Chula Med J Vol. 46 No.12 December 2002

Opinions of medical teachers, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, about research on medical education

Boonnart Laisnitsarekul* Kitpramuk Tantayaporn**
Anan Srikiatkhachorn*** Nutjaree Pholwan*

Laisnitsarekul B, Tantayaporn K, Srikiatkhachorn A, Pholwan N. Opinions of medical teachers, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, about research on medical education. Chula Med J 2002 Dec; 46(12): 975 - 84

Objective : *This study is aimed to determine opinions of medical teachers of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, about research on medical education.*

Design : *Descriptive study.*

Methods : *A questionnaire was constructed and distributed to 375 instructors of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University in February 2002. They returned 161 questionnaires (42.93 %) by the end of the month. The data were analyzed by SPSS for Windows version 8.0 and presented in frequency and percentage.*

Results : *Among the medical teachers, 100 were male (62.11 %) and 61 female (37.89%). There were 42 instructors (26.09 %), 43 assistant professors (26.71 %), 65 associates professors (40.37 %) and 11 professors (6.83 %). The 44 (27.33 %) medical teachers were from pre-clinic; 116 (72.05 %) from clinic; and 1 (0.62%) did not identify themselves. 47 (29.19 %) of the medical teachers used to read journals on medical education such as Academic Medicine and Medical Education; and 88 (54.66 %) of the medical teachers thought that research on medical education is a kind of research on medical science. Most of them (95.65 %) said that research on medical education is necessary for Thailand*

* Medical Education Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University
** Department of Obstetric and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University
***Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University

because the results can be applied to improve both the teaching and learning processes and curriculum development. When asked who should run the research, 108 (67.08 %) of the medical teachers suggested those who are interested in medical education. The main obstruction is that medical teachers themselves are not interested to do the research. Given that the research is a part of academic promotion in the faculty, the number of research papers will surely increase. One of the best ways to promote research on medical education is to count it as workload legible for academic promotion. Other alternatives are namely: providing training course on research on medical education and increasing the reward.

Conclusion : *Most medical teachers of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University thought that research on medical education is valuable for both the improvement of teaching and learning processes as well as curriculum development. Another possibility that promotes research on medical education is to count it as workload and a factor influencing academic promotion. Since the number of medical teachers who returned the questionnaire were only 43 %, the result cannot be used to represent the opinion of the whole body of medical teachers of the Faculty. However, the research should be taken as a pilot study, a complete study should be carried out again in the future.*

Keywords : *Research on medical education, Opinions, Medical teachers.*

Reprint request : Laisnitsarekul B, Medical Education Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand.

Received for publication. October 15, 2002.

บุญนาท ลายสนิทเสรีกุล, กิจประมุข ตันตยาภรณ์, อนันต์ ศรีเกียรติขจร, ณัฏฐ์จรีย์ พลวัน. ความคิดเห็นของคณาจารย์ คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ที่มีต่อการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา. จุฬาลงกรณ์เวชสาร 2545 ธ.ค;46(12): 975 – 84

วัตถุประสงค์ : *การศึกษานี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจความคิดเห็นของคณาจารย์ คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ที่มีต่อการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา*

รูปแบบการวิจัย : *การศึกษาเชิงพรรณนา*

วิธีการศึกษา : *ผู้วิจัยได้สร้างแบบสอบถามและส่งให้คณาจารย์คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย จำนวน 375 คน ในเดือนกุมภาพันธ์ 2545 และได้รับกลับคืนเมื่อถึงวันสิ้นเดือน จำนวน 161 ฉบับ คิดเป็นร้อยละ 42.93 ข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามนำมาวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลด้วยโปรแกรม SPSS for Windows เวอร์ชั่น 8.0 หาค่าสถิติในรูปความถี่ และร้อยละ*

ผลการศึกษา : *คณาจารย์ที่ตอบแบบสอบถาม เป็นเพศชายจำนวน 100 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 62.11 เป็นเพศหญิงจำนวน 61 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 37.89. ดำรงตำแหน่งทางวิชาการเป็นอาจารย์ 42 คนคิดเป็นร้อยละ 26.09 เป็นผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ 43 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 26.71 เป็นรองศาสตราจารย์ 65 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 40.37 และเป็นศาสตราจารย์ 11 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 6.83 คณาจารย์จำนวน 44 คน หรือร้อยละ 27.33 มาจาก ภาควิชาทางปรีคลินิก คณาจารย์จำนวน 116 คน หรือร้อยละ 72.05 มาจากภาควิชาทางคลินิก มีอาจารย์ 1 คนที่ไม่ได้ระบุว่ามาจากภาควิชาใด คณาจารย์ จำนวน 47 คน หรือร้อยละ 29.19 เคยอ่านวารสารวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา เช่น Academic Medicine และ Medical Education. คณาจารย์จำนวน 88 คนหรือ ร้อยละ 54.66 คิดว่าการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาเป็นการวิจัยทางวิทยาศาสตร์การแพทย์ชนิดหนึ่ง คณาจารย์ส่วนใหญ่ (ร้อยละ 95.65) เห็นว่าการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาเป็นสิ่งจำเป็นสำหรับประเทศไทย เนื่องจากผลงานวิจัยสามารถนำมาปรับปรุงกระบวนการจัดการเรียนการสอน และการพัฒนาหลักสูตร เมื่อถามคำถามว่าใครควรเป็นผู้รับผิดชอบ ในการทำวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา คณาจารย์ จำนวน 108 คน หรือร้อยละ 67.08 แนะนำว่าควรเป็นผู้ที่สนใจในงานด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา อุปสรรคหลักคือคณาจารย์ไม่สนใจที่จะทำวิจัยชนิดนี้ แต่ถ้างานวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาสามารถนำไปขอ*

สรุป : *ตำแหน่งทางวิชาการ เชื่อว่าจำนวนรายงานการวิจัยจะเพิ่มมากขึ้น วิธีที่ดีที่สุดในการส่งเสริมการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาคือการยอมรับงานวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาเป็นองค์ประกอบหนึ่งในกระบวนการคิดภาระงานหรือขอตำแหน่งทางวิชาการ สำหรับวิธีอื่นๆ ได้แก่ การจัดหลักสูตรอบรมความรู้ทางการวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา และการให้รางวัล*

คณาจารย์คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ส่วนใหญ่คิดว่างานวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา มีคุณค่าสามารถนำไปใช้ปรับปรุงกระบวนการจัดการเรียนการสอนและการพัฒนาหลักสูตร วิธีหนึ่งที่จะส่งเสริมให้มีการทำวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาเพิ่มมากขึ้นคือการยอมรับให้งานวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษา เป็นองค์ประกอบหนึ่งในกระบวนการคิดภาระงาน หรือขอตำแหน่งทางวิชาการ เนื่องจากจำนวนคณาจารย์ คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย มีเพียงร้อยละ 43 ที่ตอบแบบสอบถาม ดังนั้นผลการวิจัยจึงไม่สามารถสรุปพาดพิง ว่าเป็นความคิดเห็นส่วนใหญ่ ของคณาจารย์ทั้งหมด อย่างไรก็ตามงานวิจัยนี้อาจจัดเป็นการศึกษานำร่อง สมควรที่จะได้มีการศึกษาความคิดเห็นของคณาจารย์ คณะแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ที่มีต่องานวิจัยด้านแพทยศาสตรศึกษาต่อไปในอนาคต

สถาบันวิทยบริการ
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Medical education in Thailand began at the same time with Medicine. Modern medical education developed in 1922 when Prince Mahidol of Songkla donated his personal funds to construct buildings and sent young instructors to study overseas. The Rockefeller Foundation also responded to the request of Prince Mahidol by funding the development of medical curricula programme.[1] Since then medical education in Thailand has been secured. Currently, there are 14 medical schools throughout the country. Moreover, there have been seven conferences on medical education, held at national level during the past 40 years. The conferences had the significant impact upon the development of medical education in the country. Important changes such as innovation of curriculum has been initiated after recommendations were raised during the conferences. The Faculty of Medicine of Chulalongkorn University was established in April 22, 1947. It was officially opened on June 11, 1947 at King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, affiliated with the Thai Red Cross Society. On October 1st, 1967, the school was transferred to Chulalongkorn University and renamed "The Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University."[2] In 1971, the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University set up Medical Education Unit (MEU). The function of the Unit was to advise members of the faculty on developing curriculum to accommodate the needs of the country. When the World Health Organization (WHO) was looking for a site to establish a Regional Teacher Training Centre in South-East Asia, and it was found that MEU would be most appropriate. For this reason, WHO selected ten medical doctors from the members of the Faculty to study medical education in the United States of America.[3] Subsequently, on July 1st, 1988, the Faculty of Medicine of Chulalongkorn University has been designated as WHO Collaborating Centre for Medical Education. The terms of reference have been outlined as follow: A) To act as a resource centre in providing advisory service and participating in activities related to Human Resources for Health (HRH), in line with Health for All Strategies; B) To develop and collect training materials in Human Resource Development for Health for All; C) To organize and conduct activities and training for professional health teachers to support the Health for All strategies in the country and the South-East Asia region; and D) To coordinate and / or collaborate with other WHO centres for HRH. A proposed work plan of 2001-2004 was to conduct research on various projects on development of manpower in healthcare, e.g. development of community-targeted and problem-based curriculum, production of manpower for healthcare, learning materials on health science, evaluation of the healthcare reform movement in Thailand: impact on quality, efficiency and equity, etc.[4] After 30 years of MEU's activities within the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, the researchers would like to study their opinions, about research on medical education.

Objectives

This study is aimed to study opinions of medical teachers of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University about research on medical education.

Materials and Methods

The research design in this study was descriptive. The study population was medical

teachers of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University during 1-28 February 2002. A questionnaire was designed and distributed to 375 medical teachers and 161 of the questionnaire forms (42.93 %) were returned. The data were analyzed by SPSS for Windows version 8.0 and presented in frequency and percentage.

Results

1. The results showed that among the 161 medical teachers who returned the forms, 100 were male (62.11 %), and 61 female (37.89 %). There were 42 instructors (26.09 %), 43 assistant professors (26.71 %), 65 associate professors (40.37 %), and 11 professors (6.83 %). 44 (27.33 %) medical teachers were from pre-clinical departments, 116 (72.05 %) from clinical departments; 1 (0.62 %) did not identify their departments of affiliation. The general characteristics of the medical teachers are shown in Table 1.

2. 47(29.19 %) of the medical teachers used to read journals on medical education such as Academic Medicine and Medical Education; and 88 (54.66 %) of the medical teachers thought that research on medical education is a kind of research on medical science. Most of them (95.65 %) said that researches on medical education are necessary in Thailand because their results can be applied for the improvement of teaching and learning processes and curriculum development [Table 2.].

When they were asked who should be responsible to do the research, 108 (67.08 %) of the medical teachers suggest that those who are interested in medical education. The main obstacle is that medical teachers themselves are not interested to do this kind of research. If the research could be applied for academic promotion in every department, the number of research papers should increase. One of the best ways to promote research on medical education is to accept it as a factor in academic promotion.

Table 1. The general characteristics of medical teachers.

Item		f	%
Sex	Male	100	62.11
	Female	61	37.89
Academic Position	Instructor	42	26.09
	Assistant Professor	43	26.71
	Associate Professor	65	40.37
	Professor	11	6.83
Department	Pre-clinic	44	27.33
	Clinic	116	72.05
	No identified	1	0.62

Remark: f = Numbers of medical teacher

Table 2. Opinion of medical teachers toward medical education research.

Item	Yes		No		N/A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Do you use to read medical education research journals such as Academic Medicine and Medicine Education?	47	29.19	111	68.95	3	1.86
Do you think the medical education research is a kind of medical sciences research ?	88	54.66	56	34.78	17	10.56
Is the medical education research necessary in Thailand and Why ?	154	95.65	2	1.24	5	3.11

Remark: f = Numbers of medical teacher, N/A = No Answer

Table 2. (Cont.) Opinion of medical teachers toward medical education research.

Item	f	%
Who should do the medical education research ? (can choose more than one answer)		
- All medical teachers	36	22.36
- Those who interested	108	67.08
- Educator, Researcher	62	38.51
- Other	14	8.70
- No Answer	1	0.62
The main obstruction to do the medical education research is : (can choose more than one answer)		
- The medical teachers do not interest this kind of research.	109	67.70
- They do not know how to do.	59	36.65
- The paper can not used for academic promotion.	43	26.71
- Other	27	16.77
Should the medical education research be applied for academic promotion ?		
- No	6	3.73
- Yes, for all department.	97	60.25
- Yes, for only medical education.	53	32.92
- No answer.	5	3.10
If the medical education research could be applied, do you want to do this research ?		
- No	75	46.58
- Yes	64	39.75
- No answer	22	13.67

Table 2. (Cont.)

Item	f	%
The best way to promote medical education research is : (can choose more than one answer)		
- Training	80	49.69
- Medical education conference	64	39.75
- Acceptance it as a factor for academic position	84	52.17
- Extra reward	37	22.98

Remark: f = Numbers of medical teacher, N/A = No Answer

Discussion

Only 47 (29.19 %) of the medical teachers claimed that they used to read journals on medical education, in spite of the fact that the library of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University has journals of Medical Education since 1951, Academic Medicine since 1989, and Medical Education of 1976-1999. Articles on medical education are also available in Thai language, namely: Chulalongkorn Medical Journal since 1973,[5] and Siriraj Hospital Gazette, since 1962.[6] However, 88 (54.66 %) medical teachers thought that research on medical education is a kind of research on medical sciences. Their reasons were namely: 1) it uses scientific process in research methodology; 2) the content involved medical science; 3) the results can be applied in medical school. Most of the medical teachers (95.65 %) thought that research on medical education is necessary in Thailand because it gives the followings: (1) basic knowledge for planning and developing education in healthcare profession; (2) feedbacks about curriculum objectives, teaching methods, evaluation systems; and (3) innovation of medical education. Their opinions are relevant with recommendations raised during the 1st – 7th National Conferences on Medical Education.[7-13] When they were asked who should do run the research, 108 (67.08 %) of the medical teachers suggested those who are interested in medical education. But in a recommendation raised during the 2nd National Conference on Medical Education[8] suggests that every medical school should establish a division of research on medical education in order to evaluate the quality of medical students, examination systems and other problems concerning educational quality. The main obstacle to the research on medical education were, namely: (1) medical teachers are not interested in this kind of research (67.70 %); (2) they did not know how to do it (36.65 %) and the paper could not be used for academic promotion (26.71%), respectively. Their reasons were as follows: (1) the faculty does not have any policy to promote research on medical education, and they could not use it for academic promotion. In case that the faculty staff did not know how to run a research on medical education, the medical education unit, Phramongkutkloa College of Medicine[14] has set up a workshop for the promotion of research on medical education among medical

teachers. One of the best ways to promote research on medical education is by integrating it as a part of academic promotion. Hongladarom[15] suggests that a medical teacher who works both in medicine and in medical education and has done a research on medical education deserves to receive extra money as well as academic promotion from the Faculty. Wasi[16] suggests that academic positions in medical schools they should have a variety of professorship in specialized fields such as Professors of Medical Service, Professor of Education, Professor of Research, and Professor of Development. Another way of promoting research on medical education is through the training in medical education. Bukkavesa [17] reports that medical teachers have to pass a training in medical education because it helps them to be better medical teachers. Since only 43 % of medical teachers responded to the questionnaire , the results cannot represent the opinions of the entire staff of the Faculty of 375. However, this research should be taken as a pilot study, a complete study is recommended in the future.

Summary

This descriptive research is aimed to study opinions of the staff members of the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, in February 2002. 161 questionnaires (42.93 %) were responded from the 375 medical teachers and the data were analyzed for frequency and percentage. Most of the medical teachers who responded to the questionnaire thought that research on medical education is valuable for the improvement of the teaching and learning processes as well as the development of medical curriculum. Possible ways that can promote research on medical education were, namely: 1) to integrate the research is as a factor in academic promotion; 2) to set up training courses in research on medical education; and 3) to award the researchers in the field.

References

1. Hongladarom T. The development of medical education in Thailand. Chula Med J 1988 Apr; 32(4): 319 - 25
2. Sirisup N, ed. History of Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University. Annual report of the year 2000 (Jun 2000 - May 2001), Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University. Bangkok: Interprinting, 2000, 6
3. Varavithya C. Story of medical education. (Editorial). Chula Med J 1984 Apr; 28 (4): 347 - 8
4. Jayawickramarajah PT. Terms of reference. Redesignation of Medical Education Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand as a WHO Collaborating Centre for Medical Education (CC No. 111). New Delhi : World Health Organization regional office for South-East Asia, 2001, 1
5. Hongladarom T. Medical education. Chula Med J 1973 Jan; 18(1): 63 - 4
6. Vachananda B. Opinion about medical teacher. Siriraj Hosp Gaz 1962 Jan ; 14(1): 32
7. Medical University, Ministry of Public Health. Report on the 1st National Conference on Medical Education, 1957 Nov 25-30; Bangsan, Chonburi. Bangkok : Siwaporn, 1957, 1 - 4
8. Medical University, Ministry of Public Health. Report on the 2nd National Conference on Medical Education, 1964 Aug 17-22; Sala Suntithum, Bangkok : Siwaporn,1965, 1 - 6

9. Report on the 3rd National Conference on Medical Education, 1971 Nov 9-11; Ramathibodi Hospital, Bangkok : Thailand Cooperation Union Press, 1972, 134 - 8
10. Report on the 4th National Conference on Medical Education, 1979 Oct 29-Nov 2; Ambassador Hotel, Bangkok : The Express Transportation Organization of Thailand Press, 1980, 230 - 40
11. Report on the 5th National Conference on Medical Education, 1986 Sep 8-12; Bhumiphol Hospital, Bangkok : Mahidol University, 1987, 27 - 30
12. Thai Medical Consortium. Report on the 6th National Conference on Medical Education, 1993 Nov 18-19; Ambassador City Hotel, Cholburi. Bangkok : Dan Suttha Publishing, 1994, 66 - 87
13. Thai Medical Consortium. Report on the 7th National Conference on Medical Education, 2001 Apr 9-11; Thai Medical Council, Bangkok. Chiengmai : Rattapong – Eakalat, 2001, 1 - 7
14. Medical Education Unit, Phramongkutklao College of Medicine. Report on the seminar of research and development in medical education, 1999 Jan 15; Phramongkutklao College of Medicine, Bangkok: Medical Education Unit, 1999. 1 - 15
15. Hongladarom T. Medical education development in Thailand. Siriraj Hosp Gaz 1981 Apr; 33(4): 269 - 76
16. Wasi P. Academic position in medical school should be reform. Siriraj Hosp Gaz 1984 Jan; 36(1): 55 - 6
17. Bukkavesa S. Medical teacher. Siriraj Hosp Gaz 1971 Nov; 23(11): 1786 - 91

สถาบันวิทยบริการ
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย