

Miller, Paul K., Woods, Amanda L., Sloane, Charles and Booth, Lisa (2017) Obesity, heuristic reasoning and the organisation of communicative embarrassment in diagnostic radiography. *Radiography*, 23 (2). pp. 130-134.

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/2531/>

***Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.***

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

**provided that**

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
  - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

**You may not**

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing [insight@cumbria.ac.uk](mailto:insight@cumbria.ac.uk).

# **Obesity, heuristic reasoning and the organisation of communicative embarrassment in diagnostic radiography**

## **Authors:**

1. Dr. Paul K. Miller<sup>a</sup>
2. Amanda L. Woods<sup>a,b</sup>
3. Charles Sloane<sup>a</sup>
4. Dr. Lisa Booth<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Medical and Sport Sciences, University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, UK. LA1 3JD.

<sup>b</sup> Diagnostic Imaging Department, Lancaster Royal Infirmary, Ashton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 4RP.

## **Corresponding Author**

Dr. Paul K. Miller (paul.miller@cumbria.ac.uk)

Senior Lecturer, Department of Medical and Sport Sciences, University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, LA1 3JD, UK. Tel: +441524 384427.

**Manuscript Wordcount:** 3968

## **Abstract**

This paper, the second of three arising from a broader qualitative study, explores difficulties emerging around radiographer-patient communication regarding obesity in hospital-based encounters, and the situated strategies found by experienced radiographers for handling such situations. Semi-structured interviews with eight clinicians working in plain radiography (mean experience = 21.56 years) were analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), so as to highlight the practical, nuanced and real-world experiences of these individuals regarding obesity communication. Participants generally viewed communicating with obese patients as a potential interpersonal 'minefield'. Most reported having had negative experiences in which patients had acted with denial or outright aggression during examinations but, conversely, all reported cases in which patients had been frank and open about their obesity, and even been happy to joke about it. Equally, all participants were able to document a range of communicative strategies for effectively handling potentially difficult situations. Results further indicate that the documented communicative problems and embarrassment for the patient only generally arose within specific material contexts; i.e. when equipment is inadequate or multiple exposures are necessary. It is concluded that, while participants largely expected any interaction about obesity with a patient to be embarrassing for both parties, their actual experience was much more varied. This indicates a more complex communicative environment than may be expected, and also a potential metacognitive availability heuristic in play - something that might be clarified with future quantitative investigation.

**Keywords:** Communication; Interaction; Obesity; Qualitative Research; Radiography; Stigma

## **Obesity, heuristic reasoning and the organisation of communicative embarrassment in diagnostic radiography**

### **Highlights**

- Radiographers tend to assume obesity is an inherent communicative ‘minefield’.
- Patients do sometimes find their obesity a challenging topic, and react aggressively.
- Patients also sometimes accept or joke about their obesity.
- Radiographers have a range of interactional strategies for handling the topic of obesity.
- Embarrassment around obesity in radiography is tied to material *and* communicative concerns.

1 **Obesity, heuristic reasoning and the organisation of communicative embarrassment in**  
2  
3 **diagnostic radiography**  
4  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 **Introduction**  
10

11 According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), worldwide obesity rates have more  
12 than doubled since 1980, reaching ‘epidemic’ proportions by 1997, particularly in the  
13 Western world.<sup>[1]</sup> In the United Kingdom (UK), from which the data used in this paper  
14 emerge, and as noted in current National Health Service (NHS) guidelines on ‘Identification,  
15 assessment and management of overweight and obesity in children, young people and  
16 adults’,<sup>[2]</sup> over one quarter of all adults were classed as clinically obese by 2013. This upward  
17 trend is placing increasing pressures on national healthcare systems<sup>[3]</sup> in two key ways.  
18  
19 Firstly, the corollary increases in rates of associated comorbidities, such as coronary heart  
20 disease, osteoarthritis, diabetes mellitus and respiratory problems increase the overall number  
21 of individuals requiring care.<sup>[4]</sup> Secondly, and more pertinent to the primary material  
22 addressed here, the everyday management of obese patients in practical healthcare can create  
23 further workload-escalating problems for clinicians, not least in medical imaging  
24 departments.<sup>[5]</sup>  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Recent research has reported a range of pertinent difficulties for radiographers. The  
45 most commonly observed emerge around precise imaging itself, whereby decreased  
46 penetration of X-rays through high levels of subcutaneous fat, intra-abdominal fat deposition,  
47 and other obesity-related changes in soft tissue structures, can result in the need for repeat  
48 projections, the need to image in quadrants, higher recall incidences and increased biopsy  
49 rates.<sup>[6-8]</sup> On a more practical, everyday level, the manual handling of obese patients also has  
50 implications for clinical practice in a range of ways. Positioning such an individual so as to  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 effect diagnostically-satisfactory results can be awkward and time-consuming, sometimes  
2 requiring extra staff, multiple image receptors and particular attention to the patient's  
3  
4 respiration and general comfort.<sup>[5,9-11]</sup>  
5  
6

7  
8         There remains, however, a serious scarcity of research exploring how affected  
9  
10 clinicians in-the-field actually communicate with obese patients, and particularly how they  
11  
12 handle attendant matters of stigma and embarrassment (both for the patient and themselves).  
13  
14 There is an abundance of work in the broader healthcare sciences relating to professional-  
15  
16 patient communicative encounters around a variety of nominally difficult topics, such as  
17  
18 mental illness,<sup>[12,13]</sup> HIV,<sup>[14]</sup> and, indeed, obesity itself.<sup>[15-17]</sup> Within radiography there has been  
19  
20 some valuable investigation of general practitioner-patient communication, typically using  
21  
22 transactional analysis<sup>[18,19]</sup>, but little published literature has emerged to date regarding the  
23  
24 specific management of difficult communicative matters. Using Interpretative  
25  
26 Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)<sup>[20]</sup>, therefore, this paper reports communication-specific  
27  
28 findings arising from a broader qualitative study of the impacts of patient obesity upon the  
29  
30 working lives of experienced diagnostic radiographers working in the NHS.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Methods**

41  
42  
43 IPA is centrally ordered to qualitatively describe the complex ways in which individuals  
44  
45 make sense of their own experience, and in medical fields has thereby encouraged a focus  
46  
47 upon the acquired 'soft skills' of practitioners *and* patients as used in specific contexts, and  
48  
49 with respect to specific procedures.<sup>[20,21]</sup> As such, the approach builds an evidence-base from  
50  
51 real clinical experiences, rather than legislating from common-sense or idealised deductive  
52  
53 assumptions regarding what constitutes best practice.<sup>[13,22]</sup>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## *Participants*

Established studies in medical IPA typically use small and relatively homogeneous populations to elucidate the relationship between healthcare cultures and the social psychological experiences of individuals involved therein.<sup>[21]</sup> With full institutional ethical approval, eight experienced diagnostic radiographers were interviewed (mean years in practice = 21.56), recruited from four different NHS hospitals in the North West of England.

## *Procedure*

Consistent with the IPA approach,<sup>[20]</sup> semi-structured interviews were used and core issues for discussion were posed as simply and openly as possible, to encourage free discourse around the topic at hand. These issues are summarised in Table 1:

*Table 1: Core interview schedule*

---

Core Question	Major Prompts
Could you give me an overview of the main problems that patient obesity has caused in your professional role?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How did it affect the process?</li><li>• How did it affect you?</li><li>• How did it affect the patient?</li><li>• Can you provide examples?</li></ul>
How did you handle these situations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What worked and what didn't?</li><li>• Can you provide examples?</li></ul>

---

1 Further minor prompts were used to encourage elaboration where pertinent, as is standard in  
2 IPA data collection.<sup>[20]</sup> Each interview was captured using a digital voice recorder and  
3  
4 transcribed verbatim. As required by institutional ethical mandate, all data were rendered  
5  
6 anonymous during transcription, and all participants were allotted labels based on the order in  
7  
8 which the interviews took place (i.e. 'R1, 'R2' etc.) when connected to any given quotation in  
9  
10 the results. The mean interview length was 30 minutes.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 *Analysis*

19  
20  
21 Analysis was manually conducted in line with the standard methods of IPA. Raw textual  
22  
23 codes were collected into linked (subordinate) themes, and then formulated into master  
24  
25 (superordinate) themes that maintained form across the full corpus of data.<sup>[23]</sup> The original  
26  
27 study yielded four superordinate themes, of which “Communication and Stigma” was one; in  
28  
29 terms of participants’ own discursive focus, however, communication was the single matter  
30  
31 of greatest concern and is, thus, handled as a singular issue here. A parallel paper, addressing  
32  
33 two further superordinate themes (pertaining to the organisational and material/technological  
34  
35 aspects of handling obese patients) is available elsewhere.<sup>[23]</sup> A paper addressing implications  
36  
37 around the final theme – everyday diagnostic challenges - is, at time of writing, in  
38  
39 preparation. This methodologically-appropriate division of dissemination was explicitly  
40  
41 permitted within the conditions of ethical approval.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *Trustworthiness*



1 As recommended by Yardley<sup>[24]</sup>, the character of the provisional analysis was determined  
2 through consistent discussion and review of data by all four authors<sup>a</sup> until consensus was  
3 reached. *Impact and importance* was tested by presenting this provisional work at a major  
4 radiological conference; peer feedback arising from this presentation was then utilised to  
5 fine-tune the analysis for publication. *Transparency and coherence* are, ideally, evident in the  
6 close correspondence between presented data and claims advanced.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **Results**

19 The issue of Communication and Stigma is addressed in terms of its two core subordinate  
20 aspects.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 ***1. The Radiographer – Anxiety, professionalism and social experience***

30 When discussing patient obesity in general, all participants broadly argued that such  
31 interactions had simply been a communicative ‘minefield’ for them at times, and that this  
32 often led them to expect that raising the issue would be embarrassing for both them and their  
33 patient. As such, they approached any such situation with trepidation regarding what to say  
34 or, more specifically, how to say it. For example, with respect to the contexts of repeat  
35 projection and table weight limit.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 **R2:** *“If they are obese and approaching that [table] limit, having to explain to them*  
48 *that you might need to be waiting for the only room that will take the excess weight on*  
49

---

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 <sup>a</sup> One junior radiographer, two experienced professional and academic radiographers, and one veteran medical  
58 researcher with no core background in professional radiography. This diversity allowed for a range of  
59 interpretations of the given data.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*the table. [A]nd how to approach that without appearing to discriminate against the patient?”*

The anxiety that a radiographer can experience around such scenarios is typified in the following account:

**R6:** *“[I]t’s this thing of social embarrassment... and actually we we’re embarrassed to bring the subject up...I suppose of things that didn’t work in terms of communication was actually our comfort with it, and if maybe we had a set way of dealing with it, a sort of, almost an algorithm of doing something like that, that [made it] acceptable to discuss issues of weight with patients.”*

When prompted to examine specific incidences more closely, however, all participants identified multiple cases in which they had found a way of handling communicative problems that had (a) not caused any (evident) embarrassment to the patient, or (b) minimised troubles in already difficult situations. These strategies were accounted for in three broad ways, as discretely typified in the data presented. Respectively: (a) taking a general ‘neutral’ and professional stance (i.e. working through the situation in as polite a manner as possible), (b) using general professional experience (i.e. adapting context-by-context), and (c) using general *social* experience that can simply negate obesity as a communicative problem.

**R8:** *“I think you just have to be very professional about it and not [appear] judgemental or sort of condescending...you have to be diplomatic.”*

**R5:** *“[Y]ou get very practiced at wording it correctly for a patient...so I usually dress it up in something a bit more socially acceptable to them specifically.”*

**R7:** *“I’ve got large friends; I just don’t think twice about it.”*

It is important to note that these strategies were not necessarily framed as mutually exclusive by participants. For example, the ‘neutral’ approach reported by R8 was viewed by R2 and

1 R4 as just one of the contextually-useful registers reported by R5, which can be developed  
2 through professional experience.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

## 8 **2. The Patient – Aggression, humour and transparency** 9

10 In terms of how the participants viewed the patients' side of the reported communicative  
11 exchanges, negative stances taken were framed in terms of simple non-recognition:  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 **R4:** *“[S]ome people are really sensitive about [their obesity] and in and a little bit in  
17 denial about it.”*  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 In such cases, R1, R5 and R7 contended that person-specific sensitivity (i.e. addressing their  
23 specific social circumstances) had been a success in mitigating problems in advance. More  
24 aggressive acts from patients during examinations were also reported; in these cases, a more  
25 neutral and polite approach was always advocated as the only viable one *in response*:  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 **R8:** *“Some obese patients are not quite as understanding, and they can get quite  
33 offhand really...which can be more tricky to deal with...you just have to really  
34 be...polite, professional and just you know, try not to cause any offence.”*  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 This is particularly evident in a specific reported incidence, in which repeat projections were  
41 necessary on account of the patient's size:  
42  
43  
44

45 **R1:** *“Normally I would be very...subtle about these things, I would never actually  
46 say, no this is direct cause...your body size, but...I had to actually say in this case,  
47 ‘I’m sorry I have to do another one’ and she said ‘why are you doing another one?’, I  
48 said ‘I’m sorry it’s because you are a larger patient.’ Which was quite embarrassing  
49 at the time...she was getting quite offended and almost quite aggressive about it.”*  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Conversely, participants also reported patients making their task much ‘easier’ by casting potentially awkward moments within a humorous frame, and even making self-deprecatory jokes. These were particularly cited within activities relating to patient positioning:

**R2:** *“[S]ome people do understand, you know they do make a bit of a joke about it, they do say ‘Ooh you, ooh it’s alright, you won’t see my bones because I’m so large’.”*

In such cases, radiographer anxiety about talking to the obese patient is often seen to have been allayed to some extent by the patient's own communicative approach. In these contexts, there remained an issue for some participants around what they could still say as a professional. For example:

**R1:** *“[Y]ou have to be very careful about what you say, because if you go along with them and sort of go... ‘Oh I know what you mean’. Clearly then you’re just saying to them ‘Yes, I think you are large too’, so you can’t do that.”*

Finally, participants also reported patients being simply transparent about, and acceptant of, their own obesity:

**R3:** *“It’s clearly easier to deal with people who know they are big, and know therefore that you are going to struggle a bit, and are quite accepting of that.”*

As evidenced, this was taken to facilitate less awkward communication on the part of the radiographer. Unlike humour, however, the acceptant form of interaction from a patient was often taken to be a direct actual product of the radiographer’s own approach. For example:

**R4:** *“Most patients are generally aware of their size aren’t they? And as long as you are sympathetic...and are treating them with respect when you’re asking them to position slightly differently.”*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Crucially, however, a patient's acceptance and transparency were not always reported to be  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 congruous with an unproblematic form of interaction.

13  
14  
15 **R6:** “[The] patient that that we dealt with, it was more...the poor chap was just  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
*resigned to it and...I mean we said, ‘You know you’re you’re...’ I think [he] was 28  
stone, and he wasn’t offended by it, but I think, I think it just, he was embarrassed.”*

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

## Discussion

Within a great deal of healthcare science, it is assumed that certain topics are self-evidently embarrassing to talk about. For example, with respect to a mood disorder such as depression, embarrassment arising during diagnostic delivery is taken to be a socio-biological reaction resultant of a global stigma attached to depression itself.<sup>[25,26]</sup> From this perspective, an individual reacts impulsively and negatively to being ‘tagged’ with what is widely known to be a socially undesirable label. As Erving Goffman noted well over a half-century ago, however, this rather mechanical explanation does not square well with the observable fact, familiar to all, that it is also possible to be embarrassed *for* someone even, crucially, if they are not apparently embarrassed for themselves.<sup>[27]</sup> There is evidently a strong social and institutional component to embarrassment. This is implicitly recognised in medical guidelines that stipulate how a patient’s embarrassment about a potentially stigmatised diagnosis can be countered by explaining that the condition is a ‘common thing’ to have;<sup>[13]</sup> embarrassment itself stems first and foremost from a particular sense of being discrepant within a given social context or group. Hence, the participants in the present study report patient embarrassment, aggression or denial (all reflective of what, in Transactional Analysis, is

1 termed the ‘Adapted Child Ego State’)<sup>[18,19]</sup> as arising only during ‘problematic’  
2 procedures.<sup>[5,6,28]</sup> In some ways, this mirrors the classical Social Model of disability.<sup>[29]</sup> For  
3  
4 example, where a hospital has enough high weight-sustaining examination tables such that no  
5  
6 obese patient has to wait for a ‘specialist’ resource, that specific source of interactional  
7  
8 embarrassment is potentially negated. The communicative world is seldom isolated from the  
9  
10 material world<sup>[23]</sup> and we cannot consequently consider radiographic communication about  
11  
12 obesity as a thing *in itself*. Rather, it is bound-up in the everyday business of actually doing  
13  
14 radiographic procedures.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 It is also the case that the notion of a governing stigma about obesity that permeates  
21  
22 all contexts, directing behaviour, is also very hard to uphold if we take a serious look at the  
23  
24 data analysed.<sup>[30]</sup> When an obesity-related problem emerges in practice, some patients do  
25  
26 indeed react with open embarrassment, denial or aggression, but also some with humour and  
27  
28 some with simple acceptance; moreover, acceptance and embarrassment are not necessarily  
29  
30 mutually exclusive reactions. Simple, rigid directives about communication can only have  
31  
32 limited facility when handling these situations. The value of flexibility in contextual  
33  
34 approach, essentially the use of tacit social skills,<sup>[13]</sup> was recognised by the participants  
35  
36 throughout.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 This matter draws attention to the central, and practical, concern of ‘whose  
43  
44 embarrassment is it?’ It is no small leap to view humorous communication around ones own  
45  
46 obesity as a model for handling potential communicative embarrassment.<sup>[27]</sup> This issue may  
47  
48 indicate an orientation on the part of a patient to the implications of having to have a serious  
49  
50 discussion about their weight, and a distinct preference to not do so.<sup>[15]</sup> Indeed, the  
51  
52 Transactional Analysis stance on this kind of humour-use by a patient (a ‘Free Child Ego  
53  
54 State’) is that, while generally seen by practitioners as a ‘good thing’, it is often an adaptation  
55  
56 to the contextual stress of feeling outside of a social group.<sup>[18,19]</sup> It has been well noted in the  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 medical sciences, however, that delicate matters can be actively rendered as such in the  
2 situated activity of talking about them delicately.<sup>[22]</sup> This is a fairly self-evident matter if we  
3  
4 give it due concern. Silverman,<sup>[14]</sup> for example, plainly demonstrates how a practitioner who  
5  
6 begins to deliver the results of an HIV test in an overtly delicate manner virtually always  
7  
8 engenders a ‘worst case scenario’ anticipation in the client, irrespective of the actual  
9  
10 outcome. Several participants here stated that even when a patient draws attention to their  
11  
12 own obesity, it would be unprofessional to follow that line of conversation, an issue which in  
13  
14 itself caused them anxiety. It should be noted, however, that (in the UK, at least) current  
15  
16 healthcare guidelines do not actually make any explicit recommendations regarding  
17  
18 communication itself.<sup>[2]</sup>  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 We might further ask if a radiographer’s reluctance to engage with the broader social  
26  
27 norm of sharing a joke about obesity with another person - because professionally “you can’t  
28  
29 do that” (R1) - potentially highlights the situational stigma for the patient, rather than reduces  
30  
31 it? This is also pertinent in situations where a patient is simply open about their own obesity.  
32  
33 To respond to openness with ‘expressive caution’<sup>[14]</sup> runs the risk of flagging-up a social  
34  
35 stigma where the patient was actually working to downgrade it in that context. It is therefore  
36  
37 important to reflect (ethically) upon whether a patient’s embarrassment might be better  
38  
39 managed through a static and assumed professional norm mandating simple avoidance of  
40  
41 given topics unless absolutely necessary, or by the radiographer’s core social skills<sup>[22]</sup> that  
42  
43 might engage with those topics if they judge the context prospectively appropriate. Indeed,  
44  
45 some research has demonstrated how a patient’s transparency or humour about a potentially  
46  
47 awkward topic can open opportunities to talk candidly about it, with a view to making  
48  
49 positive change.<sup>[13,14]</sup>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Putting together these observations leads us to consider a key point relating to  
58  
59 heuristic reasoning in professional practice.<sup>[31]</sup> Most of the participants interviewed had  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 experienced difficult situations with obese patients in specific examination contexts. All of  
2 the participants, however, when pressed, had been able to more clearly discuss situations in  
3 which the patient's obesity had (a) not been a problem, or (b) they had found a relatively  
4 uncomplicated way of handling it. Nonetheless, there prevailed an overarching assumption  
5 among most that - in principle - obesity was generally difficult to talk about, and/or should be  
6 avoided as a topic, even when the patient talks about it openly. This would imply an  
7 *availability heuristic*<sup>[32]</sup> at work for some practitioners, whereby vivid negative personal  
8 examples, or received wisdom of a similar order, govern general global attitudes about  
9 obesity communication rather more than everyday positive examples. If such a cognitive  
10 shortcut is instrumental in promoting a radiographer's own embarrassment about a patient's  
11 obesity *a priori* of any formal interaction, then it has a range of potentially negative  
12 communicative possibilities. This is one emergent finding of the present study that would  
13 lend itself to quantification in future work, formal models for which are well-established.<sup>[33]</sup> If  
14 demonstrated, there are significant implications for contemporary radiography education at  
15 the very least. Among these, for example, are lessons pertinent to the NHS expectation that  
16 healthcare professionals will engage with the 'Every Contact Counts' mandate, and address  
17 holistic public health concerns within individual contexts. A sense that a professional  
18 'cannot', or 'should not', address a patient's obesity when performing any radiographic  
19 procedure that is not specifically related to obesity itself (especially when due to an abstract  
20 sense of embarrassment) is one that runs absolutely counter to this imperative.

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 It was further demonstrated that issues of communicative embarrassment (or moments  
50 in which a broader social stigma becomes situationally apparent) are not inherently general,  
51 but often specific. If the equipment is sufficient, procedures run smoothly and, notably, if the  
52 patient is amicable about these things, then their obesity need not be a point of  
53 embarrassment for patient or clinician from the outset. Communicative successes were  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 actually reported far more often than failures. The experienced radiographers in this study  
2 found a way to manage apparently difficult interactions most of the time. They oriented to the  
3 situation, and utilised one of several communicative registers to negate (or at least attempt to  
4 limit) situational embarrassment for one or both parties. However, an assumption made about  
5 the professional acceptability of certain forms of discourse can render an acceptant or even  
6 joking patient a source of communicative difficulties. In short, radiographers can be  
7 embarrassed even when patients do not appear to be embarrassed themselves.<sup>[27]</sup> Some of this  
8 embarrassment appears to stem from prior negative experiences, which are foregrounded over  
9 positive ones in a potential availability heuristic.<sup>[31,32]</sup> What is evident herein is a supposition  
10 among some participants that one ‘cannot’ mention a patient’s obesity unless it is absolutely  
11 necessary (i.e. if they are actually being hostile). For these, this remains true even if the  
12 patient seems to be making a joke at their own expense, or simply talking about obesity  
13 without any obvious inhibition.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Given that there is no mandate to actively avoid the topic of obesity within extant  
33 NHS guidelines within which the participants were nominally working<sup>[2]</sup>, we might therefore  
34 consider that the participants are orienting to wider rules relating to patient dignity as  
35 enshrined in the NHS constitution.<sup>[34]</sup> As previously discussed, however, a patient’s dignity  
36 might better be preserved through trusting their own instincts, rather than working against  
37 them.<sup>[13,22]</sup> Indeed, NHS guidelines concerning some other nominally tricky communicative  
38 subjects, such as depression and even suicidal ideation, recommend that a clinician should  
39 talk about them as openly as possible, exactly so as to normalise those issues.<sup>[35]</sup> The rigidity  
40 of *these* guidelines have, meanwhile, also been shown to have serious problems in terms of  
41 patient embarrassment.<sup>[13]</sup> The combination of these points, and those emergent of the data,  
42 indicate that any one-size-fits-all approach to obesity communication in radiography can be  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 no less risky in terms of preserving a patient's dignity than simply allowing the clinician to  
2 make their best judgement on how to accommodate the situation as it arises.  
3  
4

5 At this point it is important to stress the limitations of this study, some of which  
6 extend to all qualitative studies of this order. There is no suggestion made that findings  
7 implicate any statistical distribution of issues over wider populations, nor that the issues  
8 raised are the only matters that occur within communication about obesity in plain  
9 radiography. As it has been noted, there is a strong link between material environments and  
10 communicative difficulties. Moreover, cultural differences are also likely to arise. Clinicians  
11 working with patients in countries with higher obesity rates than the UK, or even parts of the  
12 UK with higher obesity rates, are likely to have access to more efficacious equipment  
13 (thereby negating some contexts of difficulty); they are also likely to be more practiced at  
14 handling interpersonal issues that manifest. The counterpoint is also likely true. Nevertheless,  
15 it is reasonable to anticipate that some aspects of the findings will have more widespread  
16 relevance in plain radiography and, indeed, other allied areas of healthcare. The  
17 communicative issues arising from, for example, obesity-oriented difficulties with patient  
18 positioning and equipment infelicity could well be features of many tactile and/or  
19 technology-dependent diagnostic and therapeutic fields.<sup>[23]</sup> Equally, one might reflect on the  
20 discrepancies that might emerge between the findings presented here (regarding experienced  
21 radiographers) and the prospective experiences of novices. There is a body of work that needs  
22 to be conducted on how a freshly qualified professional might adapt to the issues at hand. For  
23 them, handling obese patients will be a far more common business than it may have been for  
24 their forebears, but they will also (for now) lack the same practical, social and clinical  
25 experience.  
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 **Conclusions**

61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 This study has taken steps towards illustrating a range of issues within an apparently singular  
2 one. Foremost among these is that the nominal social stigma of obesity in direct radiographic  
3 encounters often becomes apparent only within material circumstances, and as a consequence  
4 of it being treated *as* embarrassing/difficult by one party or the other (or both).<sup>[14,27,30]</sup> While  
5 no individual clinician may necessarily have control over the former, with respect to the latter  
6 the participating radiographers had indeed found ways of working with patients, to either talk  
7 through a comfortable situation, or make the best of a bad one. It need not be assumed, thus,  
8 by a radiographer or a researcher, that obesity is *inherently* a ‘minefield’ for communication  
9 in practice. Rather, and much as Goffman argued<sup>[30]</sup>, stigma and embarrassment themselves  
10 were seen to arise at the intersection of context, assumptions and (most importantly)  
11 interpersonal actions.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **References.**

- 32 1. Mitchell N, Catenacci V, Wyatt HR, Hill JO. Obesity: Overview of an epidemic. The  
33 Psychiatric Clinics of North America 2011;34:717–732.  
34  
35
- 36 2. National Institute for Health Care Excellence. Obesity: Identification, assessment and  
37 management of overweight and obesity in children, young people and adults. CG189.  
38 London: National Institute of Health and Care Excellence; 2014.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44
- 45 3. Shah S, Shah V, Ahmed AR, Blunt DM. Imaging in bariatric surgery: Service set-up, post-  
46 operative anatomy and complications. Br J Radiol 2011;84:101-111.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52
- 53 4. Lee RE, McAlexander K, Banda J. Reversing the obesogenic environment. Leeds: Human  
54 Kinetics; 2011.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
5. Buckley O, Ward E, Ryan A, Colin W, Snow A, Torreggiani WC. European obesity and the radiology department. what can we do to help? *Eur Radiol* 2009;19:298-309.
6. de Bucourt M, Streitparth F, Wonneberger U, Rump J, Teichgräber U. Obese patients in an open MRI at 1.0 tesla: Image quality, diagnostic impact and feasibility. *Eur Radiol* 2011;21:1004-1015.
7. Reynolds A. Obesity and medical imaging challenges. *Radiol Technol* 2011;82:219-242.
8. Yanch JC, Behrman RH, Hendricks MJ, McCall JH. Increased radiation dose to overweight and obese patients from radiographic examinations. *Radiology* 2009;252:128-139.
9. Carucci L, R. Imaging obese patients: Problems and solutions. *Abdom Imaging* 2013;38:630-646.
10. Dean ER, Scoggins ML. Featured article: Essential elements of patient positioning: A review for the radiology nurse. *J Radiol Nurs* 2012;31:42-52.
11. McClean KM, Kee F, Young IS, Elborn JS. Obesity and the lung: 1. epidemiology. *Thorax* 2008;649-654.
12. Nieuwsma JA, Pepper CM. How etiological explanations for depression impact perceptions of stigma, treatment effectiveness, and controllability of depression. *J Ment Health* 2010;19:52-61.
13. Miller PK. Depression, sense and sensitivity: On pre-diagnostic questioning about self-harm and suicidal inclination in the primary care consultation. *Commun Med* 2013;10:39-51.

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

14. Silverman D. Discourses of counselling: HIV counselling as social interaction. London: Sage; 1997.

15. Wiggins S. Managing blame in NHS weight management treatment: Psychologizing weight and ‘obesity’. *J Community App Soc Psychol* 2009;19:374-387.

16. Swift JA, Choi E, Puhl RM, Glazebrook C. Talking about obesity with clients: Preferred terms and communication styles of U.K. pre-registration dietitians, doctors, and nurses. *Patient Educ Couns* 2013;91:186-191.

17. Drew P. “But then I learned...”: Weight loss surgery patients negotiate surgery discourses. *Soc Sci Med* 2011;73:1230-1237.

18. Booth L. The radiographer-patient relationship: Enhancing understanding using a transactional analysis approach. *Radiography* 2008;14:323-331.

19. Booth L, Manning DJ. Observations of radiographer communication: An exploratory study using transactional analysis. *Radiography* 2006;12:276-282.

20. Smith JA, Flowers P, Larkin M. Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research. London: Sage; 2009.

21. Brocki JM, Wearden AJ. A critical evaluation of the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in health psychology. *Psychol Health* 2006;21:87-108.

22. McLeod J. Doing counselling research. London: Sage; 1994.

23. Woods AL, Miller PK, Sloane C. Patient obesity and the practical experience of the plain radiography professional: On everyday ethics, patient positioning and infelicitous equipment. *Radiography* 2016;22:118-123.

- 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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
24. Yardley L. Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychol Health* 2000;15:215.
  25. Cook TM, Wang J. Causation beliefs and stigma against depression: Results from a population-based study. *J Affect Disord* 2011;133:86-92.
  26. Corrigan PW, O'Shaughnessy JR. Changing mental illness stigma as it exists in the real world. *Australian Psychologist* 2007;42:90-97.
  27. Goffman E. Embarrassment and social organisation. *American Journal of Sociology* 1956;62:264-271.
  28. Ghanem MA, Kazim NA, Elgazzar AH. Impact of obesity on nuclear medicine imaging. *J Nucl Med Technol* 2011;39:40-50.
  29. Paley J. The Cartesian melodrama in nursing. *Nursing Philosophy* 2002;3:189-192.
  30. Goffman E. *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall; 1963.
  31. Gigerenzer, G., Fast and Frugal Heuristics: The Tools of Bounded Rationality, in: Koehler, D.J. and Harvey, N., eds., Handbook of Judgment and Decision Making, Blackwell, Oxford, 2004.
  32. Vaughn LA. Effects of uncertainty on use of the availability heuristic for self-efficacy judgments. *Eur J Soc Psychol* 1999;29:407-410.
  33. Poses RM, Anthony M. Availability, wishful thinking, and physicians' diagnostic judgments for patients with suspected bacteremia. *Med Decision Making* 1991;11:159-168.
  34. Department of Health. *The NHS constitution for England*. London: Williams Lea; 2015.

35. National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Depression: Management of depression in  
primary and secondary care. clinical guideline 90 (amended). CG90. London: National  
Institute for Clinical Excellence; 2016.

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65