

EFFICACY OF APPLYING REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE ON UNDERGRADUATES' LEARNING ATTRIBUTES IN AYURVEDA RASA SHASTHRA

U.R.S.R.K.Senarathne

Senior Lecturer grade II, Department of Ayurveda Pharmacology, Pharmaceutics and Community Medicine, Faculty of Indigenous Medicine, University of Colombo Abstract

Past experience of more informative lectures given to the students under the topic of Appliance (Yantra used is Ayurveda Rasa Shastra) has shown less effectiveness in the assessment from a previous batch of undergraduates. Though the students could retrieve the information, creativity and applicability like high level of learning objectives have not been well performed. It was realized that silent listeners and passive learners can achieve only the low level of learning outcomes mentioned in Bloom's Taxonomy. To improve the undergraduates' attributes of retention, identification, application and innovation regarding ancient appliances used in Ayurveda Rasa Shasthra (Alchemy), the reflective dialogue method of active learning was applied. The expected undergraduate batch (n=168) was considered as research group A and the previous parallel batch which was learned without using this method was taken as group B (n=159). Group A encouraged self-reflection and peer dialogue about the subject matter by providing subject guidelines three days before the scheduled lecture. Dialogue with the lecture was continued at the beginning of the lecture, during each important point, and at the end of the lecture. Randomly selected two students got the opportunity of discussion per each point. Cognitive levels of students' learning in both groups were assessed by the structured essay questions created by following the stages of Bloom's Taxonomy. Results were compared by using paired and unpaired t-test. The overall marks earned by Group A were higher than Group B. There was a significant difference between the two clusters. Similarly, there was a significant difference among the levels when the questions went up to the upper hierarchical planes. The mean difference between each level of the corresponding groups again exhibited a significant difference when doing the evaluation. (p < 0.001). The reflective dialogue method of active learning was more effective than teacher-oriented learning, and the students' applicable knowledge of Yantra and the novel invention of appliances were enhanced by the discussion method.

Key Words:

Reflective dialogue, active learning, Bloom's Taxonomy, Ayurveda Rasa Shasthra, innovation



EFFICACY OF APPLYING REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE ON UNDERGRADUATES' LEARNING ATTRIBUTES IN AYURVEDA RASA SHASTRA

U.R.S.R.K.Senarathne

Senior Lecturer grade II, Department of Ayurveda Pharmacology, Pharmaceutics and Community Medicine, Faculty of Indigenous Medicine, University of Colombo

INTRODUCTION

Ayurveda Rasa Shasthra (Alchemy) is one of the pharmaceutical subjects which includes herbal, metal, mineral and animal-originated materials (Savrikar & Ravishankar, 2011). There is a specific apparatus called Yantra used in manufacturing such medicines as there are specific procedures to convert these ingredients in a way of precocious intake into the body. The teacher-centered learning approach (Mahmood et al., 2011) used in a previous batch has shown less interest in the lesson and poor performance under the creative type of questions in the continuous assessment (CA). To improve the student's knowledge in the direction of applicability and inventiveness like high-order cognitive skills, the teaching-learning method was changed for the same topic in the next parallel batch. The development of the cognitive domain of the student is important as the undergraduates are expected to accomplish the professional level and their attributes will enlighten their future. An alternative to the traditional approach to learning, it is better to practice a special kind of discussion to expand the students' listening capacity and to cultivate individual reflection for student-centered active learning (Ozola, 2014). Focusing on the development of students' knowledge and intellectual skills in line with the Bloom's Taxonomy of cognitive skills (Ahmed, 2021), the reflective dialogue method of discussion was applied. Reflective dialogue is one of the active learning components mentioned by Fink L. D. (2003). Implementation of such kinds of discussions in any subject as a tool of teachinglearning enhances the learning and expert development in higher education. It will also encompass engaging in meaningful and respectful discussions that challenge assumptions, explore perspectives and adoptive critical thinking.

METHODOLOGY

Though the teacher-centered passive learning type of lecture series done previously are full of information, and students have behaved in a silent and obedient manner, they could retrieve the subject content well. However, their applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating like high level of learning objectives have less upgraded. It was understood that the teaching learning method should be reformed to boost the students' learning attributes. Research students were designated from the two parallel batches of second professional BAMS (Batcheler of Ayurveda Medicine and surgery) continuing their studies under the same syllabus. Group A, (n = 168) was the batch who applied reflective dialogue type of teaching learning method, and the other batch who learned earlier without using a new system was considered as a control group (Group B) (n=159). The content of a six-hour lecture series on the topic of special instrument used in Ayurveda Rasa Shastra (Yantra) was subjected for the evaluation. At the end of the session, both groups faced the same assessment test and then the results were compared. The reflective dialog method was applied as an active learning method to Group A and distributed handouts containing subject guidelines three days before the scheduled lecture. They were instructed to write notes on what they know about the topic and subtopics (selfreflection) and to have discussions with their colleagues (dialogue with others/ peers) and improve their notes. Finally, they had to express their ideas to the lecturer at the beginning of the session. Then, they were taught the subject by using a PowerPoint presentation. A discussion with the teacher continued during the particular point of the subject and students had to summarize the respective session at the end. Randomly selected two students got the opportunity to participate in a discussion per each point. The hierarchical level of students' achievement was assessed by the structured essay questions. Level one (L1) included five questions for remembering purpose and L2 encompassed 04 questions for identification and differentiation of *Yantras*. There were three questions in Level 03 (L_3)



relevant to the application of *Yantra*. In L₄, two questions were placed to assess their capability of comparison of ancient apparatus with modern apparatus and modify some appliance by using ancient concepts. L₅ question was to imply their creativity of new apparatus to make quality products according to the requirement under the given circumstances (**Table: 1**). Paired t- Test and Wilcoxon signed rank test were applied to evaluate the performance in each level of questions comparatively among the groups and to check the level gap comparatively. Level of significance considered for 't' test ('p' Value) is, insignificant > 0.05, significant ≤ 0.05 , ≤ 0.01 and highly significant ≤ 0.001 .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

While comparing the results for each hierarchical level of assessment, overall marks earned by the student group A has shown great enough compared to Group B and their difference was highly significant (P <0.001) (**Table: 2**). When comparing the mean value of difference of each level of L₁and L₂, L₂ and L₃, L₃ and L₄ and, L₄ and L₅ of group A with Group B, that differentiation also exhibited the significant difference (**Table: 3**) and the level gap of group A was less than group B. The marks of each nearest levels in group A were compared by paired t – test and Wilcoxon rank test for the Group A. The difference between L₁ and L₂, L₃ and L₄ and L₅ was significant (P <0.001); but the change that occurred among L₂-L₃ was not great enough to exclude the possibility that it is due to chance (P = 0.458).

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Statistical comparison of the results showed that a significant transformation was observed from Group A. It might be due to the student's active engagement in the lecture. There was a momentous difference among the cognitive levels within the groups. The number of students earning high marks showed a gradual decrease when achieving the upper hierarchical steps in both groups. It is obvious that the development of cognition and critical thinking are not an easy task. The gap of the nearest steps of Group A was less than Group B's level diverse and it was a significant change. As per the above analysis, it can be concluded that the reflective dialogue like active learning methods is effective for the shortened knowledge gap and it will direct towards the highest achievement of the profession. The reflective dialogue method is one of the effective ways of teaching and learning and can be applied to enhance undergraduates' learning attributes in Ayurveda Rasa Shasthra. Furthermore, this method will be simply implemented to any other subjects as well to establish the students' higher performance.

Le vel	Learning objective of the lesson	Question / assessment relevant to the Learning outcome	Marks allocat ed	Time allocated (minutes)	Evaluation of Bloom's hierarchical level
L ₁	To identify and differentiate Yantra/apparatus	Q ₁ -Q ₅ (05 quizzes)	05	(10)	Knowledge
L ₂	Identify the utility of Yantra	$\begin{array}{c} Q_6-Q_{10} \\ (04 \text{ quizzes}) \end{array}$	05	(10)	Comprehens ion
L ₃	Apply the knowledge for practical purposes	$Q_{11}-Q_{13}$ (03 quizzes)	05	(10)	Application
L ₄	To equate ancient apparatus with modern apparatus,	Q14-Q15			

Table 1: Evaluation of students' cognitive level equivalent to Bloom's Taxonomy by the given questions



	modify Yantra by using	(02 quizzes)	05	(10)	Analysis
	ancient concepts				
L ₅	Design new apparatus according to the requirement under the given circumstances	Q ₁₆ (01 quiz)	05	(10)	Evaluation

Table 2: Comparison of results among Groups A and B

	Gro up	n	Missing	Mean ± S.E.M	t -value	Confidenc e Interval	P - value	Significa nt Level
L ₁	A	168	2	4.278 ± 0.0326	t = 53.740	2.264 to 2.436	<0.00 1	HS
	В	159	6	1.928 ± 0.0287				
L ₂	А	168	2	4.003± 0.0359	t - 26 969	1.825 to	<0.00 1	HS
	В	159	6	2.075± 0.0381	t = 30.808	2.031		
L ₃	A	168	2	3.956± 0.0472		2.032 to	< 0.00	нс
	В	159	6	1.800± 0.0415	t = 34.072	2.281	1	
L_4	A	168	2	2.852±0.059 2	t - 17 520	1.236 to	< 0.00	HS
	В	159	6	1.461±0.052 0	t = 17.339	1.348	1	
L_5	Α	168	2	2.199±0.0997		1.231 to	<0.00	116
	В	159	6	0.719±0.0756	t = 11.677	1.729	1	пз

Data Mean \pm SEM \rightarrow Mean \pm Standard Error of Mean, \downarrow = Decrease, \uparrow = Increase

Table	3.	Com	narison	of diff	erence o	f each	levels	among	Grouns	A and	I R
I able	J.	Com	pai 15011	or unit	er ence u	i cacii	10 1015	among	Groups	A anu	I D

Level	Gro	Numbe	Mis	Mean ±	t -	95%Confid	P -	Signifi
gap	up	r of	sing	S.E.M	value	ence	value	cant
		partici				Interval of		Level
		pants				means		
L_1-L_2	Α	168	2	0.275±	t =	0.285 to	< 0.001	HS
				0.0598	6.030	0.560		
	В	159	6	-0.147±				
				0.0462				
$L_2 - L_3$	Α	168	2	0.0472±	t = -	-0.390 to -	(P =	HS
				-2.852	35.290	0.0663	0.006)	



	В	159	6	0.339± 0.0689				
L ₃ -L ₄	А	168	2	-2.852± 0.0472	t —	-3.369 to - 3.013	<0.001	нс
	В	159	6	1.800± 0.119	34.072			110
L ₄ -L ₅	А	168	2	0.654± 0.119	t = -	-0.396 to 0.219	P = 0.573	NC
	В	159	6	0.742± 0.0990	0.564			IN S

Data Mean \pm SEM \rightarrow Mean \pm Standard Error of Mean, \downarrow = Decrease, \uparrow = Increase

REFERENCES

Ahmed, M. (2021). *What Is Bloom's Taxonomy? Applications & Importance Of Bloom's Taxonomy.* https://www.iitms.co.in/blog/curriculum-

Fink, L. D. (2003). A self-directed guide to designing courses for significant learning. University of Oklahoma, February.

Mahmood, M. A., Tariq, M., & Javed, S. (2011). Strategies for Active Learning: An Alternative to Passive Learning. *Academic Research International*, 1(3), 193–198. www.savap.org.pkwww.journals.savap.org.pk

Ozola, S. (2014). Views on Taxonomy and Learning. Education in a Changing Society, 1, 152–159.

Savrikar, S. S., & Ravishankar, B. (2011). Introduction to 'Rasashaastra'- The iatrochemistry of Ayurveda. *African Journal of Traditional, Complementary and Alternative Medicines*, 8(5 SUPPL.), 66–82. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajtcam.v8i5S.1