

RESEARCH

Open Access



Final-year medical students' competence profiles according to the modified requirement tracking questionnaire

Elena Zelesniack¹, Viktor Oubaid² and Sigrid Harendza^{1*}

Abstract

Background: Undergraduate medical education is supposed to equip medical students with basic competences to select any specialty of their choice for postgraduate training. Medical specialties are characterized by a great diversity of their daily work routines and require different sets of competence facets. This study examines the self-assessed competence profiles of final-year undergraduate medical students and their specialty choice for postgraduate training. Students' profiles, who wish to choose anaesthesiology, internal medicine, or paediatrics, are compared with the physicians' competence profiles from these three disciplines.

Methods: In this study, 148 volunteer final-year undergraduate medical students completed the modified requirement-tracking (R-Track) questionnaire for self-assessment of their competence profiles. The R-Track questionnaire contains 63 competence facets assigned to six areas of competence: "Mental abilities", "Sensory abilities", "Psychomotor & multitasking abilities", "Social interactive competences", "Motivation", and "Personality traits". The expression of the different competence facets had to be assessed on a 5-point Likert scale (1: "very low" to 5: "very high"). Additionally, socio-demographic data and the participants' first choice of a medical specialty for postgraduate education were collected. We used analysis of variance (ANOVA) for mean score comparison of subgroups and least significant difference (LSD) tests for post hoc analysis.

Results: The competence area with the highest rating was "Motivation" (3.70 ± 0.47) while "Psychomotor & multitasking abilities" received the lowest rating (3.34 ± 0.68). Individual facets of competence ranked from "In need of harmony" (4.36 ± 0.72), followed by "Tactfulness" (4.26 ± 0.64), and "Cooperation/Agreeableness" (4.24 ± 0.53) to "Risk orientation" (2.90 ± 0.92), "Mathematical reasoning" (2.87 ± 1.25), and "Sanctioning" (2.26 ± 0.93). The students' competence profiles showed 100% congruence with physicians' competence profiles of the postgraduate specialty of their choice for internal medicine, 33.3% for paediatrics, and 0% for anaesthesiology.

Conclusions: Undergraduate medical students could define their competence profiles with the modified R-Track questionnaire and compare them with the profile of their desired specialty for postgraduate training to discover possible learning gaps or to detect good specialty matches. A combination of students' competence self-assessment with an external assessment of students' facets of competence could provide curricular planners with useful information how to design learning opportunities for specific facets of competence.

Keywords: Competence, Final year, Medical specialty, Residency, Postgraduate medical education, Undergraduate medical education

* Correspondence: harendza@uke.de

¹III. Department of Internal Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistr. 52, D-20246 Hamburg, Germany
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s). 2021 **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Background

The goal of undergraduate medical education is to prepare medical graduates to start their postgraduate training in any medical specialty they wish to choose [1, 2]. To achieve this goal, many countries developed catalogues with basic learning objectives for undergraduate medical education [3–5]. The final year of undergraduate training or internship [6, 7], depending on the educational system [8], is supposed to facilitate the transition to residency and should prepare the students to work in clinical settings and get accustomed to the roles and responsibilities of a resident [9–11]. During the clinical rotations within the final year, the students increasingly take responsibility, gain experience, deepen their understanding of the areas of interest, and explore career options [6, 10, 12]. On the one hand, students have finished their basic education and can acquire relevant insights into their desired specialty for postgraduate training [6]. On the other hand, this experience can lead to the insight that personal interest and abilities are unsuitable for the previously desired specialty [11, 12].

The medical specialties are characterized by a great diversity regarding their everyday work routines, which require different competences. Interestingly, different personality profiles of physicians working in different specialties have been identified [13–15]. Furthermore, differences in non-technical attributes have been found between staff, trainees, and residency applicants within four surgical specialties [16]. In order to define medical specialty specific profiles, the Requirement-Tracking questionnaire (R-Track) was developed [17]. With R-Track, competence profiles for anaesthesiologists have been defined [18]. Within the internal medicine subspecialty of nephrology, we found different competence profiles for hospital-based nephrologist and nephrologists working in private practice [19]. In a pilot study, we defined competence profiles for 17 different medical specialties [20].

The individual choice of a medical specialty for postgraduate education is an important, often lifelong career decision [21, 22]. Most medical graduates make their final specialty choice early in their postgraduate years, only very few residents change their specialty during the first four years of training [23–25]. Choosing a specialty does often not include matching an individual's competences with the competences required for a certain medical specialty. It rather focuses on several other factors such as academic performance in general, clinical experiences and clerkships, or applicants' perceived benefits of a specialty with respect to a specialty's potential income, prestige, work-life balance, or amount of patient contact [26–30]. For example, the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) provides a specific algorithm that matches candidates for postgraduate education after interviews with the providers of residency programs

according to a submitted Rank Order Lists (ROLs) which includes their preferences [31]. In general, medical graduates are not given the opportunity to identify their individual competence profile and match it with competence profiles required for certain medical specialties.

The R-Track could be useful for medical students near graduation to identify their own competence profiles close to finishing their undergraduate education and match it with competence profiles of medical specialties. Therefore, this pilot study addressed two research questions: (1) What do final-year medical students' self-assessed competence profiles look like? (2) How do final-year medical students' self-assessed competences profiles compare to the competence profiles of physicians from the students' intended choice of specialty for postgraduate training?

Methods

Study design, participants and instrument

This survey of self-assessed competence profiles was part of a competence-based assessment of advanced undergraduate medical students in the physician's role during a simulated first workday [32, 33]. Participation was voluntary and registration for one of the available 150 slots for participation occurred on a first come, first served basis. All final-year medical students, approximately 280, of the Medical Faculty of the University of Hamburg, Germany, were invited by email to participate in the assessment between October and December 2019. To depict medical competence profiles, 148 (52.8%) volunteer final-year medical students of a 6-year undergraduate curriculum completed the R-Track (Requirement-Tracking) questionnaire before the simulation began. The R-Track questionnaire was conceptualized by Dr. Viktor Oubaid, psychologist at the German Aerospace Center. It was inspired by questionnaires like the Fleishman Job Analysis Survey (F-JAS) [34], and was originally designed to detect competence profiles of aviation and space personnel (e.g. airline pilots) as well as different medical specialties or professional groups [17]. The F-JAS as a job analysis instrument is usually used for the direct collection of skills and abilities (summarized as 'competences') that are relevant for the accomplishment of certain occupational tasks or activities [35]. It describes individual activities or compares entire fields of activity and can be used for all professions [35], while the R-Track was designed specifically for "safety industries" such as pilots, astronauts, physicians, and other health professionals, where personality traits and social interactive competences are of substantial relevance.

The R-Track questionnaire includes 63 questions, which are assigned to 6 areas of competence: "Mental abilities" (14 questions), "Sensory abilities" (9

questions), “Psychomotor & multitasking abilities” (2 questions), “Personality traits” (12 questions), “Motivation” (5 questions), and “Social interactive competences” (21 questions). Competences represent the individually developed repertoire of abilities, skills, personality traits, and motivational aspects critical to effective and successful performance [36]. Questionnaires for job requirements should be able to differentiate between different occupations. Previous studies with the R-Track questionnaire revealed differences between medical specialties [17, 20], which were in line with the expected differences. For this study, we adapted the R-Track questionnaire to be used for self-assessment of the respective competence facets (Supplement 1). For this purpose, the questions for the individual items were rephrased to the first person singular. The final-year medical students were asked to assess the expression of the different competences on a 5-point Likert scale (1: “very low” to 5: “very high”). They were also asked to indicate their choice of a medical specialty for postgraduate education. Additionally, socio-demographic data were collected including age and sex. The Cronbach’s alphas of the scales varied on a medium level between .51 (“Psychomotor & multitasking abilities”), .55 (“Motivation”), .56 (“Personality traits”), .71 (“Sensory abilities”), .75 (“Social interactive competences”), and .82 (“Mental abilities”). This study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the Ethics Committee of the Chamber of Physicians, Hamburg, confirmed the innocuousness of the study with consented, anonymized, and voluntary participation (PV3649). All participants provided informed written consent for participation in this study.

Data processing

The R-Track questionnaire is presented in an online version. Participants in this study used an ID code in order to avoid the storage of personal data (name, age etc.). The resulting data were analysed in SPSS 25, using ANOVA procedures for mean score comparison of subgroups. Post hoc tests were carried out by using LSD tests. Differences were considered significant for p -values < 0.05 . For comparison of participating students’ profiles with physician’s profiles from the medical specialties students wished to choose for postgraduate training, results from a previous R-track study with practicing physicians were used [20].

Results

All data sets of the 148 participants (64.9% female) were fully completed and included in the analysis. Of the self-assessed areas of competence, participants reached the highest mean score for “Motivation” (3.70 ± 0.47), followed by “Social interactive competences” (3.61 ± 0.33), “Personality traits” (3.58 ± 0.35), “Mental abilities” (3.48 ± 0.49), “Sensory abilities” (3.36 ± 0.49), and “Psychomotor & multitasking abilities” (3.34 ± 0.68) (Fig. 1). No significant gender differences could be found for any area of competence (data not shown). The ranking of individual items with regard to their respective competence area is shown in Fig. 2. “In need of harmony” (4.36 ± 0.72) reached the highest rank, followed by “Tactfulness” (4.26 ± 0.64), and “Cooperation/Agreeableness” (4.24 ± 0.53). Five of the top ten items belonged to the competence area “Social interactive competences”. Among the bottom ten items, 60% were found in the competence areas “Mental abilities” and “Sensory abilities”. Particularly low self-ratings were found for





Fig. 1 Self-assessed areas of competence



“Sanctioning” (2.26 ± 0.93), “Mathematical reasoning” (2.87 ± 1.25), “Risk orientation” (2.90 ± 0.92), “Numeracy” (2.97 ± 1.05), and “Concentration” (3.01 ± 0.89).

A total of 18 different medical specialties for postgraduate training were mentioned by the undergraduate students (Fig. 3). The three most frequently named medical specialties for postgraduate education were internal medicine (25%), paediatrics (13.5%), and anaesthesiology

(10.1%). No significant differences (p values ranging from 0.11 to 0.98) were found within the six areas of competence comparing the self-assessments of the medical students who want to choose any of these three specialties for postgraduate education (Fig. 4). While students with a future specialty choice of internal medicine and paediatrics rated “Motivation” on rank 1, “Personality traits” reached the highest rank among students who wish to




Fig. 3 Participants' first choice of a medical discipline for postgraduate education




Fig. 4 Comparison of competence areas for the postgraduate training choices of anaesthesiology, internal medicine, and paediatrics

choose anaesthesiology. “Social interactive competences” reached rank 2 in all groups. Students who wish to choose paediatrics rated “Sensory abilities” lowest, whereas students who want to choose anaesthesiology or internal medicine rated “Psychomotor & multitasking abilities” lowest. Comparing medical students’ competence profiles with the competence profiles defined by physicians working in these three specialties [20], the competence profiles showed 100% congruence for internal medicine, 33.3% for paediatrics, and 0% for anaesthesiology (Table 1). The differences between the highest, and lowest mean of the six competence areas within each group were 0.53 (students) versus 0.98 (physicians) for internal medicine, 0.43 (students) versus 0.93 (physicians) for paediatrics, and 0.66 (students), and 0.75 (physicians) for anaesthesiology.

Discussion

To make the right choice for their residency training, medical graduates should know their own abilities, interests and strengths, and compare these with the requirements of the different medical specialties [37, 38]. We found that final-year students rated themselves highest in the competence area “Motivation”. A high level of motivation was found to be necessary to successfully complete undergraduate medical training and become a physician [39, 40]. Furthermore,

the competence area “Motivation” also achieved the highest rank by physicians from different medical specialties – irrespective of the specific specialty – as the most important requirement for their daily work [20]. Being motivated for medical learning itself and being interested in a specific specialty seem to be very crucial aspects for the choice of any specialty for postgraduate training. The higher the motivation of medical students, the better the learning quality, learning strategies, perseverance, and the performance in undergraduate medical education [41]. These aspects are important for postgraduate training, too.

The students’ self-assessments also depict, which competences they feel to have acquired during undergraduate education and which competences they still seem to be lacking. The competence facets with the highest ratings mostly belonged to the competence areas “Social interactive competences” and “Personality traits”. The highly rated competence facets “In need of harmony”, “Tactfulness”, “Openness”, and “Agreeableness” reflect aspects that physicians needed for successful communication and good teamwork [42, 43]. During undergraduate medical education, communication and teamwork represent important learning goals, which are prominently integrated in the curriculum [44, 45]. Especially longitudinal and repeated exercises might make students feel more

Table 1 Means of the six competence areas for students and physicians per specialty

Specialty		Mental abilities	Sensory abilities	Psychomotor & multitasking abilities	Motivation	Social interactive competences	Personality traits
Anaesthesiology	Students MW ± SD (rank) n = 15	3.47 ± 0.41 (4)	3.41 ± 0.41 (5)	3.00 ± 0.82 (6)	3.52 ± 0.54 (3)	3.61 ± 0.28 (2)	3.66 ± 0.39 (1)
	Physicians MW ± SD (rank) n = 11	3.63 ± 0.98 (6)	3.91 ± 0.90 (4)	4.09 ± 1.04 (2)	4.38 ± 0.43 (1)	3.79 ± 0.60 (5)	4.01 ± 0.44 (3)
Internal Medicine	Students MW ± SD (rank) n = 37	3.54 ± 0.54 (4)	3.35 ± 0.50 (5)	3.23 ± 0.56 (6)	3.76 ± 0.50 (1)	3.62 ± 0.34 (2)	3.58 ± 0.30 (3)
	Physicians MW ± SD (rank) n = 20	3.76 ± 0.59 (4)	3.43 ± 0.70 (5)	3.38 ± 0.72 (6)	4.36 ± 0.39 (1)	3.91 ± 0.41 (2)	3.89 ± 0.42 (3)
Paediatrics	Students MW ± SD (rank) n = 20	3.44 ± 0.59 (5)	3.31 ± 0.56 (6)	3.48 ± 0.70 (4)	3.74 ± 0.37 (1)	3.62 ± 0.37 (2)	3.57 ± 0.35 (3)
	Physicians MW ± SD (rank) n = 7	3.37 ± 0.38 (4)	3.27 ± 0.57 (6)	3.36 ± 0.85 (5)	4.20 ± 0.58 (1)	3.79 ± 0.38 (3)	3.92 ± 0.54 (2)

comfortable with facets of competence required for good communication and successful teamwork. The competence facets with the lowest scores belonged to the areas of “Sensory abilities”, “Social interactive competences”, and “Psychomotor & multitasking abilities”. The competence facets “Hearing sensitivity” and “Auditory discrimination”, for instance, are not specifically trained during undergraduate medical education but highly required and exercised in postgraduate anaesthesiology education [46]. “Sanctioning” represents a management and leadership competence [47], which is usually not acquired during undergraduate medical education. The competence facet “Multitasking capacity” received low self-assessment scores, but final-year medical students were also externally rated lowly in this competence facet during a training simulating the first day of residency [48]. An improvement for the transition from undergraduate to postgraduate training with respect to competence has been demanded [49]. In this respect, the modified R-Track could be an additional tool to support curricular planners for undergraduate and postgraduate medical education.

Internal medicine, paediatrics, and anaesthesia have been found in another study to be among the top four specialty choices for postgraduate training in Germany [50]. For these three specialties, we discovered complete to none accordance of the ranks of the six competence areas in the self-assessment of the students, who want to choose the respective specialty for their postgraduate training, with the relevance of the six competence areas for their daily work as assessed by physicians from the respective specialties [20]. However, the difference of the means for the six competence areas was much smaller in the students’ self-assessment than in the physicians’ rating. This suggests that students seem to acquire basic competences in all competence areas [3]. More specific facets of competence from certain competence areas necessary for specific specialties could either be gained during electives in undergraduate training [51, 52] or are very specific for a certain specialty and have to be acquired during postgraduate training [53, 54].

The career decision of physicians for a specialty is of great importance for the long-term structure and safeguarding of the composition of the health workforce [21] and at the same time has a major influence on the job satisfaction of physicians [13]. It could be helpful for undergraduate medical students to be aware of the competence profiles of the different specialties [20] to match their individual self-assessed competence profile with the profile of their desired specialty for postgraduate training, e.g., to identify areas for personal improvement. This could also be useful for undergraduate medical students’ planning of electives and eventually lead to further

development of the undergraduate medical curriculum with respect to acquiring specialty specific competences. Additional longitudinal self-assessment might be helpful to identify improvement in certain competences during undergraduate medical education. As differences in self-assessment and rater-based assessments of skills have been observed [55, 56] a combination of students’ self-assessment with the R-Track and assessment of students’ competences by supervisors could be useful to support students’ specialty-specific competence development.

Our study has several limitations. First, a self-assessment is not equivalent to an external assessment. Therefore, an additional external rating of the students’ facets of competence would have provided information about their actual performance in the six areas of competence. Furthermore, only 148 final-year medical students participated. They studied at the same medical school and their participation was voluntary. This limits the generalisability of our study. Another limitation is that the modified R-Track questionnaire – in contrast to its original version [20] – has acceptable Cronbach’s alphas only for three competence areas. Nevertheless, this study provides a first insight about students’ self-assessment in these six competence areas. Comparing the results with physicians’ R-Track results with respect to competence profiles provided first hints for curricular planners to pay attention to certain facets of competence in general. It also helps students to plan their electives concerning their specialty of choice for postgraduate training. Additionally, the comparison of students’ self-assessment versus the R-Track specialty profiles for anaesthesiology, internal medicine, and paediatrics gives first hints for specific facets of competence, which should be acquired or deepened in postgraduate education. Additional studies with larger cohorts of participants from different medical schools are needed to underscore and differentiate our findings. Nevertheless, our data provide evidence that the modified R-Track could provide an additional tool to help undergraduate medical students to make a good choice of the specialty for their postgraduate training.

Conclusions

With the modified R-Track questionnaire, we were able to define self-assessed competence profiles of final-year undergraduate medical students. The six competence areas showed very similar means with the competence area “Motivation” reaching the highest rank. Regarding the individual facets of competence, the top ten and bottom ten seem to depict these facets of competence as being represented or not represented in the undergraduate medical curriculum, respectively. Comparing the students’ R-Track self-assessment and their choice of specialty for postgraduate training with physicians’ R-Track

assessment from the respective specialties, discrepancies in expression and requirement of the competence areas became evident. Students' use of the modified R-Track questionnaire could support them in planning their undergraduate education with respect to the facets of competence, which are particularly required in their specialty of choice for postgraduate training. Combined with medical students' external assessment, results from the modified R-Track questionnaire could provide curricular planners with useful information how to design learning opportunities for general and more specialty-specific facets of competence.

Abbreviations

ANOVA: Analysis of variance; F-JAS: Fleishman job analysis survey; ID code: Identification code; LSD: Least significant difference test; NRMPP: National resident matching program; ROLs: Rank order lists; R-Track: Requirement-Tracking; SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02728-2>.

Additional file 1: Supplement 1. Competence facets of the self-assessment R-Track Questionnaire.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all medical students who participated in this study.

Authors' contributions

EZ and SH designed and performed the study. VO designed the questionnaire. SH recruited the participants and EZ coordinated the study and the data acquisition. VO performed the statistical analyses together with EZ and interpreted the results with SH. EZ and SH drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

The Joachim Herz Stiftung supported this work. The funding body played no role in the design of the study and in collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

All data and materials are available from the manuscript and from the corresponding author upon request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the Ethics Committee of the Chamber of Physicians, Hamburg, confirmed the innocuousness of the study with consented, anonymized, and voluntary participation (PV3649). All participants provided informed written consent for participation in this study.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

SH has a position as Senior Editorial Board Member to BMC Medical Education. EZ and VO have no competing interests.

Author details

¹III. Department of Internal Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistr. 52, D-20246 Hamburg, Germany. ²German Aerospace Center (DLR), Hamburg, Germany.

Received: 28 November 2020 Accepted: 7 May 2021

Published online: 05 June 2021

References

1. Ten Cate O. What is a 21st-century doctor? Rethinking the significance of the medical degree. *Acad Med* 2014;89(7):966–999.
2. Long MD. Competency based Residency Training: the next advance in graduate medical education. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2001;78:153–158.
3. Fischer MR, Bauer D, Mohn K. Finally finished! National competence based catalogues of learning objectives for undergraduate medical education (NKLM) and dental education (NKLZ) ready for trial. *GMS Z Med Ausbild* 2015;32(3):Doc35.
4. Metz JCM, Verbeek-Weel AMM, Huisjes HJ, editors. *Blueprint 2001: training of doctors in the Netherlands. Adjusted objectives of undergraduate medical education in the Netherlands*. Nijmegen: University Publication Office; 2001.
5. Michaud PA, Jucker-Kuper P. The profiles working group: the "Profiles" document: a modern revision of the objectives of undergraduate medical studies in Switzerland. *Swiss Med Wkly* 2016;146:wt14270.
6. Reddy ST, Chao J, Carter JL, Drucker R, Katz NT, Nesbit R, et al. Alliance for clinical education perspective paper: recommendations for redesigning the "final year" of medical school. *Teach Learn Med* 2014;26(4):420–427.
7. Scicluna HA, Grimm MC, Jones PD, Pilotto LS, McNeil HP. Improving the transition from medical school to internship – evaluation of a preparation for internship course. *BMC Med Educ* 2014;14:23.
8. Wijnen-Meijer M, Burdick W, Alofs L, Burgers C, Ten Cate O. Stages and transitions in medical education around the world: clarifying structures and terminology. *Med Teach* 2013;35(4):301–307.
9. Walling A, Merando A. The fourth year of medical education: a literature review. *Acad Med* 2010;85(11):1698–1704.
10. Lyss-Lerman P, Teherani A, Aagaard E, Loeser H, Cooke M, Harper GM. What training is needed in the fourth year of medical school? Views of residency program directors. *Acad Med* 2009;84(7):823–829.
11. Jonker G, Hoff RG, Max S, Kalkman CJ, Ten Cate O. Connecting undergraduate and postgraduate medical education through an elective EPA-based transitional year in acute care: an early project report. *GMS J Med Educ* 2017;34(5):Doc64.
12. Wolf SJ, Lockspeiser TM, Gong J, Guiton G. Students' perspectives on the fourth year of medical school: a mixed-methods analysis. *Acad Med* 2014;89(4):602–607.
13. Sievert M, Zwir I, Cloninger KM, Lester N, Rozsa S, Cloninger CR. The influence of temperament and character profiles on specialty choice and well-being in medical residents. *PeerJ* 2016;4:e2319.
14. Mulla S, Hakulinen C, Presseaux J, Ruiz de Porras DG, Jokela M, Hintsala T, et al. Personality traits and career choices among physicians in Finland: employment sector, clinical patient contact, specialty and change of specialty. *BMC Med Educ* 2018;18(1):52.
15. Borges NJ, Savickas ML. Personality and medical specialty choice: a literature review and integration. *J Career Assess* 2002;10:362.
16. Doyen B, Vlerick P, Maertens H, Vermassen F, van Herzele I. Non-technical attributes and surgical experience: a cross-sectional study comparing communication styles and attitudes in surgical staff, trainees and applicants. *Int J Surg* 2019;63:83–89.
17. Oubaid V. *Der Faktor Mensch*. Berlin: MWV-Verlag; 2019. [Book in German]
18. Gassner S, Oubaid V, Hampe W, Zöllner C, Kubitz J. Fragebogenbasierte Anforderungsanalyse für das Berufsbild des Anästhesiologen. *Anästhesiol Intensivmed* 2018;59:114–120. [Article in German]
19. Harendza S, Kim WC, Oubaid V. Anforderungsanalyse für Nephrologen in Klinik und Praxis. *Der Nephrologe*. 2019;14:159–63 [Article in German].
20. Zelesniack E, Oubaid V, Harendza S. Defining competence profiles of different medical specialties with the requirement-tracking questionnaire – a pilot study to provide a framework for medical students' choice of postgraduate training. *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21:46.
21. Lachish S, Gildacre MJ, Lambert TW. Views of UK doctors in training on the timing of choosing a clinical specialty: quantitative and qualitative analysis of surveys 3 years after graduation. *Postgrad Med J*. 2018;94(117):621–6.

22. Birck S, Gedrose B, Robra BP, Schmidt A, Schultz JH, Stosch C, et al. Stability of long-term professional objectives of young physicians during postgraduate training. Results of a multicenter cohort study. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr*. 2014;139(43):2173–7 [Article in German].
23. Jacobs JA, Boullis A, Messikomer C. The movement of physicians between specialities. *Res Soc Stratif Mobil* 2001;18:63–95.
24. Van den Bussche H, Ziegler S, Krause-Solberg L, Scherer M. Stability and changes of medical specialty of residents over four years of postgraduate training in Germany. *Gesundheitswesen* 2017;79(10):865–870. [Article in German]
25. Lambert TW, Davidson JM, Evans J, Goldacre MJ. Doctors' reasons for rejecting initial choices of specialties as long-term careers. *Med Educ* 2003;37(4):312–318.
26. Cleland J, Johnston PW, French FH, Needham G. Associations between medical school and career preferences in year 1 medical students in Scotland. *Med Educ* 2012;46(5):473–484.
27. Patel K, Binder L, Desai BK, Goodwin F, Mattu A, Cheaito MA, et al. Designing the third- and fourth-year clerkship schedule. *J Emerg Med* 2020;58(3):e173–e176.
28. Reed VA, Jernstedt GC, Reber ES. Understanding and improving medical student specialty choice: a synthesis of the literature using decision theory as a referent. *Teach Learn Med* 2001;13(2):117–129.
29. Pianosi K, Bethune C, Hurley K. Medical student career choice: a qualitative study of fourth- year medical students at Memorial University, Newfoundland. *CMAJ Open* 2016;4(2):E147–E152.
30. Laurence C, Elliott T. When, what and how South Australian pre-registration junior medical officers' career choices are made. *Med Educ* 2007;41(5):467–475.
31. Roth AE, Peranson E. The redesign of the matching market of American physicians: some engineering aspects of economic design. *Am Econ Rev* 1999;89(4):748–780.
32. Harendza S, Berberat PO, Kadmon M. Assessing competences in medical students with a newly designed 360-degree examination of a simulated first day of residency: a feasibility study. *J Community Med Health Educ* 2017;7:4.
33. Prediger S, Schick K, Fincke F, Fürstenberg S, Oubaid C, Kadmon M, et al. Validation of a competence-based assessment of medical students' performance in the physician's role. *BMC Med Educ* 2020;20(1):6.
34. Fleishman EA, Reilly ME. *Fleishman Job Analysis Survey. Administrator Guide*. Potomac: MD Management Research Institute; 1995.
35. Kleinmann M, Manzey D, Schumacher S, Fleishman EA. *F-JAS Fleishman Job Analyse System für eigenschaftsbezogene Anforderungsanalysen*. Göttingen: Hogrefe; 2010. [Article in German]
36. Ten Cate O, Snell L, Carracco C. Medical competence: the interplay between individual ability and the health care environment. *Med Teach* 2010;32(8):669–75.
37. Weissman C, Tandeter H, Zisk-Rony R, Weiss YG, Elchala U, Avidan A, et al. Israeli medical students' perceptions of six key medical specialties. *Isr J Health Policy Res* 2013;2(1):19.
38. Freeman B. *The ultimate guide to choosing a medical speciality*. Lange medical book. New York: McGraw-Hill Medical; 2004.
39. Holland C. Critical review: medical students' motivation after failure. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract* 2016;21(3):695–710.
40. Ten Cate OTJ, Kusurkar RA, Williams GC. How self-determination theory can assist our understanding of the teaching and learning processes in medical education. *AMEE guide No. 59. Med Teach* 2011;33(12):961–973.
41. Pelaccia T, Viau R. Motivation in medical education. *Med Teach* 2017;39(2):136–140.
42. Bakić-Mirić NM, Bakić NM. Successful doctor-patient communication and rapport building as the key skills of medical practice. *Med Biol* 2008;15(2):74–79.
43. Stoller JK. "How I do it": building teams in healthcare. *Chest* 2020;S0012-3692(20)34513-X. [online ahead of print]
44. Rider EA, Keefer CH. Communication skills competencies: definitions and a teaching toolbox. *Med Educ* 2006;40(7):624–629.
45. Lerner S, Magrane D, Friedman E. Teaching teamwork in medical education. *Mt Sinai J Med* 2009;76(4):318–329.
46. Dobson G, Chow L, Flexman A, Hurdle H, Kurrek M, Laflamme C, et al. *Guidelines to the practice of anesthesia – revised edition* 2019. *Can J Anesth* 2019;66(1):75–108.
47. Stoller JK, Rose M, Lee R, Dolgan C, Hoogwerf BJ. Teambuilding and leadership training in an internal medicine residency training program. *J Gen Intern Med* 2004;19(6):692–697.
48. Prediger S, Fürstenberg S, Berberat PO, Kadmon M, Harendza S. Interprofessional assessment of medical students' competences with an instrument suitable for physicians and nurses. *BMC Med Educ* 2019;19:46.
49. Ten Cate O, Carraccio C. Envisioning a true continuum of competency-based medical education, training, and practice. *Acad Med* 2019;94(9):1283–1288.
50. Ziegler S, van den Bussche H, Römer F, Kraus-Solberg L, Scherer M. Preference changes regarding future work area and intended position among German residents after four years of residency. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr* 2017;142(12):e74–e82. [Article in German]
51. Benson NM, Stickle TR, Raszka WW Jr. Going "fourth" from medical school: fourth-year medical students' perspectives on the fourth year of medical school. *Acad Med* 2015;90(10):1386–1393.
52. van den Heuvel M, Au H, Levin L, Bernstein S, Ford-Jones E, Martimianakis MA. Evaluation of a social pediatrics elective: transforming students' perspective through reflection. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2014;53(6):549–555.
53. AlShammari A, Inayah A, Ali Afsar N, Nurhussen A, Siddiqui A, Answer ML et al. Evaluation of effectiveness of a paediatric simulation course in procedural skills for paediatric residents - a pilot study. *J Pak Med Assoc* 2018;68:240–246.
54. Canales C, Storm S, Anderson CT, Fortier MA, Cannesson M, Rinehart JB, Kain ZN, Perret D. Humanistic medicine in anaesthesiology: development and assessment of a curriculum in humanism for postgraduate anaesthesiology trainees. *Br J Anaesth* 2019;123(6):887–897.
55. Jahan F, Sadaf S, Bhanji S, Naeem N, Qureshi R. Clinical skills assessment: comparison of student and examiner assessment in an objective structured clinical examination. *Educ Health (Abingdon)* 2011;24(2):421.
56. Ammentorp J, Thomsen JL, Jarbøl DE, Holst R, Øvrehus ALH, Kofoed PE. Comparison of the medical students' perceived self-efficacy and the evaluation of the observers and patients. *BMC Med Educ* 2013;8:13:49.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

