

Research Article

A comparative study of the correlation of student's self assessment of the outcome of final year M.B.B.S examination to the final university results of the final year M.B.B.S PART II general surgery examination in a medical college.**Dr. Asayas Bosco Chandra Kumar¹, Dr. Vijaya Ragavan², Dr. Dr. Thirugananasambandhan³, Dr. Boblee James⁴,
Dr. K.V. Maheswaran⁵, Dr. Balagurunathan⁶**¹Associate professor of surgery, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Pondicherry, India²Assistant professor of orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Pondicherry, India³Senior resident of orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Pondicherry, India⁴Professor of orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Pondicherry, India^{5,6}Professor of surgery, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Pondicherry, India***Corresponding author**

Dr. Asayas Bosco Chandra Kumar

Email: asayas.journal@gmail.com

Abstract: The final year exams are the most important exam in the career of the undergraduate medical student. And the performance can be made by the self assessment or not is the question most of us as students have. Hence a study to see if any such correlation exists. This is a comparative study of the student's self assessment of the outcome of final year M.B.B.S examination to the final university results of the final year M.B.B.S PART II general surgery examination in a medical college. Using a questionnaire method we have try to find a correlation between the above said topics. And by use of the Microsoft excel we have drawn the tables and charts. The important comparison is that the students with a self assessment of performing poor in the final year exams also have a 60% chance of a pass. So the correlation of the student's self performance to the final year university surgery clinical exams and the self assessment has a least value to the end result of the exams except in problem based learning. we have concluded that there no correlation of the student's self performance to the final year university surgery exams and the self assessment has a least value to the end result of the exams.

Keywords: self assessment, evaluation methods, self assessment validity

INTRODUCTION

As a student the most important day is the day your final exam results are going to be displayed on the college notice board. And hope we had a gadget to predict the outcome before it comes. So the intent of the study is to find if such prediction can be done using questionnaire to the final outcome "the results", with respect to the performance on the day of the exam.

METHODS

We have used a questionnaire method. We have interviewed the candidates on the end of the surgery practical's viva of the surgery final year university exams.

We also noted to the response to the questions in details to the components of the exams. And questions how they did in the examinations to the scale of 0-10. Further categorised as 0-5, 6-8, >8. And individual questionnaire on various subsets of the surgery exams noted down long case, short case, orthopaedics and their expected outcome.

And the response noted against their role numbers and results tabulated.

Also an attempt to find if these students unsuccessful performance has a correlation on other final year subjects especially medicine, obstetrics and paediatrics results as well.

Inclusion criteria: All students who appeared for final year M.B.B.S PART II general surgery practical exam.

Exclusion criteria: Those failed in the theory exams.

Analysis and Interpretation

The response noted in the Performa and using Microsoft excel sheet we have computed the results and the results as follows.

RESULTS

Our study group a total of 133 students who appeared for the exam. Which included a regular of 115 students appeared for the first time and 18 were

repeaters. Of which 15 failed from the regular batch and 4 failed from the repeaters and a 13% and 22% failure rate respectively.

In long case 109 expected to score average (06-08), and 24 in short case expected to score < 5 (below average). No students expected to score > 8. In short case 95 expected to score average (06-08), and 33 in short case expected to score < 5 (below average). And 5 students expected to score > 8. In orthopaedics 102 have done average (06-08), and 31 students did below 5.

Overall performance 62 student's response was good and 66 did a average performance and the balance of 5 students had a negative performance.

Now analysis of the failed candidates and comparison with their responses prior to the results. And this is what was obtained. Out of 19 unsuccessful, in long case 8 belonged to the score of 0-5 group, and 11 students belong to score average (06-08).

Out of 19 unsuccessful, in short case 7 belonged to the score of 0-5 group, and 11 students belong to score average (06-08). One belonged from the > 8 group.

And to the final comparison the student's self assessment and the final university exam results. The results showed that these candidates who thought they had done well in the exam and failed are about 5/66, from the average group 12/66 and 2/5 from the poor performance group.

With a fail percentage of 8% in the good performance group and in average group 18% and in the poor performance group 40% chance of failure.

Pass percentage for the good performance is 91.9 % and in the average group the percentage is 82% the surprising results are that a 60 % pass seen the students who's performance assessment was poor.

Table-1

| Overall Information | Appeared | Passed | Pass Percentage | Failed | Fail Percentage |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Regular Batch | 115 | 100 | 86.9 | 15 | 13.1 |
| Additional Batch | 18 | 14 | 77.7 | 4 | 22.3 |
| TOTAL | 133 | 114 | 85.7 | 19 | 14.3 |

Table-2

| Performance | Overall | Passed | Failed | Pass Percentage | Fail Percentage |
|-------------|---------|--------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Good | 62 | 57 | 5 | 91.9 | 8 |
| Average | 66 | 54 | 12 | 81.8 | 18 |
| Bad | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60 | 40 |

DISCUSSION

In our study group we found that the students have ninety percentage pass rate if they asses their performance is good end of the day. And if students self assessment was average then he had a chance of 82 percent as pass percentage. The important comparison is that the students with a self assessment [1] of performing poor in the final year exams also have a 60% chance of a pass.

So the correlation of the student's self performance to the final year university surgery clinical [2] exams and the self assessment has a least value to the end result of the exams except in a problem based learning [3].

So the intent of the study to find a co relation is not serving due to contradicting results.

To conclude the findings that the self assessment of the student in their final year university exams are not relevant. And it tells to all of us the student and the

facilitator that the students self assessment is not to be considered seriously. But the study has given few valuable points for the student that the subjective feeling of poor performance and good performance is not valid [4].

The advantage of the study is we have not assessed the reading capacity [5] rather than the practical application of the knowledge. Which is a higher order application and reasoning and to asses also has many parameters and the existing system usefulness is doubted and most is part of a theory assessment [6].

Several meta-analyses are done regarding the self assessment and prove an important tool for to know a scope for improvement in the student's behaviour towards learning [7].

And the medical students' self assessment should be the state of art for student education evaluation should be considered [8]. And helps us to encourage the student

by stating this study as a pioneer study in this respect of correlation of the self assessment and the final university exams results.

REFERENCES

1. Blanch-Hartigan D; Medical students' self-assessment of performance: results from three meta-analyses, *Patient Educ Couns*, 2011; 84(1): 3-9.
2. Antonelli MA; accuracy of second year medical students' self assessment of clinical skills. *Acad Med*, 1997; 72: 563-565.
3. Tousignant M, Desmarchais JE; Accuracy of student self-assessment ability compared to their own performance in a problem-based learning medical program: a correlation study, *advances in health sciences education*, 2002; 7: 19-27.
4. Ross JA; *The Reliability, Validity, and Utility of Self-Assessment* , Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 2006,
5. Johansson S; The relationship between students' self-assessed reading skills and other measures of achievement, *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 2013; 1(1): 1:3.
6. Edward JP, Devit PG; Assessment of higher order cognitive skills in undergraduate education, *BMC medical education*, 2007; 7: 49.
7. Blanch Hartigan D; medical students' self assessment of performance: result from three meta-analyses, *patient Educ. Couns*, 2011; 84(1): 3-9.
8. Ward M, Gruppen L, Regehr G; measuring self-assessment: current state of the art. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 2002; 7(1): 63-80.