



Pilot Study: Does the White Coat Influence Research Participation?

Jon F. Merz; Timothy R. Rebbeck; Pamela Sankar; Emma A. Meagher

IRB: Ethics and Human Research, Vol. 24, No. 4. (Jul. - Aug., 2002), pp. 6-8.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0193-7758%28200207%2F08%2924%3A4%3C6%3APSDTWC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>

IRB: Ethics and Human Research is currently published by The Hastings Center.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hastings.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Pilot Study:
Does the White Coat Influence Research Participation?*

In health care, the white coat symbolizes professionalism, trustworthiness, and competence;^{1,2} it also represents power.³ This suggests that the wearing of a white coat could influence the decisions of potential subjects who are asked to participate in clinic-based research. Ethical standards require that subjects' decisions to participate in research be free from undue influence, however.^{4,5} Here, we report on a pilot study that examined whether subjects were more willing to participate when asked to do so by researchers who wear white coats. The opportunity to carry out this study arose in the context of other research we were conducting regarding informed consent.

We performed a randomized controlled trial of alternative forms of a consent form for DNA banking for research (results in preparation). Subjects were recruited in the clinical apheresis unit and the General Clinical Research Center (GCRC) at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania. Clinic staff identified and approved patients whom we could approach and invite to participate in this study. Following such approval, one of three interviewers asked potential subjects to participate in the consent form study. Potential subjects were told that we were studying a consent form and would like them to read and complete the form as if it were real, but that no blood or medical information would be taken as part of our study. The interviewers wore casual business attire. It was recommended that our interviewers wear white coats, conforming to standards of professional decorum (as well as hygiene) in the hospital setting.

Our interviewers were authorized to be in the clinics, but they had no medical responsibilities or clinical training (nor were such necessary for our study of consent forms). But the wearing of white coats could be interpreted by patients as a sign of medical training and sta-

tus, and thus potentially affect their decisionmaking. Because it is completely unknown whether the white coat influences potential subjects' decisions, we decided to study whether the coats make a difference in willingness to participate.

This pilot study was approved by the Penn Committee on Studies Involving Human Beings. We randomly assigned days of the week on which interviewers would wear white coats, with no stratification by clinic or interviewer to ensure that the interviewers would be dressed the same if they appeared in the clinics together. Between January 1999 and March 2000, we were cleared by clinic staff to approach 370 individuals. Of these, we were able to ask 255 (69%) to participate. Others were asleep or otherwise occupied. Complete

Table 1. Summary of participant-provided demographic information	
Number of participants	206
Gender	
male	93
female	101
unknown	12
Age	
mean	46
range	18-80
Race	
White	159
African American	23
other	9
unknown	15
Education	
< high school	37
some college	55
college graduate	48
> college	53
unknown	13

data is available on 250 (98%) of those approached. Of these, 206 subjects (81%) participated. We collected demographic data only from participants (Table 1).

We examined whether wearing a white coat increased the likelihood of participation, whether individuals already involved in research in the GCRC were more likely than patients in the apheresis unit to participate, and whether there were different par-

Jon F. Merz, Timothy R. Rebeck, Pamela Sankar, and Emma A. Meagher, "Pilot Study: Does the White Coat Influence Research Participation?" *IRB: Ethics & Human Research* 24, no. 4 (2002): 6-8.

Table 2.
Raw participation data (participation rate) for each interviewer, by clinic in which potential subjects were solicited (General Clinical Research Center vs. the clinical apheresis unit), and by whether the interviewer was wearing a white coat (WCt)

Interviewer	GCRC		Apheresis		Totals
	NoWCt	WCt	NoWCt	WCt	
1	24/30 (.80)	27/30 (.90)	48/64 (.75)	22/30 (.73)	121/154 (.78)
2	4/5 (.80)	7/7 (1.0)	21/22 (.95)	37/42 (.88)	69/76 (.91)
3	--	--	12/16 (.75)	4/4 (1.0)	16/20 (.80)
Total	28/35 (.80)	34/37 (.92)	81/102 (.79)	63/76 (.83)	
Clinic totals	62/72 (.86)		144/178 (.81)		206/250(.82)

participation rates among the three interviewers. Participation data is presented in Table 2.

Results of logistic regressions of participation are presented in Table 3. While our data show that potential subjects appeared slightly more likely to agree to participate if the interviewer wore a white coat (85% vs. 80%), and that individuals in the GCRC were more likely to participate (85%) than patients in the apheresis unit (79%), these were not significant differences. All interactions were not significant at an $\alpha=0.05$. These results do show, however, that interviewer 2 had a significantly higher participation rate (91%) than the others (79%; $p = 0.026$). These results are confounded by the fact that the interviewer who had the high participation rate also was more likely than the other interviewers to wear a white coat ($\chi^2 = 16.4, p < 0.001$) and performed most of the interviews in the apheresis unit. We believe these were artifacts of the part-time schedules of two of the interviewers and their individual choices of clinic in which to work, both of which factors were uncontrolled in our study design.

This was a pilot study, and it was not powered to answer the white coat question; as such, we had limited power to detect effects of the size observed here. However, the relatively small odds ratio estimates of 1.2-1.5 associated with wearing a white coat imply that there is unlikely to be a large effect on potential participants' behaviors. Of course, whether any particular influence is "undue" would be difficult to determine. These results are limited to situations in which individuals in medical clinics are asked by someone not involved in their care to participate in research unrelated to their medical condition.

On one hand, we do believe that wearing a white coat would be unethical if done only in an attempt to manipulate trust for the purpose of increasing enrollment in research, regardless of magnitude of the effect. Institutional review boards should be sensitive to manipulative practices. On the other hand, if wearing white coats is otherwise justified on professional and situational grounds, the risk of modest influence suggested by our study may not be problematic. In some types of clinical

Table 3
Single and multiple factor logistic regression analyses of participation and refusal.

Factor	Simple LR			Multiple LR		
	OR	p-value	95% C.I.	OR	p-value	95% C.I.
White coat worn by interviewer	1.5	0.26	[0.76; 2.8]	1.2	0.60	[0.59; 2.4]
Interviewer 2 (vs. 1 and 3)	2.9	0.015	[1.2; 6.8]	2.8	0.026	[1.1; 6.8]
Apheresis unit (vs. GCRC)	0.67	0.29	0.32; 1.4]	0.59	0.19	[0.27; 1.3]

research (such as a clinical trial), these influences may also be simply unavoidable.

Not surprisingly, our results show that the researcher may have a marked influence on the participation decisions of potential subjects. This could reflect the perceived trustworthiness of an interviewer known to the prospective subject, which has been shown to be a strong factor in decisions to participate in clinical research.^{6,7} However, our interviewers were strangers to our subjects, suggesting that some other interpersonal factors play a role as well.

In conclusion, IRBs are charged with assuring voluntariness of participation; that is, with assuring that conditions in which potential subjects are solicited for participation and in which informed consent is secured minimize the risks of undue influence or coercion. Given the numerous possible factors that could affect participation decisions, we believe further study is needed to understand what characteristics of the researcher, the environment, the potential subject, and the interaction of these have the greatest influences on individuals' decisions to participate in research.

Acknowledgment

This study was supported by the NIH, DOE, VA Consortium on Informed Consent Research under grant RO1 HG/CA01765

and by the NIH under grant MO1 RR00040. The authors thank Dan Abse, Aimée Kahan, Tricha Shivas, Bernadette Spina, clinic staff, and all participants for their contributions. The opinions expressed are those solely of the authors.

■ **Jon F. Merz, JD, PhD**, is assistant professor, Department of Medical Ethics; **Timothy R. Rebbeck, PhD**, is associate professor of epidemiology, Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology; **Pamela Sankar, PhD**, is assistant professor, Department of Medical Ethics; and **Emma A. Meagher, MB**, is assistant professor of medicine, Department of Medicine, all in the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

References

1. Blumhagen DW. The doctor's white coat: The image of the physician in modern America. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1979; 91:111-6.
2. Gjerdingen DK, Simpson DE, Titus SL. Patients' and physicians' attitudes regarding the physician's professional appearance. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1987; 147:1209-12.
3. Wear D. On white coats and professional development: The formal and the hidden curricula. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1998; 129:734-7.
4. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. Washington DC: Department of Health and Human Services, 1979.
5. Nelson RM, Merz JF. Voluntariness of consent for research: An empirical and conceptual review. *Medical Care* 2002; forthcoming.
6. Daugherty C, Ratain MJ, Grochowski E, et al. Perceptions of cancer patients and their physicians involved in phase I trials. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 1995; 13:1062-72.
7. Kass NE, Sugarman J, Faden R, Schoch-Spana M. Trust: The fragile foundation of contemporary biomedical research. *Hastings Center Report* 1996; 26(5):25-9.

Job Opportunities

Applications are being accepted for **full-time support** for active **Human Use Research Protection Program** of major military organization located in Washington, D.C. Candidate would provide oversight review of individual research protocols, and assist local programs in ensuring compliance with federal and military regulations. Healthcare, research, or legal professionals are encouraged to apply. Some domestic travel required. Applicants should have knowledge of human subject protection requirements. Bachelor's degree is required; Master's or PhD in biomedical field or JD is preferred. Applicants should submit resume and statement of qualifications to: dgmcgowan@us.med.navy.mil, or fax to : (202) 762-0976 Please include position title on all correspondence.

The Department of Bioethics at Case Western Reserve University invites applications for a faculty position in the **tenure track at the assistant professor level**. The applicant must possess a doctoral degree in the humanities or social sciences, a serious interest in bioethics and public policy issues, familiarity with social science methodology, and the ability to teach undergraduate and master's level courses in bioethics. This position will have major teaching and administrative responsibility in our undergraduate and Master's Degree programs. In addition to teaching, the applicant will be expected to pursue a research program. Case Western Reserve University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Submit a letter of interest, current curriculum vitae, and names of three references to: Barbara Juknialis, Case Western Reserve University, 10900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland OH 44106-4976.