## A Study on Curriculum Preferences of I M.B.B.S Students In A Government Medical College In Maharashtra

Shilpa S. Gupta\*

\* Assistant Professor, Department Of Physiology, SVNGMC, Yeotmal, Maharashtra, India

**Abstract:** Introduction: MBBS course content has increased enormously owing to newer discoveries, emerging diseases and technological advances etc., but removal of redundant and obsolete content from the textbooks has never been done. University, Government and medical councils are now thinking of changing this situation. The importance of obtaining student perception about the existing system before advocating any change is very important. In view of this need students' preferences and inclinations about I MBBS curriculum and Physiology content were obtained. Methodology: This is an observational study conducted by administering a questionnaire in ShriVasantraoNaik, Govt. Medical College, Yavatmal, from September 2015 to December 2015, on 130 II MBBS students. Results: Majority i.e. 107 (82.3%) students preferred duration of I MBBS course, to be one year.Most i.e. 75(57.7%) students liked Anatomy and in Physiology, CVS was the most preferred system by 43(33%) students.51 students (39.2%) preferred blood as system to be taught first. Conclusion: The present study gives a guideline regarding preferences of I MBBS students about their curriculum with emphasis on contents of Physiology as a subject and to some extent, the way it is taught. [Shilpa G NJIRM 2017; 8(3):127-129]

Key Words: Curriculum, Preference

Author for correspondence: Shilpa S. Gupta, C/O, sharad S. Gupta, Flat NO. 101, Rachana-Shanti Appartment, CAMP,Amravati-444602 Maharashtra E-Mail:drshilpagupta14@gmail.com M:7588751548

Introduction: Medical education day by day becomes more competitive. Students struggle to get admission in M.B.B.S course. They are suddenly exposed to a vast and complex basic sciences syllabus after admission, the tenure of which was recently curtailed by Medical Council of India from 3 semesters to 2 semesters. Moreover, since decades, the course content in all the subjects has increased owing to discoveries, emerging newer diseases and technological advances etc., but nobody has bothered about removal of redundant and obsolete content from the textbooks which has kept on pilling-up over these years. University, Government and medical council are thinking in terms of students' interest.

This scenario calls for a different perspective and fresh look at the MBBS curriculum, for all pre, para& clinical subjects <sup>1, 2</sup>. Any revision in the curriculum is a gradual process and warrants evaluation of its input, process, outcome and an overall impact by experts in the field <sup>3, 4</sup>. This is an era of student centric approaches in education and their opinions form a useful basis for modifying and improving the quality of the existing curriculum as they are at the receiving end of the educational process <sup>5, 6</sup>. The importance of obtaining their perception about the existing system before advocating any change needs no further emphasis<sup>7</sup>. Many students think and informally indicate that the contents of basic sciences do not seem relevant to their later clinical work <sup>8, 9</sup>. There have hardly been any studies done to assess the perceptions of students about their course. In view of this need and the fact that preclinical medical specialty requires high motivation and is academically demanding, students' preferences and inclinations about I MBBS curriculum and Physiology content were obtained.<sup>10</sup>

**Aims & Objectives: Aim:** To study student preferences about I MBBS curriculum with special emphasis on Physiology subject contents

**Objectives:** To know student preferences regarding duration of I MBBS academic year. To study student choice of basic sciences subjects. To know student inclination toward the topics of Human Physiology

**Method:** This is an observational study conducted in ShriVasantraoNaik, Govt. Medical College, Yavatmal, from September 2015 to December 2015

After all permission and approval from Institutional ethical committee, the data was collected by administering a pre-designed & pre-validated questionnaire regarding open and close-ended questions pertaining to student (II semester) preferences about I MBBS curriculum and their inclinations about contents human physiology as a subject. Informed consent was taken from all 130 students included in the study, before their participation. The gathered data was analysed using percentages and presented in graphical format. **Results:** When the respondents were asked about their preference regarding total duration of I MBBS course, most i.e. 107 (82.3%) students,out of 130 preferred duration to be one.



The students, when asked about the subject in first professional MBBS, they most like, 75 out of 130 (57.7%) preferred Anatomy.





The above graph shows student liking about systems taught in physiology. CVS was most preferred 43(33%).



In the above graph, 51 students out of total 130 (39.2%) preferred blood as system to be taught first, while 42(32.3%) wanted the teaching to start with CNS, 28 (21.5%) with CVS, 6(4.6%) with RS, 3(2.3%) with GIT. No student in the study preferred excretory system to be taught first.

**Discussion:** In this study, majority i.e. 107 (82.3%) of the students out of 130, opined that the duration of I MBBS should continue to be one year, while 21 (16.1%) students said that one and half year was preferable and only 2 (1.5%) wanted it to be changed to two years.

These findings were similar to a study conducted in Patiala<sup>11</sup>, where majority (66.2%) of the students were inclined towards a 1 year timeframe for I MBBS while the findings were in contrast to a study conducted in Manipur medical college; in which majority of the students (60%) felt that one and half year was appropriate tenure to cover the first I MBBS syllabus which was in the earlier MCI format for MBBS course, which was later reduced to 1 year.<sup>12</sup>

The participants in the present study, when asked about the subject in first MBBS they most like, 75 out of 130 (57.7%) preferred Anatomy while 48 (i.e.

NJIRM 2017; Vol. 8(3) May - June

eISSN: 0975-9840

36.9%) preferred Physiology and only 7 (i. e. 5.3%) said that they liked Biochemistry.

These findings are in line with the findings of a study conducted in Nigeria where majority of the respondents preferred Anatomy and Physiology and felt that they were the most relevant to the medical curriculum. In this study, although most of the respondents (53.7%) claimed that Anatomy was the most difficult to understand of the three subjects, majority (59.4%) were however of the view that they had the most interaction with their teachers in Anatomy.<sup>10</sup>

The reason why Medical Biochemistry was least preferred by the students could be due its relatively more abstract nature compared to the other two. Anatomy and Physiology can usually be presented to students through demonstrations, pictorially and graphically; which could be appealing to them.

The participants when asked about the system in Physiology, they preferred to be taught first, 51 students out of total 130 (39.2%) preferred blood as system to be taught first while 42(32.3%) wanted the teaching to start with CNS. These findings are similar to a study conducted in Manipur in which students preferred blood to be taught first.<sup>11</sup>

**Conclusion:** The present study gives a guideline regarding preferences of I MBBS students about their curriculum with emphasis on contents of Physiology as a subject and to some extent, the way it is taught. The findings of this study will pave a way to many elaborative and diverse studies in different settings and geographical areas across India and perhaps, all over the world. This would lead to a more student friendly curriculum designs and its operational aspects.

## **References:**

- Drake, R. L. (1998) Anatomy education in a changing medical curriculum, The NewAnatomist, 253, pp. 28–31.
- 2. Siddiqui, A. (2006) The changing shape of teaching physiology in south Asia: problems and prospects, ActaPhysiologicaHungarica, 93, 1, pp. 91–98.
- 3. Prideaux, D. (2003) ABC of learning and teaching in medicine: curriculum design, British MedicalJournal, 326, pp. 268-270.

- Gitanjali, B. & Shashindran, C. H. (2006) Formulating a curriculum in clinical pharmacology for medical undergraduate students in India, Indian Journal ofPharmacology, 38, Suppl 2, pp. S105-S107.
- Valle, R., Alaminos, I., Contreras, E., Salas, L. E., Tomasini, P. & Varela, M. (2004) Student questionnaire to evaluate basic medical science teaching (METEQ-B), RevistaMédicadel IMSS, 42, 5, pp. 405-411.
- Tufts, M. A. & Higgins-Opitz, S. B. (2009) What makes the learning of physiology in a PBL medical curriculum challenging? Student perceptions, Advances in Physiology Education, 33, 3, pp. 187-195.
- Lata, H., Walia, L. & Gupta, V. (2008) Student feedback on teaching and evaluation methodology in physiology, South East Asian Journal ofMedical Education, 2, 1, pp. 31-37.
- Lujan, H. L. &DiCarlo, S. E. (2006) First-year medical students prefer multiple learning styles, Advances in Physiology Education, 30, pp. 13– 16.
- Garg, A., Rataboli, P. V. &Muchandi, K. (2004) Students' opinion on the prevailing teaching methods in pharmacology and changes recommended, Indian Journal ofPharmacology, 36, 3, pp. 155-158.
- MI Ebomoyi and F D Agoreyo. Preclinical students' perceptions of their courses and preclinical specialty choice, Journal of Medicine and Biomedical Research, Vol. 6, No. 1 & 2, December 2007, pp. 47-58
- 11. OmnaChawlaet. al.Students' perspective of the MBBS Physiology curriculum,South-East Asian Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 6 no. 2, 2012
- Florence Lalvarmawi et al. Feedback on teaching and evaluation methodology in Physiology, National Journal of Physiology, Pharmacy & Pharmacology, 2015. Vol 5. Issue 1, pp. 36 – 38

## Conflict of interest: None

Funding: None

Cite this Article as: Shilpa G. A Study on Curriculum Preferences of I M.B.B.S Students In A Government Medical College In Maharashtra. Natl J Integr Res Med 2017; 8(3):127-129