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**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES:** Third-year family medicine clerkship students at our urban medical school are assigned to clinics in diverse settings, where they are required to video record one patient interview. Our research goals were to describe student communication behaviors and compare the frequency of these behaviors at clinics serving primarily uninsured patients to clinics with primarily insured patients.

**METHODS:** Eighty-seven student-patient recordings were reviewed and analyzed.

**RESULTS:** Seventy-two percent of students performed general interviewing skills at an adequate or outstanding level; however, only a small number of students asked contextual questions about patients’ use of social services (7%), barriers to care (6%), or patients’ cultural/spiritual values and health concerns (13%), regardless of clinic type (underserved or insured). In visits with female patients, all students were more likely to show a personal interest in the patient (88% versus 71%). In visits where there was gender concordance between the patient and student, the students were more likely to face the patient (98% versus 73%).

**CONCLUSIONS:** This study indicates that, even though third-year students may have adequate general interviewing skills, they may need additional training and practice in obtaining contextual information about patients in all clinical settings. These findings also suggest that the gender of the patient, as well as gender concordance between patient and student, play a role in student-patient interactions.

(Fam Med 2012;44(7):508-13.)

As our patient populations become more diverse, medical students need to develop effective communication skills to better understand patients’ concerns and provide optimal patient-centered care. Medical school “doctoring” courses have increasingly recognized the importance of teaching communication and typically focus on basic clinical skills. However, they rarely incorporate curricula that specifically address doctor-patient communication with vulnerable and underserved populations. Moreover, much of the research that addresses doctor-patient communication in educational settings is done with standardized patients or in simulated clinical practice settings. Few studies explore student interactions with real patients in various clinical settings.

To better understand communication between medical students and real patients in clinically diverse settings, we examined their interactions during the third-year family medicine clerkship to determine (1) the type and frequency of verbal and non-verbal communication behaviors used by family medicine clerkship students with patients and (2) if any trends or patterns existed in these behaviors based on differences in practice setting, student demographics, or clerkship variables.

**Methods**

We examined interviews by third-year family medicine clerkship students at an urban medical school over a 2-year period. Students are placed in one of 14 clinical settings, which range from academic to medically underserved community settings and serve patients from multiple cultural backgrounds. During their 6-week clerkship, all students are required to video record one patient interview for clinical supervision. Students select these patients on the basis of language concordance and schedule availability. With Institutional Review Board approval for the study, we asked clerkship students for their consent to review the history-taking component of their patient interview, excluding the physical examination or any subsequent consultations with...
attending physicians. Clerkship evalu-
ators do not know the identity of
students who do or do not consent.

Because no previous observational
tool had been developed to identify
communication behaviors of students
with real patients in diverse clinical
settings, we created a new instrument
that included items from the
Patient-Physician Interaction Scale
and from research on cultural com-
petence communication.17-19 This tool
identified 44 communication behav-
iors within nine categories: greeting
the patient; eliciting patient’s con-
cerns; setting the agenda; explain-
ing diagnosis, medications, and
treatment options; closing the in-
terview; listening actively; building
rapport; exploring contextual fac-
tors; and demonstrating professional
behavior. A trained research assist-
ant, fluent in Spanish, reviewed
and coded for the presence or ab-
sence of each behavior, gave each
introduction an overall quality score
(inadequate, adequate or outstand-
ing), and noted student and patient
gender, type of visit, and clinic site.
Only interviews conducted in Eng-
lish, Spanish, or with an interpret-
er were included in the study. Two
of the study investigators (WS and
JM) coded a sample of the interviews
to estimate inter-rater reliability
using the Fleiss’s kappa statistic.20 The
frequency of each behavior was com-
pared for pre-specified subgroups
using a chi-square statistic or Fisher's
exact test (if any cell was <5). Anal-
yses were done using SPSS 17.0.

Results
Two hundred students were eligible
during the 2-year study period. We
obtained consents from 96 students
(48%) to review their recordings. Af-
after eliminating nine recordings for
technical problems, 87 interviews
were analyzed.

As seen in Table 1, visits were
nearly equally divided by student
gender and patient gender and were mostly
initial appointments. Fifty-six per-
cent of the students were at med-
ically underserved clinic sites serv-
ing primarily low-income patients;
44% were in clinics with insured
middle and upper class patients.

Of the 44 communication behav-
iors initially identified, six could
not be captured as they occurred
off camera, either during the initial
greeting or at the end of the visit.
Two items were dropped because
there were too few visits to allow
for meaningful analysis: “interactions
with family members in the room”
(10 visits) and “use of an interpret-
er” (six visits, three in underserved
and three in private clinics). Of the
remaining 36 items, four had kappa
scores <0.40 and were excluded. Ta-
ble 2 shows frequencies of the final
32 items with 95% confidence inter-
vals and the ratings for overall inter-
view quality, along with their kappa
scores. (See Table 2 footnote for com-
plete list.)

Seventy-two percent of all stu-
dents performed general inter-
viewing skills at an adequate or
outstanding level. However, regard-
less of the type of clinic (underserved
or insured), only a small number of
students asked contextual questions
about patients’ use of social serv-
ces (7%), barriers to care (6%), or pa-
tients’ cultural/spiritual values and
health concerns (13%).

We also examined the 32 com-
munication behaviors by clerkship
timing, type of clinic/clinic site, student
gender, patient gender, and
gender concordance. As shown in Ta-
ble 3, students who took the clerk-
ship in the second half of their third
year were more likely to negotiate an
agenda with patients than students
taking the clerkship earlier. Their
interviews were also more likely to
be rated as adequate or outstanding.
When comparing clinic type, we
found that students at underserved
clinics appeared more focused on the
patient, less distracted during the
interview, and more likely to show
personal interest in the patient than
those at non-underserved clinics.
Communication behaviors exhib-
ited by students also varied accord-
ing to patient gender. If the patient
were female, both male and female
students were more likely to demon-
strate empathy, express reassurance,
and explore patients’ cultural val-
ues. Students seeing patients of the
same gender (gender concordance)
were more likely to face the patient
than those in gender discordant in-
trviews.
**Limitations**

Limitations of this study include technical problems with the recordings; our focus on the history-taking component of the patient interview, which precluded examination of students’ introductions to patients, physical exams or post-consultation discussions with patients; and our inability to analyze family interaction behaviors.

**Conclusions**

Our results suggest that clerkship timing, type of clerkship clinic, and gender of patient and student can influence the quality of communication between medical student

---

### Table 2: Frequency of Student Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behavior by Category*</th>
<th>Inter-rater Kappa</th>
<th>Percent Yes</th>
<th>95% CI**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greets patient</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81–94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions him/herself facing patient</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits patient’s concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks patient about reason for visit/why now</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks patient to prioritize concerns/what most worried about</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks patient what she/he thinks is going on</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks patient to describe symptoms</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75–91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks about treatments patient has tried so far</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52–73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks about impact of health problem on life at home/school/work/ADLs</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses open-ended, non-leading questions</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53–73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses validation (empathy)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69–86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiates agenda with patient</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains diagnosis, medications, and treatment options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly explains health problem to patient/treatment options</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to patient’s/family’s questions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60–83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks if there are any further questions</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens actively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses verbal expressions of interest throughout the interview</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86–97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses non-verbal expressions of interest (facial expressions, nods, appropriate touching, pauses, leans toward patient)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84–96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on patient – not distracted by phone, staff, computer, writing</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupts infrequently and appropriately</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds rapport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows personal interest in patient</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70–86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in informal conversation when appropriate</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses empathy</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges and responds to patient’s ideas, feelings, values</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassures patient/validates patient behavior</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61–79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
and patient. Further, this study demonstrates that while third-year medical students generally displayed good interviewing skills with patients, most failed to gather the contextual information that could potentially be critical to the care of their patients. While important in caring for all patients, awareness and discussion of contextual factors are essential in taking care of vulnerable populations since they can represent significant barriers to health care, as well as provide information about the strengths that help patients cope. To ensure that students are equipped with effective skills to optimize care of all patients, we need to develop curricula that specifically address doctor-patient communication with vulnerable and underserved populations. Further consideration is needed to determine how to best incorporate this skills training into our preclinical and clinical communication curricula and how to best evaluate students’ practice of communication skills in the care of real patients.
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Table 2: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behavior by Category*</th>
<th>Inter-rater Kappa</th>
<th>Percent Yes</th>
<th>95% CI**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores contextual factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explores patient’s cultural/spiritual values, expectations about health concerns</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks about patient’s use of social services (Medicaid, home health, etc)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks about access/barriers to care (housing, money, transportation, ability to make appointments, immigration concerns, etc)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for contextual information about occupation, diet, lifestyle, family, home and neighborhood safety, access to grocery stores, etc</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks follow-up questions to clarify</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses minimal medical jargon</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks for comprehension (teach back, closing loop)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates professional behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys nonjudgmental/respectful attitude</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in appropriate behaviors (no slang, did not chew gum, etc)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresses appropriately (white coat, minimally exposed tattoos, no midriff exposed, minimal piercings, etc)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of interview</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67–85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Behaviors not included in analysis (see Methods section) were: Greets patient warmly/expresses interest in patient; introduces him/herself to patient and others in room; asks for/responds to family members’ concerns; asks patient how prefers to be addressed; asks if patient has other concerns; clearly explains medications, prescription refill needs; asks patient about preferences/if wants to participate in decision-making; suggests clear and specific follow-up; summarizes discussion; asks if there are further questions; asks if patient wants interpreter/works with interpreter effectively; summarizes patients’ statements.

** Fisher exact confidence intervals

Table 3: Behaviors With Significant Differences in Frequency (Percent) by Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Clerkship Timing</th>
<th>Clerkship Site</th>
<th>Patient Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early n=49</td>
<td>Late n=38</td>
<td>P Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under-served n=49</td>
<td>Not Under-served n=38</td>
<td>P Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiates agenda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate versus &lt; adequate</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on patient</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows personal interest</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassures patient</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers cultural values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Concordance</th>
<th>Initial Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiates Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes n=54</td>
<td>No n=30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate versus &lt; adequate</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows personal interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassures patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers cultural values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faces patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for contextual information</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fischer exact confidence intervals


