Article title: Effects of Parent Race on Communication During Elective Pediatric Surgery Consultations

Author information:

*Chenery Lowe, ScM, CGC, PhD [1,2], email: clowe7@jhmi.edu

Mary Catherine Beach, MD, MPH [3], email: mcbeach@jhmi.edu

Somnath Saha, MD, MPH [3], email: ssaha9@jhmi.edu

Anne R. Links, MS, MHS [2,3], email: alinks1@jhmi.edu

Emily F. Boss, MD, MPH [2], email: boss@jhu.edu

Author affiliations:

[1] Center for Biomedical Ethics, Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

[2] Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

[3] Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

*Corresponding author: Chenery Lowe

Phone: 650.725.4027

Email address: clowe7@stanford.edu

Mailing address: 300 Pasteur Drive, Edwards Research Building, Room R2DCIR, Stanford, CA 94305

Word count: 2814/3000

Key Points

Question: How does parent-clinician communication differ by parent race during initial pediatric surgery consultations?

Findings: Consultations with Black parents had higher clinician verbal dominance, less parent emotional expression, and less social chit-chat (both parent and clinician) relative to visits with White parents.

Meaning: Our findings reveal opportunities to mitigate racial differences in communication and bridge social distance in pediatric surgical care, including through improved clinician elicitation of patient and family concerns and intentional attempts to build rapport.

Abstract

Importance: Children of marginalized racial groups have poorer surgical outcomes compared to White children. Clinical communication may contribute to these disparities.

Objective: We explore racial differences in parent-clinician communication during initial consultations for elective surgical procedures in children.

Design: Cross-sectional study of communication during consultations between surgical clinicians and parents of children (age 2-17) referred for initial evaluation for tonsillectomy/adenoidectomy, hernia repair, and circumcision between 2016 and 2023.

Setting: Academically affiliated outpatient clinics in the Baltimore, Maryland region.

Participants: Parent-clinician dyads including 22 surgical clinicians and 153 parents.

Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s): Visits were audio-recorded and coded using the Roter Interaction Analysis System. Outcomes included visit-level measures (parent versus clinician verbal dominance and patient-centeredness ratio), clinician communication (facilitation/activation statements to encourage parent participation, emotional statements, social chit-chat, and positive affect), and parent communication (emotional statements, social chit-chat, positive affect). We used generalized estimating equations to test associations of parent race with visit communication, accounting for nesting of visits within clinicians and adjusting for parent sociodemographic variables.

Results: Of the 142 parents, 57 (40%) were Black and 85 (60%) were White. Of the 22 clinicians, 14 were White and 8 reported other or multiple ethnicities. In unadjusted models, visits with Black parents had higher clinician verbal dominance but no difference in overall patient-centeredness scores relative to visits with White parents. However, visits with Black parents had fewer clinician chit-chat statements, fewer total parent statements, fewer parent emotional statements, fewer parent chit-chat statements, and lower parent positive affect. After adjusting for parent sociodemographic variables, clinician verbal dominance remained significantly higher, with clinicians making 0.39 more statements per parent statement (95% CI: 0.08 to 0.70).

Conclusions and Relevance: Parent race was associated with differences in clinician, parent, and interactive visit communication, although some differences appear to be mediated by sociodemographic factors. Parents' non-racial sociodemographic factors did not appear to explain why verbal dominance was higher during visits with Black parents. Application of patient-centered communication and engagement strategies may help to bridge social distance in pediatric surgical care.

Keywords: RIAS, patient-provider communication, elective surgery, pediatric surgery, racial disparities

Introduction

In a 2013 meta-analysis of post-surgical outcomes for 91,891 children in the United States, Black children had higher rates of post-operative mortality and morbidity and longer hospital stays relative to White children, even after adjusting for co-morbid conditions[1]. While multiple factors likely contribute to this disparity, one that merits further consideration is communication between parents and clinicians. In other settings, clinician bias is associated with poorer care, [2,3] including less patient-centered communication with patients from marginalized racial/ethnic backgrounds in adult primary care.[4] In pediatric surgery, this raises concerns about the extent to which parents from marginalized groups are informed and able to discuss their concerns about the risks, benefits, and options when making decisions about surgery for their children. However, there is limited evidence about racial differences in communication during pediatric surgical consultations.

Our objective was to explore racial differences in parent-clinician communication during initial consultations for three common referral indications: tonsillectomy/adenoidectomy, hernia repair, and circumcision. We hypothesized that visits with Black parents would have higher clinician verbal dominance and lower patient-centeredness relative to visits with White parents. We also explored possible race effects on specific aspects of clinician communication (facilitation/activation statements, social chit-chat, emotional statement, and global affect) and parent communication (social chit-chat, emotional statements, and global affect).

Methods

Participants and Data Collection

Data were collected at three outpatient otolaryngology clinics, one urology clinic, and one general surgery outpatient clinic at Johns Hopkins Medicine (2016-2023), as part of a study evaluating communication, shared decision-making, and bias in consultations for pediatric elective surgery. Clinicians were eligible to participate if they regularly evaluated children for tonsillectomy or sleep-disordered breathing, hernia repair, or circumcision. Parents were eligible to participate if they had a child undergoing initial evaluation for sleep-disordered breathing or tonsillectomy, hernia, or circumcision. Eligible parent participants were identified via electronic health records and contacted prior to their visit. All participants completed written informed consent before engaging in study activities. Parents and clinicians completed baseline questionnaires with demographic information prior to their visits. Consultations were audio-recorded for analysis as described below. Johns Hopkins School of Medicine Institutional Review Board approved all procedures and was the IRB of record for the study (IRB00259996).

Sociodemographic variables

The parent pre-visit sociodemographic questionnaire included questions about parent age, parent gender, parent race/ethnicity, annual household income, highest level of parent education, health insurance type, child procedure, child gender, child age, and child race/ethnicity (Table 2). Clinicians completed baseline surveys in which they reported their gender, race/ethnicity, and years of experience (Table 2).

Communication Coding

Visit audio-recordings were coded by an experienced coder using the Roter Interaction Analysis System (RIAS), a widely-used quantitative communication coding system developed for medical interactions. RIAS coding involves coding each unit of clinician or patient/parent expression that conveys a complete thought into one of 37 mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories that reflect both

medical task-focused and socioemotionally-focused dialogue.[5] Individual codes were combined to produce analytic categories described in the section below, with additional definitions and examples in Table 1.

Visit-level measures. RIAS-coded statements were combined to calculate verbal dominance, which is the ratio of all clinician statements to all patient statements during the visit. Codes were also combined to calculate the patient-centeredness ratio, which reflects the balance between socioemotional and biomedical exchange during the visit, with higher values indicating a higher share of socioemotional exchange.

Clinician communication behaviors. Individual RIAS codes were combined to capture the following categories of clinician communication behavior: facilitation/activation statements, emotionally responsive statements, and social chit-chat. These categories capture socioemotionally focused (as opposed to biomedically focused) communication. When more than one clinician spoke during a visit, RIAS coding distinguished between the primary clinician and other clinicians who were present, typically an advanced practice provider or trainee. To ensure that analyses captured the patient's entire experience of the consultation, the RIAS outcome variables reflect communication with both the primary and supporting clinicians.

Parent communication behaviors. Individual RIAS codes were combined to create categories to reflect parent emotional expression and social chit-chat. RIAS coding distinguished between the parent speech directed to either the primary clinician or other clinicians who were present during the visit. When more than one parent or adult caregiver was present during a visit, RIAS coding did not distinguish between the different speakers.

Clinician and parent global affect ratings. After coding the entire visit, the RIAS coder rated clinician and parent affect during the visit using a Likert scale ranging from one to six. Positive clinician

and parent affect were each determined by calculating the average of global ratings across five dimensions: interest/ attentiveness, friendliness/ warmth, responsiveness/ engagement, sympathetic/ empathetic, and respectfulness. Due to the potential for coder drift over time, these ratings were normalized as Z-scores based on the mean clinician and parent affect ratings of each study.

Statistical Analysis

Analyses included parents who identified as Black or White. Bivariate analyses assessed the unadjusted association of parent race with the parent and clinician communication behaviors and visit outcomes listed in Table 1. Differences in sociodemographic characteristics by parent race were assessed using ANOVA for continuous variables (parent, child, and clinician age) and chi-square tests for categorical variables (all other characteristics). Since clinicians in the study saw multiple patients, we used generalized estimating equations with an exchangeable correlation structure to evaluate the association of parent race with each of the communication behaviors, accounting for clustering within clinicians. Models also adjusted for parent age, gender, insurance type, and parent education (trichotomized as "High school or less," “Some college or 2-year degree”, or “4-year degree or any postgraduate education”). Because annual household income and health insurance type were significantly correlated, only insurance type was included as a model covariate although both were correlated with parent race. Missing data were considered to be missing completely at random. Reasons for missing data included inability to code the visit due to poor quality audio recording or need for additional processing, technical issues with the recording, or multiple children being evaluated during the visit (n=13) as well as non-completion of survey measures (Table 2). Analyses were conducted using R Statistical Software (Version 4.3.1) [6].

Results

Participant characteristics

Parent and child characteristics. Parent, child, and clinician's self-reported sociodemographic information is shown in Table 2. Of the 153 enrolled parent-patient dyads that were included in this analysis, 63 (41%) of the parents were Black and 90 (59%) were White. Relative to Black parents, White parents were older, had higher annual family income, and higher levels of educational attainment. White parents were more likely to have employer-based, private, or commercial health insurance rather than state-funded or medical assistance insurance and had a higher proportion of male relative to female children being evaluated for surgical procedures (P's <0.05).

Clinician characteristics. Clinicians (n=22) were predominantly female (54.5%). Thirteen clinicians were White (59.1%), 2 (9.1%) were Asian, 1 (4.5%) Hispanic or Latino, and 3 (13.6%) identified as another race or ethnicity. Three clinicians (13.6%) identified as multiple races/ethnicities that included Black/African American for one and White for another. Because data were collected over multiple years, clinician age and years of experience varied over time. Table 2 shows the characteristics of clinicians involved in the 153 consultations. Clinicians conducted study visits with an average of 6.95 enrolled families each (median: 3, sd: 7.93, range: 1 to 24 visits per clinician).

Visit-level communication

Clinicians' verbal dominance was lower during visits with White parents relative to visits with Black parents, indicating that clinician statements made up a larger share of the dialogue relative to parent statements (**Error! Reference source not found.**). This association was significant in the unadjusted model (Model 1), with clinicians making 0.42 (95% CI: 0.08 to 0.77) more statements per parent statement in visits with Black parents. This association was also significant after adjusting for

parent age, gender, and insurance type (Model 2, β=0.45, 95% CI: 0.12 to 0.78), and after additionally adjusting for parent educational attainment (Model 3, β=0.39, 95% CI: 0.08 to 0.70). Regression models that excluded dialogue between the supporting clinician and the parent(s) found similar unadjusted and adjusted relationships between parent race and verbal dominance (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Since differences in verbal dominance may reflect clinicians talking more, parents talking less, or both, we explored the effects of parent race on total clinician statements and parent total statements. The unadjusted model (Table 3, Model 1) indicates that Black parents made 26.63 (95% CI: 46.05 to 7.22) fewer total statements. While models that adjusted for parent demographics (Models 2 and 3) show that visits with Black parents had fewer parent statements and more clinician statements, none of these individual differences was statistically significant. There were no differences by parent race found for patient-centeredness score (**Error! Reference source not found.**)

Clinician communication

Clinicians' frequency of social chit-chat was lower during visits with Black parents relative to visits with White parents, with clinicians making 2.31 (95% CI: 3.31 to 1.31) fewer chit-chat statements per consultation with Black parents in the unadjusted model (Table 3, Model 1). After adjusting for parent demographics characteristics (Models 2 and 3) there was no statistically significant difference in clinician chit-chat statements by parent race. There were no differences in clinician facilitation/activation statements, and emotionally responsive statements (Table 3).

Parent communication

Black parents made 1.68 (95% CI: 2.81, 0.55) fewer social chit-chat statements relative to White parents in the unadjusted model (Table 3, Model 1) and also made fewer statements in a model that adjusted for parent age, gender, and insurance type (Model 2, β=-1.42, 95% CI: -2.57 to -0.26). However, the racial difference was no longer significant after adjusting for parent educational attainment (Model

3, β=-0.88, 95% CI: -2.19, 0.43). Black parents made 2.13 (95%CI: 3.59 to 0.67) fewer emotional statements than White parents in the unadjusted model (Table 3, Model 1). However, after adjusting for parent demographics, the relationship between parent race and emotional statements was no longer statistically significant (Models 2 and 3).

Clinician and parent affect

Internal consistency across positive global affect categories was adequate for both parent (standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0.86, 95% CI: 0.81 to 0.89) and clinician (standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0.82, 95% CI: 0.75 to 0.87) ratings. White parents were rated as showing more positive affect compared to Black parents in the unadjusted model (Table 3, Model 1) and in the model that adjusted for parent age, gender, and insurance type (Model 2). This effect was attenuated after adjusting for parent education (Model 3). There were no differences by parent race in clinician positive affect in adjusted or unadjusted models (Table 3).

Discussion

While there were no significant differences by parent race in many of the communication behaviors assessed, visits with Black parents were characterized by higher clinician verbal dominance and other differences in parents' emotional expression and positive affect as well as parents' and clinicians' social chit-chat. Collectively, these associations are consistent with an underlying pattern of social distance between predominantly White clinicians and Black relative to White parents. Racial differences in each of these behaviors may contribute to disparities in the quality and outcomes of patient care.

Verbal dominance, the ratio of clinician statements to parent statements, was lower in visits with White parents compared to visits with Black parents. Adjusting for parent demographic characteristics did not reduce this difference. Differences in verbal dominance ratios appear to be

primarily due to Black parents making fewer total statements in the unadjusted model. Higher verbal dominance during visits with patients of marginalized racial and ethnic backgrounds has been previously observed in other settings including primary care and oncology [7–12], although it is not a consistent finding across all studies and settings [13]. In primary care, verbal dominance and the similar metric of clinician-patient talk-time ratio have been previously associated with clinician's scores on the Race Implicit Association Test [14] – a measure of implicit racial bias[4,15] – and patients' perceived past discrimination.[15] Moreover, higher physician-patient talk-time ratios have been associated with decreased adherence to medical recommendations.[15] Future research should further explore the role of implicit bias and the effects of parent participation on decisional processes, care experiences, and clinical outcomes during and following pre-surgical consultations.

Parent emotional expression was more frequent in visits with White relative to Black parents in the unadjusted model. This may reflect differences in parents' spontaneous expression of emotion, clinicians' effectiveness at facilitating discussion of parent emotions, or a combination of patient and clinician factors. In a study that analyzed communication between predominantly White clinicians interacting with White or Black HIV patients, Black patients were less likely to spontaneously discuss their emotions, but clinicians were also more likely to block emotional expression and less likely to respond in ways that provided space for further discussion of the emotional issue.[16] Inadequate emotional exchange is potentially concerning in initial surgical consultations because clinicians may miss opportunities to respond to parent concerns that are relevant to treatment decision-making. Future research to better understand the impact of unequal emotional expression may include exploring the content of emotional exchange – using methods such as conversation analysis[17], Verona Coding[18], or qualitative methods – and examining how emotional statements are associated with differences in parent-reported and clinical outcomes.

Parent and clinician social chit-chat were less frequent in visits with Black parents relative to visits with White parents. Black parents also had lower observer-reported positive affect than White parents, potentially signaling lower parent engagement or satisfaction during the visit. Both findings indicate possible disparities in rapport-building and the quality of the patient-clinician relationship. While there is limited research on non-medical social talk, we reason that it may strengthen relationships by conveying warmth and appreciation for the conversation partner. These non-medical interactions may help to build trust and rapport, which may encourage more parent engagement and disclosure. Moreover, they can help clinicians to see patients as unique individuals rather than as members of groups, which may reduce stereotyping and mitigate the harmful effects of implicit bias on clinical communication [19,20].

Education may have both direct and indirect effects on visit communication. On an individual level, more education may contribute to higher health literacy and empowerment, resulting in parents who are more likely to actively participate in visits. Higher educational attainment may also influence clinician communication implicitly by signaling higher socioeconomic status, which may decrease perceived social distance between parents and clinicians. White parents reported higher educational attainment than Black parents in our study. However, racial differences in verbal dominance remained in regression models that adjusted for parent education, suggesting that this dynamic is not solely influenced by individual differences in education-linked factors such as patient understanding and empowerment. By contrast, adjusting for parent level of education attenuated the strength of association between parent race and the outcomes of chit-chat and parent positive affect. These findings collectively suggest that structural forces such as racial disparities in educational access may interact with interpersonal dynamics to produce communication disparities in this setting. Thus, disparities in parent characteristics that are linked to education – such as knowledge, empowerment, and health literacy – should be taken into account when developing mitigation strategies.

Limitations and implications for practice and future research

Our study population included predominantly participants from a limited number of outpatient clinics in the Baltimore, Maryland region. Moreover, while multiple surgical indications are represented, tonsillectomy/adenoidectomy accounted for more than 80% of analyzed visits. Our findings may therefore not be generalizable to all settings or surgical contexts. In addition, this analysis only assessed differences in communication during visits with Black and White parents due to the relatively low representation of parents of other races or ethnicities in this study. Due to the small number of clinicians and their limited racial and ethnic diversity, we were unable to examine the possible effects of clinician race/ethnicity and racial/ethnic concordance between clinicians and patients. Additionally, as an analytic method, RIAS captures general categories of medical task-focused and socio-emotional communication but is more limited in measuring contextual and linguistic aspects of clinical communication[5].

Avenues for future research include examining the relationship between visit communication, parent-reported outcomes, and clinical outcomes; exploring the extent to which clinician bias influences the relationship between patient race and visit communication; correlating quantitative findings with qualitative analysis of visit communication; and further examining how communication with multiple clinicians during a consultation may influence the quality and equity of care. These results also suggest possible intervention approaches to promote more equitable clinical communication in this setting. Clinician behaviors that may help to encourage parent participation include using facilitation/activation strategies to elicit parent perspectives, asking more open-ended questions, responding to parent emotions, and engaging in rapport-building social talk. Patient activation interventions that enhance parent empowerment and knowledge may also be valuable.

Conclusions

Visits with Black parents were characterized by higher verbal dominance, less social chit-chat, fewer parent emotional statements, and lower positive parent affect compared to visits with White parents. Verbal dominance was higher in visits with Black parents, regardless of adjustment for other parent sociodemographic factors. These findings signal opportunities for clinicians to encourage parent participation in decision-making for elective pediatric surgical procedures.

Data sharing statement

Data is not shared.

Acknowledgements

We thank Michele Massa and Debra Roter for their assistance related to RIAS data coding and management.

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

1. Stone ML, LaPar DJ, Kane BJ, Rasmussen SK, McGahren ED, Rodgers BM. The effect of race and gender on pediatric surgical outcomes within the United States. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2013;48(8). doi:10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2013.01.043

2. FitzGerald C, Hurst S. Implicit bias in healthcare professionals: a systematic review. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2017;18(1):19. doi:10.1186/s12910-017-0179-8

3. Hall WJ, Chapman MV, Lee KM, et al. Implicit racial/ethnic bias among health care professionals and its influence on health care outcomes: a systematic review. *Am J Public Health*. 2015;105(12):e60-76. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2015.302903

4. Cooper LA, Roter DL, Carson KA, et al. The Associations of Clinicians' Implicit Attitudes About Race With Medical Visit Communication and Patient Ratings of Interpersonal Care. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(5):979-987. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300558

5. Roter D, Larson S. The Roter interaction analysis system (RIAS): utility and flexibility for analysis of medical interactions. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2002;46(4):243-251. doi:10.1016/S0738-3991(02)00012-5

6. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Published online 2023. https://www.r-project.org/.

7. 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

8. Martin KD, Roter DL, Carson KA. Physician Communication Behaviors and Trust Among Black and White Patients With Hypertension. *Med Care*. 2013;51(2).

9. Eggly S, Barton E, Winckles A, Penner LA, Albrecht TL. A disparity of words: racial differences in oncologist–patient communication about clinical trials. *Health Expect*. Published online 2013.

10. Gordon HS, Street Jr. RL, Sharf BF, Souchek J. Racial differences in doctors' information-giving and patients' participation. *Cancer*. 2006;107(6):1313-1320. doi:10.1002/cncr.22122

11. Beach MC. Patient–Provider Communication Differs for Black Compared to White HIV-Infected Patients. Published online 2012.

12. Johnson RL, Roter DL, Powe NR, Cooper LA. Patient race/ethnicity and quality of patient-physician communication during medical visits. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(12):2084-2090. doi:10.2105/AJPH.94.12.2084

13. 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

14. Greenwald AG, Poehlman TA, Uhlmann EL, Banaji MR. Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2009;97(1):17-41. doi:10.1037/a0015575

15. Hagiwara N, Penner LA, Gonzalez R, et al. Racial attitudes, physician-patient talk time ratio, and adherence in racially discordant medical interactions. *Soc Sci Med 1982*. 2013;87:123-131. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.03.016

16. Park J, Beach MC, Han D, Moore RD, Korthuis PT, Saha S. Racial disparities in clinician responses to patient emotions. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2020;103(9):1736-1744. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2020.03.019

17. Goodwin C, Heritage J. Conversation Analysis. *Annu Rev Anthropol*. 1990;19:283-307.

18. Del Piccolo L, de Haes H, Heaven C, et al. Development of the Verona coding definitions of emotional sequences to code health providers' responses (VR-CoDES-P) to patient cues and concerns. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2011;82(2):149-155. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2010.02.024

19. Brewer MB. Category-based vs. Person-based Perception in Intergroup Contexts. *Eur Rev Soc Psychol*. 1998;9(1):77-106. doi:10.1080/14792779843000054

20. Devine PG, Forscher PS, Austin AJ, Cox WTL. Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *J Exp Soc Psychol*. 2012;48(6):1267-1278. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

Tables and figures

Table 1. Parent and clinician communication behaviors and examples

Category	RIAS codes	Example/ definition
Visit variables		
Verbal dominance	n/a	Ratio of all clinician to all parent statements
Patient-centeredness ratio	n/a	Ratio including the sum of: • Clinician psychosocial questions, psychosocial information, emotionally responsive statements, and facilitation/activation statements • Parent psychosocial questions, psychosocial information, emotionally responsive statements, and medical questions Divided by: • Clinician clinical questions and medical/therapeutic information-giving • Parent medical/therapeutic information-giving
Clinician behaviors		
Facilitation/activation statements	Ask for patient opinion Ask for patient understanding Paraphrase Back-channel (cues of interest)	"So do you have a preference in what way we go?" "Does that make sense?" "…sounds like the sleep is impacting her during the day." "Right."
Emotionally responsive statements	Concerns Reassurance/optimism Empathy and legitimation Partnership Self-disclosure	"Sorry about that." "Generally, removing the tonsils is pretty effective." "I know it's really tough." "Let me know how I can help you." "In my 3-year-old, I would do a partial [tonsillectomy]."

Social chit-chat	Non-medical social chit-chat	"Yeah, [city name] has changed over time."
Positive global affect	Ratings on a scale of 1 to 6 of the following attributes: • Interest/Attentiveness • Friendliness/Warmth • Responsiveness/Engagement • Sympathetic/Empathic • Respectfulness	Average ratings were normalized as study-specific Z-scores
Parent behaviors		
Emotional expression	Concerns Reassurance/optimism Asks for reassurance Empathy and legitimation	"It was really painful." "We are going on a better path now." "Do you think it's serious?" "Many people feel the same way."
Social chit-chat	Non-medical social chit-chat	"I graduated from there."
Positive global affect	Ratings on a scale of 1 to 6 of the following attributes: • Interest/Attentiveness • Friendliness/Warmth • Responsiveness/Engagement • Sympathetic/Empathic • Respectfulness	Average ratings were normalized as study-specific Z-scores

Table 2. Visit characteristics

	White (N=90)	Black/African American (N=63)	Total (N=153)	p value
PARENT CHARACTERISTICS				
Parent age				0.021
Mean (SD)	36.13 (6.50)	33.56 (6.81)	35.08 (6.73)	
Parent gender				0.082
Female	76 (84.4%)	59 (93.7%)	135 (88.2%)	
Male	14 (15.6%)	4 (6.3%)	18 (11.8%)	
Annual household income				< 0.001
<$20,000	3 (3.4%)	23 (39.0%)	26 (17.8%)	
$20,000-$49,999	9 (10.3%)	22 (37.3%)	31 (21.2%)	
$50,000-$79,999	15 (17.2%)	6 (10.2%)	21 (14.4%)	
$80,000-$100,000	14 (16.1%)	3 (5.1%)	17 (11.6%)	
More than $100,000	46 (52.9%)	5 (8.5%)	51 (34.9%)	
Not reported	3	4	7	
Parent highest level of education				< 0.001
Did not graduate high school	0 (0.0%)	4 (6.6%)	4 (2.6%)	
High school/ GED	4 (4.4%)	18 (29.5%)	22 (14.6%)	
Some college/ 2y degree	27 (30.0%)	21 (34.4%)	48 (31.8%)	
Graduated college/ 4y degree	23 (25.6%)	13 (21.3%)	36 (23.8%)	
Masters, professional, or doctoral degree	36 (40.0%)	5 (8.2%)	41 (27.2%)	
Not reported	0	2	2	
Health insurance type				< 0.001
Employer-based, private, or commercial	68 (77.3%)	14 (23.0%)	82 (55.0%)	
State funded/ medical assistance	20 (22.7%)	47 (77.0%)	67 (45.0%)	
Not reported	2	2	4	
Procedure type				0.191
Tonsillectomy	78 (86.7%)	55 (87.3%)	133 (86.9%)	
Circumcision	4 (4.4%)	6 (9.5%)	10 (6.5%)	
Hernia	8 (8.9%)	2 (3.2%)	10 (6.5%)	

Child gender				0.007
Female	27 (30.0%)	32 (51.6%)	59 (38.8%)	
Male	63 (70.0%)	30 (48.4%)	93 (61.2%)	
Not reported	0	1	1	
Child age				0.220
Mean (SD)	5.22 (3.62)	5.91 (3.08)	5.50 (3.42)	
Child race/ethnicity				< 0.001
White	76 (84.4%)	0 (0.0%)	76 (49.7%)	
Asian	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.3%)	
Black/African American	0 (0.0%)	61 (96.8%)	61 (39.9%)	
Multiple ethnicities	12 (13.3%)	2 (3.2%)	14 (9.2%)	
CLINICIAN CHARACTERISTICS (visit-level characteristics of clinicians)				
Clinician gender				0.684
Female	47 (52.2%)	35 (55.6%)	82 (53.6%)	
Male	43 (47.8%)	28 (44.4%)	71 (46.4%)	
Clinician race/ethnicity				0.065
Asian	2 (2.2%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (2.6%)	
Hispanic or Latino	1 (1.1%)	2 (3.2%)	3 (2.0%)	
White	58 (64.4%)	44 (69.8%)	102 (66.7%)	
Other	9 (10.0%)	9 (14.3%)	18 (11.8%)	
Multiple races/ethnicities; White	18 (20.0%)	2 (3.2%)	20 (13.1%)	
Multiple races/ethnicities; Black/African American	2 (2.2%)	3 (4.8%)	5 (3.3%)	
Multiple races/ethnicities; Not specified	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (0.7%)	
Clinician years of experience				0.317
0-5 years	26 (28.9%)	20 (31.7%)	46 (30.1%)	
6-10 years	20 (22.2%)	11 (17.5%)	31 (20.3%)	
11-15 years	20 (22.2%)	24 (38.1%)	44 (28.8%)	
16-20 years	7 (7.8%)	1 (1.6%)	8 (5.2%)	
More than 20 years	17 (18.9%)	7 (11.1%)	24 (15.7%)	

Table 3. Unadjusted and Adjusted Effects of Parent Race on Communication During Consultations

	Outcome	Black Parents (n=57)[1]	White Parents (n=85)	Model 1. Unadjusted Race Effect (White = ref))	Model 2. Race Effect Adjusted for Demographics (Excl. Education)	Model 3. Race Effect Adjusted for Demographics (Incl. Education)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Coefficient [95% CI]	Coefficient [95% CI]	Coefficient [95% CI]
Overall	Verbal dominance	1.8 (0.78)	1.36 (0.43)	0.42 [0.08, 0.77]**	0.45 [0.12, 0.78]**	0.39 [0.08, 0.70]**
	Patient centeredness	0.37 (0.13)	0.37 (0.1)	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.02]	0 [-0.02, 0.02]	0.01 [0.00, 0.03]
Clinician Behavior	Total statements	220.68 (98.64)	204.73 (84.24)	16.3 [-17.31, 49.91]	27.8 [-13.21, 68.81]	31.91 [-14.93, 78.74]
	Facilitation/ activation	36.93 (27.1)	37.42 (19.93)	-0.23 [-5.52, 5.05]	2.61 [-4.91, 10.12]	3.78 [-4.84, 12.41]
	Emotional statements	11.7 (9.77)	9.78 (7.57)	1.79 [-1.68, 5.25]	2.57 [-0.63, 5.78]	3.08 [-0.64, 6.8]
	Chit-chat	3.88 (3.56)	6.01 (5.3)	-2.31 [-3.31, -1.31]***	-1.26 [-2.83, 0.3]	-0.93 [-2.44, 0.58]
	Positive affect	-0.17 (0.92)	-0.05 (0.98)	-0.12 [-0.41, 0.17]	-0.19 [-0.46, 0.08]	-0.21 [-0.49, 0.08]
Parent Behavior	Total statements	140.63 (79.73)	162.52 (82.33)	-26.63 [-46.05, -7.22]**	-17.28 [-46.41, 11.84]	-8.5 [-39.64, 22.63]
	Emotional statements	6.28 (6.19)	7.91 (5.96)	-2.13 [-3.59, -0.67]**	-1.19 [-3.20, 0.83]	-0.61 [-2.73, 1.51]
	Chit-chat	2.65 (3.09)	4.26 (4.07)	-1.68 [-2.81, -0.55]**	-1.42 [-2.57, -0.26]**	-0.88 [-2.19, 0.43]
	Positive affect	-0.30 (1.08)	0.13 (0.88)	-0.63 [-1.04, -0.23]**	-0.56 [-1.06, -0.05]**	-0.47 [-1.02, 0.07]*

[1] *P<0.1, **P<0.05, ***P<0.01

Online-Only Table

eTable 1. Unadjusted and Adjusted Effects of Parent Race on Communication With Primary Clinicians Only

	Outcome	**Mean (SD) for Black Parents (n=57)[1]**	**Mean (SD) for White Parents (n=85)**	**Model 1. Unadjusted Race Effect (White = ref)**	**Model 2. Race Effect Adjusted for Demographics (Excl. Education)**	**Model 3. Race Effect Adjusted for Demographics (Incl. Education)**
		Mean (SD)	**Mean (SD)**	**Coefficient [95% CI]**	**Coefficient [95% CI]**	**Coefficient [95% CI]**
Overall	Verbal dominance	1.81 (0.75)	1.39 (0.45)	0.4 [0.08, 0.71]**	0.41 [0.1, 0.73]**	0.36 [0.06, 0.66]**
	Patient centeredness	0.37 (0.14)	0.37 (0.12)	0 [-0.04, 0.03]	0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	0.02 [-0.01, 0.06]
Clinician Behavior	Total clinician statements	184.32 (80.05)	154.87 (68.86)	14.46 [-18.42, 47.34]	14.17 [-18.28, 46.63]	15.43 [-15.66, 46.53]
	Clinician facilitation/ activation statements	28.09 (14.27)	26.89 (14.25)	-0.35 [-4.04, 3.34]	-0.5 [-5.69, 4.68]	-0.81 [-5.16, 3.54]
	Clinician emotional statements	9.91 (9.39)	7.09 (5.71)	1.67 [-1.55, 4.88]	1.96 [-0.86, 4.79]	2.27 [-0.95, 5.49]
	Clinician chit-chat statements	3.04 (2.58)	3.84 (3.69)	-0.69 [-1.68, 0.3]	-0.4 [-1.18, 0.39]	-0.32 [-1.18, 0.55]
Parent Behavior	Total parent statements	113.35 (56.22)	118.76 (53.3)	-4.79 [-22.41, 12.83]	-10.24 [-24.38, 3.89]	-2.48 [-22.76, 17.81]
	Parent emotional statements	5.11 (5.49)	6.16 (4.5)	-0.78 [-1.88, 0.32]	-1.04 [-2.65, 0.58]	-2.53 [-5.99, 0.93]
	Parent chit-chat statements	2.32 (3.05)	2.87 (2.88)	-0.56 [-1.39, 0.28]	-0.27 [-0.94, 0.4]	0.02 [-0.87, 0.9]

[1] *P<0.1, **P<0.05, ***P<0.01