Medical student attitudes to patient involvement in healthcare

O'Neill, J.[a]*, Docherty Stewart, B. [b], Ng, A., XN. [b], Roy, Y. [b], Yousif, L.[b], McIntyre, K., R.[a]

[a] *Lecturer, School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom;* [b] *Undergraduate Medical Student, School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom.*

* University of Glasgow, University Avenue, Glasgow, G12 8QQ. Email: jennifer.oneill@glasgow.ac.uk

Manuscript Revision

This pre-print represents the second version of this manuscript, which has been submitted for peer-review.

Summary of minor changes made to version 2:

- General formatting
- Amended spelling (from UK English to US English)
- Minor changes to the references section (including the removal of inconsistencies and the addition of the missing reference for Duce v Worcestershire Acute Hospitals 2008 EWCA Civ 1307 (Eng.)).
- Removal of text duplication in the Discussion section and re-phrasing of the remaining text to accommodate this change.

Medical student attitudes to patient involvement in healthcare

Objective

Patient involvement is used to describe the inclusion of patients as active participants in healthcare. This study aimed to investigate incoming Year 1 medicine (MBChB) students' attitudes and opinions regarding patient involvement in healthcare and research.

Methods

We partnered with four Year 2 MBChB students in formulating the design of an online survey. All incoming Year 1 MBChB students (n = 333) were invited to complete the survey before formal teaching commenced. The survey included Likert scale questions and three short vignette scenarios which were designed to probe student attitudes towards patient involvement linked to existing legal precedent.

Results

15% of invited students responded. The data indicate that participants were broadly familiar with, and supportive of, patient involvement in medical treatment. There was least support for patient involvement in conducting (22.4%), contributing to (34.7%) or communicating research (30.6%), although there was unanimous support for patients' lived experiences of innovative treatment shaping future practice (100%).

Conclusion

Incoming members of the medical profession demonstrate awareness of the need to actively involve patients in healthcare decision-making but are unfamiliar with the utility and value of such involvement in research. Further empirical studies are required to examine attitudes to patient involvement in healthcare.

Keywords: patient involvement; decision-making; healthcare; health research

Medical Student Attitudes to Patient Involvement in Healthcare

Introduction

Patient and public involvement are terms used to collectively describe engagement with, and inclusion of, patients and the public in the clinical and/or research context. Such terminology reflects growing recognition of the need for *inclusive* models of healthcare which view patients as active participants in, rather than passive recipients of, healthcare (NIHR, 2022; O'Neill, 2021).

This evolution towards greater involvement has, however, been inconsistent across the healthcare landscape with greater strides made towards facilitating patient involvement in treatment decision-making than research. It was in the United Kingdom (UK) Supreme Court (SC) ruling of *Montgomery v Lanarkshire* [2014] UK SC 11 that Lady Hale clarified patients are no longer to be viewed as "*…passive recipients of the care of the medical profession…*" (Montgomery, at 75). Accordingly, there have been noticeable moves to adopt models of 'shared' and 'supported' decision making in relation to treatment (GMC, 2020; Royal College of Surgeons of England, 2018).

In terms of *research*, patient inclusion has developed at a far slower pace. Whilst the Nuremberg Code of 1947 emphasized that "*[persons involved in research] should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision"* (Germany, 1949: s.1) it has been slow to translate into practice. This is perhaps reflective of an overarching emphasis upon paternalistic notions of beneficence in research, which views the researcher in a position of authority (Sacristán et al., 2016). More recently, the importance of patient involvement in *both* the clinical and research settings was re-emphasized in Baroness Cumberlege's report on

findings of the Independent Medicines and Medical Device Safety Review (IMMDSR) of 2020, '*First Do No Harm'*. The report is a cautionary tale against silencing the patient voice - both in the research and clinical settings - in favor of unfettered research innovation (Cumberlege, 2020, see pp17-21; 22-25;50 at s2.107). Accordingly, it may be argued that greater patient involvement in treatment and research could mitigate against patient harm and the erosion of trust in medical science and promote improved healthcare outcomes (Bombard et al., 2018; World Health Organization, 2019).

To contribute to the existing scholarship, we sought to develop greater appreciation of the attitudes of incoming members of the medical profession towards patient involvement by surveying a new Year 1 cohort of medical students. Our aim was to determine what pre-conceived attitudes these students held towards patient involvement in healthcare.

To ensure that we communicated with our student target group appropriately, we partnered with four existing Year 2 medical (MBChB) students from the design phase of the study. The student partners had each recently completed a Student Selected Component (SSC) on '*Patient Perspectives in Research'.* SSCs are short modules, chosen by students, which allow them to study an area of interest in more depth – a requirement of the General Medical Council (GMC) (General Medical Council, 2009, s94). We adopted a staff-student partnership model reflective of the '*student as apprentice'* dynamic described in Olsen's 'Student Partnership Framework' to facilitate the shared pursuit of knowledge and, to support development of our student partners' research skills (Holen et al., 2020; Olsen, 2007 at 30l2020).

Methods

Study design

Author Kirsty McIntyre ran a five-week SSC module on '*Patient Perspectives in Research'* from January 2022, which four students completed (co-authors BDS, AN, YR, LY). Separate to this, informal discussions between JO and KM led to the development of a study idea to investigate student opinions of patient involvement. KM approached the four Year 2 students who had completed the SSC module on 4th February 2022 to ask whether they would be willing to co-develop the study aims and research survey.

All authors met on 9th February 2022 to discuss the scope of the project and to outline expected commitments. We next held a focus group on 21st February 2022, attended by all four students. Here, JO and KMdiscussed the background to the study, proposed study aims, and offered potential survey questions for students to evaluate. Students were then informed of the key research process milestones that they could contribute to; namely 'defining the research question', 'developing research design', 'data collection' and 'dissemination'.

The student partners were given time to discuss the project amongst themselves and were provided whiteboard pens, post-it notes and paper to record their thoughts and amendments. During the focus group, students suggested contextualizing some statements in the survey (for example "doctors should work in partnership with patients") with a scenario. Subsequently, JO developed three scenarios to directly reflect current legal precedent and relevant regulatory issues pertaining to patient involvement in healthcare (Table 2). The student partners advised on and edited the wording of the scenarios.

An iterative feedback loop was established thereafter, whereby staff (KM, JO) shared the current versions of the survey and subsequently enacted the suggested changes of the student partners until all authors were happy with the finalized survey (Supplementary File 1). At all stages of the research process, students were offered the opportunity to withdraw their contributions to the study and were reminded that there would be no repercussions should they choose to do so.

Ethical approval

Approval for this study was obtained from the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences (MVLS) Ethics Committee for Non-clinical Research Involving Human Participants [No: 200210131] with staff and student partners included as named researchers. The ensuing collection, storage and processing of all personal data was in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.

Survey Dissemination

The survey was built and disseminated via Qualtrics (Qualtrics LLC 2022) using an institutional license. Incoming Year 1 medical students were invited to participate on 2nd September 2022 via an announcement posted on their virtual learning environment, Moodle. The release of the survey in this manner, prior to the start of the academic year (20th September 2022), was possible on account of our well-established pre-entry online course for incoming Year 1 MBChB students (n = 333). The survey closed on 22nd September 2022, prior to students' first scheduled lecture on the topic of ethics.

Results

Responses containing only demographic information were disregarded from analysis (n = 6). Subsequently, three partially complete and 46 complete responses were included in the analyses (49 total, 14.7% of year group). The majority of respondents were female (43/49, 81.6%), between 18-21 years old (36/49, 73.5%) and had joined the University directly from school (36/49, 73.5%). Demographic characteristics of participants are summarized in Tables and **Figures**

Table 1**.**

Survey participants were asked to rate how much they agreed or disagreed with seven statements on a five-point Likert scale (Figure 1). The majority of students (35/49, 71.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that patients' lived experience should be valued as much as clinical knowledge or expertise. All respondents agreed that it is important to represent the patient voice in healthcare (4/49, 8.2% agreed; 45/49, 91.8% strongly agreed), to consider patient input alongside scientific findings (23/49, 46.9% agreed; 26/49, 53.1% strongly agreed) and to involve patients in management decisions (9/49, 18.4% agreed; 40/49, 81.6% strongly agreed). Conversely, 8.2% (4/49) of participants agreed that a doctor should have the final say in decision-making with some also agreeing that patients should be the passive recipients of care (3/49, 6.1% agreed; 1/49, 2.0% strongly agreed).

Participants were presented with three scenarios related to an existing legal precedent (rationale) of which the participants were not informed and were asked to choose what the doctors should do in each scenario. All respondents (n = 47) chose the option that aligned with the legal precedent for scenarios 1 and 3 (Table 2). In scenario 2, participants were asked whether a surgeon undertaking surgery on a patient for a specified purpose could then undertake an additional, non-urgent procedure without explicit consent. Three participants

(6.4%) opted to proceed with the additional surgical intervention in this scenario (Table 2). Participants were asked to select aspects of healthcare that they thought patients could be involved in from a standard list (Table 3). They could select multiple options. The most popular options were ‘choosing treatment from a selection of options' (93.9% of participants) and ‘deciding where to receive healthcare’ (83.7%). Fewer participants selected options related to designing (34.7%), conducting (22.4%) or communicating medical research findings (30.6%).

To explore how participants’ own experiences might influence their opinions, participants were asked whether they felt their opinion had been valued in their own experience of healthcare. Closed text responses (Table 4) indicated that most respondents felt that their opinion had been valued (29/38, 63.0%). Nine participants (19.6%), all female, felt that their opinion had not been valued.

Participants were offered the opportunity to provide other relevant comments in an open text box at the conclusion of the survey. Here, participants conveyed the importance of ensuring that patients have capacity to give informed consent and the role of the doctor in providing the potential risks and benefits of any treatment.

> *“Important for patient’s [sic] to be able to make an informed decision, and their doctor should own this even if they disagree with the decision made. I think patient input can sometimes be a grey error [sic] i.e. If the patient does not have capacity to make a decision.”*

"I think it is important to respect the patien't [sic] wishes about a treatment they do not wish to have, even if the doctor thinks it is best for them. However, the doctor should do their best to educate the patient about the risks of not having the treatment and also inform them of any other treatment options available."

A third respondent discussed the necessity to listen to female patients.

"I think doctors need to take women's [sic] opinions much more seriously."

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study in the UK to examine medical student attitudes towards patient involvement in healthcare. For the purposes of this study, patient involvement in healthcare refers to engaging with, and involving patients in, two key areas of healthcare: medical (treatment) decision-making and research. Our findings demonstrate that respondents were broadly supportive of patient involvement in aspects of medical decision-making yet less supportive of research involvement.

Patient Involvement in Medical Decision-Making

There was almost unanimous agreement amongst our students that doctors should involve patients in 'management decisions' (18.4% agreed; 81.6% strongly agreed). 'Medical management' is an umbrella term which may relate to 'micro' (patient-practitioner) or 'meso' (organizational) level healthcare. Whilst there was general support for patient involvement in micro-level healthcare (93.9% of students supported patient involvement in choosing from a range of treatment options), there was less support for the concept of patient involvement in "*medical decision-making about treatment*" which could encapsulate broader meso-level

healthcare (61.2%) (See Table 3). Upon examination, these results may indicate the respondents hold a more nuanced appreciation of the current legal standard than may have been anticipated.

Our respondents' recognition of the importance of representing the patient voice in healthcare (91.8% strong agreement) demonstrates respect for the principle of medical autonomy. Autonomy – which encapsulates the patient's right to self-determination – is upheld through the meaningful dialogues and collaboration that models of "*shared*" and "*supported*" decision-making in micro-level healthcare facilitate (General Medical Council, 2020; Royal College of Surgeons, 2018). A key aspect of such *inclusive* decision-making is patient involvement, whereby the patient – viewed as an active stakeholder in their own healthcare – is endowed with the information necessary for informed medical decision-making (O'Neill, 2021). The current legal standard – established in the case of *Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* [2015] – outlines the duty placed upon doctors to inform patients of the benefits, material risks and reasonable treatment alternatives available to them (*Montgomery v Lanarkshire* [2015] at 81). The case marked a dramatic landmark departure from the preceding legal precedent set by the 1957 case of *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee*. The paternalistic nature of the *Bolam* ruling set the medical profession firmly in control of what information patients would, and would not, receive as a matter of professional judgement (*Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957]). It is to this end that the case has long been criticized for reducing the patient's role to that of infant, against the parental doctor (Cave & Milo 2020; Watt, 2018). Yet whilst *Montgomery* reframed the requirements of information disclosure regarding treatment, subsequent cases have established that its remit does not extend to the matter of *initial* treatment selection which remains a matter of professional judgement according to *Bolam* (*Bolam v Friern Hospital*

Management Committee [1957]; *Duce v Worcestershire NHS Acute Hospitals Trust* [2018]; *Montgomery v Lanarkshire* [2015]). It is at this stage that the interpretation of "*medical decision-making about treatment*" becomes important. Whilst fewer respondents agreed that patients should be involved in "*medical decision-making about treatment",* it may be possible that they interpreted this statement – reflecting the doctor's initial decision to propose a suitable treatment – according to their professional judgement. In which case, the opine of the 38.8% of respondents opposed to such patient involvement would correctly reflect current legal norms. Indeed, the courts have long-established that patients cannot actively demand a particular form of treatment before it is first offered to them by the healthcare professional (See Lord Philips MR in *Burke v GMC [2015]*). To this end, patients are only *partially* involved in the concept of micro-level medical management to the extent that they are fully informed when consenting to treatment.

Patients are also not routinely included in meso-level (organizational) medical management decision-making, although it is not completely unprecedented. Choy and colleagues described their 2007 pilot study that concerned the involvement of breast cancer patients in the multi-disciplinary team (MDT) meeting. The MDT typically excludes patients and instead involves a team of specialist healthcare practitioners who seek consensus on the diagnosis and treatment of complex medical cases. Choy et al., (2007) nonetheless, described their successful pilot as being *"highly valued by most of the participating patients and … welcomed by most health professionals in the [MDT]"* without creating undue patient anxiety. Such meso-level patient involvement, however, remains contrary to current norms within the wider profession. It is therefore unlikely that our incoming student cohort interpreted medical management as relating to organizational, meso-level healthcare and we

can conclude to a degree of certainty that their support for 'management' relates to micro-level informed consent.

Overall, we may conclude that our incoming medical students demonstrated an awareness of the current requirements to involve patients in medical decision-making with most students *against* doctors having the final say in decision-making and against patients being viewed as passive recipients of care (See Figure 1). Furthermore, engagement with the scenarios confirms awareness of the basic principles of consent as per *Montgomery* with unanimous support (100%) of patients being fully informed (Table 2). There were, however, a small proportion of students (6.4%) who erroneously supported the undertaking of additional surgical procedures beyond the scope of initial consent – an action the US courts rejected in *Schoendorff* and which would likely fail the *Bolam* test of professional judgement (*Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957]; *Schonendorff v Society of New York* [1914]). It is, therefore, important that incoming members of the profession are made aware of the dynamic and *ongoing* nature of consent.

Patient Involvement in Research

Our data show less support regarding general patient involvement in medical research. There was least support amongst incoming medical students for patient involvement in conducting (22.4%), contributing to (34.7%) or communicating (30.6%) research. The National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) defines patient involvement in research as "*research being carried out 'with' or 'by' members of the public rather than 'to', 'about' or 'for' them*" (NIHR Involve, n.d.). This reflects a model of shared decision-making whereby the epistemic value of the patient is recognized at the research and development stage of product development (O'Neill, 2021). However, our findings are also reflective of a systematic

review by Biddle et al., (2020) which found growing support for the concept of patient involvement in healthcare but "*to a lesser extent, in health research*". Biddle and colleagues describe the UK as a leading contributor to patient involvement research compared to several other European countries (Biddle et al., 2020). They note that whilst *"general attitude towards … [patient involvement…] is changing"* to reflect more acceptance, it is often in a *"marginal or tokenistic"* sense (Biddle et al., 2020). Similarly, a study by Boaz et al., (2016) suggests that researchers demonstrate *"active resistance"* to sharing control of the research process with patients and so patients are constrained to "*tinkering at the edges*". Such attitudes appear to be reflected in our incoming medical student cohort. Whilst demonstrating less support for patient involvement in the aforementioned stages of research, respondents unanimously support (100%) retrospective or observational research input derived from patients' lived experience of medical devices or treatments to *"shape future practice*" (Scenario 3). Such input, however, reflects research carried out *to* rather than *by* patients. It is possible that the respondents' support of this form of patient involvement derives from increased awareness of pharmacovigilance and the Yellow Card reporting schemes that have come into the public consciousness due to the rapid COVID-19 vaccine rollout (Maxwell, 2022). Whilst observational research is important – indeed, Baroness Cumberlege described how use of harmful polypropylene mesh was prolonged due to "*patient reports of harm … not [being] listened to or… dismissed as subjective, unscientific, and anecdotal*" (Cumberlege, 2020 at p63, s2.127) – it is vital to address why attitudes towards patient involvement in *earlier* stages of the research process remain less agreeable. These combined findings indicate that there may be a need to improve student awareness of the role, and benefits, of patient involvement in research.

Strengths and Weaknesses

One of the weaknesses of our study lies in the relatively high non-response rate (85.3%) from the Year 1 cohort. Porter and Whitcomb (2005) suggest that the decision not to participate in a survey is multi-factorial and that developing an appreciation of these factors can assist in interpreting the *quality* of data. We look to both general and specific factors that may account for our high non-response rate. Generally, factors such as a lack of incentives to complete the survey and the timing of survey distribution (in week 0, when students faced burdens associated with transitioning into medical school) are likely to have been contributory. A *strength* of our study derives from our inclusion of questions on demographics which enable us to draw hypotheses on the specific factors associated with response decisions. Most of our study respondents were under the age of 21 (91.0%) and 'school leavers' (73.5%) which is broadly reflective of our Year 1 medical student demographic. There was, however, a notably higher response rate from female medical students (81.6%) than their male counterparts (18.6%). This is, perhaps, not surprising given that in the 2021/22 year, the GMC reported that 64.0% of medical student entrants were women (GMC, 2022). Furthermore, generic studies have shown female students to be far more likely to engage in surveys than males within the *general* student population (Porter & Whitcomb, 2005). However, it is pertinent to consider the influences that may affect engagement within this specific cohort of professional students. There is a body of evidence to suggest that female medical students and doctors are more likely to show an interest in themes of patient involvement than males. In practice, female medics are more likely to actively promote shared decision-making by explaining advantages and disadvantages of treatment options, by helping patients understand information and by enquiring about patient preferences (Alameddine et al., 2022). Female doctors are also shown to spend more *time* engaging with "*collaborative models of the patient-physician relationship"* than male colleagues (Roter & Hall, 2009). Araújo and colleagues (2017) suggest that greater collaborative tendencies amongst female medics may

derive from them placing greater emphasis upon egalitarian values that align with shared decision-making and overall patient involvement than males. As such, our findings could be reflective of this established gender disparity within the medical community. Scholars have suggested that such gender disparity could also derive from the *lived* experience of female medics as patients themselves. Ommen et al., (2011) describe a significantly negative correlation between patient female gender and shared decision making with female patients significantly less likely to feel "*integrated*" into treatment decision-making processes than males. Our findings would support this reasoning as fewer female respondents (60.5%) felt that their opinion had been valued in their personal experience compared to male respondents (75.0%) with one of our respondents specifically commenting that *"…doctors need to take women's [sic] opinions much more seriously"*. If we, therefore, conclude that interest in patient involvement positively correlates with survey engagement, we may *conversely* assume that some non-respondents may have found the subject matter to be "*boring*" or to lack relevance (Porter & Whitcomb, 2005). Such information may have utility for medical curriculum development by demonstrating the importance of engaging students on the issue of patient involvement. However, further empirical studies would need to be completed before any firm conclusions could be drawn.

A further consideration in interpreting our results – and a further potential weakness – is that of social desirability bias (SDB). Defined by Zerbe and Paulhus (1987) as *"the tendency of individuals to present themselves favourably with respect to current social norms and standards"*, we recognize that our respondents — as incoming medical students — were likely to respond in a manner they perceived as being 'expected of them'. Whilst we timed the survey distribution to precede the Year 1 ethics teaching, it is pertinent to note that this incoming cohort had successfully completed rounds of medical school applications and

interviews and so, were likely to have a pre-existing level of awareness of such issues that could shape their survey responses. We sought to address this by examining the dimensions of those attitudes through our survey design by including questions with wording reversals, negations, and opposites. Whilst the inclusion of such survey questions holds the potential for mis-response deriving from misinterpretation (see Baumgartner et al., 2018), we determined that, on balance, such question-types held utility in examining the depth of respondents' beliefs and attitudes related to patient involvement. Furthermore, a strength of our study lies in our collaboration with our student partners who assisted in the wording of the questions to ensure our survey demographic could comprehend the statements. We are therefore confident that whilst SDB is likely to be an inevitable influencing factor within this demographic, our responses remain valid and of value.

Another limitation of our study is that it only addresses the attitudes of incoming medical students and does not address how attitudes amongst medical students may evolve throughout their medical school studies. For example, there is evidence to suggest that empathy – *"one of the most highly desirable professional traits"* and *"crucial for [establishing the] successful physician-patient"* relationship that underpins meaningful patient involvement – erodes over time (Newton et al., 2008). Since empathy is linked to shared decision-making, it is likely that attitudes towards patient involvement could erode in a similar way, over time. Indeed, there is further evidence to suggest that medical student attitudes can be shaped by their experiences in the clinical environment and from exposure to the negative attitudes of practicing clinicians (Pohontsch et al., 2018). This suggests that further study is required to determine whether there is a negative correlation between attitudes towards patient involvement over time which would be of utility in determining whether ongoing education or training is required.

Conclusion

Incoming medical students demonstrate awareness of the need for patient involvement in healthcare treatment but lack appreciation for the role of patient involvement in medical research. There are preliminary indications that there may be a gender-bias with female medical students demonstrating more positive attitudes towards patient involvement than male medical students. However, there was a notable lack of engagement with the survey which could be indicative of lack of overall interest in patient involvement within the wider cohort.

Our survey results relate to the attitudes of incoming medical students only and is it pertinent to note that such attitudes may change over time. Given the correlation between practitioner empathy – shown to decline over time – and patient involvement, further empirical studies are required to determine whether such favourable attitudes to patient involvement wane over time. We anticipate that our collective findings may serve as the basis for future research and may have utility for promoting ongoing medical education to promote the value of patient involvement in medicine and health research.

Declaration of Interest

The authors have no known conflict of interest to declare.

References

Alameddine M., Otaki F., Bou-Karroum K., Du Preez L., Loubser P., AlGurg R., Alsheikh-Ali, A. (2022) Patients' and physicians' gender and perspective on shared decision-making: A cross-sectional study from Dubai. *PLoS ONE* 17(9): e0270700. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0270700

Araújo, E. B., Araújo, N. A. M., Moreira, A. A., Herrmann, H. J., Andrade, J. S. (2017) Gender differences in scientific collaborations: Women are more egalitarian than men. *PLoS One*, 12(5):e0176791. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13111

Baumgartner, H., Weijters, B., Pieters, R (2018) Mis-response to survey questions: A conceptual framework and empirical test of the effects of reversals, negations, and polar opposite core concepts. *J. Public Policy Mark.*, 55(6) https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243718811848

Biddle, M. S. Y., Gibson, A., Evans, D. (2020) Attitudes and approaches to patient and public involvement across Europe: A systematic review. *Health Soc. Care Community*, 29(1): 18-27

Boaz, A., Biri, D., McKevitt, C. (2016) Rethinking the relationship between science and society: Has there been a shift in attitudes to patient and public involvement and public engagement in science in the United Kingdom? *Health Expect.*, 19(3); 592-601 https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12295

Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 1 WLR 583 as per Justice McNair at 586

Bombard, Y., Baker, G. R., Orlando, E., Fancott, C., Bhatia, P., Casalino, S., Onate, K., Denis, J., Pomey, M. P. (2018) Engaging patients to improve quality of care: a systematic review. *Implement. Sci,* 13(98). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0784-z

Cave, E., Milo, C. (2020) Informing patients: The Bolam legacy, *Med. Law Int.*, 20(2) https://doi.org/10.1177/096853322095422

Choy, E.T ., Chiu, A., Butow, P., Young, J., Spillane, A. (2007) A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. *The Breast,* 16(2): 178-189 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2006.10.002

Cumberlege, J. (2020). First Do No Harm: The report of the Independent Medicines and Medical Devices Safety Review. Jul 8. https://www.immdsreview.org.uk/Report/html

Data Protection Act (U.K) 2018

Duce v Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust [2018] EWCA Civ 1307 (Eng.)

General Medical Council (2009). Tomorrow's Doctors: outcomes and standards for undergraduate medical education, s.94, p.50. First Published 1993. Updated September 2009 http://www.ub.edu/medicina_unitateducaciomedica/documentos/TomorrowsDoctors_2009.pdf

General Medical Council (2020). Guidance on professional standards and ethics for doctors: Decision making and consent. Published 30 September. In effect 9 November 2020. https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/updated-decision-making-and-consent-guidance_pdf-84160128.pdf

General Medical Council (2022) The state of medical education and practice in the UK: The workforce report 2022. https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/workforce-report-2022---full-report_pdf-94540077.pdf

Germany (Territory under Allied Occupation, 1946-1955: US Zone). (1949). Trials of war crimes before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10, Nuremberg, October 1946 – April 1949. US Government Printing Office.

Holen, R., Ashwin, P., Maassen, P., Stensaker, B. (2020) Student partnership: exploring the dynamics in and between different conceptualizations. *Stud. High. Educ.* 46(12) pp2726-2737 https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1770717

Independent Medicines and Medical Devices Safety Review (IMMDSR) (2018). Written Evidence. Properties of Mesh. Published November 2019. Updated April 2020. https://www.immdsreview.org.uk/downloads/Evidence/FOR_PUBLICATION_-_Properties_of_mesh.pdf

Maxwell, S. Adverse drug reaction monitoring in a post-pandemic world. Yellow Card Centre Scotland. 30 Nov. 2022. https://www.yccscotland.scot.nhs.uk/?p=1177

Montgomery v Lanarkshire [2014] UK SC 11

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School for Primary Care Research (2022) What is patient and public involvement and public engagement? https://www.spcr.nihr.ac.uk/PPI/what-is-patient-and-public-involvement-and-engagement

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Involve (n.d.) What is public involvement in research? https://www.invo.org.uk/find-out-more/what-is-public-involvement-in-research-2/

Newton, B., Barber, L., Cleveland, E., O'Sullivan, P. (2008) Physician-patient relationship: Is there hardening of the heart during medical school? *Acad. Med.* 83(3): 244-249 https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181637837

O'Neill, J. (2021). Towards conjoint solidarity, *Bioethics, 36(5), pp. 535-546*. https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12940

Olsen, J., P. (2007) *The institutional dynamics of the European university*. In: University Dynamics and European Integration, edited by P. Maassen and J.P. Olsen, pp25-54. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5971-1_2

Ommen, O., Theum, S., Janssen, C. (2011) The relationship between social support, shared decision-making and patient's trust in doctors: a cross-sectional severe of 2,197 inpatients using the Cologne Patient Questionnaire. *Int. J. Pub Health*. 56; 319-327

Pohontsch, N. J., Stark, A., Ehrhardt., M., Kotter, T., Scherer, M. (2018) Influences on students' empathy in medical education: an exploratory interview study with medical students in their third and last year. *BMC Med.,* 18(231) https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1335-7

Porter, S. R., Whitcomb, M. E. (2005) Non-response in student surveys: The role of demographics, engagement and personality. *Res High Educ.*, 46(2) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-1597-2

R (Burke) v GMC [2005] EWCA 1003 [31] whereby Lord Philips states:
Autonomy and the right of self-determination do not entitle the patient to insist on receiving a particular medical treatment regardless of the nature of the treatment. Insofar as a doctor has a legal obligation to provide treatment this cannot be founded simply upon the fact that the patient demands it. The source of the duty lies elsewhere.

Roter, D. L., Hall, J. A. (2009) Why physician gender matters in shaping the physician-patient relationship. *J. Women's Health,* 7(9) https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.1998.7.1093

Royal College of Surgeons of England (2018) Consent: Supported Decision Making. https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/standards-and-research/standards-and-guidance/good-practice-guides/consent/

Sacristán, J.A., Aguarón, A., Avendaño-Solá, C., Garrido, P., Carrión, J., Gutiérrez, A., Kroes, R., Flores, A. (2016). Patient involvement in clinical research: why, when, and how. *Patient Prefer Adherence.* 2016 Apr 27;10:631-40. https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S104259

Schoendorff v The Society of New York Hospital [1914] 105 NE 92,93 as per Justice Cardozo; *"Every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his own body; and a surgeon who performs an operation without his patient's consent commits an assault for which he is liable in damages. This is true except in cases of emergency…"*

Watt, G. (2018) Towards a rhetoric of medical law. *Law Hummanit*, 12:1, 93-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521483.2018.1462293

World Health Organization (2019) WHO calls for urgent action to reduce patient harm in healthcare. https://www.who.int/news/item/13-09-2019-who-calls-for-urgent-action-to-reduce-patient-harm-in-healthcare

Zerbe, W. J., Paulhus, D. L., (1987) Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A re-conception. *AMR*, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4307820

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants.

Characteristic	No. (% total)
Gender	
Female	43 (81.6)
Male	9 (18.4)
Not listed	0 (0.0)
Prefer not to say	0 (0.0)
Age	
17 or under	9 (18.4)
18-21	36 (73.5)
22-25	3 (6.1)
26-29	1 (2.0)
30+	0 (0.0)
Prefer not to say	0 (0.0)
Educational background	
Foundation course or pre-med	3 (6.1)
Gap year	4 (8.2)
Graduate	4 (8.2)
Repeating or returning to Year 1	2 (4.1)
School leaver	36 (73.5)
Other	0 (0.0)

Table 2. Three ethical scenarios were drafted in collaboration with student partners and were designed to interrogate the students' views related to existing legal precedent ('rationale'). The scenarios and corresponding options are provided in the table, as they appeared in the survey, alongside participants' responses.

Scenario	**Rationale**	**Scenario and survey response options**	**Response [No. (% total)]**
1	Representative of the case of *Montgomery v Lanarkshire* [2014] - which holds that patients must be informed of the benefits, material risks and reasonable treatment alternatives [at 87; 90] – scenario 1 describes the case of an expectant mother with type 1 diabetes mellitus due to deliver a larger than average baby. Participants were asked whether doctors should inform the mother of risks and alternative treatment options.	An expectant mother known to have type 1 diabetes mellitus is admitted to the labour ward and is expected to give birth soon. The mother, who is also of short stature, asks doctors whether there are any risks that she should be made aware of. Doctors know that since the mother has diabetes mellitus, she is more likely to be carrying a larger than average baby and that there may be several known complications associated with giving birth naturally compared to via a caesarean section. What should the doctors do?	
		Do not tell the patient of the risks and make a decision on her behalf	0 (0.0)
		Tell the patient of the risks and any options available	47 (100.0)

Scenario	Rationale	Scenario and survey response options	Response [No. (% total)]
2	Representative of the well-established Torts of Negligence and Battery as they relate to medical consent (see, for example, *Schoendorff v Society of New York Hospital* 1914; *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee*, 1957). Participants were asked whether a surgeon undertaking surgery on a patient for a specified purpose could then undertake an additional, non-urgent procedure without explicit consent.	A patient consents to undergo minor surgery to have a mole removed. During the surgical procedure, however, doctors discover that the patient requires an additional (non-urgent) surgical intervention. This was not previously discussed with the patient. What should the doctors do?	
		Proceed with the additional surgical intervention	3 (6.4)
		Waken the patient and ask for their consent before continuing	44 (93.6)
3	Representative of the recommendations made in *First Do No Harm* relating to increased patient input to innovative medicines and medical devices development (Cumberlege, 2020, see ss.2.135, 2.81, 2.107). Participants were asked whether researchers should take patients' lived experience into account or rely solely upon scientific clinical trial evidence during evaluation.	A group of doctors are involved in pioneering a new surgical technique using a new implant. Some months after the initial surgical implantations were performed, patients begin to complain of painful side effects. This is in spite of the fact that clinical trial data is strongly in favour of this new technique and shows little, to no, side-effects. What should the doctors do with this information from their patients?	

Scenario	Rationale	Scenario and survey response options	Response [No. (% total)]
		Disregard this information and continue to rely upon the scientific clinical trial evidence to provide the implantation for new patients	0 (0.0)
		Explore the existing patients' experiences in more depth and use this to shape future practice	47 (100.0)

Table 3. Ways for patients to be involvement in healthcare. Survey participants could select multiple options.

Which aspects of healthcare do you think patients can be involved in?	**No. of responses (% total)**
Choosing treatment from a selection of options	46 (93.9)
Communicating research findings	15 (30.6)
Conducting research	11 (22.4)
Contributing to the design of research studies	17 (34.7)
Deciding where to receive healthcare	41 (83.7)
Medical decision-making about treatment	30 (61.2)
None of the above	0 (0.0)

Table 4. Participants were asked to disclose whether they felt their opinion has been valued in their own experience of healthcare.

In your personal experience with healthcare, have you felt that your opinion has been valued?	**No. female (% female)**	**No. male (% male)**	**No. overall respondents (% total)**
Yes	23 (60.5)	6 (75.0)	29 (63.0)
No	9 (23.7)	0 (0.0)	9 (19.6)
Not applicable	6 (15.8)	2 (25.0)	8 (17.4)

Figure 1. Participants' responses to Likert scale statements.



Supplementary File 1: Survey

Student perceptions of patients' involvement in medical care

Start of Block: Participant Information

Q1 **Participant Information**

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask us if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. By completing the questionnaire you will be considered to be consenting to the study.

Background to this study

There is growing interest in the role and scope of patient involvement in healthcare in the United Kingdom, however, research is still ongoing to reach a consensus as to what this means in practice.

The purpose of this study is to investigate medical students' attitudes and perceptions of patient involvement in healthcare. It aims to do so by surveying incoming year 1 medical students. This study has been designed in collaboration with four current year 3 medical students.

Why am I being asked to participate?

You have been asked to take part as you are a current 1st year medical student. It is your decision whether or not to take part in this study. A decision not to participate will not affect your grades in any way.

What will happen if I decide to take part?

If you take part, you will be asked to fill out a short online questionnaire. The questionnaire will take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. The completed questionnaires will be analyzed to see if there are any common themes. The information we gather will give us a better understanding of how students view patient involvement in healthcare and may help in future course design.

Are there any benefits or risks involved?

Although there is no specific benefit to taking part in the study, completing the questionnaire may allow you to reflect on your experiences, which you may find helpful. In the unlikely event that participants inadvertently disclose personal information such as that regarding the mental and/or physical health of themselves or others, information relating to criminal acts and/or acts of professional misconduct, participants should understand that the research team may have to report such disclosures to the appropriate authorities as deemed necessary by the nature of the disclosure.

What will happen to my data if I take part?

Researchers from the University of Glasgow collect, store and process all personal information in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (2018). You will not be asked to disclose any personally identifiable information. All data will be stored in electronic format on secure password-protected computers. The data will be stored in archiving facilities in line with the University of Glasgow retention policy of up to 10 years. After this period, further retention may be agreed or your data will be securely destroyed in accordance with the relevant standard procedures. Your rights to access, change or move the

information we store may be limited, as we need to manage your information in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate. You can find out more about how we use your information from Dr Jennifer O'Neill.

How will the results be communicated?

It is anticipated that the results of the study will be presented both internally and externally and submitted for publication in the appropriate literature. No-one will be identifiable from the information presented. The project has been reviewed by the College of Medicine, Veterinary and Life Sciences Ethics Committee.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, you can contact the organizer of the study: Dr Jennifer O'Neill, (Lecturer in Biology) by e-mail: jennifer.oneill@glasgow.ac.uk

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet.

Q3 I understand that should I inadvertently disclose personal information such as that regarding the mental and/or physical health of myself or others, information relating to criminal acts and/or acts of professional misconduct, the research team may have to report

such disclosures to the appropriate authorities as deemed necessary by the nature of the disclosure.

Yes (1)

No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I understand that should I inadvertently disclose personal information such as that regarding the... = No

Q4 I have read the participant information sheet and understand that by completing the questionnaire I consent to participation.

Yes (1)

No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I have read the participant information sheet and understand that by completing the questionnaire... = No

End of Block: Participant Information

Start of Block: Demographics

Q5 What is your gender?

Female (1)

Male (2)

Not listed (3)

Prefer not to say (4)

Q6 What age are you?

17 or under (1)

18-21 (2)

22-25 (3)

26-29 (4)

30+ (5)

Prefer not to say (6)

Q7 What is your educational background

Foundation course or pre-mend (1)

Gap year (2)

Graduate (3)

Repeating or returning to year 1 (4)

School leaver (5)

Other (6)

End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Patient involvement

Q8 **This section of the survey aims to explore your views on the roles of doctors and patients' in healthcare.**

Q9 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Patients' lived experience should be valued as much as clinical knowledge or expertise (1)					
Representing the patient voice in healthcare is important (2)					
Patients should be passive recipients of care (3)					

A doctor has the final say in decision making (4)

Scientific findings should be considered alongside patient input (5)

Patients should be active collaborators in their care (6)

Doctors must understand the need to involve patients in management decisions (7)

End of Block: Patient involvement

Start of Block: Patient scenarios

Q10 **Patient scenarios**

For each scenario, select the option that you think best suits the situation.

Q11 **Scenario 1**

Q12 An expectant mother, known to have type 1 diabetes mellitus, is admitted to the labor ward and is expected to give birth soon. The mother, who is also of short stature, asks doctors whether there are any risks that she should be made aware of. Doctors know that since the mother has diabetes mellitus, she is more likely to be carrying a larger than average baby and

that there may be several known complications associated with giving birth naturally compared to via a caesarean section. What should the doctors do?

Do not tell the patient of the risks and make a decision on her behalf (1)

Tell the patient of the risks and any options available (2)

Q14 **Scenario 2**

Q13 A patient consents to undergo minor surgery to have a mole removed. During the surgical procedure, however, doctors discover that the patient requires an additional (non-urgent) surgical intervention. This was not previously discussed with the patient. What should the doctors do?

Proceed with the additional surgical intervention (1)

Waken the patient and ask for their consent before continuing (2)

Q15 **Scenario 3**

Q16 A group of doctors are involved in pioneering a new surgical technique using a new implant. Some months after the initial surgical implantations were performed, patients begin to complain of painful side effects. This is in spite of the fact that clinical trial data is strongly in favour of this new technique and shows little, to no, side-effects. What should the doctors do with this information from their patients?

Disregard this information and continue to rely upon the scientific clinical trial evidence to provide the implantation surgery for new patients (1)

Explore the existing patients' experiences in more depth and use this to shape future practice (2)

End of Block: Patient scenarios

Start of Block: Patient involvement

Q17 Which aspects of healthcare do you think patients can be involved in? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Choosing treatment from a selection of options (1)
- ☐ Communicating research findings (2)
- ☐ Conducting research (3)
- ☐ Contributing to the design of research studies (4)
- ☐ Deciding where to receive healthcare (5)
- ☐ Medical decision-making about treatment (6)
- ☐ None of the above (7)

Q18 In your personal experience with healthcare, have you felt that your opinion has been valued?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Not applicable (3)

End of Block: Patient involvement

Start of Block: Free text questions

Q19 Please use this space to provide any other relevant comments. We do not wish to capture any personally identifiable information or information related to personal circumstances. Students are reminded to avoid sharing such information when responding to this question.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Free text questions