pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION OF THE INTEGRATIVE CLINICAL COMPETENCE DEVELOPMENT MODEL: EVIDENCE FROM THREE UZBEK MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS

Suyarov Shoxrux Murodil ugli

Fergana Public Health Medical Institute, Fergana, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article reports the findings of a quasi-experimental study evaluating the effectiveness of the Integrative Clinical Competence Development Model (ICCDM) in developing clinical competency among future physicians at three medical institutions in Uzbekistan. The study involved 465 students enrolled in clinical medicine programs at Fergana Public Health Medical Institute, Andijan State Medical Institute, and Bukhara State Medical Institute. Using a pre-test/post-test control group design, the research assessed student competency development across four criteria—motivational, cognitive, communicative-activity, and perceptual-reflective—before and after implementation of the ICCDM. Statistical analysis using Student's t-test confirmed statistically significant improvements in the experimental group across all four criteria, with an overall effectiveness coefficient of 1.14–1.15 (14–15% improvement over the control group). These findings provide robust empirical support for the ICCDM's effectiveness and its suitability for broad adoption in Uzbekistan's medical education system.

Keywords: ICCDM, experimental study, clinical competency, quasi-experimental design, Student's t-test, medical education, Uzbekistan, USMLE, effectiveness, integrative methodology

1. Introduction

The theoretical and methodological foundations of the Integrative Clinical Competence Development Model (ICCDM) have been elaborated in preceding work. The present article addresses the critical empirical question: does the ICCDM, when implemented in actual medical education settings, produce measurable and statistically significant improvements in clinical competency among future physicians?

This question is of considerable practical importance for medical education policy in Uzbekistan, where calls for alignment with international USMLE standards have intensified in recent years but evidence-based, locally validated methodological models remain scarce. By reporting the full experimental procedure and statistical results of the ICCDM validation study, this article aims to provide the empirical foundation necessary for informed policy adoption.

2. Research Design and Methodology

The study employed a quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test control group design, consistent with established standards in educational research (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The research was conducted across three medical institutions: Fergana Public Health Medical Institute, Andijan State Medical Institute, and Bukhara State Medical Institute. A total of 465 students were enrolled in the study, distributed across experimental groups (n=234) and control groups (n=231).

The experimental group received instruction using the full ICCDM methodology, which integrates Kaplan, UWorld, and NBME platforms with structured pedagogical protocols including the DEAR, SNAPPS, and SAR methods. The control group received conventional instruction in accordance with the standard curriculum currently in use at the three institutions.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Clinical competency was assessed across four criteria derived from the ICCDM's outcome framework: (1) the motivational criterion, reflecting students' intrinsic motivation for clinical learning and self-directed study; (2) the cognitive criterion, measuring biomedical and clinical knowledge integration and diagnostic reasoning; (3) the communicative-activity criterion, assessing clinical communication skills, collaborative decision-making, and professional empathy; and (4) the perceptual-reflective criterion, evaluating students' capacity for self-assessment, error analysis, and adaptive learning.

Assessments were conducted using structured questionnaires and clinical performance ratings on a 5-point scale. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, confidence intervals) and inferential statistics (Student's t-test) at a significance level of $p < 0.05$. The critical value T_crit was established at 1.97 for the full sample (degrees of freedom: $k \approx 461$).

The research was conducted in three sequential phases: (1) a diagnostic phase, in which baseline competency levels were established and confirmed to be homogeneous between experimental and control groups; (2) an experimental phase, in which the ICCDM methodology was implemented; and (3) a summative evaluation phase, in which final assessments were conducted and between-group differences were analyzed.

3. Baseline Assessment Results

Pre-test results confirmed the homogeneity of experimental and control groups across all four assessment criteria. The mean scores for the experimental and control groups were statistically equivalent at baseline ($T_{emp} < T_{crit} = 1.97$), with no significant between-group differences detected. Across all three institutions and all four criteria, the null hypothesis (H0: no difference between groups) was retained, validating the comparability of the two groups prior to intervention.

The baseline assessment also revealed systematically low clinical competency scores across both groups, consistent with the structural deficiencies in the existing curriculum identified in the theoretical review. Mean scores across all four criteria ranged from 3.37 to 3.39 on a 5-point scale, indicating a moderate but uniform competency deficit prior to ICCDM implementation.

4. Post-Intervention Results

Following the experimental intervention, significant between-group differences were observed across all four assessment criteria. For the motivational criterion, experimental group means ranged from 3.95–3.99 (by institution), compared to 3.44–3.49 in the control group, yielding a mean effectiveness coefficient of 1.15 (15% improvement). For the cognitive criterion, experimental group means ranged from 3.96–4.00 compared to 3.45–3.50 in the control group, with an effectiveness coefficient of 1.14–1.15 (14–15% improvement). For the communicative-activity criterion, experimental means were 3.82–3.85 versus 3.29–3.31 for the control group, again yielding an effectiveness coefficient of 1.15. For the perceptual-reflective criterion, experimental means were 3.86–3.99 versus 3.32–3.45 for controls, with an effectiveness coefficient of 1.14–1.15.

Statistical analysis confirmed the significance of these differences. Across all four criteria and all three institutions, the Student's t-statistic exceeded the critical value ($T_{emp} > T_{crit} = 1.97$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H1: experimental group outperforms control group). The most pronounced results were observed at Bukhara State Medical Institute for the cognitive criterion ($T = 4.91$; $T_{crit} = 1.98$) and at Fergana Public Health Medical Institute for the perceptual-reflective criterion ($T = 4.80$; $T_{crit} =$

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

1.98), suggesting that the ICCDM is particularly effective in developing reflective clinical reasoning.

5. Discussion

The experimental findings provide strong empirical support for the ICCDM's effectiveness across all four clinical competency criteria. The consistent 14–15% improvement in experimental group scores, confirmed by statistically significant t-test results at all three participating institutions, demonstrates that the model's integrative methodology—combining Kaplan-based knowledge organization, UWorld-based case reasoning, and NBME-based standardized evaluation—produces measurable gains in clinical competency that are unlikely to be attributable to chance.

The particularly strong gains on the motivational and communicative-activity criteria merit specific attention. The motivational criterion results suggest that engagement with the USMLE-aligned, platform-based learning environment substantially increases students' intrinsic motivation for clinical study—a finding consistent with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and with research on the motivating effects of authentic task engagement in professional education. The communicative-activity gains reflect the model's success in developing clinical communication skills through the SAR, DEAR, and SNAPPS protocols, which provide structured occasions for collaborative clinical reasoning and reflective dialogue.

The perceptual-reflective gains, strongest at Fergana Public Health Medical Institute (mean: 3.90 in experimental group vs. 3.37 in control group), indicate that the ICCDM's systematic emphasis on reflective self-assessment and error analysis effectively cultivates the meta-cognitive capacities that are central to ongoing professional development throughout the physician's career.

These results also speak to the broader question of educational equity and transferability. The consistency of the ICCDM's effectiveness across three geographically dispersed institutions with varying resource levels suggests that the model is robust to contextual variation and suitable for system-wide adoption.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The experimental study reported in this article provides robust empirical validation for the Integrative Clinical Competence Development Model (ICCDM) as an effective methodology for developing clinical competency in future physicians within the Uzbek medical education context. The statistically significant gains observed across all four competency criteria—motivational, cognitive, communicative-activity, and perceptual-reflective—at three independent medical institutions confirm the model's reliability, transferability, and effectiveness.

On the basis of these findings, the following recommendations are advanced for medical education policy and practice. First, the ICCDM should be adopted as the standard methodology for USMLE-preparatory instruction across Uzbekistan's medical institutions, with phased implementation beginning in Year 4 of the clinical medicine curriculum. Second, investment in Kaplan, UWorld, and NBME platform licenses should be prioritized as a system-level infrastructure requirement. Third, faculty development programs should be designed to train medical educators in the pedagogical protocols of the ICCDM, including the DEAR, SNAPPS, SAR, and reflective feedback methodologies. Fourth, assessment systems should be reformed to incorporate the four-criterion competency evaluation framework developed and validated in this study. Fifth, longitudinal follow-up research should be conducted to assess the durability of competency gains and their association with USMLE examination performance.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

References

1. Boursicot, K., & Roberts, T. (2005). Assessing the Clinical Skills of Medical Students. Medical Education, 39(4), 369–377.

2. Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1963). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

3. Cook, D.A., & Hatala, R.M. (2020). Simulation-Based Education in the Health Professions. Medical Education, 54(2), 131–146.

4. Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior. New York: Plenum.

5. Kogan, J.R., & Holmboe, E.S. (2019). The Assessment of Clinical Competence in USMLE and Beyond. Academic Medicine, 94(3), 356–364.

6. Motola, I., & Devine, L.A. (2013). Simulation-Based Training: The Next Revolution in Medical Education. Academic Medicine, 88(8), 1108–1114.

7. Nestel, D., & Bearman, M. (2015). Simulated Patient Methodology: Theory, Evidence and Practice. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

8. Papadakis, M., & Hodgson, C. (2018). The Step Exams and Clinical Preparedness of Graduates. New England Journal of Medicine, 378(7), 595–597.

9. Rudolph, J.W., & Simon, R. (2008). The Art of Debriefing in Simulation-Based Education. Simulation in Healthcare, 3(3), 155–167.

10. Swanson, D.B., & Case, S.M. (1997). Assessment in Basic Science Instruction. Academic Medicine, 72(10), 62–66.