ABSTRACT

Objective: Pharmaceutical calculations are an essential aspect of learning for pharmacy students in order to avoid drug dose errors and maintain patient safety in future practice. Learning styles influence how lecturers approach the teaching-learning process. So far no specific learning preference is believed to be most appropriate for the pharmacy curriculum; however certain learning styles are favoured by students as they improve their understanding of course material, knowledge and performance.

Methods: 148 Master of pharmacy participants from the second and third year were given a questionnaire to complete during a compulsory Individual Readiness Assurance Test session. Participants were restricted to just one option.

Results: Workshops with a tutor was the most selected (36%) followed by 25% of participants favouring formative assessments, 28% selected workshops alone, 37% for whole-class lecturers and videos option was the least selected. Reasons for the most and least preferred learning styles were highlighted and separated into advantages and disadvantages using themes. In the knowledge test; 92% of participants selected “unsure” or “didn’t know” the answer; 29% had a partially correct answer and 19% selected incorrect answers.

The overall order of ranking arose in regards to the most beneficial learning style which enhances performance. The responses revealed a variety of advantages and disadvantages which were reflected between year groups and similar to views obtained from recent literature. Students reflected a lack of understanding on extemporaneous preparation (EPs) terms used in pharmaceutical compounding practices, thus the university should consider addressing the lack of awareness and consider the best teaching-learning style in doing so.

Conclusion: Overall the findings suggested that the sample students have similar views on the learning styles used to deliver pharmaceutical calculations on their academic performance to that expressed by the authors from recent published literature.
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INTRODUCTION

The use of pharmaceutical calculations (PCs) in practice is fundamental to patient safety [1, 2]. Pharmacists must calculate doses tailored for specific patients, avoiding both toxic and sub-therapeutic doses for any route of administration [3].

The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) requires pharmacy graduates to pass a registration examination in which one part is solely based on PCs. Candidates must achieve 70% to qualify [4]. Regular practice of various PCs throughout the course will build stable background at university [5].

In 2014, the University of Wolverhampton (UoW) altered their course structure. The new structure includes teaching the mathematical skills required, plus multiple opportunities within each academic year to practise, improve and evaluate PC skills [6].

A variety of learning styles and support materials are used by universities to improve teaching and academic performance [7]. To date, no specific delivery style has been identified as the most appropriate for the pharmacy curriculum, but certain styles have been preferred as they appear to improve students’ understanding of course material, overall knowledge and performance. This means students achieve more confidence in carrying out calculations, [9-11] to avoid drug dose errors and promote patient safety [2, 12].

One method of teaching PCs is via an e-learning, non-credit based module (topic tutorials, work booklets and self-assessments [13]. Students are enabled to progress at their own pace, in their own comfort zones. They gain direct feedback, increasing their understanding of the sub-topics [14]. However, students find some topics within the module less relevant to them or that tutorials to take up too much time and the degree of ease/difficulty is not uniform. Also, students who are less computer-literate are discouraged, [13]. Van [15] claims students attending traditional uniform. Also, students who are less computer-literate are discouraged, [13]. Van [15] claims students attending traditional face to face lectures greatly improved in performance when compared to e-learning modules.

The standard lecture format at UoW covers a presentation, made available 24 h before a timetabled session [16]. Both lecturers and students reportedly enjoy this style of teaching; benefits include interaction with lecturers’ face to face lectures greatly improved in performance when compared to e-learning modules.

Interactive workshops comprised of small groups of students’ solving practice-scenario challenging questions. Their workshops were designed to improve students’ skills to an appropriate level of understanding application and competence [10]. According to Batchelor [5] more than 50% of students learn better in workshops compared to lectures. Further, the use of team work within these sessions increased scores >20% compared to individual marks [9]. Workshops appear able to improve students’ understanding of course material, making them confident in carrying out calculations [9].

A more recent concept being used to teach PCs is video recordings; a complete presentation is recorded by the lecturer and made available to students to download or simply watch online [16]. In this model, lecturers are able to track student engagement and students are able revisit concepts multiple times to understand...
A pilot study was conducted (n=10) using students from year four of the MPharm course. From the study results two main alterations were made in light of the responses. A "Prefer not to say" option was added to questions relating to previous GCSE or A-level mathematics grades as half the students in the pilot refused to answer these questions and also decided not to circle the "Not applicable" option concerning the grade they had obtained in mathematics. Another change was the addition of directions to sets of questions, as it was noticed that students were selecting two or more options where only one was required. Thus, these specific directions restricted students from selecting a number of options and also clarified questions further.

Participants were given a questionnaire containing 22 questions and an information sheet, explaining the reasons to why they have been selected. The questionnaire was handed out before a compulsory Individual Readiness Assurance Test (iRAT) session, maximising attendance. No unique identifiers were included in the questionnaire and participants were verbally informed that all responses would be anonymous and confidential. They were also informed that there was no obligation to take part in the study. The method was applied to both year groups and all returned questions were recorded and accounted for.

The qualitative data was analysed thematically. The thematic analysis combined similar statements the quantitative data was analysed using tables and graphical charts, where trends in results were simply observed between the year groups. Student responses which were submitted incomplete or completely blank were not included in the final study population.

RESULTS
From a total of 168 students, 148 students took part in the study, equating to a response rate of 88% (table 2).

| Category                  | Year 2 | Year 3 | Total |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|-------|
| Number of students eligible | 90     | 78     | 168   |
| Number of participants    | 79     | 69     | 148   |
| Drop outs                 | 0      | 0      | 0     |
| Response rate (rounded to the nearest whole number) | 88%    | 88%    | 88%   |
The results gathered from questions 1-5 are presented in table 3. Of the participants, 93% had completed GSCE mathematics, with 1% opting to not state their grades and 5% reporting taking an equivalent qualification. In addition, 43% of students also completed A-level mathematics, with 4% opting not to state their grade.

**Table 3: Participants’ backgrounds before enrolling on the course**

| Category                                | Available responses | Number of year 2 students | Number of year 3 students | Total Number of students |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gender                                  |                    |                           |                           |                          |
| Male                                    | 39                 | 41                        | 80                        |                          |
| Female                                  | 40                 | 28                        | 68                        |                          |
| GCSE mathematics grade                  |                    |                           |                           |                          |
| A*                                      | 4                  | 13                        | 17                        |                          |
| A                                       | 26                 | 28                        | 54                        |                          |
| B                                       | 30                 | 20                        | 50                        |                          |
| C                                       | 13                 | 4                         | 17                        |                          |
| Prefer not to say                       | 1                  | 1                         | 2                         |                          |
| Not applicable                          | 5                  | 3                         | 8                         |                          |
| A-level mathematics grade               |                    |                           |                           |                          |
| A*                                      | 2                  | 1                         | 3                         |                          |
| A                                       | 1                  | 10                        | 11                        |                          |
| B                                       | 7                  | 16                        | 23                        |                          |
| C                                       | 9                  | 9                         | 18                        |                          |
| D                                       | 4                  | 4                         | 8                         |                          |
| Below D                                 | 1                  | 0                         | 1                         |                          |
| Prefer not to say                       | 3                  | 3                         | 6                         |                          |
| Not applicable                          | 52                 | 26                        | 78                        |                          |
| Pharmaceutical calculation sub-topics covered |                |                           |                           |                          |
| before learning about them at University|                    |                           |                           |                          |
| Doses calculation                       | 29                 | 27                        | 56                        |                          |
| Dilutions                               | 23                 | 40                        | 63                        |                          |
| Displacement volumes and values         | 22                 | 34                        | 56                        |                          |
| Concentrations                          | 31                 | 39                        | 70                        |                          |
| Quantities to supply                    | 18                 | 28                        | 46                        |                          |
| Molecular weights                       | 59                 | 58                        | 117                       |                          |
| Using provided formulae                 | 48                 | 43                        | 91                        |                          |
| Infusion rates                          | 6                  | 19                        | 25                        |                          |
| Pharmacokinetics                        | 10                 | 13                        | 23                        |                          |
| Health economics                        | 4                  | 6                         | 10                        |                          |

The results obtained from questions 6-9 are presented in table 4: 86% of participants felt PCs were vital for the MPharm degree and 85% agreed on the importance of calculations to their future careers. Also, 32% of students felt they either needed more support or lacked confidence in solving PCs compared to the 68% who generally felt confident or very confident. However, within both year groups, 10% of students scored under 70% in their final examination compared to 87% achieving a comfortable pass rate, possibly due to 52% of students regularly relying on additional text books, 10% on private tuition, 43% on videos and 4% on workbooks.

**Table 4: Responses to questions 6-9**

| Category                                | Available responses | Number of year 2 students | Number of year 3 students | Total number of students |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Importance of pharmaceutical calculations to MPharm degree | Not important at all | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|                                        | Somewhat important | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                                        | Important          | 8 | 3 | 11 |
|                                        | Very important     | 16 | 8 | 24 |
|                                        | Absolutely essential | 55 | 38 | 93 |
| Importance of pharmaceutical calculations to future job as a pharmacist | Not important at all | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                                        | Somewhat important | 4 | 0 | 4 |
|                                        | Important          | 8 | 7 | 15 |
|                                        | Very important     | 14 | 11 | 25 |
|                                        | Absolutely essential | 53 | 33 | 86 |
| Self-confidence at solving pharmaceutical calculation questions | Very confident | 10 | 16 | 26 |
|                                        | Confident          | 43 | 31 | 74 |
|                                        | Need more support  | 24 | 21 | 45 |
|                                        | Not confident      | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| End-of-year pharmaceutical calculations exam score | Can’t remember | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                                        | Less than 39%      | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|                                        | 39-69%             | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|                                        | 70%+               | 69 | 60 | 129 |
|                                        | Prefer not to say  | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Additional resources regularly relied on: | Text books         | 36 | 41 | 77 |
|                                        | Private tuition    | 7 | 8 | 15 |
|                                        | YouTube clips      | 33 | 30 | 63 |
|                                        | Other (Workbooks)  | 6 | 0 | 6 |
Table 5 reports participants' perception of the pre-registration exam. Generally within both year groups, more than 50% of participants were aware of all the different types of questions set by the GPhC, except for questions based around estimations of kidney functions and health economics. Also, 65% of students estimated the GPhC examination pass rate at 70% and over, where 6% estimated a pass mark of 50% or under.

Table 5: Responses to questions 10 and 11

| Category | Available responses | Number of year 2 students | Number of year 3 students | Total number of students |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Familiarity of the different type of questions set by the GPhC | Doses and dose regimens | 54 | 54 | 108 |
| | Dosage and unit conversion | 63 | 53 | 116 |
| | Estimations of kidney functions | 9 | 8 | 17 |
| | Displacement volumes and values | 43 | 44 | 87 |
| | Concentrations | 68 | 54 | 122 |
| | Dilutions, including concentrated waters | 48 | 45 | 93 |
| | Molecular weight | 54 | 47 | 101 |
| | Using provided formulae | 41 | 44 | 85 |
| | Infusion rates | 13 | 33 | 46 |
| | Pharmacokinetics | 19 | 14 | 35 |
| | Health economics | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | Quantity to supply | 39 | 37 | 76 |
| Understanding the pass % mark for the GPhC exam | 40% | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | 50% | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| | 70% | 45 | 51 | 96 |
| | 90-100% | 28 | 15 | 43 |

Presented in Table 6 are the categorised responses to question 12-19 which were collated and analysed using a thematic approach. Questions 12-19 were included at the request of teaching staff who wished to establish whether students are familiar with some of the key components of CP involving EPs. One hundred participants chose not to answer questions 12-19 leaving only 48 participants for this specific section.

Tables 7 and 8 are thematic analysis students' responses about the reasons of the most and least preferred learning styles.

Table 6: Responses to questions 12-19

| Questions | Themes derived | Responses (%) year 2 students | Responses (%) year 3 students | Responses (%) all participants |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| What therapeutic indication is potassium permanganate solution used for? | Answer incorrect | 83 | 17 | 13 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 33 | 67 | 87 |
| Why is potassium permanganate diluted before use? | Answer partly correct | 8 | 92 | 27 |
| | Answer incorrect | 78 | 22 | 19 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 42 | 58 | 54 |
| What adverse reactions can potassium permanganate solution cause? | Answer partly correct | 0 | 100 | 8 |
| | Answer incorrect | 20 | 80 | 10 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 46 | 54 | 81 |
| What is chloroform water used for? | Answer partly correct | 0 | 100 | 6 |
| | Answer incorrect | 0 | 100 | 2 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 43 | 57 | 92 |
| What percentage strength is single strength chloroform water? | Answer incorrect | 33 | 67 | 12.5 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 40 | 60 | 87.5 |
| What is the standard % v/v strength for: concentrated chloroform water, concentrated peppermint water, concentrated witch hazel? | Answer incorrect | 40 | 60 | 10 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| Betamethasone ointment standard strength is 0.1%w/v. Why might you wish to dilute this with white soft paraffin? | Answer partly correct | 38 | 62 | 17 |
| | Answer incorrect | 44 | 56 | 19 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 39 | 61 | 65 |
| Two antibiotic bottles both contain 1g of dry powder for reconstitution to 100 ml. To reconstitute these to 100 ml you add 75 ml of water to one bottle and 85 ml to the other bottle. Assuming both of these are correct, can you explain why these two volumes differ? | Answer partly correct | 86 | 14 | 29 |
| | Answer incorrect | 57 | 43 | 15 |
| | Unsure, don't know or made no comment | 33 | 67 | 56 |
Table 7: Thematic analysis on second year students' responses

| Learning styles | Whole-class lectures | Workbooks only | Formative assessments | Workshops with tutor and workbook | Videos |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Responses for most preferred | Visual learner (7) | Independent learning (7) | Practice questions (3) | Similar to the real exam (4) | Apply knowledge (6) |
|                  | Detailed explanations (2) |                  | Similar to the real exam (4) | | Can re-watch again (4) |
| Responses for least preferred | No interaction (5) | Can't ask questions (10) Hard to cover new concepts alone (3) | Independent learner (3) | Lack of concentration (4) | Lack of detail (4) |
|                  | Independent learner (3) |                  |            | | can't ask questions (10) |
|                  | learn at a different pace (3) |                  |            | | A single method shown (2) |

Participants who did not attempt the question: 19

*brackets indicate the number of students whose responses fit into the theme

Table 8: Thematic analysis on third year students' responses

| Learning styles | Whole-class Lectures | Workbooks only | Formative assessments | Workshops with tutor and workbook | Videos |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Responses for most preferred | Visual learner (4) | Independent learning (6) | Practice exam style questions (5) | Identify areas of weakness (3) | Apply knowledge (10) |
|                  | Interaction, can ask questions (4) |                  |                    | | Verbal explanations (8) |
| Responses for least preferred | difficult to keep up (8) | Can't ask questions (12) Hard for new concepts (4) | Not good as a learning style (2) | Loss of concentration (2) | No interaction (17) |
|                  | no interaction (6) |                  |                    | | No as straightforward when applying knowledge (4) |
|                  | Loss of attention (4) |                  |                    | | |

Participants who did not attempt the question: 8

*brackets indicate the number of students whose responses fit into the theme, Question 20 represented in fig. 1-5 ranked the learning styles in graphical charts. The responses from both second and third years were merged and ranked. Work shop was selected as first option, followed by formative assessments and workbooks and lectures and videos came last.

Fig. 1: The number of students who ranked the available learning styles as their most preferred

Fig. 2: The number of students who ranked the available learning styles as their second preferred
Fig. 3: The number of students who ranked the available learning styles as their third preferred

Fig. 4: The number of students who ranked the available learning styles as their fourth preferred

Fig. 5: The number of students who ranked the available learning styles as their least preferred

Table 6: Thematic analysis on the overall responses for question 21-22

| Learning styles | Whole-class lectures | Workbooks only | Formative assessments | Workshops with tutor and workbook | Videos |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Positive        | Visual learner (11)  | Independent learning (13) | Practice questions (8) | Apply knowledge (16) | Can re-watch again (4) |
|                 | Detailed explanations (2) | Good revision tool (4) | Similar to the real exam (4) | Ask for help (18) | Visual/audio learner (5) |
|                 | Interaction, can ask questions (4) | Recognise areas of weakness (10) | Number of methods shown and interaction (11) | Verbal explanations (8) |
| Negative        | No interaction (11) | Can't ask questions (22) | Pressure (9) | Independent learner (5) | Lack of detail (4) |
|                 | Independent learner (3) | Hard to cover new concept alone (7) | Not good as a learning style (2) | Loss of concentration (6) | Can't ask questions (10) |
|                 | Lack of concentration (8) |  | | | A single method shown (2) |
|                 | difficult to keep up (11) |  | | | No interaction (17) |
| No attempts     | 27                    |  |  | | No knowledge application (4) |

*Brackets indicate the number of students whose responses fit into the theme*
Finally question 21-22, presented in table 7 were analysed using the thematic analytic technique. Only 121 students answered the questions. During the analysis, a range of similar themes were found and all answers to questions were read thoroughly to identify repetition. The responses were initially assessed in terms of for and against each learning style; they were then counted and recorded in terms of occurrence of themes.

**DISCUSSION**

The results from this study are broadly similar to other published studies. An advantage of this study is that because our students are exposed to a variety of styles of delivery, they are able to make informed judgements about which methods they prefer, and why they believe enhances their academic performance and clearly these are not necessarily the same thing.

From our study, 67 participants (36%) stated they most preferred workshops with a tutor and a workbook as their learning style. From 121 students, 53 provided positive responses as to why they believed these workshops were more beneficial than the other listed options. The themes that emerged highlighted how "verbal explanations" was perceived to facilitate better understanding of the content and improved performance. Of the students who ranked workshops as their most preferred learning style, 96% of students achieved grades of 70% or over in their final PCs exam. Similarly, Ofsted and Brunn[9] expressed how the ‘interaction’ of staff and individuals at workshops was able to increase marks by around 20%. They suggested this may be due to having the opportunity to "ask for help" at the first instances or being able to "apply knowledge" they have gained from the demonstrations immediately and receive feedback. Within active workshops, tutors are perceived to demonstrating more than one cooperative learning style amongst the selection. 17 positive comments where received from 121 students, 69% of participants stated they were "independent learners" and therefore prefer workshops, tutors are perceived to facilitating better understanding of the content and improved performance. Of the students who ranked workshops as their most preferred learning style, 96% of these students achieved grades of 70% over, while 4% received grades of less than 39% in their final PCs examination. The most common theme derived by students was being "visual learners" and favouring the addition of "interaction" with tutors. The findings suggest like Fike [17], students felt the "interaction" allowed them to "ask questions" at any stage of the "detailed" demonstration and explanations, thus further enhancing students understanding, retention and academic performance. However 11 student stated how they were "unable to keep up" with whole-class lectures due to the fast pace. Also the full on lectures with large groups of individuals led students to "lacking in concentration" and "interaction", in which Pressler and Hoopes [10] believes smaller classes will increase interactive engagement, cooperation and are more preferable by students. A minority of students claimed to be "independent learners" and therefore prefer to work on their own, which is supported by Fike [17] who expresses how no significant differences have been portrayed in grades from students who attend lectures to those who wish not to.

Amongst 67 participants, 30% I preferred videos compared to the other options. 12 students left negative comments whilst 37 individuals mentioned negative aspects about the learning style. 95% of students who generally commented on videos achieved grades of 70% and over, while 5% achieved grades between 39-69%. Most students stated themselves as being "visual or audio learners" whereas others generally felt using videos had a benefit of being "re-watched" again to either relook at difficult concepts right from a beginner's stage or replaying videos for revision purposes. This finding is further supported by Powers [18] and Karyn [16], who express how revisiting concepts multiples of times aid understanding and enhances learning and performance. Also students favoured the "practice questions" built within the videos as it gave them the opportunity to attempt methods, in agreement with Karyn [16] this aspect is known to improve exam grades. On the other hand students claimed the videos were "not interactive" and "not as straightforward when applying knowledge" thus disadvantaging its benefits with a "single method" being demonstrated which "needed in detail". The comments in support of the above theme derived on how videos eliminate the chance of "asking questions" which is one of the reasons why students prefer face to face learning styles compared to those over a screen.

Finally although no assumptions should be made when analysing the results, the fact that 100 out of 148 (68%) students chose not to answer questions 12-19 implies that they were either unable to answer them or were not comfortable to do so. A range of 54-92% of participants took the opportunity to state either that they were "unsure" or "didn't know" the answers to the questions (table 5). Regardless of the year group, no single student was able to completely state the correct answers. The results reflect that the UoW need to consider addressing the issue of students being unaware or lacking understanding of the terms used within PC questions. They would also need to consider using a learning style which is most favoured by students and believed to be more beneficial in terms of enhancing performance.

One of the main limitations, was during the analysis of responses, a flaw was noticed in question 20, which asked students to rank the currently used learning styles for PCs in terms of preference and benefit. Less than half of participants ranked learning styles compared to the majority which used the numbers 1-5 as a Likert scale. This could have possibly been due to the layout of the question, where each learning style had an option to circle a number of options, or may have been due to students being unable to understand the question and therefore not reading the directions in bold which asked them to...
rank the learning styles. Another aspect which may have cause student to use the numbers as a Likert scale was the fact that the questionnaire was handed out just before an iRAT exam, and thus leading student to rush the questionnaire to start their iRAT which is known to count partly for a core module grade. For future projects, the administration of the questionnaire would not be handed out before a timetabled exam and numbers from 1-5 would not be displayed in a table format for circling, instead students would be asked to physically rank the learning styles by writing numbers 1-5 by each option and only using each number once.

LIMITATIONS

Participants had different educational levels background e.g, B-level, A-level and GSEC, which could have possibly led to students preferring a learning style which they are familiar with. For future studies, inclusion and exclusion criteria would be applied to participants. Specifically for this study, students who regularly rely on additional sources (such as text books/private tutors) would need to be excluded as they would be achieving help outside the scope of the learning styles used to teach them a sub-topics, which would in fact effect their perception of the learning style. All participants would need to have an equal mathematics and PCs background with no additional support to obtain a fair representation on the learning styles that influence performance.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, it can be said that a significant number of second and third year students in the study sample ranked the currently used learning style in the following order: workshops, formative assessments, workshops alone, whole-class lectures and videos, due to preferences which benefits their academic performance. The specific findings suggest that the views of students were similar to the authors from recent literature. It was also identified that student slack an understanding of extemporaneous preparation terms and thus require more support to appreciate the need to learn compounding calculations. The university could potentially use a learning style, such as practicums, to teach this aspect of calculations.
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