

## A QUESTIONNAIRE-BASED STUDY TO ASSESS FEEDBACK ON CURRENT TEACHING-LEARNING METHODS AND THEIR OPINION FOR PERSPECTIVE CHANGES AMONG SECOND-YEAR MBBS STUDENTS

G. MUTHUKAVITHA<sup>1</sup>, KUMARAN R.<sup>2</sup>, C. UMAMAHESHWARI<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Government Thiruvavur Medical College, Thiruvavur, Tamil Nadu, India, <sup>2</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Government Medical College, Nagapattinam, Tamil Nadu, India, <sup>3</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Government Villupuram Medical College.  
\*Corresponding author: C. Umamaheshwari; \*Email: [maheshwari200789@gmail.com](mailto:maheshwari200789@gmail.com)

Received: 03 Oct 2025, Revised and Accepted: 24 Nov 2025

### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To collect and analyze feedback from second-year MBBS students about commonly used teaching-learning methods and to summarize their perspectives for potential changes.

**Methods:** A validated 25-item questionnaire covering five domains (Assignments, Seminars, Small Group Discussions, Lectures, Self-Directed Learning) was administered to second-year MBBS students. Responses are recorded in a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) and were summarized with descriptive statistics.

**Results:** Assignments, small group discussions and lectures received predominantly positive responses. Seminars showed moderate acceptance with varying neutrality, while self-directed learning elicited mixed responses, suggesting the need for clearer guidance and structure.

**Conclusion:** A blended approach that retains high-quality lectures and assignments while expanding small group activities and improving the scaffold for self-directed learning is recommended.

**Keywords:** Feedback, Assignment, Self-directed learning, Lectures

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ijcpr.2026v18i1.8046> Journal homepage: <https://innovareacademics.in/journals/index.php/ijcpr>

### INTRODUCTION

Medical education is shifting from passive, teacher-centered formats to <sup>m</sup> interactive and learner – driven formats. Traditional lectures efficiently deliver content to large students but may not always promote deep understanding or critical thinking [1, 2]. Conversely, active-learning strategies such as small group discussions, assignments, and structured self-directed learning have been associated with improved retention and clinical application [3-5]. Student feedback provides a pragmatic view for evaluating these teaching methods and helps identify practical areas for curricular refinement [6, 7]. This study was done to collect student's opinion regarding current teaching methods and possible changes that might be required in existing teaching methods.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a questionnaire based descriptive cross-sectional observational study. Participants were second-year MBBS students of Government Medical College, Nagapattinam. Before initiating the study, Institutional ethics committee clearance was obtained. Students were explained about the purpose of the study and written consent was obtained.

#### Inclusion criteria

All II MBBS students from the 2021 and 2022 batches who were willing to participate were included.

#### Exclusion criteria

Students who were absent on the day of the study or who did not provide consent were excluded.

#### Sample size

A total of 150 students participated in the study. Study instrument: Data were collected using a predesigned, structured, pre validated 25-item questionnaire encompassing five domains-Assignments (Q1-Q5), Seminars (Q6-Q10), Small Group Discussions (Q11-Q15), Lectures (Q16-Q20), and Self-Directed Learning (Q21-Q25). Each

item was rated on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Difference, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).

#### Data collection and analysis

Responses were tabulated and expressed as counts and percentages.

### RESULTS

A total of 25 items across five domains were evaluated. The domain-wise summary tables are presented below.

### DISCUSSION

The findings from this study reflect the dynamic balance between traditional and innovative teaching-learning methods in medical education (table). Students favored assignments acknowledging their contribution to conceptual clarity, wider literature exploration and improved learning confidence. Small group discussions (SGDs) were also strongly endorsed, reflecting the preference for collaborative and interactive learning. The opportunity for equal participation and peer-to-peer interaction contributes to improved conceptual clarity and problem-solving ability. These findings reinforce the value of incorporating structured SGDs into the curriculum, particularly when they are supported by facilitators who can guide discussion, clarify misconceptions, and encourage participation from all students. Lectures, though sometimes criticized for passivity, continue to hold significant value among the students. Students appreciated concise, exam-oriented lectures, particularly when integrated with clinical relevance and interactive elements such as formative assessments e. g., Google quizzes. This suggests that traditional lectures remain indispensable, provided they are adapted to modern expectations by being focused, interactive, and well-aligned with assessment patterns. Brown *et al.* (2002) reported that student attitudes in health-professional education improve when assessment and feedback are clearly structured-mirroring our participants' positive views on assignments and formative quizzes [8].

**Table 1: Feedback of second year MBBS students towards current teaching learning approaches**

Assignment	Strongly agree	Agree	No difference	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1 Assignment is helpful to learn concepts and boost the confidence as an Indian medical graduate	32(21%)	67(45%)	29(19%)	11(7%)	11(7%)
2 Assignment is appropriate if it is given once in a month	51(34%)	70(47%)	8(5%)	13(9%)	8(5%)
3 Assignment helps us to refer many books for a valuable content	18(12%)	60(40%)	36(24%)	21(14%)	15(10%)
4 Assignment is Evaluated and Feedback is given all the time	34(23%)	75(50%)	15(10%)	11(7%)	15(10%)
5 The topic for the assignment should be exam oriented	88(59%)	48(32%)	4(3%)	1(0.6%)	9(6%)
<b>Seminar</b>					
6 Seminar is helpful to learn concepts from peers during the session	40(27%)	64(43%)	26(17%)	8(5%)	12(8%)
7 Seminar is appropriate if it is given once in a month	32(21%)	67(45%)	10(7%)	27(18%)	14(9%)
8 Adequate time is given to prepare for the seminar	50(33%)	82(55%)	2(1%)	10(7%)	6(4%)
9 Preferences given to all to participate in the seminar	62(41%)	70(47%)	8(5%)	6(4%)	4(3%)
10 The topic for the seminar should be on recent advances	55(37%)	71(47%)	13(9%)	4(3%)	7(5%)
<b>Small group discussion</b>					
11 SGD is helpful to learn concepts	62(41%)	63(42%)	12(8%)	6(4%)	7(5%)
12 SGD is conducted once in a month	57(38%)	67(45%)	6(4%)	11(7%)	9(6%)
13 The topic for the SGD should be Exam oriented	75(50%)	63(42%)	4(3%)	2(1%)	6(4%)
14 Formative assessment following SGD is done	34(23%)	77(51%)	15(10%)	18(12%)	6(4%)
15 SGD provides equal opportunity to all with more interactions	53(35%)	63(42%)	18(12%)	8(5%)	8(5%)
<b>Lecture</b>					
16 Lecture is helpful to learn concepts with less interactions	33(22%)	82(55%)	20(13%)	6(4%)	9(6%)
17 Lecture is appropriate if it is scheduled Twice in a week	38(25%)	79(52%)	12(8%)	11(7%)	10(7%)
18 The topic for the Lecture should be Crisp and Exam oriented	84(56%)	51(34%)	5(3%)	6(4%)	4(3%)
19 Alignment and integration are preferred much during lecture sessions	37(25%)	70(47%)	24(16%)	12(8%)	7(7%)
20 Method of assessing with google quiz is very useful after the session	47(31%)	59(39%)	22(15%)	12(8%)	10(7%)
<b>Self-directed learning (SDL)</b>					
21 Information provided during the session will be retainable	31(21%)	85(57%)	22(15%)	6(4%)	6(4%)
22 SDL will be appropriate if it is given once in a month	40(27%)	71(47%)	19(13%)	10(7%)	10(7%)
23 SDL is Evaluated all the time	26(17%)	81(54%)	24(16%)	11(7%)	8(5%)
24 Feedback to the SDL given all the time	23(15%)	71(47%)	22(15%)	24(16%)	10(7%)
25 The topic for the SDL should be exam oriented	78(52%)	56(37%)	6(4%)	5(3%)	5(3%)

Seminars received comparatively mixed responses. While some students valued the exposure to recent advances and peer-led teaching, others expressed ambivalence, likely due to variation in presentation quality, uneven participation, or insufficient faculty involvement. This indicates the need for structured mentoring, clearer objectives, and possibly hybrid formats where faculty and students share responsibilities in content delivery. Dolmans *et al.* (2005) highlighted tutor guidance as a determinant of success in problem-based learning, paralleling students' call for faculty-facilitated sessions.

Self-directed learning (SDL) generated the most divergent views. Although students acknowledged its potential for long-term knowledge retention, many expressed challenges in maintaining motivation and direction. This underlines the necessity for scaffolding SDL activities through curated resources, periodic feedback, and formative assessments rather than leaving students entirely on their own. Early orientation sessions on self-directed learning strategies may also reduce variability in acceptance and effectiveness. Overall, the study highlights that while students are open to varied teaching-learning methods, their effectiveness depends heavily on how they are structured, facilitated, and aligned with assessment. These findings support a blended teaching model where the strengths of lectures, assignments, and SGDs are preserved while seminars and SDL are refined to improve consistency and student engagement. Harden RM and Laidlaw JM (2018) emphasised that effective learning environments balance structure and flexibility, consistent with our observation that students value guided small-group discussions [9].

#### Implications for practice

The findings suggest a blended curricular model that preserves concise, high-quality lectures and assignments while expanding small-group activities. Seminars should be standardized with clear objectives and faculty mentorship to improve consistency. For self-directed learning, we should provide orientation sessions, curated learning resources, and formative checkpoints.

#### LIMITATIONS

This study was conducted at a single institution with a limited sample frame, which may affect generalizability. The questionnaire captured perceptions rather than objective measures of learning or performance. Finally, response bias is possible if students provided socially desirable answers.

#### CONCLUSION

Second-year MBBS students demonstrated a strong preference for structured teaching strategies. The results suggest that curricular planners should move toward a blended model that retains the clarity of lectures and the rigor of assignments expands the interactive nature of SGDs and enhances the utility of seminars and SDL through clear objectives and supportive infrastructure. Incorporating systematic feedback, orientation to independent learning, and formative evaluation will be critical for the sustained success of these methods. Ultimately, the integration of student feedback into ongoing curricular reforms can help create a more engaging, effective, and future-ready medical education framework.

#### FUNDING

Nil

#### AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors have contributed equally

#### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Declared none

#### REFERENCES

1. Bligh DA. What's the use of lectures? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2000.
2. Kumar S. Impact of assignments on medical student learning. Int J Med Educ. 2018;9:123-8.

3. Harden RM, Laidlaw JM. Essential skills for a medical teacher: an introduction to teaching and learning in medicine. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2017.
4. Steinert Y. Student perceptions of effective small group teaching. *Med Educ.* 2004;38(3):286-93. doi: [10.1046/j.1365-2923.2004.01772.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2004.01772.x), PMID [14996338](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14996338/).
5. Prince M. Does active learning work? A review of the research. *J Eng Educ.* 2004;93(3):223-31. doi: [10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x).
6. Spencer J. Learning and teaching in the clinical environment. *BMJ.* 2003;326(7389):591-4. doi: [10.1136/bmj.326.7389.591](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7389.591), PMID [12637408](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12637408/).
7. Dolmans DH, De Grave W, Wolfhagen IH, Van Der Vleuten CP. Problem-based learning: future challenges for educational practice and research. *Med Educ.* 2005;39(7):732-41. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02205.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02205.x), PMID [15960794](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15960794/).
8. Brown G, Manogue M, Rohlin M. Assessing attitudes in dental education: is it worthwhile? *Br Dent J.* 2002;193(12):703-7. doi: [10.1038/sj.bdj.4801665](https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.4801665), PMID [12529727](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12529727/).
9. Harden RM. Ten key features of the future medical school-not an impossible dream. *Med Teach.* 2018;40(10):1010-5. doi: [10.1080/0142159X.2018.1498613](https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2018.1498613), PMID [30326759](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30326759/).