

# Improving students' learning and performance in pre-clinical endodontics



THE UNIVERSITY  
*of* ADELAIDE

School of Dentistry

**Mohamed Yahya El-Kishawi**

DDS, BScDent (Hons)

---

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Dentistry

**May 2016**



# Table of contents

<b>Table of contents</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>List of tables</b> .....	<b>IX</b>
<b>List of figures</b> .....	<b>XI</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b> .....	<b>XIII</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>XV</b>
<b>Thesis declaration</b> .....	<b>XIX</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>XXI</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Literature review</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1 Current knowledge related to motor skill learning in dentistry .....	5
2.2 Learning endodontic skills.....	6
2.2.1 Root canal preparation instruments .....	9
2.2.2 Root canal instrumentation techniques.....	10
2.2.2.1 Crown-down.....	11
2.2.2.2 Step-back.....	12
2.2.2.3 Hybrid (modified double-flared) .....	12
2.2.3 Hand instrument manipulation: balanced force technique.....	13
2.2.4 Endodontic measures of success.....	14
2.2.4.1 Quality of root canal preparation .....	15
2.2.4.2 Root canal preparation errors.....	15
2.3 Neurophysiology of fine motor skill learning and control .....	18
2.3.1 Sensory input during fine motor skill learning .....	22
2.4 Factors affecting motor skill learning.....	24
2.4.1 Instructions.....	24
2.4.2 Abilities of the learner .....	26
2.4.3 Variation in practice .....	28
2.5 Motor skill learning theories .....	29
2.5.1 Schema theory.....	29

2.5.2	Cognitive load theory .....	33
2.5.2.1	Types of cognitive load.....	35
2.5.3	Novice-Expert continuum.....	38
2.5.4	Reinvestment theory.....	40
2.5.4.1	Implicit and explicit learning .....	42
2.5.4.2	Implicit and explicit learning approaches .....	43
2.5.4.3	Impact of stress on motor skill learning.....	46
2.6	Summary .....	47
2.7	Aims and hypotheses .....	49
<b>3</b>	<b>Study 1: Errorless vs errorful learning .....</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	51
3.2	Methods .....	54
3.2.1	Curriculum context: Adelaide pre-clinical endodontic component .....	54
3.2.2	Research design for Study 1 .....	56
3.2.3	Pilot study.....	59
3.2.3.1	Type, number and sequence of learning blocks .....	59
3.2.3.2	Selection of hand instruments and working length .....	60
3.2.3.3	Number of trials .....	61
3.2.3.4	Instructions .....	62
3.2.3.5	Time frame .....	63
3.2.4	Participants.....	64
3.2.4.1	Recruitment procedures .....	64
3.2.4.2	Inclusion and exclusion criteria.....	64
3.2.4.3	Sample size.....	65
3.2.5	Research materials and methods.....	66
3.2.5.1	Preparation of blocks for the learning phase.....	66
3.2.5.2	Learning phase procedure .....	67
3.2.5.3	Instructions provided .....	68
3.2.5.4	Preparation of teeth for testing phase .....	69
3.2.5.5	Transfer test phase procedures .....	73
3.2.6	Sequence and timing of data collection.....	75
3.2.7	Data analysis.....	76
3.2.7.1	Assessment of performance .....	76
3.2.7.2	Errors of measurement .....	81
3.2.7.3	Comparison of performance between groups.....	83
3.3	Results .....	86
3.3.1	Demographic data of participants.....	86

3.3.2	Error of measurements .....	86
3.3.2.1	Intra-rater measures of prepared canals lengths .....	86
3.3.2.2	Inter-rater measures of prepared canals lengths .....	88
3.3.3	Learning trials .....	89
3.3.3.1	Accuracy of preparation .....	89
3.3.3.2	Completion time .....	90
3.3.3.3	Procedural errors .....	91
3.3.4	Transfer tests .....	92
3.3.4.1	Accuracy of preparation .....	92
3.3.4.2	Completion time .....	93
3.3.4.3	Responses to secondary task .....	94
3.3.4.4	Procedural errors .....	94
3.3.4.5	Reported rules .....	96
3.4	Discussion .....	97
3.5	Study limitations .....	103
3.6	Implications for practice .....	103
3.7	Future research .....	105
3.8	Conclusions .....	106
<b>4</b>	<b>Study 2: Learning by observation .....</b>	<b>109</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	109
4.2	Methods .....	113
4.2.1	Research design for Study 2 .....	113
4.2.2	Pilot study .....	116
4.2.2.1	Type, number and sequence of learning blocks .....	116
4.2.2.2	Selection of hand instruments and working length .....	117
4.2.2.3	Number of trials .....	117
4.2.2.4	Time frame .....	118
4.2.2.5	Video demonstration .....	118
4.2.2.6	Verbal instructions .....	119
4.2.2.7	Selection of stressors and measurement of stress levels .....	119
4.2.3	Participants .....	122
4.2.3.1	Recruitment procedures .....	122
4.2.3.2	Inclusion and exclusion criteria .....	122
4.2.3.3	Sample size .....	123
4.2.4	Research materials and methods .....	123
4.2.4.1	Preparation of blocks for the learning phase .....	123
4.2.4.2	Learning phase procedure .....	123

4.2.4.3	Instructions provided .....	124
4.2.4.4	Preparation of teeth for testing phase .....	126
4.2.4.5	Transfer test phase procedures .....	126
4.2.5	Sequence and timing of data collection .....	128
4.2.6	Data analysis.....	129
4.2.6.1	Assessment of performance .....	129
4.2.6.2	Errors of measurement .....	131
4.2.6.3	Comparison of performance between groups.....	131
4.3	Results .....	133
4.3.1	Demographic data of participants.....	133
4.3.2	Error of measurements .....	133
4.3.2.1	Intra-rater measures of prepared canals lengths .....	133
4.3.3	Learning trials.....	135
4.3.3.1	Accuracy of preparation.....	135
4.3.3.2	Completion time .....	136
4.3.3.3	Procedural errors .....	137
4.3.4	Transfer tests.....	139
4.3.4.1	Accuracy of preparation.....	139
4.3.4.2	Completion time .....	140
4.3.4.3	Procedural errors .....	141
4.3.4.4	Responses to secondary task .....	142
4.3.4.5	Stress levels .....	142
4.3.4.6	Reported rules.....	146
4.4	Discussion.....	147
4.5	Study limitations .....	154
4.6	Implications for practice .....	154
4.7	Future research .....	155
4.8	Conclusions .....	156
<b>5</b>	<b>Study 3: Impact of reinvestment on performance .....</b>	<b>159</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	159
5.2	Methods .....	161
5.2.1	The Reinvestment Scale (RS).....	161
5.2.2	The Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) .....	162
5.2.3	The Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) .....	163
5.2.4	Data analysis.....	164
5.2.4.1	Descriptive statistics.....	164
5.2.4.2	Validity assessments .....	164

5.2.4.3	Impact of reinvestment on performance.....	166
5.3	Results .....	167
5.3.1	Descriptive statistics for Study 1 .....	167
5.3.1.1	Responses to the three surveys .....	167
5.3.1.2	Reinvestment survey scores.....	169
5.3.2	Descriptive statistics for Study 2 .....	170
5.3.2.1	Percentage of responses to the three surveys .....	170
5.3.2.2	Reinvestment survey scores for Study 2 .....	173
5.3.3	Comparison of survey scores with previous studies .....	173
5.3.4	Factor analysis and internal consistency reliability.....	174
5.3.4.1	Reinvestment Scale (RS).....	174
5.3.4.2	Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) .....	176
5.3.4.3	Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) .....	177
5.3.5	Impact of reinvestment on performance.....	179
5.3.5.1	Performance of low and high reinvesters in Study 1 .....	179
5.3.5.2	Performance of low and high reinvesters in Study 2 .....	183
5.4	Discussion.....	190
5.5	Study limitations .....	194
5.6	Future research .....	195
5.7	Conclusions .....	196
<b>6</b>	<b>General discussion.....</b>	<b>199</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	199
6.2	Study limitations .....	206
6.3	Implications for practice .....	208
6.4	Future research .....	209
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>228</b>
9.1	List of achievements and professional development activities of Mohamed El-Kishawi during PhD candidature 2012-2015 .....	228
9.2	Steps for root canal instrumentation using hand instruments.....	231
9.3	Ethical approval notice for Study 1 .....	233
9.4	Pilot test (Study 1).....	235
9.4.1	Study 1 pilot blocks and teeth.....	235
9.4.2	Study 1: pilot test results for order of learning blocks according to difficulty....	237

9.4.3	Study 1: pilot test completion times results for learning blocks.....	238
9.4.4	Study 1: pilot for number of trials to show improvement .....	238
9.5	Run sheets Study 1 and 2 .....	240
9.5.1	Learning phase .....	240
9.5.2	Transfer test .....	241
9.5.3	Audio response recording sheet .....	242
9.6	Ethical approval notice for Study 2 .....	243
9.7	Study 2 video link: .....	244
9.8	Study 2 video script:.....	244
9.9	Stress scales.....	247
9.9.1	State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI).....	247
9.9.2	Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) .....	248
9.10	Sample of Heart Rate data during learning and testing phases.....	249
9.11	Reinvestment surveys: .....	250
9.11.1	The Reinvestment Scale .....	250
9.11.2	Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale.....	252
9.11.3	Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale .....	254
9.12	Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) data .....	256
9.13	Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) data .....	258
9.14	Composition of factors for confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis models.....	260
9.15	Comparison of factor analysis with previous studies.....	261

## List of tables

Table 3.1. Number of hours spent during endodontic interactive lectures and simulated clinical sessions .....	55
Table 3.2. Summary of pilot study results for Study 1 .....	63
Table 3.3. Summary of demographic data for the two experimental and comparative groups for Study 1 .....	86
Table 3.4. Intra-rater repeated measures of prepared canal length of the plastic blocks and teeth from learning and testing trials .....	87
Table 3.5. Inter-rater repeated measures of prepared canal length of the plastic blocks and teeth from learning and testing trials .....	88
Table 4.1. Summary of pilot study results for Study 2 .....	121
Table 4.2. Summary of demographic data for the guided-observation (GO), instructed-observation (IO), observation-only (OO), and comparative (COM2) groups .....	133
Table 4.3. Intra-rater repeated measures of prepared canal length of the plastic blocks and teeth from learning and testing trials .....	134
Table 4.4. Comparisons of procedural errors between learning blocks within each experimental group .....	138
Table 4.5. Comparisons of completion times between transfer tests 1, 2, and 3 within each experimental and comparative groups .....	140
Table 4.6. Comparisons of State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) scores between transfer tests 1, 2, and 3 within each of the experimental and comparative groups .....	143
Table 4.7. Comparisons of mean heart rate (HR) between transfer tests 1, 2, and 3 within each experimental and comparative group .....	145
Table 5.1. Percentages for responses to items for the Reinvestment Scale in Study 1 .....	167
Table 5.2. Percentages for responses to items for the Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale in Study 1 .....	168
Table 5.3. Percentages for responses to items for the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale in Study 1 .....	169
Table 5.4. Percentages for responses to items for the Reinvestment Scale in Study 2 .....	171
Table 5.5. Percentages for responses to items for the Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale in Study 2 .....	171
Table 5.6. Percentages for responses to items for the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale in Study 2 .....	172
Table 5.7. Comparison of the mean survey scores between the present study (Study 1 and 2 data combined) and previous published data for the three reinvestment surveys .....	174
Table 5.8. Goodness of fit tests of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models for the Reinvestment Scale .....	175
Table 5.9. Goodness of fit tests of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models for the Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale .....	176
Table 5.10. Goodness of fit tests of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models for the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale .....	178
Table 5.11. Numbers of low (L) and high (H) reinvesters in each group based on a median split of the three reinvestment surveys scores .....	180
Table 5.12. Numbers of low (L) and high (H) reinvesters in each group based on a median split of the three reinvestment survey scores .....	183
Table 9.1. Model fit indices used, their cut-off values, and description .....	256
Table 9.2. Items and loadings for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Reinvestment Scale (RS) .....	256

Table 9.3. Items and loadings for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) .....	257
Table 9.4. Items and loadings for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) .....	257
Table 9.5. Items and loadings for the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the Reinvestment Scale (RS).....	258
Table 9.6. Items and loadings for the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) .....	259
Table 9.7. Items and loadings for the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) .....	259
Table 9.8. The Reinvestment Scale composition of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models .....	260
Table 9.9. The Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale composition of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models.....	260
Table 9.10. The Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale composition of factors for confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models.....	260
Table 9.11. Comparison of the comparative fit indices between the current study and the original surveys data for the three reinvestment surveys.....	261
Table 9.12. Comparison of subscale Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha$ ) values between the current data and data from the Movement- and Decision-Specific Reinvestment Surveys. ....	261

## List of figures

Figure 2.1. A diagram summarising the three key movements in the balanced force technique. ....	14
Figure 2.2. Parts of the brain involved in fine motor movement (modified from Watson, 2006). ....	20
Figure 3.1. Summary of Study 1 plan .....	58
Figure 3.2. Illustration of the three key movements in the balanced force technique. ....	63
Figure 3.3. Setup for learning trials.....	66
Figure 3.4. Learning phase: plastic blocks sequence (Study 1).....	68
Figure 3.5. Testing phase: plastic tooth (mandibular left first molar).....	70
Figure 3.6. A: Setup for transfer test. ....	73
Figure 3.7. Digital radiographic image of plastic teeth in the manikin model.....	74
Figure 3.8. Learning block radiographic assessment. ....	78
Figure 3.9. Plastic teeth assessment setup.....	79
Figure 3.10. An example of a digital radiograph of plastic teeth for assessment.....	80
Figure 3.11. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (17.5 mm) for the prepared canal in each of the endodontic learning blocks for E less and E ful groups.....	90
Figure 3.12. Mean time (minutes) taken to complete canal preparation for each type of the endodontic learning blocks for E less and E ful groups. ....	91
Figure 3.13. Number of procedural errors made by E less and E ful groups during the learning phase.....	92
Figure 3.14. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 and 2 for E less, E ful, and COM1 groups... ..	93
Figure 3.15. Mean time (minutes) spent to complete the task during transfer tests 1 and 2 for E less, E ful, and COM1 groups. ....	94
Figure 3.16. Number of procedural errors made by E less, E ful and COM1 groups during the testing phase.....	95
Figure 3.17. Mean number of reported rules from instructions related to the preparation technique provided to E less and E ful groups.....	96
Figure 4.1. Summary of Study 2 plan .....	115
Figure 4.2. Diagram used in the second section of the video to indicate the progress of each instrument. ....	119
Figure 4.3. Learning phase clear plastic blocks sequence.....	124
Figure 4.4. Guided-observation group demonstration model.....	125
Figure 4.5. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (17.5 mm) for the prepared canal in each of the endodontic learning blocks for GO, IO, and OO groups.....	136
Figure 4.6. Mean time (minutes) taken to complete canal preparations for each type of the endodontic learning blocks for GO, IO, and OO groups. ....	137
Figure 4.7. Number of procedural errors made by GO, IO, and OO groups during the learning phase.....	138
Figure 4.8. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1, 2 and 3 for GO, IO, OO, and COM2 groups. ....	139
Figure 4.9. Mean time (minutes) spent to complete the task during transfer tests 1, 2 and 3 for GO, IO, OO, and COM2 groups. ....	141

Figure 4.10. Number of procedural errors made by GO, IO, OO, and COM2 groups during the testing phase.....	142
Figure 4.11. Mean STAI survey scores (out of 24 points) and PSS scores (out of 40 points) at transfer tests 1 (STAI1), 2 (STAI2), and 3 (STAI3) for GO, IO, OO, and COM2 groups. ....	144
Figure 4.12 Mean heart rate (bpm) for GO, IO, OO, and COM2 groups during transfer tests 1, 2 and 3. ....	145
Figure 4.13. Mean number of rules related to the balanced force technique reported by GO, IO, and OO groups following the testing phase. ....	146
Figure 5.1. Scores from the errorless (E less), errorful (E ful), and comparative (COM1) groups for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	170
Figure 5.2. Scores from the guided-observation (GO), instructed-observation (IO), observation-only (OO), and comparative (COM2) groups for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	173
Figure 5.3. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters based on a median split, for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	180
Figure 5.4. Mean time (minutes) spent to complete the task during transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters, based on a median split for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	181
Figure 5.5. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters (using 25 <sup>th</sup> & 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles) for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	182
Figure 5.6. Mean time (minutes) spent to complete the task during transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters (using 25 <sup>th</sup> & 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles) for the three reinvestment surveys.....	182
Figure 5.7. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 (primary task), 2 (multi-tasking), and 3 (under stress) for low and high reinvesters (based on a median split) for the three reinvestment surveys.....	184
Figure 5.8. Mean time (minutes) spent to complete the task during transfer tests 1 (primary task), 2 (multi-tasking), and 3 (under stress) for low and high reinvesters (based on a median split) for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	184
Figure 5.9. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters (using 25 <sup>th</sup> & 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles) for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	186
Figure 5.10. Mean distance (millimetres) that the last instrument reached compared to the target distance (19.5 mm) in transfer tests 1 (primary task) and 2 (multi-tasking) for low and high reinvesters (using 25 <sup>th</sup> & 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles) for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	186
Figure 5.11. Mean heart rate (HR) measures in transfer tests 1 (primary task), 2 (multi-tasking), and 3 (under stress) for low and high reinvesters (based on a median split) for the three reinvestment surveys.....	187
Figure 5.12. Mean state trait anxiety inventory (STAI) survey scores (out of 24 points) in transfer tests 1 (primary task), 2 (multi-tasking), and 3 (under stress) for low and high reinvesters (based on a median split) for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	188
Figure 5.13. Mean perceived stress scale (PSS) scores (out of 40 points) in transfer tests 1 (primary task), 2 (multi-tasking), and 3 (under stress) for low and high reinvesters (based on a median split), for the three reinvestment surveys. ....	189

## List of abbreviations

AIC	Akaike Information Criterion
BDS	Bachelor of Dental Surgery
BFT	Balanced Force Technique
CF	Cognitive Failure
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
CMP	Conscious Motor Processing
COM1	Comparative group (Study 1)
COM2	Comparative group (Study 2)
DRe	Decision Reinvestment
DRu	Decision Rumination
DSRS	Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
E <sub>ful</sub>	Errorful
E <sub>less</sub>	Error less
GFI	Goodness-of-Fit Index
GO	Guided-observation
HR	Heart Rate
IO	Instructed-observation
ISAT	Imperial Stress Assessment Tool
MSC	Movement Self-Consciousness
MSRS	Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale
N0°	Narrow straight canal block
N20°	Narrow 20° curved canal block
NiTi	Nickel-titanium
OO	Observation-only
PrSC	Private Self-Consciousness
PSS	Perceived Stress Scale
PuSC	Public Self-Consciousness
RH	Rehearsal
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
RS	Reinvestment Scale
SRMR	Standardised Root Mean-squared Residual
STAI	State-Trait Anxiety Inventory
W0°	Wide straight canal block
W20°	Wide 20° curved canal block



## **Abstract**

There has been limited use of contemporary learning theories or available evidence when designing activities to develop fine motor skills in dentistry. Recent evidence from non-dental studies concerning levels of performance following fine motor skill learning highlights the negative impact of reinvestment, i.e. conscious monitoring and control of movements when learning, particularly during the early stages of learning. Learning implicitly so that minimal conscious involvement is required (e.g. approaches that minimise errors or involve observation with physical guidance), has been shown to limit the effect of reinvestment on subsequent performance. This leads to positive and sustained outcomes, even under multi-tasking or stressful conditions, in comparison to commonly used explicit approaches (e.g. approaches that involve error production or observation with instructions) (Maxwell et al., 2001; Poolton et al., 2011).

Outcomes of learning implicitly are important in dentistry because working under stressful conditions (e.g. physiological or psychological) is a consistent characteristic, either during undergraduate study or in practice. However, there are no published data about this approach for learning dental skills. The aim of this research was to evaluate the effect of learning approaches, consistent with implicit or explicit learning, on the acquisition of endodontic hand instrumentation skills among dental students. It was hypothesised that learning implicitly (e.g. by limiting errors or observation with guidance) would result in minimal decrement in performance under pressured or stressful conditions. In contrast, it was expected that learning explicitly (e.g. through increasing errors or observation with instructions and observation alone)

would lead to a reduction in performance under pressured or stressful conditions. It was also aimed to investigate the impact of reinvestment on performance of the dental students. It was hypothesised that individuals with a high propensity for conscious monitoring during root canal preparation would not perform as well as low reinvesters, as a consequence of allocating working memory resources to monitoring and controlling their movements.

Participants were volunteer dental students from the University of Adelaide, with no previous endodontic work or learning experiences. These students were randomly assigned to the experimental groups. Other volunteer dental students who had completed the normal pre-clinical learning activities provided comparative performance data.

Participants performed fundamental root-canal hand instrumentation tasks during learning (experimental groups: 1.5-2h; comparative groups: 15-20h) and testing phases (0.5-1h). During learning, participants in the experimental groups prepared standardised canals with different canal diameters and curvatures using the balanced force technique. Learning methods in the experimental groups involved minimising (errorless: n=21) or maximising errors (errorful: n=21) in Study 1, or guided-observation (n=23), instructed-observation (n=23), or observation-only (n=13) in Study 2. Participants in Study 1 and Study 2 completed the three previously published reinvestment surveys related to propensity to reinvest. These were used to evaluate participants' focus of attention behaviours on learning and performance in general.

To test performance levels after the learning phases, all participants prepared the distal canal on a plastic tooth (Test 1), then completed the same task under multi-

tasking condition (Test 2), with the observation groups completing Test 1 again but under stressful conditions (Test 3). Performance was assessed by preparation accuracy, completion time, procedural errors, and reported rules. For accuracy and time, repeated measures ANOVA and post-hoc analyses were used to assess differences within and between groups, while procedural errors were analysed using Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test. Differences in the number of reported rules between the groups were assessed by an unpaired t-tests for Study 1 and a one way ANOVA and post-hoc analyses for Study 2.

Performance by the experimental groups was similar during learning. When tested, accuracy of preparation and completion time in the errorless and comparative groups did not change significantly under multi-tasking conditions ( $p > 0.05$ ), whereas, learners who learnt with errors showed a significant deterioration in preparation accuracy when multi-tasking ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants' reported significantly increased stress levels in all observation groups for all tests ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, preparation accuracy did not differ significantly within or between the experimental observation and comparative groups ( $p > 0.05$ ). The errorful and instructed-observation learning groups reported significantly more 'root canal instrumentation rules' than the errorless, guided-observation and observation-only groups. Correlation analyses of data from the Reinvestment Scale (RS), the Movement-specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS), and the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) showed significant association between the three reinvestment surveys. However, no significant differences for the three reinvestment surveys were found between experimental and comparative groups in Study 1 and 2. Furthermore, no significant differences in accuracy of canal preparation or completion times were found between 'low' and

'high' reinvesters based on a median split for the primary task, under multi-tasking, or under stressful conditions.

Findings from Study 1 provide the first evidence that learning endodontic skills implicitly, i.e. under conditions that limit errors, resulted in stable performance when multi-tasking. This may be explained by reduced use of working memory for error management when learning. However, the learning strategies adopted when learning by observation with guidance were not consistent with implicit learning approaches. This conclusion is supported by the high number of errors produced during learning trials on plastic blocks and the apparent low level of accuracy of performance during transfer tests. This finding highlights difficulties associated with designing approaches that are consistent with learning implicitly in the real world.

The apparently low impact of reinvestment on performance of participants in Study 1 and 2 may be explained by the small number of low and high reinvesters in both studies and the variable level of complexity in the instructions provided. Propensity to reinvest is suggested to be dependent on performance context and task attentional demands. The fine motor learning context in endodontics and the complexity of dental tasks are likely to be different to those encountered in sports or in surgery, which might explain the variable impact of reinvestment on performance. Further research of learning other skills by dental students is needed, including testing different implicit learning paradigms and investigating the role that the reinvestment might play when learning endodontic skills. These studies should lead to better outcomes, especially during multi-tasking and under stressful environments.

# Thesis declaration

Name: **Mohamed Yahya El-Kishawi**

Program: **PhD in Dentistry**

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## Acknowledgments

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my principal supervisor Associate Professor Tracey Winning; you have been a tremendous mentor for me. I would like to thank you for encouraging my research and for allowing me to grow as a researcher and educator. Your advice and guidance throughout my candidature has been invaluable, without which this research would have been impossible to complete. I would like also to thank my co-supervisor Professor Grant Townsend for his effortless support, encouragement and guidance. You have been a great mentor and a wonderful team leader for our group. I am thankful and grateful to Miss Suzanne Edwards for the time and effort she placed in assisting and guiding me through the data analysis. My appreciation and thankfulness to Professor Rich Masters for providing me with valuable comments that added to my knowledge and enriched my thoughts. I would like to thank Dr Peter Cathro for believing in this research and sharing with me some of his valuable clinical teaching experience in Endodontics. I would like to thank all my supervisors for their valuable feedback, not only in preparation of this thesis, but for insight, knowledge, and clarification over the past years and for all of their countless hours they spent in assessing and reviewing my previous drafts.

My appreciation and thankfulness extends to all members of the Craniofacial Biology and Dental Education Group who overwhelmed me with their kindness, their warm smiles and their family like environment. I am thankful to Associate Professor John Kaidonis for being my family grantor and for supervising my clinical teaching during my candidature. I would especially like to thank Karen Squires for being helpful at all times and for organising our afternoon gatherings and travel arrangements, and thanks to Michelle Bockmann for her generous help and lovely smiles.

Warmest thanks go to my dearest friends Dr Abdulaziz Almajed, Dr Akram Qutoub, Dr Abdulrahman Al-Azri, Captain Abdullah Alhariri and their families, for sharing with me this journey on weekly basis, my brother Abdulrahman El-qishawi and Nour Abu-qasem for their unlimited support and care. All of you have been there to

support me when I needed most and you made my long journey less lonely full of fun and memories, thank you.

A special thanks to my family, Words cannot express how grateful I am to my lovely wife and best friend Dr Ruba Odeh for all of the sacrifices that you have made on my behalf; I cannot thank you enough for encouraging me throughout this experience. My darling boys, Zaid and Malik, I would like to express my thanks for being such good boys always cheering me up. Moreover, to my sweetheart Zeina, who encouraged me with every smile.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to the most loving, caring and kindest ever, to my mother Fahima Al Qeshawi. Your prayers for me were what sustained me this far, I hope I have made you proud. In addition, this thesis is dedicated to my brothers Abdulhay, Abdelrahman, Ahmad, and Hussain for all the support care and unconstrained love.

Many thanks to the students of the School of Dentistry at The University of Adelaide. I would like to thank the Australian Dental Research Foundation (ADRF); the Australian Society of Endodontology (ASE); Centre for Orofacial Research and Learning (CORAL); International Association for Dental Research (IADR), Education Research Group (ERG) for their research grants; and the University of Adelaide 2012-2014 for providing me with a scholarship.