Improvement in Academic Performance of Undergraduate Dentistry Students after Learning Stress Coping Skills

Dr. Rajeev Saxena¹, Dr Ravi V Shirahatti², Dr.Avinash Supe³, Dr Chinmay Shah⁴, Mr.

Mohammad Mukhit Kazi⁵, Mrs.Ashwini Bhosale⁵, Dr.Mrs.Ladkat⁶,

Dr.Devendra Panchawadkar⁶, Dr. Shrikant Diwanay⁶

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To assess the effectiveness of learning stress coping skills in improving academic performance and reducing anxiety levels amongst undergraduate students of dentistry. Methods: 43 students received a pre-validated module on stress coping skills. The module consisted of 13 units, a total duration of 24 hours consisting of topics related to stress, coping skills and relaxation techniques. 41 students were in the control group without any special training. **Results:** In training group majority of students reported normal (58.1%) or minimal to moderate anxiety (27.9%) in contrast the control group students 39% students reported most extreme anxiety as measured by Zung anxiety self-assessment tool, and Coping as measured by "Ways of coping scale by Folkman and Lazarus". Significantly more number of students in the training group reported lower levels of exam related stress, better coping ability, higher satisfaction about performance in exam compared to control group. Blinded faculty assessment of student performance, students stress levels and students coping ability showed that trained students had significantly higher ratings compared to control group. Students who underwent stress control program showed better academic performance in written assessment examination as well as practical assessment. Conclusions: Training program helped the students in having less stress, better coping skills and superior academic performance.

Key words: Dental student, Education, Performance, Psychological stress, Stress coping skills, Zung anxiety self-assessment

¹Professor and Head, ⁵Lecturer, Department of Microbiology, ⁶Reader, Department of Pathology, Sinhgad Dental College and Hospital Pune, Maharashtra.

²Reader, Public Health dentistry, A.B.Shetty Memorial Institute of dental sciences, Deralakatte, Mangalore, Karnataka, ³Dean, GSMC & KEM Hospital Mumbai, Director, GSMC FAIMER Regional Institute, Maharastra,

⁴Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, Government Medical College, Bhavnagar, Gujarat

Corresponding author mail: shirahattiravi@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION: The dental education in highly stessful^{1,2 3}. A comparative study found that stress levels increase significantly throughout the years of course for dental students whereas the stress levels progressively decreased in medical students.^{3,4} Dental students also reported higher pathological values of burnout, depression and depersonalization compared to medical students⁵. The high stress of dental students may lead to behaviours⁶, maladaptive coping depression and anxiety and substance abuse thus adversely affecting personal life of the students.⁵⁻⁷

Stress could lead to adverse effects on health like difficulty concentrating, intense fatigue, back pain, and feeling down/depressed and thus adversely affect academic performance⁴.It can thus be implied that dental students' anxiety can interfere with their performance during dental procedures as well as operator's anxiety could in turn adversely affect patient anxiety. Higher emotional intelligence in a dental student can significantly reduce stress and improve patient satisfaction⁸. Some dental students do require enhanced support to enhance learning and it has been recommended that dental students be provided with a stress management program during their dental training^{9,10}. Though some recent reviews of literature¹¹ and individual studies involving dental students¹² have suggested positive effects of isolated stress management programs on surgical skills¹² or on examination success¹³ there is need for comprehensive study that measures effects of such introduction of such a program as a part of curriculum on knowledge, skills and coping strategies of dental students. Thus, aim of our study was to assess the effectiveness of learning coping skills in improving stress academic theoretical and practical performance, reducing anxiety levels and supporting positive coping behaviours amongst undergraduate students of dentistry in our dental institution.

MATERIAL AND METHODS:

<u>Study population and groups</u>: All the second year undergraduate students of dentistry were invited to participate in the

study. Written informed consent was obtained from all the students willing to participate. Institution ethics committee approved the protocol. The participating students (n=84) were randomly (????) divided into two groups: Group 1 (n=43) : Training group received 24 hours prevalidated stress coping skills module included 13 units and Group 2(n=41): Control group without any special training. The principal investigator is a recognized trainer in stress control training programs. He conducted the 'learning stress coping skills' program for students. Method of instruction included interactive lectures with PowerPoint presentations and group activities. Curriculum and contents of stress coping skills module included 13 units was pre-validated and is as shown in annexure (Annexure I)

Assessments and evaluations: First internal exams attended by students prior to the study participation served as baseline assessment. The second internal assessments and preliminary examination conducted after the stress coping training served training program as post assessments for comparison of groups. The exams were for all the subjects taught during the second year including general pathology, microbiology, and pharmacology. The assessments were in

written assessment format as well as skills assessment. Written practical assessment included multiple choice questions, short answer questions and long answer questions. Practical skills assessments included spotting, table viva, procedures. During the examinations the students were also asked to assess exam related stress and self-assess their own performance in the exam. The stress levels of student and overall performance was also measured as perceived by blinded faculty. Faculty ratings were calculated by taking average ratings taken independently by four faculties. All the participants also responded to assessment of anxiety using "Zung anxiety self-assessment tool" and details regarding the common coping styles using "Ways of coping scale by Folkman and Lazarus". The students also answered questions related to their sleep and diet and also rated their coping ability. Finally, the students in the training group also evaluated various aspects of 'stress coping training program".

Statistical analysis : Analysis was conducted using the statistical computation software SPSS Version 17. All the continuous variables were first checked for normalcy using Shapiro-Wilk test. P-value of <0.05 was assumed to be significant deviation from normal distribution. In such cases the analysis was followed by application of non-parametric tests. Comparison of training and control group's continuous variables following normal distribution was done bv Independent samples --t-test. Comparisons for comparison of ordinal variables were done using Mann-Whitney test. Probability value of <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

Observation and **Results:** General characteristics of study participants: A total of 84 participants took part in the study. Mean age of study participants was 18.7 with a standard deviation of 0.5. There were 60 females (72.3%) and 23 males (27.7%) participating in the study. 49 participants (59%) stayed at hostel provided in campus whereas 26 participants (31.3%) were from the same city and stayed with their family and a minority of participants (9.6%) stayed outside campus at a rented place. Majority

of participants spoke Marathi - the regional language- as their mother tongue (n= 56, 68.3%) whereas rest of the students had other languages as mother tongue. Majority of participants were having English language as their medium of study (n=69, 85.2%) whereas 12 others (14.8%) studied with regional language as medium of instruction. The qualifying examination (12th standard) performance for the study participants was 78% with a standard deviation of 0.1%. Only 34 of the study participants (41%) had dentistry as their first preference while selecting their career. Though majority of participants chose dentistry on their own (n=67, 80.7%) parents strongly influenced the choice for the other students (n=16, 19.3%). Common stressors and relaxing Table factors are presented in 1. Evaluation of the program by the students in the training group is presented in table 2.

Common stressors	Not stressful	Slightly	Moderately	Highly
		stressful	stressful	stressful
Amount of assigned class work	8 (9.5%)	31 (36.9 %)	42 (50.0%)	2 (2.4%)
Examinations and grades	8 (9.5%)	25 (29.8%)	34 (40.5%)	17 (20.2%)
Competition for postgraduate seats	9 (10.7%)	13 (15.5%)	23 (27.4 %)	29 (34.5%)
Fear of failure in exam	15 (17.9%)	23 (27.4%)	24 (28.6%)	17 (20.2%)
Insecurity concerning professional	17 (20.2%)	25 (29.8%)	24 (28.6%)	13 (15.5%)
future				
Overall stress:	12 (14.3%)	24 (28.6%)	28 (33.3%)	20 (23.8%)
How much of stress did you feel this				
week?				

Table 1: Top five stressors and relaxing factors identified by students (information obtained at baseline, n= 84)

Original article

Improvement in academic performance after learning stress coping skills Dr Rajeev Saxena et al.

Relaxing factors	Very much relaxing	Considerably relaxing	Somewhat relaxing	Little relaxing
Listening to music in clinical	64 (76.2%)	14 (16.7%)	3 (3.6%)	3 (3.6%)
departments				
Personal hobbies like music, sports	58 (69.0%)	16 (19.0%)	7 (8.3%)	3 (3.6%)
Interaction with your friends	54 (64.3%)	24 (28.6%)	3 (3.6%)	3 (3.6%)
Vacations and holidays	48 (57.1%)	20 (23.8%)	4 (4.8%)	12 (14.3%)
Beautiful campus of college	52 (61.9%)	18 (21.4%)	11 (13.1%)	3 (3.6%)

Table 2: Evaluation of the stress-coping skills program by the students in the training group

Aspects of evaluation	Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
	agree	17 (45 00())		0 (00)	disagree
The training met your expectations	16 (43.2%)	17 (45.9%)	4 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	0(0%)
You will be able to apply the	10 (27 %)	27 (73%)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
knowledge learned					
The training objectives for each	11 (29.7%)	22 (59.5%)	3 (8.1%)	1 (2.7%)	0(0%)
topic were identified and followed					
The content was organized and easy	14 (37.8%)	22 (59.5%)	1 (2.7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
to follow					
The presentation of trainer was	18 (48.6%)	18 (48.6%)	1 (2.7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
effective		\ \			
The trainer was knowledgeable	30 (81.1%)	7 (18.9%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
The quality of instruction was good	14 (37.8%)	22 (59.5%)	1 (2.7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
The trainer met the training	10 (27 %)	27 (73%)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
objectives					
Class participation and interaction	14 (37.8%)	20 (54.1%)	3 (8.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
were encouraged					
Adequate time was provided for	12 (32.4%)	23 (62.2%)	2 (5.4%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
questions and discussion					
The stress management program	24 (64.9%)	13 (35.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
may help you in life					
The rating of the training overall	24 (64.9%)	13 (35.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)

*Out of 43 participants of the training group only 37 participated in providing feedback.

Effect academic performance: on Baseline comparison (first internal exam) showed no significant differences between the training and control groups for all the three subjects. The training program students performed significantly better than control group during II internal exam in general pathology and pharmacology subjects. The difference was not significant for microbiology subject for II internal exam between the two groups. However, the training program students performed significantly better than control group during preliminary examination in all the three subjects. Overall implication is that the students who underwent Stress control program showed better academic performance in written assessment examination when compared to the control group. The results suggest a beneficial effect of the stress management programs on performance of students in theory examination. (**Table 3**)

Effect on performance in practical examination: Baseline comparison (first internal exam) and preliminary examination marks showed no significant differences between the training and control groups for all the three subjects. The training program students performed significantly better than control group during II internal exam in all the three subjects. The results suggest a beneficial effect of the stress management program on performance of students for a **short period of time**. The beneficial effect seems to wear off by _____months as seen in preliminary exam marks. (Table 3)

Table 3: Comparison of academic performance of the students in both groups in the subject of general pathology written assessment examination (Independent samples -t-test)

est subject an	d test name	Training program group(n = 43)	Control group (n=41)	Mean Difference of	Significance
		group(n = 43)	0 1	Difference of	
			(n-41)		
			(11-41)	training	
		Mean + Standard		minus control	
		deviation		(95% confidence	
-				limits)	
eneral	First internal	25.4 <u>+</u> 7.0	25.1 <u>+</u> 5.7	0.3 (-2.5, 3.1)	0.81, NS
thology			27.0 <u>+</u> 4.9	3.1 (1, 5.1)	0.003, S
	Preliminary	30.3 <u>+</u> 6.5	26.1 <u>+</u> 5.5	4.2 (1.6, 6,8)	0.002, S
	First internal	31.4 <u>+</u> 5.6	31.2 <u>+</u> 5.5	0.2 (-2.2,2.6)	0.89, NS
icrobiology	Second internal	32.2 <u>+</u> 5.2	30.1 <u>+</u> 5.4	2.1 (-0.2, 4.4)	0.06, NS
	Preliminary	34.6 <u>+</u> 4.9	31.0 <u>+</u> 5.7	3.6 (1.3, 5.9)	0.003, S
armacology	First internal	24.3 <u>+</u> 9.7	21.1 <u>+</u> 8.1	3.3 (-0.6, 7.1)	0.09, NS
	Second internal	26.7 <u>+</u> 8.5	22.2 <u>+</u> 7.7	4.5 (1, 8.1)	0.01, S
	Preliminary	47.0 <u>+</u> 11.0	37.9 <u>+</u> 10.1	9.1 (4.5, 13.7)	<0.001, S
eneral	First internal	32.0 <u>+</u> 7.3	31.7 <u>+</u> 6.1	0.4 (-2.6, 3.3)	0.81, NS
thology	Second internal	36.3 <u>+</u> 4.8	33.5 <u>+</u> 7.2	2.9 (0.2, 5.5)	0.03, S
	Preliminary	36.5 <u>+</u> 4.2	35.1 <u>+</u> 5.8	1.4 (-0.8, 3.6)	0.21,NS
icrobiology	First internal	30.3 <u>+</u> 6.5	29.6 <u>+</u> 4.8	0.6 (-1.9, 3.1)	0.62, NS
	Second internal	31.7 <u>+</u> 4.5	29.9 <u>+</u> 5.0	1.8 (-0.3, 3.8)	0.09,S
	Preliminary	33.7 <u>+</u> 3.4	32.3 <u>+</u> 4.5	1.4 (-0.3, 3.1)	0.11, NS
armacology	First internal	43.5 <u>+</u> 6.6	40.6 <u>+</u> 8.0	2.9 (-0.3, 6.1)	0.08, NS
	Second internal	46.6 <u>+</u> 8.2	42.1 <u>+</u> 10.5	4.5 (0.4, 8.5)	0.03,S
	Preliminary	64.3 <u>+</u> 9.2	63.1 <u>+</u> 11.5	1.2 (-3.3, 5.8)	0.59,NS
	thology icrobiology armacology eneral thology icrobiology armacology	thology Second internal Preliminary First internal Second internal Preliminary armacology First internal Second internal Preliminary eneral First internal thology Second internal Preliminary icrobiology First internal Second internal Preliminary armacology First internal Second internal Preliminary armacology First internal Preliminary Preliminary	thologySecond internal 30.1 ± 4.4 Preliminary 30.3 ± 6.5 First internal 31.4 ± 5.6 icrobiologySecond internal 32.2 ± 5.2 Preliminary 34.6 ± 4.9 armacologyFirst internal 24.3 ± 9.7 Second internal 26.7 ± 8.5 Preliminary 47.0 ± 11.0 eneralFirst internal 32.0 ± 7.3 thologySecond internal 36.3 ± 4.8 Preliminary 36.5 ± 4.2 icrobiologyFirst internal 30.3 ± 6.5 Second internal 31.7 ± 4.5 Preliminary 33.7 ± 3.4 armacologyFirst internal 43.5 ± 6.6 Second internal 46.6 ± 8.2 Preliminary 64.3 ± 9.2	thologySecond internal 30.1 ± 4.4 27.0 ± 4.9 Preliminary 30.3 ± 6.5 26.1 ± 5.5 First internal 31.4 ± 5.6 31.2 ± 5.5 Second internal 32.2 ± 5.2 30.1 ± 5.4 Preliminary 34.6 ± 4.9 31.0 ± 5.7 armacologyFirst internal 24.3 ± 9.7 21.1 ± 8.1 Second internal 26.7 ± 8.5 22.2 ± 7.7 Preliminary 47.0 ± 11.0 37.9 ± 10.1 eneralFirst internal 32.0 ± 7.3 31.7 ± 6.1 thologySecond internal 36.3 ± 4.8 33.5 ± 7.2 Preliminary 36.5 ± 4.2 35.1 ± 5.8 icrobiologyFirst internal 30.3 ± 6.5 29.6 ± 4.8 Second internal 31.7 ± 4.5 29.9 ± 5.0 Preliminary 33.7 ± 3.4 32.3 ± 4.5 armacologyFirst internal 43.5 ± 6.6 40.6 ± 8.0 Second internal 46.6 ± 8.2 42.1 ± 10.5 Preliminary 64.3 ± 9.2 63.1 ± 11.5	thologySecond internal 30.1 ± 4.4 27.0 ± 4.9 $3.1(1, 5.1)$ Preliminary 30.3 ± 6.5 26.1 ± 5.5 $4.2(1.6, 6.8)$ First internal 31.4 ± 5.6 31.2 ± 5.5 $0.2(-2.2, 2.6)$ Second internal 32.2 ± 5.2 30.1 ± 5.4 $2.1(-0.2, 4.4)$ Preliminary 34.6 ± 4.9 31.0 ± 5.7 $3.6(1.3, 5.9)$ armacologyFirst internal 24.3 ± 9.7 21.1 ± 8.1 $3.3(-0.6, 7.1)$ Second internal 26.7 ± 8.5 22.2 ± 7.7 $4.5(1, 8.1)$ Preliminary 47.0 ± 11.0 37.9 ± 10.1 $9.1(4.5, 13.7)$ eneralFirst internal 32.0 ± 7.3 31.7 ± 6.1 $0.4(-2.6, 3.3)$ thologySecond internal 36.3 ± 4.8 33.5 ± 7.2 $2.9(0.2, 5.5)$ Preliminary 30.3 ± 6.5 29.6 ± 4.8 $0.6(-1.9, 3.1)$ second internal 31.7 ± 4.5 29.9 ± 5.0 $1.8(-0.3, 3.8)$ Preliminary 33.7 ± 3.4 32.3 ± 4.5 $1.4(-0.3, 3.1)$ second internal 43.5 ± 6.6 40.6 ± 8.0 $2.9(-0.3, 6.1)$ second internal 46.6 ± 8.2 42.1 ± 10.5 $4.5(0.4, 8.5)$

S – Significant, NS – Not significant

Stress	and	coping	duri	ng	the
examina	tions	based	on	anxi	iety

questionnaires:Intraininggroupmajorityofstudentsreportednormal(58.1%)orminimal tomoderateanxiety

(27.9%). Only 11.6% students reported marked to severe anxiety whereas one
student (2.3 %) reported extreme anxiety when assessed by by Zung anxiety self-assessment tool. In contrast, in control group 39% students reported most extreme anxiety. Only 14.6% students in

control group showed normal stress levels. The stress levels in training group were significantly lesser than control group when statistical test was applied. It is implied that undergoing training program for stress reduction could significantly reduce exam related stress in students.

(Table 4)

Measurement scale	Statistical parameter	Training	Control group	Overall
	_	program	(n=41)	total
		group $(n = 43)$		
	Mean <u>+</u> Standard	35.8 <u>+</u> 9.8	52.0 <u>+</u> 19.0	
Zung's raw scores	deviation			
-	Median (25 th and 75 th	35 (29,39)	45 (37,75)	
	percentiles)			
	p-value and significance*	p <0.001, Signi	ficant	
	Mean <u>+</u> Standard	44.9+ 12.2	65.5+23.7	
Anxiety index	deviation		<u> </u>	
scores	Median (25 th and 75 th	44 (36,49)	56 (46,94)	
	percentiles)	(,,		
	p-value and significance*	p <0.001, Signi	ficant	
Number and	Within normal range	25 (58.1 %)	6 (14.6%)	31 (36.9%)
percentage of	anxiety			
participants with	Minimal to moderate	12 (27.9 %)	18 (43.9%)	30 (35.7%)
corresponding	anxiety			
clinical	Marked to severe anxiety	5 (11.6%)	1 (2.4%)	6 (7.1%)
interpretation of				
"Zung anxiety self-	Most extreme anxiety	1 (2.3 %)	16 (39.0%)	17 (20.2 %)
assessment tool"	Total	43 (100 %)	41 (100%)	84 (100%)
	p-value and significance			
	(Mann-Whitney test)	P<0.001, Signif	ïcant	

Table 4: Comparison of training and control groups based on "Zung anxiety self-assessment tool"

*Mann-Whitney U test

Self reported stress, coping skills and self-perceived performance during exam: Significantly more number of students in the training group reported lower levels of exam related stress compared to control group when measured on Likert scale. Significantly more number of students in the training group reported better coping ability to exam related stress and significantly better self- rated satisfaction about performance in exam.(**Table 5**) Comparison of stress, coping and training performance between and control groups based on Faculty ratings: Blinded faculty assessment ratings showed that stress levels were significantly higher in control group whereas coping ability of student was rated higher for the students in the training group. Faculty assessment of student performance in test had significantly higher ratings for the students in training group compared to control. (Table 5)

Coping styles employed by students: Training groups students were having mean scores for all coping types compared to control group except escape avoidance coping and distancing coping. The control group had higher levels of escape avoidance coping. There was no significant difference between the groups for distancing coping. (**Table 6**)

Table 5: Comparison of exam related stress, coping and satisfaction about performance in
exam between test and control groups

		Number and perce	entage of students		
		Training group	Control	Total / Combined	p-value
	Not at all stressful	4 (9.3 %)	0 (0%)	27 (32.1%)	p<
	A little bit stressful	16 (32.7 %)	7 (17.1%)	33 (39.3%)	0.0001, Significa nt
	Moderately stressful	20 (46.5%)	18 (49.3%)	9 (10.7%)	
Self-rated exam stress	Very stressful	3 (7%)	15 (36.6%)	15 (17.9%)	
	Extremely stressful	0 (0%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (1.2%)	
	Total	43 (100 %)	41 (100%)	84 (100%)	
Self-rated coping	Not coping at all	1 (2.3 %)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	
ability	Coping a little	8 (18.6 %)	25 (61%)	33 (39.3%)	
	Coping satisfactorily	20 (46.5%)	13 (31.7%)	33 (39.3%)	p<
	Coping well	11 (26.5%)	3 (7.3%)	14 (16.7%)	0.0001,Si
	Coping Extremely well	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.6%)	gnificant
	Total	43 (100 %)	41 (100%)	84 (100%)	-
Self-rated satisfaction	Not satisfied at all	2 (4.7 %)	12 (29.3%)	14 (16.7%)	
about performance	A little bit satisfied	16 (37.2 %)	19 (46.3%)	35 (41.7%)	
	Moderately satisfied	15 (34.9%)	10 (24.4%)	25 (29.8%)	p<
	Very satisfied	10 (23.3%)	0 (0%)	10 (11.9%)	0.0001,Si
	Extremely satisfied	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	gnificant
	Total				
Faculty rated exam	Mean <u>+</u> Standard	2.5 <u>+</u> 0.4	3.1 <u>+</u> 0.9		
stress	deviation				p <0.001,
	Median (25 th and 75 th percentiles)	2.5 (2, 2.75)	2.75 (2.25, 4.25)		Significa nt
Faculty rated coping	Mean <u>+</u> Standard	3.2 <u>+</u> 0.7	2.4 <u>+</u> 0.6		p <0.001,

Positive re-appraisal

2.9 + 0.6

1 • 1 • 4	1			Q1	
ability	deviation			Significa	
	Median (25 th and	3 (2.75, 3.75)	2.5 (1.87,3)	nt	
	75 th percentiles)				
Faculty rated	Mean + Standard	3.3 <u>+</u> 0.6	2.2 <u>+</u> 0.86	p <0.001,	
satisfaction about	deviation			Significa	
performance	Median (25 th and	3.25 (2.75,3.75)	2.5 (1.25,3)	nt	
	75 th percentiles)				
Table 6: Comparison of	f faculty ratings of co	oping styles in t	raining and control grou	ips	
Type of coping	Training	Control	Significance		
	program group	group			
	(n = 43)	(n=41)			
	Mean <u>+</u> Standa	rd deviation			
Confrontive coping	2.3 <u>+</u> 0.41	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.33	0.01,Significant		
Distancing coping	2.3 <u>+</u> 0.57	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.5	0.17, Not significant		
Self-controlling coping	2.5 <u>+</u> 0.47	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.7	p - 0.001, Significant		
Seeking social support	2.5 <u>+</u> 0.47	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.7	p - 0.001, Significant		
Accepting responsibility	2.5 <u>+</u> 0.47	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.7	p - 0.001, Significant		
Escape-avoidance	2.1 <u>+</u> 0.5	2.6 <u>+</u> 0.7	p <0.001, Significant		
Painful-problem solving	2.7 <u>+</u> 0.6	2.2 ± 0.8	p <0.001, Significant		

2.3 + 0.9

DISCUSSION: Studies have revealed that being a student is stressful and it is more stressful for students of dentistry compared to medical. Stresses may be the schoolwork related items such as amount and difficulty of class work, obtaining of grades, fear of failing a course and fear of being unable to catch up if left behind. Some potential stressors may be related to atmosphere of school like belittlement, criticism, inconsistency bullying, in feedback...etc. The personal life stressors of students like financial problems, family issues and insecurities about professional prove to be of future could also detrimental effect to the students' academic life.

It is well known that people can be trained to positively cope with stress and anxiety. When stress has prevailed as unwanted side effect of the learning process, it is desirable that the curriculum itself incorporates modules to annihilate the effects of stress on academic progress of students. The effects of such training positive reported programs have been in literature earlier and many medical and dental schools have tried to incorporate a stress control $program^{14-24}$.

p - 0.001, Significant

Kelly JA in 1982¹⁴ conducted stress management training amongst medical students and found the training

superior be in group to stress management. We share the authors concerns that although there are ample studies reporting high stress amongst medical students very few studies are reported that model a training program to deal with this stress effectively. In a more recent study Rosenzweig S^{15} and colleagues in reported reduction in psychological stress following mindfulness based training program for medical students. In another training program, et.al.¹⁶ WG Whitehouse reported а reduction in stress after а stress management training using self- hypnosis techniques. These programs though based on different strategies of dealing with stress could be offered as a part of the course itself or can be electively chosen or offered to the students in academic or personal distress. Lee J and Graham AV^{17} reported in 2001 the effectiveness of a "wellness elective" for students in medical school. Rosenzweig S et al conducted a study on effectiveness of mindfulnessbased stress reduction to improve coping skills. It was found that mood disturbance was higher in control group compared to intervention group that received mindfulness based stress reduction program¹⁵. Similar beneficial

effects have been found after students were trained in a self- hypnosis stress management program¹⁶, mindfulness based programs¹⁷, programs based on bio-feedback-aided relaxation techniques. Iglesias SL¹⁸ studied the effects of different types of stress management programs and used objective measures like salivary cortisol levels an one of the outcome measures and found that the stress management program participants did show decreased levels of cortisol in saliva.

As suggested by authors such programs need to be designed to train the students for a life-long habit of dealing with stressful medical practice. Similar suggestions have been made by Kjeldstadli K et.al²³ that conducted a longitudinal, nationwide six vear comparative study in Norway and concluded that medical schools should encourage students to improve social and personal lives as health-promoting coping strategies. Similar views have been reported by Dunn et.al.^{25.}

Most of these aforementioned programs reported beneficial effects in reducing stress but very few programs academic

examined

students who meditated or used diaphragmatic breathing (Five minutes of meditation) Deep Breathing showed significant increases in students' academic learning and achievement. One limitation of our study was that there was no 'randomization' done to allot the students to the different groups. (Explanation of how the allotment done might not have affected the study results.) The duration of our study was for 6 months. Though the effectiveness has been seen for the shorter duration it is to be expected that there may be some long term decay in the knowledge and skills learnt in the training period.

REFERENCES

report

performance.

its

impact

One

on

study

- 1. Elani HW, Allison PJ, Kumar RA, Mancini L, Lambrou A, Bedos C. A systematic review of stress in dental students. J Dent Educ. 2014 Feb; 78(2):226-42.
- 2. Acharya S. Factors affecting stress among Indian dental students. J Dent Educ. 2003 Oct; 67(10):1140-8.
- 3. Murphy RJ, Gray SA, Sterling G, Reeves K, DuCette J. A comparative

It remains to be seen the length of duration up to which positive effect of the training program will remain and at what stage do we need to repeat the program to reinforce the positive effects training all though the course of the dentistry program.

CONCLUSION: The students in training group had significantly lesser stress levels during exam, better coping skills and better academic performance and practical skills when self-assessed and assessed by blinded faculty. In view of the positive impacts observed in this study author highly recommend introduction of modules of stress coping skills for all students.

study of professional student stress. J Dent Educ. 2009 Mar;73(3):328-37.

- 4. Silverstein ST, Kritz-Silverstein D. A longitudinal study of stress in first-year dental students. J Dent Educ. 2010 Aug;74(8):836-48.
- 5. Prinz P, Hertrich K, Hirschfelder U, de Zwaan M. Burnout, depression and depersonalisation--psychological factors and coping strategies in dental and medical students. GMS Z Med Ausbild. 2012; 29(1):Doc10. doi:

10.3205/zma000780. Epub 2012 Feb 15. English, German.

- Newbury BD, Lowry RJ, Kamali F. The changing patterns of drinking, illicit drug use, stress, anxiety, and depression in dental students in a UK dental school: a longitudinal study. Br Dent J 2002;192:646-9.
- Dahan H, Bedos C. A typology of dental students according to their experience of stress: a qualitative study. J Dent Educ. 2010 Feb;74(2):95-103.
- Azimi S, AsgharNejad Farid AA, Kharazi Fard MJ, Khoei N. Emotional intelligence of dental students and patient satisfaction. Eur J Dent Educ. 2010 Aug;14(3):129-32.
- 9. Piazza-Waggoner CA, Cohen LL, BK. Kohli K. Taylor Stress for students management dental performing their first pediatric restorative procedure. J Dent Educ. 2003 May;67(5):542-8.
- Hendricson WD, Kleffner JH. Assessing and helping challenging students: Part One, Why do some students have difficulty learning? J Dent Educ. 2002 Jan; 66(1):43-61.
- Shapiro SL, Shapiro DE, Schwartz GE.
 Stress management in medical education: a review of the literature. Acad Med. 2000 Jul;75(7):748-59.

- Malathi A, Damodaran A. Stress due to exams in medical students--role of yoga. Indian J Physiol Pharmacol. 1999 Apr;43(2):218-24.
- 13. Shankarapillai R, Nair MA, George R. The effect of yoga in stress reduction for dental students performing their first periodontal surgery: A randomized controlled study. Int J Yoga. 2012 Jan;5(1):48-51.
- 14. Kelly JA, Bradlyn AS, Dubbert PM, St
 Lawrence JS. Stress management
 training in medical school. J Med Educ.
 1982 Feb; 57(2):91-9.
- 15. Rosenzweig S, Reibel DK, Greeson JM, Brainard GC, Hojat M. Mindfulness-based stress reduction lowers psychological distress in medical students. Teach Learn Med. 2003 Spring;15(2):88-92.
- 16. Whitehouse WG, Dinges DF, Orne EC, Keller SE, Bates BL, Bauer NK, Morahan P, Haupt BA, Carlin MM, Bloom PB, Zaugg L, Orne MT. Psychosocial and immune effects of self-hypnosis training for stress management throughout the first semester of medical school. Psychosom May-Jun;58(3):249-63. Med. 1996 PubMed PMID: 8771625.
- 17. Lee J, Graham AV. Students' perception of medical school stress and

eISSN: 2319 - 1090

their evaluation of a wellness elective. Med Educ. 2001 Jul;35(7):652-9. PubMed PMID: 11437967.

- 18. Iglesias SL, Azzara S, Argibay JC, Arnaiz ML, de Valle Carpineta M, Granchetti H. Lagomarsino E. Psychological and physiological response of students to different types of stress management programs. Am J 2012 Jul-Health Promot. Aug;26(6):e149-58. doi: 10.4278/ajhp.110516-QUAL-199. PubMed PMID: 22747323.
- 19. Shapiro SL, Schwartz GE, Bonner G.
 Effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction on medical and premedical students. J Behav Med. 1998
 Dec;21(6):581-99.PubMed PMID: 9891256.
- 20. Fehring RJ. Effects of biofeedbackaided relaxation on the psychological stress symptoms of college students. Nurs Res. 1983 Nov-Dec;32(6):362-6. PubMed PMID: 6387631.
- 21. Rathbun J. Helping medical students develop lifelong strategies to cope with stress. Acad Med. 1995 Nov;70(11):955-6. PubMed PMID: 7575945.
- 22. Khoo TK, Tan TS. Burnout, depression, and quality of life in

medical students. Mayo Clin Proc. 2007 Feb;82(2):251-2

- 23. Kjeldstadli K, Tyssen R, Finset A, Hem E, Gude T, Gronvold NT, Ekeberg O, Vaglum P. Life satisfaction and resilience in medical school--a six-year longitudinal, nationwide and comparative study. BMC Med Educ. 2006 Sep 19;6: 48.
- 24. Frank E, Carrera JS, Stratton T, Bickel J, Nora LM. Experiences of belittlement and harassment and their correlates among medical students in the United States: longitudinal survey. BMJ. 2006 Sep 30;333(7570):682.
- 25. Dunn LB, Iglewicz A, Moutier C. A conceptual model of medical student well-being: promoting resilience and preventing burnout. Acad Psychiatry. 2008 Jan-Feb; 32(1):44-53.
- 26. Palmer A, Rodger S, Mindfulness, stress, and coping among university students. Canadian Journal of Counseling 2009, 43:3; 198-212.