Empathy, the ability to understand and share the feelings of another, is a fundamental aspect of patient care. Empathy shown by a health care professional to a patient, or ‘therapeutic empathy’, involves a) understanding the patient, b) communicating that understanding, and c) acting on that shared understanding in a helpful (therapeutic) way. This would suggest that to authentically communicate understanding, or act upon that understanding there must be the understanding within the health care professional.
outcomes for patients, such as reducing pain and anxiety.\textsuperscript{3} The second is patient adherence via the facilitation of information exchange, the growth of interpersonal trust and a sense of partnership.\textsuperscript{4} The third outcome is patient satisfaction, primarily through the strengthening of patient enablement and lowering of patient anxiety and distress,\textsuperscript{4} and the final outcome is a reduction in patients’ thoughts of litigation.\textsuperscript{5}

Evidence suggests current levels of empathy among medical students are suboptimal. Research measuring patient assessment of health professionals’ empathy using the CARE scale were pooled across 64 independent studies by Howick et al. (2017).\textsuperscript{6} The authors found that medical students and physicians had the lowest average empathy scores compared with other health care professionals. This is despite the fact that empathy training (often experiential and skills-based) tends to be effective.\textsuperscript{7}

Evidence suggests current levels of empathy among medical students are suboptimal.

Further evidence has suggested that medical students’ empathy declines as they progress from their first year of study to their final year and become junior doctors,\textsuperscript{8} although see Smith et al.\textsuperscript{9} Contributing factors include; a) a high volume of material to learn, b) time pressures, and c) a focus on the biomedical model of health and illness. Furthermore, when confronted with a clinical reality characterized by illness, human suffering and death, medical students may shift their focus from people to technology and objectivity.\textsuperscript{10} The focus on the biomedical model of illness and a shift in attention focus to technology and objectivity could potentially leave medical students at a disadvantage when thereafter trying to understand the patients’ perspective to base an empathetic response upon.

1.1 | Empathy maps – a novel approach

An ‘empathy map’ is a tool to assist understanding another’s perspective.

They were originally developed in a business environment to develop customer profiles.\textsuperscript{11} The empathy map synthesizes known information on an individual through the visualization of what he or she says, does, sees and hears. Further sections focus attention on the individuals’ worries, fears and frustrations, wants and needs and what makes them happy (See Figure 1). Those wishing to understand another’s perspective complete the empathy map from the perspective of that individual. An ‘empathy map’ is a tool to assist understanding another’s perspective.

The empathy map engages with the sensed, lived experience of an individual, alongside their cognitive and emotional world. Empathy maps therefore have the potential to aid medical students in their understanding of a patient’s perspective, the first component of therapeutic empathy. Furthermore, this understanding may
bring forth a sense of common humanity: that suffering is part of the shared human experience. This sense would enable medical students to appreciate that communicating empathy and acting upon it, may be useful within the doctor-patient relationship, enhancing the likelihood that the second and third components of therapeutic empathy occur. However, to date we are unaware of any research which has examined the use of empathy maps within medical education.

The empathy map engages with the sensed, lived experience of an individual, alongside their cognitive and emotional world.

1.1.1 | Aims

The aim of this study was to understand the impact of using empathy maps within medical education on student perception of empathy within the doctor-patient relationship. To enable this we addressed the following research questions:

The aim of this study was to understand the impact of using empathy maps within medical education.

1. How do patients and students currently experience empathy map training?
2. Is there an impact of empathy map training on student perceptions of empathy towards patients, and the doctor-patient relationship? If so, what do participants perceive is the mechanism of action?
3. Do patients and students have ideas as to how empathy map training could be improved?

2 | METHODS

First-year medical students and patient partners (current or former patients with a chronic illness who volunteer with medical teaching) from the Universities of St Andrews and Leicester who were taking part in training involving empathy maps were invited to take part in interviews. Sampling was purposive and opportunistic. Students were invited to interviews at three time points; just prior to, shortly afterwards and three months following the empathy map training. Patient partners were invited to interview shortly after the empathy map training. Ethics approval was granted by the University of Leicester and St Andrews School of Medicine Ethics Boards (MD14036).

2.1 | Empathy map training

In both institutions first-year students in a group of no more than nine took part in conversations with patient partners on topics such as the meaning of words like ‘patient’ and ‘health’ and what health care experiences the patient partner had. In St Andrews this conversation was a single face-to-face meeting, whilst in Leicester there was an initial face-to-face meeting followed by a year-long online discussion. After these conversations, students drew on their interpretations of what the patient partner had said to complete an empathy map for their patient partner as a group. In both institutions patient partners completed a map from their own perspective to allow students to make comparisons. Students were unaware of the content of the empathy map prior to completing it.

2.2 | Participants and Interviews

Twenty-eight participants in total agreed to be interviewed, ten male and eighteen female (see Table 1). This included twelve patient partners (five in St Andrews and seven in Leicester) and sixteen students (eight in St Andrews and eight in Leicester) totalling forty-eight interviews which were approximately fifty minutes in length. These semi-structured interviews, carried out by PC and IP, focused on participants’ views concerning empathy, patient-centred care and the use of empathy maps in medical training. EW, AL and AW developed the interview schedule. It was designed to prompt broad reflection of participants around areas of empathy and the doctor-patient relationship and as an evaluation of the empathy map training.

2.3 | Analysis

Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Transcripts were analysed qualitatively using framework analysis. We adopted a relativist ontology which accepted that the representation of things in the world is socially constructed and cannot be taken as a simple reflection of how things are. A selection of transcripts (students at each time point and patient partners) were read by three of the authors (PC, EW and AL) who then discussed the codes they drew from the data. Authors came from different training perspectives, health psychology, nursing and medical education respectively. This resulted in a refined set of codes, which could be compiled under broad themes. These codes were then applied to the rest of the dataset.
### 3 | RESULTS

Three main themes were constructed from the data (see Table 2 for themes and representative participant quotes). Firstly, both patient partners and students enjoyed the experience. Secondly, during interviews following the empathy map training students described how they had come to realise that greater empathic and patient-centred communication could lead to more trusting interactions and more accurate, personalized diagnoses and health care plans which were tailored to a patient’s life. Finally, patient partners and students had ideas as to how the empathy map training could be improved by adding instructions, defining the context of the map more clearly and additional empathy map sessions.

### 4 | DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest that empathy maps were a useful and enjoyable training tool for medical students. This research has limitations which should be considered. Our recruitment of medical students and patient partners for interview

### TABLE 1  Demographics of study participants

|                      | St Andrews |                      | Leicester |                      | Total       |
|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------|
|                      | Students   | Patient Partners    | Students  | Patient Partners    | Students    | Patient Partners |
| N                    | 8          | 5                    | 8         | 7                    | 16          | 12               |
| Average age          | 19.8 (2.25)| 65.8 (1.1)           | 21.1 (2.98)| 62.9 (13.3)         | 20.4 (2.8)  | 64.1 (10.3)      |
| Gender               | 5 F, 3 M   | 4 F, 1 M             | 4 F, 4 M  | 5 F, 2 M             | 9 F, 7 M    | 9 F, 3 M          |

Notes: Standard deviation in brackets. F = Female. M = Male.

### TABLE 2  Selection of quotes from students and patient partners relating to the themes drawn out during thematic analysis

| Theme                                           | Student Quote                                                                 | Patient Partner Quote                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Empathy map training experience                | ‘…yeah they’re really, really good. They’re a good piece, they’re a good induction tool for students in general. I don’t think just medical students, I think they’d be good for nurses and stuff as well, maybe dentists and pharmacists.’ - Stu_001_M_StA_T2 | ‘…we always come out saying that we enjoyed it, that it’s really valuable, that it’s nice to see them when they’re sort of shiny and new em, so yeah I think we all take something different out of it.’ - PP_005_F_StA |
| Impact of empathy map training on student perceptions of empathy towards patients, and the doctor-patient relationship. | ‘…if it weren’t for the empathy map I don’t think we would have the exchange with the patient, gotten to the situation, to the point where we realised that we’re not necessarily thinking exactly as the patient does…’ - Stu_002_M_Lei_T3 | ‘It impacted in the way that it showed how the doctor-patient relationship should be and how it should be a two-way conversation and how it should be the doctor listening to what the patient values, and how it influences what the doctor’s advice is and how they can coalesce that into a plan that works for both.’ - Stu_004_F_StA_T2
| How the empathy map training could be improved  | ‘Em, I think it might be slightly better if we had slightly longer at the end to go over the empathy maps, compare them and then have a facilitator just give us a platform to raise discussion with the group, all that we’d seen and all that we’d heard. Just a little bit more time to develop ideas and to hear what other people have to say.’ - Stu_005_F_StA_T2 | ‘I think maybe it would be interesting to have a subsequent one … it might be quite interesting to see whether students were more receptive to what patients were telling them at that time or actually become less so after their two or three years of their degree course.’ - PP_004_F_StA
was opportunistic and therefore the variety of views expressed may be narrower than those of the entire cohort. Those who agree to participate may be the most engaged.

Our findings tentatively agree with previous findings that empathy training can be effective and engaging. Further research is needed to assess whether empathy map training is effective at increasing empathy in medical students, and if so, to what degree. Exploration of the mechanisms of action of the empathy map training is also warranted.

**Exploration of the mechanisms of action of the empathy map training is warranted.**

The positive impact of the empathy map session was not greatly influenced by the main mode of interaction between students and patient partners (online or face-to-face) and lasted at least until the follow-up period three months following the teaching session. Therefore internet-based communication could prove useful in situations where face-to-face meetings are not possible. Minor modification suggestions to improve the empathy map experience focused on clarification of the activities within sessions and adding additional empathy map training to the curricula.

**5 | CONCLUSION**

This study examined the use of empathy map training with medical students. Students found the empathy map training engaging, perceived value in it and exhibited changes in perspectives as a result of the training. This shows that empathy maps could be a useful training tool to allow medical students to develop a more empathetic approach to health care.
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