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Background
Responsiveness to feedback is a complex phenomenon but how faculty members respond to residents’ feedback on their teaching performance is unclear.

Purpose
To increase the understanding of how clinical supervisors react to and act upon residents’ feedback on their teaching performance, to gain insight into:
(i) how clinical teachers proceed after they have received residents’ feedback on their teaching performance, and
(ii) the factors that influence their progression.

Type of paper
Research: qualitative analysis of interviews

Key Points on the Methods
Multi-specialty (7), multi-institution (6) interview-based.
Participants: random choice of 24 faculty members who had received formative feedback on their teaching performance through validated feedback systems – the SETQ.

Data collection: individual semi-structured interviews where they reflected upon their reaction to feedback and their actions based on it.

Data analysis: of transcripts (and interview protocol) guided by Prochaska’s comprehensive transtheoretical (TTM) framework which describes stages and processes of behavioural change – see diagram. ‘Template analysis’ with iterative development of codes.

Key Outcomes

Clinical teachers used residents’ feedback to different extents to adapt or improve their teaching performance. Important ‘tipping points’ in the processes of change necessary for faculty staff to put feedback into practice were:

- experiencing negative emotions in themselves or recognising those in residents as a result of failure to act upon feedback;
- realising that something should be done (with or without support from others),
- making a strong commitment to change;

Having the confidence to act upon feedback and recognising the benefits of change were found to stimulate faculty members to change their teaching behaviour. In other words, the teacher’s self-efficacy and the relative weight of pros and cons also influenced their actions.

Teachers’ reactions and actions could be mapped to the TTM as follows.
**Key Conclusions**

The authors conclude that there is a variable responsiveness of faculty members to residents’ feedback on their teaching performance. The TTM framework explains how and why faculty members do or do not proceed to action after receiving residents’ feedback. They suggest that organising residents’ feedback for faculty teachers in a systematic way is a first step and is necessary to effect potential improvements in teaching performance.

**Spare Keys – other take home points for clinician educators**