

1 **DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.888>**

2
3 **Patient's expectations of privacy and confidentiality in Pakistan:**
4 **a mixed-methods study**

5
6 **Bushra Shirazi, Sualeha Shekhani**

7 Centre of Biomedical Ethics and Culture CBEC, Sindh Institute of Urology and
8 Transplantation SIUT, Karachi, Pakistan

9 **Correspondence:** Bushra Shirazi **Email:** bbushrashirazi@gmail.com

10
11 **Abstract**

12 Privacy and confidentiality are considered a cornerstone in the practice of
13 medical ethics. However, these notions may play out differently in the cultural
14 context of Pakistan. In order to understand the perceptions and expectations of
15 privacy and confidentiality, a cross-sectional mixed method study was
16 undertaken in a tertiary care hospital in Karachi, Pakistan. While the subjects
17 demonstrated unfamiliarity with the Western terms, majority of them also
18 exhibited a high expectation for privacy (both informational and physical) and
19 confidentiality. Patients appeared most comfortable with sharing private
20 medical information with the primary physician, indicating the level of trust
21 placed in the physician. Participants also showed high expectations for
22 confidentiality, thus, even in a collectivist society, patients may not want their
23 private information shared across the medical team and also among family
24 members. The onus is, therefore, on healthcare professionals to assess patients'
25 preferences and choices.

26 **Keywords:** Privacy, Confidentiality, Patient perception, Pakistan.

27

28

29 **Introduction**

30 Practice of ethics in the largely collectivist society of Pakistan cannot be based
31 on presumptions of “imported Westernised practices.” It is important that local
32 context is considered when developing pertinent healthcare practices.⁽¹⁾ Privacy
33 and confidentiality are considered cornerstones of medical ethics. Cultural
34 values, however, can pose challenges to the way practices of privacy and
35 confidentiality unfold in traditional, collectivist societies like Pakistan.^(2, 3)
36 In order to understand the local perceptions of privacy and confidentiality, a
37 pilot study was undertaken at the two campuses of Dr Ziauddin Hospital, a
38 tertiary care hospital in Karachi, from March 2016 to November 2017. This
39 paper is a short communication of the study findings, and to the best of our
40 knowledge, this is the first of its kind research originating from Pakistan.

41

42 **Patients / Methods and Results**

43 The study followed a mixed method approach with an exploratory qualitative
44 arm using in-depth interviews with 15 participants, along with a survey-based
45 quantitative arm with 138 participants recruited through convenience sampling.
46 The participants were selected from both in-patient and out-patient clinics, all of
47 whom were above 18 years of age and belonged to either gender. The
48 qualitative arm allowed us to pick the nuances of the patients’ choice.

49 The “Western” terms of ‘privacy’ and ‘confidentiality’ were unfamiliar to most
50 participants. Once translated into Urdu (using words such as “*Posheida*
51 [hidden] and *raazdaari* [confidentiality])” the participants defined privacy as
52 “something that must be kept private” and “keeping one’s secrets to oneself”
53 and confidentiality as “things which cannot be told to just about anyone” and
54 “[to] not tell things to everyone.” One respondent touched upon the basic
55 premise of confidentiality by stating, “trusting the doctor and his team to not
56 broadcast [information] to just about anyone.”

57 Ninety-five percent (n=131) were most willing to share private information with
58 their primary physician. This decreased with the hierarchy of the medical team,
59 particularly the students and nursing staff. One may postulate that the readiness
60 to share information with the primary physician occurs due to the requirement
61 for diagnosis and management. However, the position of physicians as “healer”
62 or as many patients reverently state “after God there is only you (the doctor)”
63 indicates the pedestal on which patients place physicians, and also conveys an
64 inherent power dynamic in the doctor-patient relationship.^(4, 5) This power
65 dynamic potentially explains the seeming acceptance of practices within the
66 healthcare system: fear of offending the doctor and limited available choices.
67 Hesitation in sharing information with students and nurses may stem from
68 inhibition of being judged or stigmatised, or also because patients believe that
69 they do not need this information since the primary responsibility to treat rests
70 with the main physician.

71 While exploring their choices of confidentiality one patient shared: “there are
72 some things which should remain between the doctor and the patient. This is
73 because other people can exaggerate it to a great deal.” While patients may not
74 voice this in clinical encounters, this communicates the trust and expectations
75 that patients have towards clinicians. Furthermore, a participant also elaborated
76 that information should not be shared with family members unless they are
77 emotionally close to the patient, leaving the onus on the doctor to be able to
78 assess the internal dynamics within the family unit.

79 The nature of the disease appeared to be important, as one participant stated, “I
80 would not share information about Hepatitis C ... because people have wrong
81 beliefs that they cannot sit next to such patients.” Patients believed that
82 conditions specific to females, such as breast- or menstruation-related problems
83 would limit marriage prospects in the traditional Pakistani society as a female
84 participant explained, “menstruation issues may lead to infertility in the future
85 thus influencing attitudes of people” and that they are also “personal issues”.

86 Infertility in Pakistani society is a stigma and in such a context, such “private
87 matters” can lead to problems for women, threatening the stability of their
88 marriages; hence it seems natural that patients prefer such health issues to be
89 hidden.⁽⁶⁾

90 Majority (94%, n=129) did not want information related to sexual health and
91 sexually transmitted diseases shared beyond the primary physician. Possible
92 explanation for this attitude could be that other medical conditions may be
93 regarded as part of life, or due to fate, while STDs carry a huge stigma and may
94 be perceived as occurring due to a lapse in morality, thus resounding a
95 behavioural component.⁽⁷⁾ However, the practical importance of sharing this
96 information was highlighted: “It has to be told (to the doctor) because these
97 diseases can spread in the society.” A study from New Zealand also
98 demonstrated that there was an increasing reluctance to share information once
99 it acquired a sensitive nature.⁽⁸⁾ This study also observed that more than 50% of
100 the participants were willing to share information with people across the
101 healthcare team for common diseases like diabetes and hypertension, and
102 surgical procedures like hernias and gall bladder.

103 An important dimension that emerged on physical privacy was the influence of
104 gender. Females showed greater preference to be examined by only the primary
105 physician. According to one female participant, “it is better if it is the doctor
106 who is examining” because “the doctor knows more.” This expectation/choice
107 again emphasises the importance given to the doctor-patient relationship, with
108 the physician considered a confidante. Conversely, a male participant stated,
109 “anyone can examine me, whether it’s a doctor or student. This is because
110 today’s student is tomorrow’s physician.”

111

112

113

114 **Conclusion**

115 The findings of this study have direct impacts on clinical practice. Without
 116 being able to define terms, patients have a sense of these concepts and a
 117 preference that they verbalise when explored. The ideals of privacy and
 118 confidentiality in a society where physicians are powerful, authoritative and do
 119 not have enough time because of patient overload, requires focus and attention.
 120 This is further complicated in hospitals where treatment is provided at a
 121 subsidised cost, as in the case of one of the campuses of the teaching hospital
 122 where the study took place. Due to limited choice, patients may find it difficult
 123 to demand their rights. Research shows that participants may also not possess an
 124 understanding about their rights.^(9, 10) This puts physicians at a higher moral
 125 ground to assess patients' preferences, and act accordingly.

126 The study has several limitations with regards to its generalisability with respect
 127 to the quantitative arm. However, the nuances are reflected in the information
 128 that comes from the qualitative interviews allowing for preliminary
 129 understanding of patients' preferences, and future directions for research.

130

131 **Disclaimer:** The first author was working at Ziauddin Hospital when the study
 132 was being conducted. Institutional approval and ethical clearance was obtained
 133 from the said institution.

134 **Conflict of interest:** No conflict of interest

135 **Funding disclosure:** No funding as required

136

137 **References**

- 138 1. Elkhammas EA, Beshyah SA, Greiw AH, Aburawi EH. Practice of
 139 clinical ethics in developing countries: About time to revisit. *Ibnosina*
 140 *Journal of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences*. 2018 ;10:33.
- 141 2. Humayun A, Fatima N, Naqqash S, Hussain S, Rasheed A, Imtiaz H,
 142 Imam SZ. Patients' perception and actual practice of informed consent,

- 143 privacy and confidentiality in general medical outpatient departments of
144 two tertiary care hospitals of Lahore. BMC medical ethics. 2008;9:14.
- 145 3. Shamim MS, Baig L, Torda A, Balasooriya C. Culture and ethics in
146 medical education: The Asian perspective. JPMA. The Journal of the
147 Pakistan Medical Association. 2018;68:444-6.
- 148 4. Sigerist HE. The place of the physician in modern society. Proceedings of
149 the American Philosophical Society. 1946 ;90:275-9.
- 150 5. Harrison N. Regressing or progressing: what next for the doctor–patient
151 relationship? The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2018 ;6:178-80.
- 152 6. Canada: Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, Pakistan: Treatment
153 of infertile couples by society; legality of in vitro fertilisation (IVF) and
154 the use of sperm donors (2011-January 2014), 10 February 2014,
155 PAK104760.E, available at:
156 <https://www.refworld.org/docid/54ca286d6.html> [accessed 17 July 2019]
- 157 7. Eng TR, Butler WT, editors. The hidden epidemic: confronting sexually
158 transmitted diseases. National Academies Press; 1997 Apr 11.
- 159 8. Whiddett R., Hunter I, Engelbrecht J, Handy J. Patients' attitudes towards
160 sharing their health information. International Journal of Medical
161 Informatics. 2006;75: 530–541.
- 162 9. Sankar P, Mora S, Merz JF, Jones NL. Patient perspectives of medical
163 confidentiality: a review of the literature. Journal of general internal
164 medicine. 2003;18:659-69.
- 165 10. Agrawal U, D'Souza BC, Seetharam AM. Awareness of Patients' Rights
166 among Inpatients of a Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital–A Cross-sectional
167 Study. Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR. 2017;11:IC01.
- 168