Original Research Article

Case-based learning in pharmacy practice: Observations from an Indian pharmacy college

ABSTRACT

Today, it's getting harder to learn a career in pharmacy. In addition to self-guided individual learning, pharmaceutical educators are required to find and adopt ways that support higher-level thinking, collaborative learning, and student motivation. One strategy to achieve these aims is to develop and use case-based learning as an addition to traditional teaching techniques. They support learner-centered, small-group, interactive learning experiences as opposed to large-group, teacher-centered, didactic instruction. A cross-over study between two groups equally exposed to both didactic lectures and case-based pedagogy musculoskeletal system diseases and drug therapy; which involves assessment of perception and small group responses towards case-based learning. The outcome of which is further investigated by administering an objective structured clinical examination. The vast majority of the students reported satisfaction with case-based learning sessions and highly appreciated this method of teaching pharmacotherapy of musculoskeletal system diseases. In our study, more than 93.22% of the students opined that they enjoyed sessions and it held their interest and motivated them to learn better. The 't-test between post-test 1 and post-test 2 scores was statistically significant with a P value of 0.0001. This suggests that CBL is effective in students' learning, and reinforces important concepts, strengthening information retention and long-term memory. In conclusion, the perception of pharmacy practice students towards case-based learning is highly contented and encountered a very positive impact on understanding and retention of knowledge in musculoskeletal system diseases and drug therapies.

Keywords: Cross over, didactic lectures, perception, post-test, pharmacy practice.

1. INTRODUCTION

Clinical and technology breakthroughs are occurring at a record pace challenging existing models of education and training of millennial graduates, urging a robust shift of pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences education to that of a continuum of professional development. Students to be successful out of the academic path need to acquire four core competency sets: knowledge, skills, attitude, and values; pharmaceutical educators are encouraged to find and implement ways to promote higher order thinking, and collaborative learning and to increase students' motivation. Complementing traditional instruction with case-based learning (CBL), problem-based learning (PBL), or simulation-based training (SBT), supported in real-world contexts, is one strategy for achieving these goals.

It is incumbent upon academic programs to move students from learning the material to applying that knowledge in a meaningful way [1]. Many health professions programs, including medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, nursing, and optometry are currently experimenting with variations of case-based learning to address this problem and to prepare the learner for the unexpected [2-6]. Furthermore, case-based learning allows the learner to go beyond

knowledge acquisition in the pedagogical process and proceed to the point of knowledge application.

CBL allows students to develop a collaborative, team-based approach to their education [7], and promote authentic learning [8]. The implementation and assessment of CBL is well documented in various levels of biomedical sciences such as Medicine [9] Geriatrics [10], Nursing [11], Therapeutics and Medicinal Chemistry [12], Pharmaceutics [13], Obstetrics and Gynecology [14], and Allied Health [15]. In our observation, literature is very dwarf in the incorporation of case-based learning in pharmacy education and practice in developing and industrialized countries like India, which mandated a transformed teaching-learning process for better rational practices with expanded patient care responsibilities. It is our goal with this text to share our experience in the design and implementation of a case-based approach to pharmacotherapeutics in musculoskeletal system diseases

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The current prospective observational exploratory study of six months duration (October 2021 - March 2022) approved by the institutional review board (RIPER/IRB/PP/2021/008) was performed in a self-financing, private, unaided, pharmacy institute of south India among students pursuing pharmacy practice program, which aimed to implement and evaluate a model of small group CBL to assess (a) the perception of students towards case-based learning, and (b) the effectiveness of case-based learning in understanding and retention of knowledge in musculoskeletal system disease of pharmacotherapeutics course (rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and gout).

The cross-over study between two groups of students equally exposed to both didactic lectures and case-based pedagogy in musculoskeletal system diseases and drug therapy; included assessment of perception and small group responses towards case-based learning. The outcome of which is further investigated by administering an objective structured clinical examination.

Study Procedure

The study was carried out on PharmD ($3^{rd}$and 4^{th}Year) students, after obtaining prior permission from the Research and Development Cell and Institutional Review Board of the institute, through a structured framework involving the following steps: (i) Six clinical cases were prepared for the case-based learning sessions, in consultation with the faculty of department of pharmacy practice RIPER Autonomous. (ii) The topics covered in the clinical cases were rheumatoid arthritis (RA), osteoarthritis (OA), and gout. (iii). CBL session questions will be validated and finalized based on faculty member inputs. (iv). During the CBL session, the students will be divided into subgroups. (v). Each subgroup will be provided with handouts of the clinical case scenario a week before the session, and will be asked to study the case. (vi). Group A will have three CBL sessions (each on Rheumatoid Arthritis, Osteoarthritis, and Gout) whereas Group B will have three DLs (didactic lectures) on the same topics. (vii). The students exposed to CBL will be administered with a feedback form, and the same group will be administered with another set of three cases for small group discussion and interactions and their experiences and responses will be documented. (viii). After three sessions, the cross-over of groups will be performed. (ix). Group A will have three (DLs) didactic lectures (each on rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and gout) whereas Group B will have three CBL sessions on the same topics. The students exposed to CBL will be administered with a feedback form, and the same group will be administered with another set of three cases for small group discussion and interactions and their experiences and responses will be documented. (x). CBL sessions and didactic lectures will be conducted in

the lecture hall and each lasted for a minimum of 60 to 90 minutes. (xi). Feedback questionnaires for students were designed, validated, and pretested with colleagues and students from the previous batch. The students' feedback form had two parts: (a) The first part: to assess perception towards CBL (5-point Likert Scale), and (b) The second part: to assess the small group experiences towards CBL case studies discussion (Close-ended questions). (xii). Post-test was conducted for the entire group of students immediately after the three CBL and DL sessions were completed, and then a repeat test was taken after 6 weeks duration from the first post-test. (The post-test was in an objective structured clinical examination - OSCE format).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Characteristics of study participants

In our study out of 59 student participants, 27.12% were male and 72.88% were female, in which 61.02% belonged to PharmD 3rd year and the rest 38.98% were PharmD 4th students respectively, results of which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of study participants

Program and Year	Gender distribution		Total (n%)
	Male (n%)	Female (n%)	
PharmD IIIYear	9(25)	27(75)	36(61.02)
PharmDIVYear	7(43.75)	16(56.25)	23(38.98)
Total	16(27.12)	43(72.88)	59

3.2 Student perception towards case-based learning

The study participants experienced case-based learning in musculoskeletal system disease (rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and gout) and pharmacotherapy, facilitated by the researcher followed by which feedback form designed with 5-point Likert scale was administered to assess the study participant's perception of sessions.

The vast majority of students expressed satisfaction with CBL sessions and great appreciation for this approach to teaching musculoskeletal system illnesses and drug therapy. CBL sessions were liked by more than 93.22% of students because it kept their attention and motivated them to learn more. Many students (52.54 %) felt that the cases taught in CBL sessions posed many challenging questions that helped them prepare for and improve clinical problem-solving. Students also opined that CBL improved their ability in terms of physical examination/drug monitoring skills/laboratory investigations interpretation. About (72.88%) of the students agreed that the case presented was relevant to the program and course curriculum. The majority of the students (93.22%) were in favor of CBL sessions in terms of benefits for knowledge retention and long-lasting memory. However, only (47.46%) stated that the cases facilitated active discussion, the responses of which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Student perception towards case-based learning

S. No	Inventories	5PointLikertScale				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Class Mean	SD
1	The cases were engaging and includes multiple disciplines	93.22	6.78	0	1.07	0.254
2	The case presented were pertinent to curriculum and program	72.88	27.12	0	1.27	0.448
3	The presentation/course was well-structured	76.27	22.03	1.7	1.25	0.477
4	The cases prompted lively debate	47.46	52.54	0	1.53	0.504
5	Case-based learning is beneficial to traditional teaching and learning methods	54.24	45.76	0	1.46	0.502
6	CBL enhanced laboratory investigation interpretation, drug monitoring, and physical examination skills	76.27	23.73	0	1.24	0.429
7	CBL enhanced my capacity to formulate therapeutic plans	62.71	37.29	0	1.37	0.488
8	CBL trained us for solving clinical problems	52.54	40.68	6.78	1.49	0.569
9	CBL promoted communication between the facilitator and the students	52.54	45.76	1.7	1.49	0.537
10	CBL teaching and learning process was enjoyable	71.19	27.12	1.7	1.31	0.5

3.3 Small group case-based learning response

In our study, pharmacy practice students of Group A and Group B after experiencing the CBL sessions were sub-grouped as small groups, and administered with another set of three cases. The observations of discussion, interactions, and experiences towards small group case-based learning established that female student responded more positively to tasks undertaken in the initial discussion sessions, responses of which are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Small group case-based learning response

S. No	Inventories	Yes		No	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
1	The session had a clear goal and purpose	16	43	0	0
2	Have you engaged in the small group discussion	16	38	0	5
3	Have you become more adept at analyzing the evidence and the case's background	16	36	0	7
4	Have you developed the capacity to make predictions and suggestions	15	40	1	3
5	Have you become more competent at presenting the point clearly	16	39	0	4
6	Sessions were beneficial for learning new skills	16	35	0	8
7	The concept map for each case study was helpful	16	42	0	1
8	Small group formulated learning objectives	15	42	1	1
9	Session emphasized teamwork	16	42	0	1
10	Facilitator would have fostered the conversation	9	40	7	3

better

3.4 Response towards objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) post-test 1 versus post-test 2

The outcome of case-based pedagogy towards musculoskeletal system disease and pharmacotherapy among pharmacy practice students was evaluated through objective structured clinical examinations with 20 inventories administered twice to the students, as post-test 1 (for investigating the understanding), and the post-test 2 (for investigating the retention) with a time-interval difference of 6 weeks. The completed response sheets were collected and statistically analyzed to compute the results using Microsoft Excel and SPSS version 26. Qualitative data were expressed in the form of percentages and the quantitative data were expressed in the form of mean ± standard deviation. Student's "t" test was used to compare post-test 1 and post-test 2 scores and expressed in terms of "p" value. The value of $p<0.0001$ was considered statistically significant, the results of which are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Response towards objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) post-test 1 versus post-test 2

Inventories	Post-test 1			Post-test 2		
	Male (n =16)	Female (n =43)	Total (n =59)	Male (n =16)	Female (n =43)	Total (n =59)
Q1	14	36	50	15	38	53
Q2	8	28	36	10	33	43
Q3	14	36	50	15	39	54
Q4	12	29	41	13	33	46
Q5	7	27	34	10	34	44
Q6	14	25	39	15	32	47
Q7	14	24	38	15	30	45
Q8	14	28	42	15	33	48
Q9	14	28	42	15	35	50
Q10	14	28	42	15	34	49
Q11	11	16	27	13	28	41
Q12	11	37	48	13	39	52
Q13	10	29	39	12	35	47
Q14	12	34	46	13	38	51
Q15	14	37	51	15	39	54
Q16	13	32	45	14	37	51
Q17	13	33	46	14	36	50
Q18	14	28	42	15	32	47
Q19	14	35	49	15	37	52
Q20	14	23	37	15	31	46
Pvalue		0.0001*			0.0001*	

3.5 Comparison of the students score in the post-test 1 and post-test 2

In our study, the post-test 2 scores after 6 weeks of CBL sessions were significantly better than post-test 1 scores. The 't' test between post-test 1 and post-test 2 scores was statistically significant with a P value of 0.0001, which suggests that CBL is effective in students' learning, and reinforced important concepts, and thereby strengthens information retention and long-term memory, results of which are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of the students score in the pre-test and post-test

Post-test	Mean ± SD		P value
1	12.55 ±2.139	13.85 ±1.631	0.0001
2	29.65 ±5.422	34.65±3.200	0.0001
Total	42.2±7.561	48.5±4.831	0.0001

4. DISCUSSION

Case-based learning involves guided inquiry and is grounded in constructivism whereby students form new meanings by interacting with their knowledge and the environment [16]. In Medical [17-25], dentistry [26-30], nursing [31,32], occupational and physical therapy [33] or pre-health students, case-based learning demonstrates the use of clinical reasoning, suggests pertinent testing, develops a differential diagnosis, and therapeutic plan. CBL is an effective method of teaching–learning and the prospects of incorporating the same within the curriculum to make the learning more simplified and authentic has been explored by medical colleges in India [34,35]. The worldwide literature on case-based learning in pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences available is minuscule. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first of its kind performed to evaluate the perception, and effectiveness of case-based learning in terms of understanding and retention of knowledge among pharmacy practice students in India.

In our study, the basic characteristics of study participants showed nearly three-fourth of female (72.88%) students in comparison to male (27.12%), similar observations have been reported by Crawford et al, 2012 [36]. The perception of pharmacy practice students of our study towards case-based learning facilitated self-directed learning and team building capacity, in addition interest and inclination for enhancement of critical analysis and decision making in musculoskeletal system disease and pharmacotherapy, observation of which were consistent with other similar studies, but in the field of medical education [37,39].

Small-group case-based learning is an effective strategy for facilitating interprofessional learning, with interaction factors influencing student interest, learning, and satisfaction [40]. In our study, female student responded more positively to tasks undertaken in the initial discussion sessions, similar observation has been reported by Peplow et al, 1998 [41].

The current cross over study between two groups of pharmacy practice students equally exposed to both didactic lectures and case-based pedagogy in musculoskeletal system diseases and drug therapy revealed significantly higher learning, observations of which are similar to CBL studies performed in medical students [42-45].

In our study, the post-test 2 scores after 6 weeks of CBL sessions were significantly better than post-test 1 scores; which showcases retention of knowledge was well facilitated through case-based learning in pharmacy practice students. Ciraj et al, 2010 [46] observed the same in medical microbiology course.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the perception of pharmacy practice students towards case-based learning was highly contented, which encountered a significant outcome in terms of understanding and retention of knowledge in musculo-skeletal system diseases and drug therapies. The Indian professional pharmacy curriculum should facilitate integration of case-based learning into the students' daily instruction across all facets in order to adapt to the changing demands of the profession.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The institutional review board of the institute approved our study protocol with approval number (RIPER/IRB/PP/2021/008).

REFERENCES

1. Yolton DP, Yolton RL, Laukkanen HR. Implications of problem-based education for the future of optometric practice. Optometry. 2000;71(2):104-10.
2. Marinho VC, Richards D, Niederman R. Variation, certainty, evidence, and change in dental education: employing evidence-based dentistry in dental education. J Dent Educ. 2001;65(5):449-55.
3. Demarco R, Hayward L, Lynch M. Nursing students' experiences with and strategic approaches to case-based instruction: a replication and comparison study between two disciplines. J Nurs Educ. 2002;41(4):165-74.
4. Pungente MD, Wasan KM, Moffett C. Using Learning Styles to Evaluate First-Year Pharmacy Students' Preferences Toward Different Activities Associated with the Problem-Based Learning Approach. Am J Pharm Educ. 2003 Summer;66:119-124.
5. Tärnvik A. Advantages of using the multiple case method at the clinical stage of medical education. Med Teach. 2002;24(4):396-401.
6. Williams B. Case based learning--a review of the literature: is there scope for this educational paradigm in prehospital education? Emerg Med J. 2005;22(8):577-81.
7. Schmidt HG. Assumptions underlying self-directed learning may be false. Med Educ. 2000;34(4):243-5.
8. Jesus A, Gomes MJ, and Cruz A. A B-learning strategy for Therapeutics at the Bachelor Level. 2012. Presented at the FIP World Centennial Congress of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Amsterdam: International Pharmaceutical Federation.
9. Jamkar AV, Burdick W, Morahan P, Yemul VY, Sarmukadum, Singh G. Proposed model of case based learning for training undergraduate medical student in surgery. Indian J Surg. 2007;69(5):176-83.
10. Struck BD, Teasdale TA. Development and evaluation of a longitudinal Case Based Learning (CBL) experience for a geriatric medicine rotation. GerontolGeriatr Educ. 2008;28(3):105-14.
11. Yoo MS, Park JH, Lee SR. [The effects of case-based learning using video on clinical decision making and learning motivation in undergraduate nursing students]. J Korean AcadNurs. 2010;40(6):863-71.
12. Ives TJ, Deloatch KH, Ishaq KS. Integration of medicinal chemistry and pharmacotherapeutics courses: a case-based, learner-centered approach. Am J Pharm Educ. 1998;62(4):406–411.
13. Romero, R, Erikson S, and Haworth I. A decade of teaching pharmaceutics using case studies and problem-based learning. Am J Pharm Educ. 2004;68(2):1-10.
14. Massonetto JC, Marcellini C, Assis PS, de Toledo SF. Student responses to the introduction of case-based learning and practical activities into a theoretical obstetrics and gynaecology teaching programme. BMC Med Educ. 200429;4(1):26.
15. White P, Mckay J. Case-based learning introduced into an allied health programme. 2003. Paper presented at International Leteracy and Education Research Network Conference on Learning.

16. Lee, Virginia Snowden. “What is inquiry-guided learning?” New Directions for Teaching and Learning 2012 (2012): 5-14.
17. Ward R. Active, collaborative and case-based learning with computer-based case scenarios. Computers Education. 1998;30(1-2):103-10.
18. Eisenstein A, Vaisman L, Johnston-Cox H, Gallan A, Shaffer K, Vaughan D, O'Hara C, Joseph L. Integration of basic science and clinical medicine: the innovative approach of the cadaver biopsy project at the Boston University School of Medicine. Acad Med. 2014;89(1):50-3.
19. Srinivasan M, Wilkes M, Stevenson F, Nguyen T, Slavin S. Comparing problem-based learning with case-based learning: effects of a major curricular shift at two institutions. Acad Med. 2007;82(1):74-82.
20. Guarner J, Amukele T, Mehari M, Gemechu T, Woldeamanuel Y, Winkler AM, Asrat D, Wilson ML, del Rio C. Building capacity in laboratory medicine in Africa by increasing physician involvement: a laboratory medicine course for clinicians. Am J Clin Pathol. 2015;143(3):405-11.
21. FrengleyRW, Weller JM, Torrie J, Dzendrowskyj P, Yee B, Paul AM, Shulruf B, Henderson KM. The effect of a simulation-based training intervention on the performance of established critical care unit teams. Crit Care Med. 2011;39(12):2605-11.
22. Li S, Yu B, Yue J. Case-oriented self-learning and review in pharmacology teaching. Am J Med Sci. 2014;348(1):52-6.
23. Begley KJ, Coover KL, Tilleman JA, Haddad AM, Augustine SC. Medication therapy management training using case studies and the MirixaPro platform. Am J Pharm Educ. 2011;75(3):49.
24. Marshall LL, Nykamp D. Active-learning assignments to integrate basic science and clinical course material. Am J Pharm Educ. 2010;74(7):119.
25. Dupuis RE, Persky AM. Use of case-based learning in a clinical pharmacokinetics course. Am J Pharm Educ. 2008;72(2):29.
26. Ilgüy M, Ilgüy D, Fişekçioğlu E, Oktay I. Comparison of case-based and lecture-based learning in dental education using the SOLO taxonomy. J Dent Educ. 2014;78(11):1521-7.
27. Du GF, Li CZ, Shang SH, Xu XY, Chen HZ, Zhou G. Practising case-based learning in oral medicine for dental students in China. Eur J Dent Educ. 2013;17(4):225-8.
28. Keeve PL, Gerhards U, Arnold WA, Zimmer S, Zöllner A. Job requirements compared to dental school education: impact of a case-based learning curriculum. GMS Z Med Ausbild. 2012;29(4):Doc54.
29. Woelber JP, Hilbert TS, Ratka-Krüger P. Can easy-to-use software deliver effective e-learning in dental education? A randomised controlled study. Eur J Dent Educ. 2012;16(3):187-92.
30. Alcota M, Muñoz A, González FE. Diverse and participative learning methodologies: a remedial teaching intervention for low marks dental students in Chile. J Dent Educ. 2011;75(10):1390-5.
31. Giddens JF. The Neighborhood: a Web-based platform to support conceptual teaching and learning. Nurs Educ Perspect. 2007;28(5):251-6.
32. Pearson D, Pandya H. Shared learning in primary care: participants' views of the benefits of this approach. J Interprof Care. 2006;20(3):302-13.
33. Parmar SK, Rathinam BA. Introduction of vertical integration and case-based learning in anatomy for undergraduate physical therapy and occupational therapy students. Anat Sci Educ. 2011;4(3):170-3.
34. Kapoor N. Teaching pathology of breast cancer to medical undergraduates by case based learning method. Indian J Cancer. 2015;52(2):215-6.
35. Singhal A. Case-based Learning in Microbiology: Observations from a North West Indian Medical College. Int J Appl Basic Med Res. 2017;7(Suppl 1):S47-S51.

36. Crawford SY, Alhreish SK, Popovich NG. Comparison of learning styles of pharmacy students and faculty members. Am J Pharm Educ. 2012;76(10):192.
37. Chamberlain NR, Stuart MK, Singh VK, Sargentini NJ. Utilization of case presentations in medical microbiology to enhance relevance of basic science for medical students. Med Educ Online. 2012;17.
38. Dulloo, P., and Pathare, N.A.Case-based methodology: a method to enhance the learning of physiological basis of a cardiovascular and respiratory system to undergraduate medical students. American Journal of Educational Research. 2013;1(10):425-29.
39. Vora MB, Shah CJ. Case-based learning in pharmacology: Moving from teaching to learning. Int J Appl Basic Med Res. 2015;5(Suppl 1):S21-3.
40. Curran VR, Sharpe D, Forristall J, Flynn K. Student satisfaction and perceptions of small group process in case-based interprofessional learning. Med Teach. 2008;30(4):431-3.
41. Peplow P. Attitudes and examination performance of female and male medical students in an active, case-based learning programme in anatomy. Med Teach. 1998;20(4):349-55.
42. Rustagi, S.M., Prakash, S.H., Dave, V., Dhuria, R., & Gorla, S. Case Based learning in Neuroanatomy in Small Groups for First MBBS Students. Indian J Anat.2020;9(1):55-60.
43. Nair S.K, and Rai N. Comparing the Effectiveness of Case Based Learning with Conventional Teaching in Anatomy. Academia Anatomica International. 2019;5(2):34-36.
44. Blewett EL, Kisamore JL. Evaluation of an interactive, case-based review session in teaching medical microbiology. BMC Med Educ. 2009;27;9:56.
45. Tathe, S.S., and Singh, A.L. Case based lectures versus conventional lectures for teaching medical microbiology to undergraduate students.Int J Cur Res Rev. 2014;6(4):35-41.
46. Ciraj AM, Vinod P, Ramnarayan K. Enhancing active learning in microbiology through case based learning: experiences from an Indian medical school. Indian J PatholMicrobiol. 2010;53(4):729-33.

ABBREVIATIONS

CBL:Case-based learning; PBL:Problem-based learning; SBT:Simulation-based training; IRB:Institutional Review Board; PP:Pharmacy Practice; PharmD:Doctor of Pharmacy; RA:Rheumatoid Arthritis; OA:Osteoarthritis; DL:Didactic Lectures; OSCE:Objective Structured Clinical Examination; SPSS:Statistical Package for Social Sciences.