

Understanding and Improving Trust Across the Health Care Ecosystem

L. Lorraine Basnight

Trust is critical for optimal outcomes in health care, including keeping a healthy and thriving workforce and providing high-quality care. Understanding the issues of trust in health care relationships and addressing threats can improve trust.

Introduction

Capable. Reliable. Honest. These words are often used to describe people we trust. Trust is complex—a state between two or more parties involving confidence that the other *can* do the right thing, *will* do the right thing, and will act with your best interest in mind. Trust cannot survive in the absence of any one of these elements [1]. In the *New York Times* essay, “Do You Trust the Medical Profession?”, trust is assessed with these three questions: “Do you know what you’re doing? Will you tell me what you’re doing? Are you doing it to help me or help yourself?” [2]. These are questions of ability, reliability, and goodwill.

While many think of trust as a sociological phenomenon, both genetics and life experiences influence trust in others, and research shows that several hormones, including oxytocin, cortisol, serotonin, and dopamine, affect trust [3]. Of note, these hormones also mediate stress, and as stress changes the balance of these hormones, trust decreases [3]. Loss of trust may result in poor quality of care and, if standard of care is maintained, loss of trust still may result in anxiety, resentment, anger, and departures from health care relationships [4].

Data on trust in health care is mixed, incomplete, and often focused on patient trust in physicians. However, there is increasing interest in the role of trust across the health care ecosystem. Recent studies show that there has been a decisive decrease in trust in the health care system in the last 60 years [5–7]. Trust in medical leaders by US residents decreased from 73% in 1966 to 34% in 2012 [8]. In 2021, 30% of physicians stated that their trust in the health care system declined due to the COVID-19 pandemic [9]. Trust is likely decreasing because the foundations of trust—ability, reliability, and goodwill—have eroded. In addition, two primary mediating factors of trust—communication and stress—have had additive negative effects. These issues accelerated over the course of the pandemic [10].

To understand the issues and potential solutions, the various trust relationships need to be considered.

Trust Between Clinicians

Robust relationships with and between members of the health care team have waned as clinicians in outpatient practice stopped seeing patients in the hospital, and encounters between the inpatient and outpatient teams diminished or occurred only through the medical record. Communication through the electronic health record (EHR) is often unsatisfactory, with notes meant for optimizing billing and full of unnecessary information for communicating medical issues. Medical society gatherings and face-to-face hospital staff meetings, where physicians could get to know others practicing in their community, have withered. Clinical teams that used to be stable over time have been replaced with teams that quickly gather and dissolve, sometimes before the entire team can develop a trusting relationship.

To improve trust among members of the health care team, we need to increase the opportunities for clinicians to be with each other outside of stressful clinical encounters. Building personal relationships would increase understanding of each other’s values and increase the likelihood of direct conversations when needed in difficult clinical situations. The use of communication tools needs to be optimized so that key information is easily accessible and clear. Excessive documentation should be eliminated, and training should include concise communication skills. We can improve trust among the clinical team by ensuring that team members are prepared for their work both as individuals and as teammates. The team needs to be skilled in interprofessional practice, with each person knowing who their teammates are, and understanding each member’s roles and skills. Everyone needs to be supported to work at the appropriate level for their role. Team formation can be enhanced, even for short-lived teams, and leaders need greater skill in forming strong teams quickly [11].

Electronically published May 1, 2023.

Address correspondence to Lorrie Basnight, Eastern AHEC, 2600 W. Arlington Blvd, Greenville, NC 27834 (BasnightL@ecu.edu).

N C Med J. 2023;84(3):172-176. ©2023 by the North Carolina Institute of Medicine and The Duke Endowment. All rights reserved. 0029-2559/2023/84312

Reducing Health Disparities: Is Concordant Care the Answer?

David G. Jacobs

Despite the fact that health disparities have existed since the founding of this country, these disparities have garnered significantly more attention over the past two decades, most notably as a result of the publishing of *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care* by the Institute of Medicine in 2003. Not only did this monograph provide unequivocal evidence of the volume, variety, and extent of health disparities between Black and White Americans, it also provided several potential interventions that might be undertaken to mitigate these disparities. Among these recommendations was "Recommendation 5-3: Increase the proportion of underrepresented U.S. racial and ethnic minorities among health professionals" [1]. This, they believed, would bring about increased racial/ethnic concordance between minority patients and their health care providers, leading to enhanced patient-provider partnerships characterized by greater patient participation in care processes, higher patient satisfaction, and greater adherence to treatment [1].

Although research into the role of racial concordance in health care outcomes dates back only two decades, the concept was clearly articulated by Flexner in his well-known review of the state of medical education in 1910, in which he recommended that only two of the seven extant Black medical schools be preserved in order to train their students to "serve their people humbly" as "sanitarians" [2]. The first studies examining the role of racial concordance were published around the turn of the 21st-century and demonstrated that patients prefer racial concordance with their clinicians [3-5]. Since these early studies, hundreds have been published, using a variety of outcome measures (patient satisfaction, adherence, health care

utilization), patient populations (primary care, surgery, obstetrics/gynecology, pediatrics, neonatology, mental health, emergency medicine, etc.), conditions and disease states (diabetes, hypertension, cancer screening and treatment, pain management, etc.), and research methodologies (surveys, actual health care utilization records, vignettes, prospective randomized studies). Studies have also sought to examine dimensions of patient-provider concordance other than race, most notably gender and language, although racial/ethnic concordance has received by far the greatest attention in the medical literature. Although the rigor of scientific investigation on this subject is low, and overall conclusions are mixed, the preponderance of data would suggest that racial concordance is associated with improvements in communication, which facilitates improved adherence to treatment plans, deeper partnership formation between patients and clinicians, more appropriate utilization of health care resources, and ultimately better health outcomes [6].

A recent review of Medical Expenditure Panel Survey data from 2010-2016 found that emergency department use was lower among Whites and Hispanics with race-concordant clinicians compared to those without a concordant clinician, and total health care expenditures were lower among Black, Asian, and Hispanic patients with race-concordant clinicians than those with discordant clinicians [6]. The most compelling evidence to date supporting better health outcomes is from a prospective observational study performed in Oakland, California, in which over 1300 Black men were recruited to participate in a free health screening [7]. Upon arriving for the screening, study participants were randomly assigned to see either a Black or non-Black male physician and were

Trust Between Clinicians and Administration

Health care administration takes place in the clinical setting as well as at the system, state, and federal levels. There are numerous reasons that trust has diminished between clinicians and administration. Clinicians and administrators often don't understand one another's day-to-day world, and administrative directives may arise with little opportunity for the clinical team to interact with the decision-makers. Mergers and acquisitions of hospitals and health systems have resulted in changing practice patterns, scheduling rubrics, and productivity requirements. If the clinical team does not understand organizational goals, those goals may appear to be for the benefit of the organization rather than clinical care [12].

To improve trust, health systems need to make their goals, strategies, and tactics more transparent to clinicians. In addition, trust would be improved by administration ensuring there are resources to support the implementation of clinical guidelines and quality measures. Clinicians need to express their needs directly and clearly. Improved understanding between clinicians and administrators will help improve the belief in the positive intent of the other party, reducing stress and increasing trust. Administrators and clinicians can spend time with one another so that all parties have a better understanding of the work of the other. Work should be done to align the values of administration and clinical care. Increased emphasis on quality and outcomes over financial and volume-productivity targets will improve collaboration and trust. Administrators and clinicians should

provided a photograph of that physician prior to the actual in-person screening. Physicians and staff were told the study was designed to improve the takeup of preventive care among Black men in Oakland, but not specifically informed about the role of physician race. Participants were then provided the opportunity to select which, if any, of four cardiovascular screening tests they would like to receive. After meeting with their assigned physician in person, study participants were given an opportunity to revise their choice of cardiovascular screening tests. Participants randomly assigned to Black physicians, after interacting with them, were 18 percentage points more likely to request cardiovascular screening tests—even invasive ones—relative to those assigned to Non-Black physicians [7]. While this study does not demonstrate actual improved health outcomes per se, the authors speculate that the increased demand for health care screening of Black males induced by racial/ethnic concordance could lead to a 19% reduction in the Black-White male cardiovascular mortality gap and an 8% decline in the Black-White male life expectancy gap [7]. Direct evidence of improved health outcomes was, however, provided in a more recent observational study in neonates that demonstrated lower mortality for Black newborns when Black doctors provide their care than when White doctors do [8].

Enhanced patient-provider communication is the most-commonly cited mechanism through which patient-provider racial/ethnic concordance exerts its purported benefit, though literature support for this proposed mechanism is mixed at best [9, 10]. Other suggested mechanisms include enhanced trust; shared cultural beliefs, values, and experiences; geographic proximity (facilitating easier access); decreased implicit bias; shared language (particularly for non-English speakers); greater patient self-efficacy; and overt racism (negative attitudes about “out-group” members). Future research should focus on elucidating the true mechanisms behind the “concordance effect,” as these will be critical in the design and implementation of strategies to reduce health disparities.

An additional area of potential investigation involves the concept of intersectionality as it applies to concordance. How, for example, is concordance defined for individuals who claim multiple dimensions of “otherness” (for example: Hispanic ethnicity, female gender, and LGBTQIA+ sexual identity)? What does concordance look like for these individuals? These issues are particularly pertinent today in light of the current demographics of the US physician workforce. Focusing just on race/ethnicity momentarily, even if patient-provider concordance does indeed provide all of the benefits its advocates claim, there are simply not enough underrepresented-in-medicine (URIM) physicians to provide the primary care required by their respective patient populations, let alone subspecialty care. Currently, Blacks represent approximately 13.6% of the US population, but only 5.7% of the US physician population [11]. Likewise, Hispanics account for 18.9% of the US population, but only 6.9% of the US physician population [12]. Current trends in medical school enrollment will not correct this racial/ethnic imbalance in the physician workforce in the foreseeable future.

Furthermore, the concordance approach seems to assume that the Asian and Hispanic populations in America are monolithic. We should not assume that a patient of Mexican heritage and a physician of Puerto Rican descent will automatically be able to establish a deep and productive partnership simply because both are assigned “Hispanic” ethnicity. Similarly, there are many nationalities represented within the “Asian” race, and it is at best naive of us to assume that all Asians should be considered collectively when exploring the concept of concordance. Thus, patient-provider racial/ethnic concordance cannot be the sole response to health care disparities in America. If, indeed, enhanced patient-provider communication is the mechanism through which patient-provider racial/ethnic concordance exerts its purported benefit, then Recommendation 6-1 from *Unequal Treatment* (“Integrate cross-cultural education into the training of all current and future health professionals”), deserves attention equal to

feel that they are doing the right thing for the right reason, and the move from pay-for-volume to pay-for-value should be supported and hastened. Collaboration on—and clarification of—new directives will help build trust between administrators and clinicians.

Patient Trust in Health Care

Patients trust clinicians when the clinician truly hears the patient’s concerns and demonstrates that they are acting in the patient’s best interest. Time pressure in the clinical setting and unskilled use of electronic tools worsens two-way communication. The ways patients can engage with the health care system have also changed significantly in recent years. Health topics that were not usually talked about in

public are frequently discussed openly. Prescription medications are advertised directly to the consumer. Patient portals, virtual visits, and texting all offer benefits of increased engagement with health care providers but are also in their infancy with regard to best practice. Anyone can access information about a health condition online, so many patients go into a clinical encounter well versed in information they have gained outside the clinical setting that may be accurate, skewed, or incorrect. These changes especially affect members of marginalized populations. As data have become more available, variation in clinical experience among marginalized populations is more visible and adds to skepticism about the goodwill of clinicians and the health care system [13, 14].

that paid to Recommendation 5.3 cited here [1]. Cross-cultural education focuses on attitudes, knowledge, and skills to enhance health professionals' awareness of how cultural and social factors influence health care, while providing methods to obtain, negotiate, and manage this information clinically once it is obtained.

It seems appropriate to end with a quote taken from the first-ever scientific paper written on the subject of racial concordance: "In the meantime, by reducing the number of underrepresented minorities entering the US workforce, the reversal of affirmative action policies may adversely affect the delivery of health care to Black and Hispanic Americans" [3]. NCMJ

David G. Jacobs, MD, FACS Division of Acute Care Surgery and vice-chair, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, Department of Surgery, Atrium Health – Carolinas Medical Center, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure of interests. No interests were disclosed.

References

1. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Understanding and Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care. Smedley BD, Stith AY, Nelson AR, editors. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2003. PMID: 25032386
2. Hunt S. The Flexner Report and black academic medicine: an assignment of place. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 1993;85(2):151-155. PMID: 8441191
3. Saha S, Komaromy M, Koepsell TD, Bindman AB. Patient-physician racial concordance and the perceived quality and use of health care. *Arch Intern Med*. 1999;159(9):997-1004. doi: 10.1001/archinte.159.9.997
4. Cooper-Patrick L, Gallo JJ, Gonzales JJ, Vu HT, Powe NR, Nelson C, Ford DE. Race, gender, and partnership in the patient-physician relationship. *JAMA*. 1999;282(6):583-589. doi: 10.1001/jama.282.6.583
5. Laveist TA, Nuru-Jeter A. Is doctor-patient race concordance associated with greater satisfaction with care? *J Health Soc Behav*. 2002;43(3):296-306. PMID: 12467254
6. Jetty A, Jabbarpour Y, Pollack J, Huerto R, Woo S, Petterson S. Patient-physician racial concordance associated with improved healthcare use and lower healthcare expenditures in minority populations. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2022;9(1):68-81. doi: 10.1007/s40615-020-00930-4
7. Alsan M, Garrick O, Graziani G. Does diversity matter for health? Experimental evidence from Oakland. *American Economic Review*. 2019;109(12):4071-4111. doi: 10.1257/aer.20181446
8. Greenwood BN, Hardeman RR, Huang L, Sojourner A. Physician-patient racial concordance and disparities in birthing mortality for newborns. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020;117(35):21194-21200. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1913405117
9. Cooper LA, Roter DL, Johnson RL, Ford DE, Steinwachs DM, Powe NR. Patient-centered communication, ratings of care, and concordance of patient and physician race. *Ann Intern Med*. 2003;139(11):907-915. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-139-11-200312020-00009
10. Shen MJ, Peterson EB, Costas-Muñiz R, et al. The effects of race and racial concordance on patient-physician communication: a systematic review of the literature. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2018;5(1):117-140. doi: 10.1007/s40615-017-0350-4
11. Population Estimates, July 1 2021, (V2021). United States Census Bureau. Accessed March 30, 2023. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221>
12. Physician Specialty Data Report: Active physicians who identified as Black or African-American, 2021. Association of American Medical Colleges. Accessed March 20, 2023. <https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/workforce/interactive-data/active-physicians-black-african-american-2021>

Electronically published May 1, 2023.

Address correspondence to David G. Jacobs, Department of Surgery, Atrium Health-Carolinas Medical Center, 1000 Blythe Blvd, MEB-6th Floor, Charlotte, NC 28203 (david.jacobs@atriumhealth.org).

N C Med J. 2023;84(3):173-175. ©2023 by the North Carolina Institute of Medicine and The Duke Endowment. All rights reserved. 0029-2559/2023/84313

Patients feel the changes in the system, especially when they do not understand them. As Lee and colleagues note:

"Organizations are merging, creating new structures, and adopting new names in place of those known to patients for decades, leading to the loss of familiar brands with trusted reputations. The merging process can also lead to changes in tangible and intangible aspects of the care experience that leave patients feeling like they have changed clinicians even when they are seeing the same clinicians but in a setting that looks, feels, and acts differently" [15].

To improve patient trust, clinicians need to take the time to listen and engage with their patients to determine and carry out the appropriate care plan. More needs to be learned about the best ways to utilize the EHR and other virtual tools, and both patients and clinicians will need to adopt best practices. The health care system and clinicians need to focus on understanding and meeting the needs of racial minorities and marginalized populations, since trust is most often lacking in these groups of patients [14]. Systems need to ensure that patients understand the structure of new and merged systems and should function in ways that demonstrate the benefit of these new constructs to the patient.

Patients need to be empowered to find the best information available and develop skills to differentiate good information from bad. Clinicians should recognize that while they may have a knowledge advantage about a clinical condition, the patient has the knowledge advantage about the patient's own experience. Patients and clinicians need to improve two-way conversations about concerns and plans.

Addressing Stress

Stress among the workforce in the clinical setting has increased dramatically due to organizational mergers, inadequate staffing, tight clinical schedules, performance targets, and burdens arising from the EHR. Chaos in a clinical setting—including diminished control and bottlenecks in clinic flow—leads to lower job satisfaction, decreased teamwork and professionalism, more stress, and a higher likelihood of leaving the practice within two years. Chaotic clinics also have higher rates of medical errors and missed opportunities for preventive care [16, 17].

Too much stress has a serious negative impact on trust. Clinicians should have an opportunity to fully understand new administrative constructs and requirements. Clinical

sites need to be managed in a way that reduces chaos, clinicians should have the tools to provide needed care, schedules should be realistic, and supports must be in place to streamline the workflow. Emphasis on quality, communicating accurate information, clinician cohesion, and values alignment between clinicians and administration will improve trust [12]. In addition, clinicians and administrators need to practice self-care and be given the time to do so. “Found” time (efficiencies gained by good use of EHR, for example) should be returned to clinicians for clinical engagement or self-care, instead of pushing more patients through the system.

What can we do to improve trust in health care?

Federal guidelines, changes in reimbursement, productivity requirements, the unknowns of the pandemic, hospital mergers and closings, and the way people receive their health news all affect stress and trust. It is no wonder that trust in the health care ecosystem is low. However, we aren’t going back to the health care system of the past, and we must learn to build trust in this larger, ever-changing health care climate.

Trust allows people to feel safe even when they are vulnerable. Lacking trust, people reduce their engagement; patients are more likely to accept and follow physician treatment recommendations when they trust their physicians, and high trust can mitigate disparities in care [6, 18]. Teams are more effective when the team members trust each other, when clinicians trust their health care organizations, and when patients can be moved through systems more effectively [12]. Every participant in the health care ecosystem can learn knowledge and skills that will improve trust.

We need to learn more about trust in health care. There is a growing body of literature on the topic, and more research needs to be done. Where are the weak points, how are they changing over time, and what is causing changes in trust? To slow and reverse the decline in trust, we need to focus as much on trust as we do on quality of care. We should survey administration, clinicians, patients, and their families on trust as well as on outcomes and satisfaction. Identifying specific factors that undermine trust can pinpoint areas to target for improvement.

Finally, the pandemic has certainly affected trust across the world and within health care. The opportunity to witness the emergence of a disease as well as the resulting evolution of knowledge, treatment recommendations, and questions of politicization, all can lead to reduced trust in health care [10, 13, 19]. We need to gain more understanding of the ways that trust has been challenged by the pandemic and work to improve trust so that the health care ecosystem will be more resilient in the future. NCMJ

Lorrie Basnight, MD, FAAP executive director, Eastern AHEC and associate dean, CME, Brody School of Medicine, ECU, Greenville, North Carolina.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure of interests. No interests were disclosed.

References

1. Blakey J. The 3 Pillars of Trust: Ability, Integrity and Benevolence. Kogan Page. Published November 10, 2020. Accessed January 30, 2023. <https://www.koganpage.com/article/the-3-pillars-of-trust>
2. Khullar D. Do You Trust the Medical Profession? *The New York Times*. Published January 23, 2018. Accessed January 30, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/23/upshot/do-you-trust-the-medical-profession.html>
3. Riedl R, Javor A. The biology of trust: integrating evidence from genetics, endocrinology, and functional brain imaging. *J Neurosci Psychol Econ*. 2012;5(2):63–91. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026318>
4. Perez HR, Beyrouty M, Bennett K, et al. Chaos in the clinic: characteristics and consequences of practices perceived as chaotic. *J Healthc Qual*. 2017;39(1):43–53. doi: 10.1097/JHQ.0000000000000016
5. ABIM Foundation. Building Trust. Accessed February 14, 2023. <https://abimfoundation.org/what-we-do/rebuilding-trust-in-health-care>
6. Edelman Trust Barometer 2022. *Special Report: Trust and Health*. Edelman Trust; 2022. Accessed February 14, 2023. <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2022-08/2022%20Trust%20Barometer%20Special%20Report%20Trust%20and%20Health%20with%20Talk%20Track.pdf>
7. Gallup. Healthcare System. Accessed February 2, 2023. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/4708/healthcare-system.aspx>
8. Blendon RJ, Benson JM, Hero JO. Public trust in physicians: US medicine in international perspective. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(17):1570–1572. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1407373
9. *Surveys of Trust in the U.S. Health Care System*. ABIM Foundation and NORC; May 21, 2021. Accessed February 10, 2023. https://buildingtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210520_NORC_ABIM_Foundation_Trust-in-Healthcare_Part-1.pdf
10. Baker DW. Trust in health care in the time of COVID-19. *JAMA*. 2020;324(23):2373–2375. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.23343
11. Wageman R. Fast Team Formation: 5 steps, 10 minutes. 6 TEAM CONDITIONS. Published April 8, 2020. Accessed February 7, 2023. <https://6teamconditions.com/2020/04/fast-team-formation-5-steps-10-minutes/>
12. Linzer M, Neprash H, Brown R, et al. Where trust flourishes: perceptions of clinicians who trust their organizations and are trusted by their patients. *Ann Fam Med*. 2021;19(6):521–526. doi: 10.1370/afm.2732
13. Artiga S, Corallo B, Pham O. Racial disparities in COVID-19: key findings from available data and analysis. Kaiser Family Foundation. Published August 17, 2020. Accessed March 11, 2023. https://www.kff.org/racial-equity-and-health-policy/issue-brief/racial-disparities-covid-19-key-findings-available-data-analysis/?utm_campaign=KFF-2020-Disparities-Policy&utm_medium=email&_hsmt=2&_hsenc=p2ANqtz--65kluoBfaqfMgjb7-gjETpha8GQizHNOgPrgc4lUq3oYer4Kgi9UIEFoEBm2JZ9yfZiQ4a2DZ0JF8NAYcAlsLLInb8A&utm_content=2&utm_source=hs_email
14. Halbert CH, Armstrong K, Gandy OH Jr, Shaker L. Racial differences in trust in health care providers. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006;166(8):896–901. doi:10.1001/archinte.166.8.896
15. Lee TH, McGlynn EA, Safran DG. A framework for increasing trust between patients and the organizations that care for them. *JAMA*. 2019;321(6):539–540. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.19186
16. Perez HR, Beyrouty M, Bennett K, et al. Chaos in the clinic: characteristics and consequences of practices perceived as chaotic. *J Healthc Qual*. 2017;39(1):43–53. doi: 10.1097/JHQ.0000000000000016
17. Linzer M, Baier Manwell L, Mundt M, et al. Organizational Climate, Stress, and Error in Primary Care: The MEMO Study. In: Henriksen K, Battles JB, Marks ES, et al., eds. *Advances in Patient Safety: From Research to Implementation (Volume 1: Research Findings)*. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2005.
18. Wyatt R, Tucker L, Mate K, et al. A matter of trust: commitment to act for health equity. *Healthc (Amst)*. 2023;11(1):100675. doi: 10.1016/j.hjdsi.2023.100675
19. Bolsen T, Palm R. Politicization and COVID-19 vaccine resistance in the U.S. *Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci*. 2022;188(1):81–100. doi: 10.1016/bs.pmbts.2021.10.002. Epub 2021 Nov 10. PMID: 35168748; PMCID: PMC8577882.