

# Active Learning in Flipped Classroom and Tutorials: Complementary or Redundant?

## Abstract

Cambridge undergraduates have regular active-learning opportunities in small-group tutorials, in which they solve problems and discuss ideas based on course material. Would they see any value in performing similar tasks in flipped-classroom settings, or would they regard the introduction of a second active-learning modality as redundant? Following the replacement of traditional lectures with flipped teaching within three physiology courses, with tutorials ongoing, questionnaire responses showed that students felt that they learned and understood more, and felt better-prepared for exams. Although similarities were recognised, the context of the active learning evidently made flipped classroom and tutorial teaching feel very different, probably because of the different levels of attention from the instructors. Questionnaire and interview comments suggested a complementarity between the two approaches, in that engaging with problems within a flipped classroom could give students more confidence in tutorials and in essay-writing, while tutorials offered more opportunities for individually-tailored feedback.

## Introduction

Active learning within a small-group teaching setting forms an important part of the education offered by many universities worldwide, while flipped-classroom teaching (FCT), introduced more recently, is gaining popularity within the higher education sector. There is a growing body of work based around students' subjective perceptions of the flipped classroom experience in STEM subjects, compared to traditional lecturing (e.g., Ramnanan & Pound, 2017; Rotellar & Cain, 2016). For example, the preclinical medical students surveyed by Street et al. (2015) felt that flipped-classroom teaching had improved their understanding of the course material and provided better preparation for exams. The purpose of the present study was to examine whether undergraduates who had regular opportunities for active learning in small-group tutorials would also feel that FCT benefited their studies in this way, or whether the similar nature of the problem-solving exercises would leave them feeling that they would have learned more from a didactic session.

### *The flipped classroom approach*

'Flipped classroom' refers to the swapping of tasks typically engaged with during class, that is, the formalised teaching settings in an instructor's presence, and those carried out in independent study time (Akçayır & Akçayır, 2018). The rationale for the flipped approach is to augment the interactive and dialogic nature of students' engagement with the instructor, departing from the more traditional, one-way knowledge flow from teacher to student. This facilitates "discussion, solving problems proposed by the students, hands-on activities, and guidance" (Akçayır & Akçayır, 2018, p. 334). Learners must become familiar with the necessary content in advance, often utilising online material; when learners come to the classroom they can then be challenged to a greater extent, with increased emphasis on deep thinking and collaborative learning (McNally et al., 2017). Although often characterised primarily as an inversion of class-internal and class-external activities, changes to the tasks themselves contribute to enhancing the learning process (Murillo-Zamorano et al., 2019).

FCT's potential advantages have been widely discussed, including the emphasis on active learning, improvements in motivation and greater scope for tailoring teaching and learning to students' needs (Díaz & Narciso, 2019). The teacher can respond with immediate feedback to student answers, which might be communicated electronically, and can adapt the session accordingly. There have been many reports of improvements in students' learning outcomes following flipped courses (e.g., Bhagat et al., 2016; Mason et al., 2013), although the results from the study of Jensen et al. (2015) suggest

43 that it might be the increase in active learning, rather than the flipped classroom approach *per se*, which results in these  
44 positive effects. O’Flaherty and Phillips (2015) indicate that an enduring impact on learning is difficult to prove, given the  
45 limited longitudinal data regarding the relationship between FCT and learning performance indicators (see also  
46 Bouwmeester et al., 2019).

47 FCT’s potential benefits must be balanced against the additional preparation time likely required, both by  
48 students and teachers (Herreid & Schiller, 2013; Mok, 2014). Some students evidently do not feel confident in their  
49 mastery of more complex material, prepared independently in advance of the flipped sessions (Ramnanan & Pound, 2017),  
50 and students may feel isolated from the learning process when trying to assimilate content on their own (Rasheed et al.,  
51 2020). Within the flipped classroom, however, sub-groups of students can be formed within the wider cohort and  
52 encouraged to work together. There is some evidence to suggest that incorporating a collaborative element into FCT  
53 approaches can improve examination performance (Foldnes, 2016), critical thinking and collaborative practices (Gomez-  
54 Lanier, 2018). A recent systematic review of the literature on medical students’ perceptions of the flipped classroom  
55 approach found that students particularly appreciate the increased opportunities for active learning and group work  
56 (Ramnanan & Pound, 2017), although some individual students can have negative perceptions of the value of peer learning  
57 (He et al., 2019).

58

#### 59 ***Learning context: small-group teaching in Cambridge***

60 As mentioned above, flipped-classroom teaching can involve an element of small-group learning, if students are  
61 placed in sub-groups for the purposes of discussing answers and solving problems together. Active learning in a  
62 collaborative setting also features in some forms of small-group teaching (SGT), although SGT is a wider term defined only  
63 by the limited numbers of students involved, encompassing more didactic forms of teaching too (Exley & Dennick, 2004).  
64 The SGT in Cambridge which is relevant to the current discussion falls into the ‘Tutor-led SGT’ category of Exley & Dennick  
65 (2004), and within this would be best-described as a ‘tutorial’, as opposed to a ‘seminar’ or a ‘problem-based learning’  
66 group. Indeed, these SGT sessions, which have been run for centuries within the universities of Cambridge and Oxford  
67 (Morgan, 2013), are referred to generically as ‘Oxford tutorials’ in the literature. We shall use this term throughout,  
68 although in Cambridge these SGT sessions are locally known as ‘supervisions’.

69 While Exley and Dennick (2004) cite 4-12 as typical numbers of students in a tutorial group, there would usually  
70 be 2-4 students in a Cambridge science tutorial. They would be joined by an academic tutor, who would have particular  
71 expertise in the topic in question but might range in experience from a postgraduate student to a full professor. Each  
72 student in Cambridge is a member of one of around 30 colleges: the tutors are appointed by the separate colleges, not  
73 centrally. A tutor might teach the same students weekly for the full academic year or just for part of it, and has  
74 considerable autonomy in how their sessions run. Typically, students are encouraged to ask and answer questions about  
75 the course material presented previously in large-group lectures and practical classes. They are often set problems to  
76 consider and discuss as a group. The tutor might explain new ways to understand the material, lead a conversation about  
77 its implications, suggest wider reading, recommend approaches to preparing for summative exams, and set and mark work  
78 which would be discussed in the next session. Each tutorial session lasts for one hour, and there is one per week in each  
79 major module a student is taking.

80 The weekly tutorials are intended to complement the lectures and practicals which the students also receive. The  
81 lectures in the courses of interest here typically follow the traditional, didactic format and are often fact-heavy. While a  
82 student would likely have a different tutor to their peers from another college, all students attend the same lectures (three  
83 per week in each major module) and ultimately sit the same summative assessments. Tapper and Palfreyman (2002)  
84 suggest that the direction taken in lectures and tutorials is disparate if not completely unconnected, since academic

85 faculties take central control of lectures, while tutorials are organised separately by the colleges. However, Horn (2013)  
86 sees a much closer relationship, with lectures essentially supporting Oxford tutorials in humanities subjects, and tutorials  
87 supporting the lecture courses in some science subjects. Morgan (2013) explains that while lectures do not necessarily  
88 prohibit dialogue or debate, the tutor offers personal guidance in the Oxford tutorial and this is where the student is  
89 challenged and held accountable for their learning, requiring them to take an “active rather than a passive role” (North  
90 Report of 1997, 163-64; cited in (Morgan, 2013)). Oxford tutorials are believed to place high-level academic demands on  
91 students, including the opportunity to develop critical thinking skills (Cosgrove, 2011), with a focus on students’ autonomy  
92 in this regard (Beck, 2007).

93 Oxford tutorials might have different roles according to discipline (Horn, 2013; see also Beck, 2007). In Ashwin’s  
94 studies (Ashwin, 2005, 2006), students and academics in the sciences seemed more likely than those from the humanities  
95 and social sciences to view tutorials as an opportunity for tutors to help students understand difficult concepts, as opposed  
96 to the more constructivist conception of “a place where new positions on the topic are developed and refined” (Ashwin,  
97 2006, p. 656). The Oxford tutorial is evidently not a fixed and unified teaching method, and for early-years science students  
98 it might involve more didactic teaching than is commonly supposed, but it is always centred around students asking and  
99 answering questions.

100

### 101 ***Comparing and contrasting the flipped classroom with tutorials***

102 This study examines the effects of introducing FCT, as a substitute for traditional lectures, into a course in which  
103 students already had regular active-learning opportunities in their tutorial sessions. In both FCT and tutorials, students are  
104 asked to assimilate material prior to the live session, and then in that session work through problems introduced by an  
105 academic instructor, often as part of a group, with immediate feedback. Both teaching methods have the potential for  
106 promoting interactivity and meaningful teacher-student and student-student dialogue, facilitating active and student-  
107 centred learning and moving away from a top-down mode of imparting knowledge (Morgan, 2013). There are three key  
108 differences, however, between FCT and the small-group teaching characterising Oxford tutorials:

109

- 110 1. The instructor-student interaction in the tutorial is much more intensive, owing to the very high instructor:  
111 student ratio (around 1:3). In FCT, one instructor would typically oversee a much larger number of students (over  
112 350 in one of the courses considered here), and so there would be much less interaction between the instructor  
113 and any one individual, and therefore much less opportunity for a given student to ask questions and direct the  
114 discussion.
- 115 2. In tutorials, all students work together in the same group, guided by the tutor. Students may or may not be  
116 working in groups in FCT classes, but if they are encouraged to work collaboratively (as in our case), there would  
117 be multiple groups within the same classroom, working in parallel on a common problem.
- 118 3. Because tutors are recruited and managed independently by the colleges within the Oxford tutorial system, Horn  
119 (2013) reports tutors feeling quite free to develop their sessions as they see fit, not needing to coordinate with  
120 colleagues, nor necessarily plan what will be covered ahead of time. This sits notably at odds with FCT, which is  
121 generally part of a centrally-run course with learning objectives specified in advance.

122

123 Anecdotally, several experienced academic colleagues had told us that they did not feel that FCT would add  
124 anything of value to our physiology courses, given that our students already had regular opportunities for active learning  
125 within their weekly tutorials. For them, the similarities in teaching methods outweighed the differences, but would  
126 students see things the same way? We addressed this by asking students to comment in questionnaires on how replacing

127 traditional lectures with FCT classes affected their learning, understanding and preparation for exams; their weekly  
128 tutorials continued throughout. We pursued the similarities and differences between their experiences of FCT and tutorials  
129 in interviews. The results of this study were of interest to us in considering future course design, and will be of wider  
130 interest to academics at other institutions, who may be contemplating introducing a second form of active learning into  
131 their teaching.

132

133

### Methodology

134

135

136

Flipped classroom teaching was introduced, as a substitute for regular, traditional lectures, into three physiology  
modules. The students' experiences of this were assessed through questionnaires and interviews. Three cohorts of  
undergraduates participated in this study:

137

1. 187 First-year Natural Science students taking a module called NST 1A Physiology of Organisms (henceforth PoO).

138

The flipped classroom course within this module was given in November 2018.

139

2. 39 Second-year Natural Science students taking NST 1B Physiology (henceforth Phys). The flipped classroom

140

course was given in February and March 2020. All of these students had taken the PoO module in the previous

141

academic year, which had included the 'flipped' course outlined above.

142

3. First-year medical and veterinary students (n = 319 and 67 respectively) taking M&VST 1A Homeostasis

143

(henceforth HOM). The flipped classroom course was also given in February and March 2020.

144

145

146

It was briefly explained in advance to all three cohorts, via a page on the virtual learning environment (VLE), that  
'flipped classroom' teaching involves core material presented in advance, while the class itself becomes interactive. This  
was backed up by a YouTube video of Eric Mazur explaining his own experiences of teaching in this way, together with a  
link to a supporting paper (Mazur, 2009). Students were told that their reaction to the flipped teaching would form part of  
an educational study. They were provided with course material in advance of the live classes (see Table 1), and were told  
to work through it since they would need to be familiar with the material in order to be able to participate in those classes.  
They were told that they would have the opportunity to ask questions after each class, if anything was unclear. Whether or  
not the students had prepared the course material in advance of the live classes was assessed only through self-declaration  
in the questionnaire issued at the end of the courses: preparatory work was not tracked or graded. Within the live sessions  
themselves, which took place in traditional, tiered lecture theatres, students were asked to self-organise into small groups  
(Table 1). Members of each group were asked to work together to discuss and answer the questions posed by the single  
academic instructor present.

157

Weekly tutorials, organised and overseen by the separate colleges, had been given throughout the academic year  
in support of the lectures, and continued throughout the weeks that these three flipped courses were taking place.

159

Students should each have had one tutorial based on the flipped PoO course, or two if taking the longer Phys and HOM  
courses. Many different tutors were involved in running these sessions. They had been made aware of the new, flipped,  
format of the courses, but had not been told to adapt their tutorials in any way.

162

The academic instructor leading these three flipped courses (MJM) also had a tutorial role in one of the colleges.  
Many of the questions used in the flipped courses, including the essay question discussed in the PoO course, were based  
on those previously used by MJM in his own tutorial sessions.

164

165

166

**Table 1: Major differences in the FCT courses given to the three cohorts of students**

Module	Material provided in advance of class	Course time freed up for preparation?	Student subgroup size in class	Student responses in class	Active learning tasks
PoO	Lecture notes plus PowerPoint presentations	No	4-6	Clickers and oral	Multiple-choice questions Open-ended questions Calculations Diagram completion Essay structuring
Phys	Lecture notes plus videos	Yes	2-3	Oral only	Open-ended questions Diagram completion
HOM	Lecture notes plus videos	Yes	3-4	Oral only	Open-ended questions Diagram completion

167

168

169 **The 2018 PoO module**

170 A three-lecture course on ‘Nutrient Acquisition’ within the PoO module was converted to a flipped classroom  
 171 format when the first author took over as a sabbatical replacement. The academic content was changed only slightly, to  
 172 suit the rest of the 2018-2019 module, and was made available as PowerPoint presentations and lecture notes, uploaded in  
 173 advance to the VLE. No video presentations were included, and no extra time was freed up in the course for preparation  
 174 (Table 1).

175 In the live classes, students were asked to self-organise into groups of 4-6. These sessions, each one hour long,  
 176 consisted largely of the instructor asking the members of each group to work together to come up with answers to a series  
 177 of questions and discuss ideas, based on the material they had read in advance. Some of the questions were multiple-  
 178 choice questions (MCQs), answered with the use of ‘clickers’ (Turning Technologies ResponseCard RF). One clicker was  
 179 given to each group, and the students were told by the instructor how to use the clicker within the class itself. After  
 180 students had been given a few minutes to collaborate on the answers to each MCQ, anonymised clicker responses were  
 181 revealed to the audience together with the correct answers. Answers were collected and presented using Microsoft  
 182 PowerPoint 2016 running in association with TurningPoint software (Turning Technologies). The students were also asked  
 183 other types of questions including calculations, diagram completion and open-ended questions, which did not involve  
 184 clickers and required oral responses. In all cases, the correct answers to the questions were explained and often expanded  
 185 on afterwards, and the instructor would answer any follow-up questions from the audience.

186 In the last live class, students were invited to consider how they might structure an essay on the topic. The essay  
 187 title was representative of a type of essay that the students could expect in the end-of-year exam. Having discussed in their  
 188 groups what elements they might include in the introduction, different strands of the essay’s argument and its conclusion,  
 189 the instructor compared the answers that the students shared with the instructor’s own approach. This exercise was  
 190 intended to help them with two of the course learning outcomes, which were to be able to integrate related topics from  
 191 separate parts of the course, and to be able to develop cogent and critical arguments based on the course material.

192 At the end of the last live session, the students were each given a paper questionnaire (see subsection entitled  
 193 “The questionnaires”, below). All students were also invited to volunteer to be interviewed by the second author, whom  
 194 they had not previously met, in order to explore their feelings about the FCT approach in more detail. It was explained in  
 195 the e-mail asking for volunteers that the first author (their instructor) would not be present at the interviews and would

196 not be told which students had volunteered. From the cohort, 12 students volunteered to be interviewed, 3 in person and  
197 9 by telephone. Despite the convenience-sampling approach taken, the 12 interviewees varied in their linguistic and  
198 cultural background, gender, and types of school attended before university. All interviews were audio-recorded and  
199 conducted within 11 weeks of the classes; the mean interview length was 18 minutes. Despite the delays between the  
200 course and interviews, which were necessitated in some cases by the vacation period which followed soon after the course  
201 ended, students appeared to have no difficulties in recalling details of the flipped classroom courses. NVivo software was  
202 used to carry out thematic analysis of the qualitative data from interviews and all three sets of course questionnaires (PoO,  
203 Phys and HOM), to capture students' views holistically, both favourable and unfavourable (Comber & Brady-Van den Bos,  
204 2018). All interviews were fully transcribed, salient points from each interview transcript in turn were coded, and core  
205 themes established on this basis.

206  
207

### 208 ***The 2020 Phys and HOM modules***

209           Following the perceived success of the PoO course, it was decided to run the Phys and HOM courses on 'Digestive  
210 Physiology', usually given by the first author in a traditional lecture format, as FCT in the following academic year. Unlike  
211 the shorter PoO course which had been little modified, these courses were substantially adapted. The material was  
212 identical, but the Phys and HOM courses were presented separately.

213           Given that some of the PoO cohort in the previous year had complained about the amount of background  
214 preparatory work, three of the six timetabled lecture class-times (1 hour each) were redesignated as preparation time for  
215 students, and no classes were scheduled in those hours. The 'core' content of the established six-lecture series was made  
216 into online video presentations, and the students were encouraged to watch these in the time that had been freed up in  
217 the timetable for this purpose. Videos were not used in any other lecture courses in PoO, Phys or HOM. The videos in total  
218 lasted 42 minutes longer than the three hours freed up, because the core content from six lectures had been compressed  
219 down to three units.

220           In the three 'flipped' classes, the students were asked to form small groups (2-3 students for Phys, 3-4 students  
221 for the larger HOM module). No clickers were used in these courses, in part because we wanted to move away from MCQs  
222 and towards more synthetic and open-ended questions which would allow us to explore deeper levels of understanding,  
223 and in part because the limited numbers of these devices available to us would not have permitted sufficiently small  
224 student subgroups to be formed in the large HOM classes. Instead, students were invited to shout out answers, once they  
225 had had a chance to discuss the questions within their groups. Open-ended and diagram-completion questions were  
226 similar to those used in the PoO course, but there were neither calculations nor detailed discussions of essay structure.  
227 Much of the 'peripheral' content of the established lecture series which had not been included in the videos was  
228 introduced, in the context of questions or their explanations, in the flipped sessions.

229           The questionnaire given to Phys and HOM students in the last of their flipped classes was almost identical to the  
230 PoO questionnaire. The 2020 courses ended at the point that the coronavirus pandemic hit the UK: no follow-up interviews  
231 could be conducted, and a comparison of examination marks which had been planned could not proceed.

232

### 233 ***The questionnaires***

234           Paper questionnaires were used in this study because of the very low response-rate that the department had  
235 seen from online questionnaires in the past. Questionnaires were given out in the last classes of each flipped course and  
236 were also available afterwards, including as electronic copies on the VLE. Only a handful of students submitted  
237 questionnaires after the last classes, however.

238 The questions asked students to compare the flipped courses with the traditional lecture courses they had  
239 replaced, the style of which they were very familiar with. Careful consideration was given to whether students should also  
240 be directly asked to compare the flipped classes with tutorials, within the same questionnaires. Rather than this direct  
241 comparison, the main purpose of our study was to establish whether replacing lectures with FCT would benefit a course  
242 which already offered active learning opportunities in this other context. In line with recommendations in the research  
243 methods literature (e.g., Arksey & Knight, 1999; Cohen et al., 2017), it was decided that it would be better to avoid leading  
244 questions of this nature, because this would inevitably introduce the notion that there are similarities between the two  
245 ways of teaching and, following this, make it hard to untangle casual observations from deeply-felt concerns. We reasoned  
246 that if the students felt that the flipped-classroom courses were simply repeating the same active learning experience that  
247 they were getting in their ongoing tutorials, this would be clear from negative responses, expanded upon in the open-  
248 ended comments. If students did not spontaneously recognise similarities, or did not regard them as significant enough to  
249 mention, we could reasonably conclude that any cross-over in learning method did not reflect a problematic redundancy.

250 The questionnaires contained five Likert-scale questions:

- 251 1. "Did you read through the online material (lecture notes and slides)..." (PoO), or "Did you watch the videos..."  
252 (Phys/HOM), "...associated with each topic in advance of the live presentations?"
- 253 2. "How much do you feel you learned from the flipped classroom approach taken in Nutrient Acquisition (this  
254 includes both prior reading and the presentation itself)..." (PoO), or "How much do you feel you learned from the  
255 flipped classroom approach taken in Digestive Physiology (this includes both the videos and the presentations)..."  
256 (Phys/HOM), "...in comparison to what you would have learned from traditional lectures?"
- 257 3. "How would you rate the depth of your understanding gained from the flipped-classroom approach, in  
258 comparison to that gained from traditional lectures?"
- 259 4. "To what extent do you feel that the flipped classroom presentations helped prepare you for tests and exams, in  
260 comparison with the traditional lecture format?"
- 261 5. "Over a whole, year-long lecture course, what proportion of lectures would you recommend should be presented  
262 as "flipped-classroom" presentations, in the future?"

263  
264 For Question 1, the three answer options were that the student in question had either (A) not looked at the  
265 available material, (B) had looked at some but not all, or (C) had looked at all of it. For Questions 2-4, the five answer  
266 options available ranged from (A) "much less", (B) "a little less", (C) "about the same", (D) "a little more" and (E) "much  
267 more". For Question 5, the answer options were (A) "None", (B) "A small proportion", (C) "Half", (D) "The majority" and (E)  
268 "All". Open-ended comments boxes followed each question, and an "Any other comments?" box concluded the  
269 questionnaire. Some further questions followed in the PoO questionnaire, relating to another study: these are not  
270 considered here.

271 The Likert-scale answers were converted into numerical scores for purposes of averaging (scores from 1 to 3 for  
272 Question 1, scores from 1 to 5 for Questions 2 to 5). Where a student had ringed more than one answer, an average value  
273 was used. Mean scores for each of the three cohorts (PoO, Phys and HOM) were compared using one-way analysis of  
274 variance (ANOVA; see Norman (2010) for a defence of this approach). Although there were differences between how the  
275 PoO course and the Phys/HOM courses were presented, in particular concerning the use of clickers and video  
276 presentations (Table 1), it was not the purpose of the present study to compare flipped course designs in any detail. For  
277 this reason, it was decided not to alter the questions asked of the three cohorts of students in any substantial way.

278  
279

280 **Ethical approval**


281 This project was approved in advance by the Faculty of Biology, the Head of Teaching in the department  
282 concerned, and the Course Organisers. Consent was obtained from the relevant colleague for the adaptation of their  
283 lecture material for the PoO course. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional Ethics Committee. It was made  
284 clear to students that their comments would remain anonymous, and that participation was voluntary.

285

286

**Results**

287 Out of 187 PoO students, 123 (66%) completed questionnaires. Of the 39 Phys students, 29 (74%) completed  
288 questionnaires. Of the 386 HOM students, 113 (29%) completed questionnaires. Some of the Phys students may have  
289 answered a similar questionnaire based on their PoO course in the previous year, but because the surveys were  
290 anonymous this could not be established for certain. The HOM students did not take PoO or Phys, so this was a totally  
291 separate cohort.




292

293 **Figure 1: responses of the three cohorts to Question 1, relating to the amount of preparation done for the flipped sessions**  
294 **(A, had not looked at the available material in advance; B, had looked at some but not all; C, had looked at all of it).**  
295


296 Question 1 asked students about the amount of preparation they undertook before attending the flipped classes.  
297 This preparatory work was not tracked or graded: it was entirely up to the students how much time to put into it. As shown  
298 in Fig. 1, the majority of the Phys and HOM students responded with option C, indicating that they had looked at all the  
299 available material. Relatively more students in the PoO cohort, who had not had any time in their schedules freed up for  
300 preparation, responded with option B, that they had looked at some but not all of it. The extra time needed for advance  
301 preparation represented a common concern among all three cohorts. Some students commented that watching video  
302 recordings took longer than the videos themselves, because they would periodically stop the recordings to make notes.





303  
304  
305  
306  
307

**Figure 2: responses of the three cohorts to Question 2, relating to how much the students felt they learned from the flipped-classroom courses, compared to traditional lectures (A, much less; B, a little less; C, about the same; D, a little more; E, much more).**



308  
309  
310  
311  
312

**Figure 3: responses of the three cohorts to Question 3, relating to how the students rated the depth of their understanding gained from the flipped-classroom courses, compared to traditional lectures (A, much less; B, a little less; C, about the same; D, a little more; E, much more).**

313 Question 2 asked students how much they felt they learned from the flipped classroom approach, while Question  
314 3 asked how they would rate the depth of understanding they had gained, in both cases compared to the traditional  
315 lecture format which the students were familiar with. Although Questions 2 and 3 were similar, Question 2 was targeted  
316 towards factual knowledge, while Question 3 was intended to assess the conceptual framework which brings these facts  
317 together (e.g., Krathwohl, 2002). This distinction is particularly important for undergraduate science courses, which are  
318 often fact-heavy. In retrospect, we felt it possible that the two questions might be conflated by the students taking the  
319 survey, and so the answers to the two questions are considered together here. In both cases and for all three cohorts, the  
320 most frequent response was D, “a little more” (Fig. 2, 3).

321 The written comments gave some of the reasons why the students felt that their understanding had been  
322 enhanced through the flipped classroom:

323

324 It was easier to understand the core content as you could pause/go back on the videos and the 'extra  
325 material' could be discussed in greater depth during the lectures (*Phys questionnaire*)

326

327 This comment forms an interesting counterpoint to the common complaint about the time spent watching  
328 preparatory videos. Many students reported that learning was facilitated during the flipped classes as the greater level of  
329 engagement required meant that it was not possible to switch off. The flipped classroom approach also helped students  
330 reflect on the material in a different way:

331

332 what the flipped classroom teaching actually makes possible for us is to apply the concepts [...] and also [...] if  
333 you make a mistake during the flipped classroom teaching then it makes it for you much easier to understand  
334 the concept and actually remember it because then you remember the mistakes you've made and you  
335 understand why it was wrong and this is not something that you could experience in regular lectures  
336 (*Interviewee 9*)

337

338 This is big benefit of this style. Encourages thinking about consequences and what ifs...? (*Phys questionnaire*)

339

340 Actually made me think about the stuff I had learnt rather than assuming I understood it. [...] Felt like I was  
341 building on top of knowledge rather than trying to learn everything at once. (*HOM questionnaire*)

342

343 Some of the more measured comments suggest why option E ("much more" learning and understanding) was  
344 not so commonly selected in Questions 2 and 3. Any improvements in knowledge clarification, recall or understanding  
345 might be a result of any additional time taken in preparation, rather than the flipped classroom model itself.

346

347 If this [*extra*] work was put in alongside traditional lectures maybe the same outcome? (*Phys questionnaire*)

348

349 Depth of understanding currently is less - as could not complete videos. However, if had time would be better  
350 depth. (*HOM questionnaire*)

351


352 There was also a sense that when a group dynamic worked well, then group work was a positive aspect of the  
353 flipped classroom, but that the converse also held true. The following comment refers to the discussion encouraged  
354 between students within the flipped class:

355

356 discussion makes us think deeper about the content of the videos - however relies on the people you are  
357 discussing with the make the [*sic*] discussion sessions helpful (*HOM questionnaire*)

358

359 How much work a student puts into the preparation for a flipped class will clearly affect their ability to  
360 participate constructively within the group: the fundamental role played by students' accountability for their learning as  
361 part of a flipped classroom approach has been widely recognised in previous research (e.g., Ramnanan & Pound, 2017;  
362 Rotellar & Cain, 2016).



363  
364  
365  
366  
367

**Figure 4: responses of the three cohorts to Question 4. relating to how well-prepared the students felt for tests and exams following the flipped-classroom courses, compared to traditional lectures (A, much less; B, a little less; C, about the same; D, a little more; E, much more).**

368  
369  
370  
371

The end-of-year summative assessments in these courses include multiple-choice and essay components. In rating their level of preparedness for these examinations following FCT as compared to traditional lectures, the great majority of students selected option C, “about the same”, or D, “a little more” (Fig. 4). Positive perspectives included the following:

372

because multiple choice forms such a large part of the exam [...] having that just sort of reintroduced particularly at that point because it was so close to the end of the year, um and close to mocks and stuff, it was definitely helpful (*Interviewee 3*)

376

I feel ready to start [*exam*] revision from a basis of good notes & understanding, many other series I need to go over my understanding & better improve my notes before I can even start revision. (*HOM questionnaire*)

379

I found essay writing much easier, mostly regarding structure and the main points to be focussing on, as usually this is completely missed in all the details in normal lectures. (*Phys questionnaire*)

382

Thinking around the subjects probably will have helped in essays, in trying to think laterally and draw connections. I think this will have helped. (*HOM questionnaire*)

385

386

Formative essays are set by tutors throughout the year and are often discussed in the weekly tutorials. The last two comments above suggest that the FCT approach usefully complements this aspect of tutorial work. However, not all students were certain that the more in-depth learning gained would be beneficial for the summative assessments at the end of the academic year:


390

difficult to balance broad themes with detail in exam essay in time given so not sure how much broader thinking can be incorporated into timed essays. (*Phys questionnaire*)

392

393

394 This comment suggests that the deeper understanding of underlying physiological concepts which was promoted  
 395 in the flipped sessions might not be something that this student could take advantage of in the summative assessments,  
 396 given the time limitations. One of the learning outcomes of the Phys course as a whole was that students should  
 397 understand how different organ systems interact to yield integrated physiological responses, and this does require an  
 398 understanding of such concepts. If producing a timed essay of this nature were impossible, this would suggest a failure in  
 399 alignment between course objectives and the examination process, but there was no indication that this was a widespread  
 400 view among the student cohort. It would, however, appear that some students would benefit from further guidance in how  
 401 to translate the broader perspective gained from the flipped classroom into specific exam technique – guidance which  
 402 would typically come from their tutors.



403  
 404 **Figure 5: responses of the three cohorts to Question 5, relating to what proportion of the teaching over the course of the**  
 405 **year should be flipped-classroom, as opposed to traditional lectures (A, none; B, a small proportion; C, half; D, the majority;**  
 406 **E, all).**  
 407

408 Finally, students were asked what proportion of lectures should be flipped in future. For the PoO and Phys  
 409 cohorts, the most common response was B, “a small proportion”; slightly more HOM students responded C, “half” (Fig. 5).  
 410 Several factors were cited to support these views, the nature of the academic content being most commonly raised.  
 411 Despite broad consensus that only certain topics would suit flipped classroom delivery, there was no agreement on which  
 412 topics they would be. Some felt FCT was the more suitable way to teach physiological topics that required much factual  
 413 knowledge, while traditional lectures might be better for others:

414  
 415 [FCT], for me, is a more sensible way to cover factually-dense subjects. Lecs [lectures] better for conceptual  
 416 understanding. (HOM questionnaire)

417  
 418 I think it really depends on the topic. Digestion worked well as the content is quite factual, so bringing this  
 419 together in the flipped classroom was useful, however other topics may be less suited for this style. (Phys  
 420 questionnaire)

421  
 422 Others took the opposite view, however:  
 423

424 Dependent on topic. for less factual learning, this is wonderful. For more factual stuff, lectures suffice. (*HOM*  
425 *questionnaire*)

426  
427 maybe for the more conceptually difficult content (*Phys questionnaire*)

428  
429 Students also raised concerns about the required preparation time, the feeling that the benefits of FCT would  
430 depend on the lecturer, and the quality of background material provided. Overall, there was a clear sense that FCT should  
431 not replace traditional lectures entirely, but there were elements (especially the preparatory videos) that should be  
432 ubiquitous.

#### 433 434 **Comparing between cohorts**

435 Although it was not the main focus of this study, it was necessary to see if there were any substantial differences  
436 in how the three cohorts of students answered the questionnaire questions, before drawing general conclusions. The  
437 Likert-scale answers having been converted to numbers (1 to 3 for Question 1, 1 to 5 for the other questions), one-way  
438 ANOVA tests were performed on the data for each question in turn. These showed statistically significant differences  
439 ( $p < 0.01$ ) between the means of the three student cohorts for all questions other than Question 4 ( $p = 0.895$ ). In all cases,  
440 the mean for the PoO cohort was lower than the means for the Phys and HOM cohorts, although the difference was never  
441 large in absolute terms (Table 2). We suggest why this might be in the Discussion section. Importantly, the mean scores for  
442 all cohorts were well above neutrality (i.e. answer C, numerical value 3) for questions 2, 3 and 4, indicating that all three  
443 cohorts felt that the FCT benefited their learning, in comparison with traditional lectures.

444  
445 **Table 2: mean  $\pm$  standard deviation for each cohort of students**

Question	PoO	Phys	HOM
1	2.44 $\pm$ 0.55, n=123	2.76 $\pm$ 0.44, n=29	2.65 $\pm$ 0.57, n=113
2	3.55 $\pm$ 0.89, n=121	4.07 $\pm$ 0.53, n=29	3.97 $\pm$ 0.77, n=113
3	3.50 $\pm$ 0.87, n=123	4.05 $\pm$ 0.71, n=29	3.93 $\pm$ 0.73, n=113
4	3.63 $\pm$ 0.91, n=120	3.71 $\pm$ 0.76, n=28	3.65 $\pm$ 0.72, n=111
5	2.28 $\pm$ 0.68, n=122	2.86 $\pm$ 1.06, n=29	2.78 $\pm$ 0.81, n=109

#### 446 447 **Comparing flipped classroom and tutorials**

448 We wanted to see whether students would regard any cross-over between FCT and tutorials, the students'  
449 weekly, small-group teaching sessions known locally as 'supervisions', to be significant enough to raise as an issue without  
450 prompting. Our questionnaires therefore avoided asking about this directly. In fact, from the 265 completed  
451 questionnaires, only 13 students mentioned tutorials at all (4 PoO, 2 Phys and 7 HOM) in their open-ended comments  
452 (Table 3). Three only mentioned tutorials in passing as another source of work (1, 2, 3), four of them note that tutorials and  
453 FCT are similar – although evidently not identical - but this was not seen as a problem (4, 5, 7, 13), while another five refer  
454 to the continued importance of tutorials which are regarded as complementary (6, 8, 9, 10, 12). Comment 11 compares  
455 FCT unfavourably with tutorials, seemingly on the grounds of group size.

456  
457 **Table 3: open-ended questionnaire comments mentioning tutorials ('supervisions' or 'supos')**

Comment number	Comment	Question this elaborates on, and selected option	Cohort
1	too many flipped classroom sessions might take too long to prepare for and reduce the time I can spend on supervision work and other reading	5; B	PoO

2	since the format is to [sic] dependent on preparation if other things e.g. supervision work need to be prioritised, it would be easy to fall behind	5; B	PoO
3	They work well, but previous preparation for a lot of the course, alongside supervision work, could become unmanageable	5; B	PoO
4	Very analogous to supervisions so to do lots would not be useful – however a few are nice – effectively like getting perspective of a different supervisor	5; B	PoO
5	it felt like the lecture was almost a supervision, so details were explored more thoroughly	2; D	Phys
6	[I feel somewhat less prepared for tests/exams] because less on core content (although haven't had supervisions yet)	4; B	Phys
7	Felt the live sessions were similar to a large supervision which I appreciated	2; D	HOM
8	Although college supervisions tend to make up for any lack of understanding	3; D	HOM
9	More supos/practicals on digestion would be useful!	4; C	HOM
10	The information is still the same and reinforced by supervisions	4; C	HOM
11	Still doesn't beat asking supervisors, and working small groups	3; D	HOM
12	most exam aid is from supos	4; C	HOM
13	questions in 'lectures' were supervision style - so stretched the concepts. → took longer however.	2; D	HOM

458

459

The crossover between FCT and tutorials was actively pursued in the interviews following the PoO course.

460

Students clearly recognised similarities in terms of the interactive nature of both types of teaching. The differences they highlighted generally related to the small tutorial group-sizes, which allowed for increased individual attention from their academic tutors ('supervisors'):

461

462

463

464

I was going to say it resembled a supervision in the sense that it was more of us contributing than us absorbing information. I can't say it's entirely similar because we we can only answer through the clicker, we can't give our answers in prose, we could write it down but it wouldn't be evaluated by the lecturer so it's different in that sense (*Interviewee 6*)

465

466

467

468

in supervisions you are usually only together with one or two students or in a group of 3 or something like that, so it's much more individual I would say, and [...] in supervision there is not the competitive aspect, while the flipped classroom teaching [...] was actually more fun and people got more engaged because they wanted to get the marks and compare the results to others, so that's all so stimulating, I would say so there are similarities there are differences as well (*Interviewee 9*)

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

I think the supervisions are definitely a more intense environment because you are directly confronted, you have a conversation and you need to answer something, and I think in the flipped classroom there are also definitely people who just didn't take part [...] but I mean in the style of questions I think was kind of similar (*Interviewee 12*)

476

477

478

479

480

I think yes [*the flipped classroom is similar to supervisions*] it is because in my supervisions, my supervisor also asks questions and then sort of asks has us answer and then he gave us explanations, well it's almost identical I think just with many more people (*Interviewee 4*)

481

482

483

484

As with the questionnaire responses, the similarities identified between FCT and tutorials were apparently not regarded as problematic. Attending the flipped classes might actually improve engagement within tutorials, compared with the normal approach of assimilating the course material through a traditional lecture:

485

486

487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528

I already was very confident with the material before going into the supervision because I had to go through it myself [...] so it wasn't so ok so let's sit here and try and understand this concept, [*but*] now apply this to more complicated problems (*Interviewee 3*)

Participating students had different academic tutors, who inevitably led their tutorial sessions differently (see Table 3, comment 4). This might account for some finding the two approaches more dissimilar than others:

...my supervisor doesn't typically like ask us a bunch of questions on the lecture notes, um he more gives us an opportunity to ask our own questions and then we walk through the lecture notes and that was very different to what we did in the flipped classroom (*Interviewee 8*)

In summary, the evidence from questionnaires and interviews suggested that although students recognised the similarities in the active learning opportunities provided in FCT and tutorials, the students' experiences of the two teaching methods were different. This seemed to relate largely to the more intense environment and personal attention possible in a tutorial, and could be exaggerated by different approaches to the course material taken by different academic tutors.

#### Discussion

This study has shown that our undergraduates generally reported benefitting from FCT in the amount they felt they learned, their depth of understanding and how well-prepared they felt for exams, in comparison with the 'traditional' lectures they were used to. Both the traditional lectures and the flipped courses considered here were supported by weekly small-group teaching sessions (tutorials), organised by the students' colleges. Although tutorials differed by college, students would normally be made to perform tasks similar to those in the 'flipped classroom' sessions - indeed, many of the questions asked in the flipped sessions considered here were adapted by the first author from his own tutorials. Before the flipped courses were introduced, academic colleagues had expressed scepticism about what FCT could offer beyond this, and hence whether there would be any point in replacing traditional lectures with flipped classes. However, perhaps our most striking finding was how very few students spontaneously remarked upon this supposed similarity between FCT and tutorials, although they did recognise the cross-over when prompted to reflect on it in interviews. Despite the regular tutorials that students were still attending throughout the study, there was clearly no widespread feeling that flipped teaching was superfluous, and no indication that traditional lectures would under these circumstances have done a better job in enhancing the students' understanding. Indeed, several comments from questionnaires and interviews suggested that FCT and tutorials were complementary, in that the FCT approach could give students more confidence in tutorials and help them with the formative essay assignments set by tutors, while the greater opportunity to ask questions in tutorials helped to clarify any areas of confusion after the FCT classes.

These results must be interpreted with caution, however. The great majority of questionnaire responses came from students who were present in the final class of each series: we have little insight from students who failed to attend. The relatively low response rate from HOM students can be attributed in part to many having missed the final class. These students had an exam based on another course the following day, and some may have remained at home given escalating concerns about coronavirus. Factors contributing to positive responses to FCT among those students who did attend potentially include the 'novelty effect' of a different approach (Lo & Hwang, 2018), while feedback scores for teaching are also notoriously dependent upon the instructor (Shevlin et al., 2000). The introduction of video presentations doubtless

529 contributed to student satisfaction in the Phys and HOM courses (see e.g., Ramnanan & Pound, 2017), but cannot account  
530 for positive scores in the PoO course which lacked them. Having the opportunity to pause and review videos meant that it  
531 took much longer for some students to get through the background material. This is not necessarily a bad thing, given that  
532 increased time taken in studying could in itself improve learning, but student comments suggested that adequate  
533 preparation might not be sustainable if FCT were implemented more widely. Complaints about increased workload have  
534 followed the introduction of flipped teaching into physiology courses elsewhere (Rae & O'Malley, 2017), but this has not  
535 universally been the case (Street et al., 2015). Some recent research suggests that overall working time may be re-  
536 distributed under the flipped classroom model (Bouwmeester et al., 2019; He et al., 2019). The medical students in the  
537 study of Bouwmeester et al. (2019) indicated that they did not need to spend as much time on revision prior to  
538 examinations.

539 Although they seemed to value the 'flipped classroom' courses, few students felt that FCT should account for  
540 more than half the teaching within the module. This was not because of any cross-over with tutorial work, but was  
541 apparently based largely on the work-load required to prepare for FCT classes, and also because of a perception that FCT  
542 would work better for some subjects than others. Mok (2014) proposed that FCT involving pre-prepared videos can be  
543 particularly useful in fact-heavy subjects, but our students were divided on whether FCT would be better for learning facts  
544 or concepts. Roehl, Reddy, and Shannon (2013) emphasized the usefulness of FCT in courses where information  
545 assimilated in advance can be applied to problem-solving or practical tasks in the flipped sessions. The practical application  
546 of content was most obvious in our HOM course, in which some of the questions asked of our preclinical medical and  
547 veterinary students in the flipped sessions related to how patients might be affected by different digestive conditions.

548 While we remain uncertain of the explanation for the PoO cohort responding with slightly less favourable  
549 average scores than the Phys and HOM cohorts, two factors likely contributed. One was the introduction of video material  
550 into the Phys and HOM courses, mentioned above. Secondly, PoO students were asked to prepare for the flipped classes in  
551 their own time, while the Phys and HOM students had timetabled lecture sessions reallocated for this purpose. The lack of  
552 'clickers' in Phys and HOM evidently did not detract from the students' overall positive impression of these flipped courses.

553

554

555

### Conclusions

556 From the positive student responses to all three FCT courses introduced, the lack of evidence that the students  
557 found interactive classes too similar to their tutorials, and student comments suggesting complementarity of the two  
558 approaches, we conclude that FCT can successfully coexist alongside these small-group teaching sessions. Although the  
559 style of active learning may be similar when a FCT class is divided into smaller subgroups, and the tasks given to those  
560 subgroups are akin to those given to a tutorial group, we believe that the different levels of individual attention from the  
561 instructor represents the key distinction between these teaching types. The amount of individual attention will inevitably  
562 depend upon factors including group-size and physical setting: working in a relatively anonymous way in a large lecture  
563 theatre, as part of one group among many, evidently feels very different to tackling similar problems when sat at a table  
564 opposite an academic tutor. The intense learning environment in Oxford tutorials is likely to exaggerate the perceived  
565 difference between interactive small-group teaching and FCT, in comparison with other educational institutions which  
566 might offer small-group teaching with more students in a group. However, as long as those students know that their  
567 contribution is being individually monitored, we suggest that they would still regard FCT as offering a different type of  
568 learning experience. Although we were not able to investigate learning outcomes in the present study, increasing the  
569 amount of active learning would be regarded as beneficial by most teaching professionals, and active learning is popular  
570 among students too. The results of our study show that both FCT and small-group tutorials can usefully contribute to this,



571 within the same course. These findings should be broadly applicable to other institutions considering introducing flipped  
572 classroom to courses with active learning opportunities already available through small-group teaching, or vice versa.

573

574

575

576

577

## References

- 578 Akçayır, G., & Akçayır, M. (2018). The flipped classroom: A review of its advantages and challenges. *Computers &*  
579 *Education, 126*, 334-345.
- 580 Arksey, H., & Knight, P. T. (1999). *Interviewing for Social Scientists*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- 581 Ashwin, P. (2005). Variation in students' experiences of the 'Oxford Tutorial'. *Higher Education, 50*, 631-644.
- 582 Ashwin, P. (2006). Variation in academics' accounts of tutorials. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(6), 651-665.
- 583 Beck, R. J. (2007). *Towards a pedagogy of the Oxford Tutorial* Conference on the Oxford tutorial, Lawrence University,  
584 Appleton, WI, March 31, 2007.
- 585 Bhagat, K. K., Chang, C. N., & Chang, C. Y. (2016). The impact of the flipped classroom on mathematics concept learning in  
586 high school. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 19*(3), 134-142.
- 587 Bouwmeester, R. A., de Kleijn, R. A., van den Berg, I. E., ten Cate, O. T. J., van Rijen, H. V., & Westerveld, H. E. (2019).  
588 Flipping the medical classroom: Effect on workload, interactivity, motivation and retention of knowledge.  
589 *Computers & Education, 139*, 118-128.
- 590 Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge.
- 591 Comber, D. P. M., & Brady-Van den Bos, M. (2018). Too much, too soon? A critical investigation into factors that make  
592 Flipped Classrooms effective. *Higher Education Research & Development, 37*(4), 683-697.
- 593 Cosgrove, R. (2011). Critical thinking in the Oxford tutorial: A call for an explicit and systematic approach. *Higher Education*  
594 *Research & Development, 30*(3), 343-356.
- 595 Díaz, M. J. S., & Narciso, D. (2019). The impact of the flipped classroom in higher education: a case study. *Aloma: Revista de*  
596 *Psicología, Ciències de l'Educació i de l'Esport, 37*(2), 15-23.
- 597 Exley, K., & Dennick, R. (2004). *Small Group Teaching: Tutorials, Seminars and Beyond*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- 598 Foldnes, N. (2016). The flipped classroom and cooperative learning: Evidence from a randomised experiment. *Active*  
599 *Learning in Higher Education, 17*(1), 39-49.
- 600 Gomez-Lanier, L. (2018). Building collaboration in the flipped classroom: a case study. *International Journal for the*  
601 *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12*(2, article 7), 1-9.
- 602 He, W., Holton, A., Gu, H., Warschauer, M., & Farkas, G. (2019). Differentiated impact of flipped instruction: when would  
603 flipped instruction work or falter? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 31*(1), 32-  
604 49.
- 605 Herreid, C. F., & Schiller, N. A. (2013). Case studies and the flipped classroom. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 42*(5),  
606 62-66.
- 607 Horn, J. (2013). Signature pedagogy/powerful pedagogy: the Oxford tutorial system in the humanities. *Arts and Humanities*  
608 *in Higher Education, 12*(4), 350-366.
- 609 Jensen, J. L., Kummer, T. A., & Godoy, P. D. d. M. (2015). Improvements from a flipped classroom may simply be the fruits  
610 of active learning. *CBE Life Sciences Education 14*(1, article 5), 1-12.
- 611 Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: an overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*, 212-218.
- 612 Lo, C. K., & Hwang, G.-J. (2018). How to advance our understanding of flipped learning: directions and a descriptive  
613 framework for future research. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning, 10*(4), 441-454.  
614 file:///C:/Users/44793/Downloads/38-118-1-PB.pdf
- 615 Mason, G. S., Shuman, T. R., & Cook, K. E. (2013). Comparing the effectiveness of an inverted classroom to a traditional  
616 classroom in an upper-division engineering course. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 56*(4), 430-435.
- 617 Mazur, E. (2009). Farewell, lecture? *Science, 323*, 50-51.
- 618 McNally, B., Chipperfield, J., Dorsett, P., Del Fabbro, L., Frommolt, V., Goetz, S., Lewohl, J., Molineux, M., Pearson, A.,  
619 Reddan, G., Roiko, A., & Rung, A. (2017). Flipped classroom experiences: student preferences and flip strategy in  
620 a higher education context. *Higher Education 73*(2), 281-298.
- 621 Mok, H. N. (2014). Teaching tip: the flipped classroom. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 25*(1), 7-11.
- 622 Morgan, J. H. (2013). Re-inventing the tutorial in an internet world: an enhancement of an old English tradition. *Journal of*  
623 *Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences, 5*(3), 522-532.
- 624 Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., Sánchez, J. Á. L., & Godoy-Caballero, A. L. (2019). How the flipped classroom affects knowledge,  
625 skills, and engagement in higher education: effects on students' satisfaction. *Computers & Education,*  
626 *141*(103608).
- 627 Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education,*  
628 *15*, 625-632.
- 629 O'Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *The Internet and*  
630 *Higher Education, 25*, 85-95.

- 631 Rae, M. G., & O'Malley, D. (2017). Student attitudes towards semi-flipped classroom teaching in a pre-clinical graduate  
632 entry to medicine Physiology module. *MedEdPublish*, 6(1), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.12017.000009>  
633 Ramnanan, C. J., & Pound, L. D. (2017). Advances in medical education and practice: student perceptions of the flipped  
634 classroom. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 8, 63-73.  
635 Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: a systematic  
636 review. *Computers & Education*, 144(103701).  
637 Roehl, A., Reddy, S. L., & Shannon, G. J. (2013). The flipped classroom: an opportunity to engage Millennial students  
638 through active learning strategies. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, 105(2), 44-49.  
639 Rotellar, C., & Cain, J. (2016). Research, perspectives, and recommendations on implementing the flipped classroom.  
640 *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 80(2, article 34), 1-9.  
641 Shevlin, M., Banyard, P., Davies, M., & Griffiths, M. (2000). The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher  
642 education: love me, love my lectures? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25, 397-405.  
643 Street, S. E., Gilliland, K. O., McNeil, C., & Royal, K. (2015). The flipped classroom improved medical student performance  
644 and satisfaction in a pre-clinical physiology course. *Medical Science Educator*, 25, 35-43.  
645 Tapper, T., & Palfreyman, D. (2002). Understanding collegiality: the changing Oxbridge model. *Tertiary Education &*  
646 *Management*, 8(1), 47-63.

647