

Assessing the Learning Approach to Basic Sciences among Undergraduate Students of Optometry in Munawar Memorial Hospital & College of Optometry by using Bigg's Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire

Iqra Khalil ¹, Ghousia Iqbal ², Rizwana Shahid ^{3*}, Sajjad Haider ⁴

¹ Optometrist, Munawar Memorial Hospital & College of Optometry Chakwal.

² Final year student of BSc (Hons) Optometry & Orthoptics, Munawar Memorial Hospital & College of Optometry Chakwal.

³ Assistant Professor Community Medicine, Rawalpindi Medical University, Rawalpindi.

⁴ Medical Director, Munawar Memorial Hospital Chakwal.

*Corresponding Author: Rizwana Shahid, Assistant Professor Community Medicine, Rawalpindi Medical University, Rawalpindi.

Received Date: July 26, 2023; Accepted Date: August 15, 2023; Published Date: September 01, 2023

Citation: Rizwana Shahid, Iqra Khalil, Ghousia Iqbal, Sajjad Haider, (2023), Assessing the learning approach to basic sciences among undergraduate students of Optometry in Munawar Memorial Hospital & College of Optometry by using Bigg's Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire, *Clinical Medical Reviews and Reports*, 5(6); DOI:10.31579/2690-8794/173

Copyright: © 2023, Rizwana Shahid. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Objectives: To assess the learning approaches of undergraduate optometry students with respect to different subjects of basic sciences.

Results: Annual scores of 2 group of BSc Optometry students in basic sciences were almost equal. However; group of students with Anatomy and Physiology scores studied by opting deep and surface learning approach comparatively more than those of Pathology and Biochemistry group with statistically significant difference (P =0.0001).

Conclusion: Group of students with Anatomy and Physiology scores were involved in deep learning of their subjects.

Keywords: learning environment, Bigg's Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire, learning approaches.

Introduction

Multiple aspects seem to influence the learning of students in any learning climate. Apart from aptitude of learning, educational standard of an institute is attributed to learning strategies of its students, the curriculum provided, teaching methodologies adopted by tutors, assessment schemes, feedback mechanisms, access to diverse learning resources and conducive learning environment.[1]. Students approach to an academic learning seems to be considerably linked to existing educational circumstances.[2].

Adoption of suitable learning approaches is genuinely linked to become high achievers [3]. Students intrinsically motivated to learn preferably opt deep learning strategy while those who are influenced by extrinsic factors for learning prioritize surface approaches [4]. Institutes intended for higher education must provoke their students to indulge in deep learning of their subjects for conceptual learning [5]. According to McLoone P et al, deep learning approach among students can appropriately be incorporated by

ensuring sufficient constructive alignment of the intended learning outcomes with teaching methodologies and assessment tools [6].

A study by Kek et al highlighted age, ethnicity, parental guidance and learning climate as probable attributes for learning approach of students [7]. Moreover; health of the students, their IQ level and study habits are also determined as quite influential in achievement of planned educational outcomes [8]. Students do not adhere to one learning approach; they are likely to switch to other approaches that is contingent upon their cognitive abilities and learning style [9]. Strategic learning approach has also been acknowledged [10]. which emphasizes the application of surface or deep learning tactics in alignment with the scenario like fear of getting failed in exams or for norm-referenced assessments [11].

Although numerous studies have already been carried out to evaluate the learning approaches of Pakistani medical students [12]. but such learning

approaches among paramedical and allied health sciences students also need to be emphasized. Allied health education is perceived quite complex as students have to acquire clinical proficiency and skills in addition to gaining theoretical knowledge [13]. The present study is therefore intended to determine the learning approaches used by students of BSc Optometry studying at Munawar Memorial Hospital Chakwal. The results of this study will enable us to perceive the learning strategy chosen by the students in comparison with their assessment scores and hence to provide the stakeholders particularly the tutors with productive suggestions.

Subjects & Methods

A cross-sectional comparative study was carried out to assess the learning approach to basic sciences subjects among 2nd, 3rd and final year BSc Optometry students of Munawar Memorial Hospital & College of Optometry. About 40 students were included in the study through simple random sampling. 20 students filled Bigg’s Revised Two Factor Study

Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F) for Anatomy and Physiology while rest of the 20 students filled it for Pathology and Biochemistry. This tool was proved to be sufficiently reliable [14]. as well as valid [15]. for assessing learning approaches of medical students. The scores of respective subjects were also noted while measuring the learning approaches. The difference in mean score pertaining to deep and superficial motives, strategies as well as approaches between two groups of students was statistically determined by independent sample t-test. P < 0.05 was taken as significant.

Results

Of the total 40 undergraduate optometry students enrolled in our study, about 32(80%) were females. Annual result scores of the students in the context of various basic subjects is revealed below in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The difference in mean of two factors- Study Process Questionnaire (SPQ) pertaining to different basic subjects is depicted below in Table 1.

Subscales	Anatomy & Physiology (n=20)	Pathology & Biochemistry (n=20)	P-value
Deep motive	16.78 ± 0.67	17.25 ± 0.34	0.008
Deep strategy	11.43 ± 0.56	11.82 ± 0.36	0.01
Surface motive	12.68 ± 0.76	13.25 ± 0.23	0.003
Surface strategy	14.56 ± 0.35	12.85 ± 0.35	0.0001
Deep approach	28.21 ± 1.23	20.07 ± 0.56	0.0001
Surface approach	27.24 ± 0.46	26.1 ± 0.38	0.0001

Table 1: Difference in Mean scores of SPQ Subscales

Annexure

Bigg’s Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F)

Sr.#	Items	Subscale	Never or only rarely true of me (5)	Sometimes true of me (4)	True of me about half the time (3)	Frequently true of me (2)	Always or almost always true of me (1)
1.	I find that at times studying gives me a feeling of	DM					

	deep personal satisfaction.						
2.	I find that I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusions before I am satisfied.	DS					
3.	My aim is to pass the course while doing as little work as possible.	SM					
4.	I only study seriously what's given out in class or in the course outlines.	SS					
5.	I feel that virtually any topic can be highly interesting once I get into it.	DM					
6.	I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them.	DS					
7.	I do not find my course very interesting so I keep my work to the minimum.	SM					
8.	I learn some things by rote, going over and over them until I know them by heart even if I do not understand them.	SS					
9.	I find that studying academic topics can at times be as exciting as a good novel or movie.	DM					
10.	I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely.	DS					
11.	I find I can get by in most assessments by memorising key sections rather than trying to understand them.	SM					
12.	I generally restrict my study to what is specifically set as I think it is unnecessary to do anything extra.	SS					
13.	I work hard at my studies because I find the material interesting.	DM					
14.	I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics which have been discussed in different classes.	DS					
15.	I find it is not helpful to study topics in depth. It confuses and wastes time, when all you	SM					

	need is a passing acquaintance with topics.						
16.	I believe that lecturers shouldn't expect students to spend significant amounts of time studying material everyone knows won't be examined.	SS					
17.	I come to most classes with questions in mind that I want answering.	DM					
18.	I make a point of looking at most of the suggested readings that go with the lectures.	DS					
19.	I see no point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination	SM					
20.	I find the best way to pass examinations is to try to remember answers to likely questions.	SS					

DM – Deep Motive

DS – Deep Strategy

SM – Surface Motive

SS – Surface Strategy

Discussion

Construction of new knowledge and its incorporation in schema of students can significantly be attributed to constructive alignment between the learning objectives to be covered, teaching methods and assessment plans [16]. as constructively aligned courses are more likely to enhance adoption of deep learning approach deemed essential for conceptual and long-term learning of the subject [17].

In current study, about 20 students with Anatomy and Physiology results and another 20 students with Pathology and Biochemistry results filled Bigg's Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F). This questionnaire was filled by each group of students pertaining to deep and surface learning approach opted by them for studying the respective subjects during under graduation in Optometry. Although students who filled the questionnaire regarding learning strategy opted by them for Anatomy and Physiology studies were having less score pertaining to deep motive items (16.78 ± 0.67) than those of Pathology & Biochemistry students with mean score of 17.25 ± 0.34 for deep motive items but their means score related to deep strategy items were very closer (Table 1) though statistically significant ($P = 0.01$). Basic sciences have been recognized as the fundament component of medical and paramedical curricula as it is impossible to acquire new knowledge without getting acquisition with the core concepts [18]. Although apart from interest in the subject, desire to become high achiever also leads to inclination of students towards in depth learning [19]. yet in-depth learners are more prone to link the course content to their preceding knowledge and hence more capable of building schema in their brain [20]. A study recently done by Qureshi SS et al among medical students of a Qatar medical school by using revised 2 factor study process questionnaire revealed gender and academic year-based difference in learning approaches [21].

In present study, academic performance in terms of pass, fail or extraordinary performance did not reflect remarkable variation among 2 groups of students whose score with respect to basic sciences' subjects were analysed. However, visualizing the learning approaches holistically, students with

Anatomy and Physiology scores were more found to be indulged more in deep learning ($P=0.0001$) (Table 1). A similar study carried out by May W

et al among 4th year medical students illustrated positive correlation of deep and strategic learning of students with their academic score in terms of

summative clinical performance examination [22]. Al though numerous studies have been done to highlight the impact of learning approach on academic performance, yet the role of institutes in provision of conducive educational environment to postgraduate trainees for enhancement of their conceptual and practical learning should also be visualized [23]. Therefore, accrediting bodies both nationally as well as Reviewing the learning style of medical students by utilizing Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (LSI) concluded that although students who prioritized conceptual learning achieved higher scores in basic sciences subjects, yet those students had to emphasize their interviewing competencies. Hence recommendation was to apply diverse teaching methods for achievement of desired results instead of just relying on the learning styles of the students [24]. However, implication of teaching strategies on academic achievement is another debate that should also be given due consideration by the stakeholders and strategic planners for betterment in future.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Students with Anatomy and Physiology scores were more inclined to both surface and deep learning approaches. Being healthcare personnel, BSc Optometry students should practice thorough and in-depth learning of their subject for better healthcare management of their patients. Sufficient sample size with scrutinization of other demographic and subject based attributes would enable us to visualize the scenario in true sense.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Source of Funding: The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship and or publication of this article.

References

1. Shah DK, Yadav RL, Sharma D, Yadav PK, Jha RK.et al. (2016). Learning approach among health sciences students in a medical college in Nepal: A cross-sectional study. *Adv Medical Educ Pract*; 137-143.

2. Chonkar SP, Ha TC, Chu SSA, Ng AX, Lim MLS, et al. (2018). The predominant learning approaches of medical students. *BMC Med Educ*; 18: 17.
3. Smith TW, Colby SA. (2007). Teaching for deep learning. *The Clearing House*; 80(5): 205-210.
4. Gordon C, Debus R. (2002). Developing deep learning approaches and personal teaching efficacy within a preservice teacher education context. *Br J Educ Psychol*; 72: 483–511.
5. Wang X, Cheung S, Wong E, Kwong T. (2013). An exploration of Biggs' constructive alignment in course design and its impact on students' learning approaches. *Assess Evaluat Higher Educ*; 38: 477-491.
6. McLoone P, Oluwadun A. (2014). Approaches to learning in higher education: A review. *Afr Educ Res J*; 2(3): 110-115.
7. Kek, M. A. Y. C., Darmawan, I. G. N., and Chen, Y. S. (2007). Family, learning environments, learning approaches and student outcomes in a Malaysian private university. *International Education Journal*, 8(2):318-336.
8. Deary I J, Johnson W. (2010). Intelligence and educational causal perceptions drive analytic processes and therefore conclusions. *International Journal of Epidemiology*; 39(5):1362-1369.
9. Dahlgren, L. (2005). Learning conceptions and outcomes in: F. Marton, D. Hounsell, and N. Entwistle. (Eds) *The Experience of Learning: Implications for teaching and studying in higher education*. 3rd ed: 23-38.
10. D'cruz SM, Rajaratnam N. (2018). Study of the learning approaches of medical students before and after clinical posting in a medical college in South India. *Int J Sci.Study*; 6:95–98.
11. Abedin NFZ, Jaafar Z, Husain S, Abdullah R. (2013). The validity of ASSIST as a measurement of learning approach among MDAB students. *Proc Soc Behav Sci*; 90: 549–557.
12. Rehman R, Ahmed K, Rehan R, Hassan F, Syed F. (2016). Learning approaches and performance of medical students. *J Pak Med Assoc*;66(2):198-202.
13. Brown T, Robinson L, Gledhill K, Yu ML, Isbel S, et al. (2022). 'Learning in and out of lockdown': A comparison of two groups of undergraduate occupational therapy students' engagement in online-only and blended education approaches during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Aust Occup Ther J*; 301–315.
14. Biggs, J., Kember, D., & Leung, D. Y. P. (2001). The revised two-factor Study Process Questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(1), 133–149.
15. Malik AA, Khan RA, Malik HN, Humayun A, Baig M. et al. (2019). Assessing reliability and validity of Revised Biggs Two-Factor study process questionnaire to measure learning approaches among undergraduate medical students in Lahore, Pakistan. *J Pak Med Assoc*; 69(3): 337-342.
16. Tran, ND, Nguyen TT, Nguyen MTN. (2019). The standard of quality for HEIs in Vietnam: A step in the right direction? *Quality Assurance in Education*; 19(2): 130–140.
17. Biggs J, Tang C. *Teaching for quality learning at university: what the student does*. 2007. 3rd ed., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
18. Dominguez I, Zumwalt AC. (2020). Integrating the basic sciences in medical curricula: Focus on the basic scientists. *Adv Physiol Educ*; 44(2): 119-123.
19. Biggs J, Kember D, Leung DYP. (2001). The revised two-factor Study Process Questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F. *Br J Educ Psychol*; 71:133–49.
20. Kember D, Webster B, Chan W. (2020). Refocusing the 3P model to incorporate a learning and teaching environment and graduate attributes. *Educ Psychol*; 40: 1–16.
21. Qureshi, S.S., Larson, A.H. & Vishnumolakala, V.R. (2022). Factors influencing medical students' approaches to learning in Qatar. *BMC Med Educ*; 22: 446.
22. May W, Chung E-K, Elliott D, Fisher D. (2012). The relationship between medical students' learning approaches and performance on a summative high-stakes clinical performance examination. *Med Teach*; 34: e236-e241.
23. Negash TT, Eshete MT, Hanago GA. (2022). Students' learning approaches as a factor of academic achievement at selected public universities: A cross-sectional study. *Front Educ*; 7: 1-9.
24. Davies SM, Rutledge CM, Davies TC. (1997). The impact of student learning approaches on interviewing skills and academic performance. *Teach Learn Med*; 9: 131–135.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here:

Submit Manuscript

DOI:10.31579/2690-8794/173

Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://auctoresonline.org/journals/clinical-medical-reviews-and-reports->