



HAL
open science

Creating scripted video-vignettes in an experimental study on two empathic processes in oncology: Reflections on our experience

Lucie Gehenne, Véronique Christophe, Clarisse Eveno, Aurélien Carnot, Anthony Turpin, Diane Pannier, Guillaume Piessen, Sophie Lelorain

► To cite this version:

Lucie Gehenne, Véronique Christophe, Clarisse Eveno, Aurélien Carnot, Anthony Turpin, et al.. Creating scripted video-vignettes in an experimental study on two empathic processes in oncology: Reflections on our experience. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 2021, 104 (3), pp.654-662. 10.1016/j.pec.2020.08.041 . hal-04522527

HAL Id: hal-04522527

<https://hal.science/hal-04522527v1>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Title: Creating scripted video-vignettes in an experimental study on
2 two empathic processes in oncology: reflections on our experience

3
4 Authors: Gehenne, Lucie¹, Christophe, Véronique^{1,2}, Eveno, Clarisse.³, Carnot, Aurélien.⁴,
5 Turpin, Anthony.^{5,6}, Pannier, Diane.⁴, Piessen, Guillaume.^{3,7} & Lelorain, Sophie ¹.

6
7 Corresponding authors:

8 Lucie Gehenne (PhD Student) and PhD Sophie Lelorain at Laboratoire SCALab, University
9 of Lille, Rue du Barreau BP 60149, Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex. [lucie.gehenne@univ-](mailto:lucie.gehenne@univ-lille.fr)
10 lille.fr/sophie.lelorain@univ-lille.fr; +33-320-416-704.

11
12 Affiliations:

13 ¹ Cognitive and Affective Sciences, UMR CNRS 9193, SCALab, University of Lille, Lille,
14 France

15 ² Department of Human and Social Sciences, Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France

16 ³ Department of Digestive and Oncological Surgery, University of Lille, Claude Huriez
17 University Hospital, Lille, France

18 ⁴ Department of General Oncology, Centre Oscar Lambret, Lille, France

19 ⁵ Department of Medical Oncology, University of Lille, Claude Huriez University Hospital,
20 Lille, France

21 ⁶ University of Lille, CNRS, Inserm, CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, UMR9020 – UMR-
22 S 1277 – Canther – Cancer Heterogeneity, Plasticity and Resistance to Therapies, F-59000
23 Lille, France

24 ⁷ Jean-Pierre Aubert Research Center, Neurosciences and Cancer, University of Lille, IMR-S
25 1172-JPArc, Lille, France

26

27

28

1 **Abstract:**

2 **Objective:** The aims were to: (1) apply the guidelines to develop and test the validity of
3 video-vignettes manipulating empathy and context in oncology; (2) compare lay people's and
4 patients' assessments of validity; (3) reflecting on our experiment

5 **Methods:** Guidelines were followed: (1) deciding whether video-vignettes were appropriate;
6 (2) developing a valid script; (3) designing valid manipulations; (4) converting the scripted
7 consultations into videos. One hundred sixteen lay people and 46 cancer patients filled in the
8 Video Engagement Scale, the CARE, and ad hoc questionnaires on realism and emotions.

9 **Results:** The video-vignettes are valid for experimental use. Differences appeared in the
10 emotions participants reported. The empathic processes were successfully manipulated and
11 perceived. Lay people's and patients' assessments were equivalent, except for video-vignettes
12 in neutral consultations. Participants' comments on nonverbal behavior, camera perspective,
13 scripts and empathy assessment were reported.

14 **Conclusion:** Patients' assessments are impacted by their personal experiences. Researchers
15 should control for this in analogue patient studies.

16 **Practice implications:** Based on this experience, we reflect on: (1) adopting congruent
17 nonverbal behavior throughout the video-vignettes; (2) alternating camera perspectives; (3)
18 avoiding the sole use of written scripts; (4) using quantitative and qualitative analysis to
19 validate scripts and video-vignettes.

20
21 **Keywords:** Analogue Patients, Video-vignette, Empathy, Cancer, Methodology.

22
23
24

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Although physician empathy (PE) is associated with beneficial patient outcomes [1], its
3 nature remains unclear [2]. PE is generally considered as a whole, while subcomponents can
4 be identified [3,4]. Based on a model by Neumann et al., (2009) [5], we postulate that PE
5 impacts patient outcomes via two distinct processes: the emotional process of empathy (emo-
6 emp) by which physicians understand, acknowledge patients in their difficulties, and the
7 cognitive process (cog-emp) by which physicians provide more medical information and
8 involve patients in their own care. While patient satisfaction is higher in cog-emp
9 consultations [6], mixed results are found regarding emo-emp consultations [6,7]. Medical
10 context should also be taken into account as the effect of PE differs between “follow-up”
11 consultations (follow-cons) and “bad-news” consultations (bad-cons) [4,8,9]. Therefore,
12 further research is needed to clarify the impact of these empathic processes on cancer
13 patients’ outcomes according to the type of consultation.

14 However, PE is difficult to manipulate. The use of experimental studies has developed,
15 with analogue patient paradigm (APP) studies. Analogue patients (AP), who may be
16 current/former patients or lay people, are asked to adopt a patient’s perspective and to judge a
17 video-vignette depicting mock patient-physician interactions. Although the use of AP studies
18 is validated, it is unclear whether lay people can put themselves in the shoes of current
19 patients. Lay people are able to adopt patient perspective [10–12]. However, slight differences
20 appeared between analogue and current patients’ preferences regarding information exchange
21 in bad-cons [11]. Moreover, anxiety and negative affect after viewing video-vignettes were
22 higher in lay people compared to current patients [13].

23 APP requires creating and validating video-vignettes, which is a long methodological
24 process rarely detailed in studies [11,14]. The challenge is to ensure both external and internal
25 validity: the realism and generalization of videos (external validity, i.e. the consultation is
26 plausible) and the effectiveness of the manipulations (internal validity or manipulation check,
27 i.e. the physician is empathetic when he/she is supposed to be). Guidelines have been
28 developed to help researchers [14,15]. However, for certain issues such as whether to
29 alternate camera perspectives or not, guidance is still lacking, hence the development of
30 research to address this gap [16].

31
32 To conduct a future APP study aiming at assessing the effect of two empathic processes
33 on patients’ adjustment to cancer, we needed to develop video-vignettes with: (1) neutral

1 empathy consultations (neutral-emp) used as a control condition; (2) consultations with the
2 emotional process of empathy (emo-emp); (3) consultations with the cognitive process of
3 empathy (cog-emp). For each type of consultation, two different contexts were used: (a)
4 “follow-up” consultations (follow-cons); (b) “bad-news” consultations (bad-cons).
5 Abbreviations are provided in Table 1.

6 The present paper follows the example of Hillen et al. (2013) and Van Vliet et al. (2013)
7 [14,15] and aims at:

- 8 1. Applying the existing guidelines to develop and test the internal and external validity
9 of six video-vignettes manipulating surgeons’ empathic processes and medical context
10 [14,15]. Validating the written scripts is a preliminary step to validate the video-
11 vignettes. Therefore, written scripts’ development and validation will **also** be
12 described.
- 13 2. Comparing lay people’s and patients’ assessments of internal and external validity of
14 the video-vignettes
- 15 3. Proposing some reflections about this experiment.

16

17

18

-Insert Table 1-

19

2. Methods

The phases suggested by the guidelines were respected with the exception of the “administering the videos” phase [14,15], because the objective was not to report the results of the experiment. Figure 1 presents the phases. Developing and testing the validity of the scripts is a preliminary step to develop and test the video-vignettes. **We describe the testing and validation of both written scripts and video-vignettes.**

- *Insert Figure 1* -

Procedure

The study was carried out online. Each participant was randomized to rate only one script/video in order to avoid any contagion effect as material was similar, except for manipulation statements. All participants provided written informed consent and the university ethics committee validated the study (Ref: 2018-296-S63).

2.1. Phase 1

The first phase consisted in justifying the use of video-vignettes as an appropriate methodology. This paradigm was used for several reasons. First, it is not possible to manipulate communication in real encounters for ethical considerations. Second, since two empathic processes were tested, the use of video-vignettes ensured the rigorous standardization of surgeons’ communication, which is impossible in clinical care [17]. Thanks to this standardization, a causal effect of manipulations can be drawn [14]. Finally, as one of our hypotheses in the planned study was that the perception of PE depends on certain patient characteristics such as emotional abilities [4], the viewing of video-vignettes by several participants would allow us to test this hypothesis.

2.2. Phase 2

Before developing the video-vignettes, written scripts are developed. The second phase consisted in writing a standard script, the basis of all scripts. Scripts can be based on either experience/literature guidelines or on real interactions [14,15]. Experts are rarely involved at this stage [14]. Our scripts were inspired by real consultations in order to be closer to reality. Surgeons were involved in writing them so that the medical content was credible. It is recommended to start off with an introduction to the simulated consultation to help viewers

1 understand the situation and identify with the mock patient [14,15]. Audiovisual introductions
2 allow greater engagement for viewers than written ones [16]. Before the simulated
3 consultation, a short video sequence was created in which the patient introduced himself and
4 the context of the consultation (i.e. the patient is waiting for surgery outcomes). Finally, the
5 scripts can reflect a whole consultation or part of it. Shorter scripts have a major impact and
6 allow greater video feasibility [14]. This is why the scripts only reflect the “surgical report”
7 part of the consultations (successful in follow-cons vs. unsuccessful in bad-cons). Two
8 standard scripts were written: one for follow-cons and one for bad-cons.

10 **2.3. Phase 3**

11 The third phase consisted in designing the manipulations. In general, studies do not
12 sufficiently clarify what their manipulations comprise [14]. As PE is not clearly defined [2],
13 we drew a search of the literature to create the manipulations. It mainly focused on the
14 manipulation of PE in APP studies and on the tools used to assess PE. Our literature search
15 was not restricted to the term “empathy”, because “patient-physician communication” and
16 “patient centeredness” also encompass this notion.

17 The emo-emp encompassed validating patients’ emotions and difficulties; questioning and
18 encouraging them to speak about it; ensuring medical presence throughout care; showing
19 concern [e.g. 13,18,19].

20 The cog-emp encompassed involving patients in their own care; giving thorough
21 information; verifying patients’ understanding and encouraging questions; discussing the next
22 steps and introducing a plan of action; giving control and being positive [e.g. 9,20,21].

23 The standard script was the neutral-emp version and fragments were added to design
24 the emo-emp and cog-emp versions. For example, the emo-emp version was the neutral-emp
25 with added emotional empathy fragments. The neutral-emp did not have non-empathetic
26 statements as it was a neutral consultation. Surgeons were involved to ensure realism.

27 The follow-cons was a good news consultation as it described the success of an oncology
28 surgery report. In the bad-cons, the surgeon explained that since the cancer had spread, he was
29 not able to remove the tumor. Conditions are described in Table 2.

30 It is recommended to decide on the verbal and/or nonverbal nature of the
31 manipulations. Manipulations mainly focused on the verbal content. Manipulating both verbal
32 and non-verbal behaviors would not allow us to conclude which of these two aspects
33 influenced the results. Non-verbal behavior was standardized between the films. However,
34 non-verbal communication is inseparable from verbal communication [22,23]. Therefore,

1 during the added manipulated parts, nonverbal behavior was congruent with verbal content.
2 The rest of the consultation was strictly identical across the different versions.

3 Researchers also need to decide whether they compensate for duration differences,
4 which appeared between the follow-cons and bad-cons versions. We chose not to compensate
5 for duration differences, which is common practice [13], as adding fillers could impact the
6 perception of the consultation [14]. Duration differences also appeared between the neutral-
7 emp, the emo-emp and the cog-emp versions. Similarly, we did not compensate for these
8 differences, as long as the emo-emp and cog-emp versions lasted the same amount of time.
9 Moreover, it was expected that neutral-emp consultations would be shorter as there were no
10 manipulations. Scripts are available in Appendix C. Participants and measures are described
11 after the following section.

12
13 - *Insert Table 2* -
14

15 **2.4. Phase 4**

16 This phase consisted in turning the scripts into role-playing, and then into video-vignettes.
17 To save time and because the scripts were thoroughly reviewed by surgeons and experts, we
18 decided to skip the role-playing part. However, the scripts were rehearsed and adjusted
19 several times with a stage director before shooting the final video-vignettes.

20 We had to decide whether to choose actors or real care providers. Since there were six
21 versions to shoot and certain skills required to standardize nonverbal behavior, we chose
22 actors. The actor patient was a man to best depict the digestive cancer patient who was our
23 target. The actor surgeon was also a man in our case but could have been a woman.

24 We decided to alternate camera perspectives, as recommended [14–16]. Close-ups were
25 made on the patient at key emotional moments, and on the surgeon during manipulations.
26 Video durations are available in Appendix A. We filmed in the comprehensive cancer center
27 in Lille (Centre Oscar Lambret). Once the vignettes were filmed, external and internal validity
28 were assessed as described after the following section. If validity was not satisfying, it was
29 planned to film again, which was unnecessary. Videos are available upon request.

1 **Script validation**

2

3 **The scripts were developed and then modified thanks to experts' feedback. The final**
4 **version of the scripts, which took experts' feedback into account, was tested for validity.**

5

6 **Participants**

7 1) Twenty experts, comprising 10 physicians (8 oncologists, 1 medical student and 1 surgeon)
8 and 10 researchers in health psychology, validated the written scripts providing written
9 comments on realism and manipulations. Their feedback led to readjustments.

10 2) Forty-eight lay people rated the success of manipulations (i.e. internal validity), realism
11 and the emotions felt during viewing (i.e. external validity).

12

13 **Measures**

14 For internal validity, we used the ten-item CARE measure, assessing PE and the
15 emotional and cognitive empathic processes [24]. The emotional process subscore refers to
16 items 4 – 5 – 6 (i.e. how was your doctor at showing care and compassion?); and the cognitive
17 process subscore refers to items 7 – 8 – 9 – 10 (i.e. how was your doctor at helping you take
18 control?) [3,25,26]. For external validity, realism was assessed with an ad-hoc item with a
19 five-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 “Not realistic at all” to 5 “Very realistic”. A
20 free comment section was available. Finally, an ad-hoc scale of the emotional impact of the
21 script was used. The scale assessed anxiety, interest for the script, fear, sadness, and relief on
22 a five-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 “Not at all” to 5 “Strongly”. Participants
23 were invited to comment on the script.

24

25 **Video-vignette validation**

26

27 **Video-vignettes were created according to the final validated script and were directly**
28 **tested for validity.**

29

30 **Participants**

31 1) Fourteen experts were involved. Seven physicians (6 oncologists and 1 surgeon) and 7
32 researchers in health psychology provided written comments on the video-vignettes and rated
33 the effectiveness of the manipulations (e.g. in an emo-emp, did the physician listen to the
34 patient?).

1 2) One hundred sixteen lay people, different from those in validation step 1, and 46 cancer
2 patients were involved, as recommended [11]. Patients were recruited via the patient
3 committee of the French National League Against Cancer.

4 5 **Measures**

6 Internal and external validity were assessed in the same way as in the validation of the scripts.
7 The Video Engagement Scale, which has a 15-item seven-point Likert response scale [27],
8 was used to assess participants' engagement in the video-vignettes. Higher scores indicate
9 higher engagement in the video-vignette. Three questions about satisfaction with image and
10 sound on a five-point Likert response scale were asked. Higher scores indicate higher
11 satisfaction. For patients, medical information comprising tumor localization and stage,
12 diagnostic date and current treatments were recorded (Table 3).

13 14 **Hypotheses**

15 To confirm the internal validity, we expected the following:

- 16 - compared to the neutral-emp, we expected a significantly higher level of the emotional
17 process for the emo-emp versions (H1 for scripts and H1' for videos) and a
18 significantly higher level of the cognitive process for the cog-emp versions (H2 and
19 H2').
- 20 - Bad-cons were expected to be associated with more participant anxiety, fear and
21 sadness compared to follow-cons (H3 and H3'), while the latter were expected to be
22 associated with more participant relief compared to the former (H4 and H4').

23
24 To confirm the external validity:

- 25 - all versions were expected to be equal in realism and in interest for the script (H5 and
26 H5').
- 27 - Emo-emp and cog-emp were expected to be equal in emotional arousal after viewing
28 (H6).
- 29 - Engagement in video-vignettes was expected to be equal in all conditions (H7).

30 We expected that patients' and lay people's evaluations of internal and external validity
31 would overlap (H8).

32 33 **Data analysis**

1 Non-parametric tests were used due to the small sample size and ANOVA assumptions were
2 not met. We performed the Mann-Whitney test to compare follow-cons and bad-cons and the
3 Kruskal-Wallis test to compare the neutral-emp, emo-emp and cog-emp conditions. Pairwise
4 comparisons with adjusted p values were performed when possible. The analyses were
5 conducted using IBM SPSS version 24.

6 7 8 **3. Results**

9 10 **3.1. Script validation**

11 Socio-demographic information is provided in Table 3 and descriptive statistics in
12 Appendix B. The scripts were rated “fairly realistic” (follow-cons: $M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.55$; bad-
13 cons: $M = 4$, $SD = 0.34$, possible range 0-5).

14
15 *- Insert Table 3 -*
16

17 **Internal validity**

18 For follow-cons, empathic processes significantly affected the emotional process
19 subscore ($H(2) = 7.18$, $p = .028$), but not the cognitive process subscore ($H(2) = 3.03$, $p =$
20 $.22$). Pairwise comparisons with adjusted p-values showed that the emo-emp had a higher
21 emotional process subscore than the neutral-emp ($p = .035$, $r = -0.65$). For bad-cons, empathic
22 processes showed a tendency to affect the emotional process subscore ($H(2) = 5.8$, $p = .055$),
23 and significantly affected the cognitive process subscore ($H(2) = 7.06$, $p = .029$). Pairwise
24 comparisons showed that the cog-emp had a higher cognitive process subscore than the
25 neutral-emp ($p = .03$, $r = -0.71$). Since the effect was not significant for the emo-emp,
26 pairwise comparisons could not be performed. Descriptive statistics indicated that the neutral-
27 emp had a lower emotional process subscore than the emo-emp. H1 and H2 are partially
28 validated.

29 30 31 **External validity**

32 Anxiety, fear and sadness were higher in bad-cons than in follow-cons. Furthermore,
33 relief was higher in follow-cons than in bad-cons. H3 and H4 are validated. There were no

1 differences between follow-cons and bad-cons on realism and interest for the script. H5 is
2 validated. Results are presented in Table 4.

3
4 - *Insert Table 4* -
5

6 For the follow-cons, the emo-emp and cog-emp scripts were equivalent on realism
7 ($H(2) = 2.36, p = .307$), anxiety ($H(2) = 4.272, p = .118$), interest for the script ($H(2) = 2.29, p$
8 $= .32$), fear ($H(2) = 4.83, p = .09$) sadness ($H(2) = 0.49, p = .784$) and relief ($H(2) = 1.92, p =$
9 $.382$).

10 For bad-cons, the neutral-emp, emo-emp and cog-emp scripts were equivalent on
11 realism ($H(2) = 2.63, p = .268$), anxiety ($H(2) = 2.44, p = .295$), interest for the script ($H(2) =$
12 $3.54, p = .17$), fear ($H(2) = 3.68, p = .16$) sadness ($H(2) = 1.36, p = .51$) and relief ($H(2) = 2.6,$
13 $p = .273$). There were no differences on realism and emotions felt during viewing between the
14 three versions.

15 16 **3.2.Video-vignettes validation**

17
18 Socio-demographic and medical information is provided in Table 3 and descriptive
19 statistics in Appendix B. The scripts were rated “fairly realistic” (FC: $M = 3.52, SD = 0.74$;
20 BNC: $M = 3.62, SD = 1.09$, possible range 0-5).

21 22 **Internal validity**

23 For follow-cons, empathic processes significantly affected both the emotional ($H(2) =$
24 $23.8, p < .001$) and cognitive ($H(2) = 22.42, p < .001$) process subscores. The emo-emp had a
25 higher emotional process subscore ($p < .001, r = -0.41$) than the neutral-emp version. The
26 cog-emp had a higher cognitive process subscore ($p = .000, r = -0.67$) than the neutral-emp
27 version.

28 For bad-cons, empathic processes significantly affected both the emotional ($H(2) = 6.61, p =$
29 $.037$) and cognitive ($H(2) = 8.85, p = .012$) process subscores. Pairwise comparisons with
30 adjusted p-values showed that the emo-emp had a higher emotional process ($p = .07, r = -$
31 0.31) than the neutral-emp. The cog-emp had a higher cognitive process subscore ($p = .009, r$
32 $= -0.45$) than the neutral-emp version. H1’ and H2’ are validated.

33 34 **External validity**

1 There were no differences between follow-cons and bad-cons regarding realism,
2 interest for the video and satisfaction with image. H5 is validated. Anxiety, fear, sadness and
3 engagement in the video were higher in bad-cons than in follow-cons. H3' is validated while
4 H7 is not. As expected, relief was higher in follow-cons than in bad-cons. H4' is validated.
5 Results are provided in Table 4.

6 For follow-cons, the neutral-emp, emo-emp and cog-emp video-vignettes were
7 equivalent regarding realism ($H(2) = 1.14, p = .567$), anxiety ($H(2) = .02, p = .99$), interest for
8 the video ($H(2) = 1.53, p = .47$), fear ($H(2) = .434, p = .81$), engagement in the video ($H(2) =$
9 $2.28, p = .32$), satisfaction with image ($H(2) = 0.05, p = .97$) and sound ($H(2) = .667, p = .72$).
10 Empathic processes affected relief ($H(2) = 11.912, p = .003$) and tended to affect sadness
11 ($H(2) = 5.84, p = .054$). The cog-emp video-vignette generated more relief than the neutral-
12 emp version ($p = .002, r = -0.51$). Descriptive information indicated that the neutral-emp had
13 the highest score on sadness.

14 For bad-cons, the neutral-emp, emo-emp and cog-emp video-vignettes were equivalent
15 regarding realism ($H(2) = 2.42, p = .30$), anxiety ($H(2) = 4.04, p = .13$), interest for the video
16 ($H(2) = 1.51, p = .47$), fear ($H(2) = 1, p = .61$) sadness ($H(2) = 1.91, p = .385$), relief ($H(2) =$
17 $0.2, p = .991$), engagement in the video ($H(2) = 2.37, p = .31$), satisfaction with image ($H(2) =$
18 $0.74, p = .69$) and sound ($H(2) = 1.44, p = .49$).

19 To conclude, H6 is validated with the exception of relief and sadness issues in follow-cons.

20

21 **Differences between lay people and patients**

22 In follow-cons, for the neutral-emp version, the emotional and cognitive process
23 subscores were higher for lay people than for patients.

24 In bad-cons, for the neutral-emp version, the emotional process subscore was higher
25 for lay people than for patients. In the emo-emp video-vignette, sadness was higher for
26 patients than for lay people. In the cog-emp video-vignette, realism was higher for lay people
27 than for patients. Results are presented in Table 5.

28 There were no differences in any other measures (data not shown). H8 is not validated.

29

30

31

- Insert Table 5 -

32

33

34

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3.3.Reflection on the experience

Participants' comments provided us with feedback on the choices we made.

1. Comments on nonverbal behavior :

Out of the 43 participants who provided comments, 8 reported that it seemed odd that the surgeon was first neutral and then leaned towards the patient when being empathetic. Two experts also provided this comment.

2. Comments on camera perspective:

Twelve participants reported that close-ups on the surgeon enabled them to pay attention to the medical discourse and to adopt the patient's perspective, while close-ups on the patient made them empathize with him at key emotional moments.

3. Comments on validation of written scripts:

Out of the 48 participants, 10 reported it was difficult for them to assess PE, because a written sentence could be interpreted in various ways, due to lacking important communication parameters such as intention or paralinguistic cues.

4. Comments on empathy assessment:

A single sentence (i.e. "I see that you are worried") was perceived as being empathetic (i.e. the physician is concerned) or non-empathetic (i.e. the physician insists on negative emotions without doing anything). Perception of PE remains a subjective process that is sensitive to various socio-demographic and personal variables, which created much heterogeneity in the participants' assessments.

1 **4. Discussion and conclusion**

2 **4.1. Discussion**

3
4 The first objective was to test the internal and external validity of six video-vignettes
5 manipulating empathic processes and medical context. Developing and testing the six written
6 scripts was a preliminary step.

7 As for internal validity, manipulations were successful in both scripts and video-vignettes
8 (H1, H1', H2, H2'). However, in the script of follow-cons, the cog-emp did not differ from
9 the neutral-emp version regarding the cognitive process subscore (H1, H2). Comments
10 indicated that participants had difficulties assessing the surgeon's empathy, as only written
11 verbal content was provided without any intentions or paralinguistic parameters.

12 Concerning external validity, both scripts and video-vignettes were perceived as realistic
13 in all conditions (H5, H5'). Anxiety, fear and sadness were higher in bad-cons, while relief
14 was higher in follow-cons (H3, H3', H4, H4'). This comes as no surprise given that in bad-
15 cons, the surgeon reported that he was not able to operate because the disease had spread
16 more than expected. In follow-cons, the surgeon gave a successful surgical report. It was
17 easier to identify with the patient in bad-cons than in follow-cons, since this type of
18 consultation caused more negative emotions in participants (H7). High correlations between
19 engagement score and anxiety, sadness and fearfulness induced by video-vignettes have
20 previously been observed [27]. However, other factors such as personal confrontation with
21 bad news consultations could also increase participants' engagement in viewing.

22 Participants were asked to assess the emotions they felt after viewing but not to adopt
23 patient perspective. The empathic processes did not affect the emotions that participants
24 reported, except for two conditions in the validation of video-vignettes (H6).

25 First, in follow-cons, sadness was higher in the neutral-emp condition than in other ones.
26 In this context, a neutral physician could be perceived negatively and trigger more sadness in
27 the participant, who identifies with the patient.

28 Second, still in follow-cons, relief was higher in the cog-emp version than in the neutral-
29 emp version, which was not the case for the emo-emp condition. This finding might seem
30 surprising but it is in line with an oncology study that demonstrated that compassion and
31 listening could actually be frightening and hasten patients' death [28]. Cog-emp could indeed
32 bring more relief, because physicians show that they have the situation under control as they
33 provide advice and a plan of action.

1 To conclude, the analysis revealed that the video-vignettes were valid to be used in an
2 experiment.

3 The second objective was to compare lay people's and patients' assessments of the video-
4 vignettes (H8). Overall, their assessments matched, as previously reported [10–12]. However,
5 slight differences appeared. In bad-cons, realism was higher for lay people in the cog-emp
6 version, maybe suggesting that lay people expect cog-emp. Furthermore, sadness was higher
7 for patients in the emo-emp version. This in line with studies demonstrating that empathy is
8 not expected in some contexts and may be perceived as frightening [28,29].

9 For the neutral-emp versions, the emotional process subscores were higher for lay people
10 than for patients in both types of consultations, and the cognitive process subscore was higher
11 for lay people than for patients in follow-cons. In sum, in neutral encounters, the encounter
12 was neutral, namely without empathic statements, patients perceived lower emotional and
13 cognitive empathy than lay people. Patients' comments were very critical of the surgeon in
14 the neutral-emp versions. They reported feeling angry because the surgeon did not empathize
15 enough with the patient, which two patients described as a "very realistic" attitude. Several
16 patients reported their personal experiences with oncologists in the comment section,
17 suggesting it might have influenced their assessment of the video-vignettes, as previously
18 described in a qualitative study [30]. It may even have affected their general perception of
19 physicians negatively (e.g. *I have never met a doctor who was interested in my concerns, or*
20 *gave me advice to take care of myself*) and positively with top-down social comparison
21 processes (e.g. *I remember my surgeon patting my hand before anesthesia, saying everything*
22 *would be all right*). Although one study could not find any influence of the self-reported
23 experiences of lay people with their physicians [31], our results suggest an opposite statement
24 for patients and even for lay people. The latter also reported that their personal experiences
25 with relatives who had cancer could have an effect on their perception of the scripts or video-
26 vignettes (e.g. *My father died of lung cancer and I was very moved, I think it impacted my*
27 *answers*). Therefore, it would be important to control for patient-physician relationship in
28 patients and lay people and controlling for personal confrontation with cancer in lay people.

29
30 The third objective was to reflect on this experiment based on this validation and on
31 participants' comments. Based on these comments, we provide 4 reflections: (1) Though it
32 could limit determining causal effects and cause more differences between the neutral and
33 manipulated versions, if researchers do not want to focus on verbal or nonverbal content
34 specifically, they could adopt congruent non-verbal behavior throughout the video-vignettes,

1 in order not to separate standard parts from manipulations parts (2) Research indicates it is
2 recommended to alternate camera perspective [16], which is supported by our sample (3)
3 Using written scripts only would not be the best option to assess the effect of various
4 communication types (4) Using both quantitative and qualitative analysis to validate scripts
5 and video-vignettes could be relevant. As there are few evidence-based recommendations,
6 guidelines are generally based on the pros and cons of each possible decision [14]. Although
7 our reflections warrant further investigation to be confirmed, we think they already offer
8 useful insights for researchers. This study has several strengths because it involved experts,
9 lay people and patients. They reported both qualitative and quantitative data to validate the
10 video-vignettes, which is rare [11]. It also has limitations: we did not validate the role-played
11 scripts, although scripts were rehearsed with a stage director and commented by the research
12 team. Moreover, sample sizes were small, especially for the patients, so that larger samples
13 are needed to confirm the temporary results. Therefore, we cannot ascertain there is no
14 difference in engagement and realism between the videos. The reflections we provided were
15 based on our experience. Further research is needed to establish evidence-based choices.
16 Finally, this type of paradigm does not ensure full ecological validity, as communication
17 processes and their effect go way beyond verbal and non-verbal behaviors [32].

18

19 **4.2. Conclusion**

20 Six video-vignettes manipulating PE and medical context were created and validated
21 for experimental use. Lay people's and patients' assessments of the video-vignettes were
22 mainly similar, except in the neutral-emp condition, indicating a potential bias in patient
23 perception owing to their medical history. Researchers should control for physician-patient
24 relationship if AP are current patients.

25

26 **4.3. Practice implications**

27 Based on participants' feedback, we reflect on: (1) having a physician congruent
28 nonverbal behavior throughout the video-vignettes; (2) using various camera perspectives; (3)
29 avoiding the sole use of written scripts in experimental studies; (4) using both quantitative and
30 qualitative analysis to validate scripts and video-vignettes; (5) controlling for participants'
31 personal experiences with physicians. However, evidence-based research is needed to test
32 these reflections. Finally, scripts are available in French and English. Video-vignettes are also
33 available in French for the same purpose.

1 **Acknowledgements:**

2 We would like to thank all the participants who took part in this study for their time and rich
3 feedback, and all the doctors: Stéphane Cattan, Luc Ceugnart, Anne Gandon, Victoire
4 Lassaux, Samira Makhloufi, David Pasquier, Anne Ploquin, and Thibault Voron. We would
5 also like to thank all the researchers for their precious comments: Eva Andreotti, Anne-Sophie
6 Baudry, Anne Brédart, Laura Caton, Emilie Constant, Charlotte Dassonneville, Christelle
7 Duprez, Cécile Flahault, Michèle Koleck, Yves Libert, Isabelle Milhabet, Marie Préau,
8 Aurélie Untas, Clémence Willem, and Emmanuelle Zech. Special thanks to Mieczyslaw
9 Cholewa, Fabien Delfosse, Michel Destrebecq, Eléonore Dumas, Marie-France Ghesquière
10 and Manuelle Thebault. We also want to thank the Centre Oscar Lambret for their kind help,
11 especially Nicolas Penel and Sophie Costa.

12

13 **Funding:** This study received a grant from the Ligue Nationale Contre le Cancer (LNCC).
14 Lucie Gehenne is supported by the Institut National du Cancer with a doctoral grant (INCa).

15

16

References:

- [1] S. Lelorain, A. Brédart, S. Dolbeault, S. Sultan, A systematic review of the associations between empathy measures and patient outcomes in cancer care, *Psychooncology*. 21 (2012) 1255–1264. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.2115>.
- [2] S.H. Sulzer, N.W. Feinstein, C. Wendland, Assessing Empathy Development in Medical Education: A Systematic Review, *Med. Educ.* 50 (2016) 300–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12806>.
- [3] C.S. Fung, S.W. Mercer, A qualitative study of patients' views on quality of primary care consultations in Hong Kong and comparison with the UK CARE Measure, *BMC Fam. Pract.* 10 (2009) 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-10-10>.
- [4] S. Lelorain, S. Cattan, F. Lordick, A. Mehnert, C. Mariette, V. Christophe, A. Cortot, In which context is physician empathy associated with cancer patient quality of life?, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 101 (2018) 1216–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2018.01.023>.
- [5] M. Neumann, J. Bensing, S. Mercer, N. Ernstmann, O. Ommen, H. Pfaff, Analyzing the “nature” and “specific effectiveness” of clinical empathy: A theoretical overview and contribution towards a theory-based research agenda, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 74 (2009) 339–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2008.11.013>.
- [6] L.M. Ong, M.R. Visser, F.B. Lammes, J.C. de Haes, Doctor-patient communication and cancer patients' quality of life and satisfaction, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 41 (2000) 145–156.
- [7] P.N. Butow, R.F. Brown, S. Cogar, M.H.N. Tattersall, S.M. Dunn, Oncologists' reactions to cancer patients' verbal cues, *Psychooncology*. 11 (2002) 47–58.
- [8] T. Takayama, Y. Yamazaki, N. Katsumata, Relationship between outpatients' perceptions of physicians' communication styles and patients' anxiety levels in a Japanese oncology setting., *Soc. Sci. Med.* 53 (2001) 1335–1350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00413-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00413-5).
- [9] S.M. Dowsett, J.L. Saul, P.N. Butow, S.M. Dunn, M.J. Boyer, R. Findlow, J. Dunsmore, Communication styles in the cancer consultation: Preferences for a patient-centred approach, *Psychooncology*. 9 (2000) 147–156. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1611\(200003/04\)9:2<147::AID-PON443>3.0.CO;2-X](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1611(200003/04)9:2<147::AID-PON443>3.0.CO;2-X).
- [10] D. Blanch-Hartigan, J.A. Hall, E. Krupat, J.T. Irish, Can naive viewers put themselves in the patients' shoes?: reliability and validity of the analogue patient methodology, *Med. Care.* 51 (2013) e16-21. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e31822945cc>.
- [11] L.M. van Vliet, E. van der Wall, A. Albada, P.M.M. Spreeuwenberg, W. Verheul, J.M. Bensing, The validity of using analogue patients in practitioner–patient communication research: Systematic review and meta-analysis., *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* 27 (2012) 1528–1543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-012-2111-8>.
- [12] L.N.C. Visser, M.S. Tollenaar, J.A. Bosch, L.J.P. van Doornen, H.C.J.M. de Haes, E.M.A. Smets, Analogue patients' self-reported engagement and psychophysiological arousal in a video-vignettes design: Patients versus disease-naïve individuals., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 99 (2016) 1724–1732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2016.04.012>.
- [13] J. Zwingmann, W.F. Baile, J.W. Schmier, J. Bernhard, M. Keller, Effects of patient-centered communication on anxiety, negative affect, and trust in the physician in delivering a cancer diagnosis: A randomized, experimental study, *Cancer.* 123 (2017) 3167–3175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.30694>.
- [14] M.A. Hillen, L.M. van Vliet, H.C.J.M. de Haes, E.M.A. Smets, Developing and administering scripted video vignettes for experimental research of patient–provider communication., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 91 (2013) 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2013.01.020>.

- 1 [15] L.M. van Vliet, M.A. Hillen, E. van der Wall, N. Plum, J.M. Bensing, How to create and
2 administer scripted video-vignettes in an experimental study on disclosure of a palliative
3 breast cancer diagnosis., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 91 (2013) 56–64.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2012.10.017>.
- 5 [16] L.N.C. Visser, N. Bol, M.A. Hillen, M.G.E. Verdam, H.C.J.M. de Haes, J.C.M. van
6 Weert, E.M.A. Smets, Studying medical communication with video vignettes: a
7 randomized study on how variations in video-vignette introduction format and camera
8 focus influence analogue patients' engagement, *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* 18 (2018)
9 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0472-3>.
- 10 [17] M.A. Heverly, D.X. Fitt, F.L. Newman, Constructing case vignettes for evaluating
11 clinical judgment: An empirical model, *Eval. Program Plann.* 7 (1984) 45–55.
12 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189\(84\)90024-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189(84)90024-7).
- 13 [18] M. Hojat, J. DeSantis, J.S. Gonnella, Patient Perceptions of Clinician's Empathy, *J.*
14 *Patient Exp.* 4 (2017) 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2374373517699273>.
- 15 [19] M.S.C. Sep, M. van Osch, L.M. van Vliet, E.M.A. Smets, J.M. Bensing, The power of
16 clinicians' affective communication: How reassurance about non-abandonment can
17 reduce patients' physiological arousal and increase information recall in bad news
18 consultations. An experimental study using analogue patients, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 95
19 (2014) 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2013.12.022>.
- 20 [20] G. Makoul, E. Krupat, C.-H. Chang, Measuring patient views of physician
21 communication skills: development and testing of the Communication Assessment Tool,
22 *Patient Educ. Couns.* 67 (2007) 333–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2007.05.005>.
- 23 [21] L. Robieux, L. Karsenti, M. Pocard, C. Flahault, Let's talk about empathy!, *Patient*
24 *Educ. Couns.* 101 (2018) 59–66.
- 25 [22] A. Mehrabian, *Nonverbal Communication*, Routledge, 1972.
26 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351308724>.
- 27 [23] S. Saha, M.C. Beach, The impact of patient-centered communication on patients'
28 decision making and evaluations of physicians: a randomized study using video
29 vignettes, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 84 (2011) 386–392.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2011.04.023>.
- 31 [24] S.W. Mercer, M. Maxwell, D. Heaney, G.C.M. Watt, The consultation and relational
32 empathy (CARE) measure: Development and preliminary validation and reliability of an
33 empathy-based consultation process measure., *Fam. Pract.* 21 (2004) 699–705.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmh621>.
- 35 [25] L. Gehenne, S. Lelorain, A. Anota, A. Brédart, S. Dolbeault, S. Sultan, G. Piessen, D.
36 Grynberg, A.-S. Baudry, V. Christophe, Testing two competitive models of empathic
37 communication in cancer care encounters: a factorial analysis of the CARE measure.,
38 (2020).
- 39 [26] S.W. Mercer, M. Maxwell, D. Heaney, G.C. Watt, The consultation and relational
40 empathy (CARE) measure: development and preliminary validation and reliability of an
41 empathy-based consultation process measure, *Fam. Pract.* 21 (2004) 699–705.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmh621>.
- 43 [27] L.N.C. Visser, M.A. Hillen, M.G.E. Verdam, N. Bol, H.C.J.. M. de Haes, E.M.A. Smets,
44 Assessing engagement while viewing video vignettes; validation of the Video
45 Engagement Scale (VES)., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 99 (2016) 227–235.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2015.08.029>.
- 47 [28] S. Lelorain, A. Cortot, V. Christophe, C. Pinçon, Y. Gidron, Physician Empathy
48 Interacts with Breaking Bad News in Predicting Lung Cancer and Pleural Mesothelioma
49 Patient Survival: Timing May Be Crucial, *J. Clin. Med.* 7 (2018) 364.
50 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm7100364>.

- 1 [29] F. Derksen, T.C.O. Hartman, A. van Dijk, A. Plouvier, J. Bensing, A. Lagro-Janssen,
2 Consequences of the presence and absence of empathy during consultations in primary
3 care: A focus group study with patients., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 100 (2017) 987–993.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2016.12.003>.
- 5 [30] L. van Vliet, A. Francke, S. Tomson, N. Plum, E. van der Wall, J. Bensing, When cure is
6 no option: How explicit and hopeful can information be given? A qualitative study in
7 breast cancer, *Patient Educ. Couns.* 90 (2013) 315–322.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2011.03.021>.
- 9 [31] M.S. Mast, A. Kindlimann, W. Langewitz, Recipients’ perspective on breaking bad
10 news: How you put it really makes a difference., *Patient Educ. Couns.* 58 (2005) 244–
11 251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2005.05.005>.
- 12 [32] R. Hughes, M. Huby, The application of vignettes in social and nursing research, *J. Adv.*
13 *Nurs.* 37 (2002) 382–386. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02100.x>.
- 14

1 **Tables**

2

3 **Table 1**

4 *Legend Abbreviations*

5

6

Abbreviation	Full expression
AP	Analogue Patients
APP	Analogue Patient Paradigm
Bad-cons	Bad-news consultation
Cog-emp	Cognitive process of physician empathy
Emo-emp	Emotional process of physician empathy
Follow-cons	Follow-up consultation
Neutral-emp	Neutral consultation
PE	Physician empathy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Table 2
Conditions of the Various Video-Vignettes

	Medical context	
	Follow-up consultations (follow-cons)	Bad news consultations (bad-cons)
Empathic processes	Neutral consultation (neutral-emp)	Neutral consultation (neutral-emp)
	Neutral consultation + Emotional process (emo-emp)	Neutral consultation + Emotional process (emo-emp)
	Neutral consultation + Cognitive process (cog-emp)	Neutral consultation + Cognitive process (cog-emp)

1

2 **Table 3:** *Socio-Demographic and Medical Characteristics of Lay People and Patients*

3 *Validating Scripts and Video-Vignettes*

		<i>Patients</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>Lay people</i> <i>N (%)</i>
SCRIPT VALIDATION			N = 48
Age	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		35.06 (14.25)
	Median (min-max)		28.5 [21 – 71]
Gender	Man		16 (33.3%)
	Woman		32 (66.6%)
Socio-professional category	Farmer		0 (0%)
	Craftsman, company manager		1 (2.1%)
	Intellectual profession		21 (43.75%)
	Intermediate occupations (school teacher, technician, civil servant)		9 (18.75%)
	Employee		5 (10.42%)
	Worker		0 (0%)
	Retired		4 (8.33%)
	Student		6 (12.5%)
	Unemployed		2 (4.16%)
VIDEO-VIGNETTE VALIDATION		N = 46	N = 116
Age	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	48.54 (14.37)	41.78 (15.33)
	Median (min-max)	53 [18 – 72]	39.5 [19 – 70]
Gender	Man	6 (13%)	26 (22.4%)
	Woman	40 (87%)	90 (77.6%)
Socio-professional category	Farmer	1 (2.2%)	2 (1.7%)
	Craftsman, company manager	2 (4.3%)	6 (5.2%)
	Intellectual profession	22 (47.8%)	36 (31%)
	Intermediate occupations (school teacher, technician, civil servant)	3 (6.5%)	17 (14.7%)
	Employee	1 (2.2%)	7 (6%)
	Worker	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)
	Retired	5 (10.9%)	10 (8.6%)
	Student	1 (2.2%)	8 (6.9%)
	Unemployed	3 (6.5%)	2 (1.7%)
		Other	8 (17.4%)
	Missing	0 (0%)	22 (19%)
Time since diagnosis (in months)	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	70.84 (63.81)	
	Median (min-max)	57 (2 – 224)	
Tumor localization	Breast	13 (28.26%)	
	Prostate	2 (4.35%)	
	Colon	1 (2.17%)	
	Lymphoma	2 (4.35%)	
	Pancreas	1 (2.17%)	

	Head and neck	2 (4.35%)	
	Gynecologic	3 (6.52%)	
	Lung	4 (8.7%)	
	Other	4 (8.7%)	
Cancer stage	Stage I	5 (10.9%)	
	Stage II	5 (10.9%)	
	Stage III	7 (15.2%)	
	Stage IV	6 (13%)	
	Missing	23 (50%)	
Current treatments	No treatment	29 (63%)	
	Chemotherapy	5 (10.9%)	
	Radiotherapy	1 (2.2%)	
	Immunotherapy	2 (4.3%)	
	Surgery	2 (4.3%)	
	Hormonotherapy	7 (15.2%)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

Table 4*Differences between Follow-cons and Bad-cons in Scripts and Video-Vignettes*

	Follow-up consultations	Bad news consultations	<i>U</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>r</i> (<i>effect size</i>)	<i>P</i>
	Mean rank	Mean rank				
SCRIPT VALIDATION						
Realism	24.78	24.03	261.5	-.25	-.04	.81
Anxiety	18.98	32.08	406	3.35	.49	.001
Interest	25	23.67	255	-.34	-.05	.73
Fear	20.95	30.42	376.5	2.52	.36	.012
Sadness	18.07	35.22	463	4.29	.62	.000
Relief	29.62	14.94	98	-3.98	-.58	.000
VIDEO-VIGNETTE VALIDATION						
Realism	47.83	53.17	1383. 5	.99	.09	.322
Anxiety	38.96	62.04	1827	4.09	.41	.000
Interest	52.5	48.5	1150	-.73	-.07	.47
Fear	40.46	60.54	1752	3.66	.37	.000
Sadness	39.28	61.72	1811	3.97	.40	.000
Relief	59.58	41.42	796	-3.64	-.36	.000
Video Engagement Scale (VES)	43.9	56.22	1530	2.14	.21	.033
Satisfaction with image	47.83	53.17	1383. 5	.99	.09	.322
Satisfaction with sound	44.96	54.23	1427	1.87	.02	.061

Table 5*Significant Differences between Lay People's and Patients' Assessments*

	Mean rank lay people	Mean rank patients	<i>U</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>r (effect size)</i>	<i>P</i>
Follow-cons and neutral-emp						
Emotional process subscore	9.93	5.07	7.5	-2.24	-.60	.026
Cognitive process subscore	10.29	4.71	5	-2.51	-.67	.010
Bad-cons and neutral-emp						
Emotional process subscore	9.3	3	2	-2.65	-.70	.008
Bad-cons and emo-emp						
Sadness	8.87	15.4	77	2.21	.49	.033
Bad-cons and cog-emp						
Realism	10.33	3	2	-2.88	-.72	.004

Figures

Figure 1

Procedure to Create Valid Scripted Video-Vignettes

Research phase	Action undertaken	Assessment
<p>Phase 1: Deciding if video-vignettes are appropriate</p>	<p>Creation of standard scripts Creation of manipulations</p>	<p>Experts: Qualitative comments</p>
<p>Phase 2 + 3: Developing a valid script and designing valid manipulations</p>	<p>Validation step 1: - Experts : 10 physicians and 10 researchers - 48 Lay people - Adjustment of the scripts</p>	<p>Lay people: Manipulation success, realism, emotional impact.</p>
<p>Phase 4: Converting the scripted consultations to video</p>	<p>Casting actors and rehearsing Filming</p>	<p>Experts: Qualitative comments</p>
<p>Phase 5: Administrating the videos Procedure of experiment</p>	<p>Not reported here</p>	
	<p>Validation step 2: - Experts : 7 physicians and 7 researchers - 116 Lay people - 46 patients with cancer</p>	<p>Lay people and patients: Manipulation success, realism, emotional impact, engagement in the video, satisfaction with image and sound.</p>