



## Obstacles and Challenges Facing the Education of Hospital Staff and Ways to Address Them

**1Ali Jamaan Thamir Alharbi, 2Mohammed Abdullah Alsaedi, 3Mohammed Abdullah Altuwayjiri, 4Faris Jazi M Alotaibi, 5Mohammed Abdulrahman Abdullah Alamri, 6Saud Mohammed Alotaibi, 7Assaf Shuaib Mofareh Alharbi, 8Khalid Fayadh Abdullah Alotaibi, 9Abdulaziz Mudhhi Abdullah Alquraini, 10Ahmed Abdullah Faihan Alotaibi**

1Health Assistant-Emergency Medical Services, King Abdulaziz Medical City

2Health Assistant-Emergency Medical Services, King Abdulaziz Medical City

3Technician-Medical Devices, King Abdulaziz Medical City

4Paramedic Technician

5Technician-Emergency Medical Services, King Abdulaziz Medical City

6Medical Laboratory, Ministry Of The National Guard

7Medical Devices Specialist, Ministry Of The National Guard

8Emergency Medical Services

9Emergency Medical Services

10Emergency Medical Services

### ABSTRACT

The education and training of hospital staff constitutes a cornerstone of high-quality, safe, and efficient healthcare delivery. However, the process of educating healthcare professionals within hospital settings is beset by a complex constellation of obstacles spanning organizational, financial, technological, cultural, and individual dimensions. This paper provides a comprehensive scientific analysis of the principal obstacles and challenges that impede effective hospital staff education, drawing on peer-reviewed literature, institutional reports, and global health workforce frameworks. For each identified challenge, the paper presents evidence-based strategies and practical recommendations designed to overcome or mitigate the obstacle. Key findings indicate that barriers such as time constraints, resource limitations, resistance to change, inadequate needs assessment, technological gaps, and workforce diversity require targeted, multi-level interventions. The paper argues that sustainable improvement in hospital staff education requires a systems-thinking approach that integrates leadership commitment, adaptive instructional design, robust evaluation, and an organizational culture that prizes continuous learning.



**Keywords:** hospital staff education, training barriers, healthcare workforce development, continuing professional development, organizational learning, training challenges, healthcare training strategies

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Hospitals are among the most complex organizations in modern society. They operate continuously, manage life-critical processes, integrate advanced technologies, and serve populations with diverse and evolving needs. The staff who work within these institutions—physicians, nurses, pharmacists, allied health professionals, technicians, and administrators—must possess current, accurate, and practically applicable knowledge to deliver safe and effective care. Education and training, therefore, are not peripheral activities in hospitals; they are central to organizational performance and patient safety.

Despite the recognized importance of hospital staff education, its delivery is fraught with persistent and multifaceted obstacles. These range from systemic challenges such as limited funding and inadequate infrastructure, to individual-level barriers including motivational deficits and learning style heterogeneity. The intersection of these challenges with the operational demands of acute care environments makes hospital staff education one of the most difficult undertakings in institutional workforce management.

Globally, health systems are grappling with an accelerating pace of medical knowledge expansion, the proliferation of digital health technologies, and increasing expectations for patient-centered, evidence-based care. These dynamics intensify the imperative for robust, ongoing staff education while simultaneously amplifying the challenges of delivering it effectively. The World Health Organization estimates that by 2030, the world will face a shortage of 18 million health workers, making the optimization of existing workforce training capacity an urgent global priority (WHO, 2016).

This paper undertakes a systematic examination of the primary obstacles facing hospital staff education and proposes evidence-based solutions for each. It is organized thematically, addressing organizational, financial, technological, pedagogical, cultural, and individual-level challenges in turn, before presenting an integrative framework for sustainable improvement.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: UNDERSTANDING BARRIERS TO LEARNING IN HOSPITALS

Barriers to staff education in hospitals can be understood through several complementary theoretical lenses. Organizational learning theory (Argyris & Schon, 1978) frames hospitals as systems capable of collective learning, and identifies structural, cultural, and cognitive factors that inhibit or enable that learning. Human capital theory (Becker, 1964) highlights the economic dimensions of training investment and return. Adult learning theory (Knowles, 1984) underscores the importance of self-direction, relevance, and experience in effective



professional education, while change management frameworks illuminate the interpersonal and institutional dynamics of training adoption.

A multi-level conceptual model is particularly useful for organizing hospital staff education barriers. At the macro level, national policy frameworks, healthcare funding models, and regulatory environments shape what education is mandated, supported, and resourced. At the meso (organizational) level, institutional culture, leadership priorities, scheduling infrastructure, and learning management systems determine the conditions in which education is delivered. At the micro (individual) level, personal motivation, learning preferences, prior education, workload, and psychological safety influence whether and how effectively learning occurs.

Effective solutions must therefore be designed and implemented across all three levels simultaneously. Piecemeal interventions that address individual motivation without resolving scheduling barriers, or that invest in technology without addressing pedagogical quality, are unlikely to produce sustainable improvements in staff education outcomes.

### **3. PRINCIPAL OBSTACLES AND CHALLENGES**

#### **3.1 Organizational and Structural Barriers**

##### **3.1.1 Time Constraints and Workload Pressures**

Time is universally cited as the most significant barrier to hospital staff participation in education and training programs (O'Brien et al., 2001). Healthcare professionals operate in environments characterized by high patient volumes, unpredictable demand fluctuations, shift rotations, and staffing shortages. Carving out dedicated time for learning within such environments is inherently difficult. When education competes directly with patient care responsibilities, it is invariably deprioritized—not because staff are indifferent to learning, but because patient welfare is the immediate and overriding imperative.

The problem is further compounded in hospitals that do not build protected learning time into staff schedules. Without formal structures that relieve staff from clinical duties during training, education becomes an add-on activity pursued at the margins of an already demanding workday. This leads to inconsistent participation, superficial engagement, and high dropout rates from multi-session programs.

##### **3.1.2 Inadequate Staffing Levels**

Insufficient staffing levels create a paradox: the hospitals most in need of education to improve performance are often the least able to release staff for training without compromising service delivery. In under-resourced settings, every staff member released for education represents a gap in clinical coverage, creating a powerful disincentive for managers to approve training



leave. This structural constraint is particularly acute in low- and middle-income countries but is also well-documented in under-resourced hospitals within high-income nations.

### **3.1.3 Absence of Systematic Needs Assessment**

Many hospital education programs are designed without rigorous, data-driven needs assessments. Training content is often selected based on tradition, convenience, regulatory requirements, or the interests of program organizers rather than on a systematic analysis of actual competency gaps. As a result, staff are subjected to education that may be redundant, misaligned with their current role demands, or irrelevant to the specific quality and safety challenges facing their unit. This disconnect erodes engagement and reduces the practical impact of training investments.

### **3.1.4 Poor Coordination Between Education and Operations**

In many hospitals, the education department and clinical operations function in organizational silos, with limited communication about departmental priorities, upcoming policy changes, or emerging clinical challenges. This fragmentation means that training programs are rarely timed to coincide with the introduction of new protocols, equipment, or care models. The result is a persistent lag between operational change and the educational preparation of staff to navigate it—a gap that contributes to errors, inefficiency, and staff frustration.

## **3.2 Financial and Resource Barriers**

### **3.2.1 Limited Training Budgets**

Financial constraints represent a pervasive obstacle to hospital staff education. Training requires investment in faculty, materials, facilities, simulation equipment, and, in the case of digital education, technology platforms and content development. In environments of fiscal austerity or competing budget priorities, training allocations are frequently reduced or eliminated. A survey of hospital administrators across multiple countries found that insufficient budget was among the top three barriers to implementing effective staff education programs (Crisp & Chen, 2014).

### **3.2.2 Inequitable Resource Distribution**

Even within hospitals that allocate education budgets, resources are not always distributed equitably. Physicians and clinical specialists often receive preferential access to funded continuing medical education, conferences, and training opportunities, while nursing staff, allied health professionals, and support workers receive comparatively limited investment. This inequity creates a stratified workforce in which some staff are well-equipped for evolving role demands while others are left behind—a pattern that undermines team-based care effectiveness and reinforces professional hierarchies.



### **3.2.3 Hidden Costs of Training**

Beyond direct program costs, hospitals incur significant indirect costs associated with staff education, including backfill staffing costs, productivity losses during training periods, and the opportunity cost of managerial time spent coordinating training logistics. These hidden costs are rarely captured in training budget analyses, leading decision-makers to underestimate the true investment required and to undervalue the proportional return that effective education delivers.

## **3.3 Technological Barriers**

### **3.3.1 Inadequate Digital Infrastructure**

The expansion of e-learning, simulation-based training, and virtual reality education has created new opportunities for flexible, high-impact staff development. However, these opportunities are inaccessible to hospitals with inadequate digital infrastructure. Unreliable internet connectivity, outdated hardware, absence of learning management systems (LMS), and lack of institutional IT support all constrain the adoption of technology-enhanced education. In hospitals serving rural or low-resource communities, these deficits are particularly pronounced.

### **3.3.2 Low Digital Literacy Among Staff**

Even where technology infrastructure exists, disparities in digital literacy among staff can impede effective use of e-learning platforms and digital training resources. Older staff cohorts, or those from educational backgrounds with limited technology exposure, may find online learning platforms intimidating, confusing, or inaccessible. Without targeted digital literacy support, technology-based education risks exacerbating rather than reducing training inequities.

### **3.3.3 Resistance to Technology-Based Learning**

Some healthcare professionals express skepticism about the equivalence of digital or simulation-based education relative to traditional apprenticeship and mentorship models. This skepticism is not entirely unfounded—poorly designed e-learning that relies on passive content consumption without interactivity, feedback, or clinical application has been shown to produce inferior learning outcomes. Resistance to technology-based learning may therefore reflect a rational assessment of platform quality rather than a simple aversion to technology.

## **3.4 Pedagogical and Curriculum Challenges**

### **3.4.1 Over-Reliance on Didactic Teaching Methods**

Despite extensive evidence that adult learners—particularly experienced healthcare professionals—learn most effectively through active, experiential, and problem-based methods, many hospital education programs continue to rely heavily on didactic lecture



formats. One-way information transfer in large group settings produces limited behavioral change and poor retention rates. Knowles's adult learning principles (1984) emphasize that professional learners are internally motivated, experience-based, and problem-centered; educational designs that ignore these characteristics produce disengaged participants and minimal practice change.

### **3.4.2 Lack of Individualized Learning Pathways**

Hospital staff bring vastly heterogeneous educational backgrounds, years of experience, specialized competencies, and learning styles to the training environment. Uniform, one-size-fits-all training programs fail to account for this diversity. More experienced staff may find basic-level content insulting or wasteful of their time, while newer staff may find advanced content overwhelming. The absence of differentiated learning pathways results in suboptimal engagement across the experience spectrum.

### **3.4.3 Weak Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms**

The majority of hospital training programs assess learner satisfaction through post-session questionnaires but conduct little or no evaluation of whether learning has been translated into improved practice or patient outcomes. Without rigorous outcome evaluation, hospitals cannot identify which educational interventions produce genuine efficiency gains and which represent poor investments of time and money. This evaluation deficit perpetuates a cycle of poorly evidenced training decisions and missed opportunities for program optimization.

## **3.5 Cultural and Organizational Climate Barriers**

### **3.5.1 Organizational Culture That Does Not Prioritize Learning**

The culture of an organization powerfully shapes the extent to which learning is valued, supported, and integrated into daily work. In hospitals where the prevailing culture emphasizes throughput, productivity metrics, and short-term performance over long-term capacity building, education is perceived as a luxury or administrative burden rather than a strategic investment. Managers in such environments may actively or passively discourage training participation, viewing it as a threat to unit productivity rather than an enhancement of it.

### **3.5.2 Resistance to Change**

Healthcare professionals who have practiced according to established routines for many years may resist educational content that challenges existing habits, introduces new protocols, or requires behavioral adaptation. This resistance is not necessarily motivated by indifference to quality; it may reflect rational concerns about the reliability of new evidence, the practicality of proposed changes, or previous experiences with top-down reforms that proved ineffective. Understanding the psychosocial roots of change resistance is essential for designing education that genuinely shifts practice behavior.



### **3.5.3 Hierarchical Professional Dynamics**

Hospital environments are characterized by pronounced professional hierarchies that can inhibit effective interprofessional learning. Junior staff may be reluctant to ask questions or acknowledge knowledge gaps in the presence of senior colleagues for fear of professional judgment. Senior clinicians may resist learning alongside subordinates or may be unwilling to acknowledge areas where their knowledge requires updating. These dynamics are antithetical to the collaborative, psychologically safe environments that adult learning research identifies as essential for effective professional development.

### **3.6 Individual-Level Barriers**

#### **3.6.1 Motivational Deficits**

Intrinsic motivation is a powerful predictor of learning engagement and knowledge retention. However, not all hospital staff are equally motivated to pursue continuing education, particularly when programs are perceived as mandatory box-ticking exercises rather than genuine opportunities for professional growth. Motivational deficits are associated with burnout, role dissatisfaction, perceived lack of career advancement opportunities, and experiences of irrelevant or poorly delivered training in the past.

#### **3.6.2 Workforce Diversity and Language Barriers**

Modern hospital workforces are increasingly diverse, encompassing staff from varied cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds. Training programs delivered exclusively in the dominant institutional language may be inaccessible to non-native speakers, resulting in comprehension gaps and unequal learning outcomes. Similarly, cultural assumptions embedded in training content—about communication norms, patient interaction styles, or professional roles—may not translate across cultural contexts, reducing the relevance and effectiveness of standardized programs for diverse staff cohorts.

#### **3.6.3 Psychological Safety and Fear of Assessment**

Formal assessment components in training programs can provoke anxiety, particularly among staff with negative prior educational experiences or those who fear professional consequences for poor performance. When training environments do not foster psychological safety—the belief that one can speak up, make mistakes, and acknowledge gaps without fear of humiliation or punishment—learning is impaired. Staff may perform surface compliance with training requirements while concealing genuine knowledge deficits, undermining the quality improvement purposes of education.



## 4. EVIDENCE-BASED SOLUTIONS AND STRATEGIES

### 4.1 Solutions to Organizational and Structural Barriers

Addressing time constraints requires a fundamental reimagining of how education is integrated into clinical workflows. Hospitals should implement protected learning time policies that formally embed training into staff schedules, ensuring that education is treated as a core job function rather than an optional supplement. Microlearning approaches—delivering content in short, focused modules of five to fifteen minutes—enable learning to occur within the natural breaks of clinical work without requiring extended absences from patient care. Research supports the equivalence of well-designed microlearning to traditional formats for knowledge acquisition and retention (Shail, 2019).

To address staffing-related constraints on training release, hospitals should explore staggered training cohort models, unit-based education sessions that minimize travel time, and cross-training of staff to provide flexible coverage during training periods. The appointment of dedicated Clinical Education Facilitators within departments—staff whose role is to coordinate and deliver training at the unit level—has been shown to significantly increase training accessibility and relevance.

Systematic training needs assessments should be conducted annually, drawing on competency assessments, incident and near-miss data, staff surveys, and emerging clinical priorities. The results of needs assessments should be transparently communicated to staff and used as the primary driver of education program design, ensuring that training investments target the competency gaps most consequential for patient safety and organizational performance.

### 4.2 Solutions to Financial and Resource Barriers

Hospitals should establish multi-year education budgets that are protected from short-term fiscal pressures, reflecting the recognition that workforce development is a capital investment with measurable long-term returns. Return-on-investment (ROI) analyses for training programs should capture not only direct costs but also the financial value of reduced adverse events, lower staff turnover, improved efficiency, and enhanced accreditation outcomes. Presenting training investments within this economic framework enables more compelling advocacy to hospital boards and finance committees.

To address resource inequity, hospitals should develop transparent, needs-based criteria for allocating training resources across professional groups, ensuring that nursing, allied health, and support staff receive proportionate investment relative to their contribution to care quality. Partnerships with academic institutions, professional associations, and public health agencies can provide access to subsidized or freely available training content, simulation facilities, and faculty expertise, expanding training capacity without proportionate cost increases.



### 4.3 Solutions to Technological Barriers

Hospitals should conduct digital infrastructure audits to identify and address connectivity, hardware, and LMS deficits that impede technology-enhanced education. Investment in institutional learning management systems provides a centralized, trackable platform for delivering, monitoring, and evaluating digital training across the workforce. Where full LMS implementation is not immediately feasible, lower-cost solutions such as mobile learning platforms accessible via personal devices can provide interim access to digital training content.

Digital literacy training should be explicitly incorporated into onboarding programs and offered as refresher modules to existing staff, ensuring that technology tools are accessible to all staff regardless of prior digital experience. Peer-to-peer technology mentoring—pairing digitally proficient staff with those less confident—has proven effective in building institutional digital literacy capacity in a contextually relevant and supportive manner.

The quality of e-learning content should be evaluated against established instructional design standards, such as those developed by the Quality Matters framework, before deployment. E-learning modules should incorporate interactive elements, branching scenarios, formative feedback, and clinical application exercises to replicate the active learning processes associated with effective face-to-face education.

### 4.4 Solutions to Pedagogical and Curriculum Challenges

Hospital education programs should systematically shift from didactic to active learning methodologies, incorporating case-based discussion, simulation exercises, role-play, reflective practice, and problem-solving activities that engage staff as active knowledge constructors rather than passive recipients. Simulation-based education, including high-fidelity mannequin simulation, standardized patient encounters, and virtual reality scenarios, has strong evidence for producing durable clinical skill improvements and is particularly effective for practicing rare or high-stakes procedures.

Differentiated learning pathways should be developed to accommodate the diverse experience levels and role-specific needs of the hospital workforce. Competency-based education frameworks, in which staff advance through learning levels based on demonstrated mastery rather than time in training, provide a personalized and efficient approach to professional development. Individualized learning plans, developed collaboratively between staff and their managers or education facilitators, align training investments with personal career goals and organizational priorities.

Evaluation frameworks should be upgraded from single-level satisfaction measurement to multi-level outcome assessment using models such as Kirkpatrick's Four Levels or the New World Kirkpatrick Model. Pre- and post-training competency assessments, direct observation of clinical practice, quality indicator monitoring, and patient outcome tracking should all be



incorporated into comprehensive training evaluation systems. Evaluation data should be routinely analyzed and used to drive iterative program improvement.

#### **4.5 Solutions to Cultural and Organizational Climate Barriers**

Building a learning organization requires sustained, visible commitment from senior hospital leadership. Chief executive officers, medical directors, and nursing executives should model lifelong learning through their own participation in education programs, public endorsement of training initiatives, and explicit inclusion of workforce development metrics in institutional strategic plans. When learning is championed from the top, it acquires cultural legitimacy and operational priority throughout the organization.

Change management principles should be applied when introducing new training programs, particularly those that challenge established clinical practices. Engaging clinical opinion leaders and peer champions to advocate for educational change leverages existing trust relationships and professional networks to build buy-in. Staff involvement in the co-design of training programs increases perceived relevance, fosters ownership, and reduces resistance by ensuring that education is developed with rather than for the workforce.

Interprofessional education (IPE) programs, which bring together staff from different professional backgrounds to learn collaboratively, address hierarchical dynamics by creating structured opportunities for mutual understanding and shared problem-solving. Evidence consistently supports IPE as a strategy for improving teamwork, communication, and collaborative practice—outcomes that directly enhance hospital efficiency and patient safety (Oandasan & Reeves, 2005).

#### **4.6 Solutions to Individual-Level Barriers**

Intrinsic motivation for learning can be cultivated through recognition systems that acknowledge and reward training participation and the application of new knowledge in practice. Career development frameworks that link education to advancement opportunities provide a tangible professional incentive for engagement. Coaching and mentoring programs that connect less experienced staff with skilled practitioners support both skill development and professional identity formation, two powerful drivers of sustained learning motivation.

Language-accessible training materials, professional interpreters for live training sessions, and culturally adapted program content should be developed to ensure equitable education access for diverse staff populations. Translation of key training materials into the primary languages represented in the workforce, combined with culturally responsive facilitation practices, reduces comprehension barriers and enhances the relevance of training across cultural contexts.

Creating psychologically safe learning environments requires intentional facilitation practices that normalize questions, acknowledge uncertainty as part of learning, and treat mistakes as



opportunities for growth rather than occasions for blame. Training sessions should establish explicit group norms at the outset that protect confidentiality and affirm the value of honest self-assessment. Anonymous pre-training knowledge surveys can help staff acknowledge gaps without public exposure, enabling more targeted and honest engagement with training content.

## **5. AN INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE HOSPITAL STAFF EDUCATION**

Addressing the obstacles to hospital staff education in a sustainable and systemic manner requires moving beyond isolated interventions toward a comprehensive, institution-wide framework for workforce learning. Such a framework should integrate four interdependent pillars: strategic leadership, adaptive design, enabling infrastructure, and continuous evaluation.

Strategic leadership ensures that hospital staff education is positioned as a core institutional priority, with dedicated governance structures, protected budgets, and accountability mechanisms that span clinical and administrative domains. Adaptive design ensures that training programs are responsive to evolving staff needs, evidence-based, pedagogically sound, and delivered through formats that accommodate the operational realities of acute care environments. Enabling infrastructure provides the physical, technological, and human resources necessary for education delivery, including simulation facilities, digital platforms, education staff, and scheduling systems. Continuous evaluation ensures that training investments are evidence-driven, outcome-oriented, and iteratively refined based on rigorous assessment of impact at the learner, practice, and patient outcome levels.

This integrative framework reflects a systems-thinking approach to hospital staff education—one that recognizes the interdependence of its component elements and the importance of sustained organizational commitment over time. Hospitals that embed this framework into their governance and operational processes are better positioned to build resilient, continuously learning workforces capable of meeting the evolving demands of modern healthcare.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

The education of hospital staff is both essential and challenging. The obstacles that impede effective training are real, varied, and deeply embedded in the structural, financial, cultural, and individual realities of hospital environments. Ignoring or minimizing these barriers leads to under-investment in workforce development, suboptimal training quality, and missed opportunities to improve patient care.

However, these obstacles are not insurmountable. This paper has demonstrated that for each category of challenge, there exist evidence-based strategies capable of producing meaningful improvements in the reach, relevance, and impact of hospital staff education. What is required is not simply the application of isolated solutions, but a commitment to systemic reform—



reform that is led from the top, designed with staff, supported by infrastructure, and measured rigorously over time.

Hospitals that invest genuinely in staff education—not as a compliance exercise but as a strategic pillar of organizational excellence—will realize returns that extend far beyond training completion rates. They will build workforces characterized by clinical competence, adaptive resilience, collaborative teamwork, and sustained motivation: the very qualities upon which exceptional patient care depends. In a global healthcare environment of increasing complexity and accountability, the capacity to educate staff effectively is not a peripheral competency. It is a defining feature of a high-performing hospital.

## REFERENCES

1. Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
2. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. University of Chicago Press.
3. Brydges, R., Hatala, R., Zendejas, B., Erwin, P. J., & Cook, D. A. (2015). Linking simulation-based educational assessments and patient-related outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Academic Medicine*, 90(2), 246-256.
4. Crisp, N., & Chen, L. (2014). Global supply of health professionals. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 370(10), 950-957.
5. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
6. Knowles, M. S. (1984). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species* (3rd ed.). Gulf Publishing Company.
7. Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
8. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.
9. O'Brien, M. A., Freemantle, N., Oxman, A. D., Wolf, F., Davis, D. A., & Herrin, J. (2001). Continuing education meetings and workshops: Effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2.
10. Oandasan, I., & Reeves, S. (2005). Key elements for interprofessional education. Part 1: The learner, the educator and the learning context. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 19(S1), 21-38.



# Power System Technology

ISSN:1000-3673

*Received: 16-08-2025*

*Revised: 05-09-2025*

*Accepted: 20-10-2025*

11. Shail, M. S. (2019). Using micro-learning on mobile applications to increase knowledge retention and work performance: A review of literature. *Cureus*, 11(8), e5307.
12. World Health Organization. (2016). *Health Workforce 2030: Towards a Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health*. WHO Press.
13. Zendejas, B., Brydges, R., Wang, A. T., & Cook, D. A. (2013). Patient outcomes in simulation-based medical education: A systematic review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 28(8), 1078-1089.