



Ethics: Bioethics (Fall 2014)

Laura Guidry-Grimes

# CHALLENGES OF INFORMED CONSENT

# REQUIREMENTS AND AIMS OF INFORMED CONSENT

- Crucial aspect of respecting autonomy of patients and research subjects
  - But respecting autonomy involves more than offering informed consent form!
- “requires much more than avoiding deception and coercion. It requires an attempt to instill relevant understanding and to avoid many forms of manipulation” (Beauchamp & Childress 118)
  - What’s an example of unintentional manipulation that could be foreseeable in a clinical or research context?



# MEANINGS OF 'INFORMED CONSENT'

## ○ Autonomous authorization

- More than mere assent
- Does not have to be perfect to have moral force

## ○ Legally and institutionally valid consent

- Based on social rules, avoiding legal liability
- “Blunt” determination – not as fine-grained or individualized

## ○ Can autonomously authorize without being able to give valid consent and *vice versa*



# LIMITS OF INFORMED CONSENT (?)

- Cannot always tailor to informational and autonomy needs of particular patient/subject
- Limitations in information processing, understanding, reflective and true beliefs
- Therapeutic privilege
  - Controversial, can be narrowly or broadly interpreted
- Research study designs
  - General vs. specific consent
  - Single- and double-blind studies, placebo control group



# FORMS OF INFLUENCE & OBLIGATIONS

## ○ Coercion

- “one person intentionally uses a credible and severe threat of harm or force to control another” (B&C 133)
- Credible threat + subject responds as if threatened

## ○ Persuasion

- Remonstrations, appeal to reason

## ○ Manipulation

- “swaying people to do what the manipulator wants by means other than coercion or persuasion” (B&C 134)
- Problem of informational manipulation

- Problems of inducement in medical research, attempts to convince patients to agree with physician in medical care, paternalistic policy measures

# SURROGATE DECISION-MAKING STANDARDS

## ○ Substituted Judgment

- Formerly capacitated patients with eligible surrogate who has sufficient knowledge of what the patient would want in these circumstances

## ○ Pure/Precedent Autonomy

- Formerly capacitated patients: “whether or not a formal advance directive exists, caretakers should accept prior autonomous judgments” (B&C 137)

## ○ Best Interests


- Never capacitated or insufficiently known wishes: Choose option with the highest net benefit and lowest net harms/risks for this particular individual

## ○ What do you foresee as difficulties with implementing each of these standards?





# DISCUSSION GROUPS

- Problem-solve the following scenarios with the aims of **securing informed consent/refusal** and **establishing a trusting physician/researcher-patient/subject relationship**.
    - **Idiosyncratic religious belief**
      - e.g., refusing treatment based on religious conviction that others in that religious community do not share
    - **False belief / therapeutic misconception**
      - e.g., case on pg. 131 of B&C
    - **Over-optimism**
      - e.g., conviction in a miracle, hopefulness that does not match the odds
    - **Inconsistent beliefs**
      - e.g., patient claims to value living but refuses life-saving procedure
- 



Questions?  
Comments?