

Chapter 31

Technologized Talk: Wearable Technologies, Patient Agency, and Medical Communication in Healthcare Settings

Erin Trauth

High Point University, High Point, USA

Ella R. Browning

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

ABSTRACT

In this study, the authors examine patient use of and feelings about wearable technologies for health attainment and management. Based on an online survey of 81 patients using wearable technologies to track and manage health, as well as interviews with three patients utilizing wearables for health management, the authors examine how wearable technologies are being used by patients to attain health, manage health, and/or prevent health issues, and what value users find in these wearable technologies. The authors also examine how such use is impacting communication between medical professionals and patients. Specifically, the authors explore how the inclusion of wearable technologies has changed the “rhetorical relationship” between patients and medical professionals. The study concludes with a discussion of the future of wearable devices in patient-medical practitioner relationships and clinical settings.

INTRODUCTION

In November 2017, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) announced its approval of Abilify MyCite, the first human-ingested digitally trackable pill. Within the pill, a sensor records that the medication has entered the patient’s body. Abilify MyCite is designed for use with patients in the treatment of schizophrenia, bipolar I disorder, and, possibly, as a supplement to depression management. Once ingested, the pill communicates from the pill sensor to a wearable patch, which then transmits information to a smartphone. Patients and approved caregivers and physicians can access the medication

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-2414-8.ch031

ingestion information through a web portal. In its press release about Abilify MyCite, the FDA noted that “Abilify MyCite’s prescribing information (labeling) notes that the ability of the product to improve patient compliance with their treatment regimen has not been shown” (FDA, 2017).

The approval of Abilify MyCite brings up important questions of patient compliance, patient-physician communication, and patient privacy. While the ability to track medication ingestion is promising for many cases, patients may find a wearable so “all knowing” and invasive to be problematic. Although medication is prescribed in the interest of the patient, concerns about surveillance at this level are real and unprecedented. In the instance of Abilify MyCite, we are faced with an example of a wearable technology and associated tool that can potentially help bridge gaps in medication compliance. However, the question remains: will patients be willing to comply with such tracking? And how might this particular type of wearable technology complicate—rather than facilitate—communication between patients and their doctors?

Abilify MyCite may seem an extreme example of the potential invasiveness of wearable technologies, but, at all levels, wearable technologies continue to redefine what it means to be human and what it means to “know” about one’s body through the collected (and possibly shared) data. Through wearables, embodied computers, smart jewelry, and other devices, we can track, analyze, and modify behaviors impacting our physical and mental health, productivity, communication, and daily routines like never before. As such, we are moving towards a truly technologized state of being and identity.

In the realm of health communication, particularly when we consider the data we can now gather about our bodies and health through wearable technologies, the impact of wearables on the patient/medical practitioner relationship is shifting in unprecedented ways. Abilify MyCite is just one example. Mobile health applications, health and fitness trackers, and even telemedicine is all shifting how and when we make health decisions, as well as who we consult (or do not consult) and when. As users, many of these technologies collect and provide us with data for which we may have had to consult a medical professional to gain access in the past, increasing the level of control many of us feel we have with regards to our bodies. Wearables are thus shifting our sense of agency about our own health. For those of us with a stake in the current and future development of the next generation of medical practitioners, considering the ways wearable technologies have changed the rhetorical relationships among patients and medical practitioners is particularly important.

Scholars in professional and technical communication have long explored the rhetorical relationships among and between individuals, groups, systems, organizations, and institutions, among other things. By rhetorical relationship we mean a relationship that likely changes based on changes in the rhetorical situation on which it relies. Bitzer (1968) described the rhetorical situation as “a natural context of persons, events, objects, relations, and an exigence which strongly invites utterance” (p. 5). A rhetorical relationship, then, is one that changes when one of these components of the rhetorical situation on which the relationship is based shifts in some way: context, persons involved, events, objects, relations, exigence. Perhaps the people involved change; for example, a shift would occur if a patient gets a new doctor. Perhaps an object around which the relationship has in the past been based upon changes or goes away; we would see a change if a patient gets a new pacemaker. Perhaps the relationship among the people involved evolves in some way; a shift would occur if a patient uses a wearable technology to develop more expertise about her health and uses it in discussions with her doctor. If a patient has an encounter with a doctor at a clinic or hospital, we typically would define that encounter as “doctor/patient relationship.” However, the term “doctor/patient relationship” is in fact shorthand for the rhetorical relationship that develops as a result of a particular rhetorical situation. That is, “doctor/patient relationship” is shorthand

28 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/technologized-talk/285433

Related Content

The Challenges of the IS/IT Projects in the Healthcare Sector

Jorge Gomes and Mário Romão (2019). *International Journal of Applied Research on Public Health Management* (pp. 67-81).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-challenges-of-the-isit-projects-in-the-healthcare-sector/218869

Personal and Public Involvement in Healthcare Provision

(2020). *The NHS and Contemporary Health Challenges From a Multilevel Perspective* (pp. 89-116).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/personal-and-public-involvement-in-healthcare-provision/258436

Psychological Immunity, Societal Response, and Their Relationship to Infection and Protection Against the COVID-19 Pandemic

Islam Hassan Abdel Wareth (2022). *Societal Resilience and Response to Contagious Diseases and Pandemics* (pp. 178-196).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/psychological-immunity-societal-response-and-their-relationship-to-infection-and-protection-against-the-covid-19-pandemic/300434

The Impact of Healthcare Information Technology on Patient Outcomes

Edward T. Chen (2018). *International Journal of Public Health Management and Ethics* (pp. 39-56).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-healthcare-information-technology-on-patient-outcomes/204408

Mental Health Access Background and Framework for Improvement in the Digital Era

LaMeeya Bumphus, Sweta Sneha, Dominic Thomas, Will Ardand Monica Nandan (2022). *International Journal of Applied Research on Public Health Management* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/mental-health-access-background-framework/290374