

1 **TITLE: Enhancing system empathy within a UK Emergency Department: A feasibility**  
2 **interprofessional priority setting exercise**

3  
4 **Running Title: Enhancing empathy in emergency departments**

5  
6 **Authors: Jeremy Howick<sup>1\*</sup>, Andy Ward<sup>1</sup>, Charlotte Grantham<sup>2</sup>, Amber Bennett-Weston<sup>1</sup>**

7  
8 **Affiliations:**

- 9 1. Stoneygate Centre for Empathic Healthcare, Leicester Medical School, George  
10 Davies Centre, Lancaster Road, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK, LE1 7HA
- 11 2. University Hospitals Leicester NHS Trust, Infirmary Square, Leicester LE1 5WW

12  
13 **\* Corresponding author:** Jeremy Howick

14  
15 **Address for correspondence:** Jeremy Howick, Stoneygate Centre for Empathic Healthcare,  
16 Leicester Medical School, George Davies Centre, Lancaster Road, University of Leicester,  
17 Leicester, UK, LE1 7HA, email: [jh815@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:jh815@leicester.ac.uk)

18  
19 **Keywords:** empathy, hospital management, leadership, interprofessional

20  
21 **Acknowledgements:** Catherine Eyres (CE) and Catherine Nunn (CN) organised the  
22 workshop. CE collected some data and proofread the article.

23  
24 **Funding:** Stoneygate Trust

25  
26 **Conflict of interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article to  
27 disclose.

28  
29 **Ethics:** Institutional review board approval was not obtained as the study was a report of an  
30 educational leadership workshop.

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Background:** System-level barriers inhibit empathy in healthcare, and this can harm patients  
33 and practitioners. The barriers include burnout-inducing administrative workloads,  
34 burdensome protocols, lack of wellbeing spaces, un-empathic leadership, and not emphasising  
35 empathy as an institutional value. A workshop aimed at enhancing empathic systems was  
36 successfully delivered in Canada but has not been tested in the UK National Health Service  
37 (NHS) setting.

38

39 **Aim:** To test the feasibility of an empathic systems workshop within the UK NHS setting.

40

41 **Methods:** We conducted an interprofessional group of an emergency department (ED). We  
42 used a modified nominal group technique to prioritise actions to enhance empathy in the ED  
43 system. Satisfaction with the workshop and confidence that the workshop would lead to change  
44 were measured on a 10-point Likert scale.

45

46 **Results:** Twenty-eight participants representing the following stakeholder groups attended the  
47 workshop: leaders, consultants, nurses, security, and porters. The group agreed to generating a  
48 better wellbeing action plan and implementing an effective secondary triage system. Seventy-  
49 three percent (73%) rated their satisfaction with the workshop as 8 or higher out of ten, and  
50 63% reported being confident that the workshop would lead to positive change.

51

52 **Limitations:** A doctors strike limited the range of stakeholders who were able to attend, and  
53 long-term follow up was not conducted.

54

55 **Conclusions:** Participants in a UK setting were satisfied with a previously developed system  
56 empathy workshop and reported being confident that it would lead to positive change.  
57 Participants were able to prioritise changes that would improve system empathy and were  
58 confident that the changes would be effective.

59

60

61 **KEYWORDS:** empathy, hospital, healthcare systems, interprofessional, communication,  
62 healthcare

## 63 1 INTRODUCTION

64 The Ockenden, Francis, and Kirkup reports into the fatal tragedies within NHS hospitals  
65 concluded that lack of empathy (often defined as caring action with interpersonal  
66 understanding<sup>1</sup>) contributed to hundreds of avoidable deaths.<sup>2-4</sup> Similar findings have been  
67 reported in the US.<sup>5</sup> Lack of empathy has been shown to increase the risk of medical errors,<sup>6</sup>  
68 patient complaints,<sup>7</sup> and medico-legal risks.<sup>8</sup> Meanwhile, patients who are treated by empathic  
69 practitioners have better outcomes, ranging from satisfaction with care to pain and quality of  
70 life.<sup>8</sup> Contrary to what is sometimes assumed, empathy can be taught.<sup>9</sup>

71  
72 Empathy in healthcare has often been discussed in the context of “relational empathy,” between  
73 patients and practitioners.<sup>10</sup> However, busy and overworked practitioners may not have time  
74 for empathy training (or, if they do take time, the increased workload could add stress to an  
75 already stressful job).<sup>11</sup> Stress, in turn, stifles the ability to relate, understand, and empathise.<sup>12</sup>  
76 Practitioners also work with often inefficient and confusing electronic health records systems<sup>13-</sup>  
77 <sup>15</sup> that take up half of their time,<sup>16</sup> managerialism,<sup>17</sup> and a culture where bullying is common<sup>18</sup>  
78 and empathy is lacking.<sup>19</sup> These problems are exacerbated by increasingly dissatisfied  
79 patients<sup>20</sup> who may have been greeted by an unwelcoming receptionist<sup>21</sup> and made to wait for  
80 their appointment for an unacceptably long time.

81  
82 In short, healthcare practitioners operate within a system which can either foster or dampen  
83 empathy between themselves and their patients.<sup>22</sup> For empathy to thrive, the system must be  
84 conducive to it.<sup>22</sup>

85  
86 To promote empathic systems, an interprofessional workshop was conducted at a hospital in  
87 Canada.<sup>23</sup> That workshop led to changes including more welcoming spaces and linked patient  
88 appointments.<sup>24</sup> However, that workshop has not been adopted for a UK setting.

89  
90 **1.1 Aims and objectives**  
91 The overall aim of this workshop was to test whether a system empathy workshop conducted  
92 in Canada was feasible in an UK National Health Service (NHS) setting. The aims of the  
93 original workshop<sup>23</sup> were (1) to identify barriers and facilitators to empathic care within a  
94 specific system; (2) to identify and prioritise changes that would improve the degree of

95 empathy within the system; and (3) to develop and commit to a strategy for making the  
96 prioritised changes. Our workshop had the same aims.

97

98 To test whether the workshop was feasible, we collected feedback regarding the satisfaction of  
99 the workshop, confidence regarding whether the workshop would lead to positive change, and  
100 what participants would improve about the workshop.

101

## 102 2 METHODS

103 Institutional review board approval was not obtained as the study was a report of an educational  
104 leadership workshop. We used relevant items from the Reporting guideline for priority setting  
105 of health research with stakeholders (REPRISE) to report this study.<sup>25</sup> See supplementary Table  
106 1 for a completed REPRISE checklist.

107

### 108 2.1 Underpinning theories of change

109 The workshop was underpinned by the nominal group technique, deep interdisciplinarity and  
110 stakeholder engagement, blue sky thinking, prioritisation, and urgency. While none of these  
111 are unique individually, we are not aware of them being combined.

112

#### 113 2.1.1 Nominal group technique

114 The nominal group technique is recommended by REPRISE as an efficient way to identify and  
115 generate consensus on priorities in healthcare.<sup>26 27</sup> It involves structured group brainstorming  
116 that encourages participation from all participants.<sup>28</sup> Quantitative and qualitative data are  
117 combined by having participants write down their ideas, voting on the ideas they believe are  
118 best.

119

#### 120 2.1.2 Deep interdisciplinarity and stakeholder engagement

121 Organisational change appears to be more effective when stakeholders (including all  
122 employees) are the agents of change.<sup>29</sup> This is contrasted with the common top-down initiatives  
123 from central bodies such as the NHS or government. Top-down initiatives reflect a managerial  
124 leadership model which can exacerbate disunity,<sup>30</sup> increase stress,<sup>31</sup> and reduce empathy.<sup>2 3</sup>  
125 Despite interprofessionalism being promoted,<sup>32</sup> the involvement of a wide range of  
126 stakeholders has rarely been adopted in priority setting exercises.<sup>33</sup> Additionally, insofar as  
127 interprofessionalism is adopted, it often excludes ancillary staff and managers.<sup>34</sup> This is a

128 mistake because receptionists,<sup>35 36</sup> cleaners,<sup>37</sup> porters, security guards,<sup>38-40</sup> and others can  
129 influence patient experience and empathy,<sup>41 42</sup> as well as other system-level changes.<sup>43</sup> Leading  
130 managers are important stakeholders for ensuring credibility and acceptability of uptake.<sup>44 45</sup>  
131 These leaders have more power to implement changes,<sup>46</sup> and involving them in a diverse group  
132 of stakeholders helps to break down the “us versus them” barrier to effective change.<sup>47</sup> Finally,  
133 especially in the healthcare setting, including patient perspectives and voices is considered a  
134 duty as well as a useful way to generate suggestions that will improve patient care.<sup>48-50</sup> While  
135 we hoped to have patient representatives in our workshop, the context prevented this (see  
136 limitations).

137

### 138 2.1.3 Blue sky thinking

139 Leaders and researchers sometimes report that they lack the time, space, or inclination to  
140 generate creative solutions to problems.<sup>51</sup> Blue sky thinking frees people from normal  
141 constraints to encourage creativity, and helps shift the focus from problems towards solutions.<sup>52</sup>

142

### 143 2.1.4 Prioritisation and commitment

144 The adage that if everything is important, nothing is important holds true for effective  
145 organisational change.<sup>53</sup> Yet, calls for organisational change often include dozens (or more)  
146 quality improvement recommendations. To wit, the 2013 Francis Report contained 290  
147 recommendations,<sup>3</sup> and nearly a decade later, the Ockenden<sup>2</sup> report contained 15 “immediate  
148 and essential” recommendations. Unsurprisingly, there is a lack of evidence that any of the  
149 recommendations have been successfully implemented.<sup>54</sup> While providing a long list of  
150 recommendations may appear comprehensive, without clear priorities it is hard to know where  
151 to start and efforts become diluted to the point of ineffectiveness. This, in turn, can create  
152 frustration and a sense of helplessness.

153

154 Failure to prioritise also suggests lack of rigour. From a long list of recommendations, some  
155 will have a bigger effect than others. Indeed, some may leverage large and far-reaching effects  
156 (“power law” initiatives).<sup>55</sup> By contrast, choosing just one, two, or three priorities that  
157 stakeholders believe will have the biggest effect focuses hearts and minds on making  
158 progress.<sup>56</sup> In addition to prioritising, it is important to get stakeholders to commit. Research  
159 suggests that people are more likely to remain committed to something if they explicitly  
160 commit to it, for example by writing it down on paper.<sup>57</sup>

161

### 162 2.1.5 Creating a sense of urgency

163 Having long-term visions for major initiatives is good. However, once the priorities have been  
164 set and there is a plan in place, it is important to set an ambitious timeline that prevents people  
165 from being able to procrastinate. This timeframe is often between 6 and 12 months.<sup>29 53</sup> Another  
166 reason for using short timelines is that it reduces the risk of unanticipated events that can derail  
167 the project.<sup>55</sup> These events can include anything from key leaders changing jobs, to pandemics.  
168 The shorter the timeframe, the less risk there is of these events derailing the project.

169

## 170 2.2 Details of workshop

### 171 2.2.1 Participants

172 The participants worked in the Emergency Department (ED) within the University Hospitals  
173 of Leicester (UHL). The context of this workshop involved junior doctor strikes and ensuing  
174 pressure on all staff, which limited the ability to choose a completely representative sample of  
175 stakeholders. Participants were therefore a convenience sample chosen by the lead of the ED.

176

### 177 2.2.2 Healthcare setting

178 We chose the ED because a patient's journey through the hospital often begins with the  
179 emergency department. At a time of high stress and emotion for the patient and their loved  
180 ones, this chaotic and overwhelming environment can set a negative first impression of their  
181 care to come. Several factors that impact the patient's experience of care in ED include  
182 overcrowding, lack of privacy, busy and overworked practitioners, all of which can result in  
183 dissatisfied patients.<sup>58</sup> This makes EDs places where an impact can be made.<sup>59</sup>

184

### 185 2.2.3 Workshop setting

186 The workshop was held at a central location with convenient access for attendees. It was  
187 conducted during working hours as part of attendees' allocated training time, and refreshments  
188 and lunch were provided.

189

### 190 2.2.4 Workshop conduct

191 Two experienced facilitators (AW, JH) conducted the session, and participants were seated at  
192 tables in groups of 5-6 people. Participants were made aware that the scope of the workshop  
193 was "system empathy," for which a definition was provided.<sup>24</sup> Systemic factors were explained  
194 to include external environmental factors, organisational factors, physical environment, job

195 factors, and individual characteristics.<sup>24</sup> The small groups then participated in five exercises  
196 (see Table 1).

197

198 1. **System level barriers.** In the first exercise participants were asked to consider the  
199 system-level barriers to empathic healthcare that they faced.

200 2. **Empathic healthcare in an ideal world.** The group then considered the system-level  
201 facilitators of empathic healthcare. To encourage “blue sky thinking,” the groups were  
202 asked to imagine the ideal situation in their department – a situation where they were  
203 given access to unlimited resources and power to make their department more empathic.  
204 Each table was given 15 minutes and tasked to produce a poster to summarise their  
205 ideas with a prize for the best.

206 3. **Empathic healthcare in your setting.** Next, participants considered how to overcome  
207 barriers and facilitate empathic healthcare in their team and setting. The first exercise  
208 required them to think practically about actions they could take, being ambitious but  
209 pragmatic. They were asked to write their individual ideas onto sticky notes and add  
210 them to a flipchart in the centre of their table. Participants were then encouraged to read  
211 the other groups’ ideas and copy any that they thought should be added to their own  
212 flipchart.

213 4. **Prioritisation.** A modified nominal group technique was used to prioritise the ideas on  
214 each table with the aim of narrowing down to a small number (up to three) priorities  
215 that could be achieved within the next six to 12 months. Each participant was given  
216 three yellow stickers to add to the sticky notes with their top-rated ideas. In the next  
217 round of voting, everyone was given a single green sticker to apply to their top priority.  
218 Interventions on each table with the greatest number of green stickers were chosen for  
219 implementation.

220 5. **Implementation plans.** Finally, each small group developed plans for how to  
221 implement, encourage, and measure progress for the chosen interventions. These were  
222 recorded on SMART Action Plan templates (provided) with a named person made  
223 responsible for implementing each. The action plans were then shared and discussed  
224 with the larger group.

225

226 At the end, participants were also provided with postcards where they could write what they  
227 were willing to commit to do individually to make the department more empathic. The  
228 postcards were collected and then mailed to the participants a week later as a reminder of their

229 commitment. Throughout the process, participant engagement was cultivated with an  
230 icebreaking exercise, a caption competition (with a prize), short humorous video clips, active  
231 breaks and an optional meditation session.

232

### 233 [2.3 Data Collection](#)

234 Data collection was done by a note taker with a medical background. This data was supported  
235 by transcribed pictures of the flipcharts used by the participants to write their ideas.

236

### 237 [2.4 Analysis](#)

238 A recent study used the human factors approach to specify the features of an empathic  
239 healthcare system.<sup>60</sup> They divided the factors into external environmental factors (such as the  
240 way in which healthcare practitioners are reimbursed), organisational factors (such as  
241 empathic leadership), physical and technical environment (whether there are healing spaces),  
242 job factors (such as sensible workload), and individual characteristics (such as wellbeing).  
243 We used this framework to categorise the facilitators and barriers (see Table 2).

244

### 245 [2.5 Evaluation](#)

246 Participants were asked to complete a short online survey at the end of the workshop to  
247 evaluate their satisfaction with the session and their confidence that it would improve  
248 teamworking in the ED. The survey included an adapted 'Friends and Family Test' question,  
249 which asked participants whether they would recommend the ED as a place to work *if* they  
250 were to implement their learning from the workshop.

251

## 252 [3 RESULTS](#)

### 253 [3.1 Participants Characteristics](#)

254 Twenty-eight participants from the following groups took part: consultants (n=1), nurses  
255 (n=20), administrators (n=5), and porters (n=2).

256

### 257 [3.2 Barriers to Empathic Care](#)

258 Participants listed six main barriers to empathy in the ED setting: stress, communication,  
259 patient expectations, lack of resources, lack of empathy training, and challenging external  
260 targets (see Table 2).

261



262 **Stress:** All participants agreed that the ED was an intense environment to work in. They also  
263 noted that anxiety and stress left little emotional “bandwidth” for clinical and non-clinical staff  
264 to communicate empathically with patients.

265

266 **Communication skills training:** Whilst some professional groups had received  
267 communication skills training, this was not universal, and it was felt that all staff at all levels  
268 could benefit. Communication with patients, colleagues and professionals outside the  
269 department were identified as areas for development.

270

271 **Patients’ (unrealistic) expectations:** Many participants in the workshop noted that high public  
272 expectations put added pressure and emotional strain on a system already working beyond  
273 capacity. The increase in media coverage of NHS services and social media attention over the  
274 years could be a contributing factor.

275

276 **Lack of resources:** The participants noted a lack of human resources as well as infrastructure  
277 resources (including space and equipment). This led to overcrowding and a comparatively  
278 tumultuous environment that made empathy between patients and both clinical and non-clinical  
279 staff difficult.

280

281 **Lack of protected training time:** Whereas the benefits of training (including empathy  
282 training) were acknowledged, it was noted that staff did not have time to attend teaching or  
283 training opportunities. This led to a feeling of being undervalued and underinvested. This was  
284 especially acute for trainees. The feeling of being undervalued led to lower staff satisfaction,  
285 which participants found stood in the way of patient-practitioner empathy.

286

287 **Challenging external targets:** Managerial pressures to reach targets such as wait time  
288 targets. These targets contributed to all the barriers listed above, including stress, poor  
289 communication, the feeling that there is not enough resource, and insufficient time for training.

290

### 291 [3.3 Empathic care in an ideal world](#)

292 For factors that could improve system empathy, unrestricted by resources, workshop  
293 participants listed the following six: on-site pharmacy, displaying waiting times, triage of  
294 frequent attenders, secondary triage, a wellbeing group, and volunteering.

295

296 **On-site pharmacy:** It was believed that having an on-site pharmacy would lead to a  
297 smoother discharge and improved adherence, which might reduce the number of avoidable  
298 repeat visits due to failure to take medication.

299

300 **Display waiting times:** It was claimed that patients often complain about not knowing how  
301 long they might have to wait. Dissatisfied patients, in turn, could become “difficult” and less  
302 easy to communicate with (empathically).

303

304 **Appropriate triage of people who attend the department frequently:** Participants  
305 specified a disproportionate number of ED visits were from frequent attenders. This patient  
306 cohort often experiences multiple disadvantages and have complex social needs that are  
307 challenging or sometimes inappropriate to address in an acute care setting. It was believed  
308 that if this cohort could be triaged more appropriately and signposted to appropriate  
309 community services, they would receive care that would help to avoid acute admission. For  
310 example, people experiencing homelessness with complex social needs could be directed to  
311 local charities for support with housing, food, clothing and addiction services if this was more  
312 appropriate for their presenting issues.

313

314 **Secondary triage:** Some participants suggested that secondary triage would be appropriate  
315 for reducing waiting times.

316

317 **Improved wellbeing:** It was believed that wellbeing could be improved with a better  
318 wellbeing programme for both clinical and non-clinical staff. It was agreed that there were  
319 various wellbeing initiatives in the hospital, but staff were not always aware of them and,  
320 insofar as they were aware, found them to be lacking.

321

322 **Volunteering:** Several participants made the others aware of the health benefits of  
323 volunteering and proposed that more opportunities to volunteer would be beneficial.

324

### 325 **3.4 Priorities**

326 Following the prioritisation exercise, two initiatives were prioritised, and participants agreed  
327 to take them forward: a wellbeing subgroup, and secondary triage. A subgroup of participants

328 agreed to meet to consolidate what was offered by UHL and how it could be better  
329 communicated. A senior consultant who attended the workshop agreed to research the most  
330 effective and evidence-based ways to introduce secondary triage.

331

### 332 3.5 Analysis

333 The barriers and facilitators fell into a range of categories of system level factors that affect  
334 empathy. Challenging external targets, lack of resources, and patients' (unrealistic)  
335 expectations are *external environmental factors*, failure to provide empathic communication  
336 skills training and lack of protected training time are *job factors* and stress an *individual factor*.  
337 Of the facilitators, three (displaying waiting times, triage of frequent attenders, and secondary  
338 triage) could be classified as *organisational factors*, one as part of the *physical and technical*  
339 environment (on-site pharmacy), and two (wellbeing, volunteering) as *individual*  
340 *characteristics*. Despite noting that several external environmental factors and job factors were  
341 barriers, none of the proposed facilitators mentioned these. This could be because many of the  
342 external environmental factors are out of the participants' control. Also, whereas none of the  
343 barriers listed were related to the physical and technical environment, many of the proposals  
344 were. The mismatch could have been due to the limitations, such as potential over-  
345 representation from senior consultants.

346

### 347 3.6 Survey Results

348 Nineteen out of the 28 participants (68%) filled in the feedback survey and consented to have  
349 their responses published (Table 3). Most (14/19, 73%) of the participants rated their  
350 satisfaction with the workshop at 8 or higher out of 10. Twelve (63%) reported being confident  
351 that the system and teamwork would improve because of the workshop. All (100%) of  
352 participants answered 'yes' when asked if they would recommend the ED to their friends and  
353 family as a place to work, if they were to successfully implement their learning from the  
354 workshop.

355

356 In the written feedback, there was an overall theme of appreciation for the opportunity to  
357 interact with colleagues in different roles from across the ED. Participants explained that this  
358 helped to establish "...concerns and themes of improvement" required to enhance team  
359 working and create a more empathic system. Participants also valued the "enthusiasm" of the  
360 facilitators, by whom they felt empowered to make changes in their workplace. For future  
361 sessions, it was suggested that greater consideration could be given to the specific challenges

362 faced by staff in the ED. Relatedly, one participant expressed a need for “increased appreciation  
363 of financial and bureaucratic limitations.” Anecdotally, from participants’ verbal feedback  
364 during the course, the humorous videos and energetic demeanour of facilitators helped with  
365 engagement.

366

## 367 4 DISCUSSION

### 368 4.1 Summary of findings

369 A successful and well-received workshop was delivered to members of a large hospital  
370 department in the UK that has the potential to enhance the empathy of the system in which they  
371 work.

372

### 373 4.2 Comparison with other evidence

374 A similar workshop was conducted at a children’s hospital in Montreal, Canada.<sup>23</sup> Both  
375 workshops were similar in that they were be feasible and enjoyed by participants. Also, some  
376 of the barriers to empathy were shared (stress, lack of communication skills training). However,  
377 whereas participants in this workshop listed (unrealistic) patients’ expectations, lack of  
378 protected training time, and challenging external targets, the participants in the Canadian  
379 workshop listed other barriers (inefficient technology, paperwork, complexity of patients, need  
380 to train new doctors, cold and unwelcoming infrastructure, and failure to acknowledge the  
381 importance of empathy). Relatedly, while several facilitators were shared (the need for staff  
382 wellbeing support), the participants in the Canadian workshop mentioned other facilitators that  
383 were not mentioned in the workshop described above (embedding empathy as an institutional  
384 goal, offering incentives for empathic care, brighter and more open spaces, additional time for  
385 trainees, more interdisciplinarity, more admin staff, and patient-centred technology). These  
386 differences are to be expected given the different contexts. In fact, a strength of the workshop  
387 is that stakeholders from organisations develop priorities that are specific to their setting. In  
388 this way, variation is expected, and most likely to be an advantage as it evidences that the  
389 participants have generated a bespoke, context-specific strategy.

390

391 All the barriers identified by our participants have been noted in the literature. Specifically,  
392 stress and burnout are widespread and increasing,<sup>61</sup> and a likely barrier to empathy.<sup>62</sup> Patients’  
393 expectations have changed, and some have noted that patients’ rights may currently be over-  
394 emphasised in comparison with patient responsibilities.<sup>24</sup> Unsurprisingly, a study showed that

395 lack of resources diminished the quality of care,<sup>63</sup> although adding resources to a system that  
396 does not manage resources well has will not solve the problem.<sup>64</sup> and could even make it  
397 worse.<sup>65</sup> Finally, external targets such as the Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) is often  
398 listed as something that gets in the way of practitioners focusing on patients,<sup>66 67</sup> although it  
399 has been shown to improve many patient outcomes.<sup>68</sup>

400

401 Relatedly, the workshop participants' suggestion to include pharmacies within the department  
402 is supported by evidence. For example, while the American College of Emergency Physicians  
403 recommends that clinical pharmacists be located within emergency departments,<sup>69</sup> the  
404 recommendation is often not followed, and the evidence that in house clinical pharmacists  
405 improve wait times are constantly reported amongst literature as one of the greatest factors  
406 impacting their ED experience.<sup>58</sup> One study found that time spent waiting before a consultation  
407 negatively impacts patient-reported empathy scores.<sup>70</sup> Relatedly, patients perceive displaying  
408 wait times as positive and needed.<sup>71</sup> Triage of frequent attenders has also been noted as  
409 important. Roughly one in five of all ED visits are from frequent attenders,<sup>72</sup> and this patient  
410 group often feels that healthcare professionals lack empathy and downplay their needs. A lack  
411 of empathy increased frequent attenders' stress levels and reduced patient satisfaction.<sup>73</sup>

412

413 The patient benefits of improving triage have been noted in a systematic review of 50 primary  
414 studies,<sup>74</sup> and triage is often susceptible to improvement.<sup>75</sup> Hence, the prioritisation of  
415 secondary triage seems likely to bear fruit.

416

417 Volunteering within a healthcare setting has several benefits for the mental and physical  
418 health of the volunteer. A volunteering scheme for medical and nursing students in US has  
419 shown an increase in empathy levels, the development of new perspectives on the patient  
420 experience, improved confidence in patient communication, a stronger professional identity  
421 and a rewarding experience.<sup>76</sup> The value of volunteering is reflected in healthcare policies  
422 such as the NHS Long-term plan and NHS workforce plan. Relatedly, the participants'  
423 suggestion to focus on improved wellbeing is reflected in key guidance documents. For  
424 example, the Royal College of Emergency Medicine recently released their 2024 key  
425 recommendations for Retention and Workforce Wellbeing in Emergency Care.<sup>77</sup> This  
426 includes recommendations on physical environment, protected study time, culture change to  
427 more compassionate leadership, inter-professional valuing and respect.

428

### 429 4.3 Strengths and limitations

430 Strengths of our research included collaboration between academia and healthcare  
431 practitioners, and “deep interdisciplinarity.” This was achieved by having a multi-disciplinary  
432 team. Our workshop and study also had some limitations. While the individuals within the  
433 workshop were representatives from a variety of stakeholders, successful implementation of  
434 the recommended changes would be further promoted by an even wider participation and  
435 targeted groups. In our workshop, there was only one senior consultant and no patient  
436 representatives. Future iterations of this workshop should involve more targeted selection of  
437 participants from a wider range of stakeholders. Another weakness is that long-term outcomes  
438 were not measured.

439

### 440 4.4 Recommendations for future research and practice

441 The workshop must be modified to account for the feedback received. Specifically, empathy-  
442 focused activities could be introduced, and facilitators with more experience in the particular  
443 setting would improve the credibility and buy-in from participants.

444

445 Further research is required in several areas. First, long-term outcomes of the system empathy  
446 workshop must be measured. Second, the theory underpinning system empathy should be  
447 further explored, perhaps informed by reverse engineering this training. Relatedly, a  
448 framework for system empathy should be developed to facilitate measuring and  
449 implementing system empathy at other institutions.

450

### 451 4.5 Conclusion

452 Empathic encounters between patients and practitioners in the hospital setting should not be  
453 experienced as a luck of the draw, but something that patients can count on to have throughout  
454 their journey. The most needed initiatives to provide systemic empathy at our tertiary  
455 emergency department were increasing the number of welcome volunteers, introducing an on-  
456 site pharmacy and implementing a secondary triage service.

457

### 458 **Grant information**

459 JH, AW, and ABW are supported by the Stoneygate Trust (grant number not applicable). The  
460 funder had no role in the conceptualisation, design, data collection, data analysis, decision to  
461 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

462

### 463 **Data availability statement**

464 Data related to this research is included in this publication. Please contact the corresponding  
465 author if additional information is required.

466

### 467 **Acknowledgements**

468 None

469

### 470 **Conflict of interest**

471 The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article to disclose.

472

473

### 474 **REFERENCES**

475

- 476 1. Mercer SW, Reynolds WJ. Empathy and quality of care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2002;52 Suppl:S9-  
477 12.
- 478 2. Ockenden D. Ockenden Report: Findings, Conclusions and Essential Actions From the  
479 Independent Review of Maternity Services at the Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital  
480 NHS Trust. London: House of Commons, 2022.
- 481 3. Francis R. Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust public inquiry, executive  
482 summary: The Stationery Office, 2013.
- 483 4. Kirkup B. Maternity and neonatal services in East Kent: 'Reading the signals' report:  
484 GOV.UK, 2022.
- 485 5. The Joint Commission. Sentinel Event Data: 2022 Annual Review 2023 [Available from:  
486 [https://www.jointcommission.org/-/media/tjc/documents/resources/patient-safety-  
487 topics/sentinel-event/03162023\\_sentinel-event-annual-review\\_final.pdf](https://www.jointcommission.org/-/media/tjc/documents/resources/patient-safety-topics/sentinel-event/03162023_sentinel-event-annual-review_final.pdf) accessed 14  
488 September 2023.
- 489 6. Ha JF, Longnecker N. Doctor-patient communication: a review. *Ochsner J* 2010;10(1):38-  
490 43.
- 491 7. Hannan J, Sanchez G, Musser ED, et al. Role of empathy in the perception of medical  
492 errors in patient encounters: a preliminary study. *BMC Res Notes* 2019;12(1):327. doi:  
493 10.1186/s13104-019-4365-2 [published Online First: 20190610]
- 494 8. Howick J, Moscrop A, Mebius A, et al. Effects of empathic and positive communication in  
495 healthcare consultations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J R Soc Med*  
496 2018;111(7):240-52. doi: 10.1177/0141076818769477
- 497 9. Winter R, Issa E, Roberts N, et al. Assessing the effect of empathy-enhancing interventions  
498 in health education and training: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials.  
499 *BMJ Open* 2020;10(9):e036471. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036471 [published  
500 Online First: 2020/09/27]
- 501 10. Mercer SW, Maxwell M, Heaney D, et al. The consultation and relational empathy  
502 (CARE) measure: development and preliminary validation and reliability of an  
503 empathy-based consultation process measure. *Fam Pract* 2004;21(6):699-705. doi:  
504 10.1093/fampra/cmh621

- 505 11. Rotenstein LS, Torre M, Ramos MA, et al. Prevalence of Burnout Among Physicians: A  
506 Systematic Review. *JAMA* 2018;320(11):1131-50. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.12777  
507 [published Online First: 2018/10/17]
- 508 12. Azulay H, Guy N, Pertzov Y, et al. Empathy Modulates the Effect of Stress Reactivity on  
509 Generous Giving. *Front Neurosci* 2022;16:814789. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2022.814789  
510 [published Online First: 20220425]
- 511 13. Bloom BM, Pott J, Thomas S, et al. Usability of electronic health record systems in UK  
512 EDs. *Emerg Med J* 2021;38(6):410-15. doi: 10.1136/emered-2020-210401  
513 [published Online First: 20210303]
- 514 14. Department of Health and Social Care. The Cavendish Review: an independent review  
515 into healthcare assistants and support workers in the NHS and social care settings:  
516 Department of Health and Social Care., 2013.
- 517 15. Patel RS, Bachu R, Adikey A, et al. Factors Related to Physician Burnout and Its  
518 Consequences: A Review. *Behav Sci (Basel)* 2018;8(11) doi: 10.3390/bs8110098  
519 [published Online First: 20181025]
- 520 16. Joukes E, Abu-Hanna A, Cornet R, et al. Time Spent on Dedicated Patient Care and  
521 Documentation Tasks Before and After the Introduction of a Structured and  
522 Standardized Electronic Health Record. *Appl Clin Inform* 2018;9(1):46-53. doi:  
523 10.1055/s-0037-1615747 [published Online First: 20180117]
- 524 17. Digital N. Quality and Outcomes Framework: NHS Digital; 2022 [cited 2022 1 July].  
525 Available from: <https://qof.digital.nhs.uk/> accessed 1 July 2022.
- 526 18. Lever I, Dyball D, Greenberg N, et al. Health consequences of bullying in the healthcare  
527 workplace: A systematic review. *J Adv Nurs* 2019;75(12):3195-209. doi:  
528 10.1111/jan.13986 [published Online First: 20191104]
- 529 19. Organizational culture and leadership [program]. Fifth edition. version. New York: John  
530 Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 2016.
- 531 20. Wellings D, Appleby J. Public satisfaction with the NHS falls to a 25-year low: The  
532 King's Fund; 2022 [Available from:  
533 <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/blog/2022/03/public-satisfaction-nhs-falls-25-year-low>  
534 accessed 26 January 2023.
- 535 21. Vargas EA, Mahalingam R, Marshall RA. Witnessed Incivility and Perceptions of Patients  
536 and Visitors in Hospitals. *J Patient Exp* 2021;8:23743735211028092. doi:  
537 10.1177/23743735211028092 [published Online First: 20210630]
- 538 22. Kerasidou A, Baerøe K, Berger Z, et al. The need for empathetic healthcare systems. *J*  
539 *Med Ethics* 2020;47(12):e27. doi: 10.1136/medethics-2019-105921 [published Online  
540 First: 20200724]
- 541 23. Kang ES, Di Genova T, Howick J, et al. Adding a dose of empathy to healthcare: What  
542 can healthcare systems do? *J Eval Clin Pract* 2022;28(3):475-82. doi:  
543 10.1111/jep.13664 [published Online First: 20220225]
- 544 24. Howick J, de Zulueta P, Gray M. Beyond empathy training for practitioners: Cultivating  
545 empathic healthcare systems and leadership. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2024 doi:  
546 10.1111/jep.13970 [published Online First: 20240304]
- 547 25. Tong A, Synnot A, Crowe S, et al. Reporting guideline for priority setting of health  
548 research (REPRISE). *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2019;19(1):243. doi: 10.1186/s12874-  
549 019-0889-3 [published Online First: 2019/12/31]
- 550 26. Gallagher M, Hares T, Spencer J, et al. The nominal group technique: a research tool for  
551 general practice? *Fam Pract* 1993;10(1):76-81. doi: 10.1093/fampra/10.1.76
- 552 27. Graefe A, Armstrong JS. Comparing face-to-face meetings, nominal groups, delphi and  
553 prediction markets on an estimation task. *Int J Forecasting* 2016;27(1):183-95. doi:  
554 doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2010.05.004



- 555 28. Tague NR. The quality toolbox. Third. ed. Milwaukee: Quality Press 2023.
- 556 29. Errida A, Lotfi B. The determinants of organizational change management success:  
557 Literature review and case study. *International Journal of Engineering Business*  
558 *Management* 2021;13(January-December 2021) doi:  
559 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979021101627>
- 560 30. de Zulueta PC. Developing compassionate leadership in health care: an integrative  
561 review. *J Healthc Leadersh* 2016;8:1-10. doi: 10.2147/JHL.S93724 [published Online  
562 First: 20151218]
- 563 31. Webster V, Brough P, Daly K. Fight, Flight or Freeze: Common Responses for Follower  
564 Coping with Toxic Leadership. *Stress Health* 2016;32(4):346-54. doi:  
565 10.1002/smi.2626 [published Online First: 20141203]
- 566 32. Carron T, Rawlinson C, Arditi C, et al. An Overview of Reviews on Interprofessional  
567 Collaboration in Primary Care: Effectiveness. *Int J Integr Care* 2021;21(2):31. doi:  
568 10.5334/ijic.5588 [published Online First: 20210622]
- 569 33. Grill C. Involving stakeholders in research priority setting: a scoping review. *Res Involv*  
570 *Engagem* 2021;7(1):75. doi: 10.1186/s40900-021-00318-6 [published Online First:  
571 20211029]
- 572 34. Babiker A, El Hussein M, Al Nemri A, et al. Health care professional development:  
573 Working as a team to improve patient care. *Sudan J Paediatr* 2014;14(2):9-16.
- 574 35. Litchfield I, Gale N, Burrows M, et al. The future role of receptionists in primary care. *Br*  
575 *J Gen Pract* 2017;67(664):523-24. doi: 10.3399/bjgp17X693401
- 576 36. Brant HD, Atherton H, Bikker A, et al. Receptionists' role in new approaches to  
577 consultations in primary care: a focused ethnographic study. *Br J Gen Pract*  
578 2018;68(672):e478-e86. doi: 10.3399/bjgp18X697505 [published Online First:  
579 20180604]
- 580 37. Schwartz B. Why we work. First TED Books hardcover edition September 2015. ed. New  
581 York: TED Books, Simon & Schuster 2015.
- 582 38. Toynbee P. I was an outsourced Carillion hospital worker. Here's what I learned. *The*  
583 *Guardian* 2018.
- 584 39. Toynbee P. Quality care means valuing care assistants, porters, and cleaners too. *Qual Saf*  
585 *Health Care* 2003;12 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):i13-5. doi: 10.1136/qhc.12.suppl\_1.i13
- 586 40. Jansen BW, Brazil K, Passmore P, et al. Exploring healthcare assistants' role and  
587 experience in pain assessment and management for people with advanced dementia  
588 towards the end of life: a qualitative study. *BMC Palliat Care* 2017;16(1):6. doi:  
589 10.1186/s12904-017-0184-1 [published Online First: 20170119]
- 590 41. Litchfield I, Burrows M, Gale N, et al. Understanding the invisible workforce: lessons for  
591 general practice from a survey of receptionists. *BMC Prim Care* 2022;23(1):230. doi:  
592 10.1186/s12875-022-01842-4 [published Online First: 20220909]
- 593 42. Healthcare Facilities Today. Perception of hospital cleanliness can impact patient  
594 satisfaction: Healthcare Facilities Today; 2023 [Available from:  
595 [https://www.healthcarefacilitiestoday.com/posts/Perception-of-hospital-cleanliness-](https://www.healthcarefacilitiestoday.com/posts/Perception-of-hospital-cleanliness-can-impact-patient-satisfaction--943)  
596 [can-impact-patient-satisfaction--943](https://www.healthcarefacilitiestoday.com/posts/Perception-of-hospital-cleanliness-can-impact-patient-satisfaction--943) accessed 26 January 2023.
- 597 43. Vance N, Ackerman-Barger K, Murray-Garcia J, et al. "More than just cleaning": A  
598 qualitative descriptive study of hospital cleaning staff as patient caregivers.  
599 *International Journal of Nursing Studies Advances* 2022;4 doi:  
600 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnsa.2022.100097>
- 601 44. Okello D, Chongtrakul P. A manual for research priority setting using the ENHR strategy:  
602 Durban: The Council on Health Research fo Development (COHRED), 2000.
- 603 45. Oxman AD, Sackett DL, Chalmers I, et al. A surrealistic mega-analysis of  
604 redisorganization theories. *Healthc Q* 2006;9(3):50-4. doi: 10.12927/hcq..18228

- 605 46. The Association of Change Management Professionals (ACMP). Standard for Change  
606 Management© Winter Springs, FL: The Association of Change Management  
607 Professionals (ACMP); 2014 [Available from:  
608 [https://www.acmpglobal.org/page/the\\_standard](https://www.acmpglobal.org/page/the_standard) accessed 18 March 2024.
- 609 47. Battilana J, Yen J, Ferreras I, et al. Democratizing Work: Redistributing power in  
610 organizations for a democratic and sustainable future. *Organization Theory* 2022;3(1)  
611 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877221084714>
- 612 48. NHS Improving Quality. First steps towards quality improvement: A simple guide to  
613 improving services: NHS Improving Quality, 2015.
- 614 49. Greenhalgh T, Hinton L, Finlay T, et al. Frameworks for supporting patient and public  
615 involvement in research: Systematic review and co-design pilot. *Health Expect*  
616 2019;22(4):785-801. doi: 10.1111/hex.12888 [published Online First: 20190422]
- 617 50. Hoddinott P, Pollock A, O’Cathain A, et al. How to incorporate patient and public  
618 perspectives into the design and conduct of research. *F1000* 2018;7(752) doi:  
619 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15162.1>
- 620 51. Bannister F. Beyond the box: Reflections on the need for more blue sky thinking in  
621 research. *Government Information Quarterly* 2023;40(3) doi:  
622 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101831>
- 623 52. Storjohann J. Generate a Cascade of Ideas With Blue Sky Thinking 2023 [Available from:  
624 <https://ideanote.io/blog/blue-sky-thinking> accessed 18 March 2024.
- 625 53. Lencioni P. The five dysfunctions of a team : a leadership fable. 1st ed. San Francisco:  
626 Jossey-Bass 2002.
- 627 54. McGowan J, Attal B, Kuhn I, et al. Quality and reporting of large-scale improvement  
628 programmes: a review of maternity initiatives in the English NHS, 2010-2023. *BMJ*  
629 *Qual Saf* 2023 doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2023-016606 [published Online First: 20231129]
- 630 55. Flyvbjerg B, Gardner D. How Big Things get Done. New York: Pan Macmillan 2023.
- 631 56. Johnston A, Lefort F, Tesvic J. Secrets of successful change implementation: McKinsey &  
632 Company; 2017 [Available from:  
633 [https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/secrets-of-successful-](https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/secrets-of-successful-change-implementation#/)  
634 [change-implementation#/](https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/secrets-of-successful-change-implementation#/) accessed 18 March 2024.
- 635 57. Maltz M. Psycho-cybernetics; a new way to get more living out of life. Englewood Cliffs,  
636 N.J.,: Prentice-Hall 1960.
- 637 58. Sonis JD, Aaronson EL, Lee RY, et al. Emergency Department Patient Experience: A  
638 Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Patient Exp* 2018;5(2):101-06. doi:  
639 10.1177/2374373517731359 [published Online First: 20170929]
- 640 59. Keshkar L, Madigan CD, Ward A, et al. The Effect of Practitioner Empathy on Patient  
641 Satisfaction : A Systematic Review of Randomized Trials. *Ann Intern Med* 2024 doi:  
642 10.7326/M23-2168 [published Online First: 20240130]
- 643 60. Howick J, de Zulueta P, Gray M. Beyond empathy training for practitioners: Cultivating  
644 empathic healthcare systems and leadership. . *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical*  
645 *Practice* 2024;Epub ahead of print doi: 10.1111/jep.13970
- 646 61. Rotenstein LS, Brown R, Sinsky C, et al. The Association of Work Overload with  
647 Burnout and Intent to Leave the Job Across the Healthcare Workforce During  
648 COVID-19. *J Gen Intern Med* 2023;1-8. doi: 10.1007/s11606-023-08153-z [published  
649 Online First: 20230323]
- 650 62. Yue Z, Qin Y, Li Y, et al. Empathy and burnout in medical staff: mediating role of job  
651 satisfaction and job commitment. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22(1):1033. doi:  
652 10.1186/s12889-022-13405-4 [published Online First: 2022/05/24]

- 653 63. Anesi GL, Kerlin MP. The impact of resource limitations on care delivery and outcomes:  
654 routine variation, the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic, and persistent shortage.  
655 *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2021;27(5):513-19. doi: 10.1097/MCC.0000000000000859
- 656 64. Bimpong KAA, Khan A, Slight R, et al. Relationship between labour force satisfaction,  
657 wages and retention within the UK National Health Service: a systematic review of  
658 the literature. *BMJ Open* 2020;10(7):e034919. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034919  
659 [published Online First: 20200721]
- 660 65. Freedman S, Wolf R. The NHS productivity puzzle: Why has hospital activity not  
661 increased in line with funding and staffing? London: Institute for Government, 2023.
- 662 66. Roland M, Guthrie B. Quality and Outcomes Framework: what have we learnt? *BMJ*  
663 2016;354:i4060. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4060 [published Online First: 20160804]
- 664 67. Lester H, Matharu T, Mohammed MA, et al. Implementation of pay for performance in  
665 primary care: a qualitative study 8 years after introduction. *Br J Gen Pract*  
666 2013;63(611):e408-15. doi: 10.3399/bjgp13X668203
- 667 68. Ahmed K, Hashim S, Khankhara M, et al. What drives general practitioners in the UK to  
668 improve the quality of care? A systematic literature review. *BMJ Open Qual*  
669 2021;10(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-001127
- 670 69. Clinical Pharmacist Services in the Emergency Department. *Ann Emerg Med*  
671 2021;77(6):e127-e33. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2021.03.009
- 672 70. Abdulkader RS, Venugopal D, Jeyashree K, et al. The Intricate Relationship Between  
673 Client Perceptions of Physician Empathy and Physician Self-Assessment: Lessons for  
674 Reforming Clinical Practice. *J Patient Exp* 2022;9:23743735221077537. doi:  
675 10.1177/23743735221077537 [published Online First: 20220201]
- 676 71. Calder-Sprackman S, Kwok ESH, Bradley R, et al. Availability of Emergency  
677 Department Wait Times Information: A Patient-Centered Needs Assessment. *Emerg*  
678 *Med Int* 2021;2021:8883933. doi: 10.1155/2021/8883933 [published Online First:  
679 20210422]
- 680 72. Shannon B, Pang R, Jepson M, et al. What is the prevalence of frequent attendance to  
681 emergency departments and what is the impact on emergency department utilisation?  
682 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intern Emerg Med* 2020;15(7):1303-16. doi:  
683 10.1007/s11739-020-02403-2 [published Online First: 20200615]
- 684 73. Olsson M, Hansagi H. Repeated use of the emergency department: qualitative study of  
685 the patient's perspective. *Emerg Med J* 2001;18(6):430-4. doi: 10.1136/emj.18.6.430
- 686 74. Hinson JS, Martinez DA, Cabral S, et al. Triage Performance in Emergency Medicine: A  
687 Systematic Review. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019;74(1):140-52. doi:  
688 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2018.09.022 [published Online First: 20181122]
- 689 75. Austin EE, Blakely B, Tufanaru C, et al. Strategies to measure and improve emergency  
690 department performance: a scoping review. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*  
691 2020;28(1):55. doi: 10.1186/s13049-020-00749-2 [published Online First: 20200615]
- 692 76. Oandasan I, Baker R, Barker K, et al. Teamwork In Healthcare: Promoting Effective  
693 Teamwork In Healthcare In Canada. In: Foundation CHSR, ed. Ottawa, Canada:  
694 Canadian Health Services, 2006.
- 695 77. Daniels J, Robinson E, Jenkinson E, et al. Psychologically Informed Practice and Policy  
696 (PiPP) Project: Study Recommendations: Royal College of Emergency Medicine,  
697 2023.
- 698

699 **Table 1. Structure and timings of the workshop**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Time allotted</b>
Introductions, aims and objectives	15 minutes
Icebreaker Exercise	20 minutes
Presentation – The evidence for empathic healthcare and empathic systems	30 minutes
Group exercise – System Barriers to empathic healthcare <i>Work in groups of 2-3 for 10 minutes, share with rest of table, share with larger group</i>	30 minutes
<b>Active Break</b>	<b>30 minutes</b>
Group Exercise – Empathic healthcare in an ideal world <i>Work in groups of 2-3 for 10 minutes, share with rest of table, share with larger group</i>	60 minutes
Self-empathy <i>Guided meditation (whole group – optional)</i>	20 minutes
<b>Active Lunchbreak</b>	<b>60 minutes</b>
Group Exercise – How to overcome barriers and facilitate empathic healthcare in your setting <i>15 minutes generating ideas, 15 minutes circulating, reading, stealing ideas</i>	30 minutes
Group Exercise – Prioritisation <i>Nominal voting</i>	30 minutes
<b>Short break</b>	<b>15 minutes</b>
Action planning <i>Creating, sharing and discussing SMART plans</i>	50 minutes
Postcard exercise	10 minutes
Close and summary	5 minutes

700

701 **Table 2. Summary of barriers and facilitators**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Barriers</b>	<b>Facilitators</b>
<b>Individual</b>	Stress	Wellbeing
		Volunteering
<b>Job factors</b>	Lack of communication skills training	
	Lack of protected training time	
<b>Physical/technical environment</b>		On site pharmacy
<b>Organisational factors</b>		Better primary triage
		Secondary triage
		Display waiting times
<b>External factors</b>	Lack of resources	
	Challenging external targets	
	Patient (unrealistic) expectations	

702

703 **Table 3. Survey results**

<b>On a scale of 0 (not at all satisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied), how satisfied were you with this training session?</b>											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>No. of participants</b>					1	1		3	7	3	4
<b>On a scale of 0 (not at all confident) to 10 (completely confident), how confident are you that today's training will lead to better team working in your place of work?</b>											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>No. of participants</b>					1		1	4	6	2	4
<b>Thinking ahead 3-6 months, imagine you were to successfully implement your learning from today's training. Would you recommend the Emergency Department to your friends and family as a place to work?</b>											
	Yes						No				
<b>No. of participants</b>	19										
	<b>What did you like most about the training?</b>						<b>What, if anything, would you improve?</b>				
<b>Exemplar responses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixed teams</li> <li>- Engaging session, good communication</li> <li>- Inclusive group work among peers</li> <li>- Different to normal study days</li> <li>- Very well structured</li> <li>- Active involvement of the team, understanding and appreciating ideas-</li> <li>- Good use of interactive activities with colleagues to</li> </ul>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make it more relevant to us</li> <li>- How to practice empathy, things to keep in mind in patient staff interactions</li> <li>- Have listened to ED problems we have</li> <li>- Introduction of empathy-based team activities</li> <li>- I would like to understand more about your backgrounds within healthcare...it allows us to feel like</li> </ul>				

	<p>establish concerns and themes of improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- I like the enthusiasm of the facilitators, keeping it relevant to healthcare and team activities</li><li>- Relaxed atmosphere, common ground</li></ul>	<p>the training remains relevant to the pressures we are under within ED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Increased appreciation of financial and bureaucratic limitations</li></ul>
--	--	---

704