

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.

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

Authors:

1. Dr. Paul K. Miller^a
2. Amanda L. Woods^{a,b}
3. Charles Sloane^a
4. Dr. Lisa Booth^a

^a Department of Medical and Sport Sciences, University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, UK. LA1 3JD.

^b 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 **Introduction**
9

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.^[1] 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’,^[2] 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^[3] 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.^[4] 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.^[5]
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.^[6-8] 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.^[5,9-11]
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,^[12,13] HIV,^[14] and, indeed, obesity itself.^[15-17] Within radiography there has been
19
20 some valuable investigation of general practitioner-patient communication, typically using
21
22 transactional analysis^[18,19], 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)^[20], 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

41 **Methods**

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.^[20,21] 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.^[13,22]
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.^[21] 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,^[20] 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">• How did it affect the process?• How did it affect you?• How did it affect the patient?• Can you provide examples?
How did you handle these situations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What worked and what didn't?• Can you provide examples?

1 Further minor prompts were used to encourage elaboration where pertinent, as is standard in
2 IPA data collection.^[20] 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.^[23] 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.^[23] 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^[24], the character of the provisional analysis was determined
2 through consistent discussion and review of data by all four authors^a 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 ^a 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 In such cases, R1, R5 and R7 contended that person-specific sensitivity (i.e. addressing their
22 specific social circumstances) had been a success in mitigating problems in advance. More
23 aggressive acts from patients during examinations were also reported; in these cases, a more
24 neutral and polite approach was always advocated as the only viable one *in response*:
25
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 Crucially, however, a patient's acceptance and transparency were not always reported to be
2 congruous with an unproblematic form of interaction.
3

4
5 **R6:** "[The] patient that that we dealt with, it was more...the poor chap was just
6 resigned to it and...I mean we said, 'You know you're you're...' I think [he] was 28
7 stone, and he wasn't offended by it, but I think, I think it just, he was embarrassed."
8
9

10
11
12
13 In some cases, then, a patient's acceptance of their obesity when interacting with a
14 radiographer does not necessarily preclude them being embarrassed *about* it.
15
16
17

18 19 20 21 **Discussion**

22
23
24 Within a great deal of healthcare science, it is assumed that certain topics are self-evidently
25 embarrassing to talk about. For example, with respect to a mood disorder such as depression,
26 embarrassment arising during diagnostic delivery is taken to be a socio-biological reaction
27 resultant of a global stigma attached to depression itself.^[25,26] From this perspective, an
28 individual reacts impulsively and negatively to being 'tagged' with what is widely known to
29 be a socially undesirable label. As Erving Goffman noted well over a half-century ago,
30 however, this rather mechanical explanation does not square well with the observable fact,
31 familiar to all, that it is also possible to be embarrassed *for* someone even, crucially, if they
32 are not apparently embarrassed for themselves.^[27] There is evidently a strong social and
33 institutional component to embarrassment. This is implicitly recognised in medical guidelines
34 that stipulate how a patient's embarrassment about a potentially stigmatised diagnosis can be
35 countered by explaining that the condition is a 'common thing' to have;^[13] embarrassment
36 itself stems first and foremost from a particular sense of being discrepant within a given
37 social context or group. Hence, the participants in the present study report patient
38 embarrassment, aggression or denial (all reflective of what, in Transactional Analysis, is
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

1 termed the ‘Adapted Child Ego State’)^[18,19] as arising only during ‘problematic’
2 procedures.^[5,6,28] In some ways, this mirrors the classical Social Model of disability.^[29] 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^[23] 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.^[30] 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,^[13] was recognised by the participants
35
36
37 throughout.
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.^[27] 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.^[15] 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.^[18,19] 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.^[22] This is a fairly self-evident matter if we
3
4 give it due concern. Silverman,^[14] 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.^[2]
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’^[14] 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^[22] 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.^[13,14]
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.^[31] 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*^[32] 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.^[33] 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.^[27] Some of this
8 embarrassment appears to stem from prior negative experiences, which are foregrounded over
9 positive ones in a potential availability heuristic.^[31,32] 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^[2], we might therefore
34 consider that the participants are orienting to wider rules relating to patient dignity as
35 enshrined in the NHS constitution.^[34] As previously discussed, however, a patient’s dignity
36 might better be preserved through trusting their own instincts, rather than working against
37 them.^[13,22] 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.^[35] The rigidity
40 of *these* guidelines have, meanwhile, also been shown to have serious problems in terms of
41 patient embarrassment.^[13] 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.^[23] 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).^[14,27,30] 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^[30], 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 2. National Institute for Health Care Excellence. Obesity: Identification, assessment and
36 management of overweight and obesity in children, young people and adults. CG189.
37 London: National Institute of Health and Care Excellence; 2014.
- 38
39 3. Shah S, Shah V, Ahmed AR, Blunt DM. Imaging in bariatric surgery: Service set-up, post-
40 operative anatomy and complications. Br J Radiol 2011;84:101-111.
- 41
42 4. Lee RE, McAlexander K, Banda J. Reversing the obesogenic environment. Leeds: Human
43 Kinetics; 2011.
- 44
45
46
47
48
49
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
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