

1 High-fidelity simulation versus case-based tutorial sessions for
2 teaching pharmacology: convergent mixed methods research
3 investigating undergraduate medical students' performance and
4 perception

5 Rachid Kaddoura^{1¶} (0009-0006-7614-2963), Hanan Faraji^{1¶} (0009-0004-4877-3755), Farah Otaki^{2,3¶}
6 (0000-0002-8944-4948), Rajan Radhakrishnan¹ (0000-0003-0792-8234), Adrian Stanley^{1,4} (0000-0003-
7 4872-0501), Agnes Paulus^{3,5} (0000-0002-2086-6106), Lisa Jackson¹ (0000-0003-4161-6031), Reem Al
8 Jayyousi¹ (0000-0001-6211-7448), Sharon Mascarenhas⁶ (0000-0003-1005-3838), Meghana Sudhir⁶
9 (0000-0002-7545-4758), Jalal Alfroukh⁶ (0000-0002-4817-0960), Hardik Ghelani¹ (0000-0001-5960-
10 7702), Aida Joseph Azar¹ (0000-0001-7659-8262), Amar Hassan Khamis⁷ (0000-0002-8518-3066),
11 Reem Jan^{1*} (0000-0002-1685-5594)

12

13 ¹College of Medicine, Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine and Health Sciences, Dubai
14 Health, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

15 ²Strategy and Institutional Excellence, Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine and Health
16 Sciences, Dubai Health, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

17 ³Department of Health Services Research, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI),
18 Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences (FHML), Maastricht University, Maastricht, The
19 Netherlands.

20 ⁴Mediclinic Middle East, United Arab Emirates.

21 ⁵School of Health Professions Education (SHE), Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences (FHML),
22 Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands.

23 ⁶Institute of Learning, Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine and Health Sciences, Dubai
24 Health, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

25 ⁷Hamdan Bin Mohammed College of Dental Medicine, Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine
26 and Health Sciences, Dubai Health, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

27

28 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

29

30 *Corresponding Author:

31 Dr. Reem Jan

32 Assistant Professor- Pharmacology

33 College of Medicine

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

34 Abstract

35 **Introduction:** Medical educators strive to improve their curricula to enhance the student learning
36 experience. The use of high-fidelity simulation within basic and clinical medical science subjects has
37 been one of these initiatives. However, there is paucity of evidence on using simulation for teaching
38 pharmacology, and the effectiveness of this teaching modality, relative to more traditional ones, have
39 not been sufficiently investigated. Accordingly, this study compares the effects of high-fidelity
40 simulation, which is designed in alignment with adult and experiential learning theories, and
41 traditional case-based tutorial sessions on the performance and perception of undergraduate Year 2
42 medical students in pharmacology in Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

43 **Methods:** This study employed a convergent mixed methods approach. Forty-nine medical students
44 were randomly assigned to one of two groups during the 16-week pharmacology course. Each group
45 underwent one session delivered via high-fidelity simulation and another via a case-based tutorial. A
46 short multiple-choice question quiz was administered twice (immediately upon completion of the
47 respective sessions and 5 weeks afterwards) to assess knowledge retention. Furthermore, to explore
48 the students' perceptions regarding the two modes of learning delivery (independently and in
49 relation to each other), an evaluation survey was administered following the delivery of each session.
50 Thereafter, the iterative joint display analysis was used to develop a holistic understanding of the
51 effect of high-fidelity simulation in comparison to traditional case-based tutorial sessions on
52 pharmacology learning in the context of the study.

53 **Results:** There was no statistically significant difference in students' knowledge retention between
54 high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions. Yet, students expressed a greater
55 preference for high-fidelity simulation, describing the corresponding sessions as more varied, better
56 at reinforcing learning, and closer to reality. As such, the meta-inferences led to expansion of the
57 overall understanding around students' satisfaction, to both confirmation and expansion of the
58 systemic viewpoint around students' preferences, and lastly to refinement in relation to the
59 perspective around retained knowledge.

60 **Conclusion:** High-fidelity simulation was found to be as effective as case-based tutorial sessions in
61 terms of students' retention of knowledge. Nonetheless, students demonstrated a greater
62 preference for high-fidelity simulation. The study advocates caution in adapting high-fidelity
63 simulation, where careful appraisal can lend itself to identifying contexts where it is most effective.

64

65 Key terms: pharmacology; high-fidelity simulation; case-based tutorial; undergraduate medical
66 education; mixed methods research; data integration; joint display analysis; Kirkpatrick evaluation
67 model; Learning-Transfer Evaluation Model; adult learning theory; self-regulated learning; Kolb's
68 experiential learning theory; social constructionism theory; assessment; evaluation; performance;
69 perception; knowledge retention; Dubai; United Arab Emirates; Middle East and North Africa

70 Introduction

71 In the ever-evolving landscape of medical education, schools strive to identify methods to enhance
72 student learning and knowledge retention. Developing in health professionals a solid foundational
73 understanding of the basic medical sciences is a given, and pharmacology is considered one of the
74 core subjects. Learning pharmacology and therapeutics concepts has long posed challenges in
75 medical education due to the complexity of drug-related information, including but not limited to
76 core pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic principles, and therapeutics' related information such
77 as adverse reactions, and drug interactions and contraindications. Consequently, many medical
78 students express difficulty in acquiring and retaining this knowledge (1). Hence, effective delivery of
79 pharmacological concepts is crucial in preparing medical students to become safe prescribers (2).
80 Pharmacology has been taught using various methods; the most implemented is traditional didactic
81 lecture-based learning, which is characterized by a teacher-centric approach with minimal
82 participation from and interaction with the students in the classroom. However, various studies have
83 highlighted the challenges in establishing effective learning using this modality (3, 4). Therefore,
84 different methods of teaching have been opted to enhance the student's understanding and
85 retention of pharmacology knowledge (4, 5). For example, problem-based methods such as case-
86 based learning engage a small group of students in active, collaborative learning where they analyse
87 cases or scenarios related to pharmacology that resemble real-world circumstances. This is usually
88 done under the supervision of one or more tutor(s), while enabling, among the students, critical
89 thinking and putting into practice the knowledge that they are acquiring (4, 6). Furthermore,
90 laboratory practical sessions, which may involve using laboratory equipment or laboratory animals
91 such as rodents, can provide direct experience in drug experimentation. This method allows the
92 students to understand practical aspects of mechanisms of drug actions and pharmacological effects
93 in a controlled setting (7).

94 Simulation-based medical education has been increasingly employed within medical curricula in
95 recent years. It refers to any educational endeavour that employs simulation tools to recreate clinical

96 situations. It allows for experimental learning and practice in a safe and controlled environment,
97 without real-world consequences (8). Such technology serves as an additional resource in the
98 students' teaching, enhancing genuine encounters through controlled situations which trigger or
99 imitate significant elements of reality (9). Furthermore, simulation emerges as a reliable tool for
100 improving education, and facilitating uniform training and assessment in a safe environment,
101 especially when effectively anchored in adult and experiential learning theories. These theories lie in
102 the premise that adults deploy self-regulated learning (10, 11), are intrinsically motivated to learn,
103 have mental models developed from previous experiences that form an increasing resource for
104 learning, and regularly exercise analogical reasoning in learning and practice (12). This brings forward
105 the Kolb's experiential learning cycle (13, 14) which suggests that learning which occurs through a
106 concrete and hands-on experience in a safe environment is followed by reflective observation (where
107 the learner identifies gaps in their mental models). Next, the learner adapts their mental models (i.e.,
108 abstract conceptualisation), then actively experiments using the adapted mental models in a new
109 experience. From this constructivist perspective (15), simulation provides a valuable resource for
110 active experimentation. This cements new knowledge and long-term changes in practice. Among the
111 previously identified limitations of the Kolb's experiential learning theory is that it does not capture
112 the learning that occurs in relating to others. The resulting simplistic view of experiential learning
113 pulls it away from its origins, where it stemmed from human relations' training (16). The literature
114 emphasizes conceptualizing experiential education in more sociological terms, illustrating how the
115 individual learner is inevitably connected to social, cultural, and/or environmental factors (17).
116 Hence, from a practical perspective, it is worth deploying Kolb's experiential learning theory in
117 conjunction with a social constructionism theory where a small group of people learn through their
118 social interactions. This emphasizes that participation and learning go together, and the learner is
119 embedded in the context of learning (18).

120 While tutorial sessions are designed to affect the understanding of the theoretical background as
121 well as practical skills in a highly interactive learning experience, simulation provides a dynamic

122 platform where learners actively immerse themselves in lifelike scenarios, promoting practical
123 application and critical thinking. Simulation offers a bridge between theory and practice, allowing
124 learners to navigate complex situations, make decisions, and experience consequences in a
125 controlled environment (19). Simulation also offers the opportunity for repeated practice and
126 experimentation, while tutorials enhance theoretical knowledge by the traditional learning
127 modalities. Learners can engage with simulation multiple times, refining their skills and strategies as
128 they progress (20).

129 Whilst tutors aim to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application, the
130 choice between traditional classroom-based tutorial teaching and simulation-based learning
131 emerges. Simulation-based learning may enhance the students' understanding of the teaching
132 materials and help in the practical part of medical education (21). However, it is still unclear, in
133 certain disciplines, whether such high-tech teaching methods are sufficiently cost-effective.
134 Furthermore, the incorporation of high-fidelity simulation into an already developed high-credit
135 course such as pharmacology calls upon careful consideration of several factors. For instance, the
136 integration of simulation teaching in the curriculum requires more time and resources from both
137 faculty members and the institution, including higher costs compared to traditional methods (22).
138 This is particularly relevant for high-fidelity simulation, which is a category of simulation that
139 provides an exceptionally immersive learning experience. It uses advanced, usually interactive
140 technology and realistic human mannequins, closely mimicking real-world scenarios (23, 24).

141 The current study uniquely integrates output of analysis around students' academic performance
142 (quantitative) with inferences made from analyses of data concerning their perception of two
143 different teaching modalities (quantitative and qualitative). The fact that the respective high-fidelity
144 simulation was designed in an evidence-driven manner, in alignment with experiential learning
145 theories, further differentiates the current study. Lastly, the uniqueness of the study is further
146 emphasized by the fact that it is conducted, among undergraduate Year 2 medical students, in a

147 university of medicine and health sciences located in the Middle East and North Africa region
148 (MENA). Hence, the overall purpose of the current study is to compare high-fidelity simulation to
149 traditional case-based tutorial sessions for teaching pharmacology to undergraduate Year 2 medical
150 students. This is done through investigating differences in knowledge retention of taught topics, and
151 in students' perception of the learning experiences and teaching modalities.

152 **Research questions:**

- 153 1. How did the learning experience of high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions
154 affect knowledge retention (i.e., performance) of pharmacology among Year 2 medical
155 students?
- 156 2. How did Year 2 medical students perceive the learning experience of high-fidelity simulation
157 and case-based tutorial sessions in the context of pharmacology teaching?
- 158 3. Which teaching modality (high-fidelity simulation or case-based tutorial sessions) is more
159 effective in supporting Year 2 medical students' learning of pharmacology?

160 **Methods**

161 **Context of the study**

162 This study was conducted at Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine and Health Sciences
163 (MBRU) in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, with a single cohort of Year 2 medical students. MBRU offers
164 a six-year Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery degree (MBBS) that follows a spiral
165 curriculum (25) which is divided into three phases: foundational basic sciences, preclinical sciences,
166 and clinical rotations. Phase 1, which covers Year 1, serves as an introduction to fundamental medical
167 concepts and basic human science. Phase 2, spanning Years 2 and 3, focuses on the different body
168 organ systems in relation to clinical medicine. Years 4, 5, and 6 constitute Phase 3. During the first
169 two years of Phase 3, students undertake clinical placements in different private and public hospitals.
170 During Year 6, students undertake an apprenticeship, and assume greater clinical responsibilities
171 under supervision (in preparation for residency). The study cohort was comprised of 49 Year 2

172 medical students in the academic year 2021-2022, aged 18-20 years (13 males and 36 females),
173 enrolled in the 'Principles of Pharmacology and Therapeutics' course.

174 Description of the intervention

175 The study revolved around the 'Principles of Pharmacology and Therapeutics' course which was
176 delivered in the second semester (January - April 2022) of Year 2 of the MBBS program at MBRU. The
177 corresponding semester ran over 16 calendar weeks, which included 3 teaching-free weeks [one for
178 conducting in-course assessments, and two for the Spring break]. The weekly educational framework
179 of this course consisted of two one-hour didactic lectures and one two-hour case-based tutorial.
180 Case-based tutorial sessions were aimed to provide a more interactive learning experience, whereby
181 students were divided into smaller sub-groups of 4-5 individuals, encouraged to address clinically-
182 oriented cases and presented their work to the rest of the class, under the guidance and support of
183 the pharmacology faculty members.

184 Two topics (which are usually taught through tutorial sessions) were selected by the research team
185 for inclusion in the current study. These two topics were developed to be offered through two
186 modalities: high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions. The first topic was Routes of
187 Administration (ROA), and its learning objectives were to (i) compare and contrast onset and
188 duration of action of a drug administered through different routes, and (ii) identify the best route of
189 administration for a patient based on patient-specific information. The second selected topic was
190 Drug Toxicity and Interactions (TOX), and its learning objectives were to (i) identify drug interactions,
191 recognize the symptoms of drug overdose, (ii) identify their consequences, (iii) suggest management
192 strategies, and (iv) describe the mechanisms underlying them. Both sessions were adapted to high-
193 fidelity simulation, using identical learning objectives and including three identical cases/scenarios,
194 assuming the learners are self-regulated and intrinsically motivated to learn from experiences. To
195 reinforce that, the learners were offered pre-session readings (e.g., treatment guidelines and drug
196 information) to enable them to maximize the learning during the respective sessions. The design of

197 those sessions was based on theoretic and empiric research in adult and experiential learning, where
198 the educators took into account the learners, their experiences, and the overall learning
199 environment (12). The high-fidelity simulation involved approximately eight members of staff,
200 including three medical and/or pharmacology faculty members, three stimulation technicians, and
201 two members of staff for ushering the student groups to their respective scenario rooms and for
202 facilitating the end-of-session assessments and surveys. The entailed learning facilitation was in
203 alignment with Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory (14, 26). Each scenario required one medical or
204 pharmacology faculty member to lead the scenario, and one simulation technician to operate the
205 mannequin, or one standardized patient. The case-based tutorial session involved one or two
206 pharmacology faculty member(s), who facilitated the learning during that session, assuming that the
207 learners are self-regulated and are intrinsically motivated (12).

208 The first topic, ROA, was delivered during Week 4 (31st January 2022). For this session, the students
209 were split into two groups: the first group attended the high-fidelity simulation, and the second
210 group attended the case-based tutorial session. The second topic, TOX, was delivered during Week
211 10 (14th March 2022). For this session, the second group attended the high-fidelity simulation
212 whereas the first group attended the case-based tutorial. For both high-fidelity simulation and case-
213 based tutorial sessions, students were sub-divided into smaller groups of 4-5 individuals who rotated
214 through the scenarios and worked on solving the corresponding cases together. The high-fidelity
215 simulation sessions took place at the Khalaf Ahmad Al Habtoor Medical Simulation Center within
216 MBRU. These sessions utilized high-fidelity mannequins and/or standardized patients that
217 manifested physical examination signs, or could be questioned about symptoms, respectively.
218 Additionally, the mannequins had continuous vital signs monitor displays which could be
219 manipulated by the operator. The other more traditional teaching method was a case-based tutorial,
220 which was delivered in a classroom setting, with no simulated patients present or any high-tech
221 module involved. A brief timeline of the course delivery is illustrated in Figure 1.

222

223 **Figure 1.** *Timeline of the delivery of the two pharmacology topics: Routes of administration (ROA)*
224 *and drug toxicity and interactions (TOX). ROA was delivered to Student Group 1 via high-fidelity*
225 *simulation and to Student Group 2 via a case-based tutorial during the fourth week of the course.*
226 *TOX was delivered during the tenth week of the course to Student Group 1 via a case-based tutorial*
227 *and to Student Group 2 via high-fidelity simulation.*
228 *ICA, In-course assessment.*

229 Research design

230 The current study relied on a convergent mixed methods research design (27, 28), which has been
231 encouraged in the health professions' education research field, and provides a more comprehensive
232 view of the topic under investigation (29, 30). Therefore, three data sources were used to address
233 the study's research questions: (i) a 10 multiple-choice question (MCQ) quiz administered at two
234 time points: a. At the end of each session (to assess short-term knowledge retention), and b. Five
235 weeks after the session (to assess long-term knowledge retention) - quantitative data, (ii) a
236 qualitative survey immediately after each session, and (iii) a quantitative survey after the students
237 completed the two sessions (irrespective of the order) to capture their perception of the experience.
238 Quantitative and qualitative data, from the three data sources, were analysed independently, and
239 then the generated inferences were integrated to result in meta-inferences using the iterative joint
240 display analysis process (26). Based on various knowledge transfer and translation frameworks, this
241 study design taps into more than one level of analysis. For example, according to the Kirkpatrick
242 evaluation model, this study's research design captures Level One (i.e., reaction- perception) and
243 Level Two (i.e., learning- knowledge retention/ performance) (31). In terms of the Learning-Transfer
244 Evaluation Model (LTEM), the research design of the current study covers Tiers One through Four
245 (namely: Attendance, Activity, Learner Perceptions, and Knowledge) (32). Accordingly, this data
246 merging is believed to raise the reliability of the study, offering a systemic point of view of the
247 subject matter (33). Ethical approval for the current study was granted by the Mohammed Bin Rashid
248 University of Medicine and Health Sciences-Institutional Review Board (MBRU-IRB-2020-001), and

249 electronic informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to participating in the research
250 study.

251 Data collection

252 A summarized descriptive overview of data collection over the study timeline is depicted in Figure 2,
253 where all the data was collected 1st January through 30th April 2022 (around the time of the
254 respective course delivery).

255 *Quantitative data source- students' performance*

256 To assess knowledge retention, a 10-MCQ quiz was used. The quiz was developed by two
257 pharmacology faculty members, and reviewed by a panel of three pharmacology experts (two basic
258 and one clinical) and two clinical faculty members in the fields of family medicine and internal
259 medicine. Any modifications were addressed to ensure the accuracy and validity of the questions.
260 The 10-MCQ quiz was delivered to the students, via an online Learning Management System (LMS),
261 immediately after their assigned session (high-fidelity simulation or case-based tutorial) assessing
262 knowledge learned while participating in the respective session (short-term knowledge retention).
263 Unbeknownst to the students, the same 10 MCQ test was delivered again 5 weeks following the
264 learning session to assess their long-term knowledge retention of the information learned. Students
265 were not briefed about the long-term knowledge retention test to minimize bias related to any
266 potential test preparation. In total, each student completed four quizzes, their scores were recorded
267 and computed, awarding one point for each correct answer and zero points for each incorrect
268 answer. The total score was calculated for each student as the sum of the correct answers, which (in
269 the context of this study) is a reflection of the students' performance/ knowledge retention.

270 *Qualitative data source- students' perception*

271 To assess the students' perception of both modalities, a descriptive survey was administered
272 following the delivery of each session. The testimonies of students were collected to explore the
273 students' perceptions regarding the two teaching modalities. Each entry was assigned a unique

274 identifier, composed of two parts. A serial number (i.e., 01 to 90), followed by 'S' for high-fidelity
275 simulation or 'T' for case-based tutorial. For example, the identifier: 21S, represents the entry
276 number 21, which corresponds to a student's feedback after their experience with high-fidelity
277 simulation. Because the data collection was anonymized, if the same student chose to provide
278 feedback after their experience with case-based tutorial, their comment will be assigned another
279 number, followed by 'T' for case-based tutorial.

280 *Quantitative data source- students' perception*

281 The corresponding survey was administered immediately after the second topic (TOX sessions). This
282 timing was chosen because, by that point, all students had experienced both the high-fidelity
283 simulation and case-based tutorial session. The survey consisted of two independent dichotomous
284 questions: (i) which is your preferred method of learning? and (ii) which method do you consider
285 more useful?, where students were asked to choose between the two teaching modalities: high-
286 fidelity simulation or case-based tutorial sessions.

287

288 **Figure 2.** *Data collection points superimposed on the timeline of the course delivery.*

289 *ROA, Routes of administration topic; TOX, drug toxicity and interactions topic; ST-Quiz, Short-term*
290 *quiz; LT-Quiz, Long-term quiz; ICA, in-course assessment; Survey Quant., quantitative survey; Survey*
291 *Qual., qualitative survey.*

292 Data analysis

293 *Quantitative data- students' performance*

294 This quantitative data was analysed using SPSS for Windows Version 27. The descriptive analysis
295 consisted of computing the Change in Knowledge Retention (Short-term Knowledge Retention minus
296 Long-term Knowledge Retention). Then, the mean and standard deviation for the Short-term
297 Knowledge Retention and Long-term Knowledge Retention, along with the newly computed variable:
298 Change in Knowledge Retention, were calculated. To select the appropriate inferential analysis tests,
299 a test of normality was conducted for each of the three variables: Short-term Knowledge Retention,

300 Long-term Knowledge Retention, and Change in Knowledge Retention. The data were all found to be
301 not normally distributed. Accordingly, the nonparametric test of two independent samples: the
302 Mann-Whitney U test, was used to assess the potentiality of associations between the following
303 variables: the Short-term Knowledge Retention, Long-term Knowledge Retention, and Change in
304 Knowledge Retention, and teaching modality (i.e., high-fidelity simulation or case-based tutorial
305 sessions).

306 *Qualitative data- students' perception*

307 The data analysis was started after the conclusion of the data collection phase. The dataset
308 constituted a consolidation of all the entries from the qualitative surveys (conducted right after the
309 respective sessions). The data was inductively analysed, by two researchers (H.F. and R.K.),
310 employing a participant-centred, phenomenological approach to thematic analysis (34). The
311 researchers proactively acknowledged potential factors influencing their perceptions of the subject
312 matter. Consistency was rigorously maintained throughout the analysis process, adhering to an
313 iterative approach rooted in constructivist epistemology (35). Unlike conventional scientific inquiry,
314 this interpretative process necessitated acknowledging and reenacting the participants' lived
315 experiences. The focus of the chosen approach is not on establishing causal explanations, but on
316 comprehending the participants, including their attitudes, behaviours, and actions (36). This
317 methodology presupposes that participants' thoughts can be apprehended by interpreting and, in
318 turn, gaining a comprehensive understanding of their self-expression.

319 The process of analysis followed the six-step framework initially introduced by Braun and Clarke (37).
320 This multi-phased approach to inductive qualitative analysis is encouraged in socio-behavioural
321 research, in general, and health professions education research, in specific (38). NVivo software
322 version 12.0 plus (QSR International Pty. Ltd., Chadstone, Australia) was utilized to code the data, and
323 in turn, accelerate the classification of the identified text segments.

324 In the first phase of the analysis, the two researchers immersed themselves in the data. They jointly
325 read through the deidentified comments, initiating a process of reflection on their content to
326 properly familiarize themselves with the data. In the second stage, the transcripts were carefully
327 examined. Text fragments pertaining, either directly or indirectly, to the research question were
328 identified and extracted. Essentially, any segment of text that reflected on the students' personal
329 encounters with the modalities: high-fidelity simulation and/ or case-based tutorial sessions, as well
330 as their involvement with the course material, was marked for reference and assigned a preliminary
331 code. This continued until no further revelations emerged from the dataset, indicating that data
332 saturation had been reached.

333 This process led to the classification of coded text fragments, paving the way for the researchers to
334 embark on the third phase of analysis. This involved multiple rounds of reflection and exploration of
335 potential connections, leading to the emergence of several potential constellations of categories. In
336 the fourth stage, the researchers determined the most effective method for amalgamating the
337 categories into overarching themes (Figure 3). All themes and categories were subsequently coded
338 and defined in the context of the current study, marking the completion of stage five. The result of
339 this process formed the study's conceptual framework, providing guidance for the sixth and final
340 phase of the thematic analysis: the narrative presentation of the findings, in accordance with
341 established guidelines (39). To enhance the credibility of the findings, the researchers conducted a
342 count and documented the number of text fragments within each category of the identified themes.
343 If a single participant contributed more than one pertinent text fragment, all were consolidated into
344 one entry. Essentially, the tally represents the number of participants who reflected on matters
345 pertinent to the respective categories.

346

347 **Figure 3.** *Mind map deployed as a tool to facilitate the qualitative analysis.*

348 *Quantitative data- students' perception*

349 This quantitative survey data was analysed descriptively using SPSS for Windows Version 27. The
350 analysis consisted of computing the proportions for the two variables.

351 *Integration*

352 Following the completion of the independent data analyses of quantitative and qualitative data, the
353 generated findings were integrated using the iterative joint display analysis process (26). This stage
354 allowed for drawing meta-inferences from the mapping of findings generated from each of the
355 independent preceding analyses. In alignment with the guidelines of reporting on mixed methods
356 research (39) that were adhered to for the current study, the output of the integration was meant to
357 address the third research question inquiring about the effectiveness of the two modalities in
358 relation to each other. Accordingly, within the context of the current study, effectiveness can be
359 defined as the extent to which the respective learning and teaching interventions (i.e., high-fidelity
360 simulation and case-based tutorial sessions) met their preset educational outcomes, taking into
361 account the students' performance and personal reflections on their lived experiences. The
362 generation of meta-inferences enabled the researchers to identify where the findings build upon (or
363 at least confirm) each other, as well as where they contradict each other.

364 *Results*

365 In alignment with the guidelines of reporting on mixed methods research (39) that were adhered to
366 for the current study, the analysis of data related to the students' performance addressed the first
367 research question of the current study, while the output of analysis of perception data answered the
368 second research question. Furthermore, as previously mentioned in the Methodology section, the
369 third research question was addressed through the integration of findings around students'
370 performance and perception.

371 Output of quantitative analysis- students' performance

372 Out of 49 learners, 43 learners experienced both teaching modalities (whereas 6 learners did not
 373 experience the case-based tutorial teaching modality). The short-term knowledge retention test was
 374 completed 92 times (by 49 learners post-simulation and 43 learners post-tutorial), while the long-
 375 term knowledge retention quiz was completed 73 times (by 35 learners post-simulation and 38
 376 learners post-tutorial) (Table 1).

| | Short-term knowledge retention quiz | Long-term knowledge retention quiz |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| High-fidelity simulation | 49 | 35 |
| Case-based tutorial sessions | 43 | 38 |

377 **Table 1.** Distribution of learners across teaching modalities vis-à-vis quizzes

378 There were no statistically significant differences in students' short-term knowledge retention, long-
 379 term knowledge retention, and change in knowledge retention between teaching modalities (high-
 380 fidelity simulation or case-based tutorial sessions) ($p > 0.05$; Table 2).

| | Short-term Knowledge Retention score mean \pm SD (%) ($p = 0.49$) | Long-term Knowledge Retention score mean \pm SD (%) ($p = 0.59$) | Change in Knowledge Retention (ST-LT) score mean \pm SD (%) ($p = 0.69$) |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| High-fidelity simulation | 78.79 \pm 17.19 | 77.71 \pm 23.77 | 2.57 \pm 26.05 |
| Case-based tutorial sessions | 81.16 \pm 15.62 | 77.37 \pm 19.82 | 2.89 \pm 17.99 |

381 **Table 2.** Short-term and long-term knowledge retention and change in knowledge retention in high-
 382 fidelity simulation versus case-based tutorial sessions

383 Output of qualitative analysis- students' perception

384 The total number of entries that underwent the qualitative analysis were 90: 48 were collected from
 385 students immediately after their experience with high-fidelity simulation and 42 were collected from
 386 students immediately after their experience with case-based tutorial sessions.

387 The qualitative analysis generated, as per this study’s conceptual framework: Differentiators of
 388 Pharmacology Teaching Modalities (Figure 4), three interlinked themes namely: Variation of
 389 experience, Reinforcement learning, and Level of realism. Within the Variation of experience theme,
 390 two categories were identified: Interactions and Movement. As for the Reinforcement of learning
 391 theme, it included the following categories: Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes. Lastly, within the Level
 392 of realism theme, the following categories were identified: Fidelity and Immersiveness.

393

394 **Figure 4.** *The study’s conceptual framework: Differentiators of Pharmacology Teaching Modalities.*

395 The semi-quantitative tally of text fragments showed the following distribution: Variation of
 396 experience (n=8), Reinforcement of learning (n=16), and Level of realism (n=8) (Table 3).

| Theme | Variation of Experience | | Reinforcing Learning | | | Level of Realism | |
|----------|-------------------------|----------|----------------------|--------|-----------|------------------|---------------|
| Category | Interactions | Movement | Knowledge | Skills | Attitudes | Fidelity | Immersiveness |
| Tally | 5 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Sum | 8 | | 16 | | | 8 | |

397 **Table 3.** *Semi-quantitative tally of the output of the participant-focused qualitative analysis.*

398 **Variation of experience**

399 This theme encapsulated fragments of text which highlight the students’ perception of the differing
 400 encounters and happenings that they experienced through participating in the respective
 401 pharmacology course.

402 **Interactions**

403 This category included text excerpts that showed students’ reflections regarding the dynamic
 404 exchanges and engagements within the session environment.

405 24/S: “...Interacting with patients made me realize the importance of making swift decisions
 406 in the clinical environment...”

407 In terms of the level of interactions, it was clear from the qualitative analysis that the majority of
408 students favoured the high-fidelity simulation over the case-based tutorial sessions.

409 7/S: "...The simulation allowed us to implement what we had learned in class in the form of
410 clinical cases that we are expected to encounter in our future practice; this made the session
411 very interesting and fostered our interactions..."

412 84/T: "...I found the simulation more interactive and engaging than the tutorial. I felt that I
413 had immediately integrated the information during the high-fidelity simulation session. The
414 more traditional method of case-based tutorial sessions is not as engaging, and although it
415 involves group work, the learning experience integral to tutorials feels more like a typical
416 lecture..."

417 Even though most of the students seemed to prefer high-fidelity simulation, there were some
418 students who commended the increased interactions amongst each other and with the faculty
419 members in the case-based tutorial session and reflected on how this enabled self-regulated
420 learning.

421 66/T: "...The intragroup discussions, that were later followed by discussing our answers with
422 the other groups (i.e., intergroup discussions) and with the professors, were very useful and
423 helped me assess my understanding so I know how best to improve my performance..."

424 ***Movement***

425 This category encompassed the students' reflections on the physical activity and mobility within their
426 learning environment.

427 22/S: "...We navigated through real-life scenarios, honing our skills in administering drugs.
428 This hands-on experience heightened our awareness of crucial pre-administration details,
429 emphasizing the specific modes of drug delivery and the importance of proper preservation
430 techniques..."

431 Relevant to movements, changes, and shifts, some students offered insightful recommendations to
432 enhance the sessions' effectiveness, proposing ideas to make the learning experience more
433 beneficial for everyone involved.

434 56/T "...Perhaps introducing a multimedia element, such as incorporating pictures or videos
435 for us to analyze, could maximize dynamism in our learning experience, this will add a hands-
436 on dimension to our problem-solving process, fostering a more interactive and immersive
437 educational environment..."

438 70/T: "...Imagine if our tutorials adopted a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) or flipped learning
439 style instead of traditional lectures. This would enable student-guided exploration of long
440 cases, analysing them independently and/ or collaboratively. This shift in approach would not
441 only deepen our understanding but also foster a sense of movement as we actively dissect
442 and solve real-life scenarios..."

443 **Reinforcement of Learning**

444 This theme revolved around the students' reflections on the different ways by which their learning
445 experiences were strengthened through the respective teaching modalities. The students alluded to
446 the knowledge gained, skills developed, and attitude shifts that they noticed.

447 ***Knowledge***

448 This category revolved around students' thoughts about the acquisition and comprehension of
449 information, facts, and concepts. This category underscored the value that the students associate
450 with deliberate, structured approaches to consolidate knowledge, leading (in the students' opinion)
451 to more robust and enduring learning outcomes. The students alluded to how the respective
452 modalities affected their capacity to retain knowledge.

453 2/S: "...Despite my oversight in revising, I found the session highly beneficial. I believe that
454 actively engaging with the material in this manner will enhance my retention of the
455 information..."

456 10/S: "...Engaging with practical applications of the lesson significantly enhanced my
457 comprehension. I find it more effective to learn by visually observing and actively identifying
458 concepts, rather than by solely relying on classroom problem-solving..."

459 They also reflected upon how the modality affected their capacity to put into practice the knowledge
460 that they had acquired.

461 51/T: "...The session facilitated a deeper comprehension of both the drugs themselves and
462 the various routes of administration. This practical application of concepts allowed me to
463 grasp the intricacies and nuances involved, leading to a more comprehensive understanding
464 of the subject matter..."

465 24/S: "...Interacting with patients provided me with a first-hand understanding of the
466 urgency in making decisions and the rationale behind selecting specific administration routes
467 over others. It also highlighted the practical convenience of selecting certain drug delivery
468 methods..."

469 **Skills**

470 This category pertained to the students' ideas about the practical application and reinforcement of
471 learned concepts. Furthermore, it emphasized the importance of having a holistic approach which
472 integrates theoretical knowledge with practical proficiency to comprehensively attain the learning
473 outcomes.

474 31/S: "...We acquired practical expertise in administering medications within real-world
475 scenarios. Additionally, we delved into pivotal pre-administration considerations,
476 encompassing a comprehensive understanding of the appropriate mode of delivery for each

477 specific drug, as well as the critical aspect of ensuring the optimal preservation conditions for
478 these medications...”

479 16/S: “...Engaging with these scenarios proved instrumental in enabling me to apply
480 theoretical knowledge to actual real-life situations. It honed my ability to think swiftly and
481 make critical decisions, particularly in high-stakes, life-threatening situations...”

482 **Attitudes**

483 This category encompassed students' disposition, motivation, and mindset toward the learning that
484 occurred through both modalities. It shed light on the critical role of nurturing a constructive
485 learning attitude for reinforcement and optimization of the learning process.

486 37/S: “...This session offered me a valuable glimpse into the realities of medical practice. It
487 provided a first-hand understanding of the day-to-day operations, decision-making
488 processes, and the intricate dynamics involved in the field. This practical exposure went
489 beyond theoretical knowledge, offering a more vivid and tangible perspective on the
490 intricacies of working in a medical setting...”

491 60/T: “...The tutorial cases served to reinforce the main points and objectives covered in the
492 lecture. This experience has significantly broadened my understanding of the inner workings
493 of medical practice, and I am truly grateful for the opportunity it provided. It has illuminated
494 the fact that there is a wealth of knowledge to be gained beyond the confines of textbooks,
495 and I am genuinely enthusiastic about embracing it all. The hands-on exposure has sparked a
496 genuine passion within me for the field, and I am eager to delve even further into the
497 practical applications of this knowledge...”

498 The students' attitudes indicated a preference for high-fidelity simulation sessions over case-based
499 tutorial sessions, underscoring their enthusiasm for hands-on, interactive learning experiences.

500 74/T: "... The tutorial cases not only supported the lecture content but also enhanced my
501 understanding. The simulation made the information more accessible and easier to grasp.
502 The interactive nature of the simulation contributed significantly to my learning
503 experience..."

504 89/T: "...Unlike a conventional tutorial, the simulation aspect facilitated a hands-on
505 approach, making complex information more digestible and accessible. This not only
506 supported the content from the lectures but also fostered a more comprehensive and
507 practical understanding of the material. Overall, the tutorial cases offered a unique and
508 effective learning opportunity that surpassed the typical tutorial session in terms of
509 interactivity and depth of understanding..."

510 **Level of Realism**

511 This theme revolved around the students' perception of the degree of authenticity and practical
512 relevance incorporated into educational activities. It emphasized the value that the students put on
513 bridging theoretical knowledge with real-world applications to create meaningful and impactful
514 learning experiences.

515 **Fidelity**

516 This category denoted the students' opinions on the learning environment around high-fidelity
517 simulation that mimicked real-world conditions. The students shared their perceptions of the
518 importance of offering them those true-to-life learning experiences, and how they believe it
519 enhanced their educational development. According to the students, the real-life scenarios fed
520 directly into improving their learning experience.

521 4/S: "...I found great satisfaction in translating theoretical concepts into practical
522 applications. Witnessing the application of our classroom learning in a scenario that

523 replicated real-life situations not only motivated my active participation but also stimulated a
524 deeper and more engaged learning experience...”

525 9/S: “...It served to fortify crucial concepts and provided us with an opportunity to immerse
526 ourselves in real-life scenarios. This practical exposure is invaluable, equipping us with the
527 skills to intervene effectively and conduct swift analyses when faced with similar conditions
528 in actual patient situations...”

529 The students also discussed how the real-life scenario and hands-on learning enabled putting the
530 theoretical knowledge into practice.

531 13/T: “...It proved to be an enriching experience, offering me a tangible, real-life outlook on
532 the theoretical knowledge I had acquired. This practical application not only solidified my
533 understanding but also allowed me to connect the dots between classroom learning and its
534 real-world implications, making the educational experience more meaningful and relevant...”

535 61/T: “...The session goes beyond mere theoretical instruction by presenting us with
536 potential real-life scenarios to apply the knowledge we've gained. What makes this
537 experience particularly valuable is its ability to integrate concepts from various courses,
538 allowing us to grasp the bigger picture...”

539 ***Immersiveness*** This category reflected the student's learning experience in terms of where the
540 educational environment engaged the senses and created a deeply involving learning atmosphere. It
541 emphasized the importance of creating immersive environments to augment the realism and impact
542 of educational experiences.

543 62/T: “...We have cultivated the mindset of a pharmacist. These sessions have not just been
544 about absorbing facts; they have trained us to think critically. From medication management
545 to dosage calculations, we have learned to analyse medical information with precision,
546 considering factors like drug interactions and patient well-being...”

547 The students reflected on how engaging in real-life scenarios during the sessions induced stress as
548 they grappled with the challenges that mirror the sophistication of the healthcare environment.

549 23/S: "...This approach proves invaluable in preparing for the challenges of a stressful
550 hospital setting, providing a more realistic and dynamic learning experience. It allows us to
551 seamlessly transition from theory to practice, fostering a deeper understanding and better
552 equipping us to navigate the complexities of our future roles in healthcare..."

553 23/S: "...In essence, the stress we encounter in these sessions is constructive, molding us into
554 more resilient and adept future pharmacists. It not only deepens our understanding but also
555 instils a sense of confidence, knowing that we are better equipped to handle the demands of
556 our profession when the stakes are high..."

557 **Output of quantitative analysis- students' perception**

558 Two closed-ended questions from the respective survey were utilized to investigate the students'
559 perspectives of their experience with high-fidelity simulation compared to the case-based tutorial
560 sessions after they completed sessions of both modalities. For the first question about the preferred
561 method of learning pharmacology, the majority of students (90.5%) preferred the high-fidelity
562 simulation method over the traditional case-based tutorial session (9.5%). Responses to the second
563 question revealed that 82.5% of the students found high-fidelity simulation to be more useful, in
564 comparison to case-based tutorial sessions (17.5%) (Figure 5).

565

566 **Figure 5.** Bar graph illustrating the students' preference and perceived usefulness of high-fidelity
567 simulation versus case-based tutorial sessions for delivery of pharmacology teaching.

568 **Integration**

569 Integrating the outcomes of the thematic analysis with those of the quantitative analyses revealed a
570 comprehensive understanding of the situation, illustrated in the study's side-by-side joint display
571 (Figure 6). The merging of findings (i.e., primary inferences) enabled the development of a thorough

572 understanding of the students' experience with high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial
573 sessions; it brought together findings about the students' perception and their performance. As such,
574 the integration led to three groupings of meta-inferences: Satisfaction, Preferences, and Retained
575 Knowledge. The students expressed, in the narrative data, satisfaction with and appreciation of both
576 teaching modalities. There appeared to be no such observations in the output of quantitative
577 analysis. Accordingly, for the 'Satisfaction' meta-inference, the integration led to an expansion of the
578 overall viewpoint. For the students' preferences, the qualitative analysis highlighted that the
579 students favour high-fidelity simulation considering the attributes that they value (namely: variation
580 in the learning experiences, means by which the modalities reinforced the learning, and the extent to
581 which the learning environment mimicked reality). Along those lines, part of the quantitative data
582 analysis showed that the students prefer high-fidelity simulation and find them more useful. This
583 shows that for the 'Preferences' meta-inference, the integration allowed for both confirmation and
584 expansion of the overall viewpoint. As for the effect of the teaching modality on the retention of
585 knowledge, the quantitative analysis showed that there is no statistically significant change in
586 knowledge retention between both modalities, whilst the qualitative data analysis showed that the
587 students perceive the high-fidelity simulation to reinforce learning more than case-based tutorial
588 sessions. Accordingly, for the 'Retained Knowledge' meta-inference, the integration led to a
589 refinement in the overall viewpoint.

590

591 **Figure 6.** *Output of the iterative joint display analysis process, resulting in three meta-inferences:*
592 *Satisfaction, Preferences, and Retained Knowledge. The secondary colour Purple emerged by mixing*
593 *the primary colour Red with the primary colour Blue (which constitutes an analogy of the lateral and*
594 *critical thinking that took place to generate the meta-inferences from the integration of two sets of*
595 *primary inferences). For the 'Satisfaction' meta-inference, integrating the quantitative with the*
596 *qualitative inferences led to an expansion in the overall viewpoint. For the 'Preferences' meta-*
597 *inference, the integration led to both: confirmation and expansion of the overall viewpoint. As for the*
598 *'Retained Knowledge' meta-inference, the integration led to the refinement of the overall viewpoint.*

599 Discussion

600 This study adds to the paucity of literature regarding the incorporation of high-fidelity simulation into
601 the pharmacology course in undergraduate medical studies. Most studies regarding the effects of

602 high-fidelity simulation in comparison to case-based tutorial sessions rely on observations, without
603 any empirical research component (40). The current study investigated the impact of high-fidelity
604 simulation and case-based tutorial sessions on Year 2 medical students' retention of pharmacology
605 knowledge. Additionally, the study explored the personal experience of individual students and their
606 subjective perception of both teaching methods. The results of this study revealed no statistically
607 significant difference in knowledge retention, as measured by performance on the 10-MCQ quiz,
608 between the two teaching modalities. The participating undergraduate medical students were
609 satisfied with both high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions for pharmacology
610 teaching, while favouring the high-fidelity simulation modality and finding it to be more useful.
611 Students brought up three groups of characteristics that they valued in both the high-fidelity
612 simulation and case-based tutorial sessions. These attributes include: the variation in the learning
613 experiences that both modalities offer, how the respective modalities reinforce the learning, and the
614 extent to which the learning environment (characteristic of each modality) mimics the reality.
615 Collectively, those attributes, constitute a novel conceptual framework, namely: Differentiators of
616 Pharmacology Teaching Modalities, that the current study introduced. This framework can enable
617 health professions' educators in systematically considering, when designing pharmacology curricula,
618 what students perceive to differentiate teaching modalities.

619 In alignment with previously conducted studies (41-43), the quantitative analysis of the current study
620 showed that the choice of modality did not affect the students' knowledge retention. However, the
621 qualitative analysis revealed that the students perceived the high-fidelity simulation to reinforce
622 their learning of pharmacology more than case-based tutorial sessions. Similar findings have been
623 observed in a previously conducted randomized controlled trial which compared simulation-based
624 learning to traditional lectures in teaching the diagnosis and management of bronchial asthma (43).
625 Thus, it is worth considering both the modality's effect on students' performance and the students'
626 perception of the learning experiences in deciding whether or not to adapt it.

627 For the students participating in this study, both modalities introduced variations in the learning
628 experiences in comparison to traditional lectures, yet the high-fidelity simulation was perceived to be
629 more interactive, entailing more physical movement. Along those lines, a previously conducted
630 mixed methods cross-over study showed that students appreciated the movement and interactions
631 integral to high-fidelity simulation (44). Moreover, another study which relied on the feedback of 103
632 fifth year medical students, who took part in a simulation training in nephrology, revealed that the
633 students' appreciated the dynamism integral to high-fidelity simulation and found it to be interesting
634 (45). Relevantly, a prospective crossover observational study showed that high-fidelity simulation
635 was superior (relative to other teaching modalities) in harvesting leadership, teamwork, and task
636 management skills (46). Also, a thematic analysis of data collected from interviews with students
637 identified three types of student engagement in the simulation-based learning environment:
638 reflective engagement, performance engagement, and interactive engagement (47).

639 Although, in the current study, both modalities appeared to contribute to reinforcing competencies,
640 including knowledge, skills, and attitudes, high-fidelity simulation was perceived by the students to
641 be more effective in this regard. Similarly, a previous examination of 177 undergraduate nursing
642 students in recognizing and responding to hypovolemia showed that high-fidelity simulation develop
643 various competencies including knowledge about the subject matter and attitudes (e.g., self-
644 confidence) (48). Another study also proved the value of high-fidelity simulation on the development
645 of skills, including but not limited to flexible and reflective thinking (49).

646 The current study also showed that both modalities were thought to bring the subject matter closer
647 to reality, although the high-fidelity simulation was considered significantly more immersive. It is
648 worth reiterating that simulation has been increasingly used by medical schools to provide students
649 with a safe environment to practice various skills, ranging from hands-on medication administration
650 to complex decision-making skills that mimic real-life clinical scenarios (50). Simulation comes in
651 various levels of fidelity. Low-fidelity simulation encompasses basic mannequins or computer

652 programs that represent simplified aspects of real-world scenarios. Medium-fidelity simulation
653 includes more advanced models and virtual environments that offer a closer approximation to real-
654 life scenarios. Finally, high-fidelity simulation (as previously described in the Introduction section)
655 utilizes advanced, often interactive technology and realistic human mannequin to closely mimic real-
656 world scenarios, providing an immersive learning experience. Yet, there remains a dilemma
657 concerning the effectiveness of high-fidelity simulation when compared to case-based tutorial
658 sessions in pharmacology education, especially when considering cost-to-benefit ratio, given that
659 high-fidelity simulation is costly (51), and requires ample of time and resources in both the planning
660 and implementation phases.

661 It is suggested that appraising the value of simulation-based medical education requires complete
662 accounting and reporting of cost. Various methods of cost analysis exist, each meant to address a
663 focused economic research question (24). A previously conducted systematic literature review, aimed
664 at summarizing studies that contain an economic analysis of simulation-based medical education for
665 training of health professions learners, showed that most studies focused on the equipment and
666 materials cost, mainly the price of the simulator, and hence, were of the most limited form of cost
667 analysis: basic cost/cost feasibility analysis (52). It is suggested that this cost analysis (i.e., evaluating
668 only cost) is useful if the evaluator wants to simply know how much a particular learning and
669 teaching intervention costs, and whether it can be executed within budgetary constraints. However,
670 if the evaluator wants to be able to reach conclusions not solely about cost, but also about the
671 relative benefits or effectiveness of a range of interventions, a cost-benefit (i.e., evaluating costs and
672 monetary outcomes) or cost-effectiveness (i.e., evaluating costs and educational outcomes) is
673 required (53). From this perspective, it is important to consider leveraging high-fidelity simulation
674 only where it is likely to add sufficient value (in terms of benefit, effectiveness, and utility), which
675 requires a full-economic evaluation (54). For instance, high-fidelity simulation has been shown to
676 improve decision-making skills, as well as support in learning effective communication with patients,
677 and thus its use in such instances is greatly encouraged (55). Moreover, there is a subset of medical

678 education where simulation-based learning has demonstrated great superiority over traditional
679 lecture-based sessions. Such examples include more hands-on skills such as surgical specialties,
680 obstetrics emergencies, and the use of medical equipment such as ultrasound (56, 57).

681 The students' reflective descriptions of their experiences with high-fidelity simulation in
682 pharmacology teaching reveal the value of designing the learning intervention in alignment with
683 both Kolb's experiential learning cycle (13, 14) and social constructionism learning theory (18, 19).
684 Relying on those experiential learning theories enabled maximizing the reflections (and in turn
685 development) that the students go through on an individual basis as part of the experience, along
686 with the growth that occurs due to the students' active participation and engagement with others
687 while immersed in the environment of learning.

688 The current study exhibited the value of deploying mixed methods research in evaluating the efficacy
689 and effectiveness of learning and teaching interventions. This research design enabled tapping into
690 more than one level of analysis which offered a systemic perspective of the students' learning
691 experience, better informing associated decisions and continuous quality enhancement activities
692 (58). This is in alignment with the literature that encourages employing models such as Kirkpatrick
693 (31) and LTEM (32) when deciding on mechanisms of evaluating learning and teaching interventions
694 (which ideally needs to be effectively done as part of the planning for the respective learning and
695 teaching interventions). In conjunction with mixed methods research design, such evaluation models
696 hold ample of potential in raising the rigor of institutional research activities conducted primarily for
697 performance improvement in medical education (58). Besides the various levels of analysis that were
698 captured via the chosen research design, the output of the integration covered more than one level,
699 as well, where 'satisfaction' and 'preferences' are more related to the students' reaction to the
700 learning experience, and 'retained knowledge' corresponds mostly to the competencies developed
701 as a consequence to the learning and teaching intervention.

702 This study showed that both modalities fostered self-regulated learning (10, 59), where (according to
703 the students) high-fidelity simulation was more influential (relative to case-based tutorial sessions) in
704 this regard. The students expressed a lot of enthusiasm around the interactive, hands-on learning
705 experiences integral to high-fidelity simulation, that were designed to catalyse students' reflective
706 practice and their active participation in the experiences themselves.

707 This study has a few limitations. Although the choice of mixed methods research design generated
708 in-depth insights, the generalizability of the findings is limited to universities that are contextually
709 similar to MBRU. Hence, it is recommended for future studies to include multiple medical colleges,
710 and/or several cohorts within the same college. Such a study can be longitudinal in nature to allow
711 for investigating causality between variables since this study was restricted to uncovering
712 associations. Lastly, the current study mainly focused on knowledge retention assessed by multiple-
713 choice questions, leaving room for future research to explore other dimensions of learning
714 outcomes, both specific and non-specific to pharmacology courses including practical skills
715 application and clinical decision-making.

716 Conclusion

717 This research investigated the impact of high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions on
718 knowledge retention of Year 2 medical students in pharmacology, as well as their perception on both
719 modalities. While there was no statistically significant difference in students' knowledge retention
720 between high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions, the study highlighted students'
721 preference for high-fidelity simulation, given the variation of experiences, reinforcing of learning, and
722 extent of realism that they believe was offered by high-fidelity simulation compared to case-based
723 tutorial sessions. This brings forth the value of anchoring the design of high-fidelity simulation in
724 experiential learning theories. The study advocates caution in adapting high-fidelity simulation,
725 where careful evaluation can lend itself to identifying contexts where it is most effective.

726 Disclosure

727 The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

728 [Acknowledgements](#)

729 The authors would like to thank the Year 2 medical students who participated in this research, and to
730 acknowledge the valuable statistics' advice that they received from Professor Jeyaseelan
731 Lakshmanan. They would also like to extend gratitude to Professor Glenn Matfin and Ms. Helen
732 Henderson, along with the rest of the staff members at the Khalaf Ahmad Al Habtoor Medical
733 Simulation Center at MBRU for their support in the planning and implementation of the learning and
734 teaching interventions reported upon in the current study.

735 References

- 736 1. Fasinu PS, Wilborn TW. Pharmacology education in the medical curriculum: Challenges and
737 opportunities for improvement. *Pharmacol Res Perspect*. 2024;12(1):e1178.
- 738 2. Engels F. Pharmacology education: Reflections and challenges. *Eur J Pharmacol*.
739 2018;833:392-5.
- 740 3. Butler JA. Use of teaching methods within the lecture format. *Med Teach*. 1992;14(1):11-25.
- 741 4. Meng X, Yang L, Sun H, Du X, Yang B, Guo H. Using a Novel Student-centered Teaching
742 Method to Improve Pharmacy Student Learning. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2019;83(2):6505.
- 743 5. Ghosh S. Combination of didactic lectures and case-oriented problem-solving tutorials
744 toward better learning: perceptions of students from a conventional medical curriculum. *Adv Physiol*
745 *Educ*. 2007;31(2):193-7.
- 746 6. Guarner J, Amukele T, Mehari M, Gemechu T, Woldeamanuel Y, Winkler AM, et al. Building
747 capacity in laboratory medicine in Africa by increasing physician involvement: a laboratory medicine
748 course for clinicians. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2015;143(3):405-11.
- 749 7. Mandel HG, Cohn VH, Straw JA. The value of laboratory teaching in pharmacology. *J Med*
750 *Educ*. 1971;46(1):69-77.
- 751 8. Al-Elq AH. Simulation-based medical teaching and learning. *J Family Community Med*.
752 2010;17(1):35-40.
- 753 9. Gaba DM. The future vision of simulation in health care. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2004;13 Suppl
754 1(Suppl 1):i2-10.
- 755 10. Panadero E. A Review of Self-regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions for
756 Research. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:422.
- 757 11. Zimmerman BJ, Moylan AR. Self-regulation: Where metacognition and motivation intersect.
758 *Handbook of metacognition in education. The educational psychology series*. New York, NY, US:
759 Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group; 2009. p. 299-315.
- 760 12. Zigmont JJ, Kappus LJ, Sudikoff SN. Theoretical foundations of learning through simulation.
761 *Semin Perinatol*. 2011;35(2):47-51.
- 762 13. Wijnen-Meijer M, Brandhuber T, Schneider A, Berberat PO. Implementing Kolb's Experiential
763 Learning Cycle by Linking Real Experience, Case-Based Discussion and Simulation. *J Med Educ Curric*
764 *Dev*. 2022;9:23821205221091511.
- 765 14. Gordon SP. Integrating the Experiential Learning Cycle with Educational Supervision. *Journal*
766 *of Educational Supervision*. 2022.
- 767 15. Yardley S, Teunissen PW, Dornan T. Experiential learning: transforming theory into practice.
768 *Med Teach*. 2012;34(2):161-4.
- 769 16. Seaman J, Brown M, Quay J. The Evolution of Experiential Learning Theory: Tracing Lines of
770 Research in the JEE. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 2017;40(4):NP1-NP21.
- 771 17. Bourgault du Coudray C. Theory and Praxis in Experiential Education: Some Insights From
772 Gestalt Therapy. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 2020;43(2):156-70.
- 773 18. Quay J. Experience and Participation: Relating Theories of Learning. *Journal of Experiential*
774 *Education*. 2003;26(2):105-12.
- 775 19. Gordon JA, Wilkerson WM, Shaffer DW, Armstrong EG. "Practicing" medicine without risk:
776 students' and educators' responses to high-fidelity patient simulation. *Acad Med*. 2001;76(5):469-72.
- 777 20. Sittner BJ, Aebersold ML, Paige JB, Graham LL, Schram AP, Decker SI, et al. INACSL Standards
778 of Best Practice for Simulation: Past, Present, and Future. *Nurs Educ Perspect*. 2015;36(5):294-8.
- 779 21. Picard M, Curry N, Collins H, Soma L, Hill J. Comparison of High-Fidelity Simulation Versus
780 Didactic Instruction as a Reinforcement Intervention in a Comprehensive Curriculum for Radiology
781 Trainees in Learning Contrast Reaction Management: Does It Matter How We Refresh? *Acad Radiol*.
782 2015;22(10):1268-76.
- 783 22. Petscavage JM, Wang CL, Schopp JG, Paladin AM, Richardson ML, Bush WH, Jr. Cost analysis
784 and feasibility of high-fidelity simulation based radiology contrast reaction curriculum. *Acad Radiol*.
785 2011;18(1):107-12.

- 786 23. Zeng Q, Wang K, Liu W-x, Zeng J-z, Li X-l, Zhang Q-f, et al. Efficacy of high-fidelity simulation in
787 advanced life support training: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.
788 BMC Medical Education. 2023;23(1):664.
- 789 24. Astbury J, Ferguson J, Silverthorne J, Willis S, Schafheutle E. High-fidelity simulation-based
790 education in pre-registration healthcare programmes: a systematic review of reviews to inform
791 collaborative and interprofessional best practice. J Interprof Care. 2021;35(4):622-32.
- 792 25. Otaki F, AlHashmi D, Khamis AH, Azar AJ. Investigating the evolution of undergraduate
793 medical students' perception and performance in relation to an innovative curriculum-based
794 research module: A convergent mixed methods study launching the 8A-Model. PLoS One.
795 2023;18(1):e0280310.
- 796 26. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods designs-principles
797 and practices. Health Serv Res. 2013;48(6 Pt 2):2134-56.
- 798 27. Fetters MD. The Mixed Methods Research Workbook: Activities for Designing, Implementing,
799 and Publishing Projects. 2020 2024/02/05. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. Available from:
800 <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/the-mixed-methods-research-workbook>.
- 801 28. Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, Creswell JW. Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Results in
802 Health Science Mixed Methods Research Through Joint Displays. Ann Fam Med. 2015;13(6):554-61.
- 803 29. Jackson L, Otaki F. Using team-based learning to optimize undergraduate family medicine
804 clerkship training: mixed methods study. BMC Medical Education. 2023;23(1):422.
- 805 30. Otaki F, Amir-Rad F, Al-Halabi M, Baqain Z, Zary N. Self-reported adaptability among
806 postgraduate dental learners and their instructors: Accelerated change induced by COVID-19. PLoS
807 One. 2022;17(7):e0270420.
- 808 31. DA K. Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. 2014.
- 809 32. Work-Learning research 2018 [Available from: <https://www.worklearning.com/Item/>].
- 810 33. Molina-Azorin JF, Fetters MD. Building a Better World Through Mixed Methods Research.
811 Journal of Mixed Methods Research. 2019;13(3):275-81.
- 812 34. Liu H, Boyatzis RE. Focusing on Resilience and Renewal From Stress: The Role of Emotional
813 and Social Intelligence Competencies. Front Psychol. 2021;12:685829.
- 814 35. George LEE. Reconsidering Constructivism in Qualitative Research. Educational Philosophy
815 and Theory. 2012;44(4):403-12.
- 816 36. Cortazzi M. Handbook of Ethnography. 2001 2023/11/14. SAGE Publications Ltd. Available
817 from: <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/handbook-of-ethnography>.
- 818 37. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology.
819 2006;3:77-101.
- 820 38. Kiger ME, Varpio L. Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. Med Teach.
821 2020;42(8):846-54.
- 822 39. Levitt HM, Bamberg M, Creswell JW, Frost DM, Josselson R, Suárez-Orozco C. Journal article
823 reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in
824 psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. Am Psychol.
825 2018;73(1):26-46.
- 826 40. Cook DA, Hatala R, Brydges R, Zendejas B, Szostek JH, Wang AT, et al. Technology-enhanced
827 simulation for health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Jama.
828 2011;306(9):978-88.
- 829 41. Raleigh MF, Wilson GA, Moss DA, Reineke-Piper KA, Walden J, Fisher DJ, et al. Same Content,
830 Different Methods: Comparing Lecture, Engaged Classroom, and Simulation. Fam Med.
831 2018;50(2):100-5.
- 832 42. Tan GM, Ti LK, Tan K, Lee T. A comparison of screen-based simulation and conventional
833 lectures for undergraduate teaching of crisis management. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2008;36(4):565-9.
- 834 43. Tawfik MMR, Fayed AA, Dawood AF, Al Mussaed E, Ibrahim GH. Simulation-Based Learning
835 Versus Didactic Lecture in Teaching Bronchial Asthma for Undergraduate Medical Students: a Step
836 Toward Improvement of Clinical Competencies. Med Sci Educ. 2020;30(3):1061-8.

- 837 44. Macnamara AF, Bird K, Rigby A, Sathyapalan T, Hepburn D. High-fidelity simulation and virtual
838 reality: an evaluation of medical students' experiences. *BMJ Simul Technol Enhanc Learn*.
839 2021;7(6):528-35.
- 840 45. Pawłowicz E, Kulesza M, Szymańska A, Masajtis-Zagajewska A, Bartczak M, Nowicki M. 'I hear
841 and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand.' – incorporating high-fidelity medical
842 simulation into the undergraduate nephrology course. *Renal Failure*. 2020;42(1):1184-91.
- 843 46. Nicolaidis M, Theodorou E, Emin EI, Theodoulou I, Andersen N, Lymperopoulos N, et al.
844 Team performance training for medical students: Low vs high fidelity simulation. *Annals of Medicine
845 and Surgery*. 2020;55:308-15.
- 846 47. Wang Y, Ji Y. How do they learn: types and characteristics of medical and healthcare student
847 engagement in a simulation-based learning environment. *BMC Medical Education*. 2021;21(1):420.
- 848 48. Haddeland K, Slettebø Å, Svensson E, Tosterud RB, Wangensteen S, Fossum M. The Effects of
849 Using High-Fidelity Simulation in Undergraduate Nursing Education: A Multicenter Randomized
850 Controlled Trial with a Process Evaluation. *International Journal of Educational Research*.
851 2021;109:101813.
- 852 49. Hill HTL. The Impact of High-Fidelity Simulation on Nursing Student's Flexible and Reflective
853 Thinking in Higher Education. . *Higher Learning Research Communications*,. 2020.
- 854 50. Bishop CE, Maradiaga G, Freeman KR, Peters TR, Jackson JM. Simulation: an Innovative
855 Approach to Engaging Preclinical Medical Students with Bioethics. *Med Sci Educ*. 2021;31(2):325-9.
- 856 51. Maloney S, Haines T. Issues of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness for simulation in health
857 professions education. *Advances in Simulation*. 2016;1(1):13.
- 858 52. Zendejas B, Wang AT, Brydges R, Hamstra SJ, Cook DA. Cost: the missing outcome in
859 simulation-based medical education research: a systematic review. *Surgery*. 2013;153(2):160-76.
- 860 53. Foo J, Cook DA, Tolsgaard M, Rivers G, Cleland J, Walsh K, et al. How to conduct cost and
861 value analyses in health professions education: AMEE Guide No. 139. *Medical Teacher*.
862 2021;43(9):984-98.
- 863 54. Maloney S, Cook DA, Golub R, Foo J, Cleland J, Rivers G, et al. AMEE Guide No. 123 – How to
864 read studies of educational costs. *Medical Teacher*. 2019;41(5):497-504.
- 865 55. Offiah G, Ekpotu LP, Murphy S, Kane D, Gordon A, O'Sullivan M, et al. Evaluation of medical
866 student retention of clinical skills following simulation training. *BMC Med Educ*. 2019;19(1):263.
- 867 56. Supramaniam PR, Mittal M, Davies R, Lim LN, Arambage K. Didactic lectures versus
868 simulation training: a randomised pilot evaluation of its impact on surgical skill. *Gynecological
869 Surgery*. 2018;15:1-7.
- 870 57. Dayal AK, Fisher N, Magrane D, Goffman D, Bernstein PS, Katz NT. Simulation training
871 improves medical students' learning experiences when performing real vaginal deliveries. *Simul
872 Healthc*. 2009;4(3):155-9.
- 873 58. Otaki F, Khamis AH, AlGurg R, Nasaif M, Davis D, Zary N. Exploring the value of the learners'
874 perception of teaching effectiveness in informing faculty development needs: A mixed-methods
875 study. *MedEdPublish* (2016). 2020;9:213.
- 876 59. Moylan BJZM. Self-regulation: Where metacognition and motivation intersect. *Handbook of
877 metacognition in education*. : Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group; 2009. 299-315 p.




Figure 3




Figure 5





Figure 1





Figure 2

| Variation of experience | Reinforcement of learning | Level of realism |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interactions• Movement | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge• Skills• Attitudes | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fidelity• Immersiveness |

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.10.24305646>; this version posted April 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

| Quantitative → | Meta-inferences | ← Qualitative |
|---|---|---|
| - | Satisfaction <i>(Expansion)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students were satisfied with both the high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students preferred high-fidelity simulation and found them to be more useful (that case-based tutorial sessions) | Preferences <i>(Confirmation and Expansion)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characteristics valued in both modalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the variation in the learning experiences, ○ how the modalities reinforced the learning, and ○ the extent to which the learning environment mimicked the reality • Favouring high-fidelity simulation over case-based tutorial sessions (since the abovementioned valued characteristics were more pronounced in the high-fidelity simulation) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no statistically significant difference in knowledge retention (i.e., difference in the students' performance between two quizzes spaced over a period of five weeks) between high-fidelity simulation and case-based tutorial sessions | Retained Knowledge <i>(Refinement)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students expressed appreciation of how the high-fidelity simulation reinforced their learning, and that this valued characteristic sets this modality apart from case-based tutorial sessions |

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.10.24305646>; this version posted April 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 6