The REDE model of healthcare communication: Optimizing relationship as a therapeutic agent

Amy K. Windover, Ph.D.,[a] Adrienne Boissy, M.D., M.A.,[b] Thomas W. Rice, M.D.,[c] Timothy Gilligan, M.D.,[d] Vicente J. Velez, M.D.,[e] and James Merlino, M.D.[f]

Abstract

The REDE model is a conceptual framework for teaching relationship-centered healthcare communication. Based on the premise that genuine relationships are a vital therapeutic agent, use of the framework has the potential to positively influence both patient and provider. The REDE model applies effective communication skills to optimize personal connections in three primary phases of Relationship: Establishment, Development and Engagement (REDE). This paper describes the REDE model and its application to a typical provider-patient interaction.

a   Office of Patient Experience, Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

b   Office of Patient Experience, Neurological Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

c   Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

d   Taussig Cancer Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

e   Department of Hospital Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

f   Office of Patient Experience, Office of Professional Staff Affairs, Digestive Disease Institute, Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, U.S.A.

Corresponding author

Amy K. Windover, Ph.D.
Director of Faculty Development,
Center for Excellence in Healthcare Communication
Cleveland Clinic
P29/9500 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44195

E-mail: windova@ccf.org
Phone: (216) 444-3673 or (216) 339-4311
FAX: (216) 445-4373

Relevant disclosures: None

Introduction

Effective communication is the foundation for any relationship in healthcare, and our ability to consistently deliver high-quality care requires that this relationship be strong and meaningful. A significant tradition of work on the therapeutic alliance, patient-centeredness and relationship-centered care has long recognized the healing potential of the healthcare relationship.[1] In our experience teaching relationship-centered communication to thousands of seasoned clinicians, we nonetheless recognized that many providers did not intuitively view forming relationships with patients as their role, nor did they perceive benefits of this mode of communication. In addition, in a world intensely focused on patient experience, providers often feel left out. Subsequently, building upon the previous theoretical and empirical work, we constructed a model that put the concept of relationships in healthcare at the forefront. To further reinforce the concept, we directly correlated phases of the healthcare relationship to phases of the medical interview and communication skills therein. Emphasizing the premise that genuine relationships are a vital therapeutic agent,[2,3] use of this framework has the potential to positively influence both patient and provider.

The REDE model

The REDE model of healthcare communication is a conceptual framework for teaching and evaluating relationship-centered communication. REDE harnesses the power of relationships by organizing the rich database of empirically validated communication skills into three primary phases of Relationship: Establishment, Development and

Engagement (see Figure 1).[4, 5, 6] Many models of healthcare communication exist.[7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] In our experience, several considerations led to the design of REDE, its resonance with advanced clinicians and implications for teaching. First, REDE is informative and also transformative because it challenges users of the model to explore their own assumptions and beliefs about patients and their role as providers. Second, we recognized that seasoned clinicians have performed countless interviews and often developed an unconscious competence in communication. Our teaching of REDE appreciates the skills clinicians already have, intentionally models relationship-centered communication in our facilitation method and encourages reflective competence by providing a common language that allows providers to reflect and refine their own skills. Third, the REDE model characterizes communication skills as tools in a toolbox, to be applied as needed. For the healing power of a relationship to be optimized, the skills must be presented in a manner that is genuine and authentic. If every provider was encouraged to recite the same lines of welcome, patients would perceive them as rote and impersonal. At the same time, we acknowledge that in early stages of learning, most newly introduced behaviors can feel scripted or unnatural until they become automated from repetition and practice. For ease of recall and utility, REDE also includes a mnemonic for each relationship phase that further supports the principles of relationship-centered care, as we have found, not unexpectedly, that learners codify information differently, and some appreciate explicit verbiage. Fourth, the REDE model can be generalized to a variety of settings. Because adult learning theory has shown that anchoring new information in what is already known facilitates learning,[15] REDE skills can easily be woven into the traditional medical interview (See Figure 2) in both outpatient and inpatient settings and used across settings in a variety of conversations.

Phase 1: Establish the relationship

Creating a safe and supportive atmosphere is essential for making a personal connection, fostering trust and collaboration. The emotion bank account is a concept originally proposed by psychologist and author John Gottman, Ph.D. It refers to a mental system for tracking the frequency with which we emotionally connect with other people.[16] Each time an emotional connection is made, it is equivalent to making a deposit in the emotion account with that person. Building up the emotion account is important to sustain a personal connection. This way, when a withdrawal inevitably occurs, such as when a patient is forced to wait to see a provider, the emotion account does not automatically go into the red.

Convey value and respect with the welcome. In doing so, we are essentially building the emotion bank account with our patients and families. Given that people form first impressions very quickly and patients are discussing emotional and value-laden topics, how we set the stage for conversation matters, even if it feels irrelevant to the clinical problem(s) at hand.[17, 18, 19, 20] The skills outlined in Phase 1 are intended to create a climate conducive to the development of trust by demonstrating that the provider is receptive and interested in the person first, patient second.

Collaboratively set the agenda. Many providers fear this practice will sacrifice time necessary for assessing or treating the primary concern. However, research has shown that sharing in agenda setting not only facilitates partnership but also improves visit efficiency, diagnostic accuracy and patient satisfaction.[21] Sharing in the agenda setting helps minimize our tendency to presume what a patient's concerns are and in what order of priority.

Introduce the computer. The electronic health record is a reality for most healthcare providers. How we introduce and utilize the computer should be explained as a means of enhancing patient care rather than detracting from it.

Demonstrate empathy. Empathy is the ability to imagine oneself in another's place and to understand that person's thoughts and feelings. In his book, "Empathy and the Practice of Medicine," Howard M. Spiro, M.D., described empathy as "I and you becomes I am you or I might be you (p. 9)."[22] Substantial research has examined the importance of empathy. Human beings are hard-wired to be empathic toward one another.[23] Unfortunately, we also know that, without intervention, empathy declines through medical training, over time in practice and with task pressure.[24, 25, 26] Our experience is that most providers care about their patients, but not all recognize emotional cues or respond to them. Making verbal statements of empathy has been shown to reduce the length of both an outpatient surgery and primary care visit.[27] In REDE, every opportunity to convey empathy is encouraged, and the mnemonic SAVE is introduced for outlining different types of empathic statements a provider can use.

Figure 1: The REDE Model Skills Checklist

Relationship:		
Establishment **Phase I**	**Development** **Phase II**	**Engagement** **Phase III**

Convey value & respect with the welcome
• Review chart in advance & comment on their history
• Knock & inquire before entering room
• Greet patient & companions formally with smile & handshake
• Introduce self & team; clarify role(s)
• Position self at patient's eye level
• Recognize & respond to signs of physical or emotional distress
• Attend to patient's privacy
• Make a brief patient-focused social comment, if appropriate
	Engage in reflective listening
	• Nonverbally – e.g., direct eye contact, forward lean, nodding
	• Verbally using continuers such as
	  – "mm-hmm", "I see", "go on" or reflecting the underlying meaning or emotion of what is said –
	  – "What I hear you saying is…" or "Sounds like…"
	• Avoid expressing judgment, getting distracted, or redirecting speaker
	• Express appreciation for sharing
		Share diagnosis & information
		• Orient patient to the education & planning portion of the visit
		• Present a clear, concise diagnosis
		• Pause if necessary
		• Provide additional education, if desired & helpful to the patient
		• Frame information in the context of the patient's perspective

Collaboratively set the agenda
• Orient patient to elicit a list of their concerns
• Use an open-ended question to initiate survey
• Ask "What else?" until all concerns are identified
• Summarize list of concerns to check accuracy; ask patient to prioritize
• Propose agenda incorporating patient & clinician priorities; obtain agreement
	Elicit the patient narrative
	• Use transition statement to orient patient to the history of present illness
	• Use open-ended question(s) to initiate patient narrative
	• Maintain the narrative with verbal & nonverbal continuers –
	  – "Tell me more…" or
	  – "What next?"
	• Summarize patient narrative to check accuracy
		Collaboratively develop the plan
		• Describe treatment goals & options including risks, benefits, & alternatives
		• Elicit patient's preferences & integrate into a mutually agreeable plan
		• Check for mutual understanding
		• Confirm patient's commitment to plan
		• Identify potential treatment barriers & need for additional resources

Introduce the computer, if applicable • Orient patient to computer • Explain benefit to the patient • Include patient whenever possible (e.g., share labs or scans) • Maintain eye contact when possible • Stop typing & attend to patient when emotion arises		**Provide closure** • Alert patient that the visit is ending • Affirm patient's contributions & collaboration during visit • Arrange follow-up with patient & consultation with other team members • Provide handshake & a personal good-bye

Demonstrate empathy using SAVE
• Recognize emotional cues & respond "in the moment"
• Allow space to be with the patient & their emotion without judgment
• Clarify the emotion if needed
• Recognize emotion evoked in you & refrain from trying to fix or reassure
• Demonstrate verbally with SAVE
  – **S**upport -"Let's work together…"
  – **A**cknowledge -"This has been hard on you."
  – **V**alidate -"Most people would feel the way you do."
  – **E**motion naming -"You seem sad."
• Nonverbally - doing only that which feels natural & authentic to you
	Explore the patient's perspective using VIEW
	• **V**ital activities –
	  – "How does it disrupt your daily activity?" or
	  – "How does it impact your functioning?"
	• **I**deas –
	  – "What do you think is wrong?"
	• **E**xpectations –
	  – "What are you hoping I can do for you today?"
	• **W**orries –
	  – "What worries you most about it?"
		Dialogue throughout using ARIA
		• **A**ssess using open-ended questions
		  – What the patient knows about diagnosis & treatment
		  – How much & what type of education the patient desires/needs
		  – Patient treatment preferences
		  – Health literacy
		• **R**eflect patient meaning & emotion
		• **I**nform
		  – Tailor information to patient
		  – Speak slow & provide small chunks of information at a time
		  – Use understandable language & visual aids
		• **A**ssess patient understanding & emotional reaction to the information provided

Figure 2. The REDE Model and the Traditional Medical Interview

Relationship:															
Establishment				Development								Engagement			
Open	Build rapport	Elicit concerns	Negotiate & set agenda	CC	HPI	PMH/PSH	Meds & allergies	FH	SH	ROS	Physical Exam	CC Manage-ment	DX	Education	Shared Decision Making	Close
Empathy															

Note: CC = chief complaint; HPI = history of present illness; PMH/PSH; past medical history/past social history; Meds = medications; FH = family history; SH = social history; ROS = review of systems; Dx = diagnosis. © 2013 The Cleveland Clinic Foundation. All Rights Reserved.

Phase 2: Develop the relationship

Genuine curiosity and interest are the necessary first steps in relationship building. However, once a safe and supportive environment has been created, the relationship needs to evolve and grow. Getting to know who the patient is as a person and understanding that person's symptoms in a biopsychosocial context is the next step. Developing the relationship also requires continued deposits into the emotion bank account and, thus, ongoing use of empathy.

Listen reflectively. Shown to enhance the therapeutic nature of a relationship, increase openness and the disclosure of feelings and improve information recall,[28, 29, 30] reflective listening is vital for developing the relationship. Yet listening in such a way as to understand and acknowledge what is being said can be a deceptively complex and challenging skill.

Elicit the patient narrative. Obtaining the history of present illness (HPI) can quickly become a series of closed-ended questions that are of most interest to the provider.[31, 32] However, the goal of this skill is to better understand the patient's perspective on his or her symptoms. This has been proven more efficient and effective than a provider-centered data gathering approach.[33]

Elicit the patient's perspective. Explanatory models are values, beliefs and experiences that shape a person.[34] Being curious to explore and open to learn are key to knowing the person, their illness that is a social response to disease and the disease itself. The REDE model suggests a simple mnemonic VIEW to explore the patient's perspective.

Phase 3: Engage the relationship

The last step in relationship building aligns with the education and treatment portion of a patient encounter. Relationship engagement enhances health outcomes by improving patient comprehension and recall,[35, 36] capacity to give informed consent,[37] patient self-efficacy,[38, 39, 40] treatment adherence and self-management of chronic illness.[41, 42, 43]

Share diagnosis and information. Telling a patient the medical facts and what he or she needs to know is not sufficient for effective care. We must also be sure the patient understands the information. Framing information in the context of the patient's perspective and engaging in dialogue that allows the patient to register new information and ask clarifying questions facilitates patient understanding.[44, 45, 46, 47]

Collaboratively develop a plan. Relationship engagement is designed to support patient understanding, decision making and consideration of potential treatment barriers. Treatment adherence and behavior change are more likely when the patient is an integral part of the planning process and agrees with the recommendations.[48]

Provide closure. Ending a visit can easily be taken for granted. However, reviewing the time spent and demonstrating respect and appreciation for the patient provides closure and engenders continued partnership.

Dialogue throughout. Patients are unable to comprehend and accurately recall a considerable amount of information presented during a typical medical visit.[49, 50] Dialogue, as opposed to monologue, keeps the patient involved in the learning process[51] and, more important, reflects the importance of the patient's role as head of his or her treatment team. In REDE, the sequence for engaging in this dialogue throughout the education and treatment portion of a patient visit is summarized by the mnemonic ARIA.

Summary

Effective communication is necessary to deliver safe, high-quality medical care. At the core of effective communication is the ability to develop meaningful relationships with patients. The REDE model builds on a significant research base including placebo, therapeutic alliance, communication skills and patient-centeredness that recognizes the healing potential of the healthcare relationship for not only patients but also providers. The REDE model helps frame the specific communication strategies that optimize their effect(s) on processes, outcomes of care and the patient-provider relationship itself. The REDE model also encapsulates evidence-based communication practices and our experience with seasoned clinicians, mostly staff physicians, within a large hospital system. It is hoped that such systemwide efforts will result in improved experience of care and self-efficacy for patients, and increased confidence, emotional connectedness and resiliency for providers. Future research will examine the generalizability of the REDE model for different contexts and provider types, as well as its potential to impact patient and provider outcomes.

References

1. Mary Catherine Beach, Thomas Inui, and the Relationship-centered Care Research Network, "Relationship-Centered Care: A Constructive Reframing," J Gen Intern Med 21 (2006): S3-8.

2. John C. Norcross. Psychotherapy Relationships that Work [electronic resource]: Evidence-Based Responsiveness (2001), http://0-ebooks.ohiolink.edu.library.ccf.org/xtf-ebc/view?docId=tei/ox/9780199737208/9780199737208.xml&query=&brand=default. Accessed August 12, 2013.

3. Anthony L. Suchman and Dale A. Matthews, "What Makes the Patient-Doctor Relationship Therapeutic? Exploring the Connexional Dimension of Medical Care," Ann Intern Med 108 (1988): 125-30.

4. Richard L. Street, Gregory Makoul, Neeraj K. Arora, and Ronald M. Epstein, "How Does Communication Heal? Pathways Linking Clinician-Patient Communication to Health Outcomes," Patient Educ Couns 74 (2009): 295-301.

5. Dana Gelb Safran, Deborah A. Taira, William H. Rogers, Mark Kosinski, John E. Ware, and Alvin R. Tarlov, "Linking Primary Care Performance to Outcomes of Care," J Fam Pract 47 (1998): 213-20.

6. L. M. L. Ong, J. C. J. M. DeHaes, A. M. Hoos, F. B. Lammes. Doctor-Patient Communication: A Review of the Literature," Soc Sci Med 40 (1995): 903-18.

7. Vaughn F. Keller V and J. Gregory Carroll, "A New Model for Physician-Patient Communication," Patient Educ Couns 45 (1994): 23-34.

8. Suzanne Kurtz, Jonathan Silverman, and Juliet Draper, Teaching and Learning Communication Skills in Medicine (2nd ed), (Abingdon Oxon, UK: Radcliffe Medical Press, 2005).

9. Gregory Makoul, "The SEGUE Framework for Teaching and Assessing Communication Skills. Patient Educ and Couns 45 (2001): 23-34.

10. Richard M. Frankel and Terry Stein, "Getting the Most out of the Clinical Encounter: The Four Habits Model," Perm J 3 (1999): 79-88.

11. Robert C. Smith, Patient Centered Interviewing: An Evidence Based Method (2nd ed), (Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2002).

12. Steven A. Cole and Julian Bird, The Medical Interview: The Three Function Approach (2nded), (St. Louis: Missouri: Mosby Inc, 2000).

13. Gregory Makoul and Bayer-Fetzer Conference on Physician-Patient Communication in Medical Education, "Essential Elements of Communication in Medical Encounters: The Kalamazoo Consensus Statement," Acad Med 76 (2001): 390-3.

14. Effective Patient-Physician Communication, Committee Opinion No. 587, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Obstet Gynecol 123 (214): 389-93.

15. Stanley D. Ivie, "Ausubel's Learning Theory: An Approach to Teaching Higher Order Thinking Skills," High Sch J. 82 (1988): 35-43.

16. John Gottman and Nan Silver, The Seven Principles for Making Marriage Work, (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1999).

17. Moshe Bar, Maital Neta, and Heather Linz, "Very First Impressions," Emotion 6 (2006): 269-278.

18. William F. Chaplin, Jeffrey B. Phillips, Jonathan D. Brown, Nancy R. Clanton, and Jennifer L. Stein, "Handshaking, Gender, Personality, and First Impressions," J Pers Soc Psychol 79 (2000): 110-17.

19. Frederic W. Platt, David L. Gaspar, John L. Coulehan, Lucy Fox, Andrew J. Adler, W. Wayne Weston, Richard C. Smith, and Moira Stewart, ""Tell Me About Yourself": The Patient-Centered Interview," Ann Intern Med 134 (2001): 1079-85.

20. Arthur J. Barsky, "Hidden Reasons Some Patients Visit Doctors," Ann Intern Med 94 (1981): 492-8.

21. Makoul, "SEGUE Framework," 23-34.

22. Howard Spiro, Mary G. McCrea Curnen, Enid Peschel, and Deborah St. James, Empathy and the Practice of Medicine: Beyond Pills and the Scalpel, (Binghamton, NY: Vail-Ballou Press, 1993).

23. Christian Keysers, The Empathic Brain: How the Discovery of Mirror Neurons Changes Our Understanding of Human Nature, Lexington, KY: Social Brain Press, 2011).

24. Mohammadreza Hojat, Michael J. Vergare, Kaye Maxwell, George Brainard, Steven K. Herrine, Gerald A. Isenberg, Jon Veloski, and Joseph S. Gonnella, "The Devil is in the Third Year: A Longitudinal Study of Erosion of Empathy in Medical School," Acad Med 84 (2009): 1182-91.

25. Cole and Bird, The Medical Interview.

26. Spiro et al., Empathy.

27. Wendy Levinson, Rita Gorawara-Bhat, and Jennifer Lamb, "A Study of Patient Clues and Physician Responses in Primary Care and Surgical Settings," J Amer Med Assoc 284 no. 8 (2000): 1021-7.

28. John L. Coulehan, Frederic W. Platt, Barry Egener, Richard Frankel, Chen-Tan Lin, Beth Lown, and William H. Salazar, " "Let Me See if I Have this Right…": Words that Help Build Empathy," Ann Intern Med 135 (2001): 221-7.

29. Erik Rautalinko, Hans-Olof Lisper, and Bo Ekehammar, "Reflective Listening in Counseling: Effects of Training Time and Evaluator Social Skills," Am J Psychother 61 (2007): 191-209.

30. Karen Tallman, Tom Janisse, Richard M. Frankel, Sue Hee Sung, Edward Krupat, and John T. Hsu, "Communication Practices of Physicians with High Patient-Satisfaction Ratings," Perm J 11 (2007): 19-29.

31. Howard B. Beckman and Richard M. Frankel, "The Effect of Physician Behavior on the Collection of Data," Ann Intern Med 101 (1984): 692-6.

32. M. Kim Marvel, Ronald M. Epstein, Kristine Flowers, and Howard B. Beckman, "Soliciting the Patient's Agenda Have We Improved?" J Amer Med Assoc 281 (1999): 283-7.

33. W. Wayne Weston, Judith Belle Brown, and Moira A. Stewart, "Patient-Centred Interviewing Part I: Understanding Patients' Experiences," Can Fam Physician 35 (1989): 147-51.

34. J. Emilio Carrillo, Alexander R. Green, and Joseph R. Betancourt, "Cross-Cultural Primary Care: A Patient-Based Approach," Ann Intern Med 130 (1999): 829-34.

35. Ong et al., "Doctor-Patient Communication," 903-18.

36. Michele Heisler, Reynard R. Bouknight, Rodney A. Hayward, Dylan Smith, and Eve A. Kerr, "The Relative Importance of Physician Communication, Participatory Decision Making, and Patient Understanding in Diabetes Self-Management," J Gen Intern Med 17 (2002): 243-52.

37. Yael Schenker, Alicia Fernandez, Rebecca Sudore, and Dean Schillinger, "Interventions to Improve Patient Comprehension in Informed Consent for Medical Procedures: A Systematic Review," Med Decis Making 31 (2011): 151-73.

38. Street et al., "How does Communication Heal," 295-301.

39. Heisler et al., "The Relative Importance of Physician Communication," 243-52.

40. Schenker et al., "Interventions to Improve Patient Comprehension," 151-73.

41. Heisler et al., "The Relative Importance of Physician Communication," 243-52.

42. Debra L. Roter, Moira Stewart, Samuel M. Putnam, Mack Lipkin Jr., William Stiles, Thomas S. Inui, "Communication Patterns of Primary Care Physicians," J Amer Med Assoc 277 (1997): 350-6.

43. Moira Stewart, Judith Belle Brown, Allan Donner, Ian R. McWhinney, Julian Oates, W. Wayne Weston, and John Jordan, "The Impact of Patient-Centered Care on Outcomes," J Fam Pract 49 (2000): 796-804.

44. Ong et al., "Doctor-Patient Communication," 903-18.

45. Heisler et al., "The Relative Importance of Physician Communication," 243-52.

46. Schenker et al., "Interventions to Improve Patient Comprehension," 151-73.

47. Dean Schillinger, John Piette, Kevin Grumbach Frances Wang, Clifford Wilson, Carolyn Daher, Krishelle Leong-Grotz, Cesar Castro, and Andrew B. Bindman, "Closing the Loop: Physician Communication with Diabetic Patients who have Low Health Literacy," Arch Intern Med 163 (2003): 83-90.

48. Marianne Schmid Mast, "Dominance and Gender in the Physician-Patient Interaction," J Men's Health Gender 1(2004): 354-8.

49. Ong et al., "Doctor-Patient Communication," 903-18.

50. Heisler et al., "The Relative Importance of Physician Communication," 243-52.

51. Schenker et al., "Interventions to Improve Patient Comprehension," 151-73.