Family vs. Patient: Cultural Dynamics in Transplant Decision-Making

Juana Gutierrez Atara & Dr. Miyuki Fukui

University of Southern California

Abstract

The United States healthcare system is built on principles of individual autonomy, yet many immigrant patients from collectivist cultures navigate medical decisions as part of collective family units. This literature review examines how extended-family obligations in collectivist immigrant cultures affect transplant decision-making and recovery outcomes. Specifically, the research seeks to understand how cultural differences in decision-making processes affect equity in transplant access and outcomes, with particular focus on systemic biases against collectivist cultural frameworks in psychosocial evaluations. Three peer-reviewed studies were analyzed: Serper et al. (2023), which documented racial disparities in psychosocial transplant evaluations; Rizzolo et al. (2024), which explored transplant experiences among undocumented immigrant families; and Yates and de Oliveira (2016), which provided theoretical frameworks for understanding cultural differences in decision-making. The review reveals that current psychosocial assessment tools systematically disadvantage patients from collectivist cultures by misinterpreting culturally appropriate collective decision-making as problematic family interference. The findings suggest that culturally adapted care approaches are essential for achieving equity in transplant access and outcomes.

Family vs. Patient: Cultural Dynamics in Transplant Decision-Making

Introduction

The United States healthcare system operates on the foundational principle of individual autonomy, in which patients are expected to make independent medical decisions. However, this framework fails to account for the reality that many immigrant patients from collectivist cultures navigate healthcare decisions as part of a collective family unit. This disconnect becomes particularly consequential in transplant medicine, where decisions about organ donation, transplant acceptance, and post-operative care carry life-altering implications for entire family networks. Serper et al. (2023) found that Black patients experience significantly longer wait times than White patients for transplants, and both Black and Hispanic/Latinx patients face higher psychosocial risk scores that reflect structural barriers, including economic instability, insurance gaps, housing insecurity, and immigration status concerns, rather than individual deficiencies. This literature review examines how extended family obligations in collectivist immigrant cultures impact transplant decision-making and recovery, and considers what culturally adapted care approaches might better serve these populations. The thesis of this review is that current psychosocial assessment tools and medical practices do not adequately recognize or accommodate collectivist cultural values, leading to inequities in transplant access and outcomes that need urgent reevaluation through culturally sensitive frameworks.

Summary of the Papers

Serper et al. (2023) investigated racial and ethnic disparities in psychosocial evaluation and liver transplant waitlisting using data from transplant centers across the United States. Their

study revealed that higher psychosocial risk scores among Black and Hispanic/Latinx patients likely reflect upstream factors and structural racism rather than individual patient deficiencies. The authors identified multiple structural barriers creating inequitable transplant access, including economic instability, insurance gaps, housing insecurity, educational and language barriers, and immigration status concerns. These systemic factors were being misinterpreted as individual patient risks rather than recognized as barriers created by the healthcare system's design.

Rizzolo et al. (2024) conducted qualitative research examining the transplant experience for undocumented immigrant patients formerly receiving emergency dialysis, along with their caregivers. The study documented how undocumented families approached transplant decisions through a collective framework extending far beyond individual medical considerations. For these families, medical decisions effectively became immigration decisions, as families had to weigh not only health outcomes but also potential legal consequences for multiple family members. The research revealed that family obligations in undocumented communities included protecting everyone from legal exposure, adding profound complexity to medical choices.

Yates and de Oliveira (2016) provided a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding how culture fundamentally shapes decision-making processes. In collectivist cultures, family harmony and group welfare are prioritized over individual preferences; duty and honor to the extended family are emphasized; and collective decision-making processes involve multiple family members, with particular respect for elder authority. In contrast, individualist cultures emphasize self-determination, independent decision-making, and maintaining healthy boundaries between individuals and their families. The research demonstrated that these

fundamental differences create significant challenges when collectivist families interact with healthcare systems designed around individualist assumptions.

Compare and Analyze Themes

Structural Barriers Masquerading as Individual Deficits

All three studies converge on a critical insight: what healthcare systems often interpret as individual patient deficiencies actually reflect the collision between collectivist cultural values and individualist healthcare structures. Serper et al. (2023) documented how psychosocial evaluation systems systematically penalize patients from collectivist backgrounds. When transplant teams assess social support adequacy or decision-making capacity, they apply individualist standards that may classify culturally appropriate collective decision-making as problematic indecision or excessive family interference.

Yates and de Oliveira (2016) provide the theoretical foundation for understanding this assessment bias. They explain that collectivist decision-making operates according to different but equally valid cultural logic. Consulting multiple family members and respecting elders' authority are culturally appropriate practices that prioritize collective wisdom and family harmony. Decision-making in collectivist cultures involves an obligation to consider the impact on the entire family network.

Rizzolo et al. (2024) reveal that for undocumented families, the situation becomes exponentially more complex. Cultural values that require collective decision-making intersect with legal vulnerabilities, creating processes that must simultaneously honor family obligations while protecting the entire network from immigration enforcement. When healthcare providers

interpret delays in decision-making as problematic, they fail to recognize the legitimate additional considerations these families must weigh.

The Question of Voluntary Consent in Collectivist Contexts

A significant tension arises around voluntary informed consent, especially in the context of living organ donation. In collectivist families, refusing to donate an organ may be perceived as abandoning family duty, creating substantial pressure on extended family members to volunteer. This challenges traditional Western bioethical frameworks that assume individual autonomy as the foundation of informed consent.

Yates and de Oliveira (2016) propose that collectivist decision-making processes are as legitimate as individualist approaches, emphasizing that forms of family involvement that are interpreted as pressure in individualist contexts may instead reflect appropriate participation in collectivist cultures. Nevertheless, their framework leaves critical gaps by insufficiently addressing the complexity of coercion that can arise when an individual's preferences diverge from collective family expectations. This limitation undermines the practical applicability of their model, as it offers limited guidance for clinicians who must distinguish between familial support and undue pressure in multicultural clinical encounters. To address these gaps, clinicians might employ strategies such as conducting private interviews with individual family members to assess their genuine preferences and provide a safe space for expressing concerns or dissent. Additionally, using culturally competent interpreters and facilitators during family meetings can help accurately convey the individual's wishes without being influenced by collective pressure. Training programs focused on multicultural ethics and communication can further equip healthcare professionals to navigate complex family dynamics effectively.

Rizzolo et al. (2024) document additional complications in undocumented families, where extended families mobilize substantial financial resources to support transplant costs. This resource mobilization can create feelings of obligation and guilt that may influence patients' decisions or pressure potential donors to volunteer despite reservations. Serper et al. (2023) highlight how current evaluations may penalize patients who make decisions in consultation with extended family networks, potentially creating barriers to transplant access and contributing to documented disparities.

Post-Transplant Recovery: Medical Compliance Versus Cultural Obligations

The studies reveal that the post-transplant recovery period highlights the disconnect between medical requirements designed for individualist patients and collectivist family realities. Serper et al. (2023) note that traditional assessments may classify patients as high-risk if extensive family obligations interfere with medication adherence or appointment attendance. However, these same family networks often provide crucial emotional support, practical assistance, and cultural understanding.

Yates and de Oliveira (2016) explain that in collectivist cultures, ongoing family obligations can be as compelling as individual medical needs, leading to situations in which the two priorities may conflict. During the recovery period, the patient is often expected to resume family roles, such as maintaining household duties, caregiving for relatives, and providing economic support, even when these expectations may hinder adherence to strict medical regimens. This interplay between fulfilling family responsibilities and meeting medical requirements illustrates the genuine tensions that can arise between cultural obligations and the demands of effective post-transplant care.

Rizzolo et al. (2024) found that undocumented patients face additional complexity during recovery. Immigration status creates barriers to accessing post-transplant care, and economic precarity means families often cannot afford a traditional recovery period with reduced responsibilities. These competing obligations exist not because of poor planning but because of structural constraints and cultural values emphasizing collective welfare.

Limitations and Gaps

The reviewed studies reveal significant research gaps. First, there is a striking lack of validated assessment tools designed to evaluate extended family dynamics from a culturally competent perspective. To address this, transplant centers should develop and pilot culturally sensitive psychosocial evaluation instruments. An example of a culturally sensitive tool could be an assessment framework that actively incorporates family narratives and traditions into the evaluation process, possibly through family mapping exercises or culturally relevant interviews that prioritize collective decision-making. This approach clarifies the role of family dynamics and obligations in the patient's healthcare journey.

Additionally, tools that employ culturally specific behavioral markers, such as collective resource sharing or elder participation in decisions, can further enhance relevance. As Serper et al. (2023) demonstrate, current instruments may systematically disadvantage patients from collectivist cultures. Second, limited comparative studies examine transplant outcomes for patients who engage in collective versus individual decision-making, leaving it unclear whether current individualist frameworks actually improve outcomes or simply reflect cultural bias. Third, the literature lacks long-term follow-up studies of culturally adapted care models. While researchers have identified problems with current approaches, insufficient evidence exists about

which alternatives might improve transplant access and outcomes. Finally, research has not adequately explored how providers can distinguish between culturally appropriate collective decision-making and genuinely coercive family dynamics. Yates and de Oliveira (2016) provide theoretical frameworks but not practical clinical guidance for making this crucial distinction.

Conclusion and Future Directions

The transplant journey for collectivist immigrant families reveals fundamental tensions between cultural values and healthcare system design. Rather than viewing extended family involvement as a barrier, the evidence suggests providers must develop culturally adapted approaches that respect collective decision-making while ensuring medical compliance. As Serper et al. (2023) demonstrate, current evaluation systems likely penalize patients for structural barriers and cultural differences rather than genuine medical risks, contributing to documented disparities in transplant access.

For undocumented families, as Rizzolo et al. (2024) reveal, culturally adapted care must acknowledge how medical decisions intersect with immigration vulnerabilities. These families engage in collective risk-benefit analyses that extend beyond health outcomes to include legal safety, a reality that providers must understand and accommodate rather than pathologize.

Future research should prioritize developing culturally adapted psychosocial assessment tools that recognize collective decision-making as legitimate rather than deficient. To directly evaluate whether individualist or collectivist decision-making frameworks lead to better transplant outcomes, future studies should employ comparative cohort or matched group designs. These studies could involve identifying two distinct groups of patients: one engaging in collective decision-making and the other in individual decision-making. Researchers can then

track and compare post-transplant outcomes, such as recovery rates, adherence to medical regimens, and psychological well-being, across these groups. Moreover, the studies could stratify participants by additional variables, such as age, socioeconomic status, and transplant type, to examine how these factors interact with decision-making styles. Additionally, research should examine peer support models within immigrant communities, which may provide culturally competent guidance for navigating tensions between medical requirements and cultural obligations.

Finally, provider training programs should help transplant teams engage with families as collective units while protecting individual patient preferences. As Yates and de Oliveira (2016) demonstrate, understanding cultural frameworks for decision-making is essential for providing care that is both clinically effective and culturally respectful. Only by recognizing that the problem lies in the mismatch between healthcare system design and patient cultural frameworks can transplant medicine move toward truly equitable care for all patients, regardless of cultural background.

References

Rizzolo, K., Rockey, N., Camacho, C., Gardner, C., Giusti, S., & Cervantes, L. (2024). The transplant experience for undocumented immigrant patients formerly receiving emergency dialysis and caregivers. *JAMA Network Open*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10905299/

Serper, M., Nunes, D., Pillai, A. A., Ghabril, M. S., Nephew, L. D., Huang, D. Q., Wong, R. J., Kamath, P. S., Lieber, S. R., & VanWagner, L. B. (2023). Racial and ethnic disparities in psychosocial evaluation and liver transplant waitlisting. *American Journal of Transplantation*, *23*(5), 684–694. https://www.amjtransplant.org/article/S1600-6135(23)00233-2/fulltext

Yates, J. F., & de Oliveira, S. (2016). Culture and decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *136*, 106–118. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7126161/