complete your history and physical examination to your satisfaction because of the patient's limited English."

Probes:

- Describe how you would feel in this situation?
- What precisely mattered about not being able to speak the same language in this situation?
- How would you approach this situation?
- What might you do differently in this situation compared to one in which there are no problems with shared language?
- What would you do?
- What would you not do?
- How do you think this might compare with what really happens?

5. In general, do you think patients with whom communication is difficult might be cared for or approached differently? If so, how?

6. This next question is about "patient-centered care" which is considered an ideal for best practices in medicine. It is defined as health care that establishes a **partnership** among practitioner, patient and family (where appropriate) to do 2 things. First, to ensure that decisions respect patients' wants, needs and preferences, and second, to solicit patients' input on the education and support they need to participate in their care.

Probes:

- Do you think the ability to be patient-centered is influenced by language proficiency? If so, how?
- Do you think patient-centered care is realistic when language is an issue?

7. Let's turn to the issue of translation aids.

- Which aids, if any, have you used in practice?
- Which do you find most helpful?
- Which do you find least helpful?
- What are some advantages and/or disadvantages of each?

1
2
3
4
5 Probes:

- 6 • How do you go about getting translation aids?
- 7 • Have you ever used means such as a patient's family member, or other
- 8 hospital staff to assist you in translation? Why or why not?
- 9 • How does the type of translation aid used affect your confidence in your
- 10 medical interview and decision-making?
- 11

12
13 8. Do you think any party in particular holds the weight of responsibility for

14 ensuring that effective communication is not hindered by language differences?

15
16 9. What are your thoughts on the issue of patient confidentiality in situations

17 when you need to use a family member as a translator (because they are the only or

18 best translation aid available)?

19
20 10. Do you have any final thoughts on the topic of language and effective

21 communication that we have not covered so far?

22
23 11. Do you have any thoughts or suggestions about how situations in which

24 communication is difficult because of language might be handled differently?