

1 Culture and understanding the role of feedback for health professions students:

2 Realist synthesis protocol.

3 Paul Fullerton

4 Mahbub Sarkar

5 Shamsul Haque

6 Wendy McKenzie

7

8 **Author details:**

9 Dr. Paul Fullerton, Jeffrey Cheah School Medicine & Health Sciences, Monash University
10 Malaysia. E-mail: paul.fullerton@monash.edu

11 Dr. Mahbub Sarkar, Monash Centre for Scholarship in Health Education , Monash University,
12 Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia E-mail: mahbub.sarkar@monash.edu

13 Assoc Professor Shamsul Haque, Jeffrey Cheah School Medicine & Health Sciences, Monash
14 University Malaysia, Bandar Sunway, Selangor Malaysia. E-mail: shamsul@monash.edu

15 Adjunct Assoc Professor Wendy McKenzie, Education, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing & Health
16 Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia E-mail:
17 wendy.mckenzie@monash.edu

18 **Corresponding author:**

19 Assoc Professor Paul Fullerton, Monash University Clinical School, 8 Jalan Masjid Abu Bakar,
20 80100 Johor Bahru, Malaysia. E-mail: paul.fullerton@monash.edu

21

22 **Word Count:** 3487

23

24 **Abstract:**

25 **Introduction:**

26 Clinical education has moved to a “competency-based” model with an emphasis on
27 workplace-based learning and assessment which, in turn, depends on feedback to be
28 effective. Further, the understanding of feedback has changed from information about a
29 performance directed to the learner performing the task, to a dialogue, which enables the
30 learner to act and develop.

31 In health professional education, feedback is a complex interaction between trainee,
32 supervisor, and the healthcare system. Most published research on feedback in health
33 professional education originates in Europe and North America. Our interest is on the
34 impact of **Culture** on this process, particularly in the context of Asian cultures.

35 The (scientific) realist approach of Pawson and Tilley provides a means to examine complex
36 interventions in social situations, and thus is an appropriate lens to use for this study. This is
37 a protocol for a realist synthesis which asks how, why and in what circumstances do Asian
38 Cultures influence health professional trainees to seek, respond to and use feedback given in
39 the clinical environment, if at all.

40

41 **Methods and analysis:**

42 An initial search was performed to help define the scope of the review question and develop
43 our initial program theory. The formal electronic search was carried out in February 2020
44 and included: CINAHL, ERIC, MEDLINE, and PsycInfo, and repeated in October 2020.

45 Retrieved articles were imported into Covidence for screening and data extraction, after
46 which components of the Context – Mechanisms – Outcomes configurations will be sought
47 to refine the initial program theory.

48 **Ethics and Dissemination:**

49 As this study is a literature review, ethics approval is not required.

50 The findings will be documented in line with the RAMESES publications standards for Realist
51 syntheses,[41] and we plan to disseminate the findings by means of a peer-reviewed journal
52 article and conference presentation(s).

53 **Keywords:** Realist review, Realist Synthesis, Health professional students, Medical
54 students, Feedback, Asia, Protocol

55

56 **Strengths and limitations of this study:**

- 57 • The synthesis aims to identify the how and why Asian **C**ultures may influence feedback
58 seeking and provision to health professional trainees, if at all.
- 59 • To our knowledge, there are few studies of feedback seeking and provision to health
60 professional trainees in Asia.
- 61 • A Realist approach has the potential to help explain the complex nature of **C**ulture's impact
62 on feedback.
- 63 • Only studies published in the English language will be included, so transferability of our
64 findings to non-English speaking environments may be lacking.
- 65 • In addition to formal literature database searches, we will need to conduct citation mining
66 to locate other relevant resources.

67

68

69 **INTRODUCTION:**

70 Clinical education has moved to a "competency-based" model with an emphasis on workplace-
71 based learning and assessment which, in turn, depends on feedback to be effective.[1,2]
72 Indeed Ramani *et al*[2](p744) describe feedback as "*a vital cog in the wheel of competency-*

73 *based medical education.*" Given that feedback is established as an important link in
74 competency-based medical education, this led to our interest in the impact of **C**ulture on the
75 feedback process, understanding of the tools used, and its acceptance by both supervisors
76 and trainees.

77 Complexity of Feedback:

78 Early definitions of feedback emphasised information giving to change behaviour.[3–5] In a
79 widely quoted paper, Ende[3] described feedback as **information** given to trainees about a
80 particular activity which was meant to guide performance of that or a similar activity in the
81 future. The emphasis was that feedback was something supervisors directed at trainees,
82 preferably after observation of the activity in question. University students commonly
83 complain that they do not receive enough feedback, or that it is done poorly, such that
84 academic staff are advised to "signpost" when feedback was being given.[6] Ajjawi and
85 Regehr[7] suggest that perhaps learners and teachers define feedback quite differently.

86

87 Over time, feedback has been understood as more than simply providing information –
88 information is only feedback when it is **used** to improve work or learning and is part of a
89 sociocultural interaction. Furthermore, feedback value is influenced by the credibility of the
90 feedback source.[8–10] As it is essential to close the feedback loop, we can think of feedback
91 as sense-making in the context of information provided from many sources to improve work
92 and learning.[11] The importance of relationships and trust between the supervisor and
93 trainee, especially when the feedback relates to assessment, has been emphasised.[12] Many
94 factors influence the effect of feedback including context (e.g. the workplace – hospital or
95 ambulatory settings, teaching a skill, formative assessment, summative assessment)[13,14]
96 regulatory focus,[15] and self-efficacy.[16,17] A person's "theory of intelligence" (their
97 understanding of whether intelligence is "fixed" or "improvable") will also impact – if a person's

98 belief is that intelligence is fixed, effort may not seem to be worthwhile, whereas if they feel
99 there is opportunity for improvement, effort becomes worthwhile.[18,19]

100

101 Feedback within the clinical learning environment is particularly complex and influenced by
102 such things as the workload of providing patient care, hierarchies, time constraints and limited
103 opportunities to observe a student's performance, the student's expectations and engagement
104 with feedback provided,[8,16,20] as well as the supervisor's experience of feedback during
105 their training and therefore understanding of feedback. These complexities will be recognised
106 by clinical teachers in Western environments, but we suspect are magnified within the Asian
107 setting.[21]

108

109 Complexity of Culture:

110 When we consider culture in the context of health professional education there are three
111 prominent and interdependent cultures – the “big-Culture”, the Workplace culture and the
112 Education culture.

113 **Culture** (sometimes referred to as “big-Culture”) in this context is defined by Hofstede as

114 *“The collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one group or category of*
115 *people from another ... culture is (a) a collective, not individual, attribute; (b) not*
116 *directly visible but manifested in behaviours; and (c) common to some but not all*
117 *people.”. [22](p58)*

118 While there are several classifications of characteristics of **Culture**, Hofstede's typology is
119 widely used and can help in our understanding of the issues. Initially four dimensions were
120 described,[23,24] with two further dimensions added later:[22,25]

121

- 122 1. Individualism – Collectivism
- 123 2. Power Distance
- 124 3. Uncertainty Avoidance
- 125 4. Masculinity – Femininity.
- 126 5. Long-term versus Short-term Orientation
- 127 6. Indulgence versus Restraint

128 Of these dimensions, Individualism-Collectivism and Power Distance appear to be the most
129 significant big-Culture influences in the clinical learning environment in South-East Asia.[21]

130

131 All authors have experience teaching in health professions education in Asia and Australia in
132 a University with campuses in both Malaysia and Australia. This experience raised the
133 question whether cultural differences may influence our students' learning. A preliminary
134 literature review of feedback within health professional education showed a heavy North
135 American and European focus, and few studies from a South East Asian perspective, except
136 notably from Indonesia.[21,26] This heightened our questioning of *whether* cultural factors
137 influence acceptance and engagement with "dialogic feedback" in an Asian context, and how
138 does it compare with the "Western" situation? (While some Western studies have included
139 international students / trainees, we contend that students who reached the clinical phase of
140 training have had time and opportunity to adapt to their host country.) In focussing on the
141 Asian region, we can recognise several *broad* Cultural groups – the "Confucian Heritage
142 Culture", Indonesian-Malaysian / Muslim cultures, and cultures of the Indian subcontinent,
143 overlaid with the cultural impacts of colonialism. Given the limited literature found in our
144 preliminary search focussing on Southeast Asia, we decided to look further afield to include
145 the Middle East (the influence of Muslim learning culture) through to the "Far East" (the
146 "Confucian Heritage Culture"). If the cultural background of students / trainees and their
147 teachers / supervisors influences their engagement with feedback, how does it do so? Is it

148 the “ethnic Culture”, the national cultures influenced by their colonial history (e.g. for Malaysia,
149 Singapore, Indonesia)[27], or is it the education system culture (e.g. school education,
150 university, or even discipline cultures) that have the predominant effect – or is there no
151 dominant effect?

152

153 Workplace culture can be viewed as another cultural layer, particularly in clinical teaching and
154 hospital environments[28] and potentially interacts with the “big-Culture”. Medicine around
155 the world tends to be hierarchical and paternalistic. However, within the Asian region teaching
156 by humiliation is common, and in Malaysia the term “scolding” is commonly used to describe
157 teaching in the clinical environment. Another term often heard in the region is *kiasu* –
158 particularly applied to students of Chinese ethnicity. According to the Oxford Dictionary,[29]
159 *kiasu* refers to a person who is “governed by self-interest, typically manifesting as a selfish,
160 grasping attitude arising from a fear of missing out on something.”. *Kiasu* (怕输) is a Hokkien
161 word meaning “fear of loss”. There are two aspects to *kiasu*, the negative side of being selfish
162 and grasping, as seen in the Oxford dictionary definition, but there is the positive aspect of
163 being successful through hard work – not evident in that dictionary definition.[30] (*Kiasu* is
164 related to the concept of “face”, which western stereotypes frequently regard as a
165 characteristic of “Asian Culture”).

166

167 The education system clearly has its overarching culture which influenced the students’
168 experiences of school – a system that emphasises regular high-stakes examinations from an
169 early stage of schooling. There has been much written about the influence of the “Confucian
170 Heritage Culture” of learning (CHC) on students from South East Asia as well as from China,
171 Japan and Korea. In his writings Confucius saw learning as a means of social change and to
172 overcome social differences, but also placed much emphasis on personal effort.[31] The

173 Chinese philosophy of education also highlighted a mutually respectful relationship between
174 teacher and learner, with the teacher guiding the learner, rather than pulling the learner
175 along.[32] This parallels the role of *guru* seen in the Indian culture of education – with the
176 *guru* (teacher) nurturing the learner.[33,34]

177

178 Malaysia and Indonesia are predominantly Islamic countries; Malaysia is a former British
179 colony, while Indonesia was formerly colonised by the Dutch. Clearly both these aspects of
180 their history have shaped the education system of the respective country and are as important
181 factors as the Confucian heritage. There is a great diversity in Islamic education which impacts
182 the southeast Asian region and interacted with the colonial experiences.[35] The school
183 culture clearly responds to the education system's overarching culture but adds its own layer.
184 An examination-oriented curriculum was seen as a legacy of the colonial era.[36]

185

186 Tertiary education culture varies enormously across the region, from hierarchical approaches
187 to being more collegial (especially in the later stages of the degrees). Student experiences in
188 high school impact their transition to university as they come with an expectation that
189 university would simply be an extension of school – first year medical students in Malaysia
190 clearly started university with the idea that knowledge was fixed and largely unchanging, and
191 that their teachers or lecturers functioned as sources of knowledge who were not to be
192 questioned. Knowledge was facts, and facts were immutable.[37] As school had emphasised
193 rote learning of fixed knowledge, and an important part of those students' adaptation to
194 university was coming to terms with thinking for themselves. As they move into workplace-
195 based learning, the culture of the medical workplace is likely to have an impact.

196

197 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS:**

198

199 **Realist Synthesis methodology:**

200 The (scientific) Realist approach was chosen as a methodology that is useful for researching
201 complex interventions in the social environment, such as healthcare and education –
202 interventions that frequently work differently in different environments.[38] The more
203 “traditional” methods used in reviews in Medicine and other Health Sciences (such as
204 Systematic Reviews) were felt to not capture or explain the complexities of feedback in the
205 social and cultural environment. The realist paradigm asks: *“What is it about this intervention*
206 *that works, for whom, in what circumstances, in what respects and how?”* .[39,40] It seeks
207 to find “mechanisms (M)” that fire in particular “contexts (C)” to produce the “Outcomes (O)”
208 in question – so called CMO Configurations. Realist synthesis or realist review (the terms are
209 used interchangeably) is a theory driven, iterative and explanation-building approach, that
210 usually starts with an initial program theory and uses findings from sources to understand
211 how and why the outcomes have occurred, and therefore refine the initial program theory.[38]
212 Interpretation involves looking for both confirming and negating data and explanations.

213

214 This synthesis asks what leads can **Culture** provide, in the Asian health professional education
215 environment, to answer?

- 216 1. How, why and in what circumstances do **health professional trainees** (e.g.
217 students and junior doctors) seek, respond to, and use feedback given in the
218 clinical environment?
- 219 2. What do **supervisors** (e.g. consultants, clinical tutors, preceptors) feel about
220 providing feedback? How do they provide feedback, in what circumstances? Do
221 they see their feedback being used?
- 222 3. How do **trainees and supervisors** perceive feedback?

223

224 The review will follow the five steps of a realist review as enunciated by Pawson and
225 colleagues,[39] namely

- 226 1. Clarify the scope and purpose of the review question
- 227 2. Search for evidence – commencing with an exploratory search, with subsequent
228 focussing and purposive and “snowball” sampling
- 229 3. Appraise studies and extract data
- 230 4. Synthesise the evidence to obtain conclusions, and ...
- 231 5. Disseminate.

232 In appraising studies, **Relevance** is assessed by whether it can contribute to theory building
233 or testing, while **Rigor** assessment is based on whether the methods which generated a
234 *particular piece of data* is trustworthy.[41] Pawson argues that the overall methodological
235 quality of a study is not appropriate grounds for excluding a study in realist reviews – “*There*
236 *are often nuggets of wisdom in methodologically weak studies*”:[42]

237

238 A PRISMA-P checklist has been completed and available as an additional file.[43]

239

240 **Search Strategy:**

241 An preliminary search was performed to define the scope of the review question and develop
242 our candidate initial program theory (IPT). This first search utilised MEDLINE and PsycInfo,
243 searching “Learner” (and variations), Feedback (and debrief) and Culture (including cross-
244 cultural, ethnic differences, anthropology). In terms of a modified PICO model[44] developed
245 for Qualitative studies (**P**opulation, **I**ntervention, **C**ontext) format: P: Learners, I: Feedback,
246 Co: Culture.

247 The formal electronic search was carried out in February 2020 and included: CINAHL, ERIC,
 248 MEDLINE, and PsycInfo. Search terms were developed in discussion with a librarian and the
 249 research team, with the same broad categories as before, although only articles available in
 250 English were retained. Articles to be considered include qualitative, quantitative and mixed
 251 methods, as well as commentaries and review articles. An example of the search strategy is
 252 given in *Table 1* and provided in more detail as a supplementary file. Both MeSH (medical
 253 subject headings) and free text were employed to ensure sufficiently wide article coverage.
 254 This search was repeated in October 2020, for articles published since the February search.
 255 A hand search will also be made of the following journals: Academic Medicine, Medical
 256 Education, Medical Teacher, BMC Medical Education, Education for Health, Teaching and
 257 Learning in Medicine, Perspectives on Medical Education, Medical Journal of Malaysia, Annals
 258 of the Academy of Medicine Singapore, and Singapore Medical Journal. These were chosen
 259 as leading health professional education journals and Southeast Asian medical journals
 260 published in English. Citation mining (“snowball”) searches of the reference list in included
 261 articles and searching for articles that cite these articles will occur. Although dissertations
 262 were initially excluded, relevant published articles arising from the dissertations will be sought
 263 by hand-searching for author and a related title.

264

Population: Learner	Intervention: Feedback	Context: Culture
Subject Headings e.g. MeSH	Subject Headings e.g. MeSH	Subject Headings e.g. MeSH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students, Health Occupations • Clinical clerkship • Education, medical/... nursing/... pharmacy/ ... public health professional • Clinical competence • Faculty • Faculty, dental/... medical/... nursing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FORMATIVE FEEDBACK • Debrief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CULTURE • Cross-Cultural Comparison • Cultural diversity • Cultural difference

Keywords and phrases	Keywords and phrases	Keywords and phrases
Trainee Student Learner Graduate Intern Supervisor Teacher Lecturer Instructor Professor Tutor	Feedback Feeding back Feed-back Feedforward Feed forward Feeding forward Fed back Debrief	Culture Cultural difference Cultural diversity Cultural understanding Cross cultural Ethnic

265

266 **Table 1:** Example of Search strategy used in Ovid MEDLINE

267

268 **Selection criteria:**

269 Following the searches as outlined, the citations were imported into Covidence[45] for Title
 270 and Abstract Screening. Duplicates were removed before title and abstract screening began
 271 with two team members (PDF and MS) reviewing a sample of the articles retrieved to ensure
 272 that criteria are agreed upon. Approximately 10% of retrieved articles were reviewed jointly
 273 by the two team members. The rest of this phase was carried out by either of those team
 274 members (predominantly PDF) but with the intention to err on retaining studies for closer
 275 evaluation at the full text screening stage.

276 Core inclusion criteria sought studies relating to

- 277 • Workplace-based learning and assessment,
- 278 • Feedback giving, seeking and acceptance,
- 279 • Culture (Ethnic and institutional),
- 280 • Post-secondary and vocational education involving health professional training.

281

282 Exclusion criteria centre around:

- 283 • Not related to health professional education
- 284 • Not related to feedback or culture
- 285 • Community health education

286

287 Following title and abstract screening, the full texts of the retained articles were imported into
288 Covidence for further screening. All full text articles will be screened by two members of the
289 team, and any discrepancies will be discussed to resolve the disagreements. Notes will be
290 made to justify inclusion or exclusion and will assist with both resolving discrepancies and
291 providing transparency. Selecting papers for the review will be guided by the research study
292 questions – Does the study involve students in health professional courses (especially in their
293 clinical training) or their supervisors? Does the study pertain to students in Asian countries?

294

295 Studies remaining after the full text screen will be assessed for Quality and Rigour using the
296 Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP-Qualitative) checklist for Qualitative studies[46] and
297 the Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument (MERSQI) for quantitative
298 studies.[47] Each study will be appraised by at least two team members – usually PDF and
299 one other. Any discrepancies will be resolved by the full team.

300

301 **Extracting Data:**

302 Data extraction will follow, with data entered into a table within Covidence 2.0. Data extracted
303 will include citation details, country or region where study was performed, population studied,
304 methodology used, and an empirical judgement of Realist Relevance will also be made at this
305 stage. Comments of potential context, mechanism and outcome will be recorded. Data
306 extracted in Covidence will be exported as a .csv file into Excel, to be used in the synthesis
307 phase. Finally, included articles will be entered into NVivo software[48] for further data
308 extraction, coding and identification of CMO configurations.

309

310 **Synthesise findings to draw conclusions:**

311 NVivo software in conjunction with the Excel spreadsheet exported from Covidence will be
312 used to synthesise findings and modify our initial program theory. The realist approach
313 involves looking for causal mechanisms and how they fire in particular contexts to produce
314 their outcome(s). Data will be extracted from the included papers by the team of reviewers,
315 with a minimum of 10% of papers being double checked. The data will be tabulated and
316 potential Contexts (C), Mechanisms (M) and Outcomes (O) identified. Discussion among the
317 team members, with the use of realist logic, will aim to further refine those Contexts (C),
318 Mechanisms (M) and find Outcomes patterns (O) to refine our initial program theory and infer
319 CMO configurations. This process will look for confirming and contradictory findings and will
320 be iterative.

321

322 **Potential limitations of the realist synthesis approach:**

323 We accept that there are possible limitations of this proposed realist synthesis. Firstly, we
324 have confined our search to trainees in clinical training for health profession disciplines, thus
325 limiting the generalisability outside this sphere of education. Secondly, our initial interest was
326 in the Southeast Asian region but due to paucity of literature from SE Asia we expanded the
327 geographical scope. However, there is significant overlap of Cultures between the Middle East
328 with the impact of Islam, through to the Far East with the influence of the Confucian Heritage
329 Culture, as well as the influence of the various colonising powers. Thirdly, we have decided
330 to assess rigour in our screening of articles, but recognise that there is a debate among realist
331 scholars as to the validity of assessing rigour of a whole study – Pawson emphasises that
332 “nuggets of wisdom” may be found in studies that are methodologically weak.[42]

333

334 **Ethics and Dissemination:**

335 As this study is a literature review, ethics approval is not required.

336 The findings will be documented in line with the RAMESES publications standards for Realist
337 syntheses,[41] and we plan to disseminate the findings by means of a peer-reviewed journal
338 article and conference presentation(s).

339

340 **IMPLICATIONS:**

341 Feedback has been recognised by others, and recognised by us, as critically important in
342 competency-based health professional education, yet feedback is a complex, socially based
343 “intervention”. Most of the published literature on feedback originates from “Western”
344 cultures. There is reason to expect that components of culture – “big-Culture”, workplace
345 culture and education system cultures will impact the provision, acceptability and use of
346 feedback. Again, complex interactions come into play. The realist approach is a relevant way
347 to examine these processes. This protocol and resulting realist synthesis will inform a planned
348 study which aims to provide further information that may lead to improving the usefulness of
349 feedback within the Malaysian context and hopefully will be relevant in the wider Southeast
350 Asian region.

351

352 **Systematic Review Registration:**

353 The protocol for this review was judged to be ineligible for registration with the International
354 Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO), as it did not “*have a direct and*
355 *clinically-relevant health-related outcome*”.

356

357 **Author details:**

358 Dr. Paul Fullerton, Monash University Malaysia. E-mail: paul.fullerton@monash.edu

359 Dr. Mahbub Sarkar, Monash Centre for Scholarship in Health Education , Monash University,
360 Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia E-mail: mahbub.sarkar@monash.edu

361 Assoc Professor Shamsul Haque, Jeffrey Cheah School Medicine & Health Sciences, Monash
362 University Malaysia, Bandar Sunway, Selangor Malaysia. E-mail: shamsul@monash.edu

363 Adjunct Assoc Professor Wendy McKenzie, Education, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing & Health
364 Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia E-mail:
365 wendy.mckenzie@monash.edu

366

367

368 **Corresponding author:**

369 Assoc Professor Paul Fullerton, Monash University Clinical School, 8 Jalan Masjid Abu Bakar,
370 80100 Johor Bahru, Malaysia.

371

372 **Author Contributions:**

373 PF developed the original idea for this review protocol in collaboration with MS, WMcK and
374 SH. PF wrote the original draft of the protocol, which was subsequently refined by MS, WMcK,
375 SH, and PF. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of this protocol. PF is guarantor
376 of the protocol.

377

378 **Competing interests:**

379 All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

380 **Funding:**

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

383 **Ethics:**

384 Not applicable.

385 **Patient and Public Involvement:**

386 None – Literature review.

387

388 **References:**

389 1 Norcini J. The power of feedback. *Med Educ* 2010;**44**:16–7. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
390 2923.2009.03542.x

391 2 Ramani S, Könings KD, Ginsburg S, *et al*. Feedback Redefined: Principles and Practice.
392 *J Gen Intern Med* 2019;**34**:744–9. doi:10.1007/s11606-019-04874-2

393 3 Ende J. Feedback in Clinical Medical Education. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc* 1983;**250**:777.
394 doi:10.1001/jama.1983.03340060055026

395 4 Butler DL, Winne PH. Feedback and Self-Regulated Learning: A Theoretical Synthesis.
396 *Rev Educ Res* 1995;**65**:245–81. doi:10.3102/00346543065003245

397 5 Hattie J, Timperley H. The Power of Feedback. *Rev Educ Res* 2007;**77**:81–112.
398 doi:10.3102/003465430298487

399 6 Boud D, Molloy E. What is the problem with feedback? In: *Feedback in Higher and*

- 400 *Professional Education*. 2012. 1–10.
- 401 7 Ajjawi R, Regehr G. When I say ... feedback. *Med Educ* 2018;;3–5.
402 doi:10.1111/medu.13746
- 403 8 Watling CJ, Driessen E, Van der Vleuten CPM, *et al*. Beyond individualism:
404 professional culture and its influence on feedback. *Med Educ* 2013;**47**:585–94.
405 doi:10.1111/medu.12150
- 406 9 Watling CJ. Unfulfilled promise, untapped potential: Feedback at the crossroads. *Med*
407 *Teach* 2014;**36**:692–7. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.889812
- 408 10 Wilbur K, BenSmail N, Ahkter S. Student feedback experiences in a cross-border
409 medical education curriculum. *Int J Med Educ* 2019;**10**:98–105.
410 doi:10.5116/ijme.5ce1.149f
- 411 11 Carless D, Boud D. The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of
412 feedback. *Assess Eval High Educ* 2018;**43**:1315–25.
413 doi:10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354
- 414 12 Carless D. Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assess Eval High*
415 *Educ* 2009;**34**:79–89. doi:10.1080/02602930801895786
- 416 13 Tekian A, Watling CJ, Roberts TE, *et al*. Qualitative and quantitative feedback in the
417 context of competency-based education. *Med Teach* 2017;**39**:1245–9.
418 doi:10.1080/0142159X.2017.1372564
- 419 14 Harrison CJ, Könings KD, Schuwirth L, *et al*. Barriers to the uptake and use of
420 feedback in the context of summative assessment. *Adv Heal Sci Educ* 2015;**20**:229–
421 45. doi:10.1007/s10459-014-9524-6
- 422 15 Watling CJ, Driessen EW, van der Vleuten CPM, *et al*. Understanding responses to
423 feedback: the potential and limitations of regulatory focus theory. *Med Educ*

- 424 2012;**46**:593–603. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2012.04209.x
- 425 16 Ramani S, Könings KD, Mann K V., *et al.* About Politeness, Face, and Feedback:
426 Exploring Resident and Faculty Perceptions of How Institutional Feedback Culture
427 Influences Feedback Practices. *Acad Med* 2018;**93**:1348–58.
428 doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000002193
- 429 17 van de Ridder JMM, Peters CMM, Stokking KM, *et al.* Framing of feedback impacts
430 student’s satisfaction, self-efficacy and performance. *Adv Heal Sci Educ* 2015;**20**:803–
431 16. doi:10.1007/s10459-014-9567-8
- 432 18 Nussbaum AD, Dweck CS. Defensiveness Versus Remediation: Self-Theories and
433 Modes of Self-Esteem Maintenance. *Personal Soc Psychol Bull* 2008;**34**:599–612.
434 doi:10.1177/0146167207312960
- 435 19 Tweed RG, Lehman DR. Learning Considered within a Cultural Context: Confucian and
436 Socratic Approaches. *Am Psychol* 2002;**57**:89–
437 99. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/62303086?accountid=12528>
- 438 20 Harrison CJ, Könings KD, Dannefer EF, *et al.* Factors influencing students’ receptivity
439 to formative feedback emerging from different assessment cultures. *Perspect Med*
440 *Educ* 2016;**5**:276–84. doi:10.1007/s40037-016-0297-x
- 441 21 Suhoyo Y, van Hell EA, Prihatiningsih TS, *et al.* Exploring cultural differences in
442 feedback processes and perceived instructiveness during clerkships: Replicating a
443 Dutch study in Indonesia. *Med Teach* 2014;**36**:223–9.
444 doi:10.3109/0142159X.2013.853117
- 445 22 Hofstede G, McCrae RR. Personality and Culture Revisited: Linking Traits and
446 Dimensions of Culture. *Cross-Cultural Res* 2004;**38**:52–88.
447 doi:10.1177/1069397103259443

- 448 23 Hofstede G. Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *Int J Intercult Relations*
449 1986;**10**:301–20. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(86)90015-5
- 450 24 Hofstede GJ. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*.
451 Beverley Hills, CA: : Sage 1980.
- 452 25 Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M. Part II: Dimensions of national cultures. In:
453 *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. Mc-Graw-Hill Education 2010. 199.
- 454 26 Suhoyo Y, Van Hell EA, Kerdijk W, *et al*. Influence of feedback characteristics on
455 perceived learning value of feedback in clerkships: does culture matter? *BMC Med*
456 *Educ* 2017;**17**:69. doi:10.1186/s12909-017-0904-5
- 457 27 Ratnam-Lim CTL, Tan KHK. Large-scale implementation of formative assessment
458 practices in an examination-oriented culture. *Assess Educ Princ Policy Pract*
459 2015;**22**:61–78. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2014.1001319
- 460 28 Ramani S, Post SE, Könings K, *et al*. "It's Just Not the Culture": A Qualitative Study
461 Exploring Residents' Perceptions of the Impact of Institutional Culture on Feedback.
462 *Teach Learn Med* 2017;**29**:153–61. doi:10.1080/10401334.2016.1244014
- 463 29 Oxford English Dictionary. 'culture, n.' OED Online. June 2014.
464 2014.<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45746?> (accessed 6 Aug 2014).
- 465 30 Hwang A, Ang S, Francesco AM. The silent Chinese: The influence of face and
466 kiasuism on student feedback-seeking behaviors. *J Manag Educ* 2002;**26**:70–98.
467 doi:10.1177/105256290202600106
- 468 31 Wang T. Understanding Chinese Culture and Learning. In: *Australian Association for*
469 *Research in Education*. 2006. 1–
470 14.<http://publications.aare.edu.au/06pap/wan06122.pdf>
- 471 32 Jin L, Cortazzi M. Changing Practices in Chinese Cultures of Learning. *Lang Cult Curric*

- 472 2006;**19**:5–20. doi:10.1080/07908310608668751
- 473 33 Marambe KN, Vermunt JD, Boshuizen HPA. A cross-cultural comparison of student
474 learning patterns in higher education. *High Educ* 2011;**64**:299–316.
475 doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9494-z
- 476 34 Crozet C. The core tenets of education in ancient India, inspirations for modern times.
477 *Int J Pedagog Learn* 2012;**7**:262–5. doi:10.5172/ijpl.2012.7.3.262
- 478 35 Kadi W. Education in Islam—Myths and Truths. *Comp Educ Rev* 2006;**50**:311–24.
479 doi:10.1086/504818
- 480 36 Idrus F. Initiating Culturally Responsive Teaching for Identity Construction in the
481 Malaysian Classrooms. *English Lang Teach* 2014;**7**:53–64. doi:10.5539/elt.v7n4p53
- 482 37 Fullerton PD. 'That's the way we learn': Exploring influences of culture on medical
483 student learning in Malaysia and Australia (MHPE Thesis - Monash University). 2014.
- 484 38 Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, *et al.* Realist methods in medical education
485 research: what are they and what can they contribute? *Med Educ* 2012;**46**:89–96.
486 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04045.x
- 487 39 Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, *et al.* Realist review - a new method of
488 systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *J Health Serv Res Policy*
489 2005;**10**:21–34. doi:10.1258/1355819054308530
- 490 40 Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Westhorp G, *et al.* Protocol - realist and meta-narrative
491 evidence synthesis: Evolving Standards (RAMESES). *BMC Med Res Methodol*
492 2011;**11**:115. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-11-115
- 493 41 Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, *et al.* RAMESES publication standards: Realist
494 syntheses. *J Adv Nurs* 2013;**69**:1005–22. doi:10.1111/jan.12095

- 495 42 Pawson R. Digging for nuggets: How 'bad' research can yield 'good' evidence. *Int J*
496 *Soc Res Methodol Theory Pract* 2006;**9**:127–42. doi:10.1080/13645570600595314
- 497 43 Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic review
498 and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;**4**:1.
499 doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 500 44 Lockwood C, Porritt K, Munn Z, *et al.* Chapter 2: Systematic Reviews of Qualitative
501 Evidence. In: *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI 2020. Section 2.6.2.
502 doi:10.46658/JBIMES-20-03
- 503 45 Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software.
504 2020.www.covidence.org
- 505 46 Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP Qualitative Checklist.
506 2018.<http://www.casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists> (accessed 22 Nov 2020).
- 507 47 Cook DA, Reed DA. Appraising the Quality of Medical Education Research Methods:
508 The Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument and the Newcastle-Ottawa
509 Scale-Education. *Acad Med* 2015;**90**:1067–76. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000000786
- 510 48 QSR International. NVIVO Software. 2020.[https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
511 [qualitative-data-analysis-software/home](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)

512