Introduction of student-led physiology tutorial classes to a traditional curriculum
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KOMMALAGE M, IMBULGODA N. Introduction of student-led physiology tutorial classes to a traditional curriculum. Adv Physiol Educ 34: 65–69, 2010; doi:10.1152/advan.00010.2010.—The curriculum in the University of Ruhuna Medical School is of the traditional type. Most teaching activities are faculty member-led activities. Since student-centered learning processes are considered to improve certain skills and attitudes, we introduced student-led group classes (SGCs) in physiology. Depending on the outcome of the SGCs, we planned to develop it further. We designed this study to compare student perceptions on newly introduced SGCs with traditional tutorials (TTs). Student perceptions were assessed using a mixed qualitative and quantitative method. Students recognized and appreciated some favorable features of the SGC, such as the opportunity for discussion, quality of the knowledge, active participation, improvement of presentation ability, and increased breadth of knowledge. However, the majority of students preferred the TT over the SGC despite the highlighted benefits of the SGC. Students appreciated the focused learning for examinations, written preparation, and more tutor involvement in the TT. Students requested a hybrid of the TT and SGC by incorporating mandatory written answers to the SGC with greater contributions from faculty members. Assessment methods that were not aligned with the SGC and ingrained passive didactic teaching-learning methods by students and faculty members had a negative effect on the implementation of SGCs. Cultural and economical factors also contributed adversely. In the second step of this Plan-Do-Check-Act process, we are planning to introduce new formative assessment to assess higher-order cognitive skills and a compulsory tutor training program. Some favorable components from the TT will be incorporated to the SGC.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A total of 129 medical undergraduates in their first and second terms participated in the study. There were 70 men and 59 women (age: 20–23 yr old). They were selected for this medical school based on their performance at a national-level competitive written examination. Usually, those who receive higher ranks in biology enter into medical schools. Teaching activities in this medical school are conducted in a term-based time frame (i.e., 3 terms/yr). The SGC was conducted in the first term, and the TT was conducted in the second term. A case was given at the beginning of the tutorial class in the SGC. However, students were aware of the broad subject matter of the case before the SGC. Formal lectures (by faculty members) were conducted parallel to the SGC to help students learn the subject material discussed in the SGC. The cases used were broader and were more of a problem solving type. As an example, the following statement was used to trigger discussion: “Coagulation status is assessed before performing a liver biopsy.” The structure of the SGC consisted of several segments: clarifying concepts and explaining difficult words, defining the problem or deciding the boundaries, brainstorming and systematic classification, and identifying further
How We Teach

Students were requested to select their choice from a Likert-type scale of 1–5 (where 1 = “strongly agree” and 5 = “strongly disagree”) for each statement. There was a separate question where students indicated their preferred tutorial type. Students were asked to describe their reasons for selecting their preferred tutorial type in as much detail as possible. This self-directed questionnaire was distributed among all the students at the end of the last tutorial in the second term. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study.

Student participation in the study was voluntary. Face validation was done for the questionnaire.

Responses to each statement were categorized into three groups according to selection by the five-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. These categories were 1) agree (those who selected 1 and 2), 2) neutral (those who selected 3), and 3) disagree (those who selected 4 and 5). For each statement, a 3 × 3 table was prepared using the three categories mentioned above, and a χ²-test was used to compare student responses for the two tutorial types.

We explored the students’ experiences in the SGC and TT by analyzing their reasons for selecting the preferred tutorial method using a qualitative research method (2). All answer sheets were read thoroughly several times by two investigators to get familiar with the content. The investigators went through them and determined the three main categories with mutual agreement. The investigators separately prepared a list of “meaning units” under each category, extracting the meaning from the text. In this process, “raw” descriptions from students were transferred into the investigators’ language to identify key information. Later, the two investigators discussed each meaning unit and prepared a common list. In this process, some similar meaning units were combined to make one meaningful unit with more clear and straightforward meaning. Both investigators went through all the answer sheets again to make sure that gathered all the information and to resolve disagreements between them. The meaning units were condensed, synthesized, and assimilated into description of themes under three categories.

RESULTS

The response rate was 93.02% (120 of 129 students). All statements comparing the TT and SGC showed significant differences. The most agreed tutorial type was identified for each statement using a χ²-test, and the results are indicated in Table 1. For example, students agreed more with the statement “preparation was easy” in the TT, whereas students agreed more with the statement “Learning is superficial” in the SGC. When the responses to the question on preferred tutorial type were analyzed, we found that 80% of the students preferred the TT over the SGC.

The investigators went through the descriptions of student experiences in justifying the selection of the preferred tutorial type. Three categories were identified: appreciation of the SGC, attachment to TTs, and suggestions for improvement. Descriptions of these categories are given below.

**Appreciation of the SGC**

Several themes were identified under the appreciation of the SGC: opportunity for discussion, quality of the knowledge, active participation, improvement of presentation ability, and increased breadth of knowledge.

**Opportunity for discussion.** Discussion among students was a highly valued feature in the SGC. Students appreciated wider participation and active involvement in the discussions. Collaborative teamwork effort with greater contributions from students with more knowledge was mentioned as an advantage.
The following are comments by students:
  ● “People who have good knowledge give a good support (in discussion) and it helps to improve knowledge of others.”
  ● “We can clear some subject matters by discussing.”

Quality of the knowledge. Some students felt that they obtained greater knowledge and remembered the subject better with the SGC. One student used the word “profitable.” He may mean that the knowledge was worth the time and energy spent in the SGC.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “We get more profitable knowledge with discussion.”
  ● “SGC is [the] most remembered method.”
  ● “We exchange knowledge with each other to understand the subject better.”

Active participation. Students mentioned active involvement in the problem-solving process. They highlighted a deficiency in writing a compulsory answer for the TT, where students have the opportunity to copy the content from textbooks without active involvement.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “Students are actively participating, gathering knowledge and solving the academic matters [problems] about the subject.”
  ● “SGC was [in] associated with huge active participation.”
  ● “There was nothing [in TTs] but only reading the answer which is copied or simply modified from a book.”

Improvement of presentation ability. Students understood the clear difference between merely reading a written answer and presenting an idea in a discussion. The opportunity to improve presentation skills was appreciated by the students.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “In SGC every student can get a chance to present their ideas, but in TT only few students get a chance to present.”
  ● “In traditional tutorials, most of the time we read the answer while others are just listening.”

Increased breadth of knowledge. Some students mentioned that a wider subject area was covered in the SGC, where the discussion was broad and general in scope. In the preparation for the SGC, students read the whole lecture notes or the whole chapter of the textbook rather than just preparing an answer to a given question in the TT. The SGC allowed students to extend the discussion to a wider area, which is an example of providing some responsibility to the students for their own learning.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “In SGC, we have to prepare not for a question, but for a topic which covers a huge area. So we read and get a large amount of knowledge.”
  ● “SGC allows us to wind up a vast area of the topic and to gain more with help of brainstorming of all the members.”

Attachment to TTs

Several themes were identified under attachment to TTs: focused learning for examinations, written preparation, and more tutor involvement.

Focused learning for examinations. Students pointed out that a considerable portion of the examination consists of written answers to questions. Writing an answer in the TT is training for the examination. Students highlighted that writing down anything makes them remember it better. They seemed to consider the tutorial as incomplete without something in writing. Students appreciated the questions used in the TT, which are similar to the questions given in the main examination.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “It [TT] helps us to well prepare for the 2nd MBBS examination.”
  ● “Because of writing answers, we are able to gain more knowledge and help us in remembering the things that is done at the tutorials.”

Written preparation. Students considered that writing mandatory answers provided good preparation, which helped them to acquire the maximum benefit from the tutorial. Writing answers was associated with referring to textbooks and lecture notes and led students to more focused and specific preparation.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “Preparation has become compulsory, so automatically we tend to self-study.”
  ● “In [the] traditional method, we can prepare and come. So we can clear about what we don’t know in the tutorials. We can gather more information before we come to the tutorials.”

More tutor involvement. Students wanted more tutor involvement and more didactic teaching in tutorials as in lectures. Some of them seemed to be reluctant to accept teaching done by anybody other than the tutor.

The following is a comment by a student:
  ● “We can learn more from the [academic] staff members... If [academic] staff members teach it again in the tutorial, it is worth [it] to us.”

Suggestions for Improvement

Two themes were identified under suggestions for improvement: 1) suggestions to incorporate mandatory written answers in the SGC and 2) more contributions from faculty members.

Incorporate mandatory written answers into the SGC. Students suggested that the SGC should contain mandatory written answers.

The following is a comment by a student:
  ● “I prefer if we had the preparation and writing an answer in SGC, so we spend our time in studying to answer the tutorial and then discussing it in front of all the group members.”

More contributions from faculty members into the SGC. Another suggestion was to increase contributions from the tutors in the SGC. They wanted the tutor to use the overhead projector and explain the subject, as in a lecture.

The following are comments by students:
  ● “SGC is good, but it should be achieved with additional knowledge given by more participation [from the] teacher.”
  ● “Unclear points of the lectures should be discussed in SGC.”

DISCUSSION

Students appreciated the opportunity for discussion in the SGC, which was offered to them for the first time. Some students considered the discussion as a better knowledge-acquiring process (one student used word “profitable”). Discussion helped them to understand unclear areas in their previous studies. They felt that they remembered the subject
well after discussing it in the SGC. The SGC allowed students to discuss about previous knowledge and perceptions on the subject that they gained through books and lectures. It also allows them to clarify misunderstandings on the subject. Learning can be further developed or sharpened from that point.

The students decided the extent of the study area for the SGC, and they led the discussion according to it. This provides responsibility in their own learning, which is an adult approach toward learning. This skill is important for the rest of their professional life in developing as a continuing learner. In the preparation for the SGC, students prepare for a wider area, such as reading the whole lecture notes or a whole chapter of the textbook, and some students considered it as an advantage rather than just preparing an answer to the given question in the TT. Therefore, some students seemed to consider that the SGC helped them to acquire wider knowledge than the TT.

Collaborative teamwork was an appreciated feature of the SGC. Students with more knowledge helped more in the discussion and led the whole group to acquire wider subject knowledge. Students appreciated the opportunity to improve their presentation skills, which is one aspect of communication skills required as a medical professional.

Active participation was an appreciated quality by students. They understood the difference between passive participation in the TT in contrast to the SGC. Students were involved in a critical-thinking process while solving problems related to the subject matter in the SGC. It appears that SGCs help to improve critical-thinking and problem-solving skills, which are much-needed skills for a medical professional.

However, the quantitative data from this study showed that the majority of students preferred the TT over the SGC. More students considered the SGC as a superficial learning process compared with the TT. Although the meaning of superficial and deep learning may be different for each student, it is clear that there was a considerable preference for the TT. This finding is contrary to the expectation we had when we were designing this PDCA process. Students considered writing an answer as a mandatory preparatory component in the TT. Since 25% of the final grade is allocated for the essay component in their main examination, students used this mandatory answer writing activity as a preparatory exercise for answering essay questions. It has been shown in a previous study (9) that adults prefer assessment-oriented learning. They pay less attention to nonassessment-oriented activities. Therefore, the assessment methods should be more focused on higher-order cognitive skills such as problem solving, analysis, and synthesis or application with considerable emphasis on skills such as team skills, communication skills, and researching to increase student motivation in student-centered learning (10).

More tutor involvement, which was highly appreciated by the students, could be one reason for the higher preference for the TT. Due to previous passive learning practices, students are not trained for self-directed or student-centered learning. They wanted more content, explanations, and clarifications from tutors. It seems that students considered that learning from tutors is superior and deep.

The majority of students felt that the SGC was a more threatening learning process than the TT. Unlike in the TT, every student in the SGC is supposed to actively contribute to the discussion. These students are used to passive learning during their primary and secondary education. Most components in this traditional curriculum-based medical school are also passive learning activities. The data, when analyzed qualitatively, also showed that students wanted to be passive learners and wanted more didactic teaching. Switching from tutor-centered passive learning to student-centered active learning might have been perceived as a “threatening” process, in contrast to the attitudes of students in previous studies conducted in some other places (7, 8). Furthermore, most Sri Lankan students have a tendency to refrain from expressing opinions directly in tutorial classes due to various cultural restraints, which may be similar to what has been described for other Asian students (1, 4, 5). The cultural reticence is a well-documented obstacle in conducting this type of student-led teaching activity (1, 4, 5).

We are planning to introduce an assessment system to assess problem-solving, synthesis, and application skills together with communication and teamwork skills in the second step of this PDCA process. A 360° assessment system will be introduced for the SGC process, where the tutor and all the students will be involved rating certain skills in the class. 360° assessment allows feedback from many people around the students to be obtained, which includes feedback from peers, the tutor, and the individual student in the process of the SGC. In the next step, it will be practiced as formative assessment, and we are planning a summative assessment in the future.

Students believed that tutors did not handle the SGC properly compared with the TT. Tutors were poorly trained and less experienced in the SGC. TTs have been conducted in this medical school for years, and the tutors were familiar with traditional teaching methods. Therefore, there were difficulties in terms of the tutors adapting to new teaching methods where they have to act as facilitators rather than traditional tutors. We are planning to introduce compulsory tutor training under a staff development program for all the tutors in the next step of this PDCA process.

Numbers of students per group were higher than what have been suggested for these types of student-centered activities (10). However, it was not easy to have smaller groups with the resources available in this medical school. The Department of Physiology has a limited number of tutors. The temporary recruitment of external tutors was not possible with the limited funds and administrative barriers. The availability of classrooms and other physical resources was also limited due to financial constrains. As previously described, student-centered learning activities are expensive and adopting them in developing countries is not easy (3).

Adopting typical student-centered tutorials to the present system in this medical school is a challenge even though it has been practiced successfully in many other places. Students have suggested combining favorable features from both the SGC and TT. Since students requested the incorporation of written answers into the SGC, we are planning to introduce an activity of writing an answer to a question given at the end of the SGC. As students mentioned, that will be training for them to write an answer to essay questions in the examination. In the next step, the SGC will include components from the TT to make a hybrid that, we believe, is more suitable for the present curriculum in this medical school. This will help students to acquire the well-recognized skills and attitudes of student-centered learning under the existing system.

In conclusion, the students recognized several favorable features of the SGC and appreciated them. However, the majority of them preferred the TT despite the highlighted benefits of the SGC.
Assessment methods that are not aligned with the SGC and ingrained passive didactic teaching-learning methods by students and faculty members both had a negative effect on the implementation of the SGC. Cultural and economical factors also contributed adversely. In the next stage of this PDCA process, we are planning to introduce a new formative assessment process. Some components from the TT such as writing an answer to an essay question will be incorporated into the SGC. We hope that these changes help to incorporate well-recognized skills and attitudes of student-centered small-group learning into the existing traditional curriculum.
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