

1 Effect of introducing interprofessional education concepts on students of various healthcare
2 disciplines in the United Arab Emirates

3 Short title: Effect of interprofessional education on health professions' students

4 Shroque Zaher^{1*}, Farah Otaki², Nabil Zary³, Amina Al Marzouqi⁴, Rajan Radhakrishnan¹

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

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

9 ³Institute for Excellence in Health Professions Education, Mohammed Bin Rashid University
10 of Medicine and Health Sciences, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

11 ⁴College of Health Sciences, University of Sharjah, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.

12 *Corresponding Author:

13 Shroque Zaher

14 Email: Shroque.zaher@mbru.ac.ae

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background:**

17 The value of interprofessional education (IPE) in nurturing healthcare professionals and
18 shaping their professional identities and attitudes towards interdisciplinary teamwork and
19 collaboration is established in the literature. It is an emerging concept in the Middle East and
20 North Africa region and is new to the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

21 **Purpose:**

22 To investigate the effect of one of the first experiences of IPE in the UAE, which was
23 designed in alignment with the principles of the Situated Learning Theory, on students of
24 various healthcare disciplines readiness for interprofessional learning and collaboration.

25 **Methods:**

26 A pre-post intervention quantitative research design was adopted for this study to assess the
27 effectiveness of the intervention in raising the level of readiness for interprofessional work
28 among the participants. The participants included students of medicine, pharmacy, nursing,
29 and physiotherapy. Readiness for Interprofessional Learning Scale (RIPLS) was used as the
30 pre- and post- intervention assessments; data was analysed using SPSS.

31 **Results:**

32 The IPE intervention under investigation significantly increased the level of readiness to
33 engage in cross-disciplinary learning and collaboration among participating health
34 professions' students. In terms of the subscales, the participants' openness to engage in
35 teamwork was raised and their professional identity was fostered. Yet, no statistical
36 significance around clarity of roles and responsibilities was detected.

37 **Conclusion:**

38 IPE interventions hold the potential to significantly increase receptiveness to cross-
39 disciplinary learning and collaboration among health professions' students. The findings of
40 this study encourage other universities in the MENA region to adopt IPE to improve future

41 health professionals' capacity to develop shared understanding and mutual respect within
42 cross-disciplinary teams, which ultimately feed into improved quality of care and patient
43 outcome.

44 **Keywords:**

45 Interprofessional Education; IPE; Situated Learning Theory; Middle East and North Africa;
46 United Arab Emirates; Relational Coordination; Teamwork

47 **Introduction**

48 Interprofessional education (IPE) is an inter-collaborative approach to develop healthcare
49 students as future interprofessional team members, and is a practice promoted by the World
50 Health Organisation (WHO) as well as by various international organisations such as the
51 Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative (CIHC), the European Interprofessional
52 Education Network, and the UK Centre for the Advancement of Interprofessional Education
53 (1, 2).

54 Relational Coordination (RC) is a concept that appears to be central to IPE. It is defined as a
55 mutually-reinforcing process of interaction between communication and relationships carried
56 out for the purpose of task integration (3). The RC theory suggests that for a team to be
57 effectively coordinated, there is a need for the development of shared knowledge and
58 understanding among its team members, as well as for the team's relationships to be built on
59 shared goals and mutual respect (4). This highlights the importance of communication and
60 relating to one another for the purpose of task integration (5). Relationships help shape the
61 communication through which coordination occurs, and hence it is of utmost importance that
62 emphasis is placed on teamwork and collaboration in the training of students in healthcare
63 professions.

64 Today's patients have complex health needs and typically require more than one discipline to
65 address issues regarding their health status to attain improved patient outcomes. Many of the
66 patients' adverse events and poor health outcomes are attributed to misunderstanding or poor
67 communication among members of the interprofessional teams. Even though physicians and
68 nurses work together, their academic courses are separate and the training in effective
69 strategies of communication and care is often postponed to future professional practice (1, 6).
70 Studies support the introduction of interprofessional education at the start of healthcare

71 student's professional education rather than at the end (7, 8). This also applies to attempts to
72 prevent the formation of negative interprofessional attitudes.

73 Another theory that is central to our study is the Situated Learning Theory (SLT) which was
74 initially proposed by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger in the late 1980s. The concept of SLT
75 relates to the conceptualization that learning occurs within authentic context, culture, and
76 activity. It promotes the idea that students learn better in collaborative group settings and
77 when the activities are based on real-life experiences. Knowledge needs to be presented in
78 authentic contexts- settings and situations, that would typically require deploying that
79 knowledge. Social interaction and collaboration are essential components of SLT; learners
80 become involved in a "community-of-practice" which embodies certain beliefs and behaviors
81 to be acquired. As the beginners or novices move from the periphery of a community to its
82 center, they become more active and engaged within the culture and eventually assume the
83 role of experts (9).

84 It is established that IPE has the potential to positively influence attitudes and perceptions
85 towards interprofessional collaboration and increase the effectiveness of clinical decision-
86 making and ultimately the quality of care (10, 11). Many of the key competencies for IPE
87 relate primarily to teamwork, including skills in setting shared goals, communication,
88 knowledge of roles and responsibilities, and negotiation for conflict resolution (1, 5, 12).

89 Understanding one's own role and that of other professionals in the healthcare team is critical
90 in IPE. As students become more immersed in their own education, they are likely to gain a
91 better and more comprehensive understanding of their role in the interdisciplinary healthcare
92 team. Establishing a strong IPE foundation and opportunities for interprofessional learning
93 within healthcare education is therefore paramount, as has long been emphasized by the
94 WHO (2, 13). Yet, many health professionals have had little or no exposure to IPE activities

95 during their own training, and many clinical sites in which faculty oversee training lack
96 robust or explicit examples of interprofessional team-based care (14).

97 Interprofessional collaboration is an emerging concept in the Middle East and North Africa
98 (MENA) region and is new to the United Arab Emirates (UAE) (15). In this paper, we
99 describe one of the first structured experiences of IPE in the UAE, conducted at the
100 Mohammed Bin Rashid University of Medicine and Health Sciences (MBRU) in
101 collaboration with the University of Sharjah (UoS). This intervention was based on the
102 principles of the SLT with the understanding that “real” learning can only happen when it is
103 contextual (i.e., simulating an authentic experience that will engage the learners in complex,
104 realistic, and problem-centered activities while recasting the role of the teacher to a
105 facilitator) (16-18).

106 Given the value of IPE in nurturing healthcare professionals, shaping their professional
107 identities and attitudes toward interdisciplinary teamwork and collaboration, and ultimately in
108 improving outcomes of care (19), the purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of an
109 IPE intervention on student readiness for interprofessional learning and collaboration.

110 Accordingly, this study’s research questions are as follows:

- 111 • How efficacious was this IPE intervention at raising the level of readiness for
112 interprofessional learning and collaboration among the health professions’ student
113 participants?
- 114 • How did this IPE intervention affect the students’ knowledge, skills, and attitudes
115 around their teamwork and collaboration, professional identity, and roles and
116 responsibilities?
- 117 • How did the effect of this IPE intervention on the level of readiness for
118 interprofessional learning and coordination vary across different professions?

119 [Materials and methods](#)

120 [Context of the study](#)

121 The study was carried out at MBRU in collaboration with the UoS. MBRU is one of 8
122 medical colleges in the UAE and one of two in Dubai. MBRU was established in 2016, and
123 currently offers a 6-year Bachelor of Medicine, Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS) program as
124 well as postgraduate degrees in dentistry, nursing, and biomedical sciences. The first 3 years
125 of this MBBS program are preclinical and the remaining years are spent in the clinical
126 setting. Being a young university, MBRU's vision is focused on innovation and research, not
127 least so in the educational setting. In line with this, one of the longitudinal themes of the
128 MBBS program is enhancing multidisciplinary teamwork in students, which formed the basis
129 of our study.

130 The UoS was established in 1997 and offers 110 programs across multiple academic
131 disciplines. It offers both undergraduate and postgraduate degrees in medicine, nursing,
132 pharmacy, and other allied health sciences such as physiotherapy. Both universities share a
133 vision of graduating future doctors with the necessary interpersonal skills that would enable
134 comprehensive multidisciplinary patient care.

135 [Description of the IPE session under investigation](#)

136 As part of the Neurosciences Course which takes place in the second semester of the third
137 year of the MBBS program of MBRU, all enrolled students (i.e., Class of 2022) were
138 required to attend an IPE session which was designed, implemented, and evaluated in
139 alignment with the respective program outcome of promoting collaborative teamwork
140 amongst students. In line with the principles of SLT (17), the session was based on realistic
141 case-based problems with students split into teams, and the session facilitated by instructors,
142 ensuring that their role was not that of a 'teacher' but that of a 'coach'. Emphasis was placed
143 on fostering meaningful interactions between the students within a cross-disciplinary team

144 setting. The students were split into groups of eight. To each group of MBRU MBBS
145 students, student representation was added from the schools of pharmacy, nursing, and
146 physiotherapy from the UoS. The session was facilitated by two faculty members: a professor
147 of pharmacology (RR) and an assistant professor of pathology (SZ). The session comprised
148 of an initial introduction to the learning concepts of inter-professional healthcare teams and
149 collaborative patient-centered care. The preset learning outcomes were as follows:

- 150 • Define interprofessional collaborative practice.
- 151 • Discuss the benefits of interprofessional collaborative practice including the impact on
152 quality and safety of patient care.
- 153 • Describe key elements of effective interprofessional team-based care.
- 154 • Discuss factors that may influence interprofessional collaboration.
- 155 • Describe the roles, responsibilities, and abilities of various healthcare professions involved
156 in collaborative work, including their training and respective scopes of practice.
- 157 • Describe one's own professional role in relation to collaborating with other healthcare
158 professionals.

159 The session then revolved around two patient case-based scenarios, created by the
160 abovementioned faculty members, on the topics of stroke and pain. These scenarios were
161 designed, in alignment with SLT, to ensure that they contain sufficient material to generate
162 discussion across all participating disciplines. The students were asked to discuss the cases
163 and then answer a series of questions which included:

- 164 1. What is the immediate management of this patient?
- 165 2. What are the long-term sequelae of this event?
- 166 3. How can this patient be managed in the long-term and which professions will play a
167 role?
- 168 4. How can the effect of another similar event be minimized for this patient?

169 5. What other health and social concerns are of importance to this patient?

170 6. What is the long-term management plan of this patient?

171 Research Design

172 A pre-post intervention quantitative research design was adopted for this study to assess the
173 effectiveness of the IPE intervention in raising the level of readiness for interprofessional
174 work among the participants. The study was conducted in two rounds.

175 Ethical approval for the study was granted by the MBRU, Institutional Review Board
176 (Reference # MBRU-IRB-2020-016).

177 Data Collection

178 The data was collected using the Readiness for Interprofessional Learning Scale (RIPLS)
179 questionnaire. RIPLS (20, 21) is a self-reporting tool that assesses perceptions of healthcare
180 students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding readiness to learn with other healthcare
181 professionals. It is composed of 19 components that are measured using a 5-point Likert-type
182 scale. The 19 components are divided into three validated subscales. The first one is the
183 “Teamwork/ Collaboration” subscale which assesses the extent to which the participant
184 values cooperative learning and respecting students from other healthcare professionals. The
185 second one is the “Professional Identity” subscale which measures the tendency of the
186 participant to value and benefit from collaborative relationships with other healthcare
187 professionals. As for the third one, it is the “Roles and Responsibilities” subscale, and
188 measures the practical application of interprofessional skills with other healthcare
189 professional students. Two out of those three subscales are further divided into two segments.
190 The Teamwork/ Collaboration subscale has the “Need for positive relationships between
191 professor and other healthcare students” and “Acquisition and effectiveness of teamworking
192 skills” segments. As for the Professional Identity subscale, it has “Positive” and “Negative”
193 segments. Scores can be generated for the segments, subscales, and overall rating. Higher

194 scores indicate more readiness to engage in interprofessional learning experiences. It is worth
195 noting that given the inverse nature of the Negative Professional Identity segment of the tool,
196 the Likert-type scale of its components (10 through 12) were coded as such: 1: Strongly
197 Agree, 2: Agree, 3: Neutral, 4: Disagree, and 5: Strongly Disagree.

198 [Data Analysis](#)

199 [Quantitative Analyses](#)

200 The quantitative data was descriptively analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 27. For
201 each of the demographic variable, the number of cases, and frequencies and valid percentages
202 were calculated. For each of the 19 quantitative components of the tool, the mean and
203 standard deviation were calculated. An overall score of readiness was calculated (1 through
204 19), along with scores for each of the 3 subscales of the tool: Teamwork and collaboration (1
205 through 9), Professional identity (10 through 16), and Roles and responsibilities (17 through
206 19). Additional scores were calculated for the two segments of the Teamwork and
207 collaboration subscale: Acquisition and effectiveness of teamworking skills (1 through 6) and
208 Need for positive relationships between professionals and other healthcare students (7
209 through 9), and for the two segments of the Professional identity subscale: Negative (10
210 through 12) and Positive (13 through 16).

211 The validity tests of Cronbach's Alpha and the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) were
212 performed to ensure the internal consistency and check external variance, respectively, of the
213 adapted tool.

214 For the inferential analyses, to select the appropriate tests, a test of normality was conducted
215 for the data of each of the 19 components, and for all eight scores (overall, 3 subscales, and 2
216 segments within each of 2 of the subscales). The data of each of the 19 components,
217 independently, and all the scores turned out to be not normally distributed. Accordingly,

218 Mann-Whitney tests were used to compare the scores, and each component independently,
219 pre- and post- intervention.

220 The scores, and each component independently, were compared across the demographic
221 variables, as well: Year of Birth (YoB), Gender, and Discipline. For the dichotomous
222 variable: Gender, Mann-Whitney test was used. As for the other two demographic variables,
223 Kruskal- Wallis tests were conducted.

224 **Results**

225 **Quantitative Analyses**

226 The response rates of the pre- and post-assessment of both rounds were 85.56% and 93.33%,
 227 respectively. In total, 161 responses were collected, out of which 88 were from the 1st round
 228 and 73 were from the 2nd round (Table 1).

229 *Table 1 Response rates pre- and post- intervention in both rounds*

Round	Pre			Post			Total		
	Number of Responses	Number of Participants	Response Rate	Number of Responses	Number of Participants	Response Rate	Number of Responses	Number of Participants	Response Rate
1st	43	45	95.56	45	45	100	88	90	97.78
2nd	34	45	75.56	39	45	86.67	73	90	81.11
Total	77	90	85.56	84	90	93.33	161	180	89.44

230 As illustrated in Table 2, the Year of Birth (YoB) of the responders, who reported on this
 231 variable, ranged between 1994 and 2000, with the biggest portion of responders born in year
 232 1999 (31.1% in the pre-assessment and 35.1% in the post-assessment). Most of the
 233 responders who reported on their Gender were Female (74.7% in the pre-assessment and
 234 71.1% in the post-assessment). In terms of Discipline, most of the responders were in
 235 Medicine (44.2% in the pre-assessment and 47.6% in the post-assessment), followed by
 236 Pharmacy, Physiology, and Nursing, consecutively.

237 *Table 2 Output of descriptive analysis of demographics data*

Variable	Values	Pre		Post	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Year of Birth	1994	2	2.7	2	2.7
	1995	5	6.8	1	1.4
	1996	8	10.8	8	10.8
	1997	6	8.1	8	10.8
	1998	19	25.7	18	24.3
	1999	23	31.1	26	35.1

	2000	11	14.9	11	14.9
	Total	74	100.0	74	100.0
Gender	Female	56	74.7	54	71.1
	Male	19	25.3	22	28.9
	Total	75	100.0	76	100.0
Discipline	Medicine	34	44.2	40	47.6
	Nursing	13	16.9	13	15.5
	Pharmacy	15	19.5	16	19.0
	Physiology	15	19.5	15	17.9
	Total	77	100.0	84	100.0
Completed questionnaire before	Yes	2	2.6	16	20.0
	No	75	97.4	64	80.0
	Total	77	100.0	80	100.0
Time since completion of questionnaire	1-3 Month(s)	1	50.0	6	60.0
	3-6 Months	1	50.0	2	20.0
	1-2 Year(s)	0	0	1	10.0
	2-3 Years	0	0	1	10.0
	Total	2	100.0	10	100.0
Experienced interprofessional teaching before	Yes	9	11.8	10	13.9
	No	67	88.2	62	86.1
	Total	76	100.0	72	100.0

238 A total of 75 responders in the pre-assessment and of 64 responders in the post-assessment
 239 indicated that this was the first time they complete a RIPLS questionnaire. In the pre-
 240 assessment, 1 responder reported completing it 1-3 Month(s) ago and 1 responder reported
 241 completing it 3-6 Months ago. As for the post-assessment, 6 responders reported completing
 242 it in 1-3 Month(s), 2 in 3-6 Months, and 1 in each of the remaining categories: 1-2 Year(s)
 243 and 2-3 Years. For 88.2% of the responders to the pre-assessment and 86.1% of those to the
 244 post-assessment, this intervention constituted their first exposure to interprofessional teaching
 245 (Table 3).

246 The reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha for the adapted RIPLS questionnaire was 72.4%.

247 The percentage of the overall score was 86.86% pre-intervention and 89.89% post-

248 intervention, as per Table 4. According to the PCA, 87.4% of the variance can be explained

249 by the instrument ($P < 0.001$) which means the instrument is not only reliable but also valid to
250 measure what it is intended to measure.

Table 3 Output of descriptive quantitative analysis of all the components and scores, pre- and post-intervention

Subscale	Segment	Component	Pre			Post		
			Mean (±SD)	Percentage of the Mean	Category	Mean (±SD)	Percentage of the Mean	Category
Teamwork and Collaboration	Teamworking Skills	1. Learning with other students will help me become a more effective member of a health care team	4.78(0.45)	95.6	SA	4.79(0.52)	95.8	SA
		2. Patients would ultimately benefit if health care students worked together to solve patient problems	4.79(0.41)	95.8	SA	4.88(0.33)	97.6	SA
		3. Shared learning with other health care students will increase my ability to understand clinical problems	4.73(0.53)	94.6	SA	4.76(0.53)	95.2	SA
		4. Learning with health care students before qualification would improve relationships after qualification	4.70(0.56)	94	SA	4.79(0.54)	95.8	SA
		5. Communication skills should be learned with other health care students	4.83(0.47)	96.6	SA	4.83(0.49)	96.6	SA
		6. Shared learning will help me to think positively about other professionals	4.60(0.63)	92	A-SA	4.71(0.57)	94.2	SA
		Segment 1A Score	28.43(2.22)	94.77	SA	28.76(2.55)	95.87	SA
	Positive Relationships	7. For small group learning to work, students need to trust and respect each other	4.73(0.55)	94.6	SA	4.82(0.42)	96.4	SA

		8. Team-working skills are essential for all health care students to learn	4.62(0.56)	92.4	A-SA	4.79(0.41)	95.8	SA
		9. Shared learning will help me to understand my own limitations	4.88(0.32)	97.6	SA	4.79(0.60)	95.8	SA
		Segment 1B Score	14.23(1.09)	94.87	SA	14.39(1.17)	95.93	SA
		Subscale 1 Score	42.66(3.11)	94.8	SA	43.15(3.56)	95.89	SA
Professional identity	Negative	10. I do not want to waste my time learning with other health care students*	4.21(0.89)	84.2	A-SA	4.55(0.77)	91	A-SA
		11. It is not necessary for undergraduate health care students to learn together*	4.03(1.10)	80.6	A	4.46(0.91)	89.2	A-SA
		12. Clinical problem-solving skills can only be learned with students from my own department*	3.60(1.35)	72	A	3.69(1.44)	73.8	A
		Segment 2A Score	11.83(2.65)	78.87	A	12.70(2.25)	84.67	A-SA
	Positive	13. Shared learning with other health care students will help me to communicate better with patients and other professionals	4.53(0.74)	90.6	A-SA	4.68(0.68)	93.6	A-SA
		14. I would welcome the opportunity to work on small-group projects with other health care students	4.40(0.94)	88	A-SA	4.76(0.51)	95.2	SA
		15. Shared learning will help to clarify the nature of patient problems	4.34(0.86)	86.8	A-SA	4.76(0.53)	95.2	SA
		16. Shared learning before qualification will help me become a better	4.50(0.74)	90	A-SA	4.71(0.64)	94.2	SA

	team worker							
	Segment 2B Score	17.60(2.94)	88	A-SA	18.86(2.08)	94.3	SA	
	Subscale 2 Score	29.43(4.15)	84.09	A-SA	31.56(3.61)	90.17	A-SA	
Roles and Responsibilities	17. The function of nurses and therapists is mainly to provide support for doctors	4.64(0.65)	92.8	A-SA	4.81(0.48)	96.2	SA	
	18. I am not sure what my professional role will be	2.29(1.17)	45.8	U	2.13(1.30)	42.6	D-U	
	19. I have to acquire much more knowledge and skills than other health care students	3.51(1.10)	70.2	A	3.83(1.10)	76.6	A	
	Subscale 3 Score	10.43(1.89)	69.53	A	10.69(2.03)	71.27	A	
Overall Score		82.52(6.53)	86.86	A-SA	85.40(7.22)	89.89	A-SA	

252 *Values corrected to match the rest of the scale

253 **Category flipped to match the rest of the scale

254 D= Disagree, U= Undecided, A= Agree, & SA= Strongly Agree

255 The post-assessment overall readiness score, with a mean of agreement of 85.40(\pm 7.22), was
256 significantly higher than its pre-assessment counterpart, with a mean of agreement of
257 82.52(\pm 6.53) ($p=0.001$).

258 The Teamwork and collaboration subscale score was significantly higher in the post-
259 assessment, relative to the pre-assessment ($p=0.031$). The Teamworking skills segment score
260 was also significantly higher in the post-assessment ($p=0.037$), while there was no significant
261 difference in the Positive relationships segment score. In terms of the components of the
262 Teamwork and collaboration subscale (1 through 9), none showed significant difference
263 between the pre- and post-assessments.

264 As for the Professional identity subscale score, with a mean of agreement of 31.56(\pm 3.61), it
265 was significantly higher than the same score assessed pre-intervention, with a mean of
266 satisfaction of 29.43(\pm 4.15) ($p=0.001$). The two segments of this score: Negative and
267 Positive professional identity, were also significantly higher in the post-assessment relative to
268 the pre-assessment ($p<0.05$). In terms of the components of the Professional identity subscale
269 (10 through 16), components 12 and 13 assessed post-intervention were not significantly
270 different than their pre-intervention assessment. As for the remaining components (10 and
271 11, and 14, 15, and 16), they significantly increased in the assessment after the intervention
272 ($p<0.01$).

273 As for the Roles and responsibilities subscale, the analysis showed no statistically significant
274 difference between pre- and post-assessment; among the components of the respective
275 subscale (17 through 19), only 17 significantly increased in the assessment after the
276 intervention ($p=0.034$).

277 In the pre-assessment, the medicine participants scored significantly higher than those of the
278 rest of the disciplines in the Teamworking skills segment. The same category of participants

279 also scored higher, relative to others, in relation to the following components: 5 and 6, and 13
280 ($p < 0.05$). As for component 2, pharmacy participants scored significantly higher on it,
281 relative to the participants of the other disciplines ($p < 0.05$). There was no statistically
282 significant difference between the scores of female and male participants, and across the
283 various categories YoB. In terms of components, there was significant difference across the
284 scores of the YoB categories for components 1, 11, 16, 18, and 19 ($p < 0.05$). For components
285 1 and 11, year 1994 was significantly higher than the rest of the YoB categories; year 1995
286 higher for 16, year 2000 for 18, and year 1998 for 19.

287 In the post-assessment, the nursing participants scored significantly higher than those of the
288 rest of the disciplines in the Roles and responsibilities subscale, only ($p < 0.05$). Moreover,
289 there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of female and male
290 participants, and across the various YoB.

291 **Discussion**

292 The current study revealed that the IPE intervention under investigation significantly
293 increased the level of readiness to engage in cross-disciplinary learning and collaborations
294 among the participating health professions' students. This intervention constituted a novel
295 experience for most of the participating students. Its efficaciousness in the context of the
296 study encourages other universities in the region to adapt such interventions to increase
297 students' level of readiness to engage in cross-disciplinary learning and collaborations.
298 Moreover, the evaluative tool utilized in this study, namely: RIPLS (21), proved to be
299 internally reliable and externally valid in evaluating the students' responsiveness to IPE.

300 There is increasing interest in the theoretical underpinning of IPE. Several key theories have
301 been used in IPE curriculum design, many of which take a constructivist approach. SLT is
302 one such example. Constructivism emphasizes how social encounters influence learners'
303 understanding and development (22). SLT emphasizes that learning occurs in the context of
304 the experience, and places great emphasis on relationships and interactions with others in
305 building understanding and developing the role of the individual within the greater
306 community (23).

307 Similarly, RC argues that for a team to be effectively coordinated, there is a need for shared
308 knowledge and understanding among its members, as well as for all the entailed relationships
309 to be built upon shared goals and mutual respect (3). It is established in the literature that
310 communication and other interpersonal skills among healthcare professionals are essential for
311 the quality of healthcare delivery (24). Strong relationships in teams are expected to
312 contribute to effective service delivery and improved patient health outcomes (25). In the
313 setting of the current study, students of differing healthcare disciplines were able to
314 collaborate and exchange knowledge. This enhanced their teamwork and fostered their

315 professional identities, which is expected to translate, on the long run, in better outcomes of
316 care.

317 Nursing students appear to significantly benefit from such IPE interventions. Relative to that
318 of the rest of the disciplines, the level of readiness for inter-disciplinary teamwork among
319 nursing students, in relation to the roles and responsibilities, increased the most after the
320 intervention under investigation in this study. Along those lines, a previously conducted study
321 revealed a significant improvement in RIPLS scores with nursing students following an
322 interdisciplinary learning intervention but not for any of the other disciplines evaluated (26).
323 For the IPE session in the current study, medical students were intentionally chosen in their
324 pre- clinical years to try and improve the level of interaction between medical students and
325 students of other health care disciplines. Non- medical students often find it difficult to
326 achieve equal interaction as they expect medical students to lead the conversation due to their
327 perception of them as ‘doctors’. This narrative is particularly prevalent in the Middle East
328 and presents a greater incentive for breaking down the silos of different disciplines (27).

329 It is established that readiness for interprofessional learning is fundamental to healthcare team
330 development (28). Hence, identifying factors that influence the students’ readiness for
331 interprofessional learning is fundamental to developing learning strategies targeted to
332 improve teamwork, quality of care, and ultimately patient health outcomes (26). An
333 evaluation of attitudes towards IPE, among pharmacy students in the MENA region, showed
334 that most respondents perceive IPE to be important (15). Another similar study looking at the
335 perception of students training in medicine, nursing, and laboratory sciences in the Kingdom
336 of Saudi Arabia (KSA) showed similar findings. It revealed that most respondents consider
337 themselves to be ready for engaging in multidisciplinary collaborations (27).

338 The receptiveness to IPE tends to vary across disciplines and from one context to another. In
339 this study, prior to the intervention, participants training in medicine scored higher in terms of

340 readiness for cross-disciplinary work. This might be attributed to the longitudinal themes that
341 are integral to most of the contemporary medical programs (including the MBBS program
342 that the medical students participating in this study are enrolled in), where competencies such
343 as professional identity and practice (which includes but is not limited to interprofessional
344 practice) are systemically nurtured throughout the respective programs. Another study
345 showed that pharmacy and dietetics students demonstrated a higher level of readiness for
346 interdisciplinary learning compared to other disciplines (26). In a study conducted among
347 South Korean health profession students, the nursing students' perception of the importance,
348 preference, and effectiveness of IPE was the highest, whereas medical students' perception
349 was the lowest. All students (i.e., medical, nursing, and pharmacy) perceived their present
350 level to be lower than that required for each interprofessional competency (29).

351 As previously outlined, specific subscales of the RIPLS include teamwork and collaboration,
352 professional identity, and roles and responsibility. Comparison of the subscale domains by
353 discipline is useful in understanding views and attitudes that may be characteristic of a
354 specific discipline and may provide an explanation for the differences observed between the
355 disciplines for RIPLS composite score. The intervention under investigation significantly
356 raised the level of readiness regarding teamwork and collaboration. It also increased the
357 readiness in relation to acquisition and effectiveness of teamworking skills. Yet, there was no
358 significant difference in relation to the need for positive relationship between professionals
359 and other healthcare students. These findings are in alignment with the work of Lairamore
360 et al. (2013) who reported improved RIPLS scores following a case-based interprofessional
361 intervention across all disciplines (8).

362 It is well established that teams offer the promise to improve clinical care because they can
363 aggregate, modify, combine, and apply a greater amount and variety of knowledge to make
364 decisions, solve problems, generate ideas, and execute tasks more effectively and efficiently

365 than any individual working alone (30). Accordingly, introducing students to interdisciplinary
366 collaboration early-on in their careers will help foster the concept of a team mentality and
367 comprehensive patient care, where each medical professional holds a piece to the puzzle.

368 Interventions such as the one investigated in this study holds the potential to significantly
369 foster the participants' professional identity. This appeared to be the case through decreasing
370 their negativity around the subject matter and improving the extent of positivity associated
371 with their identity due to such cross-disciplinary interventions. Interestingly, although the
372 intervention improved the state of readiness among the participants in relation to the first two
373 subscales: teamwork and collaboration, and professional identity, as mentioned above, there
374 was no statistical significance around roles and responsibilities. The only exceptional
375 component of this scale was: "The function of nurses and therapists is mainly to provide
376 support for doctors". Along those lines, another study aimed at evaluating the medical
377 students' readiness and perception of IPE in a medical college in the KSA revealed a similar
378 pattern and recommended for shared academic events to focus on clarifying the roles and
379 responsibilities of medical students in multi-disciplinary healthcare teams (27).

380 The current study is characterized by a few limitations, which can be perceived as
381 opportunities for further research. This investigation was deductive in nature and relied solely
382 on quantitative data. It would be useful for future studies to be exploratory in nature, where
383 focus group sessions can be conducted to better understand why there are differences across
384 healthcare disciplines in terms of receptiveness to IPE. Moreover, the study results are based
385 on a single intervention that was conducted in two rounds for different batches. Although
386 they were meant to be congruent, slight variations were inevitable. In addition, to maintain
387 the participants' anonymity, there were no personal identifiers recorded in the pre- and post-
388 assessments of this study. This disabled linking the data, on the participant-level, which is
389 why this study's analysis was performed on an aggregate level. It is recommended for future

390 studies to be based on a longitudinal design where the pre- and post- assessment are linked
391 perhaps through assigning unique identifying numbers to the participants (which will
392 maintain their anonymity). For the participants of the current study, the researchers are
393 intending to conduct a follow-up investigation to assess how this IPE intervention affected
394 their engagement in cross-disciplinary teamwork and collaborations in their clinical years and
395 internships, and as they progress in their career paths. Also, the data collection was not
396 electronic and relied on hardcopies of the respective surveys. Consequently, not all
397 participants responded to all questions.

398 **Conclusion**

399 IPE interventions, such as the one under investigation, hold the potential to significantly
400 increase the participating health profession students' level of readiness to engage in cross-
401 disciplinary learning and collaborations. It is recommended for other universities in the
402 MENA region to adapt IPE to improve future health professionals' capacity to develop
403 shared understanding and mutual respect within cross-disciplinary teams, which ultimately
404 feeds into improved quality of care and patient outcome.

405 [Acknowledgement](#)

406 The authors would like to extend gratitude to Professor Ayman Noreddin, Dr. Jaqueline Dias,
407 and Dr. Ibrahim Mustafa for their support in recruiting, and in turn enrolling into the study,
408 pharmacy, nursing, and physiotherapy students from the University of Sharjah.

409 [References](#)

- 410 1. Buring SM, Bhushan A, Broeseker A, Conway S, Duncan-Hewitt W, Hansen L, et al.
411 Interprofessional education: definitions, student competencies, and guidelines for
412 implementation. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2009;73(4):59.
- 413 2. Learning together to work together for health. Report of a WHO Study Group on
414 Multiprofessional Education of Health Personnel: the Team Approach. World Health Organ
415 Tech Rep Ser. 1988;769:1-72.
- 416 3. JH. G. Relational Coordination: Guidelines for Theory. Measurement and Analysis.
417 2011.
- 418 4. J. HG. Coordinating mechanisms in care provider groups: Relational coordination as a
419 mediator and input uncertainty as a moderator of performance effects. *Management science.*
420 2002;48(11):1408-26.
- 421 5. IE. P. Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: Report of an
422 expert panel. Interprofessional Education Collaborative Expert Panel. 2011.
- 423 6. Ho K, Jarvis-Selinger S, Borduas F, Frank B, Hall P, Handfield-Jones R, et al.
424 Making interprofessional education work: the strategic roles of the academy. *Acad Med.*
425 2008;83(10):934-40.
- 426 7. Ruebling I, Pole D, Breitbach AP, Frager A, Kettenbach G, Westhus N, et al. A
427 comparison of student attitudes and perceptions before and after an introductory
428 interprofessional education experience. *J Interprof Care.* 2014;28(1):23-7.
- 429 8. Lairamore C G-PL, McCullough K, Grantham M, Head D. A Case-Based
430 Interprofessional Education Forum Improves Students' Perspectives on the Need for
431 Collaboration, Teamwork, and Communication. *MedEdPORTAL.* 2013.
- 432 9. Lave J WE. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK:
433 Cambridge university press; 1991.

- 434 10. Hammick M, Freeth D, Koppel I, Reeves S, Barr H. A best evidence systematic
435 review of interprofessional education: BEME Guide no. 9. *Med Teach*. 2007;29(8):735-51.
- 436 11. Lapkin S, Levett-Jones T, Gilligan C. A systematic review of the effectiveness of
437 interprofessional education in health professional programs. *Nurse Educ Today*.
438 2013;33(2):90-102.
- 439 12. Thistlethwaite JE, Forman D, Matthews LR, Rogers GD, Steketee C, Yassine T.
440 Competencies and frameworks in interprofessional education: a comparative analysis. *Acad
441 Med*. 2014;89(6):869-75.
- 442 13. Chen L ED, Evans T, Sadana R, Stilwell B, Travis P, Van Lerberghe W, Zurn P,
443 Aschwanden C, McManus J. Working together for health: The world health report. Geneva,
444 Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2006.
- 445 14. Hall LW ZB. Interprofessional education and practice guide no. 1: developing faculty
446 to effectively facilitate interprofessional education. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*.
447 2015;29(1):3-7.
- 448 15. El-Awaisi A, Saffouh El Hajj M, Joseph S, Diack L. Interprofessional education in
449 the Arabic-speaking Middle East: Perspectives of pharmacy academics. *J Interprof Care*.
450 2016;30(6):769-76.
- 451 16. Zigmont JJ, Kappus LJ, Sudikoff SN. Theoretical foundations of learning through
452 simulation. *Semin Perinatol*. 2011;35(2):47-51.
- 453 17. J. Q. Experience and participation: Relating theories of learning. . *Journal of
454 Experiential Education*. 2003;26:105-12.
- 455 18. Seaman J BM, Quay J. . The evolution of experiential learning theory: Tracing lines
456 of research in the JEE. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 2017;40(4).
- 457 19. Gilbert JH. Interprofessional education for collaborative, patient-centred practice.
458 *Nurs Leadersh (Tor Ont)*. 2005;18(2):32-6, 8.

- 459 20. J. B. Critical synthesis package: readiness for interprofessional learning scale
460 (RIPLS). *MedEdPORTAL*. 2015;6(11).
- 461 21. Parsell G, Bligh J. The development of a questionnaire to assess the readiness of
462 health care students for interprofessional learning (RIPLS). *Med Educ*. 1999;33(2):95-100.
- 463 22. Prettyman SS QH, Evans E. A Comparison between Collaborative Learning and
464 Situated Learning Teams in Two Freshman Engineering Design Experiences. 10. 2005;1.
- 465 23. Anderson JR, Lynne M. Reder, Herbert A. Simon. Situated learning and education.
466 *Educational researcher*. 1996;24:5-11.
- 467 24. Reeves S, Pelone F, Harrison R, Goldman J, Zwarenstein M. Interprofessional
468 collaboration to improve professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database*
469 *Syst Rev*. 2017;6:CD000072.
- 470 25. JH. G. Relationships between service providers and their impact on customers.
471 *Journal of Service Research*. 2002;4:299-311.
- 472 26. Judge MP PE, Maruca AT, Hobson ME, Leschak A, Zakewicz H. Evaluation of
473 students' receptiveness and response to an interprofessional learning activity across health
474 care disciplines: An approach toward team development in healthcare. *International Journal*
475 *of Nursing Sciences*. 2015;2(1):93-8.
- 476 27. Alzamil H, Meo SA. Medical students' readiness and perceptions about
477 Interprofessional Education: A cross sectional study. *Pak J Med Sci*. 2020;36(4):693-8.
- 478 28. Roopnarine R, Boeren E. Applying the Readiness for Interprofessional Learning Scale
479 (RIPLS) to medical, veterinary and dual degree Master of Public Health (MPH) students at a
480 private medical institution. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(6):e0234462.
- 481 29. Yune SJ, Park KH, Min YH, Ji E. Perception of interprofessional education and
482 educational needs of students in South Korea: A comparative study. *PLoS One*.
483 2020;15(12):e0243378.

484 30. JR. L. In search of synergy in small group performance. New York, NY: Psychology
485 Press; 2010.