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Workplace Learning through Collaboration in Primary Healthcare:
A BEME Realist Review of What Works, for Whom, and in What Circumstances.

Abstract

Background: Changes in healthcare practice toward more proactive clinical, organisational and interprofessional working require primary healthcare professionals to learn continuously from each other through collaboration. This systematic review uses realist methodology to consolidate knowledge on the characteristics of workplace learning (WPL) through collaboration by primary healthcare professionals.

Methods: Following several scoping searches, five electronic bibliographic databases were searched from January 1990 to December 2015 for relevant grey and published literature written in English, French, German and Dutch. Reviewers worked in pairs to identify relevant articles. A set of statements, based on the findings of our scoping searches, was used as a coding tree to analyse the papers. Interpretation of the results was done in alternating pairs, discussed within the author group, and triangulated with stakeholders’ views.

Results: Out of 6930 references, we included 42 publications that elucidated who, when, how and what primary healthcare professionals learn through collaboration. Papers were both qualitative and quantitative in design, and focused largely on WPL of collaborating general practitioners and nurses. No striking differences between different professionals within primary healthcare were noted. Professionals were often unaware of the learning that occurs through collaboration. WPL happened predominantly through informal discussions about patient cases and modelling for other professionals. Any professionals could both learn and facilitate others’ learning. Outcomes were diverse, but contextualised knowledge seemed to be important.

Discussion/conclusions: Primary care professionals’ WPL is multifaceted. Existing social constructivist and social cognitivist learning theories form a framework from which to interpret these findings. Primary care policy makers and managers should ensure that
professionals have access to protected time, earmarked for learning. Time is required for reflection, to learn new ways of interaction and to develop new habits within clinical practice.
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Glossary

**Workplace learning** (WPL) is ‘learning taking place at work, through work and for work’ (1), which for medical professionals occurs during clinical practice. This review focuses on WPL occurring as a result of collaboration with healthcare professionals from the same or from different disciplines, at the same location or across organisational boundaries.

**Collaboration** happens when multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds work together with patients, families, caregivers and communities to deliver the highest quality of care. It allows health workers to involve any individual whose skills can help to achieve health goals (2). WPL may arise as a result of collaboration between professionals with the same educational background (intraprofessional), but, as a consequence of the rise in interprofessional collaborative practice, increasingly arises from the interaction between professionals from several disciplines working together to care for the same patient (interprofessional) (3, 4). In this review, we focus on understanding WPL arising as a result of both interprofessional and intraprofessional collaboration.

**Primary healthcare** is a discipline that has not been defined uniformly in diverse healthcare systems around the world. In Europe, the term is used to refer to community-based settings rather than hospital settings. General practitioners (family physicians), pharmacists, nurse practitioners and physiotherapists are just some members of this discipline (5). In the United States, the term ‘primary healthcare’ is used to refer to office-based practices (either family medicine, internal medicine or paediatrics) where the focus is on primary care delivery. In this review, in order to be relevant to practice worldwide, we adopted an inclusive view on primary healthcare and included papers describing primary healthcare as defined in the country where the research was undertaken.
Background

Over the last few decades, rapid demographic and epidemiological transitions (i.e. more older people with chronic multi-morbidities), coupled with increased patient proactivity regarding health-seeking behaviours, have resulted in an increase in the number of tasks and responsibilities being placed upon the shoulders of primary healthcare professionals (5-7). Awareness of these changes has led to a change in both the organisation of health care services and the ways in which healthcare professionals deliver care. To this end, current models of healthcare delivery now advocate a shift away from reactive clinical work towards proactive clinical and organisational work (8), and from working individually toward interprofessional collaborative practice (ICP) (9-11).

Professionals are expected to keep pace with these changes within healthcare by means of life-long learning. However, this can be challenging, because after graduation and during the career of all healthcare professionals, patient care seems to be the main focus of all activities and learning is often considered a mere side-effect of practice (12). Furthermore, although professionals are expected to engage in formal continuing medical education sessions to promote learning, these have limited value for physicians in terms of facilitating learning (13, 14). Instead, professionals are expected to learn during clinical practice through collaboration with others in the workplace (15), particularly in primary healthcare, where the need to maintain multiple, diverse relationships makes collaboration an essential aspect of professionals’ work.

Workplace learning (WPL) has been broadly defined as ‘learning taking place at work, through work and for work’ (1). The literature on WPL notes that working and learning are inseparable and fundamental (15-17). Learning through work may result from collaboration between professionals with the same educational background (intraprofessional), but as a consequence of the rise in ICP, often arises from the interaction between professionals from several disciplines working together to care for a patient (interprofessional) (3, 4). During undergraduate medical education, where WPL is accepted as the way students learn, WPL has been studied extensively (18, 19). In such an educational context, it is clear that learning is an important goal of participation in practice. However, this is less obvious during clinical practice after graduation. Theories of WPL have been described in the general learning sciences literature (1, 15, 20-23), including, for example, the ‘communities of practice’ model proposed by Lave and Wenger (24), which is based on the idea of learning through
participation (24-26). For healthcare professionals working and learning after graduation, theories that have a clear social dimension, such as sociocultural learning theories and social cognitive learning theories (27, 28), have particular relevance for understanding WPL. However, there is still a lack of clarity regarding the mechanisms by which WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare settings takes place, and the contextual factors that facilitate or inhibit such learning.

We intend to move the field forwards with regards to WPL in primary healthcare by using realist methodology to investigate what works, for whom, in what circumstances and in what respects (29, 30). By developing a better understanding of primary healthcare professionals’ WPL through collaboration, we hope to identify implications for practice and research that will ultimately contribute to the optimisation of life-long learning for these healthcare professionals.

Review aims and research questions

This review aims to better understand: i) the process of WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare, and ii) the conditions influencing WPL. The following research questions will be addressed:

- Who learns during WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare?
- When does this learning take place?
- How does this learning occur?
- What is being learned?

Method

Rationale for Using Realist Review

A realist review is an interpretative, theory driven evidence synthesis that uses cross-case comparison to understand, and ideally explain, how and why different outcomes have been observed in a sample of primary studies (29). We chose to use this methodology because WPL results from complex interactions during practice, during which contextual factors trigger mechanisms to generate different outcomes such as professionals’ behaviour (30). We felt that, in order to understand the process of WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare, the links between context (C), mechanisms (M) and outcomes (O), or C-M-O,
needed to be explored. These links could be best explored using realist methodology. We used the Realist Synthesis RAMESES Training Materials to provide practical guidance during the review process (31).

**Development of an analytical framework**

Typically, one of the first steps of a realist synthesis is to make explicit a programme theory for interventions (29). However, we did not feel that one overarching programme theory of WPL would suffice or be applicable, given the intrinsic complexity of WPL (32). Instead, we followed the approach taken by Walshe and Luker (33), and developed a broad analytical framework, against which we could extract relevant data to address the review questions. To do so, we first conducted broad *scoping searches* to examine the breadth and depth of the broad literature base pertaining to WPL. During a **stakeholders meeting** (with researchers and faculty members of the department of Family Medicine and Primary Healthcare in Ghent University: general practitioners, nurses, psychologists, and sociologists), we discussed the ways in which practicing healthcare professionals are likely to learn in primary healthcare to elicit *implicit assumptions* and to ensure that our review focused on practice-relevant issues. Informed by the results of our stakeholders’ discussion and the *explicit theories* identified by our scoping searches, we developed statements on WPL (Box 1), which formed an analytical framework.

Some statements align with well-known learning theories such as socio-cognitive theory, which stresses the importance of role-models (27) (e.g. “demonstrating learning behaviour affects facilitators’ behaviour”). Other statements were more experience-based, proposed by the stakeholders, such as “being a facilitator for others can be learned”. Models of workplace learning, such as the one proposed by Tynjälä (1) suggest that prerequisites for WPL may be clustered under the headings ‘learner factors’ and ‘learning contexts’. Learner factors were derived from the idea that motivation and experience are important for learning (34, 35). From the work of Illeris (23), it is well known that how the work is organised and the relations at the workplace are important with respect to the affordances for learning a workplace provides. Therefore, we developed statements with respect to the organisation of the workplace (for example whether responsibility is shared), and statements about interpersonal aspects of the workplace that may affect learning. Outcomes of learning were not covered extensively in our statements but were derived through axial – and selective coding of the data. Learning processes, clustered under the heading ‘how does learning occur?’, were informed by learning theories, such as the theory on reflective practice (36, 37).
We saw reflection as an interactive and interactional process (36). Overall we adopted a focus on social learning (theories) in our review, even though the wordings of some statements in our framework appear to reflect an individualistic learning approach.

Box 1: Statements which were used as an analytical framework

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Every professional learns from others during practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Being a facilitator for others can be learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Willingness to learn influences learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Number of years in practice influences learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Professional expertise influences the effectiveness of the facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Awareness of learning needs influences learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Workplace artefacts can be used for learning during practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>A shared aim or responsibility of a team influences the learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Workload influences learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Learning during practice can be planned or unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Difficult clinical situations have learning potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Learning during clinical practice is guided by actual patients' care needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Interprofessional relationships affect learning through collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Interprofessional hierarchy affects learning through collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>The history of a team working together influences learning during practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Learning during practice is partially implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>Reflection on practice is a major process during learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r)</td>
<td>Participating in practice has a better learning outcome than observing practice by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s)</td>
<td>Every professional facilitates others' learning during practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t)</td>
<td>Demonstrating learning behaviour affects facilitators' behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u)</td>
<td>Demonstrating facilitative behaviour affects learners' behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td>During collaboration, new knowledge can be created (besides circulating knowledge between professionals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Search Strategy**

Following several scoping searches, five electronic databases (Pubmed, ERIC, ProQuest, Embase and CINAHL) were searched for relevant published and unpublished literature. These databases were chosen to span literature on health sciences and education, and to be as comprehensive as possible when considered together. Search syntaxes were informed by the research questions and not solely by initially derived learning theories, as it was not clear at that stage of the review process whether all WPL aspects would be covered by the learning theories. Search syntaxes were devised in collaboration with a librarian. Syntax was initially developed and piloted in Pubmed before being modified to fit the requirements of the other databases, and combined synonyms of a combination of relevant components: learning.
collaboration and primary healthcare. Since the purpose of the review was to consider WPL, we limited the search to papers published after January 1990. This was based on our initial scoping searches, which showed that most of the literature on WPL started from the nineties. To reduce the number of irrelevant references, the additional filters ‘human’ and ‘language’ (English, French, German, Dutch) were used for CINAHL and Embase. For the same reason, additional publication filters (‘article’, ‘article in press’, ‘conference paper’, ‘conference review’ and ‘short survey’) were used for Embase. ProQuest was used to search grey literature. Appendix 1 contains full details of the search syntaxes used in this review.

Endnote X7 was used to store all identified references.

Screening and Selection

To achieve maximum reliability, a team meeting (PP, FM, EDG and LM) was first held to clarify the in- and exclusion criteria, jointly practice the abstract selection and discuss screening and selection procedures. Screening and selection was then performed in pairs (PP/FM and EDG/LM). Each pair screened the titles and abstracts of half of the identified citations. The two reviewers of each pair independently evaluated the retrieved citations to determine their relevance to the aims of the review. Paper selection was done in two stages: in the first stage, only the titles and/or abstracts were considered. Potentially eligible papers were obtained in full text and re-screened against inclusion and exclusion criteria in the second stage. At each stage, disagreements were discussed in pairs until obtaining agreement, with an additional researcher conducted where consensus could not be found.

Studies were included if they: a) clearly described the learning processes of healthcare professionals in primary care settings; and b) contained sufficient information to determine the content or processes by which learning took place and/or was assessed. With respect to criterion a), data were considered if they were reported either in the method section (e.g. intervention study) or in the results section (e.g. interview study on experiences and beliefs towards WPL).

Studies were excluded if: a) they exclusively described classroom-based education; b) the learning context and processes were insufficiently described; c) the study population consisted solely of undergraduate and graduate students or hospital healthcare professionals; d) they were written in languages other than English, French, German or Dutch; and/or e) they were reported as dissertations or books if they were not electronically available’.
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Analytical Procedure

Relevant study data (e.g. study design, publication year, country) were extracted and tabulated using Microsoft Excel. Data were then coded, extracted and analysed in accordance with their relevance to the review questions. To aid this, a code tree was first created using the initially formulated statements (see Box 1) as nodes. A team meeting (PP, FM, EDG, LM) was held to discuss a pilot coding of four papers and fine-tune the coding procedure, following which data coding and extraction then took place in pairs (PP/LM and FM/EDG). Each member of each pair independently read and re-read half of the included papers, and coded text fragments within the results or discussion section of the paper, provided that they were potentially relevant to one or more of the statements. These were discussed within each pair, and the resulting data were imported into NVivo 11. Next, data pertaining to each statement were examined. This phase was again executed in pairs: PP/FM and EDG/LM. Each pair discussed and analysed half of the data pertaining to the statements. C-M-O configurations were identified as follows: pairs interpreted which sections of the data functioned as context or a mechanism for a particular outcome within a paper. The duos checked each others’ interpretations of the data and discussed differences. Next, comparisons between different contexts and underlying mechanisms were made, and statements were categorised in accordance with the review questions after careful discussion within the research group (‘Who’: statement a) – f), ‘When’: statement g) – o), ‘How’: statement p) – u), ‘What’: statement v)). Analysis was facilitated through regular team meetings, during which progress was discussed and reflected upon.

Quality Appraisal

Realist reviews seek to explain complex interventions by drawing together evidence from varied sources to illuminate the richer picture (29). This includes various sources of evidence contributing to the underlying theories being explored and does not rank or exclude studies according to their research design (29, 38). Pawson argues that studies should be assessed against the criteria of ‘relevance’ (whether the study addressed the theories considered) and

1 Although the phases of abstract selection and analysis are presented as sequential, they happened overlapping and iterative, as is characteristic for realist reviews. Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, Walshe K. Realist review--a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. Journal of health services research & policy. 2005;10 Suppl 1:21-34.
‘rigour’ (whether a particular interference drawn by the original researcher has sufficient weight to make a methodologically credible contribution to the test of a particular intervention). As such, both relevance and rigour are not absolute criteria but dimensions of fitness of the data for the purpose of the review (29). In light of this, we did not use conventional approaches to quality appraisal but instead scrutinised the relevance and rigour of papers prior to inclusion in this review.

**Results**

In total, the search strategy identified 10,858 citations, resulting in 6,930 citations after de-duplication (see Table 1). Of these, 42 papers were selected for inclusion in this review, the details of which are summarised in Appendix 2.

**Table 1. Bibliographic sources of included citations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Citations found (n)</th>
<th>Duplicates (n)</th>
<th>New citations (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Pubmed search</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Pubmed search based on ERIC search</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC and additional ProQuest databases (20)</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embase</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINAHL</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                              | 10,858              | 3,928          | 6,930             |
Figure 1: Flow-chart of included studies

- 3,744 records identified through searching Pubmed (Jan 1990-Dec 2013)
- 4,788 records identified through adapted searching Pubmed, search based on ERIC (Jan 1990-Dec 2013)
- 844 records identified through searching ERIC and additional ProQuest databases (Jan 1990-Dec 2014)
- 879 records identified through searching EMBASE (Jan 1990-Dec 2015)
- 603 records identified through searching CINAHL (Jan 1990-Dec 2015)

10,858 records identified through database searching

6,930 records after duplicates removed

6,930 non-duplicate records screened

299 full-text articles assessed for eligibility

42 publications included in review

6,631 records excluded

257 full-text articles excluded. Reasons for excluding papers include: not available, theses, books, not primary research, learning process insufficient described, no learning through collaboration, hospital based data, undergraduate perspective, educational intervention.
General characteristics of the included studies

Appendix 2 provides a summary of the forty-two included papers. Of these, 23 (55%) came from Europe; nine (21%) from the USA; four from Canada; three from Australia and one each from New Zealand, Mexico and Brazil. The studies varied in design. Twenty-eight studies used a qualitative research design (66%), four studies concerned a project description and qualitative evaluation (9%), four concerned a project description and quantitative evaluation (9%), three studies concerned a project description with both quantitative and qualitative evaluation (7%), one study concerned a project and case exemplar description, one study used action research, one study used both a quantitative and qualitative research design. Thirty-two studies (76%) reported on interprofessional learning, whereas 10 studies (24%) described intraprofessional learning through collaboration. Seven papers referred to communities of practices as a learning theory and two papers referred to socio-cognitive learning theories, while the rest of the papers were not explicit about a learning theory but referred to general concepts such as workplace learning (n = 3) or described what activities were performed without mentioning a learning theory.

Main results

Results are presented according to the research questions; throughout, figures are used to illustrate an overview of all C-M-O configurations identified from the included papers. Additional examples of C-M-O configurations from individual papers are presented in Appendix 3.

Who learns during WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare?

Different perspectives were represented in the included studies, and therefore this section presents the perspectives of learners and facilitators separately for clarity.

Perspective of the learners

During WPL in practice, any professional can learn from others, both within the same profession (C) or between different professions (C). This was evident across all forty-two included studies. Ten papers reported on WPL between members of the same profession, of

---

2 In each figure, C-M-O configurations are illustrated using arrows, with references to the relevant included papers in the review. Where no configurations could be made, references pertain to individual C-M-O elements.
3 Throughout this review, we use the term ‘facilitator’ to refer to anyone who facilitates another’s learning. As such, the facilitator may be a teacher, as well a professional functioning as a role model.
which five (39-43) described the learning of nurses (39) and five (44-48) described learning taking place between specialists and GPs (47). The remaining 32 included papers reported on WPL during interprofessional collaboration, with a broad spectrum of participants: GPs, nurses, midwives, health and social care practitioners, dentists, pharmacists, occupational therapists, physiotherapists, community health workers, receptionists, practice managers and faculty members.

Professionals learn from those who are sufficiently different from themselves (C) to be able to offer additional knowledge and expertise (49-52), yet to whom they are still similar enough (C) to relate (53). Professionals’ learning appeared to be influenced by different mechanisms (M), namely: having confidence (54) and recognising others as experts in their own right (40, 45, 48, 49, 54-57); being open about uncertainties (58, 59); and perceiving partnerships as mutually satisfying (40, 55). Conversely, if others are not seen as experts and there is limited communication or trust in others’ expertise (47, 60, 61), learning may be impeded (O). The feeling that some viewpoints supersede others (M) may also impede learning (O) within a traditional hierarchical context (C) (56, 61).

Motivation to learn as an individual or within a group is a necessary mechanism (M) (42, 56, 58, 61-64) to enhance learning (O) (49, 59, 62, 65, 66), which contributes to better service delivery (56, 62, 64, 66). Awareness of practice problems that require solving and belief in the usefulness of certain learning activities contribute to willingness to learn (M) (56, 58, 61, 64). Motivation helps professionals to overcome resistance, build confidence, accept feedback and become more pro-active with respect to asking questions and seeking feedback (58, 61, 64, 67). However, willingness to learn is not sufficient to motivate learners to achieve all of their learning goals; learning goals must also be closely aligned with the context of the learner (C) (45, 48, 61, 63).

People who become aware of their own learning needs (C) (41, 47), others’ learning needs or the learning needs of the group (C) (47, 55, 59, 65, 68) are more motivated to learn (46, 56, 59, 61). Awareness of one’s learning needs helps professionals to prioritise and to control one’s own learning agenda (45, 55, 57, 58). Professionals (e.g. collaborating GPs, nurses, practice managers; pharmacists) learn values, as well as new roles (O), by actually performing tasks (63, 69), particularly those which are closely connected to their daily practice (C) (69). However, the learning process is hampered (O) when professionals are not aware of others’
learning needs (C) (45, 47). Learning ends when needs are sufficiently met (47). We found insufficient data about the number of years in practice influencing professionals’ WPL.

Figure 2: C-M-O for ‘Who learns’ – perspective of the learner

*Perspective of the facilitators*

Becoming a facilitator for others’ learning is, in principle, achievable but does not happen all by itself. Several studies reported on interventions whereby professionals became facilitators for others’ learning; namely specialised palliative care nurses facilitating GPs’ learning (42), specialists facilitating GPs’ and nurses’ learning (44, 47), and nurse specialists facilitating each other’s learning (65). Facilitating another’s learning is a competence which can be learned over time but which requires continuous reflective practice (39, 57, 70), learning by
doing (39) and, occasionally, additional formal learning as well (39). Becoming a facilitator can take place: within the context of a learning community (C) with space to exchange ideas and improve skills (67); in an action learning group (C) with other trainee facilitators (65); by observing more experienced colleagues (C), and talking through and deliberating cases with colleagues (C) (49); and/or by being nurtured and guided by supervising leaders (C) (68). Becoming a facilitator changes self-perceptions (O) (70), increases self-confidence (M and O) in the role and stimulates further growth as a facilitator (O) (57, 71, 72). Additionally, becoming more mindful of thought processes can result in long-term changes in one’s own clinical practice (O) (70, 71).

Group members’ and facilitators’ professional expertise or lack thereof, influences the effectiveness of the facilitator, both in a positive and a negative way (54, 62, 70). This influences others’ learning in different ways. A novice learner benefits from the support of an experienced clinician and from being exposed to practice under the direction and tutorship of experienced professionals (C) (54, 60, 62, 70). The professional expertise of the facilitator needs to be contextual (48, 70), that is, they must be experienced in treating a specific group of patients (54, 62). In addition, it must be viewed as being relevant to the context of the learner (M) (45). An experienced facilitator is seen as the source for answers to questions and is addressed as such (60). Furthermore, the facilitator needs to be aware of his own expertise (C) (57). However, being seen as too much as an expert, may hinder the learning process because learners might be reluctant to ask questions (M) (42). The support of an experienced facilitator results in continuous learning and the development of clinical and diagnostic skills (O) (54).

The professional role one adopts in a team influences the development and expression of facilitating competencies. A professional who adopts the facilitator role (C) uses their knowledge to advise others (42, 43, 72), sometimes implicitly by vocalizing their own clinical reasoning (42, 43, 70) or by thinking out loud (42, 43, 70). This encourages other team members to get involved in the reflective process, resulting in learning (O). On the contrary, a professional who adopts the role of the ‘clinical expert’ by contributing expertise in direct patient care to the team may find it more difficult to assimilate knowledge and competencies in facilitation if this is not seen as part of their role (M) (43).

Figure 3: C-M-O for ‘Who learns’ – Perspective of the facilitators
When does WPL take place?

Broadly, data suggested that both organizational and social factors influence WPL. These are discussed below.

Organisational factors

Learning during practice may be influenced by the way the workplace/work environment is equipped and laid-out (50, 54, 56, 60, 66, 72, 73). For example, workplace artefacts (C), shared aims (C), and marked time (C) all influence WPL (46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 72-75).

Workplace artefacts are diverse tools (for example reflective logs, (flow-) charts, daily care reports, portfolios, protocols, and technological tools) which make learning more shared,
contextualised, personalised and patient-centered (O) (46, 50, 54, 56, 60, 73). Artefacts such as protocols (C) can mandate conversations between nurses, GPs and multiple professionals about care (53, 54, 73, 75). The influence of technological tools on learning only occurs in a context where learners have adequate skills (54, 57, 67, 72) and recognise the added value (M) (45, 48, 73). However, even when these conditions are met, change does not occur automatically (although it should be noted that the majority of these studies studied GPs only) (48, 55, 58, 61, 75).

Less tangible aspects of the workplace, such as a shared aim or responsibility (C), also facilitate learning. For example, a feeling of shared responsibility for patient care triggers professionals, whether they are of the same discipline or differing disciplines, to share their knowledge and expertise with others (M) (41, 56). Within the context of a safe learning environment, with shared values and a belief in patient-centred care, recognition of the value of sharing knowledge (M) is an underlying mechanism which facilitates learning (41, 56). Interprofessional learning in itself may also be a shared aim (C) (56) which can enhance the whole team’s care quality (48) and can trigger continuous team learning dynamics (O) (65).

In organisations, both planned opportunities (e.g. structured reflection time) and unplanned learning opportunities (C) lead to WPL (47, 54, 61, 62, 64, 68, 73). However, unplanned activities seem to be more motivational (42, 44, 45, 52, 56, 57, 61, 64). For example, seeking out on-the-spot opportunities for peer feedback leads to greater responsiveness to the needs of the moment and facilitates two-way learning (O) (45, 56, 61, 62, 64). Professionals value and appreciate formal opportunities to learn from one another, such as shared visits (48), visits to each other’s workplace (45) or comparative feedback (60), but do not prioritise these opportunities over routine clinical activities.

Irrespective of professional discipline, standardising and regulating learning dynamics is not recommended (56, 61, 64). However, unplanned learning appears to happen less frequently in situations characterised by time constraints and high workloads (C) (56, 73, 76). High workload affects WPL (O) directly (by limiting the time available for time teaching-learning interactions (42), and indirectly (by impacting on professionals’ ability and willingness to learn (M) (57, 61, 73, 76)). Reflection on practice experience is time-consuming and even when convinced of the need to learn through reflection, engagement in reflection can be hindered by time constraints (61) and clinical responsibilities (45). Suggested solutions are protected time for team reflection and taking a break from daily practice in order to engage
with educational opportunities, such as interprofessional discussions or personal reflection (57, 73, 76).

In the workplace, primary healthcare professionals encounter cases with a high level of complexity at a patient level (such as cultural diversity (64)), a contextual level (practices for which resources are scarce (62, 64)) and/or a professional level (62, 64). All of these complexities provide opportunities for learning. Difficult case management occurs mostly in multidisciplinary and interprofessional collaborations (C), e.g. case discussions in multidisciplinary teams (54, 58, 61, 76), joint patient visits with different professionals (48), joint interprofessional teleconsultations (44). However, intra-professional case discussions, e.g. GP-specialist videoconferencing, also provide opportunities for learning. Besides complex cases, other opportunities for WPL are situations in which patients’ care needs lead to consultation. The clinical problems at stake trigger primary healthcare professionals to seek answers as a team (M) (56), through purposeful engagement with other professionals who have the necessary knowledge and expertise (62). This enables them to learn from each other about the specific patient problems at hand. Discussion of patient cases are seen as reciprocal teaching-learning transactions (46, 47, 77). Learning that results from interactions during (difficult) case management is motivated by both professional development outcomes and patient-related outcomes (O) (39, 42, 58, 59, 61, 72, 75). Important driving mechanisms for learning are: the desire to provide high-quality patient care (M) (46, 48, 54, 58, 62); seeking information on professional decisions (M) (59); seeking guidance on professional development (M) (39); and an eagerness to learn (M) (44, 56, 61) or teach (M) (42, 72). Nevertheless, in a study on GPs and specialists, learning was negatively affected (O) by facilitators’ reluctance to teach (M) in the presence of patients (C) (44).

Figure 4: C-M-O for ‘When’ – Organisational factors
Social factors

The social environment, such as the composition of teams and the nature of relationships at work, influences learning. Strong relationships between healthcare professionals (C) can facilitate learning, because practitioners know one another well (56), feel equivalent (47, 51, 56, 58, 59), trust each other (48, 51, 54, 58, 62, 65), develop relational awareness (in teams) (47, 54, 56, 60), keep lines of (constructive critical) communication open (45, 47, 54, 56, 58, 60) and have a willingness to learn (57). In interprofessional settings, good relationships contribute to a safe environment which supports learning, particularly when collaborating on complex cases (41, 47, 51, 54, 56, 58, 59, 68, 69, 76). Both past positive and past negative experiences of working together in teams (C) or in dyads have an effect on learning during practice. Underlying mechanisms are the intrinsic motivation, anticipation and comfort in knowledge-seeking (M) (47, 55, 56, 58, 61, 73, 75) or the lack of self-direction or considering certain learning approaches to be unsuitable (M) (49, 55, 56, 61). They result in shared (and
mostly informal) learning (O) (47, 55, 56, 58, 61, 73, 75), or learning being hindered (O) (47, 55, 56, 58, 61).

Hierarchy between professionals (C) also influences the learning process (45, 58, 60, 78), e.g. in locations where expert palliative care nurses wish to facilitate general practitioners’ learning (43). The learning process can be influenced negatively when a physician emphasises or reinforces a perceived hierarchy by adopting a lecture-like style when providing information to advanced practice nurses, resulting in nurses’ decreased motivation to learn (M) (60). However, a study about a medical specialist, acting as facilitator for learning in general practice, showed that facilitators could help to overcome barriers to learning (O) associated with hierarchy when the specialist is able to communicate with GPs while “pragmatically relating expert knowledge to clinical experience” (45, 78). Furthermore, getting to know each other in an informal and different context (e.g. a team building weekend) makes it possible to learn from each other afterwards without perceived barriers of authority (O) (56).

Figure 5: C-M-O for ‘When’ – Social factors

How does this learning occur?
Learning takes place via a number of channels, including interactions with other professionals and through others’ facilitative behaviours (including discussions, explanations, modelling and facilitating). These are each discussed in turn.

**Interactions with other professionals**

Learning often occurs without an explicit intention to learn. Sometimes learning occurs but is not explicitly discussed e.g. specialists who explain something to a generalist (C) do not always want their teaching effort noticed (47). Sometimes learning happens unconsciously and implicitly between team members while working together (C) (56). However, even though professionals in primary healthcare engage in implicit learning, not all learning is unintentional. The main driving mechanism for implicit learning is the wish to provide high quality patient care (M) (49, 56, 76, 78) by sharing and discussing tasks (42). Resulting outcomes are collective clinical learning (O) (56) or identification of knowledge gaps through comparing clinical practice and seeking peer data to inform self assessment (O) (58).

A study of interprofessional learning in GP practices, pharmacies and dental practices found that performing an action (C) is very important for the learning outcome; merely observing someone else doing it or getting an explanation on how to do it seems less efficient (56). However, studies carried out in interprofessional settings (GPs and social workers respectively) showed that observation and practice visits of colleagues (C) could be a first step in the learning process (49, 67). The intention and willingness to pass on tacit knowledge (M) is a driving mechanism to allow colleagues to learn by experience (52). Resulting learning outcomes are situated at the level of performing patient care tasks (O) (56), professional development (O) (52) and practice organisation (O) (49).

Within the context of experiential learning, reflection on practice (C) is an important part of the learning process. This reflection can be spontaneous or triggered (39, 42, 58), individual or guided or collective (46, 61, 62, 79) and can be related to the task at hand (60) or to one’s professional role and identity (61). Driving mechanisms for reflection are the motivation (M) to continue doing it after experiencing the positive effects (61), aiming for quality improvement (M) (79) or explicitly wanting to learn (M) (e.g. primary healthcare professionals learning from local community health workers in a transcultural context) (64).

Figure 6: C-M-O for ‘How’ – Interactions with other professionals
Others’ facilitative behaviour

During daily practice activities, any professional can trigger the learning of another professional. This reciprocal process is also seen in the influence learners have on their facilitators, and vice versa. When learners ask questions in an open and positive manner, request feedback and bring up-to-date knowledge into practice (C) (45, 47, 70, 80), the facilitator learns to recognise opportunities to facilitate others’ learning (O) (40, 42), which in turn triggers teaching and facilitative behaviour and challenges them to ensure that their knowledge base is up-to-date (O) (40). The learner’s actions motivate the facilitator (M) to continue teaching and facilitating in different ways (42, 57). Regardless of the triggering effect of the learner’s learning behaviour, some facilitators try to share their knowledge and give advice without being prompted, e.g. in a study with specialised palliative care nurses giving advice to GPs (42, 43). Professionals who exhibit facilitative behaviour can also affect the learning behaviour of others (39, 61, 75). Facilitators may guide joint reflection, but
should do so cautiously and implicitly (C) so as not to harm the interprofessional relationship as learning is secondary to maintaining good collaborative relationships (M) (42).

Reflective learning, implicit learning through participation in practice, modelling and reciprocal learning were all identified in the included studies on primary healthcare professionals. In interprofessional contexts, more studies focused on learning through participation and reciprocal learning, whereas in intraprofessional contexts more studies were done about reflection and modelling through facilitators. Studies examining the context in which GPs learn mostly focused upon learning through participation, compared with studies about the learning of primary healthcare nurses, which focused more on reflection. In both disciplines, modelling through facilitators was seen.

Figure 7: C-M-O for ‘How’: Others’ facilitative behaviour

What is being learned?

Outcomes of WPL differed across the 42 included studies, with eight focused specifically on WPL at the team or organisation level (48, 53, 56, 66-68, 73, 75). As such, studies primarily reported data pertaining to professionals’ individual learning outcomes, with a minority focusing on what was considered relevant for the team.
During collaboration and through interaction with each other, professionals acquire and contextualise knowledge (39, 48, 50, 51, 56, 59, 62, 73, 75). In addition, new attitudes (39, 74), increased self-awareness (41, 56, 61, 63) and new values and roles may develop (69). Professionals develop skills (39, 61, 69) and behaviour (61, 74, 75) that they did not previously possess. Learning outcomes are a more realistic and relevant view on medicine (55, 77); growth in clinical care competence (56, 65); refined coping mechanisms (68); evolved interprofessional relationships (48, 55, 76); an impact on the growing learning culture (55); and insight and awareness of one’s own and others’ professional possibilities (55, 76).

Regular patient care and difficult case management (C) result in diverse learning outcomes, centred on both patient-related and professional development outcomes. They relate to: acquisition of clinical knowledge (47, 54, 56, 72), and a broader understanding of the clinical problem (46, 54, 59); contextualisation of generic knowledge (62), acquisition of cultural knowledge and cultural proficiency (64) creativity in problem solving (61, 64); the development of strategies to integrate knowledge into the work setting (62); reciprocal learning of each other’s skills (48); development of skills for reflective practice (58, 61); improved patient care (58); individual professional growth (39, 76); enhanced patient-centeredness (77); changed attitudes and beliefs towards diseases (77); and clarification of professional roles.

Learning outcomes are evident not only with respect to independent performance of patient care tasks (56) but also at the level of non-patient related tasks, such as practice organisation or chairing a meeting (49). Additional outcomes may include transmission of tacit knowledge and professional skills (e.g. professional flexibility and creativity in unclear situations) (52), and increased insight into one’s own and others’ personal values and norms (61). Reflective practice can make it easier for professionals to understand the moral dimensions of care, which can benefit both individual practitioners and the team (61).

Facilitating the learning of others also results in enjoyment from being an expert (56); role transition from expert to facilitator (43, 61); acquisition of clinical or cultural-specific knowledge (51, 54, 56, 58, 62) which can also be a reciprocal dynamic (47, 55); and improved self-confidence (62). Other outcomes relevant for the team are professional hierarchy being replaced by knowledge hierarchy (54) and acquisition of team building skills (55). Demonstrating facilitative behaviour may lead to group members’ passion for work or learning (68) or to the realisation that one’s own judgment on a case needs to be postponed in
order to view the problem from different perspectives (61). This leads to the acquisition, sharing and development of knowledge (75), of ways to communicate guidelines’ content (63), of a more exploratory attitude (61) and/or of reflection as a skill (39).

Discussion

This review aimed to better understand the process of WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare and the conditions influencing such WPL. In this discussion, we first discuss the results of the review. We then reflect on whether our findings fit with theories of social (workplace) learning mentioned in the introduction and compare them with other theoretical frameworks. Finally, we then discuss the strengths and limitations of the review itself and outline gaps in the current evidence base, before concluding by summarising the key findings of this review.

Who learns during WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare?

In our review, we were interested in WPL across a broad range of primary healthcare professionals. Participants in the included studies were mainly GPs and nurses, working in intraprofessional or interprofessional settings; studies investigating WPL of pharmacists or dentists were underrepresented. Interestingly, we did not find large differences in what would be considered to be successful learning approaches or beneficial aspects of the learning environment for GPs and nurses. What we did find, however, is that learners who are willing to learn, and who are aware of the importance of finding solutions to practice problems and relevance of the subject matter, are strongly motivated to engage in learning. This finding is not surprising, given the prevalence of motivation theories throughout the WPL literature (1, 23) e.g. self-determination theory (81).

What is surprising, however, is that only three of the included studies reported team-level analyses. Needs and wants, essential for experiential learning from daily practice, are often viewed as something that belongs to an individual learner (35) but seems to be equally relevant for understanding WPL at the group level (34). Unfortunately, given the paucity of team-level data, we were unable to draw conclusions about the influence of motivation of teams; future research is needed to address this gap and shed further light on the process of WPL through collaboration.
In addition to needs and wants, we also identified the importance of being aware of one another’s expertise when it comes to WPL through collaboration. This phenomena was mostly observed in papers focused on interprofessional settings, and fits with Transactive Memory Theory, which posits that ‘knowing who knows what’ is essential for professional practice as it diminishes the need for every professional to have all facts in their own memory (82). As such, communicating each other’s expertise in an explicit way may enhance both patient care and interprofessional WPL.

**When does this learning take place?**

Collectively, data from the included studies indicate that learning takes place when conditions provide opportunities for learning which aligns with the work by Illeris about workplace learning (25). When resources (‘artefacts’) are available to professionals, they influence WPL. Artefacts include technical resources (such as electronic patient records or technical devices to facilitate video communication between professionals in different locations) and practical resources (such as lay-out of the work environment or days-out). Artefacts act as boundary objects, “that allow connection between different perspectives among communities to achieve a common goal” (83). Consideration of theories of the hybrid or extended mind (84) and other sociomaterial learning theories (85) may help us to better understand the potential role of artefacts. Interestingly, however, these theories were not referenced in the papers included in our review, even though artefacts were studied frequently.

When practices are very busy, professionals’ WPL is influenced by this high workload. We identified 14 studies that explicitly referred to workload; the remaining 28 studies did not mention any influence of workload. However, the relationship between learning and workload is complex, not least because workload is often seen a subjective rather than objective entity (86). When workload is low, with a small number of complex interesting patient cases, WPL through collaboration does not occur. When workload is too high, no room for constructive critical communication remains, thus hindering WPL.

Interprofessional learning is of increasing importance within the medical domain (87, 88). In our review, 32 studies focused on interprofessional learning of primary healthcare professionals, often referring to communities of practice as a relevant learning theory. We expect that, in healthcare, the idea of novices who become experts through participation is appealing because learning through socialisation is common. Not mentioned in the included
studies was Cultural Historic Activity Theory (89), which might have been a useful framework for understanding learning arising from collaboration between professionals from different professions and different organisations. In Cultural Historic Activity Theory, the wish to reach a specific goal is essential for learning to take place (89), which fits with our finding that a shared aim is important, but realising shared aims in an interprofessional setting does not always emerge naturally (90). Shared responsibility for patient care reflects the importance of authentic learning environments (28, 91, 92).

Within primary healthcare, the team’s history and past experiences was found to influence the quality of team relationships and, as such, their WPL. The history of a team is a concept that might explain successful learning thanks to shared mental models that people have developed in time while working together (93). This might also help to clarify unsuccessful learning, particularly if conflicts have arisen during the team’s history that negatively affect learning (94). Conversely, a sense of hierarchy can hinder WPL, as it can impede learners’ willingness to ask questions or to seek feedback. Existing (perceived) hierarchy can also form a barrier to providing feedback or to critical questioning. In the included studies, hierarchy was reported upon, yet at the same time measures were proposed to overcome this barrier, such as acknowledgement of others’ expertise and awareness of others’ specific contexts. Although the literature describes communication approaches to overcome communication difficulties in hierarchical situations (95), the role of acknowledging expertise has –to our knowledge- not been studied in detail.

**How does this learning occur?**

Practitioners can learn by sharing activities or working in collaboration, or by observing each other. The finding that healthcare professionals learn through participation during every-day working aligns with sociocultural learning theories, in which learning is posited to occur during regular interaction, for example in learning communities (28). An explicit reference to theory about learning communities was found in several studies, while in other studies learning theories were often mentioned much more implicitly by, for example, primarily describing the value of group discussion for learning (44, 46, 48, 54, 58, 61, 76). In such discussions, it is important to be able to ask questions and seek feedback, and value the importance of being critical in a constructive and reflective manner (96, 97). We also found that planned formal learning seem to contribute to (opportunities for) informal learning.
Studies emphasised the importance of ‘finding a middle ground between formal and informal learning; that is, not solely relying on informal learning opportunities (98, 99).

Not all of our findings match a conceptualisation of learning as an interactional process that occurs while participating in practice. The findings that professionals can learn through observation of others is more in line with Bandura’s social cognitive learning theory (100), and with the notion of transformative learning (37). Social cognitive theory (27) stresses the importance of observation, imitation and modelling of other professionals when it comes to learning new skills or behaviours. Transformative learning in this context, emphasizes the role of learning from a formal, structured mentoring arrangement, and conceptualises mentoring as a two-way learning process (100). Collectively, social cognitive theory and transformative learning put less emphasis on doing things together and discussing with one another; instead, observation of people who are perceived as role models and explicit instruction are seen as more important.

Practitioners can also learn through reflection. In our analytical framework, we drew from contemporary, social conceptualisations of reflection when producing our statement on reflection. The majority of theories of reflection focus on individual learning, often as a result of formal learning activities (36). In recent years the idea of reflection as an individualistic – and mainly mental- activity has been challenged. For example, critically reflective work behaviour is now considered to be interactive, and something which is shown in the discourse between professionals (97, 101). In the studies included in our review, the value of reflective conversations next to individual reflection was confirmed.

**What is being learned?**

Studies reported varied outcomes. Improvements in care provision appeared to be both an important and primary motivator for learning and an intended outcome of learning, thus fitting with recent data from trainee doctors. Indeed, it seems that a major advantage of WPL is that new knowledge is contextualised by adapting it to their local context (102). However, it is important to note that as most studies were qualitative and not longitudinal, evidence about improved care being an actual outcome was missing. Furthermore, the majority of included studies indicated that their interventions were successful, that outcomes were reached, or that conditions were beneficial, leading us to suspect evidence of publication bias.
(i.e. bias occurring as a result of positive findings being more easily publishable than negative findings (103)).

**Reflections**

In the previous section, we compared our findings with existing learning theories. Most of our findings could be situated in theories on workplace learning of other (healthcare) professionals. The starting point for this review was that professionals within primary healthcare have to engage in life-long learning and that WPL through collaboration might be an essential part of life-long learning. When reflecting on our findings, we found it remarkable that patient care played such a central role as a motivator for learning, while at the same time learning through collaboration was often not recognized as real learning. In sum, the findings of our review fit with general WPL literature stating that working and learning are inseparable and fundamental. Patient care appears to be a primary motivator for learning, but greater attention ought to be paid to the potential learning opportunities arising from ICP in order to optimize professionals’ WPL.

**Implications for practice**

The stakeholders with a primary interest in this research are primary healthcare professionals, WPL researchers, managers and educators in primary healthcare. The findings of this review have the following implications for these stakeholders.

**Primary healthcare professionals**

- Professionals are often unaware that they learn through collaboration. As in undergraduate medical education (104), learning during work in professional life should be made explicit and framed as being ‘inherent in the practice of patient care’ (p.667). As such, developing the competency to learn while caring may diminish the need to organize formal training in situations with a high workload.
- Healthcare professionals do not exclusively identify themselves either as learners or as facilitators. Any professional can both learn and facilitate others’ learning. Making this more explicit may help to improve WPL through collaboration.
- Acknowledgement of others’ expertise and awareness of others’ specific contexts, especially when hierarchy is involved, reduces barriers to learning.
Unplanned learning activities provide more opportunities for ‘just-in-time’ learning and for non-hierarchical collaboration than planned learning sessions. The former are perceived as being more motivational.

Professionals who act as managers in primary healthcare

Policy makers and managers working in primary care should ensure that protected time for learning is available. This time is needed to reflect upon practice, to customize oneself with the new ways of interaction and to develop new habits within clinical practice.

The layout of the workplace affects learning. Managers need to organize the workplace layout to enhance communication in the workplace. Facilitating casual encounters between different professionals provides opportunities to ask for feedback and to exchange ideas. In addition, workplace layout could promote conversations around artefacts (such as electronic patient records), when they are co-located and accessible to multiple professionals simultaneously. Managers should explicitly state that artefacts such as patient records are not only useful for recording and accounting, but can play a role in learning conversations as well.

Primary healthcare educators

(Post)-graduate educators should help learners to become aware that all kind of situations provide affordances for learning (i.e. learners do not just learn through lectures delivered outside of the workplace but learn when asking questions, discussing and asking feedback during the work to be done). Curricula should emphasise the importance of informally asking questions and requesting feedback.

Knowing and valuing the expertise of others is essential for learning, yet this is more difficult in interprofessional settings. Interprofessional modules, focusing on collaboration, should therefore be included in undergraduate education.

WPL researchers

The studies in our review refer to a limited subset of learning theories. Relying on a wider range of social learning theories as theoretical framework for future studies would improve the knowledge base on WPL through collaboration. Additionally, as most of the selected studies had individuals as their unit of analysis, we recommend
that researchers focus on supplementing current research with studies on organizational learning in primary healthcare.

- Although barriers for workplace learning in general have been described, surprisingly, findings of the intervention studies in our review were most often positive. Researchers should build on this observation and focus on clarifying barriers to WPL.

**Strengths and Limitations**

This review has a number of strengths. For example, we included only papers that provided a sufficiently detailed description of WPL, so as to allow for greater theoretical understanding of WPL in primary care. Furthermore, we ensured that all papers were independently screened, selected, assessed and coded by two researchers from different professional backgrounds, thus strengthening the rigour of our review. Also, we used the RAMESES training materials for realist synthesis (31) and the RAMESES Publications Standards (105) to provide practical guidance throughout the review and the writing process. However, it is pertinent to also consider the limitations of this review. First, we started with a broad spectrum of statements. This approach precluded us from presenting a fine-grained overview of CMOs for each and every paper supporting each statement separately. Although this may be seen as a limitation, we believe that our review provides an excellent starting point for studies designed to explore some of the complex (causal) chains of change contained within our statements. Second, we did not refine the focus of our review mid-way, as is common in realist synthesis, because we did not think it appropriate to exclude aspects of our analytical framework at this stage. Instead, we chose to broadly explore each statement, as we felt that a broad overview of all the different learning processes that occur within primary care would provide the most value as present. Third, updating our search during the review was not considered feasible. This limitation is unlikely to have substantively impacted on the findings of this review, but should be borne in mind, particularly given that a number of studies pertaining to interprofessional learning have been published since our search was conducted. Fourth, as is customary in a realist review (29), we focused on the rigour and relevance and did not assess the quality of each and every paper included in our review. Furthermore, most studies were qualitative papers, which makes our conclusions less generalizable. However, we included papers that describe WPL in sufficient detail, and, during our process of including and excluding papers, it became clear that papers using quantitative research methodologies
were less likely to describe the learning process in any detail (i.e. one of the inclusion criteria).

**Conclusion**

The results of this review indicate that interprofessional WPL through collaboration in primary healthcare is multifaceted. When situated within the context of existing social learning theories, our findings indicate that WPL does indeed take place when primary care professionals work together, within the same profession or with professionals from other disciplines, and that the mechanisms involved do not differ in major ways from those known from studies about other professionals, both inside and outside healthcare. As such, WPL should be considered to be an essential part of the continuing professional development continuum during lifelong practice. The findings of this review have a number of implications for practice. Future research should focus on clarifying and exploring the processes identified in this review further so as to optimise WPL and, ultimately, patient care.
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Appendix 1: Search syntax

Initial Pubmed search syntax

1 "Learning"[MeSH] OR “Learning”
2 “Models, educational”[MeSH] OR “Models, educational”
3 “Problem-based learning”[MeSH] OR “Problem-based learning”
4 “Professional development”
5 “Workplace learning”
6 “Participatory learning”
7 “Shared learning”
8 “Collective learning”
9 “Community-based learning”
10 “Informal learning”
11 “Work-based learning”
12 “Team-based learning”
13 “Interprofessional learning”
14 “Practice-based learning”
15 “Open learning”
16 “Situated learning”
17 “Self-regulated learning”
18 “Action learning”
19 “Lifelong learning”
20 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19
21 “Cooperative behavior”[MeSH] OR “Cooperative behavior”
22 “Interprofessional relations”[MeSH] OR “Interprofessional relations”
23 “Patient care team”[MeSH] OR “Patient care team”
24 “primary health care team”
25 “Peer collaboration”
26 “Community of practice”
27 “Collaborative practice”
28 Multi-profession* OR Multiprofession*
29 Multi-disciplin* OR Multidisciplin*
30 Inter-profession* OR Interprofession*
31 Inter-disciplin* OR Interdisciplin*
32 Teamw*
33 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32
34 “Primary health care”[MeSH] OR “Primary health care”
35 “Family practice”[MeSH] OR “Family practice”
36 “Health personnel”[MeSH] OR “Health personnel”
37 “Medical practice”
38 “Family care”
39 “Primary care practice”
40 “Family medicine”
41 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40
42 20 AND 33 AND 41
43 42 + filter publication date (1990 – 21/12/2013)

Adapted Pubmed search syntax, based on ERIC-search syntax

1 “Learning”[MeSH] OR “Learning”
2 “Models, educational”[MeSH] OR “Models, educational”
3 “Problem-based learning”[MeSH] OR “Problem-based learning”
4 “Professional development”
5 “Workplace learning”
6 “Participatory learning”
7 “Shared learning”
8 “Collective learning”
9 “Community-based learning”
10 “Informal learning”
11 “Work-based learning”
“Team-based learning”
“Interprofessional learning”
“Practice-based learning”
“Open learning”
“Situated learning”
“Self-regulated learning”
“Action learning”
“Lifelong learning”
“Active learning”
“Adult learning”
“Associative learning”
“Aural learning”
“Cooperative learning”
“Discovery learning”
“Experiential learning”
“Incidental learning”
“Intentional learning”
“Interference learning”
“Multisensory learning”
“Nonverbal learning”
“Observational learning”
“Prior learning”
“Sequential learning”
“Serial learning”
“Transfer of training”
“Transformative learning”
“Verbal learning”
“Visual learning”
“Learning experience”
“Learning strategies”
“Learning at work”
“Learning in practice” OR “Learning at practice”
1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19… OR 43
“Cooperative behavior”[MeSH] OR “Cooperative behavior”
“Interprofessional relations”[MeSH] OR “Interprofessional relations”
“Patient care team”[MeSH] OR “Patient care team”
“primary health care team”
“Peer collaboration”
“Community of practice”
“Collaborative practice”
Multi-profession* OR Multiprofession*
Multi-disciplin* OR Multidisciplin*
Inter-profession* OR Interprofession*
Inter-disciplin* OR Interdisciplin*
Teamw*
Cooperation
“Interprofessional relationship”
“Interdisciplinary approach”
“Compliant behavior*”
“Collaboration*”
“Interprofessional practice” OR “Inter-professional practice”
“Interprofessional collaboration” OR “Inter-professional collaboration”
“Medical care team*”
“Interdisciplinary health team*”
“Healthcare team*” OR “Health care team*”
“Care team”
45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR… OR 67

“Primary health care”[MeSH] OR “Primary health care”
“Family practice”[MeSH] OR “Family practice”
“Health personnel”[MeSH] OR “Health personnel”
“Medical practice”
“Family care”
“Primary care practice”
“Family medicine”
“Primary healthcare”
“Primary care”
“General practice”
“Health care provider*” OR “Healthcare provider*”
Fieldworker* OR “Field worker”
Caregiver*
69 OR 70 OR 71 OR… OR 81
44 AND 68 AND 82
83 + filter publication date (1990 – 31/12/2013)

**ERIC (Proquest) search syntax**

1. SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“ Learning”) OR “learning”
2. “Active learning”
3. “Adult learning”
4. “Associative learning”
5. “Aural learning”
6. “Cooperative learning”
7. “Discovery learning”
8. “Experiential learning”
9. “Incidental learning”
10. “Intentional learning”
11. “Interference learning”
12. “Lifelong learning”
13. “Multisensory learning”
14. “Nonverbal learning”
15. “Observational learning”
16. “Prior learning”
17. “Problem based learning”
18. “Sequential learning”
19. “Serial learning”
20. “Transfer of training”
“Transformative learning”
“Verbal learning”
“Visual learning”
“Workplace learning”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE( “Learning experience”) OR “Learning experience”
SU.EXACT(“Learning strategies”) OR “Learning strategies”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Professional development”) OR “Professional development”
“Learning at work”
“Participatory learning”
“Shared learning”
“Collective learning”
“Community-based learning”
“Informal learning”
“Work-based learning”
“Team-based learning”
“Interprofessional learning”
“Practice-based learning”
“Open learning”
“Situated learning”
“Self-regulated learning”
“Action learning”
“Learning in practice” OR “Learning at practice”
“Collaborative learning”
1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 … OR … OR 42 OR 43
SU.EXACT(“Cooperation”) OR “cooperation”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Interprofessional Relationship”) OR “interprofessional relationship”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Communities of Practice”) OR “communit* of practice” OR “CoP*”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Interdisciplinary Approach”) OR “interdisciplinary approach”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Teamwork”) OR “teamwork” OR teamw*
“cooperative behavior*”
“compliant behavior*”
“collaboration*”
“peer collaboration”
“interprofessional practice” OR “inter-professional practice”
“interprofessional collaboration” OR “inter-professional collaboration”
“collaborative practice”
Multi-profession* OR multiprofession*
Multi-disciplin* OR multidisciplin*
Inter-profession* OR interprofession*
Inter-disciplin* OR interdisciplin*
“patient care team*”
“medical care team*”
“interdisciplinary health team***”
“healthcare team***” OR “health care team***”
“care team***”
“primary health care team***” OR “primary healthcare team***”
45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR… OR… OR 65 OR 66

SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Primary Health Care”) OR “primary health care” OR “primary healthcare”
“primary care”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Family Practice(Medicine)”) OR “family practice***”
“family care”
“medical practice”
“general practice***”
“primary care practice”
“family medicine”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Health Personnel”) OR “health personnel***”
“health care provider***” OR “healthcare provider***”
Fieldworker* OR “field worker”
SU.EXACT.EXPLODE(“Caregivers”) OR caregiver*
68 OR 69 OR 70 OR … OR… OR 78 OR 79
81 44 AND 67 AND 80

82 81 + filter publication date (1/1/1990-31/12/2014)

**Embase search syntax**

1 ‘learning’/exp OR ‘learning’
2 ‘educational model’/exp OR ‘educational model’
3 ‘professional development’/exp OR ‘professional development’
4 ‘workplace learning’
5 ‘participatory learning’
6 ‘shared learning’
7 ‘collective learning’
8 ‘community-based learning’
9 ‘informal learning’
10 ‘work-based learning’
11 ‘team-based learning’
12 ‘interprofessional learning’
13 ‘practice-based learning’
14 ‘open learning’
15 ‘situated learning’
16 ‘self-regulated learning’
17 ‘action learning’
18 ‘active learning’
19 ‘adult learning’
20 ‘aural learning’
21 ‘cooperative learning’
22 ‘discovery learning’
23 ‘incidental learning’
24 ‘intentional learning’
25 ‘interference learning’
26 ‘multisensory learning’
27 ‘nonverbal learning’
‘observational learning’
‘prior learning’
‘sequential learning’
‘transfer of training’
‘transformative learning’
‘visual learning’
‘learning experience’
‘learning strategies’
‘learning at work’
‘learning in practice’
‘learning at practice’
1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 … OR … OR 37 OR 38
‘problem-based learning’ OR ‘lifelong learning’ OR ‘associative learning’ OR ‘serial learning’ OR ‘verbal learning’ OR ‘experiential learning’
39 39 OR 40
‘cooperation’/exp OR ‘cooperation’
‘cooperative behavior’
‘interprofessional relations’
‘patient care team’
‘primary health care team’
‘peer collaboration’
‘community of practice’
‘collaborative practice’
Teamwork*
Multi NEXT/1 profession* OR multiprofession*
Multi NEXT/1 disciplin* OR multidisciplin*
Inter NEXT/1 profession* OR interprofession*
Inter NEXT/1 disciplin* OR interdisciplin*
‘interprofessional relationship’
‘interdisciplinary approach’
Compliant NEXT/1 behavior*
Collaboration*
‘interprofessional practice’ OR ‘inter-professional practice’

‘interprofessional collaboration’ OR ‘inter-professional collaboration’

‘medical care’ NEXT/1 team*

‘interdisciplinary health team’ OR ‘interdisciplinary health teams’

Healthcare NEXT/1 team* OR ‘health care’ NEXT/1 team*

‘care team’

42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR … 63 OR 64

‘primary health care’/exp OR ‘primary health care’

‘general practice’/exp OR ‘general practice’

‘health care personnel’/exp OR ‘health care personnel’ OR ‘health personnel’

‘medical practice’/exp OR ‘medical practice’

‘family care’/exp OR ‘family care’

‘primary care practice’

‘family medicine’/exp OR ‘family medicine’

‘primary healthcare’/exp OR ‘primary healthcare’

‘general practice’/exp OR ‘general practice’

‘health care provider’/exp OR ‘health care provider’

‘health care providers’

‘healthcare provider’/exp OR ‘healthcare provider’

‘healthcare providers’

‘field worker’

Fieldworker*

‘caregiver’/exp OR caregiver*

66 OR 67 OR 68 OR 69 OR 70 OR … 80 OR 81

‘family practice’ OR ‘primary care’

82 OR 83

41 AND 65 AND 84 AND [1990-2015]/py AND ([dutch]/lim OR [English]/lim OR [French]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [humans]/lim

85 AND 86 AND [embase]/lim NOT [medline]/lim AND ([article]/lim OR [article in press]/lim OR [conference paper]/lim OR [conference review]/lim OR [short survey]/lim)
Cinahl search syntax

1 (MH "Learning+") OR TX learning
2 (MH "Models, Educational") OR TX "models, educational"
3 (MH "Problem-Based Learning") OR TX "Problem-Based Learning"
4 (MH "Professional Development+") OR TX "Professional Development"
5 "workplace learning" OR TX "workplace learning"
6 "participatory learning" OR TX "participatory learning"
7 "shared learning" OR TX "shared learning"
8 "collective learning" OR TX "collective learning"
9 "community-based learning" OR TX "community-based learning"
10 "informal learning" OR TX "informal learning"
11 "work-based learning" OR TX "work-based learning"
12 "team-based learning" OR TX "team-based learning"
13 "interprofessional learning" OR TX "interprofessional learning"
14 "practice-based learning" OR TX "practice-based learning"
15 "open learning" OR TX "open learning"
16 "situated learning" OR TX "situated learning"
17 "self-regulated learning" OR TX "self-regulated learning"
18 "action learning" OR TX "action learning"
19 (MH "Lifelong Learning") OR TX "Lifelong Learning"
20 "active learning" OR TX "active learning"
21 "adult learning" OR TX "adult learning"
22 "associative learning" OR TX "associative learning"
23 "aural learning" OR TX "aural learning"
24 "cooperative learning" OR TX "cooperative learning"
25 "discovery learning" OR TX "discovery learning"
26 (MH "Experiential Learning") OR TX "experiential learning"
27 "incidental learning" OR TX "incidental learning"
28 "intentional learning" OR TX "intentional learning"
29 "interference learning" OR TX "interference learning"
30 "multisensory learning" OR TX "multisensory learning"
31 "nonverbal learning" OR TX "nonverbal learning"
32 "observational learning" OR TX "observational learning"
33 "prior learning" OR TX "prior learning"
34 "sequential learning" OR TX "sequential learning"
35 "serial learning" OR TX "serial learning"
36 "transfer of training" OR TX "transfer of training"
37 "transformative learning" OR TX "transformative learning"
38 "verbal learning" OR TX "verbal learning"
39 "visual learning" OR TX "visual learning"
40 "learning experience" OR TX "learning experience"
41 "learning strategies" OR TX "learning strategies"
42 "learning at work" OR TX "learning at work"
43 "learning in practice" OR TX "learning in practice"
44 "learning at practice" OR TX "learning at practice"
45 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR… 43 OR 44
46 (MH "Cooperative Behavior") OR TX "Cooperative Behavior"
47 (MH "Interprofessional Relations+)") OR TX "Interprofessional Relations"
48 "patient care team" OR TX "patient care team"
49 "primary health care team" OR TX "primary health care team"
50 "peer collaboration" OR TX "peer collaboration"
51 "community of practice" OR TX "community of practice"
52 "collaborative practice" OR TX "collaborative practice"
53 "multi-profession*" OR TX "multi-profession*" OR "multiprofession*" OR TX "multiprofession*"
54 "multi-disciplin*" OR TX "multi-disciplin*" OR "multidisciplin*" OR TX "multidisciplin*"
55 "inter-profession*" OR TX "inter-profession*" OR "interprofession*" OR TX "interprofession*"
56 "inter-disciplin*" OR TX "inter-disciplin*" OR "interdisciplin*" OR TX "interdisciplin*"
57 (MH "Teamwork") OR TX "teamw*"
58 "cooperation" OR TX "cooperation"
59 "interprofessional relationship" OR TX "interprofessional relationship"
60 "interdisciplinary approach" OR TX "interdisciplinary approach"
61 "compliant behavi*" OR TX "compliant behavi*"
(MH "Collaboration") OR TX "collaboration*"
"interprofessional practice" OR TX "interprofessional practice" OR "inter-professional practice" OR TX "inter-professional practice"
"interprofessional collaboration"
"interprofessional collaboration" OR TX "interprofessional collaboration" OR "inter-professional collaboration" OR TX "inter-professional collaboration"
"medical care team*" OR TX "medical care team*"
"interdisciplinary health team*" OR TX "interdisciplinary health team*"
"healthcare team*" OR TX "healthcare team*" OR "health care team*" OR TX "health care team*"
"care team" OR TX "care team"
46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR… 68 OR 69

(MH "Primary Health Care") OR TX "primary health care"
(MH "Family Practice") OR TX "family practice"
(MH "Health Personnel+") OR TX "Health Personnel"
(MH "Medical Practice") OR TX "Medical Practice"
"family care" OR TX "family care"
"family medicine" OR TX "family medicine"
"primary healthcare" OR TX "primary healthcare"
"primary care" OR TX "primary care"
"general practice" OR TX "general practice"
"health care provider*" OR TX "health care provider*"
"healthcare provider*" OR TX "healthcare provider*"
"field worker" OR TX "field worker" OR fieldworker*
(MH "Caregivers") OR TX caregiver*
"primary care practice" OR TX "primary care practice"
71 OR 72 OR 73 OR 74 OR… 83 OR 84

45 AND 70 AND 85 Limiters - Published Date: 19900101-20151231; Exclude MEDLINE records; Human; Language: Dutch/Flemish, English, French, German
### Appendix 2: Included papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date, country</th>
<th>Title paper</th>
<th>Research question/aim</th>
<th>Research approach/design</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Learning theory and/or learning method used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan, 2005, UK (55)</td>
<td>Developing an interprofessional learning culture in primary care</td>
<td>To evaluate a project to develop an interprofessional learning culture within a primary care setting. To situates the findings and the experiences of the project in the context of the policies and literature on interprofessional learning</td>
<td>Combination of semi-structured and two focus group interviews with nurses and receptionists and process evaluation methodology with documentary data and secondary analysis.</td>
<td>Four members of the steering group and the project manager, six general practitioners, five nurses 14 receptionists</td>
<td>There is a need to recognize responsibility for one’s own learning as individuals as well as learning as teams of work colleagues if interprofessional learning is to be successful. Even when these pre-requisites of interprofessional learning are agreed and acknowledged openly in the workplace, participants in the development of a learning culture need to recognize that there are structural controls which influence and constrain such developments which are external to participants and beyond their immediate control.</td>
<td>Work-based learning, interprofessional learning, life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arora S, 2010, USA (72)</td>
<td>Expanding Access to Hepatitis C Virus Treatment—Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes (ECHO) Project: Disruptive Innovation in Specialty Care</td>
<td>To describe the ECHO model and its application in HCV care in New Mexico in detail and to present data from initial surveys of the providers that have participated in the program</td>
<td>Observation of ECHO weekly clinics and database of ECHO clinic participation and patient presentation by clinical provider + surveys</td>
<td>255 partner teams participating in ECHO clinics, expert interdisciplinary specialists and community-based primary care providers</td>
<td>ECHO expands access to best practice care for underserved populations, builds communities of practice to enhance professional development and satisfaction of primary care clinicians, and expands sustainable capacity for care by building local centers of excellence</td>
<td>Bandura's social cognitive theory, Vygotsky's situated learning theory, community of practice theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arora, 2011, Mexico (71)</td>
<td>Partnering Urban Academic Medical Centers And Rural Primary Care Clinicians To Provide Complex Chronic Disease Care</td>
<td>To discuss the model and the early results of a project named ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes), an innovative new model of health care education and delivery to developing capacity for safe and effective treatment of chronic, common, and complex diseases in rural and underserved areas while monitoring outcomes to ensure quality of care. Using state-of-the-art telehealth technology and clinical management tools, ECHO trains and supports primary care providers in the community to develop knowledge and self-efficacy on a variety of diseases not usually considered within their scope of practice. As a result, these providers can deliver best-practice care for complex health conditions in federally qualified health centers and other community-based sites where this specialty care was previously unavailable.</td>
<td>Combination of description of the model and the organisation of the disease-specific learning networks that meet weekly by video teleconferencing, clinical evaluations, review of cases, survey data, questionnaires.</td>
<td>Primary care providers rural and urban underserved areas of the state: doctors, nurses, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and community health workers, specialist of the University</td>
<td>Project ECHO has the potential to radically transform how health care is provided in the United States and to bring best practice care to patients with chronic health conditions, wherever they are. It creates partnerships between primary care providers in rural and underserved areas and specialty care providers at academic medical centers that allow for the sharing of new knowledge in real time. These partnerships exponentially boost the health care system’s ability to deliver specialty care to people who otherwise would lack access. Thus, Project ECHO uses technology and existing resources to magnify the capacities of the health care workforce, build a bridge across health care settings, and truly provide health care without walls.</td>
<td>Familiar case-based learning strategies, providing learning opportunities, guided feedback, shared learning, multilevel “learning loop”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam RJ, 2010, USA (39)</td>
<td>Reflective Practice Enhances Public Health Nurse Implementation of Nurse-Family Partnership</td>
<td>To describe the development and integration of reflective practice as a foundational concept of public health nursing practice in the Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)</td>
<td>Description of the NFP program model, exemplars from the experience of NFP nursing supervisors</td>
<td>nurse supervisors and nurse home visitors</td>
<td>Comments from NFP nurses and supervisors are cited to suggest how the regular use of reflective practice has the potential to improve implementation of the program with families, the authors further propose that research is needed to more rigorously examine the benefits that reflective practice may have on the quality of program implementation, family outcomes and the retention of nurses working in the NFP program</td>
<td>Reflective learning cycle by Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2011, USA (53)</td>
<td>The Phenomenon of Collaboration: A Phenomenologic Study of Collaboration between Family Medicine and Obstetrics and Gynecology Departments at an Academic Medical Center</td>
<td>To explore the essential invariant elements of collaboration between the departments of obstetrics and gynecology (OB/GYN) and family medicine (FM) at an academic medical center.</td>
<td>Phenomenologic methods, interviews</td>
<td>Departmental leaders and senior faculty in key positions residents of both departments from intern through senior level and nurses on Labor and Delivery L&amp;D. Sample size was 33, consisting of six family medicine (FM) faculty, seven obstetrics and gynecology (OB) faculty, six FM residents, seven OB Residents and seven nurses</td>
<td>Key collaborative structures included a shared vision and commitment by leaders, rigorous quality improvement, clear delineation of roles with built-in flexibility, ongoing commitment to formal and informal communication channels and conflict resolution, relationship development grounded in respect and responsiveness, and shared training in a supportive learning environment with legitimate participation fostering skill development.</td>
<td>Mutual learning, learn in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunniss S, UK</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>‘The unknown becomes the known’: collective learning and change in primary care teams</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, observational visits of 10 primary care teams and 38 semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>4 general medical practices, 3 pharmacies, 3 dental practices</td>
<td>Teams share their knowledge because they believe it has value, not because they are driven by external incentives or are monitored. This challenges the assumption that, to be effective, interprofessional learning should be externally managed. As health care develops, it will become increasingly important to consider how to support the internal learning processes of care teams as they navigate complex organisational changes and the shared learning experiences that characterise those changes. Those who support learning and development within the NHS should therefore focus on how relational processes, as well as educational content, contribute to a team’s collective learning capability and the quality of care its members provide. Informal collective learning - practice-based learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess J, Canada</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Community of Practice: A Nurse Practitioner Collaborative Model</td>
<td>Participatory action research approach</td>
<td>Nurse practitioners</td>
<td>A collaborative CoP model addresses the internal interests and needs of participating members while attending to the external concerns of the organization, and thus contributes to healthcare improvement. Community of practice theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr ECJ, 2012, UK (77)</td>
<td>Improving services for back pain: putting the patient at the centre of interprofessional education</td>
<td>To explore and capture the processes and experiences of the practice teams and patients in the interprofessional learning within a quality improvement project</td>
<td>Eight half-day IPE workshop on quality improvement of back pain management. Evaluation through focus groups with practice teams, before and after the workshops</td>
<td>44 practice staff of nine general practice teams and 11 patients</td>
<td>True engagement with patients and their inclusion in IPE, in ways that reinforced practice-based learning, was a catalyst for the sort of behavioural change, which leads to improved patient outcomes. Opportunities for patients to share their personal stories of back pain appeared to improve communication and in particular listening. Their presence challenged the unhelpful medical model in favour of a more integrative bio-psychosocial one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman K, 2014, USA (67)</td>
<td>Unlocking the Black Box - Supporting Practices to Become Patient-centered Medical Homes</td>
<td>To describe the multimodal technical assistance approach used by the SNMHI (Safety Net Medical Home Initiative) and the participating practices’ assessment of its value and helpfulness in supporting their transformation</td>
<td>Multimodal technical assistance approach. Practice survey about the perceived value of technical assistance overall and by component</td>
<td>Primary care associations, clinical membership organizations skilled in quality improvement and stakeholder engagement who partnered with 10-15 primary care practices in their region</td>
<td>There is an important role for both local and national organizations to provide non-duplicative, mutually reinforcing support for primary care transformation. How (in-person, between peers) and by whom technical assistance is provided may be important to consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interprofessional education, practice-based learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community of practice theory
<p>| Collins F, 2012, UK (49) | Relationships, learning and team working in UK services for children | To report on education, health, and social care practitioners' experiences of working across traditional boundaries and establishing new relationships in the context of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) in UK children's services | Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews | 20 education, health and social care practitioners, and operational managers | Owing to infrastructure and resource issues the move to co-located, integrated teams has occurred relatively recently within many local authorities. This research prioritises the perspective of the practitioner generating further understanding of what it means to work collaboratively; it highlights how relationships between agencies and practitioner groups have been subjected to tensions during a period of transition holding potential to impact upon service delivery. Change in the composition and leadership of teams in multi-contextual settings has also provided stimulus for new relationships, learning and ways of working. The research suggests that participation in the multi-agency forums associated with the CAF increased practitioners' individual and collective skills, facilitating information sharing and joint decision making about how best to meet a child's needs. | Experiential learning |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Study Objective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de Araujo, 2013, Brazil (80)</td>
<td>Primary Health Care workers’ view on the presence of nursing students</td>
<td>To explore the view of the workers at a basic health unit on the presence of nursing students at the service</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews (18)</td>
<td>18 workers of the Basic Health Unit who related to nursing students in their work schedules: six community health agents (CHA), nine nursing assistants, one nurse technician and two nurses.</td>
<td>There is a multiplicity of views that vary according to the professional category, the place occupied in the social and technical division of work and the year of education of the student. Views that prevailed were the ones in which students help with work, update the worker’s knowledge, but slow the care. It was found that the presence of students questions the manner of care in which minimal listening, fragmentation and a focus on procedures prevails. There was a predominance of teaching-learning concepts, such as passing information hierarchically among sectors and agents of this process. The process of formation of these workers, students themselves, with a predominance of a discipline teaching a discipline, fragmented and hierarchical, although with advances, such as the early immersion in health services. The approach between university and primary healthcare services exposes tensions which, collectively analyzed, can engender new ways of caring, teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guirguis-Younger M, 2009, Canada (62)</td>
<td>Learning and Knowledge-Integration Strategies of Nurses and Client Care Workers Serving Homeless Persons</td>
<td>To explore the learning and knowledge-integration strategies used by nurses and client care workers employed by health-care organizations that target homeless persons</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>4 registered nurses, 1 registered practical nurse, 3 client care workers</td>
<td>Knowledge exchange has the potential to improve care by accounting for the diverse needs and experiences of homeless persons and to equip healthcare workers with the skills they need to face complex challenges and achieve improved outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcomb EJ, 2012, Australia (40)</td>
<td>Practice nurses experiences of mentoring undergraduate nursing students in Australian general practice</td>
<td>To explore the experiences of Practice Nurses when supervising undergraduate nursing students</td>
<td>Qualitative research design</td>
<td>12 Practice nurses who had supervised undergraduate nursing students on clinical placement in a general practice setting</td>
<td>It is clear that providing clinical placement opportunities in general practice benefits undergraduate nursing students in terms of providing them with additional opportunities for skills consolidation and alternative employment options. Further, supervising these students was considered by Practice Nurses as being beneficial for not only their own personal development but also their development of the Practice Nurse role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Hjalmarsen, 2011, Sweden (74) | Forming a learning culture to promote fracture prevention activities | To explore interprofessional experiences of incorporating fracture prevention activities in clinical practice inspired by an empowerment approach. | Combination of focus groups interviews (8) and in depth interviews(2) and a workshop. | 19 professionals participated: four nurses, five occupational therapists, eight physiotherapists and two physicians from primary health care and orthopedic departments. | Learning processes through patient-centred interaction and face-to-face collaboration based on the professionals’ owns requests and experiences are one important motivator to promote fracture prevention activities in everyday-work. These learning processes became a driving force for the joint efforts to manage fracture prevention in clinical practice, here identified as breaking professional patterns, creating empowering meetings, making the preventive links visible and constructing a sense-of-prevention community. The inspiration of empowerment as a health-enhancing strategy for patients may also generate an empowered organisational process including individual development and improved community competence. Such a bottom-up approach might be an essential key to managing the implementation of fracture prevention. | Mentoring, reciprocity of learning |
| Hoare, 2013, New Zealand (57) | New graduate nurses as knowledge brokers in general practice in New Zealand: a constructivist grounded theory | To investigate practice nurses’ use of information | Combination of initial ethnographic fieldwork and there after interviews with practice nurses | Experienced practice nurses role modelled clinical skills to new graduate nurses. Unexpectedly, new graduate nurses were unconscious experts at sourcing information and role modelled this skill to experienced practice nurses. Once this attribute was acknowledged by the experienced practice nurse, mutual learning occurred that enabled both groups of nurses to become better practitioners. Graduate nurses of the millennial generation were identified as a resource for experienced practice nurses who belong to the baby boomer generation and generation X. | Supportive multidisciplinary learning, reciprocal role modelling |
| Humphreys J, 2013, UK (63) | A collaborative project to improve identification and management of patients with chronic kidney disease in a primary care setting in Greater Manchester | To reduce the difference between expected and recorded prevalence of chronic kidney disease by 50%, to treat 75% of chronic kidney disease patients to relevant NICE blood pressure targets | A 12-month improvement collaborative supported by an evidence-informed implementation framework and financial incentives. | Evidence-based improvement can be implemented in practice for chronic disease management. A collaborative approach has been successful in enabling teams to test and apply changes to identify patients and improve care. The model has proved to be more successful for some practices, suggesting a need to develop more context-sensitive approaches to implementation and actively manage the factors that influence the success of the collaborative | Shared learning, learning by doing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Year, Location</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Research Design and Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Learning Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, 2003, UK (41)</td>
<td>Some benefits experienced by hospice nurses from group clinical supervision</td>
<td>The aims of the research study were to gain some understanding of the different aspects of the group process concerning clinical supervision for distinct groups, i.e. hospice nurses. And to evaluate experiences of group clinical supervision that hospice nurses found most and least helpful to promoting good professional practice.</td>
<td>Combination of audiotaped one-hour facilitated supervision meetings, questionnaires and group interview</td>
<td>Clinical supervision is an effective format for exploring issues concerning professional practice, allowing nurses to: learn from each other, offer support, recognize how others see and esteem them as fellow workers, and moderate concerns and anxiety related to their work. Group work is likely to raise anxiety in all participants, however, and preparation and support are required for the group facilitator. Carefully chosen membership is also considered important to the safety of members and successes of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kousgaard MB, 2012, Denmark (78)</td>
<td>Positive experiences with a specialist as facilitator in general practice</td>
<td>To explore the experiences and assessments of GPs and nurses participating in a project in which a medical specialist (endocrinologist) acted as facilitator for quality improvement</td>
<td>Observation of facilitation sessions and interviews with the health professionals</td>
<td>The combination of specialized knowledge and hands-on clinical experience seems to be an important advantage when using a medical specialist as facilitator in quality improvement efforts directed at pharmacological issues in general practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie, 2003, UK (65)</td>
<td>Education to achieve symptom control for patients with cancer</td>
<td>To evaluate if shared interprofessional education across primary and secondary care could improve symptom control for patients with cancer.</td>
<td>Combination of training two facilitators of the group, action learning group sessions to implement a quality improvement tool and analysis the reflective diaries in three steps, with feedback meetings for health professionals and the project development team.</td>
<td>Both participants and facilitators developed skills in working with other health care settings, as well as experience of using a continuous quality improvement tool. Participants developed a greater understanding of how the NHS worked and what was required to enable patients to receive improved care. The project enabled professionals to work more effectively with both primary and secondary services, agencies, and helped patients to enhance symptom control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveng, 2010, Denmark (76)</td>
<td>Learning and recognition in health and care</td>
<td>To discuss the role of recognition in learning processes among female</td>
<td>Case study semi-structured focus group interviews with employees in the</td>
<td>The main argument is that learning is related to recognition – especially when it comes to groups of professionals, who are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacFarlane, 2006, Republic of Ireland (44)</td>
<td>A qualitative study of the educational potential of joint teleconsultations at the primary–secondary care interface</td>
<td>To explore the processes by which educational exchanges may occur from the perspective of participating clinicians through teleconsultations</td>
<td>Combination of semi-structured interviews (n=39) with specialists and GPs and focus groups (2 groups with specialists; 6 groups with GPs)</td>
<td>Specialists and general practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann K, 2011, Canada (58)</td>
<td>Tensions in Informed Self-Assessment: How the Desire for Feedback and Reticence to Collect and Use It Can Conflict</td>
<td>To explore the tensions described by learners and professionals when informing self-assessments of clinical performance</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, seventeen focus groups</td>
<td>134 participants, involving learners at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, as well as practicing physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, 1998, UK (45)</td>
<td>Qualitative study of educational interaction between general practitioners and specialists</td>
<td>To identify the main barriers to effective educational interaction between general practitioners and specialists and to suggest ways of overcoming these barriers.</td>
<td>Combination of semistructured interviews (24) and 4 focus groups</td>
<td>General practitioner principals (28) and hospital consultants (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, 2006, UK (69)</td>
<td>Partnerships and work-based learning: an evaluation of an opportunity to pioneer new ways to care for the older people in the community</td>
<td>To explore and examine the impact of work-based learning on practice, the sustainability of the preferred mechanisms that have supported the outcomes in practice. Report on the learning that has been sustained and developed over time. Explore the nurses experience of work-based learning and changing contexts.</td>
<td>Evidencing work-based learning was a new but positive experience. The evidence suggests that the expanding partnerships and synergy between practice and academia is evolving, but needs organizational support. The new ways of working, including multidisciplinary mentorship, have developed both acute and community nurses to undertake health needs assessments of identified caseloads, and in partnership with doctors and pharmacists, to diagnose, review and prescribe drugs in an attempt to reduce re-hospitalization. Evolving themes from the evaluation and the learning from the partnerships have influenced further developments in both practice and academia.</td>
<td>Case study, triangulation of evaluation methods, self-assessment, reflection, action learning sets and time to practice new skills in a workshop and in practice settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton J, 2011, USA (64)</td>
<td>Transcultural healthcare immersion: A unique interprofessional experience poised to influence collaborative practice in cultural settings</td>
<td>To describe a model for interprofessional and transcultural learning established by the author and supported by the University of New England and Ghana Health Mission</td>
<td>The transcultural immersion in healthcare experience achieved its “bounty” as seen in the enhanced cultural proficiency of students and faculty, seamless interprofessional communication and collaboration and provision of primary care and related services to patients and the Ghanaian community.</td>
<td>Cultural-clinical experience known as Transcultural Immersion in Healthcare - in an urban setting in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsen, 2011, Norway (46)</td>
<td>Workplace learning among general practitioners and specialists: The use of videoconferencing as a tool</td>
<td>To explore the use of videoconferencing for information exchange and consultation throughout the patient trajectory and to investigate how collaboration affects learning and the patient’s treatment.</td>
<td>Combination of observation interaction analysis of videoconferences (7) supplemented by interviews.</td>
<td>General Practitioners and specialists (42 of both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien JL, 2008, USA (60)</td>
<td>Negotiating transformational leadership: A key to effective collaboration</td>
<td>To explore how medical doctors, in order to be transformative, should negotiate with advanced practice nurses while working in collaboration with them.</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>5 medical doctors, 8 advanced practice nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orzano, 2008, USA (75)</td>
<td>Family medicine practice performance and knowledge management</td>
<td>To identify how family medicine practices exhibit knowledge management</td>
<td>Combination of developing a preliminary conceptual framework by the research team enriched with a synthesis of an extensive literature search of diverse disciplines. Constructing tables who identify knowledge management-associated processes and tools. Refining the tables and secondary analysing existing data from the Prevention and Competing Demands in Primary Care Study with two higher performing practices and Prevention and Competing Demands in Primary Care Study that examined organizational dimensions of 18 Midwestern family medicine practices. From this a selection of two higher performing practices and two low performing practices.</td>
<td>Differences in knowledge management (KM) occur within family practices and between family practices and other organizations and may have implications for improving practice performance. Understanding interaction patterns of work relationships and KM may explain why costly technical or externally imposed “one size fits all” practice organizational interventions have had mixed results and limited sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year, Country</td>
<td>Methods / Focus</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I beg your pardon?’ Nurses’ experiences in facilitating doctors’ learning process – An interview study</td>
<td>Pype P. 2014, Belgium</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing palliative home care nurses to act as facilitators for physicians’ learning: Evaluation of a training programme</td>
<td>Pype P. 2015, Belgium</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>A multifaceted train-the-trainer programme was designed. Evaluation was done through assignments with individual feedback, summative assessment through videotaped encounters with simulation-physicians and individual interviews after a period of practice implementation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randström B, 2012, Sweden (66)</td>
<td>Working with “hands-off” support: a qualitative study of multidisciplinary teams’ experiences of home rehabilitation for older people</td>
<td>To explore multidisciplinary teams’ experiences of home rehabilitation for older people.</td>
<td>Five focus group interviews (28 participants)</td>
<td>Participants of five multidisciplinary teams with seven different professionals physiotherapists (n = 6), occupational therapists (n = 3), district nurses (n = 5), nurse assistants (n = 5), one home helper (n = 1), home help officers responsible for needs assessment (n = 3) and home help officers in charge of home help (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowlands, 2001, UK (59)</td>
<td>Referrals and relationships: in-practice referrals meetings in a general practice</td>
<td>To conduct a qualitative study running parallel with a RCT to investigate the effect of in-practice meetings on referral rates, and to describe the learning needs of the participants as a result of the meetings.</td>
<td>Combination of audio-taped and video referrals meetings, participants diaries and evaluation forms</td>
<td>A four-partners practice that trained both registrars and medical students with a patient population of 11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw EK, 2012, USA (79)</td>
<td>How Team-Based Reflection Affects Quality Improvement Implementation: A Qualitative Study</td>
<td>How does reflection affect team processes and QI implementation?</td>
<td>Qualitative approach: qualitative analysis of recorded RAP meetings (Reflective Adaptive Process) and associated fieldnotes</td>
<td>4 primary care practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shershneva, 2006, USA (47)</td>
<td>A Model of Teaching Learning Transactions in Generalist-Specialist Consultations</td>
<td>To explore physicians’ learning through participation in generalist-specialist consultation.</td>
<td>Interviewing ten primary care physicians and 9 internal medicine subspecialists regarding their approaches to learning and teaching during generalist-specialist consultations.</td>
<td>Ten primary care physicians and 9 internal medicine subspecialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siriwardena, 2008, UK (50)</td>
<td>Drivers for change in primary care of diabetes following a protected learning time educational event: interview study of practitioners</td>
<td>To investigate the perceptions of practitioners involved in a specific educational intervention in diabetes as part of a protected learning time scheme for primary health care teams, relating to changing processes of diabetes care in general practice.</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews with key informants (12) from a sample of practices stratified according to the extent they had changed behaviour in prescribing of ramipril and diabetes care more generally, following a specific educational intervention</td>
<td>General Practitioners and practice nurses of urban and rural primary care practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp GE, 2008, Australia (51)</td>
<td>Aboriginal maternal and infant care workers: partners in caring for Aboriginal mothers and babies</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>5 AMIC workers and 4 midwives</td>
<td>Development of the partnership took commitment and time. There were issues initially with resistance from hospital staff. Skill sharing and two-way learning engendered mutual respect. Clear benefits of the care model were highlighted by both the AMIC workers and midwives while cultural safety was maintained for the Aboriginal mothers and families. The AMIC worker role will continue to require acknowledgement, support and development. This equivalent inter-cultural partnership model has the potential for much wider application and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenner K, 2008, UK (54)</td>
<td>The role of interprofessional relationships and support for nurse prescribing in acute and chronic pain</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>26 nurses who prescribed medicines for patients with acute and/or chronic pain</td>
<td>Factors that promote understanding of nurse prescribing and support interprofessional relationships are likely to have a positive impact on the effectiveness of nurse prescribing. A more consistent approach is required within organisations to support nurse prescribing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, 2007, UK (48)</td>
<td>Shared geriatric mental health care in a rural community</td>
<td>Pilot project in shared mental health care in Canada was initiated to explore opportunities to increase the capacity of the rural primary care system as a resource for older people with mental health needs.</td>
<td>Four family physicians from a rural town get 2 geriatric urban-based psychiatrists as mentor</td>
<td>Geriatric shared mental health care services were successful initiated in a rural setting achieved by the development of a respectful partnership between 2 different cultures of service providers (GPs and psychiatrist ), ease at which specialty services are accessible, the provision of alternative strategies to build capacity to provide geriatric mental health services in the primary care setting, and a continual exchange of knowledge underpinning clinical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taber, 2008, Canada (52)</td>
<td>“Grey” areas and “organized chaos” in emergency response</td>
<td>To explore the interaction between organizational policies and daily work practices of paramedics and firefighters within two emergency response organizations. How do paramedics and firefighters learn their practice?</td>
<td>Combination of In-depth, semi-structured interviews, observations of training sessions, ride alongs with paramedics and firefighters in the field. The ride alongs were in essence extended, running interviews and observing their work, leading to a deeper understanding of their practice.</td>
<td>Senior administrators, training staff, and front line personnel: paramedics and firefighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Dam, 2013, The Netherlands (61)</td>
<td>The discovery of deliberation. From ambiguity to appreciation through the learning process of doing Moral Case Deliberation in Dutch elderly care</td>
<td>To evaluate the implementation of Moral Case Deliberation (MCD) within two elderly care institutions and to present lessons learned from organizing this kind of clinical ethics support in elderly care</td>
<td>Combination of individual interviews (N = 16), two focus groups, participant observation</td>
<td>Stakeholders and employees from different wards and disciplines in two Dutch elderly care organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters L, 2011, Australia (70)</td>
<td>Demonstrating the value of longitudinal integrated placements to general practice preceptors</td>
<td>To consider why general practitioners (GPs) teach, in particular by defining the longitudinal supervisory relationships between rural clinician-preceptors and students.</td>
<td>Qualitative research design, 41 semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>GPs, practice managers, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcock, 2002, UK (73)</td>
<td><strong>The Dorset Seedcorn Project:</strong> interprofessional learning and continuous quality improvement in primary care</td>
<td>To arrange a facilitated practice-based project where five general practices formed interprofessional teams that worked over a six-month period, 3 meetings using a continuous quality improvement (CQI) approach to make a change in areas of importance to them and their patients.</td>
<td>Combination of questionnaire and a number of face-to-face and telephone interviews with participants, facilitators, and practice staff not directly involved in the project.</td>
<td>Primary care teams (5) with at least one general practitioner (GP) principal, one nurse, and one administrator. Practices were free to invite other team members or external people as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Examples of C-M-O configurations of included papers per research question

Example of C-M-O configuration for ‘Who learns?’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Developing an interprofessional learning culture in primary care’ (55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Qualitative analysis of an interprofessional learning project in a primary healthcare centre focusing on the development of a learning culture in practice. A process evaluation methodology was chosen to collect the data using 11 semi-structured interviews (conducted with four members of the steering group, the project manager and six general practitioners) and two focus groups (one with five nurses and one with 14 receptionists) and documentary data from records written during the project. The aim was to describe the views and experiences of participants on multidisciplinary learning and at mapping the processes and outcomes of change as a result of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a primary care practice with general practitioners, nurses, midwives, managers, secretaries and receptionists [C] an explicit group learning needs assessment aimed at identifying strengths and weaknesses of the group to adopt a learning culture [M] resulted in the recognition of the need for teaching skills to be spread over all the staff and to the introduction of personal development plans [O].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of C-M-O configuration for ‘When does learning take place?’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘The unknown becomes the known’: collective learning and change in primary care teams (56).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Qualitative study using an interpretative epistemology design (meaning is constructed in the researcher-participant interaction in the natural environment) and iterative research design with seven successive phases. Data (49 hours of team observations and 38 semi-structured interviews) gathered during a 1-year time period of 10 primary care teams in general medical practice (4), pharmacy (3) and dentistry (3). All teams had recently undergone one or more practice changes involving the whole team. The focus of the study was to explore how collective learning and change happen in primary care teams and how the process varies across the disciplines of general medical practice, pharmacy and dentistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a diverse team of medical professionals has the security of a collective learning relationship, [C] individuals did not feel solely responsible for the success or failure of a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particular initiative, could draw on the expertise of the rest of the team, knew one another’s strengths and were able to call upon each other [M] where necessary to perform a task or learn something new [O].

Example of C-M-O configuration for ‘How does learning occur?’:

‘I beg your pardon?’ Nurses’ experiences in facilitating doctors’ learning process – an interview study. (42)

Summary: Qualitative study based on 21 semi-structured interviews with specialised palliative care nurses who were trained to act as facilitator of GPs’ learning during collaboration. The data were analysed using Grounded Theory principles. This interview study explores the views and preferences of the nurses toward their role as facilitator of learning.

In the context of GPs and specialised palliative home care nurses collaborating in primary palliative care [C] in order to provide high quality of patient care and to improve the doctors’ palliative care competences [M], the nurses stimulate joint reflection leading to doctors’ better understanding of palliative care practice and a better interprofessional relationship [O].

Example of C-M-O configuration for ‘What is being learned?’:

‘The discovery of deliberation. From ambiguity to appreciation through the learning process of doing Moral Case Deliberation in Dutch elderly care’ (61).

Summary: Qualitative thematic content analysis of the naturalistic evaluation of the implementation of Moral Case Deliberation (MCD) in two elderly care organisations (two nursing homes and three locations with a mix of nursing and assisted-living units). Participants’ (managers and caregivers) experiences were examined through: individual interviews (16) with directors, middle managers, (para)medics and nursing assistants; three focus groups; participant observations in a number of ways: recordings of clinical site visits and project group meetings and participant observations during the MCD sessions (47 sessions of 2h each). The aim of the study, besides the evaluation, is to present lessons learned from organising this kind of clinical ethics support (MCD) in elderly care.
During MCD with healthcare professionals (nurses and physicians) in elderly care institutions [C] the sharing of frustrations and emotions and the search for relief of moral distress [M] leads to learning to postpone their own judgment and to examine an issue from another, different point of view [O].