

BMJ Open

Beyond the 'dyad': A qualitative re-evaluation of the changing clinical consultation

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006017
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Jul-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Swinglehurst, Deborah; Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health Roberts, Celia; King's College London, Department of Education and Professional Studies Li, Shuangyu; King's College London, Division of Medicine Weber, Orest; Lausanne University, Psychiatric Liaison Service Singy, Pascal; Lausanne University, Psychiatric Liaison Service
Primary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication
Keywords:	Information technology < BIOTECHNOLOGY & BIOINFORMATICS, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Beyond the 'dyad': A qualitative re-evaluation of the changing clinical consultation.

Deborah Swinglehurst*; Celia Roberts; Shuangyu Li; Orest Weber; Pascal Singy

Deborah Swinglehurst is Senior Clinical Lecturer at the Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary, University of London, UK.

Celia Roberts is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Education and Professional Studies, King's College London, UK.

Shuangyu Li is Lecturer in Clinical Communication at the Division of Medical Education, School of Medicine, King's College London, UK.

Orest Weber is Researcher at the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Pascal Singy is Associate Professor of Sociolinguistics and Director of Research at the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland.

***Corresponding author at:** Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary, University of London, 58 Turner Street, London E1 2AB, UK. Email: d.swinglehurst@qmul.ac.uk. Telephone +44 20 7882 7204 Fax +44 20 7882 2552

Keywords: globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; clinical communication; technology

Word count: 4199

ABSTRACT

Objective

To identify characteristics of clinical consultations which do not conform to the traditionally understood communication 'dyad', in order to highlight implications for medical education and develop a reflective 'toolkit' for use by medical practitioners and educators in the analysis of consultations.

Design

A series of interdisciplinary research workshops spanning 12 months explored the social impact of globalisation and computerisation on the clinical consultation, focusing specifically on contemporary challenges to the clinician-patient dyad. Researchers presented detailed case studies of consultations, taken from their recent research projects. Drawing on concepts from applied sociolinguistics, further analysis of selected case studies prompted the identification of key emergent themes.

Setting

University departments in the UK and Switzerland.

Participants

Six researchers with backgrounds in medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical education. One workshop was also attended by PhD students conducting research on healthcare interactions.

Results

1
2
3 The contemporary consultation is characterised by a multiplicity of voices. The
4 incorporation of additional voices in the consultation creates new forms of order (and
5 *dis-order*) in the interaction. The roles 'clinician' and 'patient' are blurred as they
6 become increasingly distributed between different participants in the consultation.
7
8 These new consultation arrangements make new demands on clinicians which lie
9 beyond the scope of most educational programmes for clinical communication.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Conclusion**

18
19
20 Traditional consultation models which assume a 'dyadic' consultation do not
21 adequately incorporate the realities of many contemporary consultations. A paradox
22 emerges between the need to manage consultations in a 'super-diverse' multilingual
23 society, whilst also attending to increasing requirements for standardised protocol-
24 driven approaches to care and data gathering prompted by computer use in the
25 consultation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The consultation is changing. Drawing on concepts from applied sociolinguistics and
35 the findings of these research observations, the authors offer a reflective 'toolkit' of
36 questions to ask of the consultation in the context of enquiry based learning.
37
38
39
40

41
42 **(300 words)**
43
44
45

46 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

47 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 48
49
50
51
52
53
 - Brings insights from applied sociolinguistics to the analysis of consultations
 - Addresses the mismatch between consultations as conceptualised in
54 communication models and the reality of many contemporary consultations

55
56
57
58
59
60

- Offers a research-informed output, a 'reflective toolkit', for use in practice by clinicians and educators
- Focuses on issues relevant to a globalised, technology-driven world, but does not address all types of consultation which breach the communication dyad (e.g. clinician - patient - carer)

KEYWORDS: globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; communication skills; technology

INTRODUCTION

Two of the most significant changes affecting communication in the consultation are the increasing use of computers (the 'technologisation' of care)(1) and globalisation. The use of electronic patient records (EPRs) is gathering pace throughout Europe with the UK, the Netherlands and Scandinavia leading the way. (2-4) Globalisation (the movement of people, their languages, cultural practices, artefacts and 'norms' between countries) is creating 'super-diverse' multilingual populations.(5) According to the 2011 census in England and Wales, 29% of the population were born abroad or have a parent or grandparent born abroad. In Switzerland, 35.1% of over-15s are first- or second-generation migrants.(6) These social changes have significant impacts on the consultation.

Researchers of electronic patient records have coined the term 'triadic' consultation to highlight the computer as an influential third party in the consultation.(7-10) Swinglehurst et al. go further, conceptualising the EPR as bringing a wide range of competing voices to the consultation and shaping its dynamics.(11;12) Likewise, the dynamics of multilingual consultations are changed by the inclusion of professional and *ad hoc* interpreters (untrained family members, staff or volunteers). The resulting configuration has been referred to as a 'trialogue'.(13-18) An increasing number of consultations involve patients (and doctors) communicating in a language other than their first language, or in a variety of the majority language (e.g. English) influenced by their first language. In these consultations the communication barrier may lead to a 'loss' of patient voice (examples 2 and 3 in this paper) or to unresolved misunderstandings arising from subtle differences in speech delivery, word stress and styles of self-presentation. (19)

1
2
3 Consultations which incorporate socio-technical or sociolinguistic challenges (or
4 both) are increasingly the norm in large urban areas. Although medical educators
5 recognise that consultations are growing in complexity,(20) educational resources
6 addressing these complexities remain limited. Current consultation models assume a
7 communication 'dyad' in which two voices (patient and clinician) engage in focussed
8 interaction using broadly shared ways of communicating. Communication tends to be
9 envisaged as a series of learned prototypical 'skills' or procedures for accomplishing
10 clinical tasks rather than as a dynamic interaction which emerges moment-by-
11 moment, shaped by every interactional nuance along the way. Assumptions about
12 the nature of communication are reflected in strategies currently advocated for
13 interpreted consultations such as: advising the interpreter what is expected up front;
14 explaining the interpreter's role to the patient; allowing ample time; asking one
15 question at a time; clarifying confusing responses; seeking 'cultural information' from
16 the interpreter afterwards.(17;21-23) Likewise, in computer mediated consultations
17 doctors are advised to avoid trying to attend to patient and computer at the same
18 time (e.g. by 'signposting' computer use), to use mobile monitors and to 'look at the
19 patient'.(8;24) Although these suggestions are useful, they overlook the fact that the
20 interaction is itself fundamentally and profoundly changed by these new
21 arrangements.

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 This paper explores the characteristics of these contemporary consultations through
47 presentation of case studies selected as 'telling cases' (25) highlighting the
48 challenges arising in consultations which involve a meeting of more than two voices.
49 Analytic observations are developed into a reflective 'toolkit' for use in the
50 educational context while analysing learners' video-recorded consultations.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

METHODS

A series of interdisciplinary workshops was held over a 12- month period bringing together academics specialising in healthcare communication. Their disciplinary backgrounds spanned medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical education. Case study presentations were followed by discussion, leading to further analysis of primary interactional data. The case studies were selected from four ethnographic/sociolinguistic research projects drawing on theme-orientated discourse analysis (26), conversation analysis (27) and linguistic ethnography (28). The research projects had received ethical approval (Thames Valley multi-centre REC 06/MRE12/81; NHS Bradford REC 09/H1302/106; REC of Vaud, Switzerland 271/07; St. Thomas' Hospital local REC).

The selection of case studies was informed by case study methodology and based on a key ethnographic principle, that of 'developing theory through the study of critical cases' (page 20) (29). The workshops drew on Mitchell's concept of a 'telling' case study 'in which the particular circumstances surrounding a case serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationships apparent' (page 239) (25).

So, telling cases from the four research projects were selected as examples of consultations which breach the clinician-patient 'dyad', incorporating additional 'voices'. The authors worked together to identify synergies across them, teasing out themes and valid connections between events and phenomena relevant to medical education. Case studies explored the following: the interactional structure of general practitioners' (GP) consultations involving interpreters; the shaping influence of the EPR in primary care consultations; consultations involving patients communicating in a language other than their first language. The nature of the additional 'voices' in the

1
2
3 latter example may not be immediately apparent, but relates to socio-cultural scripts
4
5 originating *beyond* the consultation and informing notions of how to present oneself,
6
7 ideas about the self (and the clinician), one's relationship to authority, expectations
8
9 of the healthcare system, for example. Although there is an extensive literature on
10
11 cultural health beliefs, precisely how patients present themselves, how they voice
12
13 their concerns and the impact of differences in linguistic background on the
14
15 orderliness and distribution of knowledge and expertise have been much less
16
17 studied.
18
19

20 21 **RESULTS**

22
23 We identified two key interrelated themes which are the main focus of this article:
24
25 *orderliness* and *distribution*. We will begin by introducing these themes and will then
26
27 present some short extracts of data analysis illustrating how these themes play out in
28
29 the contemporary consultation and how they disrupt the dyadic nature of the
30
31 consultation.
32
33
34

35 36 **'Orderliness' in the contemporary consultation**

37
38 The 'orderliness' of the consultation has been the subject of much previous research.
39
40 Medical educators will be familiar with the stages of the consultation described by
41
42 Byrne and Long in 1976,(30) and with more detailed models (e.g. Calgary-
43
44 Cambridge) which are currently favoured within educational curricula.(31) These
45
46 models describe the consultation in more-or-less discrete phases such as 'gathering
47
48 information' and 'explanation and planning'. Each stage is associated with a set of
49
50 skills which underpin formative and summative assessments of medical students and
51
52 some professional licensing examinations (e.g. the UK Clinical Skills Assessment
53
54 forms part of the licensing examination for general practitioners).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Apart from the assumption that the consultation, with its various 'phases', is an
4 orderly affair, these models tend to assume a structuralist orientation to language.
5
6
7 The talk shared between clinician and patient is assumed to represent particular
8 meanings – talk is simply *representative* of reality. For example, when a clinician
9 'summarises' the consultation, this summary is assumed to reflect a concise version
10 of the patient's story, which is in turn assumed to represent the patient's experience.
11
12 An alternative *social constructionist* perspective would also consider the additional
13 work being *accomplished* by summarising – for example: the clinician's opportunity
14 to take back the 'speaking floor';(32) the organisation of the story; the emphasis
15 afforded to those aspects perceived to be most salient to diagnostic reasoning or
16 clinical management; the clinician's construction of their professional identity. From
17 this perspective the encounter is relatively unstable, and the orderliness of the
18 consultation, or its identified 'phases' are not so much inevitable *attributes* of the
19 consultation, but are 'brought about' or 'worked up' through interaction. This 'bringing
20 about' is informed by previous cumulative experience of what usually happens in the
21 kind of interaction we recognize as a 'medical consultation', but involves a certain
22 amount of improvisation along the way.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **'Distribution' in the contemporary consultation**

42
43
44 In consultations that lie beyond the 'dyad' by inclusion of additional people (e.g.
45 interpreters) or technologies (e.g. electronic patient records) or patients whose first
46 language is not English, we face new configurations in terms of the distribution of
47 knowledge, power, authority and social identities. In what has been called the
48 "crowded" consultation(33) where many voices meet, new questions become salient
49 and contested. For example: *Who is doing the talking? Whose voice is heard? How*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *is knowledge distributed? What is important medical knowledge? Whose interests*
4 *are being served? Who is the patient? Who is the clinician?*
5
6
7

8 **Analysis of 'orderliness' and 'distribution' of roles in the contemporary** 9 **consultation**

10
11
12
13 In this section we will illustrate how 'orderliness' and 'distribution' play out in
14 consultations which breach the communication dyad, using selected data extracts.
15
16 These examples combine the micro-analytic methods used in conversation analysis
17 (CA) with ethnographic observation of the relevant institutional contexts, mindful that
18 this broader context shapes interaction in important ways. CA considers the detailed
19 systematic patterns and regularities that arise as each speaker takes up, interprets
20 and responds to the other's turn.(34;35) Our case studies show how the well-
21 described orderliness of the consultation becomes disturbed when additional voices
22 are introduced, as new forms of order and dis-order emerge and care becomes
23 increasingly distributed. We have retained the transcribing conventions used in each
24 original study (see Appendix). The text is interspersed with suggestions of reflective
25 questions which emerge from our data analysis. These questions are designed for
26 use by learners as they play back their own video-recorded consultations, sensitising
27 them to the particular challenges posed in these types of consultations. We also
28 hope that the questions will encourage learners to discover the importance of
29 considering the consultation as an emergent *co-constructed* phenomenon, requiring
30 improvisation.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 First, we look at the opening of a consultation between a nurse (N) and patient (P),
53 English speakers who haven't met before (**Figure 1**). The institutional context is an
54 annual asthma check, a requirement of the UK Quality and Outcomes Framework
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (QOF) for which incentive payments are made. The nurse is completing a computer
4 template (form) during the consultation. The transcript includes notes on bodily
5 conduct and the computer screen display.
6
7
8
9

10 <<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>>
11

12
13 She frames the consultation as an 'assessment' emphasising it is really (01:08) or
14 very (01:19) straightforward. The linearity of the upcoming consultation is alluded to
15 as she counts a 3-part list with her fingers. She demarcates the purpose of the clinic,
16 laying it out as an orderly affair and (implicitly) setting limits on what can happen.
17 She adds to this later (at 2:09, transcript not shown), while gesturing towards the
18 EPR: *"What I've got here is some questions that I – I need to ask you. They're fairly
19 straightforward ones but what they tend to do with is that they will flag up whether
20 there >actually< we have got what w- what I would call breakthrough symptoms."*
21 Reiterating that it is 'straightforward', the phrase *"I need to ask you"* points to an
22 underlying institutional requirement. Reassurance focuses on an anticipated
23 orderliness of the clinic, dealing up front with any misalignment between what the
24 patient may expect and what the nurse is required to do. But this is a different kind of
25 order to that which we might expect. This is an orderliness in which the electronic
26 template is instrumental, rather than one which emerges through dialogue between
27 clinician and patient.(12)
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The nurse then goes on to speak *not* of symptoms, but of inhalers (transcript
49 omitted) and then smoking. Here the template introduces a topic (smoking) which
50 seems tangential to this patient's particular circumstances, although it is important to
51 asthma care in general terms, and has institutional significance, being a QOF
52 indicator. The EPR thus brings an institutional voice into the encounter, making
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relevant the patient's identity as a lifelong non-smoker in this context. It contributes
4
5 to defining what is important medical knowledge, reproducing particular definitions of
6
7 'quality' in practice - gathering data about (non-)smoking for QOF being an example.
8
9 The patient becomes an epidemiological informant and 'quality' is transformed into
10
11 meeting an institutional requirement rather than focussing on the specific quality of
12
13 care of the individual. At 2.50 - 2.52 the nurse's emphatic evaluations "*excellent,*
14
15 *that's great*" are spoken towards the EPR as she types, apparently referring to her
16
17 satisfaction at meeting its demands, the patient watching from the sidelines. At the
18
19 very least it is ambiguous to whom (or what) these superlatives relate.
20
21

22
23 The analytic question of "*Who is doing the talking?*" is at issue here. For example,
24
25 the authorship of the words at 2:47 is apparently distributed between the nurse and
26
27 the EPR. We see a disruption of the usual conventions of conversation, with this
28
29 comment spoken by the nurse as she looks at the computer screen rather than at
30
31 the patient to whom she expects to hand over the speaking 'turn'. The nurse's
32
33 attention is divided between what has been called the patient *embodied* and the
34
35 patient *inscribed* (36;37) as the patient becomes (metaphorically) distributed
36
37 between person and record.(36) The nurse is *cognitively* oriented to the patient as
38
39 she establishes his smoking status by looking at the EPR, but the *affective* aspect of
40
41 her involvement - which Goffman has highlighted as crucial in a social interaction -
42
43 is compromised.(38) This "template talk" is met by a 0.4 second pause. The nurse
44
45 then turns to face the patient, adding "*that's what I've got here*" - this time evoking a
46
47 response, as they jointly repeat "*never smoked*", words which were initially displayed
48
49 on the EPR screen (visible only to the nurse).
50
51
52
53

54
55 Box 1 suggests some reflective questions to ask of consultations involving the EPR.
56
57 Students may find it helpful to use the transcript in Figure 1 to gain familiarity with
58
59
60

1
2
3 these questions before asking the same questions of their own video-recorded
4 consultations. In the following sections, we incorporate reflective questions arising
5 from our data analysis as applicable to different kinds of complex consultation.
6
7
8
9

10 <<INSERT BOX 1 ABOUT HERE>>
11

12
13 Our next example (**Figure 2**) is from a GP consultation with a patient from Nigeria
14 who speaks a variety of English that differs from local English. Whilst on holiday in
15 Nigeria he was bitten by a dog, raising the question of whether he might have been
16 exposed to rabies (lines 1-4) and considered for vaccination.
17
18
19
20
21

22 <<INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE>>
23

24
25 This example illustrates an unresolved ambiguity which arises from different
26 conventions in standard English and Nigerian English over the use of contrastive
27 stress (indicated by * in data). Disorder, misunderstanding, and an incorrect
28 assessment ensue. In lines 4-7 the patient tells the GP he knows the dog's owner
29 and that the dog visits the vet regularly. This reassures the GP that the patient is at
30 low risk (line 12: "*oh fair enough*") and he in turn later reassures the patient that no
31 vaccination is needed. In fact the patient was conveying his concern that the dog
32 may **not** be free of rabies, and that the owner could not be trusted. When the patient
33 says "*they told me the dog go to the vet regular but that's what they said*" (lines
34 6,7,9, highlighted in bold in transcript) he emphasizes the agent ("*they*") and the
35 content of the agent's talk ("*what*"). The equivalent sentiment in standard English
36 would be "*they told me the dog goes to the vet regular, but that's what they said*" with
37 the emphasis on the verbs ("told", "said"). Although the patient offers further hints of
38 his scepticism in line 13 - a hesitation, laughter and the word "but" – the underlying
39 ambiguity is passed over, and absent from the institutional record made by the
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 doctor. Misunderstandings, or the illusion of understanding, which result from small
4 and subliminally processed differences in talk, are more frequent in a multi-lingual
5 patient population(19) and challenge conventional orderliness. But no simple
6 behaviours can be taught in situations of super-diversity as our next two examples
7 also show.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 **Figure 3** shows an extract of a video-recorded consultation in a Swiss pain clinic
16 (translated from French) in which consent is sought for a spinal injection. The patient
17 left his home country 10 years earlier after a war, and has very limited command of
18 French. He has chronic low back pain for which he has received spinal injections. He
19 is worried about the risks involved, because a previous consent form (translated by
20 his daughter) referred to a risk of paralysis.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 **<<INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE>>**
30

31
32 As in the previous example, there is obvious asymmetry of the linguistic resources
33 available. Indeed the entire extract might be regarded as a continuous, extended and
34 only partly repaired misunderstanding. Both parties struggle to grasp at least some
35 meaning in the words of the other. An interview with both interactants afterwards
36 (data not shown) suggested that some areas of shared understanding were reached:
37 the patient's fear of the injection, the positive impact of a previous injection and
38 agreement to proceed today. But other communicative efforts failed, including the
39 doctor's attempt to reassure the patient that paralysis does not happen often.
40 Indeed, the patient reported that the doctor had particularly reminded him of the risks
41 of paralysis adding that he, the patient, had to take responsibility for this risk. The
42 patient's fear (linked it appears to some past experience in the war) is not explored.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Arguably under conditions of such scarce common linguistic means this topic may be
4
5 deemed too complex to tackle; the patient's voice from the past is lost.
6
7

8 Phenomena of discursive dispersion and fragmentation of the clinical decision-
9
10 making process have previously been described in monolingual contexts,(39;40) but
11
12 they become magnified when patients have limited proficiency in the language of
13
14 consultation. In this multilingual context the ideals of shared decision-making within
15
16 an ordered consultation are eroded. In this example, the doctor first presents his
17
18 idea, tries to convince the patient of the benefits of another injection and goes on to
19
20 investigate the patient's worries and possible reasons for disagreement. But the
21
22 participants fail to connect the discursive threads of this discussion to the final
23
24 decision. Patient consent follows immediately after major interactional troubles,
25
26 culminating in a self-critical meta-communicative account by the patient (*"I don't*
27
28 *know how to explain well"*) and an abrupt topic shift by the doctor. The doctor
29
30 appears to cut to the decision making when he gives up on achieving further clarity
31
32 about the patient's stance.
33
34
35
36
37

38 << INSERT BOX 2 >>
39

40 Consultations like those in **Figures 2 and 3** in which the clinician and patient are not
41
42 'in tune' with each other require considerable and not always successful
43
44 collaborative work by both parties to prevent, recognise and repair
45
46 misunderstandings.(41) The use of interpreters may address these issues to some
47
48 extent, but not without introducing different challenges. The work of consulting
49
50 becomes distributed between at least three participants, changing the relationship of
51
52 the speakers to their own words and so disturbing roles and identities. The
53
54 orderliness in interpreted consultations is changed, both in terms of overall structure
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and in micro-interactional patterns. Clinicians have to do more than simply establish
4
5 consensus on the mode of communication and the role of the interpreter as
6
7 suggested by recent guidelines.(16;17) At the micro-level, extra verbal exchanges
8
9 are required to clarify misunderstandings (as we saw in Figures 2 & 3). The
10
11 traditional doctor↔patient (dyadic) interactional sequence becomes a more
12
13 complicated 'triadic' pattern. Close inspection of interpreted consultations shows that
14
15 this assumed prototypical triadic sequence (doctor→interpreter→patient or
16
17 patient→interpreter→doctor) is not always observed by participants, so that one or
18
19 more participants' voices are 'lost'.(16;42) The power to decide who talks next is
20
21 *unequally* distributed among the three participants – with patients at the bottom of
22
23 the hierarchy. Even when the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence *is*
24
25 followed, there remains considerable scope for misunderstanding, due to ambiguity
26
27 over interpreter's role and how the interpreting task is actually done in practice. The
28
29 interpreter delivers a 'hybrid' voice which incorporates the voices of all three
30
31 participants in the interaction. **Figure 4** shows an extract from an interpreted
32
33 consultation in England with a Czech-speaking patient who has complained of
34
35 headaches. It gives some insight into how the themes of orderliness and distribution
36
37 play out in an interpreted consultation.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 <<INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE>>
45

46
47 From lines 1 to 10, the participants follow the triadic sequence in their turn-taking.
48
49 However, what the doctor and patient hear is pre-processed (re-contextualised) by
50
51 the interpreter. In Line 1, the doctor asks a question. Prior to the question he refers
52
53 to an earlier discussion about the patient's pain, signposting a change of topic.
54
55 However, this signposting is omitted by the interpreter in Lines 3-4. Similarly, in Lines
56
57 5-7 the interpreter adds '*that start afternoon*' into her translation although the patient
58
59
60

1
2
3 did not say these words here. As Bolden points out, an interpreter is constantly
4 choosing the quantity and quality of information that is translated, thus creating a
5 hybrid voice and assigning themselves an extra role as either 'doctor' or 'patient' with
6 blurring of the usual boundaries between the two.(43) The potential for voices to
7 become 'lost' in this process is greatest when the prototypical triadic sequence is not
8 followed.
9

10 At line 10, the doctor comments on the interpreter's response ("*Interesting. That's*
11 *good*"). If the (assumed) triadic sequence was followed, one would expect either that
12 the doctor would continue talking at this point, or that he would pass the speaking
13 turn to the interpreter to translate his words. Either way, we would not expect the
14 patient to have a turn here. However, the patient (line 11) brings in a new topic,
15 ostensibly in an 'inappropriate' place. Her utterance is not translated and goes
16 unheard as the doctor interrupts the patient (line 13) before she can finish her talk;
17 this marks the patient's entry as 'not legitimate'. The doctor and the interpreter then
18 continue the conversation following the triadic sequence. In the wider dataset from
19 which this extract is taken, we found that doctors also speak at such 'inappropriate
20 places'. However there is a difference. In most cases, the words of the doctor *are*
21 translated, and the patient is put 'on hold' while this is done. In other words, when
22 the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence breaks down it is the *interpreter*
23 who takes on the role of 'distributor' of speaking turns and decides whose voice will
24 be preferentially heard. In our dataset, interpreters tended to prioritise the doctor's
25 right to speak, as illustrated in **Figure 4**.
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 << INSERT BOX 3 ABOUT HERE >>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

Rapid technological and demographic change has brought challenges to the consultation which were not anticipated when the consultation models currently taught to students were developed. Using a selection of 'telling' cases as a basis for analysis we have been able to develop novel conceptual ideas about the contemporary consultation which challenge normative assumptions, showing that the notion of the consultation as a dyadic meeting of two speakers who share communicative resources is frequently challenged. Our priority has been on depth of analysis rather than breadth, with our selection of case studies informed by the 'opportunity to learn' rather than by concerns around 'typicality'.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Based on a detailed study of four contrasting cases we suggest there are complex new configurations of voices in the consultation, and - as a consequence of this - the potential for 'losing' the patient voice. These challenges to the 'dyadic' consultation rarely receive explicit attention in the educational curriculum. One striking observation which emerges from our data is that the twin social pressures of globalisation and technologisation appear to place paradoxically opposing demands on the consultation. On the one hand, clinicians are challenged with increasingly diverse, unpredictable consultations from a sociolinguistic perspective, requiring flexibility and a tolerance of ambiguity. On the other, there is increasing pressure to 'standardise' practices, for example through greater use of EPR templates.

Building on our analysis of these case studies we have offered a series of reflective questions which may be relevant to ask of complex consultations which take on these new kinds of orderliness and in which conventional understandings of the roles of clinician and patient become blurred. These questions have not yet been tested empirically in an educational setting and do not constitute a definitive checklist. They

1
2
3 may neither be relevant to all consultations nor necessarily comprehensive, but we
4
5 hope that they are a starting point to promote observation and discussion about the
6
7 consultation from an orientation which embraces its new complexities. Further
8
9 empirical research is required to test the value of this toolkit as an educational
10
11 intervention in practice and to refine it in the context of further educational research.
12
13

14 We would like to invite debate amongst medical educators about how to adapt,
15
16 extend or revise consultation models to ensure that these important aspects of the
17
18 contemporary consultation do not remain overlooked. We suggest that an orientation
19
20 to the consultation as a dynamic process which is co-constructed between clinician
21
22 and patient is helpful, one in which the structure (we prefer 'orderliness') emerges
23
24 out of the collaborative work of clinician and patient (and others) and which depends
25
26 on how the 'work' of consulting is distributed between participants. Regarding the
27
28 consultation as a co-construction demands more than a range of 'add-on' prompts
29
30 describing specific clinician behaviours. It encompasses a shift away from the idea
31
32 that consulting is a set of competences to be mastered, towards a more analytical
33
34 orientation. The most important overarching question to ask of the consultation shifts
35
36 from "Did I do that well?" towards "What did we accomplish there?" This brings the
37
38 contribution of the patient, and all relevant parties (or 'voices') into clearer view. The
39
40 questions we offer to learners within our reflective 'toolkit' in this paper fall broadly
41
42 within this overarching question.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 We urge educators to consider critically how their approach to teaching clinical
50
51 communication might change if instead of assuming that the talk *represents* some
52
53 kind of existing reality they also encourage students to consider conceptualising talk
54
55 as *constructing* reality, an assumption which underpins this paper. We suggest that
56
57 greater use of the detailed analysis of video-recordings of real (as opposed to
58
59
60

1
2
3 simulated) consultations may be helpful, exposing learners - as consulters and
4
5 critical observers - to the kinds of complexities that our research highlights. For
6
7 example, a DVD by Roberts et al. entitled "*Doing the Lambeth Talk*" shows how
8
9 misunderstandings in the multilingual consultation can be avoided and repaired.
10

11 12 13 14 15 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

16
17 The authors would like to thank the staff and patients who agreed to take part in the
18
19 four original research projects from which the data presented in this article are
20
21 selected.
22

23 24 25 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

26
27 None declared
28

29 30 31 **FUNDING**

32
33 The research projects on which this paper is based were funded by: National
34
35 Institute for Health Research Doctoral Fellowship (DS); Sir Siegmund Warburg
36
37 Voluntary Settlement (CR); NHS Bradford & Airedale PhD Fellowship (SL); Swiss
38
39 National Science Foundation (OW and PS).
40

41 42 43 44 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT**

45
46 All of the authors of this paper participated in the preparation and presentation of
47
48 case studies (drawn from their own empirical research) in the research workshops.

49
50 All authors participated in the re-analysis of case study data to identify emergent
51
52 cross-cutting themes, and in the development of the analysis into practitioner-
53
54 relevant resources. DS wrote the first draft of the paper and revised it in response to
55
56 critical commentary from all of the remaining authors.
57
58
59
60

Reference List

- (1) Peacock JW, Nolan PW. Care under threat in the modern world. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2000;32:1066-70.
- (2) Knottnerus JA. The Role of the Electronic Patient Record in the Development of General Practice in the Netherlands. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 1999;38:350-4.
- (3) Protti D, Johansen I. Widespread Adoption of Information Technology in Primary Care Physician Offices in Denmark: A Case Study. Downloadable from http://www.commonwealthfund.org/~media/Files/Publications/Issue%20Brief/2010/Mar/1379_Protti_widespread_adoption_IT_primary_care_Denmark_intl_ib.pdf. The Commonwealth Fund; 2010.
- (4) RCGP. Information Management and Technology in General Practice: RCGP Information Sheet No.7. 2005.
- (5) Vertovec S. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2007;30:1024-54.
- (6) Office fédéral de la statistique. Relevé structurel du recensement fédéral de la population selon la langue et la religion. Available from: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/news/02/03/02.html>. 2013.
- (7) Scott D, Purves I. Triadic relationship between doctor, computer and patient. *Interacting with Computers* 1996;8(4):347-63.
- (8) Ventres W, Kooienga S, Marlin R. EHRs in the Exam Room: Tips on Patient-Centred Care. *Family Practice Management* 2006;13(3):45-7.
- (9) Margalit RS, Roter D, Dunevant MA, Larson S, Reis S. Electronic medical record use and physician-patient communication: An observational study of Israeli primary care encounters. *Patient Education and Counseling* 2006 Apr;61(1):134-41.
- (10) Pearce C. Doctors, Patients and Computers, the New Consultation. PhD Thesis Department of General Practice, The University of Melbourne; 2007.
- (11) Swinglehurst D, Roberts C, Greenhalgh T. Opening up the "black box" of the electronic patient record: A linguistic ethnographic study in general practice. *Communication and Medicine* 2011;8(1):3-15.

- 1
2
3 (12) Swinglehurst D, Greenhalgh T, Roberts C. Computer templates in chronic disease
4 management: ethnographic case study in general practice. *BMJ Open* 2012;2:e001754.
5
6 (13) Greenhalgh T, Voisey C, Robb N. Interpreted consultations as 'business as usual'? An analysis
7 of organisational routines in general practices. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 2007;29:931-
8 54.
9
10 (14) Li S, Pearson D, Escott S. Language barriers within primary care consultations: an increasing
11 challenge needing new solutions. *Education for Primary Care* 2010;21:385-91.
12
13 (15) Hale SB. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2007.
14
15 (16) Seale C, Rivas C, Kelly M. The challenge of communication in interpreted consultations in
16 diabetes care: a mixed methods study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013;DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X663082.
17
18 (17) Bischoff A, Loutan L. *Other Words, Other Meanings - a guide to health care interpreting in*
19 *international settings*. Geneva: Serve de médecine internationale et humanitaire, HUG;
20 2008.
21
22 (18) Guex P, Singy P. *Quand la médecine à besoin d'interprètes*. Genève: Éditions médecine et
23 *hygiène*; 2003.
24
25 (19) Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, Sarangi S, Jones R. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of
26 primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Medical*
27 *Education* 2005;39:465-75.
28
29 (20) Lown B, Rodriguez D. Lost in Translation? How Electronic Health Records Structure
30 Communication, Relationships, and Meaning. *Academic Medicine* 2012;87:392-4.
31
32 (21) Kai J. *Valuing diversity: a resource for health professional training to respond to cultural*
33 *diversity*. London: Royal College of General Practitioners; 2006.
34
35 (22) Tebble H. *Medical Interpreting: Improving communication with your patients*. Geelong,
36 *Victoria: Deakin University*; 1998.
37
38 (23) Lie D, Bereknyei S, Braddock C, Encinas J, Ahearn S, Boker J. Assessing Medical Students'
39 *Skills in Working with Interpreters During Patient Encounters: A Validation Study of the*
40 *Interpreter Scale*. *Academic Medicine* 2009;84:643-50.
41
42 (24) Booth N, Kohannejad J, Robinson P. *Information in the consulting room - training package*.
43 *Sowerby Centre for Health Informatics at Newcastle*; 2002 Jul.
44
45 (25) Mitchell J. Producing data: Case studies. In: Ellen R, editor. *Ethnographic Research: A Guide*
46 *to General Conduct*. London: Academic Press; 1984. p. 237-41.
47
48 (26) Roberts C, Sarangi S. Theme-oriented discourse analysis of medical encounters. *Medical*
49 *Education* 2005;39:632-40.
50
51 (27) Heritage J. Goffman, Garfinkel and Conversation Analysis. In: Wetherell M, Taylor S, Yates S,
52 *editors. Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications; 2001. p. 47-56.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (28) Rampton B, Tusting K, Maybin J, Barwell R, Creese A, Lytra V. UK Linguistic Ethnography: A
4 discussion paper. Downloadable from [http://www.ling-](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf)
5 [ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf). 2004.
6
7 (29) Hammersley M. What's Wrong with Ethnography? London: Routledge; 1992.
8
9 (30) Byrne PS, Long BEL. Doctors Talking to Patients. A Study of the Verbal Behaviour of General
10 Practitioners Consulting in their Surgeries. London: HMSO; 1976.
11
12 (31) Kurtz S, Silverman J. The Calgary-Cambridge referenced observation guides: an aid to
13 defining the curriculum and organising the teaching in communication training programmes.
14 Medical Education 1996;30:83-9.
15
16 (32) Edelsky C. Who's got the floor? Language and Society 1981;10(3):383-421.
17
18 (33) Davies P. The crowded consultation. Br J Gen Pract 2012;62:648-9.
19
20 (34) Heritage J, Maynard DW. Communication in Medical Care. Cambridge: Cambridge University
21 Press; 2006.
22
23 (35) Schegloff EA. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow D, editor.
24 Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Free Press; 1972.
25
26 (36) Robinson JD. Getting Down to Business: Talk, Gaze and Body Orientation during Openings of
27 Doctor-Patient Consultations. Human Communication Research 1998;25(1):97-123.
28
29 (37) Ruusuvuori J. Looking means listening: coordinating displays of engagement in doctor-
30 patient interaction. Social Science & Medicine 2001;52(7):1093-108.
31
32 (38) Goffman E. Involvement. Behavior in Public Places. New York: The Free Press; 1966. p. 33-42.
33
34 (39) Atkinson P. Medical discourse, evidentiality and the construction of professional
35 responsibility. In: Sarangi S, Roberts C, editors. Talk, work and institutional order. Berlin, New
36 York: Mouton de Gruyter; 1999.
37
38 (40) Gwyn R, Elwyn G. When is a shared decision not (quite) a shared decision? Negotiating
39 preferences in a general practice encounter. Social Science & Medicine 1999;49(4):437-47.
40
41 (41) Roberts C. Continuities and Discontinuities in Doctor-Patient consultations in a multilingual
42 society. In: Gott M, Salager-Meyer F, editors. Advances in Medical Discourse Analysis: Oral
43 and Written Contexts. Bern: Peter Lang; 2006. p. 177-96.
44
45 (42) Li S. Co-construction of interpreted conversation in medical consultations. Applied
46 Linguistics Review 2013;4:127-49.
47
48 (43) Bolden GB. Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: interpreters'
49 involvement in history taking. Discourse Studies 2000;2:387-419.
50
51 (44) Stake RE. Qualitative Case Studies. In: Denzin NK, Lincoln YS, editors. The Sage Handbook of
52 Qualitative Research. 3rd ed. Sage Publications, Inc; 2005. p. 443-66.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. New forms of order and the distribution of authorship in the asthma clinic

Time	N/P	Spoken word	Bodily conduct / notes on EPR
01:08	N	So really straightforward. (0.4)	N puts paper on desk N rotates body and gaze to face P, her hands on her lap. P looking at N
01:09	N	Asthma assessment (0.4)	
	P	Okay	P nods
01.11	N	to see how your asthma's do:ing:	N raises both hands in front
01.13	N	what you're doing w- with it when it's good, what you do with it when it's ba:d, (0.2) have you any problems with your ↑inhalers (0.4) .hhh (0.5)	N uses fingers to count (on "good", "bad", "problems") N hands open out in front of her
01.19	N	Very straightforward stuff	N hands to lap
	P	Okaly	P nods
	N	[all right? .hhh	
[lines of transcript omitted]			
02:46	N	So:: er ((C))	N turns to face screen
02:47	N	Ho- you've never smoked. (0.4)	N -> EPR (<i>last entry in template reads 'never smoked'</i>)
	N	that's what [i've got here	N turns head towards P
	Pt	[no (0.4) [never smoked]	P looking at N
02:50	N	[never smoked] ((C)) [Ex c] ell [ent] [C] [C]	N turns back to look at screen. Emphatic keystroke
02:52	N	[Th]at's gr[:e:at] [C] [C]	N looking at screen, typing keystrokes

Figure 2. Dis-order arising from different conventions in intonation

1	GP	what kind of dog was that (.) it was somebody's (.) dog=
2	Pt	=yes somebody's
3	GP	it was a stray dog
4	Pt	no no it was somebody's dog
5	GP	right
6	Pt	yes I:: made an enquiry they said that- they *they told me
7		the dog go to the vet regular
8	GP	*right *okay
9	Pt	but that's *what they said
10	GP	right (.) *right right so did you know the owner or did=
11	Pt	= I know the owner =
12	GP	= oh fair enough (.) so
13	Pt	erm:: ((laughs)) but
14	GP	did you see any doctor then
15	Pt	no

1
2
3 **Figure 3. Negotiating consent for a spinal injection**
4

- 5 103. Dr: because I thought I'd give you an injection today
6 104. Pt: =no
7 105. Dr: =yes, give one
8 106. Pt: =yes
9 107. Dr: But if you don't want, I won't. I, for me, it's not a problem giving you an injection
10 108. Pt: =Yeah
11 109. Dr: =I don't think that it's a big problem for you either
12 110. Pt: mmh mmh.
13 111. Dr: but I think that after the other injection, you had a benefit, you felt better after the injection in
14 October . . . Didn't you?
15 112. Pt: mmh. ((*mimics express perplexity*))
16 113. Dr: So that's why I'd like to do it again, if you, if you don't want, no, I won't do it, if you say, er, you
17 are afraid, you say, er, after you are getting paralyzed or whatever, I won't do it.
18 114. Pt: mmh . well it's me now not think more, not think right . . . not er er . . . er don't know it's the cause
19 that how is paralyzed, for me speaking?
20 115. Dr: =you [told me]
21 116. Pt: [oh but yes]
22 117. Dr: you told me before
23 118. Pt: =yeah
24 119. Dr: =you said, you were afraid of getting paralyzed
25 120. Pt: =yeah
26 121. Dr: =so, this happens not often
27 122. Pt: =and next, the next (1) here keep . water. ((*patient indicates non verbally something running*
28 *down from his forehead to his temples*))
29 123. Dr: =where?
30 124. Pt: here, next (1) er injection, it's me, it's the, it's the, back pain, me come, immediately injection ah
31 . . ah, that's not much pain, after. problem, it's same like war, ah . in my country, war and then, I
32 don't know how to explain well
33 125. Dr: well, I don't know, if, today, I tell you we give the injection, we're gonna give the injection, do
34 you agree or not
35 126. Pt: =yes
36 127. Dr: =then we'll give it
37
38
39
40
41

42 1. In this translation "next" probably means "last" – this was a recurring error of vocabulary throughout the
43 consultation
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 4 Lost voices in distributed turn-taking sequence organization (English translation in italics)

1. Dr: =An (.) she says it starts in the afternoon::n (.) every day (0.3) does it last (0.4) until
2. she goes to bed, how long does it last for °in the afternoon°
3. Int: ako dlho to trvá
4. *How long does it last for*
5. Pt: tak je to hodinu, dva, to strašne bolí a potom prestane.
6. *well, it is for an hour, two, it hurts badly and then it stops.*
7. Int: ok, that start afternoon. She feel that pain about for one two hours
8. Dr: one or two h[ours
9. Int: [and after that go away:: °ok°
10. Dr: alright↑. Interesting. That's good.
11. Pt: A ešte by som sa chcela povedať, [že ja nosím oku okuliare.
12. *And I would also like to say that I wear gla glasses.*
13. Dr: [could you (0.59) show me where she feels it?
14. Int: u:hm Môžte ukáza[ť
15. *U:hm Can you show*
16. Pt: [Tu.
17. *Here*

1
2
3 **Box 1. Reflective questions based on Case 1 which might inform analysis of a student's own**
4 **video-recorded consultations**
5

6 Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?
7 Which voices are being privileged at different times in the consultation and why?
8 What is the consequence of this?
9 How do I ensure that the patient's voice is not lost?

10 How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate
11 the specific arrangement of people and computer in this consultation?
12

13 How, and to what extent am I fully 'involved' in this consultation?
14 What does this mean to me and what challenge is this particular consultation presenting?
15 To whom and what am I attending, and with what purpose?
16

17 How am I incorporating computer templates and prompts?
18 What is the consequence for my communication with the patient?
19 To what extent is the sequencing and ordering of our talk being influenced, if at all, by the
20 demands of the EPR?
21 Do I need to consider possible alternative ways of managing this situation?

22 How does interacting with the computer affect the standard models of good communication in the
23 textbooks?
24
25

26
27 **Box 2. Reflective questions based on Cases 2 and 3 which might inform analysis of a student's**
28 **own video-recorded consultations**
29

30 Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?
31

32 How do I need to adjust my approach to the consultation when the talk *itself* seems to be the
33 problem?
34

35 Am I confident that I correctly understood the patient's problem, in the knowledge that subtle features
36 such as word stress and styles of self-presentation might differ in speakers whose variety of English is
37 influenced by a language other than my own? If not, what were the other possible meanings of this
38 section of talk?
39

40 How can I ensure that I clarify the patient's intended meanings?

41 Did the strategies that I used to do relational work in the consultation have the desired effect in this
42 multilingual consultation? (*Examples might include the use of humour, metaphor, or attempts at*
43 *'informal' conversational styles*) Did I correctly identify the patient's attempts at relational work?
44

45 This consultation felt muddled and chaotic and did not evolve as I was expecting. Why might this be?
46 Does my explanation reveal any underlying assumptions about how I understand the act of
47 consulting, my expectations for the consultation, and my role as the clinician?
48

49 At what point do I decide I cannot consult effectively without an interpreter either because it is not
50 clear whether the patient and I have understood each other or because I am concerned that the
51 patient's voice is being lost?

52 Do the models of patient-centeredness and shared decision-making work when talk itself seems to be
53 the problem?
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Box 3. Reflective questions based on Case 4 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate the specific arrangement of people in this consultation? Do the models of communication in the textbooks need to be adapted in this situation?

How confident am I that this interpreter is doing what they are supposed to do?

When do I notice that the sequence of speakers (doctor, interpreter, patient) is different from that which I might expect?

What may have been the consequences of this disruption to the order of speakers on the understandings of this consultation?

Do I notice occasions when the patient's voice is lost i.e. words of the patient appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

Do I notice occasions when my own words appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

What can I do to ensure that the interpreter is working to the mutual benefit of the patient and doctor?

Appendix

Transcribing conventions

[onset of overlapping speech	.hhh	in breath
]	end of space of overlapping talk	=	no pause between speakers; contiguous utterances
:	preceding sounds is lengthened or drawn out (more :: means greater prolongation)	(())	non verbal activity / sounds. C indicates keystroke in Fig 1
<u>Underline</u> or *	emphasis	.	falling tone (not necessarily end of sentence)
(.)	pause of less than 0.2 seconds	?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
(0.4)	pause, in tenths of second		
↑↓	marked rise /fall in intonation		
° °	The talk they surround is quieter than surrounding talk		

BMJ Open

Beyond the 'dyad': A qualitative re-evaluation of the changing clinical consultation

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006017.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Aug-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Swinglehurst, Deborah; Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health Roberts, Celia; King's College London, Department of Education and Professional Studies Li, Shuangyu; King's College London, Division of Medicine Weber, Orest; Lausanne University, Psychiatric Liaison Service Singy, Pascal; Lausanne University, Psychiatric Liaison Service
Primary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication
Keywords:	Information technology < BIOTECHNOLOGY & BIOINFORMATICS, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Beyond the 'dyad': A qualitative re-evaluation of the changing clinical consultation.

Deborah Swinglehurst*; Celia Roberts; Shuangyu Li; Orest Weber; Pascal Singy

Deborah Swinglehurst is Senior Clinical Lecturer at the Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary, University of London, UK.

Celia Roberts is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Education and Professional Studies, King's College London, UK.

Shuangyu Li is Lecturer in Clinical Communication at the Division of Medical Education, School of Medicine, King's College London, UK.

Orest Weber is Researcher at the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Pascal Singy is Associate Professor of Sociolinguistics and Director of Research at the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland.

***Corresponding author at:** Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary, University of London, 58 Turner Street, London E1 2AB, UK. Email: d.swinglehurst@qmul.ac.uk. Telephone +44 20 7882 7204 Fax +44 20 7882 2552

Keywords: globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; clinical communication; technology

Word count: 4323

KEYWORDS: globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; communication skills; technology

ABSTRACT

Objective

To identify characteristics of consultations which do not conform to the traditionally understood communication 'dyad', in order to highlight implications for medical education and develop a reflective 'toolkit' for use by medical practitioners and educators in the analysis of consultations.

Design

A series of interdisciplinary research workshops spanning 12 months explored the social impact of globalisation and computerisation on the clinical consultation, focusing specifically on contemporary challenges to the clinician-patient dyad. Researchers presented detailed case studies of consultations, taken from their recent research projects. Drawing on concepts from applied sociolinguistics, further analysis of selected case studies prompted the identification of key emergent themes.

Setting

University departments in the UK and Switzerland.

Participants

Six researchers with backgrounds in medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical education. One workshop was also attended by PhD students conducting research on healthcare interactions.

Results

The contemporary consultation is characterised by a multiplicity of voices. Incorporation of additional voices in the consultation creates new forms of order (and *dis-order*) in the interaction. The roles 'clinician' and 'patient' are blurred as they become increasingly distributed between different participants. These new consultation arrangements make new demands on clinicians which lie beyond the scope of most educational programmes for clinical communication.

Conclusion

The consultation is changing. Traditional consultation models which assume a 'dyadic' consultation do not adequately incorporate the realities of many contemporary consultations. A paradox emerges between the need to manage consultations in a 'super-diverse' multilingual society, whilst also attending to increasing requirements for standardised protocol-driven approaches to care prompted by computer use. The tension between standardisation and flexibility requires addressing in educational contexts. Drawing on concepts from applied sociolinguistics and the findings of these research observations, the authors offer a reflective 'toolkit' of questions to ask of the consultation in the context of enquiry based learning.

(300 words)

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Brings insights from applied sociolinguistics to the analysis of consultations, including detailed interactional transcription and analytic concepts. These may be unfamiliar to some readers and we recognise it is not easy to make them accessible
- Addresses the mismatch between consultations as conceptualised in communication models and the reality of many contemporary consultations
- Offers a research-informed output, a 'reflective toolkit', for use in practice by clinicians and educators
- Focuses on issues relevant to a globalised, technology-driven world, but does not address all types of consultation which breach the communication dyad (e.g. clinician - patient - carer)

INTRODUCTION

Two of the most significant changes affecting communication in the consultation are the increasing use of computers (the 'technologisation' of care)(1) and globalisation. The use of electronic patient records (EPRs) is gathering pace throughout Europe with the UK, the Netherlands and Scandinavia leading the way. (2-4) Globalisation (the movement of people, their languages, cultural practices, artefacts and 'norms' between countries) is creating 'super-diverse' multilingual populations.(5) According to the 2011 census in England and Wales, 29% of the population were born abroad or have a parent or grandparent born abroad. In Switzerland, 35.1% of over-15s are first- or second-generation migrants.(6) These social changes have significant impacts on the consultation.

Researchers of electronic patient records have coined the term 'triadic' consultation to highlight the computer as an influential third party in the consultation.(7-10) Swinglehurst et al. go further, conceptualising the EPR as bringing a wide range of competing voices to the consultation and shaping its dynamics.(11;12) Likewise, the dynamics of multilingual consultations are changed by the inclusion of professional and *ad hoc* interpreters (untrained family members, staff or volunteers). The resulting configuration has been referred to as a 'trialogue'.(13-18) An increasing number of consultations involve patients (and doctors) communicating in a language other than their first language, or in a variety of the majority language (e.g. English) influenced by their first language. In these consultations the communication barrier may lead to a 'loss' of patient voice (examples 2 and 3 in this paper) or to unresolved misunderstandings arising from subtle differences in speech delivery, word stress and styles of self-presentation. (19)

1
2
3 Consultations which incorporate socio-technical or sociolinguistic challenges (or
4 both) are increasingly the norm in large urban areas. Although medical educators
5 recognise that consultations are growing in complexity,(20) educational resources
6 addressing these complexities remain limited. Current consultation models assume a
7 communication 'dyad' in which two voices (patient and clinician) engage in focussed
8 interaction using broadly shared ways of communicating. Communication tends to be
9 envisaged as a series of learned prototypical 'skills' or procedures for accomplishing
10 clinical tasks rather than as a dynamic interaction which emerges moment-by-
11 moment, shaped by every interactional nuance along the way. Assumptions about
12 the nature of communication are reflected in strategies currently advocated for
13 interpreted consultations such as: advising the interpreter what is expected up front;
14 explaining the interpreter's role to the patient; allowing ample time; asking one
15 question at a time; clarifying confusing responses; seeking 'cultural information' from
16 the interpreter afterwards.(17;21-23) Likewise, in computer mediated consultations
17 doctors are advised to avoid trying to attend to patient and computer at the same
18 time (e.g. by 'signposting' computer use), to use mobile monitors and to 'look at the
19 patient'.(8;24) Although these suggestions are useful, they overlook the fact that the
20 interaction is itself fundamentally and profoundly changed by these new
21 arrangements.

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 This paper explores the characteristics of these contemporary consultations through
47 presentation of case studies selected as 'telling cases' (25) highlighting the
48 challenges arising in consultations which involve a meeting of more than two voices.
49 Analytic observations are developed into a reflective 'toolkit' for use in the
50 educational context while analysing learners' video-recorded consultations. For
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 readers who may be unfamiliar with sociolinguistic concepts presented in this paper
4
5 we include a list of definitions in **Box 1**.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **METHODS**

12
13
14 A series of interdisciplinary workshops was held over a 12- month period bringing
15 together academics specialising in healthcare communication. Their disciplinary
16 backgrounds spanned medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical
17 education. Case study presentations were followed by discussion, leading to further
18 analysis of primary interactional data. The case studies were selected from four
19 ethnographic/sociolinguistic research projects drawing on theme-orientated
20 discourse analysis (26), conversation analysis (27) and linguistic ethnography (28).
21 The research projects had received ethical approval (Thames Valley multi-centre
22 REC 06/MRE12/81; NHS Bradford REC 09/H1302/106; REC of Vaud, Switzerland
23 271/07; St. Thomas' Hospital local REC).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The selection of case studies was informed by case study methodology and based
38 on a key ethnographic principle, that of 'developing theory through the study of
39 critical cases' (page 20) (29). The workshops drew on Mitchell's concept of a 'telling'
40 case study 'in which the particular circumstances surrounding a case serve to make
41 previously obscure theoretical relationships apparent' (page 239) (25).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 So, telling cases from the four research projects were selected as examples of
50 consultations which breach the clinician-patient 'dyad', incorporating additional
51 'voices'. The authors worked together to identify synergies across them, teasing out
52 themes and valid connections between events and phenomena relevant to medical
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 education. Case studies explored the following: the interactional structure of general
4 practitioners' (GP) consultations involving interpreters; the shaping influence of the
5 EPR in primary care consultations; consultations involving patients communicating in
6 a language other than their first language. The nature of the additional 'voices' in the
7 latter example may not be immediately apparent, but relates to socio-cultural scripts
8 originating *beyond* the consultation and informing notions of how to present oneself,
9 ideas about the self (and the clinician), one's relationship to authority, expectations
10 of the healthcare system, for example. Although there is an extensive literature on
11 cultural health beliefs, precisely how patients present themselves, how they voice
12 their concerns and the impact of differences in linguistic background on the
13 orderliness and distribution of knowledge and expertise have been much less
14 studied.

30 RESULTS

31
32 We identified two key interrelated themes which are the main focus of this article:
33 *orderliness* and *distribution*. We will begin by introducing these themes and will then
34 present some short extracts of data analysis illustrating how these themes play out in
35 the contemporary consultation and how they disrupt the dyadic nature of the
36 consultation.

45 'Orderliness' in the contemporary consultation

46
47 The 'orderliness' of the consultation has been the subject of much previous research.
48 Medical educators will be familiar with the stages of the consultation described by
49 Byrne and Long in 1976,(30) and with more detailed models (e.g. Calgary-
50 Cambridge) which are currently favoured within educational curricula.(31) These
51 models describe the consultation in more-or-less discrete phases such as 'gathering
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information' and 'explanation and planning'. Each stage is associated with a set of
4
5 skills which underpin formative and summative assessments of medical students and
6
7 some professional licensing examinations (e.g. the UK Clinical Skills Assessment
8
9 forms part of the licensing examination for general practitioners).
10

11
12 Apart from the assumption that the consultation, with its various 'phases', is an
13
14 orderly affair, these models tend to assume a structuralist orientation to language,
15
16 that is, the talk shared between clinician and patient is assumed to represent
17
18 particular meanings – talk is simply *representative* of reality. For example, when a
19
20 clinician 'summarises' the consultation, this summary is assumed to reflect a concise
21
22 version of the patient's story, which is in turn assumed to represent the patient's
23
24 experience. An alternative *social constructionist* perspective would also consider the
25
26 additional work being *accomplished* by summarising – for example: the clinician's
27
28 opportunity to take back the 'speaking floor';(32) the organisation of the story; the
29
30 emphasis afforded to those aspects perceived to be most salient to diagnostic
31
32 reasoning or clinical management; the clinician's construction of their professional
33
34 identity. From this perspective the encounter is relatively unstable, and the
35
36 orderliness of the consultation, or its identified 'phases' are not so much inevitable
37
38 *attributes* of the consultation, but are 'brought about' or 'worked up' through
39
40 interaction. This 'bringing about' is informed by previous cumulative experience of
41
42 what usually happens in the kind of interaction we recognize as a 'medical
43
44 consultation', but involves a certain amount of improvisation along the way.
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **'Distribution' in the contemporary consultation**

52
53
54 In consultations that lie beyond the 'dyad' by inclusion of additional people (e.g.
55
56 interpreters) or technologies (e.g. electronic patient records) or patients whose first
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 language is not English, we face new configurations in terms of the distribution of
4
5 knowledge, power, authority and social identities. In what has been called the
6
7 “crowded” consultation(33) where many voices meet, new questions become salient
8
9 and contested. For example: *Who is doing the talking? Whose voice is heard? How*
10
11 *is knowledge distributed? What is important medical knowledge? Whose interests*
12
13 *are being served? Who is the patient? Who is the clinician?*

14 15 16 17 **Analysis of ‘orderliness’ and ‘distribution’ of roles in the contemporary** 18 19 **consultation**

20
21
22 In this section we will illustrate how ‘orderliness’ and ‘distribution’ play out in
23
24 consultations which breach the communication dyad, using selected data extracts.
25
26 These examples combine the micro-analytic methods used in conversation analysis
27
28 (CA) with ethnographic observation of the relevant institutional contexts, mindful that
29
30 this broader context shapes interaction in important ways. CA considers the detailed
31
32 systematic patterns and regularities that arise as each speaker takes up, interprets
33
34 and responds to the other’s turn.(34;35) Our case studies show how the well-
35
36 described orderliness of the consultation becomes disturbed when additional voices
37
38 are introduced, as new forms of order and dis-order emerge and care becomes
39
40 increasingly distributed. We have retained the transcribing conventions used in each
41
42 original study (see Appendix). The text is interspersed with suggestions of reflective
43
44 questions which emerge from our data analysis. We anticipate that these questions
45
46 will encourage tutors and learners to discover the importance of considering the
47
48 consultation as an emergent *co-constructed* phenomenon, requiring a degree of
49
50 improvisation. They are intended for use by tutors in undergraduate and
51
52 postgraduate contexts (e.g. general practice (GP) training) when teaching clinical
53
54 communication and also by learners as they play back and reflect on their own
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 video-recorded consultations, sensitising them to particular challenges posed in these
4
5 complex consultations and extending the range of available tools for critical analysis.
6
7 Their value may be enhanced by educational support from a sociolinguist or a more
8
9 collaborative interdisciplinary pedagogy which brings together clinicians and
10
11 linguists. .
12

13
14
15 First, we look at the opening of a consultation between a nurse (N) and patient (P),
16
17 English speakers who haven't met before (**Figure 1**). The institutional context is an
18
19 annual asthma check, a requirement of the UK Quality and Outcomes Framework
20
21 (QOF) for which incentive payments are made. The nurse is completing a computer
22
23 template (form) during the consultation. The transcript includes notes on bodily
24
25 conduct and the computer screen display.
26
27

28
29 <<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>>
30

31
32 She frames the consultation as an 'assessment' emphasising it is really (01:08) or
33
34 very (01:19) straightforward. The linearity of the upcoming consultation is alluded to
35
36 as she counts a 3-part list with her fingers. She demarcates the purpose of the clinic,
37
38 laying it out as an orderly affair and (implicitly) setting limits on what can happen.
39
40 She adds to this later (at 2:09, transcript not shown), while gesturing towards the
41
42 EPR: *"What I've got here is some questions that I – I need to ask you. They're fairly
43
44 straightforward ones but what they tend to do with is that they will flag up whether
45
46 there >actually< we have got what w- what I would call breakthrough symptoms."*
47
48 Reiterating that it is 'straightforward', the phrase *"I need to ask you"* points to an
49
50 underlying institutional requirement. Reassurance focuses on an anticipated
51
52 orderliness of the clinic, dealing up front with any misalignment between what the
53
54 patient may expect and what the nurse is required to do. But this is a different kind of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 order to that which we might expect. This is an orderliness in which the electronic
4
5 template is instrumental, rather than one which emerges through dialogue between
6
7 clinician and patient.(12)
8
9

10
11 The nurse then goes on to speak *not* of symptoms, but of inhalers (transcript
12
13 omitted) and then smoking. Here the template introduces a topic (smoking) which
14
15 seems tangential to this patient's particular circumstances, although it is important to
16
17 asthma care in general terms, and has institutional significance, being a QOF
18
19 indicator. The EPR thus brings an institutional voice into the encounter, making
20
21 relevant the patient's identity as a lifelong non-smoker in this context. It contributes
22
23 to defining what is important medical knowledge, reproducing particular definitions of
24
25 'quality' in practice - gathering data about (non-)smoking for QOF being an example.
26
27 The patient becomes an epidemiological informant and 'quality' is transformed into
28
29 meeting an institutional requirement rather than focussing on the specific quality of
30
31 care of the individual. At 2.50 - 2.52 the nurse's emphatic evaluations "*excellent,*
32
33 *that's great*" are spoken towards the EPR as she types, apparently referring to her
34
35 satisfaction at meeting its demands, the patient watching from the sidelines. At the
36
37 very least it is ambiguous to whom (or what) these superlatives relate.
38
39
40
41

42
43 The analytic question of "*Who is doing the talking?*" is at issue here. For example,
44
45 the authorship of the words at 2:47 is apparently distributed between the nurse and
46
47 the EPR. We see a disruption of the usual conventions of conversation, with this
48
49 comment spoken by the nurse as she looks at the computer screen rather than at
50
51 the patient to whom she expects to hand over the speaking 'turn'. The nurse's
52
53 attention is divided between what has been called the patient *embodied* and the
54
55 patient *inscribed* (36;37) as the patient becomes (metaphorically) distributed
56
57 between person and record.(36) The nurse is *cognitively* oriented to the patient as
58
59
60

1
2
3 she establishes his smoking status by looking at the EPR, but the *affective* aspect of
4 her involvement - which Goffman has highlighted as crucial in a social interaction -
5 is compromised.(38) This “template talk” is met by a 0.4 second pause. The nurse
6 then turns to face the patient, adding “*that’s what I’ve got here*” - this time evoking a
7 response, as they jointly repeat “*never smoked*”, words which were initially displayed
8 on the EPR screen (visible only to the nurse).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Box 2** suggests some reflective questions to ask of consultations involving the EPR.
18 Students may find it helpful to use the transcript in Figure 1 to gain familiarity with
19 these questions before asking the same questions of their own video-recorded
20 consultations. In the following sections, we incorporate reflective questions arising
21 from our data analysis as applicable to different kinds of complex consultations.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 <<INSERT BOX 2 ABOUT HERE>>
30
31

32 Our next example (**Figure 2**) is from a GP consultation with a patient from Nigeria
33 who speaks a variety of English that differs from local English. Whilst on holiday in
34 Nigeria he was bitten by a dog, raising the question of whether he might have been
35 exposed to rabies (lines 1-4) and considered for vaccination.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 <<INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE>>
43
44

45 This example illustrates an unresolved ambiguity which arises from different
46 conventions in standard English and Nigerian English over the use of contrastive
47 stress (indicated by * in data). Disorder, misunderstanding, and an incorrect
48 assessment ensue. In lines 4-7 the patient tells the GP he knows the dog’s owner
49 and that the dog visits the vet regularly. This reassures the GP that the patient is at
50 low risk (line 12: “*oh fair enough*”) and he in turn later reassures the patient that no
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 vaccination is needed. In fact the patient was conveying his concern that the dog
4 may **not** be free of rabies, and that the owner could not be trusted. When the patient
5 says "***they** told me the dog go to the vet regular but that's **what** they said*" (lines
6,7,9, highlighted in bold in transcript) he emphasizes the agent (*'they'*) and the
7 content of the agent's talk (*"what"*). The equivalent sentiment in standard English
8 would be "*they told me the dog goes to the vet regular, but that's what they said*" with
9 the emphasis on the verbs ("told", "said"). Although the patient offers further hints of
10 his scepticism in line 13 - a hesitation, laughter and the word "but" – the underlying
11 ambiguity is passed over, and absent from the institutional record made by the
12 doctor. Misunderstandings, or the illusion of understanding, which result from small
13 and subliminally processed differences in talk, are more frequent in a multi-lingual
14 patient population(19) and challenge conventional orderliness. But no simple
15 behaviours can be taught in situations of super-diversity as our next two examples
16 also show.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Figure 3** shows an extract of a video-recorded consultation in a Swiss pain clinic
36 (translated from French) in which consent is sought for a spinal injection. The patient
37 left his home country 10 years earlier after a war, and has very limited command of
38 French. He has chronic low back pain for which he has received spinal injections. He
39 is worried about the risks involved, because a previous consent form (translated by
40 his daughter) referred to a risk of paralysis.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 <<INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE>>
50

51
52 As in the previous example, there is obvious asymmetry of the linguistic resources
53 available. Indeed the entire extract might be regarded as a continuous, extended and
54 only partly repaired misunderstanding. Both parties struggle to grasp at least some
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 meaning in the words of the other. An interview with both interactants afterwards
4
5 (data not shown) suggested that some areas of shared understanding were reached:
6
7 the patient's fear of the injection, the positive impact of a previous injection and
8
9 agreement to proceed today. But other communicative efforts failed, including the
10
11 doctor's attempt to reassure the patient that paralysis does not happen often.
12
13 Indeed, the patient reported that the doctor had particularly reminded him of the risks
14
15 of paralysis adding that he, the patient, had to take responsibility for this risk. The
16
17 patient's fear (linked it appears to some past experience in the war) is not explored.
18
19 Arguably under conditions of such scarce common linguistic means this topic may be
20
21 deemed too complex to tackle; the patient's voice from the past is lost.
22
23
24
25

26 Difficulties arising in the clinical decision-making process have previously been
27
28 described in monolingual contexts,(39;40) but they become magnified when patients
29
30 have limited proficiency in the language of consultation. In this multilingual context
31
32 the ideals of shared decision-making within an ordered consultation are eroded. In
33
34 this example, the doctor first presents his idea, tries to convince the patient of the
35
36 benefits of another injection and goes on to investigate the patient's worries and
37
38 possible reasons for disagreement. But the participants fail to connect the discursive
39
40 threads of this discussion to the final decision. Patient consent follows immediately
41
42 after major interactional troubles, culminating in a self-critical meta-communicative
43
44 account by the patient (*"I don't know how to explain well"*) and an abrupt topic shift
45
46 by the doctor. The doctor appears to cut to the decision making when he gives up on
47
48 achieving further clarity about the patient's stance.
49
50
51
52

53 **Box 3** presents some reflective questions to ask of consultations which involve
54
55 patients who have either a limited command of the dominant language of the
56
57 consultation, or speak a non-local variety of the dominant language (such as those
58
59
60

1
2
3 illustrated in **Figures 2 and 3**). These questions are intended to inform analysis of
4
5 students' own video recorded consultations.
6
7

8 << INSERT BOX 3 >>
9

10
11 Consultations like those in **Figures 2 and 3** in which the clinician and patient are not
12
13 'in tune' with each other require considerable and not always successful
14
15 collaborative work by both parties to prevent, recognise and repair
16
17 misunderstandings.(41) The use of interpreters may address these issues to some
18
19 extent, but not without introducing different challenges. The work of consulting
20
21 becomes distributed between at least three participants, changing the relationship of
22
23 the speakers to their own words and so disturbing roles and identities. The
24
25 orderliness in interpreted consultations is changed, both in terms of overall structure
26
27 and in micro-interactional patterns. Clinicians have to do more than simply establish
28
29 consensus on the mode of communication and the role of the interpreter as
30
31 suggested by recent guidelines.(16;17) At the micro-level, extra verbal exchanges
32
33 are required to clarify misunderstandings (as we saw in Figures 2 & 3). The
34
35 traditional doctor↔patient (dyadic) interactional sequence becomes a more
36
37 complicated 'triadic' pattern. Close inspection of interpreted consultations shows that
38
39 this assumed prototypical triadic sequence (doctor→interpreter→patient or
40
41 patient→interpreter→doctor) is not always observed by participants, so that one or
42
43 more participants' voices are 'lost'.(16;42) The power to decide who talks next is
44
45 *unequally* distributed among the three participants – with patients at the bottom of
46
47 the hierarchy. Even when the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence *is*
48
49 followed, there remains considerable scope for misunderstanding, due to ambiguity
50
51 over interpreter's role and how the interpreting task is actually done in practice. The
52
53 interpreter delivers a 'hybrid' voice which incorporates the voices of all three
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants in the interaction. **Figure 4** shows an extract from an interpreted
4 consultation in England with a Czech-speaking patient who has complained of
5 headaches. It gives some insight into how the themes of orderliness and distribution
6 play out in an interpreted consultation. A related set of reflective questions which
7 may be useful to students as they analyse their own interpreter-mediated
8 consultations is provided in **Box 4**.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 <<INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE>>
18

19
20 From lines 1 to 10, the participants follow the triadic sequence in their turn-taking.
21 However, what the doctor and patient hear is reformulated by the interpreter. In Line
22 1, the doctor asks a question. Prior to the question he refers to an earlier discussion
23 about the patient's pain, signposting a change of topic. However, this signposting is
24 omitted by the interpreter in Lines 3-4. Similarly, in Lines 5-7 the interpreter adds
25 'that start afternoon' into her translation although the patient did not say these words
26 here. As Bolden points out, an interpreter is constantly choosing the quantity and
27 quality of information that is translated, thus creating a hybrid voice and assigning
28 themselves an extra role as either 'doctor' or 'patient' with blurring of the usual
29 boundaries between the two.(43) The potential for voices to become 'lost' in this
30 process is greatest when the prototypical triadic sequence is not followed.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 At line 10, the doctor comments on the interpreter's response ("*Interesting. That's*
46 *good*"). If the (assumed) triadic sequence was followed, one would expect either that
47 the doctor would continue talking at this point, or that he would pass the speaking
48 turn to the interpreter to translate his words. Either way, we would not expect the
49 patient to have a turn here. However, the patient (line 11) brings in a new topic,
50 ostensibly in an 'inappropriate' place. Her utterance is not translated and goes
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 unheard as the doctor interrupts the patient (line 13) before she can finish her talk;
4
5 this marks the patient's entry as 'not legitimate'. The doctor and the interpreter then
6
7 continue the conversation following the triadic sequence. In the wider dataset from
8
9 which this extract is taken, we found that doctors also speak at such 'inappropriate
10
11 places'. However there is a difference. In most cases, the words of the doctor *are*
12
13 translated, and the patient is put 'on hold' while this is done. In other words, when
14
15 the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence breaks down it is the *interpreter*
16
17 who takes on the role of 'distributor' of speaking turns and decides whose voice will
18
19 be preferentially heard. In our dataset, interpreters tended to prioritise the doctor's
20
21 right to speak, as illustrated in **Figure 4**.
22
23

24
25
26 << INSERT BOX 4 ABOUT HERE >>
27
28
29
30
31

32 DISCUSSION

33
34
35 Rapid technological and demographic change has brought challenges to the
36
37 consultation which were not anticipated when the consultation models currently
38
39 taught to students were developed. Using a selection of 'telling' cases as a basis for
40
41 analysis we have been able to develop novel conceptual ideas about the
42
43 contemporary consultation which challenge normative assumptions, showing that the
44
45 notion of the consultation as a dyadic meeting of two speakers who share
46
47 communicative resources is frequently challenged. Our priority has been on depth of
48
49 analysis rather than breadth, with our selection of case studies informed by the
50
51 'opportunity to learn' rather than by concerns around 'typicality'.(44) Based on a
52
53 detailed study of four contrasting cases we suggest there are complex new
54
55 configurations of voices in the consultation, and - as a consequence of this - the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 potential for 'losing' the patient voice. These challenges to the 'dyadic' consultation
4 rarely receive explicit attention in the educational curriculum. One striking
5 observation which emerges from our data is that the twin social pressures of
6 globalisation and technologisation appear to place paradoxically opposing demands
7 on the consultation. On the one hand, clinicians are challenged with increasingly
8 diverse, unpredictable consultations from a sociolinguistic perspective, requiring
9 flexibility and a tolerance of ambiguity. On the other, there is increasing pressure to
10 'standardise' practices, for example through greater use of EPR templates.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Building on our analysis of these case studies we have offered a series of reflective
22 questions which may be relevant to ask of complex consultations which take on
23 these new kinds of orderliness and in which conventional understandings of the roles
24 of clinician and patient become blurred. These questions have not yet been tested
25 empirically in an educational setting and do not constitute a definitive checklist. They
26 may neither be relevant to all consultations nor necessarily comprehensive, but we
27 hope that they are a starting point to promote observation and discussion about the
28 consultation from an orientation which embraces its new complexities. Further
29 empirical research is required to test the value of this toolkit as an educational
30 intervention in practice and to refine it in the context of further educational research.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 We would like to invite debate amongst medical educators about how to adapt,
45 extend or revise consultation models to ensure that these important aspects of the
46 contemporary consultation do not remain overlooked. We suggest that an orientation
47 to the consultation as a dynamic process which is co-constructed between clinician
48 and patient is helpful, one in which the structure (we prefer 'orderliness') emerges
49 out of the collaborative work of clinician and patient (and others) and which depends
50 on how the 'work' of consulting is distributed between participants. Regarding the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consultation as a co-construction demands more than a range of 'add-on' prompts
4
5 describing specific clinician behaviours. It encompasses a shift away from the idea
6
7 that consulting is a set of competences to be mastered, towards a more analytical
8
9 orientation. The most important overarching question to ask of the consultation shifts
10
11 from "Did I do that well?" towards "What did we accomplish there?" This brings the
12
13 contribution of the patient, and all relevant parties (or 'voices') into clearer view. The
14
15 questions we offer to learners within our reflective 'toolkit' in this paper fall broadly
16
17 within this overarching question.
18
19

20
21 We urge educators to consider critically how their approach to teaching clinical
22
23 communication might change if instead of assuming that the talk *represents* some
24
25 kind of existing reality they also encourage students to consider conceptualising talk
26
27 as *constructing* reality, an assumption which underpins this paper. We suggest that
28
29 greater use of the detailed analysis of video-recordings of real (as opposed to
30
31 simulated) consultations may be helpful, exposing learners - as consulters and
32
33 critical observers - to the kinds of complexities that our research highlights. For
34
35 example, a DVD by Roberts et al. entitled "*Doing the Lambeth Talk*" shows how
36
37 misunderstandings in the multilingual consultation can be avoided and repaired.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Box 1. Definitions**Voice**

Drawing on social theory 'voice' has both literal and metaphorical meanings. It is used literally as the human voice i.e. the sound of the voice and the manner in which someone speaks. 'Voice' is used metaphorically a) in writing, to identify the distinctive style and authority that a text has e.g. the EPR b) in speech and writing, as multiple or hybrid voices, when different styles are conflated together or a dominant style is infused with a less noticed one.

Dyad and Triad

'Dyad' is the traditional one-to-one communication between two people (here the clinician and patient) which is seen as the norm. A 'triad' is an interaction of three people or voices. Here the conventional two person communication is disturbed and its norms are challenged.

Misalignment

'Misalignments' are uncomfortable or inappropriate moments or instances where one side has difficulty interpreting the assumptions of the other. They are also moments when the speakers appear to be on parallel tracks, not responding fully to the other.

Agent

'Agent' is a term used in grammar analysis to describe the person or thing in the sentence that is the main subject doing the action

Repair

'Repair' is used metaphorically to describe how misunderstandings and misalignments in interaction are dealt with. It often involves talking *about* talk, to sort the interactional problem out.

Social constructionism

An approach that assumes that reality is the result of historical, social and political processes, in which the interest of the researcher is in how phenomena come into being, the processes by which they come to be 'constructed' as they are.

Box 2. Reflective questions based on Case 1 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

Which voices are being privileged at different times in the consultation and why?

What is the consequence of this?

How do I ensure that the patient's voice is not lost?

How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate the specific arrangement of people and computer in this consultation?

How, and to what extent am I fully 'involved' in this consultation?

What does this mean to me and what challenge is this particular consultation presenting?

To whom and what am I attending, and with what purpose?

How am I incorporating computer templates and prompts?

What is the consequence for my communication with the patient?

To what extent is the sequencing and ordering of our talk being influenced, if at all, by the demands of the EPR?

Do I need to consider possible alternative ways of managing this situation?

How does interacting with the computer affect the standard models of good communication in the textbooks?

Box 3. Reflective questions based on Cases 2 and 3 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

How do I need to adjust my approach to the consultation when the talk *itself* seems to be the problem?

Am I confident that I correctly understood the patient's problem, in the knowledge that subtle features such as word stress and styles of self-presentation might differ in speakers whose variety of English is influenced by a language other than my own? If not, what were the other possible meanings of this section of talk?

How can I ensure that I clarify the patient's intended meanings?

Did the strategies that I used to do relational work in the consultation have the desired effect in this multilingual consultation? (*Examples might include the use of humour, metaphor, or attempts at 'informal' conversational styles*) Did I correctly identify the patient's attempts at relational work?

This consultation felt muddled and chaotic and did not evolve as I was expecting. Why might this be? Does my explanation reveal any underlying assumptions about how I understand the act of consulting, my expectations for the consultation, and my role as the clinician?

At what point do I decide I cannot consult effectively without an interpreter either because it is not clear whether the patient and I have understood each other or because I am concerned that the patient's voice is being lost?

Do the models of patient-centeredness and shared decision-making work when talk itself seems to be the problem?

Box 4. Reflective questions based on Case 4 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate the specific arrangement of people in this consultation? Do the models of communication in the textbooks need to be adapted in this situation?

How confident am I that this interpreter is doing what they are supposed to do?

When do I notice that the sequence of speakers (doctor, interpreter, patient) is different from that which I might expect?

What may have been the consequences of this disruption to the order of speakers on the understandings of this consultation?

Do I notice occasions when the patient's voice is lost i.e. words of the patient appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

Do I notice occasions when my own words appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

What can I do to ensure that the interpreter is working to the mutual benefit of the patient and doctor?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the staff and patients who agreed to take part in the four original research projects from which the data presented in this article are selected. We would also like to thank our peer reviewers for helpful comments on the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared

FUNDING

The research projects on which this paper is based were funded by: National Institute for Health Research Doctoral Fellowship and Medical Research Council (MRC) (DS); Sir Sigmund Warburg Voluntary Settlement (CR); NHS Bradford & Airedale PhD Fellowship (SL); Swiss National Science Foundation (OW and PS).

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

All of the authors of this paper fulfil ICMJE guidelines for authorship. All authors were involved in data collection and analysis. All authors participated in the preparation and presentation of case studies (drawn from their own empirical research) in the research workshops and in subsequent re-analysis of case study data to identify emergent cross-cutting themes. DS and CR took responsibility for developing the analysis into practitioner-relevant resources, refining these in discussion with SL, OW and PS. DS wrote the first draft of the paper and revised it in response to critical commentary from all of the remaining authors (CR, SL, OW, PS). All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

DATA SHARING

No additional data available.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. New forms of order and the distribution of authorship in the asthma clinic

Figure 2. Dis-order arising from different conventions in intonation

Figure 3. Negotiating consent for a spinal injection

Figure 4 Lost voices in distributed turn-taking sequence organisation (English translation in italics)

Reference List

- (1) Peacock JW, Nolan PW. Care under threat in the modern world. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2000;32:1066-70.
- (2) Knottnerus JA. The Role of the Electronic Patient Record in the Development of General Practice in the Netherlands. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 1999;38:350-4.
- (3) Protti D, Johansen I. Widespread Adoption of Informtion Technology in Primary Care Physician Offices in Denmark: A Case Study. Downloadable from http://www.commonwealthfund.org/~media/Files/Publications/Issue%20Brief/2010/Mar/1379_Protti_widespread_adoption_IT_primary_care_Denmark_intl_ib.pdf. The Commonwealth Fund; 2010.
- (4) RCGP. Information Management and Technology in General Practice: RCGP Information Sheet No.7. 2005.
- (5) Vertovec S. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2007;30:1024-54.
- (6) Office fédéral de la statistique. Relevé structurel du recensement fédéral de la population selon la langue et la religion. Available from: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/news/02/03/02.html>. 2013.
- (7) Scott D, Purves I. Triadic relationship between doctor, computer and patient. *Interacting with Computers* 1996;8(4):347-63.
- (8) Ventres W, Kooienga S, Marlin R. EHRs in the Exam Room: Tips on Patient-Centred Care. *Family Practice Management* 2006;13(3):45-7.

- 1
2
3 (9) Margalit RS, Roter D, Dunevant MA, et al. Electronic medical record use and physician-patient communication: An observational study of Israeli primary care encounters. *Patient Education and Counseling* 2006 Apr;61(1):134-41.
- 4
5
6
7 (10) Pearce C. *Doctors, Patients and Computers, the New Consultation*. PhD Thesis Department of General Practice, The University of Melbourne; 2007.
- 8
9
10 (11) Swinglehurst D, Roberts C, Greenhalgh T. Opening up the "black box" of the electronic patient record: A linguistic ethnographic study in general practice. *Communication and Medicine* 2011;8(1):3-15.
- 11
12
13 (12) Swinglehurst D, Greenhalgh T, Roberts C. Computer templates in chronic disease management: ethnographic case study in general practice. *BMJ Open* 2012;2:e001754.
- 14
15
16 (13) Greenhalgh T, Voisey C, Robb N. Interpreted consultations as 'business as usual'? An analysis of organisational routines in general practices. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 2007;29:931-54.
- 17
18
19 (14) Li S, Pearson D, Escott S. Language barriers within primary care consultations: an increasing challenge needing new solutions. *Education for Primary Care* 2010;21:385-91.
- 20
21 (15) Hale SB. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2007.
- 22
23 (16) Seale C, Rivas C, Kelly M. The challenge of communication in interpreted consultations in diabetes care: a mixed methods study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013;DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X663082.
- 24
25 (17) Bischoff A, Loutan L. *Other Words, Other Meanings - a guide to health care interpreting in international settings*. Geneva: Serve de médecine internationale et humanitaire, HUG; 2008.
- 26
27 (18) Guex P, Singy P. *Quand la médecine à besoin d'interprètes*. Genève: Éditions médecine et hygiène; 2003.
- 28
29 (19) Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, et al. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Medical Education* 2005;39:465-75.
- 30
31 (20) Lown B, Rodriguez D. Lost in Translation? How Electronic Health Records Structure Communication, Relationships, and Meaning. *Academic Medicine* 2012;87:392-4.
- 32
33 (21) Kai J. *Valuing diversity: a resource for health professional training to respond to cultural diversity*. London: Royal College of General Practitioners; 2006.
- 34
35 (22) Tebble H. *Medical Interpreting: Improving communication with your patients*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University; 1998.
- 36
37 (23) Lie D, Berekenyei S, Braddock C, et al. Assessing Medical Students' Skills in Working with Interpreters During Patient Encounters: A Validation Study of the Interpreter Scale. *Academic Medicine* 2009;84:643-50.
- 38
39 (24) Booth N, Kohannejad J, Robinson P. *Information in the consulting room - training package*. Sowerby Centre for Health Informatics at Newcastle; 2002 Jul.
- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (25) Mitchell J. Producing data: Case studies. In: Ellen R, editor. *Ethnographic Research: A Guide*
4 *to General Conduct*. London: Academic Press; 1984. p. 237-41.
5
6 (26) Roberts C, Sarangi S. Theme-oriented discourse analysis of medical encounters. *Medical*
7 *Education* 2005;39:632-40.
8
9 (27) Heritage J. Goffman, Garfinkel and Conversation Analysis. In: Wetherell M, Taylor S, Yates S,
10 editors. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications; 2001. p. 47-56.
11
12 (28) Rampton B, Tusting K, Maybin J, Barwell R, Creese A, Lytra V. UK Linguistic Ethnography: A
13 discussion paper. Downloadable from [http://www.ling-](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf)
14 [ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf). 2004.
15
16 (29) Hammersley M. *What's Wrong with Ethnography?* London: Routledge; 1992.
17
18 (30) Byrne PS, Long BEL. *Doctors Talking to Patients. A Study of the Verbal Behaviour of General*
19 *Practitioners Consulting in their Surgeries*. London: HMSO; 1976.
20
21 (31) Kurtz S, Silverman J. The Calgary-Cambridge referenced observation guides: an aid to
22 defining the curriculum and organising the teaching in communication training programmes.
23 *Medical Education* 1996;30:83-9.
24
25 (32) Edelsky C. Who's got the floor? *Language and Society* 1981;10(3):383-421.
26
27 (33) Davies P. The crowded consultation. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:648-9.
28
29 (34) Heritage J, Maynard DW. *Communication in Medical Care*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
30 Press; 2006.
31
32 (35) Schegloff EA. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow D, editor.
33 *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press; 1972.
34
35 (36) Robinson JD. Getting Down to Business: Talk, Gaze and Body Orientation during Openings of
36 Doctor-Patient Consultations. *Human Communication Research* 1998;25(1):97-123.
37
38 (37) Ruusuvuori J. Looking means listening: coordinating displays of engagement in doctor-
39 patient interaction. *Social Science & Medicine* 2001;52(7):1093-108.
40
41 (38) Goffman E. *Involvement. Behavior in Public Places*. New York: The Free Press; 1966. p. 33-42.
42
43 (39) Atkinson P. Medical discourse, evidentiality and the construction of professional
44 responsibility. In: Sarangi S, Roberts C, editors. *Talk, work and institutional order*. Berlin, New
45 York: Mouton de Gruyter; 1999.
46
47 (40) Gwyn R, Elwyn G. When is a shared decision not (quite) a shared decision? Negotiating
48 preferences in a general practice encounter. *Social Science & Medicine* 1999;49(4):437-47.
49
50 (41) Roberts C. Continuities and Discontinuities in Doctor-Patient consultations in a multilingual
51 society. In: Gott M, Salager-Meyer F, editors. *Advances in Medical Discourse Analysis: Oral*
52 *and Written Contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang; 2006. p. 177-96.
53
54 (42) Li S. Co-construction of interpreted conversation in medical consultations. *Applied*
55 *Linguistics Review* 2013;4:127-49.
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

(43) Bolden GB. Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: interpreters' involvement in history taking. *Discourse Studies* 2000;2:387-419.

(44) Stake RE. Qualitative Case Studies. In: Denzin NK, Lincoln YS, editors. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. Sage Publications, Inc; 2005. p. 443-66.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Beyond the 'dyad': A qualitative re-evaluation of the**
8 **changing clinical consultation.**
9

10
11 **Deborah Swinglehurst***; **Celia Roberts**; **Shuangyu Li**; **Orest Weber**; **Pascal**
12 **Singy**
13

14 Deborah Swinglehurst is Senior Clinical Lecturer at the Centre for Primary Care and
15 Public Health, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary,
16 University of London, UK.

17 Celia Roberts is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Education and
18 Professional Studies, King's College London, UK.

19 Shuangyu Li is Lecturer in Clinical Communication at the Division of Medical
20 Education, School of Medicine, King's College London, UK.

21 Orest Weber is Researcher at the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University
22 Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland.

23 Pascal Singy is Associate Professor of Sociolinguistics and Director of Research at
24 the Psychiatric Liaison Service, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne,
25 Switzerland.

26 ***Corresponding author at:** Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Barts and
27 The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary, University of London,
28 58 Turner Street, London E1 2AB, UK. Email: d.swinglehurst@qmul.ac.uk.
29 Telephone +44 20 7882 7204 Fax +44 20 7882 2552
30
31
32
33

34 **Keywords:** globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; clinical
35 communication; technology
36
37
38

39 **Word count:** **41994323**
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective

To identify characteristics of ~~clinical~~ consultations which do not conform to the traditionally understood communication 'dyad', in order to highlight implications for medical education and develop a reflective 'toolkit' for use by medical practitioners and educators in the analysis of consultations.

Design

A series of interdisciplinary research workshops spanning 12 months explored the social impact of globalisation and computerisation on the clinical consultation, focusing specifically on contemporary challenges to the clinician-patient dyad. Researchers presented detailed case studies of consultations, taken from their recent research projects. Drawing on concepts from applied sociolinguistics, further analysis of selected case studies prompted the identification of key emergent themes.

Setting

University departments in the UK and Switzerland.

Participants

Six researchers with backgrounds in medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical education. One workshop was also attended by PhD students conducting research on healthcare interactions.

Results

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The contemporary consultation is characterised by a multiplicity of voices. ~~The~~
8 ~~incorporation~~ of additional voices in the consultation creates new forms of order
9 (and *dis*-order) in the interaction. The roles 'clinician' and 'patient' are blurred as they
10 become increasingly distributed between different participants ~~in the consultation~~.
11
12 These new consultation arrangements make new demands on clinicians which lie
13 beyond the scope of most educational programmes for clinical communication.
14
15
16
17

18 Conclusion

19
20
21 ~~The consultation is changing.~~ Traditional consultation models which assume a
22 'dyadic' consultation do not adequately incorporate the realities of many
23 contemporary consultations. A paradox emerges between the need to manage
24 consultations in a 'super-diverse' multilingual society, whilst also attending to
25 increasing requirements for standardised protocol-driven approaches to care ~~and~~
26 ~~data gathering~~ prompted by computer use ~~in the consultation~~.
27
28 ~~The consultation is changing.~~ ~~The tension between standardisation and flexibility~~
29 ~~requires addressing in educational contexts.~~ Drawing on concepts from applied
30 sociolinguistics and the findings of these research observations, the authors offer a
31 reflective 'toolkit' of questions to ask of the consultation in the context of enquiry
32 based learning.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 (300 words)

45 46 47 48 ARTICLE SUMMARY

49 50 51 Strengths and limitations of this study

- Brings insights from applied sociolinguistics to the analysis of consultations, [including detailed interactional transcription and analytic concepts. These may be unfamiliar to some readers and we recognise it is not easy to make them accessible](#)
- Addresses the mismatch between consultations as conceptualised in communication models and the reality of many contemporary consultations
- Offers a research-informed output, a 'reflective toolkit', for use in practice by clinicians and educators
- Focuses on issues relevant to a globalised, technology-driven world, but does not address all types of consultation which breach the communication dyad (e.g. clinician - patient - carer)

KEYWORDS: globalisation; multilingualism; electronic patient record; communication skills; technology

INTRODUCTION

Two of the most significant changes affecting communication in the consultation are the increasing use of computers (the 'technologisation' of care)(1) and globalisation. The use of electronic patient records (EPRs) is gathering pace throughout Europe with the UK, the Netherlands and Scandinavia leading the way. (2-4) Globalisation (the movement of people, their languages, cultural practices, artefacts and 'norms' between countries) is creating 'super-diverse' multilingual populations.(5) According to the 2011 census in England and Wales, 29% of the population were born abroad or have a parent or grandparent born abroad. In Switzerland, 35.1% of over-15s are first- or second-generation migrants.(6) These social changes have significant impacts on the consultation.

Researchers of electronic patient records have coined the term 'triadic' consultation to highlight the computer as an influential third party in the consultation.(7-10) Swinglehurst et al. go further, conceptualising the EPR as bringing a wide range of competing voices to the consultation and shaping its dynamics.(11;12) Likewise, the dynamics of multilingual consultations are changed by the inclusion of professional and *ad hoc* interpreters (untrained family members, staff or volunteers). The resulting configuration has been referred to as a 'trialogue'.(13-18) An increasing number of consultations involve patients (and doctors) communicating in a language other than their first language, or in a variety of the majority language (e.g. English) influenced by their first language. In these consultations the communication barrier may lead to a 'loss' of patient voice (examples 2 and 3 in this paper) or to unresolved misunderstandings arising from subtle differences in speech delivery, word stress and styles of self-presentation. (19)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Consultations which incorporate socio-technical or sociolinguistic challenges (or
8 both) are increasingly the norm in large urban areas. Although medical educators
9 recognise that consultations are growing in complexity,(20) educational resources
10 addressing these complexities remain limited. Current consultation models assume a
11 communication 'dyad' in which two voices (patient and clinician) engage in focussed
12 interaction using broadly shared ways of communicating. Communication tends to be
13 envisaged as a series of learned prototypical 'skills' or procedures for accomplishing
14 clinical tasks rather than as a dynamic interaction which emerges moment-by-
15 moment, shaped by every interactional nuance along the way. Assumptions about
16 the nature of communication are reflected in strategies currently advocated for
17 interpreted consultations such as: advising the interpreter what is expected up front;
18 explaining the interpreter's role to the patient; allowing ample time; asking one
19 question at a time; clarifying confusing responses; seeking 'cultural information' from
20 the interpreter afterwards.(17;21-23) Likewise, in computer mediated consultations
21 doctors are advised to avoid trying to attend to patient and computer at the same
22 time (e.g. by 'signposting' computer use), to use mobile monitors and to 'look at the
23 patient'.(8;24) Although these suggestions are useful, they overlook the fact that the
24 interaction is itself fundamentally and profoundly changed by these new
25 arrangements.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 This paper explores the characteristics of these contemporary consultations through
45 presentation of case studies selected as 'telling cases' (25) highlighting the
46 challenges arising in consultations which involve a meeting of more than two voices.
47 Analytic observations are developed into a reflective 'toolkit' for use in the
48 educational context while analysing learners' video-recorded consultations. [For](#)
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 [readers who may be unfamiliar with sociolinguistic concepts presented in this paper](#)
8 [we include a list of definitions in Box 1.](#)
9
10

11 12 13 **METHODS**

14
15
16 A series of interdisciplinary workshops was held over a 12- month period bringing
17 together academics specialising in healthcare communication. Their disciplinary
18 backgrounds spanned medicine, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and medical
19 education. Case study presentations were followed by discussion, leading to further
20 analysis of primary interactional data. The case studies were selected from four
21 ethnographic/sociolinguistic research projects drawing on theme-orientated
22 discourse analysis (26), conversation analysis (27) and linguistic ethnography (28).
23
24 The research projects had received ethical approval (Thames Valley multi-centre
25 REC 06/MRE12/81; NHS Bradford REC 09/H1302/106; REC of Vaud, Switzerland
26 271/07; St. Thomas' Hospital local REC).
27
28
29

30
31 The selection of case studies was informed by case study methodology and based
32 on a key ethnographic principle, that of 'developing theory through the study of
33 critical cases' (page 20) (29). The workshops drew on Mitchell's concept of a 'telling'
34 case study 'in which the particular circumstances surrounding a case serve to make
35 previously obscure theoretical relationships apparent' (page 239) (25).
36
37

38
39 So, telling cases from the four research projects were selected as examples of
40 consultations which breach the clinician-patient 'dyad', incorporating additional
41 'voices'. The authors worked together to identify synergies across them, teasing out
42 themes and valid connections between events and phenomena relevant to medical
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 education. Case studies explored the following: the interactional structure of general
8 practitioners' (GP) consultations involving interpreters; the shaping influence of the
9 EPR in primary care consultations; consultations involving patients communicating in
10 a language other than their first language. The nature of the additional 'voices' in the
11 latter example may not be immediately apparent, but relates to socio-cultural scripts
12 originating *beyond* the consultation and informing notions of how to present oneself,
13 ideas about the self (and the clinician), one's relationship to authority, expectations
14 of the healthcare system, for example. Although there is an extensive literature on
15 cultural health beliefs, precisely how patients present themselves, how they voice
16 their concerns and the impact of differences in linguistic background on the
17 orderliness and distribution of knowledge and expertise have been much less
18 studied.
19

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 **RESULTS**

31
32 We identified two key interrelated themes which are the main focus of this article:
33 *orderliness* and *distribution*. We will begin by introducing these themes and will then
34 present some short extracts of data analysis illustrating how these themes play out in
35 the contemporary consultation and how they disrupt the dyadic nature of the
36 consultation.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **'Orderliness' in the contemporary consultation**

44
45 The 'orderliness' of the consultation has been the subject of much previous research.
46 Medical educators will be familiar with the stages of the consultation described by
47 Byrne and Long in 1976,(30) and with more detailed models (e.g. Calgary-
48 Cambridge) which are currently favoured within educational curricula.(31) These
49 models describe the consultation in more-or-less discrete phases such as 'gathering
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 information' and 'explanation and planning'. Each stage is associated with a set of
8
9 skills which underpin formative and summative assessments of medical students and
10
11 some professional licensing examinations (e.g. the UK Clinical Skills Assessment
12
13 forms part of the licensing examination for general practitioners).

14
15 Apart from the assumption that the consultation, with its various 'phases', is an
16
17 orderly affair, these models tend to assume a structuralist orientation to language.
18 that is, the talk shared between clinician and patient is assumed to represent
19
20 particular meanings – talk is simply *representative* of reality. For example, when a
21
22 clinician 'summarises' the consultation, this summary is assumed to reflect a concise
23
24 version of the patient's story, which is in turn assumed to represent the patient's
25
26 experience. An alternative *social constructionist* perspective would also consider the
27
28 additional work being *accomplished* by summarising – for example: the clinician's
29
30 opportunity to take back the 'speaking floor';(32) the organisation of the story; the
31
32 emphasis afforded to those aspects perceived to be most salient to diagnostic
33
34 reasoning or clinical management; the clinician's construction of their professional
35
36 identity. From this perspective the encounter is relatively unstable, and the
37
38 orderliness of the consultation, or its identified 'phases' are not so much inevitable
39
40 *attributes* of the consultation, but are 'brought about' or 'worked up' through
41
42 interaction. This 'bringing about' is informed by previous cumulative experience of
43
44 what usually happens in the kind of interaction we recognize as a 'medical
45
46 consultation', but involves a certain amount of improvisation along the way.

47 48 **'Distribution' in the contemporary consultation**

49
50 In consultations that lie beyond the 'dyad' by inclusion of additional people (e.g.
51
52 interpreters) or technologies (e.g. electronic patient records) or patients whose first
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 language is not English, we face new configurations in terms of the distribution of
8 knowledge, power, authority and social identities. In what has been called the
9 “crowded” consultation(33) where many voices meet, new questions become salient
10 and contested. For example: *Who is doing the talking? Whose voice is heard? How*
11 *is knowledge distributed? What is important medical knowledge? Whose interests*
12 *are being served? Who is the patient? Who is the clinician?*
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Analysis of ‘orderliness’ and ‘distribution’ of roles in the contemporary** 20 **consultation** 21

22
23 In this section we will illustrate how ‘orderliness’ and ‘distribution’ play out in
24 consultations which breach the communication dyad, using selected data extracts.
25 These examples combine the micro-analytic methods used in conversation analysis
26 (CA) with ethnographic observation of the relevant institutional contexts, mindful that
27 this broader context shapes interaction in important ways. CA considers the detailed
28 systematic patterns and regularities that arise as each speaker takes up, interprets
29 and responds to the other’s turn.(34;35) Our case studies show how the well-
30 described orderliness of the consultation becomes disturbed when additional voices
31 are introduced, as new forms of order and dis-order emerge and care becomes
32 increasingly distributed. We have retained the transcribing conventions used in each
33 original study (see Appendix). The text is interspersed with suggestions of reflective
34 questions which emerge from our data analysis. [We anticipate that these questions](#)
35 [will encourage tutors and learners to discover the importance of considering the](#)
36 [consultation as an emergent co-constructed phenomenon, requiring a degree of](#)
37 [improvisation. They are ~~designed-intended~~ for use by tutors in undergraduate and](#)
38 [postgraduate contexts \(e.g. general practice \(GP\)GP training\) when ~~designing and~~](#)
39 [teaching clinical communication and also by](#) learners as they play back [and reflect](#)
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 on their own video-recorded consultations, sensitising them to ~~the~~ particular
8 challenges posed in these types of complex consultations and extending the range
9 of available tools for critical analysis. Their value may be enhanced by educational
10 support from an ~~applied~~ sociolinguist or a more collaborative interdisciplinary
11 pedagogy which brings together clinicians and linguists. We also hope that the
12 questions will encourage learners to discover the importance of considering the
13 consultation as an emergent co-constructed phenomenon, requiring improvisation.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 First, we look at the opening of a consultation between a nurse (N) and patient (P),
22 English speakers who haven't met before (**Figure 1**). The institutional context is an
23 annual asthma check, a requirement of the UK Quality and Outcomes Framework
24 (QOF) for which incentive payments are made. The nurse is completing a computer
25 template (form) during the consultation. The transcript includes notes on bodily
26 conduct and the computer screen display.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 <<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>>
34

35
36 She frames the consultation as an 'assessment' emphasising it is really (01:08) or
37 very (01:19) straightforward. The linearity of the upcoming consultation is alluded to
38 as she counts a 3-part list with her fingers. She demarcates the purpose of the clinic,
39 laying it out as an orderly affair and (implicitly) setting limits on what can happen.
40
41 She adds to this later (at 2:09, transcript not shown), while gesturing towards the
42 EPR: *"What I've got here is some questions that I – I need to ask you. They're fairly*
43 *straightforward ones but what they tend to do with is that they will flag up whether*
44 *there >actually< we have got what w- what I would call breakthrough symptoms."*
45
46 Reiterating that it is 'straightforward', the phrase *"I need to ask you"* points to an
47 underlying institutional requirement. Reassurance focuses on an anticipated
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 orderliness of the clinic, dealing up front with any misalignment between what the
8 patient may expect and what the nurse is required to do. But this is a different kind of
9 order to that which we might expect. This is an orderliness in which the electronic
10 template is instrumental, rather than one which emerges through dialogue between
11 clinician and patient.(12)
12
13
14
15

16
17 The nurse then goes on to speak *not* of symptoms, but of inhalers (transcript
18 omitted) and then smoking. Here the template introduces a topic (smoking) which
19 seems tangential to this patient's particular circumstances, although it is important to
20 asthma care in general terms, and has institutional significance, being a QOF
21 indicator. The EPR thus brings an institutional voice into the encounter, making
22 relevant the patient's identity as a lifelong non-smoker in this context. It contributes
23 to defining what is important medical knowledge, reproducing particular definitions of
24 'quality' in practice - gathering data about (non-)smoking for QOF being an example.
25
26 The patient becomes an epidemiological informant and 'quality' is transformed into
27 meeting an institutional requirement rather than focussing on the specific quality of
28 care of the individual. At 2.50 - 2.52 the nurse's emphatic evaluations "*excellent,*
29 *that's great*" are spoken towards the EPR as she types, apparently referring to her
30 satisfaction at meeting its demands, the patient watching from the sidelines. At the
31 very least it is ambiguous to whom (or what) these superlatives relate.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The analytic question of "*Who is doing the talking?*" is at issue here. For example,
46 the authorship of the words at 2:47 is apparently distributed between the nurse and
47 the EPR. We see a disruption of the usual conventions of conversation, with this
48 comment spoken by the nurse as she looks at the computer screen rather than at
49 the patient to whom she expects to hand over the speaking 'turn'. The nurse's
50 attention is divided between what has been called the patient *embodied* and the
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 patient *inscribed* (36;37) as the patient becomes (metaphorically) distributed
8
9 between person and record.(36) The nurse is *cognitively* oriented to the patient as
10
11 she establishes his smoking status by looking at the EPR, but the *affective* aspect of
12
13 her involvement - which Goffman has highlighted as crucial in a social interaction -
14
15 is compromised.(38) This “template talk” is met by a 0.4 second pause. The nurse
16
17 then turns to face the patient, adding “*that’s what I’ve got here*” - this time evoking a
18
19 response, as they jointly repeat “*never smoked*”, words which were initially displayed
20
21 on the EPR screen (visible only to the nurse).

22
23 Box 4-2 suggests some reflective questions to ask of consultations involving the
24
25 EPR. Students may find it helpful to use the transcript in Figure 1 to gain familiarity
26
27 with these questions before asking the same questions of their own video-recorded
28
29 consultations. In the following sections, we incorporate reflective questions arising
30
31 from our data analysis as applicable to different kinds of complex consultations.

32
33 <<INSERT BOX 24 ABOUT HERE>>

34
35
36 Our next example (Figure 2) is from a GP consultation with a patient from Nigeria
37
38 who speaks a variety of English that differs from local English. Whilst on holiday in
39
40 Nigeria he was bitten by a dog, raising the question of whether he might have been
41
42 exposed to rabies (lines 1-4) and considered for vaccination.

43
44 <<INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE>>

45
46
47 This example illustrates an unresolved ambiguity which arises from different
48
49 conventions in standard English and Nigerian English over the use of contrastive
50
51 stress (indicated by * in data). Disorder, misunderstanding, and an incorrect
52
53 assessment ensue. In lines 4-7 the patient tells the GP he knows the dog’s owner
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 and that the dog visits the vet regularly. This reassures the GP that the patient is at
8 low risk (line 12: "*oh fair enough*") and he in turn later reassures the patient that no
9 vaccination is needed. In fact the patient was conveying his concern that the dog
10 may **not** be free of rabies, and that the owner could not be trusted. When the patient
11 says "*they told me the dog go to the vet regular but that's what they said*" (lines
12 6,7,9, highlighted in bold in transcript) he emphasizes the agent (*they*) and the
13 content of the agent's talk (*what*). The equivalent sentiment in standard English
14 would be "*they told me the dog goes to the vet regular, but that's what they said*" with
15 the emphasis on the verbs ("told", "said"). Although the patient offers further hints of
16 his scepticism in line 13 - a hesitation, laughter and the word "but" - the underlying
17 ambiguity is passed over, and absent from the institutional record made by the
18 doctor. Misunderstandings, or the illusion of understanding, which result from small
19 and subliminally processed differences in talk, are more frequent in a multi-lingual
20 patient population(19) and challenge conventional orderliness. But no simple
21 behaviours can be taught in situations of super-diversity as our next two examples
22 also show.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 **Figure 3** shows an extract of a video-recorded consultation in a Swiss pain clinic
39 (translated from French) in which consent is sought for a spinal injection. The patient
40 left his home country 10 years earlier after a war, and has very limited command of
41 French. He has chronic low back pain for which he has received spinal injections. He
42 is worried about the risks involved, because a previous consent form (translated by
43 his daughter) referred to a risk of paralysis.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 <<INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE>>
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 As in the previous example, there is obvious asymmetry of the linguistic resources
8 available. Indeed the entire extract might be regarded as a continuous, extended and
9 only partly repaired misunderstanding. Both parties struggle to grasp at least some
10 meaning in the words of the other. An interview with both interactants afterwards
11 (data not shown) suggested that some areas of shared understanding were reached:
12 the patient's fear of the injection, the positive impact of a previous injection and
13 agreement to proceed today. But other communicative efforts failed, including the
14 doctor's attempt to reassure the patient that paralysis does not happen often.
15 Indeed, the patient reported that the doctor had particularly reminded him of the risks
16 of paralysis adding that he, the patient, had to take responsibility for this risk. The
17 patient's fear (linked it appears to some past experience in the war) is not explored.
18 Arguably under conditions of such scarce common linguistic means this topic may be
19 deemed too complex to tackle; the patient's voice from the past is lost.

20
21
22 ~~Phenomena of discursive dispersion and fragmentation of~~Difficulties arising in the
23 clinical decision-making process have previously been described in monolingual
24 contexts,(39;40) but they become magnified when patients have limited proficiency
25 in the language of consultation. In this multilingual context the ideals of shared
26 decision-making within an ordered consultation are eroded. In this example, the
27 doctor first presents his idea, tries to convince the patient of the benefits of another
28 injection and goes on to investigate the patient's worries and possible reasons for
29 disagreement. But the participants fail to connect the discursive threads of this
30 discussion to the final decision. Patient consent follows immediately after major
31 interactional troubles, culminating in a self-critical meta-communicative account by
32 the patient ("*I don't know how to explain well*") and an abrupt topic shift by the doctor.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The doctor appears to cut to the decision making when he gives up on achieving
8 further clarity about the patient's stance.
9

10
11 << INSERT BOX 32 >>
12

13
14 Consultations like those in **Figures 2 and 3** in which the clinician and patient are not
15 'in tune' with each other require considerable and not always successful
16 collaborative work by both parties to prevent, recognise and repair
17 misunderstandings.(41) The use of interpreters may address these issues to some
18 extent, but not without introducing different challenges. The work of consulting
19 becomes distributed between at least three participants, changing the relationship of
20 the speakers to their own words and so disturbing roles and identities. The
21 orderliness in interpreted consultations is changed, both in terms of overall structure
22 and in micro-interactional patterns. Clinicians have to do more than simply establish
23 consensus on the mode of communication and the role of the interpreter as
24 suggested by recent guidelines.(16;17) At the micro-level, extra verbal exchanges
25 are required to clarify misunderstandings (as we saw in Figures 2 & 3). The
26 traditional doctor↔patient (dyadic) interactional sequence becomes a more
27 complicated 'triadic' pattern. Close inspection of interpreted consultations shows that
28 this assumed prototypical triadic sequence (doctor→interpreter→patient or
29 patient→interpreter→doctor) is not always observed by participants, so that one or
30 more participants' voices are 'lost'.(16;42) The power to decide who talks next is
31 *unequally* distributed among the three participants – with patients at the bottom of
32 the hierarchy. Even when the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence *is*
33 followed, there remains considerable scope for misunderstanding, due to ambiguity
34 over interpreter's role and how the interpreting task is actually done in practice. The
35 interpreter delivers a 'hybrid' voice which incorporates the voices of all three
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 participants in the interaction. **Figure 4** shows an extract from an interpreted
8 consultation in England with a Czech-speaking patient who has complained of
9 headaches. It gives some insight into how the themes of orderliness and distribution
10 play out in an interpreted consultation.
11
12
13

14
15 <<INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE>>
16

17 From lines 1 to 10, the participants follow the triadic sequence in their turn-taking.
18 However, what the doctor and patient hear is ~~pre-processed~~ (re-
19 contextualised) reformulated by the interpreter. In Line 1, the doctor asks a question.
20 Prior to the question he refers to an earlier discussion about the patient's pain,
21 signposting a change of topic. However, this signposting is omitted by the interpreter
22 in Lines 3-4. Similarly, in Lines 5-7 the interpreter adds 'that start afternoon' into her
23 translation although the patient did not say these words here. As Bolden points out,
24 an interpreter is constantly choosing the quantity and quality of information that is
25 translated, thus creating a hybrid voice and assigning themselves an extra role as
26 either 'doctor' or 'patient' with blurring of the usual boundaries between the two.(43)
27 The potential for voices to become 'lost' in this process is greatest when the
28 prototypical triadic sequence is not followed.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 At line 10, the doctor comments on the interpreter's response ("Interesting. That's
42 good"). If the (assumed) triadic sequence was followed, one would expect either that
43 the doctor would continue talking at this point, or that he would pass the speaking
44 turn to the interpreter to translate his words. Either way, we would not expect the
45 patient to have a turn here. However, the patient (line 11) brings in a new topic,
46 ostensibly in an 'inappropriate' place. Her utterance is not translated and goes
47 unheard as the doctor interrupts the patient (line 13) before she can finish her talk;
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 this marks the patient's entry as 'not legitimate'. The doctor and the interpreter then
8 continue the conversation following the triadic sequence. In the wider dataset from
9 which this extract is taken, we found that doctors also speak at such 'inappropriate
10 places'. However there is a difference. In most cases, the words of the doctor *are*
11 translated, and the patient is put 'on hold' while this is done. In other words, when
12 the prototypical doctor-interpreter-patient sequence breaks down it is the *interpreter*
13 who takes on the role of 'distributor' of speaking turns and decides whose voice will
14 be preferentially heard. In our dataset, interpreters tended to prioritise the doctor's
15 right to speak, as illustrated in **Figure 4**.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 << INSERT BOX [43](#) ABOUT HERE >>
25
26
27
28
29

30 DISCUSSION

31
32 Rapid technological and demographic change has brought challenges to the
33 consultation which were not anticipated when the consultation models currently
34 taught to students were developed. Using a selection of 'telling' cases as a basis for
35 analysis we have been able to develop novel conceptual ideas about the
36 contemporary consultation which challenge normative assumptions, showing that the
37 notion of the consultation as a dyadic meeting of two speakers who share
38 communicative resources is frequently challenged. Our priority has been on depth of
39 analysis rather than breadth, with our selection of case studies informed by the
40 'opportunity to learn' rather than by concerns around 'typicality'.(44) Based on a
41 detailed study of four contrasting cases we suggest there are complex new
42 configurations of voices in the consultation, and - as a consequence of this - the
43 potential for 'losing' the patient voice. These challenges to the 'dyadic' consultation
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 rarely receive explicit attention in the educational curriculum. One striking
8 observation which emerges from our data is that the twin social pressures of
9 globalisation and technologisation appear to place paradoxically opposing demands
10 on the consultation. On the one hand, clinicians are challenged with increasingly
11 diverse, unpredictable consultations from a sociolinguistic perspective, requiring
12 flexibility and a tolerance of ambiguity. On the other, there is increasing pressure to
13 'standardise' practices, for example through greater use of EPR templates.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Building on our analysis of these case studies we have offered a series of reflective
22 questions which may be relevant to ask of complex consultations which take on
23 these new kinds of orderliness and in which conventional understandings of the roles
24 of clinician and patient become blurred. These questions have not yet been tested
25 empirically in an educational setting and do not constitute a definitive checklist. They
26 may neither be relevant to all consultations nor necessarily comprehensive, but we
27 hope that they are a starting point to promote observation and discussion about the
28 consultation from an orientation which embraces its new complexities. Further
29 empirical research is required to test the value of this toolkit as an educational
30 intervention in practice and to refine it in the context of further educational research.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 We would like to invite debate amongst medical educators about how to adapt,
41 extend or revise consultation models to ensure that these important aspects of the
42 contemporary consultation do not remain overlooked. We suggest that an orientation
43 to the consultation as a dynamic process which is co-constructed between clinician
44 and patient is helpful, one in which the structure (we prefer 'orderliness') emerges
45 out of the collaborative work of clinician and patient (and others) and which depends
46 on how the 'work' of consulting is distributed between participants. Regarding the
47 consultation as a co-construction demands more than a range of 'add-on' prompts
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 describing specific clinician behaviours. It encompasses a shift away from the idea
8 that consulting is a set of competences to be mastered, towards a more analytical
9 orientation. The most important overarching question to ask of the consultation shifts
10 from “*Did I do that well?*” towards “*What did we accomplish there?*” This brings the
11 contribution of the patient, and all relevant parties (or ‘voices’) into clearer view. The
12 questions we offer to learners within our reflective ‘toolkit’ in this paper fall broadly
13 within this overarching question.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 We urge educators to consider critically how their approach to teaching clinical
22 communication might change if instead of assuming that the talk *represents* some
23 kind of existing reality they also encourage students to consider conceptualising talk
24 as *constructing* reality, an assumption which underpins this paper. We suggest that
25 greater use of the detailed analysis of video-recordings of real (as opposed to
26 simulated) consultations may be helpful, exposing learners - as consulters and
27 critical observers - to the kinds of complexities that our research highlights. For
28 example, a DVD by Roberts et al. entitled “*Doing the Lambeth Talk*” shows how
29 misunderstandings in the multilingual consultation can be avoided and repaired.
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

Box 1. Definitions**Voice**

Drawing on social theory 'voice' has both literal and metaphorical meanings. It is used literally as the human voice i.e. the sound of the voice and the manner in which someone speaks. 'Voice' is used metaphorically a) in writing, to identify the distinctive style and authority that a text has e.g. the EPR b) in speech and writing, as multiple or hybrid voices, when different styles are conflated together or a dominant style is infused with a less noticed one.

Dyad and Triad

'Dyad' is the traditional one-to-one communication between two people (here the clinician and patient) which is seen as the norm. A 'triad' is an interaction of three people or voices. Here the conventional two person communication is disturbed and its norms are challenged.

Misalignment

'Misalignments' are uncomfortable or inappropriate moments or instances where one side has difficulty interpreting the assumptions of the other. They are also moments when the speakers appear to be on parallel tracks, not responding fully to the other.

Agent

'Agent' is a term used in grammar analysis to describe the person or thing in the sentence that is the main subject doing the action

Repair

'Repair' is used metaphorically to describe how misunderstandings and misalignments in interaction are dealt with. It often involves talking *about* talk, to sort the interactional problem out.

Social constructionism

An approach that assumes that reality is the result of historical, social and political processes, in which the interest of the researcher is in how phenomena come into being, the processes by which they come to be 'constructed' as they are.

Box 2. Reflective questions based on Case 1 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

Which voices are being privileged at different times in the consultation and why?

What is the consequence of this?

How do I ensure that the patient's voice is not lost?

How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate the specific arrangement of people and computer in this consultation?

How, and to what extent am I fully 'involved' in this consultation?

What does this mean to me and what challenge is this particular consultation presenting?

To whom and what am I attending, and with what purpose?

How am I incorporating computer templates and prompts?

What is the consequence for my communication with the patient?

To what extent is the sequencing and ordering of our talk being influenced, if at all, by the demands of the EPR?

Do I need to consider possible alternative ways of managing this situation?

How does interacting with the computer affect the standard models of good communication in the textbooks?

Box 3. Reflective questions based on Cases 2 and 3 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

How do I need to adjust my approach to the consultation when the talk *itself* seems to be the problem?

Am I confident that I correctly understood the patient's problem, in the knowledge that subtle features such as word stress and styles of self-presentation might differ in speakers whose variety of English is influenced by a language other than my own? If not, what were the other possible meanings of this section of talk?

How can I ensure that I clarify the patient's intended meanings?

Did the strategies that I used to do relational work in the consultation have the desired effect in this multilingual consultation? (Examples might include the use of humour, metaphor, or attempts at 'informal' conversational styles) Did I correctly identify the patient's attempts at relational work?

This consultation felt muddled and chaotic and did not evolve as I was expecting. Why might this be? Does my explanation reveal any underlying assumptions about how I understand the act of consulting, my expectations for the consultation, and my role as the clinician?

At what point do I decide I cannot consult effectively without an interpreter either because it is not clear whether the patient and I have understood each other or because I am concerned that the patient's voice is being lost?

Do the models of patient-centeredness and shared decision-making work when talk itself seems to be the problem?

Box 4. Reflective questions based on Case 4 which might inform analysis of a student's own video-recorded consultations

Which 'voices' can I identify as being present in this consultation?

How and to what extent do I need to re-shape my own communication norms / style to accommodate the specific arrangements of people in this consultation? Do the models of communication in the textbooks need to be adapted in this situation?

How confident am I that this interpreter is doing what they are supposed to do?

When do I notice that the sequence of speakers (doctor, interpreter, patient) is different from that which I might expect?

What may have been the consequences of this disruption to the order of speakers on the understandings of this consultation?

Do I notice occasions when the patient's voice is lost i.e. words of the patient appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

Do I notice occasions when my own words appear to have gone without translation by the interpreter?

What can I do to ensure that the interpreter is working to the mutual benefit of the patient and doctor?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the staff and patients who agreed to take part in the four original research projects from which the data presented in this article are selected. [We would also like to thank our peer reviewers for helpful comments on the manuscript.](#)

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared

FUNDING

The research projects on which this paper is based were funded by: National Institute for Health Research Doctoral Fellowship [and Medical Research Council \(MRC\)](#) (DS); Sir Sigmund Warburg Voluntary Settlement (CR); NHS Bradford & Airedale PhD Fellowship (SL); Swiss National Science Foundation (OW and PS).

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

[All of the authors of this paper fulfil ICMJE guidelines for authorship. All authors](#) ~~All of the authors of this paper were involved in data collection and analysis. All authors~~ participated in the preparation and presentation of case studies (drawn from their own empirical research) in the research workshops [and in subsequent](#). ~~All authors participated in the~~ re-analysis of case study data to identify emergent cross-cutting themes. ~~DS and CR took responsibility for developing the and in the development of the~~ analysis into practitioner-relevant resources, [refining these in discussion with SL, OW and PS](#). DS wrote the first draft of the paper and revised it in response to

critical commentary from all of the remaining authors (CR, SL, OW, PS). All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

DATA SHARING

There is no additional data available.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Reference List

- (1) Peacock JW, Nolan PW. Care under threat in the modern world. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2000;32:1066-70.
- (2) Knottnerus JA. The Role of the Electronic Patient Record in the Development of General Practice in the Netherlands. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 1999;38:350-4.
- (3) Protti D, Johansen I. Widespread Adoption of Information Technology in Primary Care Physician Offices in Denmark: A Case Study. Downloadable from http://www.commonwealthfund.org/~media/Files/Publications/Issue%20Brief/2010/Mar/1379_Protti_widespread_adoption_IT_primary_care_Denmark_intl_ib.pdf. The Commonwealth Fund; 2010.
- (4) RCGP. Information Management and Technology in General Practice: RCGP Information Sheet No.7. 2005.
- (5) Vertovec S. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2007;30:1024-54.
- (6) Office fédéral de la statistique. Relevé structurel du recensement fédéral de la population selon la langue et la religion. Available from: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/news/02/03/02.html>. 2013.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (7) Scott D, Purves I. Triadic relationship between doctor, computer and patient. *Interacting with Computers* 1996;8(4):347-63.
- 8
- 9
- 10 (8) Ventres W, Kooienga S, Marlin R. EHRs in the Exam Room: Tips on Patient-Centred Care. *Family Practice Management* 2006;13(3):45-7.
- 11
- 12 (9) Margalit RS, Roter D, Dunevant MA, Larson S, Reis S. Electronic medical record use and physician-patient communication: An observational study of Israeli primary care encounters. *Patient Education and Counseling* 2006 Apr;61(1):134-41.
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 (10) Pearce C. *Doctors, Patients and Computers, the New Consultation*. PhD Thesis Department of General Practice, The University of Melbourne; 2007.
- 17
- 18
- 19 (11) Swinglehurst D, Roberts C, Greenhalgh T. Opening up the "black box" of the electronic patient record: A linguistic ethnographic study in general practice. *Communication and Medicine* 2011;8(1):3-15.
- 20
- 21
- 22 (12) Swinglehurst D, Greenhalgh T, Roberts C. Computer templates in chronic disease management: ethnographic case study in general practice. *BMJ Open* 2012;2:e001754.
- 23
- 24
- 25 (13) Greenhalgh T, Voisey C, Robb N. Interpreted consultations as 'business as usual'? An analysis of organisational routines in general practices. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 2007;29:931-54.
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29 (14) Li S, Pearson D, Escott S. Language barriers within primary care consultations: an increasing challenge needing new solutions. *Education for Primary Care* 2010;21:385-91.
- 30
- 31
- 32 (15) Hale SB. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2007.
- 33
- 34 (16) Seale C, Rivas C, Kelly M. The challenge of communication in interpreted consultations in diabetes care: a mixed methods study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013;DOI: 10.3399/bjgp13X663082.
- 35
- 36 (17) Bischoff A, Loutan L. *Other Words, Other Meanings - a guide to health care interpreting in international settings*. Geneva: Serve de médecine internationale et humanitaire, HUG; 2008.
- 37
- 38
- 39 (18) Guex P, Singy P. *Quand la médecine à besoin d'interprètes*. Genève: Éditions médecine et hygiène; 2003.
- 40
- 41
- 42 (19) Roberts C, Moss B, Wass V, Sarangi S, Jones R. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Medical Education* 2005;39:465-75.
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46 (20) Lown B, Rodriguez D. Lost in Translation? How Electronic Health Records Structure Communication, Relationships, and Meaning. *Academic Medicine* 2012;87:392-4.
- 47
- 48
- 49 (21) Kai J. *Valuing diversity: a resource for health professional training to respond to cultural diversity*. London: Royal College of General Practitioners; 2006.
- 50
- 51 (22) Tebble H. *Medical Interpreting: Improving communication with your patients*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University; 1998.
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 (23) Lie D, Berekyei S, Braddock C, Encinas J, Ahearn S, Boker J. Assessing Medical Students' Skills in Working with Interpreters During Patient Encounters: A Validation Study of the Interpreter Scale. *Academic Medicine* 2009;84:643-50.
- 8
9
10 (24) Booth N, Kohannejad J, Robinson P. Information in the consulting room - training package. Sowerby Centre for Health Informatics at Newcastle; 2002 Jul.
- 11
12
13 (25) Mitchell J. Producing data: Case studies. In: Ellen R, editor. *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*. London: Academic Press; 1984. p. 237-41.
- 14
15
16 (26) Roberts C, Sarangi S. Theme-oriented discourse analysis of medical encounters. *Medical Education* 2005;39:632-40.
- 17
18
19 (27) Heritage J. Goffman, Garfinkel and Conversation Analysis. In: Wetherell M, Taylor S, Yates S, editors. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications; 2001. p. 47-56.
- 20
21 (28) Rampton B, Tusting K, Maybin J, Barwell R, Creese A, Lytra V. UK Linguistic Ethnography: A discussion paper. Downloadable from <http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf>. 2004.
- 22
23
24 (29) Hammersley M. *What's Wrong with Ethnography?* London: Routledge; 1992.
- 25
26
27 (30) Byrne PS, Long BEL. *Doctors Talking to Patients. A Study of the Verbal Behaviour of General Practitioners Consulting in their Surgeries*. London: HMSO; 1976.
- 28
29
30 (31) Kurtz S, Silverman J. The Calgary-Cambridge referenced observation guides: an aid to defining the curriculum and organising the teaching in communication training programmes. *Medical Education* 1996;30:83-9.
- 31
32
33 (32) Edelsky C. Who's got the floor? *Language and Society* 1981;10(3):383-421.
- 34
35 (33) Davies P. The crowded consultation. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:648-9.
- 36
37 (34) Heritage J, Maynard DW. *Communication in Medical Care*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
- 38
39 (35) Schegloff EA. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow D, editor. *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press; 1972.
- 40
41
42 (36) Robinson JD. Getting Down to Business: Talk, Gaze and Body Orientation during Openings of Doctor-Patient Consultations. *Human Communication Research* 1998;25(1):97-123.
- 43
44 (37) Ruusuvuori J. Looking means listening: coordinating displays of engagement in doctor-patient interaction. *Social Science & Medicine* 2001;52(7):1093-108.
- 45
46
47 (38) Goffman E. *Involvement. Behavior in Public Places*. New York: The Free Press; 1966. p. 33-42.
- 48
49 (39) Atkinson P. Medical discourse, evidentiality and the construction of professional responsibility. In: Sarangi S, Roberts C, editors. *Talk, work and institutional order*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter; 1999.
- 50
51
52 (40) Gwyn R, Elwyn G. When is a shared decision not (quite) a shared decision? Negotiating preferences in a general practice encounter. *Social Science & Medicine* 1999;49(4):437-47.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 (41) Roberts C. Continuities and Discontinuities in Doctor-Patient consultations in a multilingual
8 society. In: Gott M, Salager-Meyer F, editors. *Advances in Medical Discourse Analysis: Oral
9 and Written Contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang; 2006. p. 177-96.
- 10 (42) Li S. Co-construction of interpreted conversation in medical consultations. *Applied
11 Linguistics Review* 2013;4:127-49.
- 12
13 (43) Bolden GB. Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: interpreters'
14 involvement in history taking. *Discourse Studies* 2000;2:387-419.
- 15
16 (44) Stake RE. Qualitative Case Studies. In: Denzin NK, Lincoln YS, editors. *The Sage Handbook of
17 Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. Sage Publications, Inc; 2005. p. 443-66.
- 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

Figure 1. New forms of order and the distribution of authorship in the asthma clinic

Time	N/P	Spoken word	Bodily conduct / notes on EPR
01:08	N	So really straightforward. (0.4)	N puts paper on desk N rotates body and gaze to face P, her hands on her lap. P looking at N
01:09	N	Asthma assessment (0.4)	
	P	Okay	P nods
01:11	N	to see how your asthma's doing:	N raises both hands in front
01:13	N	what you're doing w- with it when it's good, what you do with it when it's bad, (0.2) have you any problems with your ↑inhalers (0.4) .hhh (0.5)	N uses fingers to count (on 'good', 'bad', 'problems') N hands open out in front of her
01:19	N	Very straightforward stuff	N hands to lap
	P	Okay	P nods
	N	[all right? .hhh	
<i>{lines of transcript omitted}</i>			
02:46	N	So:: er ((C))	N turns to face EPR screen
02:47	N	Ho- you've never smoked. (0.4)	N → EPR (<i>last entry in template reads 'never smoked'</i>)
	N	that's what I've got here	N turns head towards P
	P	[no (0.4) [never smoked]	P looking at N
02:50	N	[never smoked] ((C)) [Exc] ell [ent] [[(C)]] [[(C)]]	N turns back to look at EPR. Emphatic keystroke
02:52	N	[Th] at's gr[.e:at] [[(C)]] [[(C)]]	N looking at screen, typing keystrokes

90x96mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 2. Dis-order arising from different conventions in intonation

1	GP	what kind of dog was that (.) it was somebody's (.) dog=
2	Pt	=yes somebody's
3	GP	it was a stray dog
4	Pt	no no it was somebody's dog
5	GP	right
6	Pt	yes I:: made an enquiry they said that- they *they told me
7		the dog go to the vet regular
8	GP	*right *okay
9	Pt	but that's *what they said
10	GP	right (.) *right right so did you know the owner or did=
11	Pt	= I know the owner =
12	GP	= oh fair enough (.) so
13	Pt	erm:: ((laughs)) but
14	GP	did you see any doctor then
15	Pt	no

90x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **Figure 3. Negotiating consent for a spinal injection**

- 11 103. Dr: because I thought I'd give you an injection today
12 104. Pt: =no
13 105. Dr: =yes, give one
14 106. Pt: =yes
15 107. Dr: But if you don't want, I won't. I, for me, it's not a problem giving you an injection
16 108. Pt: =Yeah
17 109. Dr: =I don't think that it's a big problem for you either
18 110. Pt: mmh mmh.
19 111. Dr: but I think that after the other injection, you had a benefit, you felt better after the
20 injection in October . . . Didn't you?
21 112. Pt: mmh. ((*mimics express perplexity*))
22 113. Dr: So that's why I'd like to do it again, if you, if you don't want, no, I won't do it, if you say,
23 er, you are afraid, you say, er, after you are getting paralyzed or whatever, I won't do it.
24 114. Pt: mmh . . . well it's me now not think more, not think right . . . not er er . . . er don't know it's
25 the cause that how is paralyzed, for me speaking?
26 115. Dr: =you [told me]
27 116. Pt: [oh but yes]
28 117. Dr: you told me before
29 118. Pt: =yeah
30 119. Dr: =you said, you were afraid of getting paralyzed
31 120. Pt: =yeah
32 121. Dr: =so, this happens not often
33 122. Pt: =and next, the next (1) here keep . . . water. ((*patient indicates non verbally something*
34 *running down from his forehead to his temples*))
35 123. Dr: =where?
36 124. Pt: here, next (1) er injection, it's me, it's the, it's the, the, back pain, me come, immediately
37 injection ah . . . ah, that's not much pain, after. problem, it's same like war, ah . . . in my
38 country, war and then, I don't know how to explain well
39 125. Dr: well, I don't know, if, today, I tell you we give the injection, we're gonna give the
40 injection, do you agree or not
41 126. Pt: =yes
42 127. Dr: =then we'll give it

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

1. In this translation "next" probably means "last" – this was a recurring error of vocabulary throughout the consultation

90x116mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 4 Lost voices in distributed turn-taking sequence organisation (English translation in italics)

1. Dr: =An (.) she says it starts in the afternoon::n (.) every day (0.3) does it last (0.4) until
2. she goes to bed, how long does it last for "in the afternoon"
3. Int: ako dlho to trvá
4. *How long does it last for*
5. Pt: tak je to hodinu, dva, to strašne bolí a potom prestane.
6. *well, it is for an hour, two, it hurts badly and then it stops.*
7. Int: ok, that start afternoon. She feel that pain about for one two hours
8. Dr: one or two h[ours
9. Int: [and after that go away:: "ok"
10. Dr: alright↑. Interesting. That's good.
11. Pt: A ešte by som sa chcela povedať, [že ja nosím oku okuliare.
12. *And I would also like to say that I wear gla glasses.*
13. Dr: [could you (0.59) show me where she feels it?
14. Int: u:hm Môžte ukázať
15. *U:hm Can you show*
16. Pt: [Tu.
17. *Here*

90x61mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Appendix

Transcribing conventions

[onset of overlapping speech	.hhh	in breath
]	end of spate of overlapping talk	=	no pause between speakers; contiguous utterances
:	preceding sounds is lengthened or drawn out (more :: means greater prolongation)	(())	non verbal activity / sounds. C indicates keystroke in Fig 1
<u>Underline</u> or *	emphasis	.	falling tone (not necessarily end of sentence)
(.)	pause of less than 0.2 seconds	?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
(0.4)	pause, in tenths of second		
↑↓	marked rise /fall in intonation		
° °	The talk they surround is quieter than surrounding talk		