BJPsych | The British Journal of Psychiatry (2026)
1–3. doi: 10.1192/bjp.2026.10730

Guest Editorial

Definitional invisibility: when institutional language reframes identity as choice

Nusrat E Mozid

Summary

Definitional invisibility is the systematic reframing of stable aspects of identity as temporary 'choices'. This Editorial explains how choice-framing distorts formulation, weakens the therapeutic alliance and sustains institutional inequities, and recommends concrete clinical, documentation and organisational strategies to reduce harm and improve person-centred care.

Keywords

Choice-framing; identity-framing; stigma; stereotype threat; person-centred care.

Copyright and usage

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Relevance statement

Definitional invisibility describes the routine relabelling of stable aspects of identity as temporary choices within clinical language and documentation. For practising psychiatrists, this framing systematically shifts causal attributions towards controllability, elevates surveillance and relapse-focused management, weakens therapeutic alliance and increases diagnostic overshadowing. Recognising and addressing definitional invisibility supports more accurate formulation, collaborative risk-planning and improved engagement across acute, liaison and community settings. Practical steps include mirroring patient self-descriptions, using identity-consistent wording in clinical notes, redesigning electronic health record intake prompts and incorporating language-focused supervision and audit. These low-cost actions promote equity, reduce unnecessary interventions and strengthen everyday clinical decision-making.

Definitional invisibility: when institutional language reframes identity as choice

Clinical language commonly reframes persistent personal attributes as voluntary behaviour. I term this practice definitional invisibility: the systematic mischaracterisation of enduring aspects of identity as temporary 'choices'. This concept complements attribution theory by identifying a prior linguistic step: the reframing of stable identity as choice, which can shape judgements of controllability, stability and responsibility. Whereas attribution bias concerns how causes are inferred, definitional invisibility concerns how the object of attribution is first constructed through language. This concept directly builds on recent editorials highlighting structural bias in clinical language: Cherney and Malhi emphasise how ableist rhetoric entrenches stigma,[1] and Arya demonstrates how presentist framings produce racially biased interpretations and interventions.[2] As an upstream linguistic process, this framing may shape subsequent causal attributions and clinical reasoning which, in turn, influence documentation, formulation and institutional responses. Choice-framing tends to treat attributes as negotiable and may contribute to attributions of responsibility, whereas identity-framing tends to treat them as stable and may invite accommodation. This is not merely semantic; framing can alter attention, memory, judgement and decision-making, and small lexical changes can shift clinical judgements.[3] Theoretical work on stigmatising language suggests that linguistic framing embedded in medical records can transmit bias and influence subsequent clinician attitudes and behaviours, contributing to disparities in care.[4]

Why wording matters for clinical reasoning

Language operates at multiple levels in clinical encounters. Psycholinguistic and decision-science evidence demonstrates that small lexical choices bias which hypotheses are considered by clinicians, which cues they attend to. They also influence which actions clinicians prefer.[5] For example, framing effects in health communication alter risk perception and adherence. At the interpersonal level, attributing controllability can shift moral judgements and helping behaviours. These mechanisms matter in psychiatry because psychiatric formulation, risk assessment and management planning are inferential tasks susceptible to framing. When an attribute is encoded in the record as a 'lifestyle choice' or 'abstinence', it primes a schema of volition and struggle. When the same attribute is recorded as part of self-identity, it activates a schema of stability and rights to accommodation. Thus, wording both reflects and drives the cognitive frames that shape clinical decisions.

Clinical consequences: formulation, risk and care trajectories

The primary clinical risk is distorted formulation. Labelling a lifelong non-drinker as 'abstinent' implies temporality and relapse risk, which may redirect attention from stable protective factors and social supports. This is one illustrative example of a broader pattern in which stable identity descriptors are reframed as temporary behavioural states in clinical documentation. Recognising a non-drinking identity can shift formulation towards accommodating environmental protections and collaborative risk-planning rather than relying on surveillance. Diagnostic overshadowing, misattributing new symptoms to an existing label, illustrates how salient frames occlude alternative hypotheses, delay diagnosis and produce harms in acute and liaison settings.[6]

Definitional invisibility can also shift management. Choice-framing can increase perceived volatility and reduce trust, often producing conservative, surveillance-focused plans (frequent checks, restrictive referrals, defensive documentation). Such responses may stigmatise patients and divert scarce resources. By contrast, identity-framing often produces an orientation towards accommodation, adjusting care processes to align with the patient's

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 20:32:54, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

self-presentation and needs. Both errors, over-medicalising an identity or under-responding to a needs-based presentation, carry harms. The pragmatic task for clinicians is to align language, hypothesis and intervention in ways that reduce false assumptions about controllability.

The clinician–patient relationship is sensitive to moral tone. Justificatory questions (e.g. 'Why did you choose not to drink?') can feel delegitimising and erode trust. Perceived controllability also reduces empathy and the propensity to help. These processes undercut therapeutic alliance, adherence and retention, particularly for patients whose experiences diverge from clinicians' normative expectations. Mirroring patients' self-descriptions and recording identity-consistent language reduce this dissonance and support engagement.[7]

Organisational dynamics and institutional language

Definitional invisibility is sustained when institutional artefacts embed choice-framed norms. Intake forms, electronic health record (EHR) templates, supervision proformas and appraisal language that default to leading options such as 'reason for abstinence' channel both patients and staff into tacitly normative frames. Performance appraisal fields that accept or encourage vague labels, such as 'needs more experience', create discretionary spaces in which competence is deferred rather than assessed on concrete criteria. These rhetorical practices operate as gatekeeping mechanisms: they delimit whose experiences count as legitimate and who must repeatedly justify themselves. Recent analyses of rhetoric and ableism show how linguistic practices can shape social perceptions in ways that devalue certain bodies and identities, contributing to stigma and discrimination.[8] Similar dynamics appear in studies demonstrating that documentation characterised by stigmatising language is more frequent in notes about patients from minoritised groups than in those about patients from dominant groups, suggesting that clinician documentation patterns can systematically differ across identity categories.[9]

Organisational culture moderates whether clinicians enact identity-consistent practice. Psychological safety, clear evaluative criteria, effective supervision and senior role modelling enable clinicians to mirror patient language and challenge inappropriate framing. Cultures that tolerate vague critique, penalise dissent or valorise rigid hierarchies can reproduce patterns of definitional invisibility. Evidence from workplace psychology shows that microaggressions, subtle exclusion and stereotype threat measurably impair performance, advocacy and retention; staff who are chronically discounted are less likely to challenge misframing or to advocate for patients whose identities fall outside normative expectations.

Ethical, legal and equity implications

Clinical notes are durable legal and social documents. Words recorded today can shape future care, insurance decisions, social services eligibility and medico-legal outcomes. Mischaracterising identity as a temporary choice can expose patients to inappropriate interventions, discrimination or denial of services. Ethically, clinicians are bound by duties of veracity, respect for persons and non-maleficence. Linguistically misrepresenting identity risks violating these duties and perpetuating systemic inequities. From an equity perspective, choice-framing disproportionately burdens those outside dominant social norms, including marginalised gender and sexual identities, non-normative relationship configurations and culturally distinct health behaviours.

Practical, low-cost interventions

Several pragmatic strategies can be implemented immediately to address definitional invisibility in clinical practice. These target documentation, assessment, clinician training and attention to populations particularly vulnerable to misframing. The most immediate clinician-level changes centre on three practices: mirroring patient self-description, replacing justificatory questions and aligning assessment with patient-described identities. Clinicians should mirror patients' self-descriptions in both conversation and documentation rather than impose choice-framed language that implies temporality or struggle. For example, documenting 'patient describes themselves as a non-drinker' preserves the stability of identity whereas 'patient abstains from alcohol' implies a temporary choice and potential relapse. Similar patterns may apply across other identity domains, including gender identity, cultural practices and neurodiversity. Questions that require justification, such as 'Why did you choose not to drink?', may be experienced as interrogative and delegitimising and should be replaced with open-ended prompts such as 'Can you tell me more about what this means for you?', to encourage patients to elaborate on their experiences without suggesting evaluation or doubt. Documentation should consistently reflect identity-consistent descriptors for stable traits, including health behaviours, cultural practices and gender or sexual identities.

Aligning assessment and formulation with patient-described identities helps prevent misattribution and unnecessary monitoring. Framing a lifelong non-drinking pattern as a stable identity directs attention towards collaboration, environmental accommodations and protective-factor exploration rather than narrowly focusing on relapse prevention. Explicitly documenting assumptions and reasoning can enhance transparency and safeguard against cognitive biases that distort formulation, risk assessment or diagnostic interpretation. Identity-consistent framing also reduces the risk of diagnostic overshadowing, ensuring that new or concurrent symptoms are evaluated on their own merits rather than being attributed to previously salient labels.

Training should teach definitional invisibility and framing effects through experiential exercises (role-play, case-based work) and audit-and-feedback cycles that highlight choice-framing patterns. Supervision must give concrete, measurable feedback to foster psychological safety and empower clinicians to challenge inappropriate framing.

Definitional invisibility may disproportionately affect patients whose identities or experiences diverge from dominant social norms, including marginalised gender and sexual identities, culturally minoritised groups, neurodiverse patients and individuals with non-normative lifestyle or health behaviours. Certain clinical contexts, such as acute care, liaison psychiatry or high-stakes risk-assessment settings, are particularly sensitive to misframing, because rapid judgements and hierarchical pressures can amplify the consequences of choice-framed documentation. Recognising these vulnerabilities allows clinicians to prioritise identity-consistent practice where it matters most, improving therapeutic alliance, adherence and equitable care delivery.

Embedding changes in EHR design, intake templates, supervision protocols and audits reinforces consistent practice: open-ended prompts, routine language review and senior role modelling normalise identity-consistent recording and reduce stigma. At the service level, the priority is to embed these practices into

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 20:32:54, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

documentation systems, supervision and audit processes. Together, these approaches provide a practical framework for reducing definitional invisibility, strengthening therapeutic relationships and improving the accuracy and appropriateness of clinical decision-making.

To be credible, interventions must be measurable. Services can define process indicators such as the proportion of notes using patient-mirrored language, the frequency of recorded justificatory probes, the prevalence of vague evaluative phrasing in appraisals and the number of notes that initiate surveillance pathways. Outcome indicators should include patient-reported experience measures of perceived validation and alliance, appointment attendance and drop-out rates, rates of diagnostic revision attributable to corrective assessments, and staff measures of psychological safety and advocacy behaviour. Where feasible, triangulation of routine data, patient surveys and qualitative interviews will clarify mechanisms and highlight unintended consequences.

Research and evaluation priorities

Conceptual clarity requires empirical testing across settings and populations. Key questions include whether intentional changes in clinician language may improve therapeutic alliance, adherence and attendance; whether identity-consistent documentation reduces diagnostic overshadowing or unnecessary monitoring; which educational interventions produce durable clinician behaviour change; and which organisational levers, such as audit, supervision and EHR prompts, most reliably embed practice change. Mixed-methods designs and pragmatic implementation trials are appropriate given the complex, context-sensitive nature of clinical practice. Work on automated detection of stigmatising wording shows promise for scalable audits, but must be linked to rigorous outcome research before wide deployment.

Illustrative vignette

Two clinicians record the same presentation differently. Entry A: 'Patient abstains from alcohol and reports resisting drinking despite social pressure.' Entry B: 'Patient describes themselves as a non-drinker.' Entry A primes management focused on relapse prevention, monitoring and motivational interventions. Entry B prompts inquiry into social supports, identity-consistent resources and collaborative safety planning. The lexical difference is small; the clinical pathways it triggers are not.

Definitional invisibility is a discursive mechanism that reproduces power by rendering some realities negotiable and others invisible. Psychiatry's remit includes stewarding clinical language, as well as diagnosing and treating. Small, feasible changes in how clinicians ask, record and reflect patient self-descriptions are low-cost and ethically consonant with person-centred care. Implementing these changes will require modest adjustments to training, documentation and governance, alongside empirical evaluation. The potential gains, including improved diagnostic accuracy, stronger therapeutic alliances and fewer unnecessary interventions, make this a practical agenda for contemporary psychiatric practice.

Nusrat E Mozid, MD, MPH, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, New York University School of Global Public Health, New York, New York, USA; and Department of Health and Kinesiology, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, Illinois, USA

Email: nm4258@nyu.edu.

First received 9 Feb 2026 UTC, final revision 20 Apr 2026 UTC, accepted 31 May 2026 UTC

Data availability

Data availability does not apply to this article because no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of interest

None.

References

1 Cherney JL, Malhi GS. Stigma and the pejorative use of disabling conditions. *Br J Psychiatry* 2025: **226**: 197–9.

2 Arya R. Racism in psychiatry and the case of presentism. *Br J Psychiatry* 2024: **225**: 471–2.

3 Flusberg SJ, Holmes KJ, Thibodeau PH, Nabi RL, Matlock T. The psychology of framing: how everyday language shapes the way we think, feel, and act. *Psychol Sci Public Interest* 2024: **25**: 105–61.

4 Park J, Saha S, Chee B, Taylor J, Beach MC. Physician use of stigmatizing language in patient medical records. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021: **4**: e2117052.

5 Goddu A P, O'Conor KJ, Lanzkron S, Saheed MO, Saha S, Peek ME, et al. Stigmatizing language and the transmission of bias in the medical record. *J Gen Intern Med* 2018: **33**: 685–91.

6 Barcelona V, Scharp D, Idnay BR, Moen H, Cato K, Topaz M. Identifying stigmatizing language in clinical documentation: a scoping review of emerging literature. *PLOS One* 2024: **19**: e0303653.

7 Healy M, Richard A, Kidia K. How to reduce stigma and bias in clinical communication: a narrative review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022: **37**: 2533–40.

8 Link BG, Phelan JC. Conceptualizing stigma. *Annu Rev Sociol* 2001: **27**: 363–85.

9 Himmelstein G, Bates D, Zhou L. Examination of stigmatizing language in the electronic health record. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022: **5**: e2144967.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 20:32:54, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.