

2016

## Effect of medical student preference on rural clinical school experience and rural career intentions

L Walters

A Seal

*The University of Notre Dame Australia*, alexa.seal@nd.edu.au

J McGirr

*The University of Notre Dame Australia*, joe.mcgirr@nd.edu.au

R Stewart

D DeWitt

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/med\\_article](https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/med_article)



Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

This article was originally published as:

Walters, L., Seal, A., McGirr, J., Stewart, R., DeWitt, D., & Playford, D. (2016). Effect of medical student preference on rural clinical school experience and rural career intentions. *Rural and Remote Health*, 16 (4).

Original article available here:

<http://www.rrh.org.au/articles/subviewnew.asp?ArticleID=3698>

This article is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at [https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/med\\_article/796](https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/med_article/796). For more information, please contact [researchonline@nd.edu.au](mailto:researchonline@nd.edu.au).



---

**Authors**

L Walters, A Seal, J McGirr, R Stewart, D DeWitt, and D Playford

This is the author's version of an article published in the *Rural and Remote Health* on 17 November 2016, available online at <http://www.rrh.org.au/articles/subviewnew.asp?ArticleID=3698>

Walters, L., Seal, A., McGirr, J., Stewart, R., DeWitt, D., and Playford, D. (2016) Effect of medical student preference on rural clinical school experience and rural career intentions. *Rural and Remote Health*, 16(4). Retrieved from <http://www.rrh.org.au/articles/subviewnew.asp?ArticleID=3698>

1 **Manuscript title: The effect of medical student preference on rural clinical school**  
2 **experience and rural career intentions**

3 Manuscript type: Original research article

4 Names and qualifications, affiliations and full mailing address, email addresses for each author

5  
6 1. A/Prof Lucie Walters \* (Corresponding author)  
7 MBBS, DCH, Dip RACOG, FRACGP, FACRRM, PhD,  
8 A/Prof Rural Medical Education  
9 Flinders University Rural Clinical School,  
10 PO Box 3570, Mount Gambier 5290, South Australia  
11 lucie.walters@flinders.edu.au Fax +618 8723 6301 Tel +618 87263914

12  
13 2. Dr Alexa Seal (BSc, PhD)  
14 Research Assistant  
15 School of Medicine Sydney  
16 University of Notre Dame Australia  
17 PO Box 5050, Wagga Wagga 2650  
18 Phone: +61 2 8204 4197  
19 alexa.seal@nd.edu.au

20  
21 3. A/Professor Joe McGirr  
22 MBBS (Syd), BSc (med) (Syd), MHSM (Charles Sturt), FRACMA, FACEM  
23 Associate Dean Rural  
24 School of Medicine Sydney  
25 University of Notre Dame Australia  
26 PO Box 5050, Wagga Wagga 2650  
27 Mobile: 0421963193 Phone: 02 8204 4110  
28 joe.mcgirr@nd.edu.au

29  
30 4. A/Professor Ruth Stewart  
31 Associate Professor of Rural Medicine  
32 MBBS, PhD, FACRRM, DRANZCOG adv.

33 Cairns Clinical School, Atherton Clinical School  
34 Phone:+61 7 42267392 Mobile :+61 7 428284028  
35 Fax: +61 7 42266831  
36 Email: ruthalison.stewart@jcu.edu.au

37

38 5. Professor Dawn DeWitt  
39 BA MSc MD MACP FRACP  
40 Vice Dean Student and Faculty Experience  
41 Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine  
42 Spokane Academic Center PO Box 1495  
43 Spokane, WA 99201-1495, USA  
44 Phone +15093686841  
45 Dawn.dewitt@wsu.edu

46

47 6. A/Professor Denese Playford  
48 BA PhD W.Aust., MCS Regent Coll  
49 Medical Education  
50 Co-ordinator MD Scholarly Activity  
51 The Rural Clinical School of WA, M706  
52 The University of Western Australia  
53 35 Stirling Highway, CRAWLEY, WA, 6009 Australia  
54 Mob: +61 421562872 FAX: +61 893463120  
55 denese.playford@rcswa.edu.au

56

57 Word counts:

58 Abstract – 273

59 Manuscript - 2242

60 References – 17

61 Tables – 5

62

63 Statements of funding

64 All Rural Clinical Schools involved are funded by the Commonwealth Government of Australia. This  
65 project did not have specific funding.

66

67 Prior conference presentations and submissions

68 Dewitt D, Stagg P, Koschel A, Krahe L, McGirr J, Major L, Playford D, Walters L. FRAMEing the  
69 Question: How does conscription influence students' rural clinical school experience and career  
70 intentions? Rural Medicine Australia Conference, Perth October 2012

71

72 Conflicts of Interest of each author/contributor

73 LW and JMc have direct leadership responsibilities for medical student education programs in  
74 Australian rural clinical schools. Their students participate in the FRAME exit survey.

75

76 Criteria for inclusion in the authors'/contributions' list

77 LW and DD developed the study design and the data collection process, LW drafted the initial version  
78 of the manuscript. AS and JMc analysed the data and presented initial results to the group. DP, JMc,  
79 RS, AS and LW contributed to data interpretation and critical revision and all authors approved the  
80 final version of the paper.

81

82 Acknowledgement

83 The authors thank Sharon Liu from Flinders University Rural Clinical for her work distributing and  
84 collating the Rural Clinical Schools exit survey from schools across Australia.

85

86 Key words: (please add up to 10 words)

87 general practice career intent

88 medical students

89 placement allocation

90 rural placements

91 rural clinical schools

92 rural medical workforce

93 rural career intention

94 student support

95 student selection

96

97 **The effect of medical student preference on rural clinical school experience and rural**  
98 **career intentions.**

99 **Abstract**

100 **Background:**

101 The key parameter for Rural Clinical Schools (RCSs) is to provide at least 1 year of clinical training  
102 in rural areas for 25% of Australian Commonwealth supported medical students with the intent to  
103 influence future rural medical workforce outcomes. The objective of this study is to describe the  
104 association between a medical student's selection preference and their RCS experience and rural  
105 career intent.

106 **Methods:**

107 Medical students completing a RCS placement in 2012 and 2013 were encouraged to complete a  
108 survey regarding their experience and future career intent. Data were analysed to compare medical  
109 students for whom the RCS was their first choice with students who described the RCS as other than  
110 their first preference.

111 **Results:**

112 Students for whom RCS was their first choice (724/1092) were significantly more likely to be female,  
113 come from a rural background and be from an undergraduate programme. These students reported  
114 more positive experiences of all aspects of the RCS programme (costs, access, support and networks,  
115 safety) and were 2.36 times more likely to report intentions to practice in a non-metropolitan area [OR  
116 2.36 (95% CI 1.82-3.06),  $p < 0.001$ ]. This was true for students of rural [OR = 3.11 (95% CI 1.93-5.02),  
117  $p < 0.001$ ] and metropolitan backgrounds [OR = 2.07 (95% CI 1.48-2.89),  $p < 0.001$ ]. More students in  
118 the first choice group (68.8%) intended to practice in a regional area (not a capital or major city),  
119 significantly higher than the 48.4% of participants in the other preference group [ $X^2(1) = 42.79$ ,  
120  $p < 0.001$ ].

121 **Conclusions:**

122 The decision to choose a RCS placement is a marker of rural career intention and a positive rural  
123 training experience for students of both rural and metropolitan backgrounds. It may be important to  
124 identify other preference students and their specific social support needs to ensure a positive  
125 perception of a future rural career.

126



## 127 Introduction

128 In Australia, Rural Clinical Schools (RCSs) provide at least one year of clinical training in rural areas  
129 for 25% of Australian Commonwealth supported medical students. The intent is to strengthen future  
130 rural medical workforce. There is considerable evidence in the literature demonstrating the positive  
131 impact on rural medical workforce recruitment of meaningful exposure to rural areas during medical  
132 school.<sup>1</sup> Some of this literature also suggests that voluntary rural placement positively impacts health  
133 professional students' feelings towards rural practice <sup>2-4</sup>.

134

135 At the time of this study, there are three common selection processes used to allocate medical students  
136 to rural clinical schools. Firstly, a number of medical schools have admission options where  
137 candidates apply for an RCS-linked medical school position<sup>5</sup>. Secondly, other medical schools invite  
138 medical students to apply to the RCS in a competitive process, sometime after they have been  
139 accepted into medicine. Finally, many medical schools run an allocation process for RCS and urban  
140 clinical placements based on student preference, taking into account special circumstances and  
141 placement numbers. These three selection processes can all result in students gaining either their first  
142 choice or another preference for clinical training. The objective of this study is to describe the  
143 association between a medical student's selection preference and their RCS experience and career  
144 intent.

145

## 146 Methods

147 Since 2007, the Federation of Rural Australian Medical Educators (FRAME) has collected data from  
148 medical students who have recently completed a full academic year at a rural clinical school (RCS) in  
149 Australia about their experience and future career intent <sup>6</sup>. Note that the Australian Standard  
150 Geographical Classification RA2-5 was used as the definition of rural, excluding metropolitan  
151 centres. Research Ethics was granted by Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics  
152 Committee (project 4098). Medical students from 19 RCS were invited to complete the questionnaire

153 during a period from four weeks prior to completion of their RCS placement to 12 weeks after  
154 completion of their placement. Individual medical schools nominated whether to invite students by  
155 email to participate in an online version of the questionnaire or to have administrative staff at the RCS  
156 distribute paper-based questionnaires.

157

158 Responses to the 2012 and 2013 versions of the questionnaire (available  
159 at <http://www.ausframe.org/index.php/2012-06-15-05-28-07/national-rcs-project-secure-data-linkage>  
160 ) have been analysed herein, comparing responses from students whose preference to attend a RCS  
161 was their top choice with students for whom it was not their first choice (other preference group).  
162 SPSS (Version 22, SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA) was used to calculate descriptive statistics and  
163 determine differences between groups. Due to small numbers in some categories of preferred location  
164 of future practice, small rural community and remote areas were coded as one cohort.

165

166 Missing data were excluded from analysis on a variable by variable basis. Categorical responses were  
167 analysed using Pearson's Chi Square test and continuous variables were analysed using Student's T-  
168 test with a significant  $p$ -value  $<0.05$ . Wilcoxon signed ranks tests were used for questions relating to  
169 views (ordinal data) prior to and following attendance at a Rural Clinical School. The odds ratio (OR)  
170 for future practice in a metropolitan vs non-metropolitan area (RA2-5), as influenced by whether  
171 attendance at a RCS was a student's first choice, was determined via binary logistic regression.

172

## 173 Results

174 There were 440 and 652 responses to the 2012 and 2013 FRAME questionnaires respectively (1092  
175 participants). Survey response rates were 72% of the students invited to participate in 2012 and 88%  
176 of this cohort in 2013. Students from Monash University, the University of Wollongong and the  
177 University of Melbourne made up 20.9, 12.8 and 10% of responses, respectively. Overall, students

178 from Victoria and New South Wales contributed almost three quarters of responses (73.4%). The  
 179 majority of rural clinical schools engaged in the study (Table 1).

180

181 Table 1: Response proportions for all Rural Clinical Schools

University Rural Clinical School by State	Number of responses (%)			School response rates
	2012	2013	All	
<b>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</b>				
Australian National University	5 (1.1)	20 (3.1)	25 (2.3)	57%
<b>SOUTH AUSTRALIA</b>				
Flinders University (Flinders University RCS)	27 (6.1)	31 (4.8)	58 (5.3)	*73%
Flinders University (NT Rural Clinical School)	-	5 (0.8)	5 (0.5)	
University of Adelaide	-	35 (5.4)	35 (3.2)	85%
<b>VICTORIA</b>				
Deakin University	-	-	-	-
Monash University (Undergraduate)	54 (12.3)	60 (9.2)	114 (10.4)	*96%
Monash University (Graduate)	63 (14.3)	52 (8.0)	115 (10.5)	
University of Melbourne (Undergraduate)	36 (8.2)	20 (3.1)	56 (5.1)	*94%
University of Melbourne (Graduate)	9 (2.0)	44 (6.7)	53 (4.9)	
<b>NEW SOUTH WALES</b>				
University of Newcastle	32 (7.3)	30 (4.6)	62 (5.7)	88%
University of New England	20 (4.5)	20 (3.1)	40 (3.7)	70%
University of New South Wales	11 (2.5)	63 (9.1)	74 (6.8)	58%
University of Notre Dame (Sydney)	11 (2.5)	23 (3.5)	34 (3.1)	54%
University of Sydney	17 (3.9)	55 (8.4)	72 (6.6)	58%
University of Western Sydney	18 (4.1)	24 (3.7)	42 (3.8)	80%
University of Wollongong	71 (16.1)	69 (10.6)	140 (12.8)	92%
<b>WESTERN AUSTRALIA</b>				
University of Western Australia (Undergraduate)	2 (0.5)	41 (6.3)	43 (3.9)	*47%
University of Western Australia (Graduate)	3 (0.7)	15 (2.3)	18 (1.6)	
University of Notre Dame (Fremantle)	2 (0.5)	23 (3.5)	25 (2.3)	52%
<b>TASMANIA</b>				
University of Tasmania	57 (13.0)	22 (3.4)	79 (7.2)	90%
No affiliation	2 (0.5)	-	2 (0.2)	-
Total	440 (100.0)	652 (100.0)	1092 (100)	

182 \*Response rates are calculated at a university level as the authors did not collect the potential numbers of  
 183 students in each school subgroup.

184

185 Overall, 724 of 1,092 students across Australia who attended the RCS chose their placement as their  
 186 first choice, indicating that for 33.7% (n=368) of participants their RCS placement was a preference  
 187 other than first choice (Table 2).

188

189

190

191 Table 2: Reported preference to attend a RCS

	Number of participants	%
My last choice	37	3.4
Low on my list	37	3.4
My mid choice	117	10.7
High on my list	177	16.2
My first choice	724	66.3

192

193 Overall, 45.4% of participants had attended an Australian secondary/high school outside a capital city  
 194 or major urban centre. These participants attended an average of 5.1 years (+/- 1.6 SD) of high school  
 195 outside a capital city or major urban centre, with no significant difference in years of attendance  
 196 between first choice and other choice groups. . No difference was observed between the first choice  
 197 and other preference groups in age, bond status, and mean number of years of high school spent  
 198 outside a capital city (Table 3). Over 60% of RCS first choice participants were female compared to  
 199 54% of other preference students [ $X^2(1)=4.31, p=0.038$ ]. Almost 56% of participants whose first  
 200 choice was a RCS were from universities with undergraduate entry into medicine compared with 38%  
 201 of other preference students [ $X^2(1)=29.68, p<0.001$ ]. Rural origin students were more commonly  
 202 found in the first choice group [45% compared to 37%,  $X^2(1)=6.69, p=0.010$ ].

203 Table 3: Demographic characteristics of participants

Characteristic	RCS first choice (n=724)	RCS other preference (n=368)	All (n=1092)	$X^2, p$ -value (T, $p$ -value)
Age [Mean (SE)]	25.7 (0.17)	26.2 (0.18)	25.9 (0.13)	1.69, $p=0.090$
Gender [frequency (%)]*				
Male	283 (39.4)	167 (46.0)	450 (41.6)	4.31, $p=0.038$
Female	435 (60.6)	196 (54.0)	631 (58.4)	
Bond status [frequency (%)] #				
Bonded	240 (33.3)	109 (29.9)	349 (32.1)	1.30, $p=0.254$
un-bonded	481 (66.7)	256 (70.1)	737(67.9)	
Self-identified background [frequency (%)]*				
Non-rural	393 (55.2)	226 (63.5)	619 (58.0)	6.69, $p=0.010$
Rural	319 (44.8)	130 (36.5)	449 (42.0)	
Years of high school outside a capital city [Mean (SE)]	2.43 (0.104)	2.41 (0.15)	2.42 (0.09)	-0.138, $p=0.890$
Entry [frequency (%)]**				
Undergraduate	404 (55.9)	141 (38.4)	545 (50.0)	29.68, $p<0.001$
Graduate	319 (44.1)	226 (61.6)	545 (50.0)	
Participated in longitudinal integrated clerkship [frequency (%)]				
Yes	361 (50.3)	194 (54.3)	555 (51.7)	1.52, $p=0.217$
No	356 (49.7)	163 (45.7)	519 (48.3)	

204 \* $p<0.05$ , \*\* $p<0.01$

205 # Bonded medical students at the time this data was collected had received a place in medical school based on  
 206 the requirement that they work rurally after graduation for equivalent numbers of years as their medical course

207

208 There were significant differences in which geographical area participants intended to practice upon  
209 completion of their medical training [ $X^2(3)=47.58, p<0.001$ ] (Table 4). Significantly fewer first  
210 choice participants intended to practice in a capital or major city [31.2% vs 51.5 %,  $X^2(1)=42.79,$   
211  $p<0.001$ ]. More students in the first choice group (24.2%) intend to practice in a smaller town,  
212 significantly higher than the 13.5% of participants in the other preference group [ $X^2(1)=16.88,$   
213  $p<0.001$ ]. In addition, more first choice participants reported intending to work in a small rural  
214 community or remote area (8.7% compared with 4.4%) [ $X^2(1)=6.66, p=0.010$ ].

215

216 Overall, first choice students were 2.36 times more likely to report intentions to practice in a non-  
217 metropolitan area than other preference students [OR 2.36 (95% CI 1.82-3.06),  $p<0.001$ ]. If only  
218 students who reported having a metropolitan background are included in the analysis, first choice  
219 participants were twice as likely to indicate future rural practice [OR = 2.07 (95% CI 1.48-2.89),  
220  $p<0.001$ ] as students in the other choice group. First choice students with a reported rural background  
221 were three times as likely to indicated future rural practice as rural background students in the other  
222 preference group [OR = 3.11 (95% CI 1.93-5.02),  $p<0.001$ ].

223

224 Students in the first choice group were more likely to agree with the statement (in 2013 survey only)  
225 that their RCS medical experience increased their interest in pursuing a career in regional or rural  
226 Australia [88.2% vs 75.7%,  $X^2(1)=16.94, p<0.001$ ] and remote and very remote Australia [42.6 vs  
227 30.8%,  $X^2(1)=8.51, p=0.004$ ]. More first choice RCS students agreed with the statements that they  
228 intend to do further medical training (PGY2, PGY3, PGY4 and PGY5) based in a non-metropolitan  
229 area (RA2-5) ( $t=-5.269, p<0.001$ ).

230

231

232

233 Table 4: Impact on career intentions

Location	Participants (%)			X <sup>2</sup> , p-value
	First choice	Other preference	All	
Preferred geographical location for future practice (RCS)				
capital or major city**	222 (31.2)	187 (51.5)	409 (38.0)	42.79, p<0.001
inner regional city (25 000 - 100 000)	256 (36.0)	111 (30.6)	367 (34.1)	3.20, p=0.074
smaller town (10 000 - 24 999)**	172 (24.2)	49 (13.5)	221 (20.6)	16.88, p<0.001
small rural community or remote area*	62 (8.7)	16 (4.4)	78 (7.3)	6.66, p=0.010
My RCS medical experience has increased my interest in pursuing a career in (% agreed) (2013 only):				
General practice	277 (65.6)	137 (62.3)	414 (64.5)	0.72, p=0.397
A medical career in regional or rural Australia**	374 (88.2)	168 (75.7)	542 (83.9)	16.94, p<0.001
A medical career in remote and very remote Australia (RA4-5)**	180 (42.6)	68 (30.8)	248 (38.5)	8.51, p=0.004
I intend to do the following years of training based in a non-metropolitan areas RA 2-5 (% agree) (2013 only)				
Internship	213 (50.4)	79 (35.6)	292 (45.3)	12.82, p<0.001
Accredited PGY2 in specialty of preference	227 (53.7)	93 (42.3)	320 (49.8)	7.51, p=0.006
Accredited PGY3 in specialty of preference	227 (53.9)	88 (40.4)	315 (49.3)	10.55, p=0.001
Accredited PGY4 in specialty of preference	229 (54.1)	85 (38.6)	314 (48.8)	13.92, p<0.001
Accredited PGY5 in specialty of preference	222 (52.6)	85 (38.8)	307 (47.9)	10.99, p=0.001

234 \**p*<0.05, \*\**p*<0.01

235

236 Table 4 indicates that RCS medical experience increased participants' interest in general practice  
 237 (65% of total cohort). Further exploration of future specialty plans found that overall preference for  
 238 general practice did not increase when compared to participants reported career preference before  
 239 commencing RCS. When asked about career preference on entry to a RCS significantly more first  
 240 choice participants chose general practice or rural medicine as their first preference [30.6 vs 19.8%,  
 241 X<sup>2</sup>(1)=13.70, *p*<0.001] and significantly more other preference participants ranked sub-specialist as  
 242 their first choice [28.9 vs 20.5%, [X<sup>2</sup>(1)=9.20, *p*=0.0002]. There was no significant change in these  
 243 preferences for either group when asked about career preference upon exit from their RCS.

244

245 More students in the first choice group would recommend the RCS experience to other medical  
 246 students than did other preference students [96.1% vs 86.7%, X<sup>2</sup>(1)=32.39, *p*<0.001]. Significantly  
 247 more students in the first choice group reported that "Overall I felt well supported by my RCS"  
 248 [87.1% vs 69.9%, X<sup>2</sup>(1)=46.42, *p*<0.001]. This was true for their experience of financial [66.1% vs

249 52.1%,  $X^2(1)=19.83, p<0.001$ ], and academic [87.3% vs 76.9%,  $X^2(1)= 18.85, p<0.001$ ] support, as  
 250 well as their sense of wellbeing [84.5% vs 66.5%,  $X^2(1)=27.78, p<0.001$ ]. Significantly fewer first  
 251 choice students reported feeling academically isolated [25.3% vs 36.4%,  $X^2(1)=14.22, p<0.001$ ]. The  
 252 greatest difference between the two groups related to whether they felt socially isolated [27.6% vs  
 253 48.0%,  $X^2(1) = 26.61, p<0.001$ ]

254

255 **Table 5: Participant agreement with statements about their RCS experience**

	Somewhat agree or strongly agree on 5-point Likert scale [frequency (%)]			
	First choice	Other preference	All	$X^2, p$ -value
Would recommend the RCS experience to others**	692 (96.1)	314 (86.7)	1006 (93)	32.39, $p<0.001$
Overall I felt well supported by my RCS**	626 (87.1)	251 (69.9)	877 (81.4)	46.42, $p<0.001$
I felt well supported financially by my RCS**	475 (66.1)	188 (52.1)	663 (61.4)	19.83, $p<0.001$
I felt well supported academically by my RCS**	630 (87.3)	277 (76.9)	907 (83.8)	18.85, $p<0.001$
I felt academically isolated during my rural placement <sup>a**</sup>	183 (25.3)	131 (36.4)	314 (29.0)	14.22, $p <0.001$
I felt socially isolated during my RCS placement**	118 (27.6)	106 (48.0)	224 (34.6)	26.61, $p<0.001$
I have a rural based clinician as a mentor <sup>a*</sup>	257 (60.5)	110 (50.5)	367 (57.1)	5.90, $p=0.015$
I have a metro based clinician as a mentor <sup>a</sup>	76 (18.1)	39 (17.9)	115 (18.0)	0.003, $p=0.960$
My RCS informed me of health and counselling services that I could access for support if needed*	322 (44.8)	133 (37.1)	455 (42.3)	5.80, $p=0.016$
Overall, my RCS placement impacted positively on my wellbeing <sup>a**</sup>	360 (84.5)	147 (66.5)	507 (78.4)	27.78, $p<0.001$

256 *\* $p<0.05$ , \*\* $p<0.01$ , <sup>a</sup> 2013 participants only*

257

## 258 Discussion

259 There were striking differences between the responses of first choice and other preference students on  
 260 the FRAME survey of student experience and work intention. Students whose first choice was to  
 261 enter RCS were consistently positive about their RCS experience; more so than their other preference  
 262 peers. First choice students reported being better supported financially and academically, feeling less  
 263 isolated during their rural year, and having their wellbeing more positively impacted than other  
 264 preference students. These findings are particularly significant because a previous study has shown  
 265 that health professional graduates' workforce outcomes are strongly related to their subjective course-

266 based experiences <sup>4</sup>. In this respect it may be important to be aware of the experiences of other  
267 preference students in the RCS to ensure that negative experiences do not adversely impact on  
268 decisions about rural practice.

269

270 Indeed the present study data confirms that first choice entrants were more likely than other  
271 preference entrants to prefer a rural location for their subsequent practice. This first choice effect was  
272 accentuated in their higher preference for small town, remote and very remote work. Previous studies  
273 have identified that RCS graduates in general work more remotely <sup>7-8</sup>. Recognising that RCS student  
274 interest in non-metropolitan work is reassuringly higher than their city-based peers<sup>9</sup>, we propose that  
275 first choice students may be responsible for this effect. The rural preference appears robust because  
276 first choice, over other preference students, preferred rural locations for prevocational as well as  
277 vocational training. Furthermore, these first choice students were more likely to opt for a vocational  
278 choice – general practice - which is compatible with their preferred work location. The results  
279 presented does not demonstrated that RCSs provide independent impact enough to change the career  
280 preference of many students who commenced without interest in rural and remote careers or general  
281 practice. However knowing that tertiary hospital experience is de-motivating to students who wish to  
282 pursue both both rural and general practice, it is valuable to recognise the impact RCSs have on  
283 cementing students’ interests in rural and remote practice and in general practice.

284

285 The strength of these data lies in the consistent difference between first choice and other preference  
286 responses throughout the survey. Although 66% of the sample was first choice, half of the remainder  
287 put RCS as “high on the list” yet were consistently more negative about their experience and rural  
288 career intentions. This demonstrates that there is something very important about students for whom  
289 a RCS is their first choice. The distinction may be partly due to demographic factors, since there were  
290 clear differences between the characteristics of first choice and other choice students. RCS students  
291 who identified as rural background were more likely to have made the RCS their first choice. This



292 may be due to rural students' prior commitment to rural practice<sup>9</sup>, to their different sense of place<sup>10</sup>  
293 and our data on social isolation among non-first-preference students suggest that they may also be in a  
294 better position than their urban peers to disengage from their metropolitan based social support  
295 networks and re-establish networks in a rural area during the clinical years of their medical course<sup>11</sup>.  
296 On the other hand 55% of first choice students were from non-rural backgrounds and further analysis  
297 of the data must be done to clarify this issue.

298

299 First choice students were also significantly also more likely to be female. The predilection of women  
300 for entering RCS has been described previously<sup>12</sup>. FRAME survey data demonstrate that between  
301 2009 and 2014 women consistently made up 58-59% of the cohort<sup>13</sup>. However, this is the first  
302 demonstration that the gender difference in interest persists even amongst those who actually enter  
303 RCSs, with men entering with lower preferences than women. The reasons for the association  
304 between women and RCSs requires further exploration. One possibility is that female students are  
305 attracted to the wealth of positive female role models who contribute as clinical academics in  
306 Australian RCSs<sup>14</sup>. This finding may also demonstrate that rural practice lacks the rarefied medical  
307 hierarchies traditionally found in tertiary hospital specialist training, which can override the capacity  
308 for individuals to influence their way of practicing<sup>15</sup>.

309

310 The principal limitation of this study is the possibility of a systematic bias where students' preferences  
311 for RCS have been influenced by reliable reports of poor levels of support provided by specific RCSs.  
312 For example, an RCS that provides less support may attract fewer first preference students, and the  
313 students attending such a RCS would be less likely to report that they were well supported. As the  
314 majority of RCSs are distributed across multiple sites, such a systematic error is unlikely. It is more  
315 likely that other preference students require additional or alternate accommodation and social supports  
316 and have wisely altered their preferences for clinical training locations accordingly<sup>16</sup>.

317

318 It is unlikely that academic support would be systematically different between first choice and other  
319 preference students, however the level of academic support was experienced differently between first  
320 choice and other preference students. Other preference students are by definition not in their  
321 preferred placement locations. It is noteworthy that the most marked difference between the first  
322 choice and other preference groups is in students' reported levels of social isolation. It is possible that  
323 confirmation bias may predetermine the anxiety of other preference students, increase their sense of  
324 social isolation and create a subconscious case-building process leading to reporting more negative  
325 perceptions of the support they receive from their RCS <sup>17</sup>. Even if the differences in reported  
326 academic support were due to subjective differences in perception, we offer the first data to suggest  
327 that it is important to identify other preference students and identify their specific social support  
328 needs.

329

## 330 **Conclusions**

331 This is the first time that the workforce impact of RCS entrance preference has been reported.  
332 Preference for RCS is a significant factor in predicting students' reported positive experience during  
333 RCS training. The extent to which reported positive experience is related to objective differences in  
334 support requirements or confirmational bias is yet to be explored.

335

336 The data also indicate that entrance preference could be a significant factor in students' subsequent  
337 workforce choices. RCS can cement interest in rural practice in students who did not initially  
338 preference rural clinical school attendance. First choice students were significantly more positive than  
339 other preference students in expressing a rural career intention. This finding was the case for  
340 prevocational as well as vocational training. This highlights the priority to ensure that, as far as  
341 possible, first preference students are provided with the opportunity to participate in rural clinical  
342 school training. It may also be of value to identify other preference students and their specific social  
343 support needs, to proactively facilitate a more positive perception of a future rural career.

345 **References**

- 346 1. Ranmuthugala G, Humphreys J, Solarsh B, et al. Where is the evidence that rural exposure  
347 increases uptake of rural medical practice? . Aust J Rural Health 2007;15:285-8
- 348 2. Peach H, Bath N. Comparison of rural and non-rural students undertaking a voluntary rural  
349 placement in the early years of a medical course. Medical Education 2000;34:231-3.
- 350 3. Denz-Penhey H, Shannon S, Murdoch JC, Newbury J. Do benefits accrue from longer  
351 rotations for students in Rural Clinical Schools? Rural and Remote Health 5 (online) 2005;414:  
352 Available from <http://www.rrh.org.au>. (Accessed 25/1/11).
- 353 4. Playford D, Larson A, Wheatland B. Going country: rural student placement factors  
354 associated with future rural employment in nursing and allied health. Australian Journal of Rural  
355 Health 2006;14:14-9.
- 356 5. Stagg P, Rosenthal D. Why community members want to participate in the selection of  
357 students into medical school. Rural and Remote Health 2012;12:1954 Available at [www.rrh.org.au](http://www.rrh.org.au)  
358 Accessed 15/3/2013.
- 359 6. DeWitt D, McLean R, Newbury J, Shannon S, Critchley J. Development of a common national  
360 questionnaire to evaluate student perception about the Australian Rural Clinical Schools Program.  
361 Rural and Remote Health 2005;5:486 Available from <http://rrh.deakin.edu.au> Accessed 9/9/2011.
- 362 7. Sen Gupta T, Murray, R., Hays, B., & Woolley, T. James Cook University MBBS graduate  
363 intentions and intern destinations: a comparative study with other Queensland and Australian  
364 medical schools. Rural and Remote Health 2013;13: 2313 (Online)
- 365 8. Playford D, Nicholson, A., Riley, G.J., and Puddey, I.B. . Longitudinal Rural Clerkships:  
366 increased likelihood of more remote rural medical practice following graduation. . BMC Medical  
367 Education 2015:55.
- 368 9. Walker J, DeWitt D, Pallant J, Cunningham C. Rural origin plus rural clinical school placement  
369 is a significant predictor of medical students' intention to practice rurally: a multi-university study.  
370 Rural and Remote Health 12 2012;1908:Available: <http://www.rrh.org.au>.
- 371 10. Cutchin MP. Physician retention in rural communities: the perspective of experiential place  
372 integration. Health & Place 1997;3:25-41.
- 373 11. Greenhill J, Fielke K, Richards J, Walker L, Walters L. Towards an understanding of medical  
374 student resilience in longitudinal integrated clerkships. . BMC Medical Education 2015;[Accepted  
375 May 2015].
- 376 12. Playford D, Evans, S., Atkinson, D., Auret, K., and Riley, G. Impact of the Rural Clinical School  
377 of Western Australia on work location of medical graduates. The Medical journal of Australia  
378 2014;200:104-7.
- 379 13. FRAME survey results <http://www.ausframe.org/index.php/2012-06-15-05-28-07/national-rcs-project-secure-data-linkage>. Fellowship of Rural Australian Medical Educators., 2014. June 2015,
- 380  
381 14. Playford DE, Worthington R, Riley G. Women in the rural medical academic workforce. Rural  
382 Remote Health 2013;13:2309.
- 383 15. Wainer J. Athena's Journey: The Feminine and medicine. PhD thesis, Monash University,  
384 Melbourne 2005.
- 385 16. King K, Purcell R, Quinn S, Schoo A, Walters L. Supports for medical students during rural  
386 clinical placements: factors associated with intention to practice in rural locations. Rural and Remote  
387 Health Rural and Remote Health 2016;[in press].
- 388 17. Nickerson R. Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises. Review of  
389 General Psychology 1998;2:175-220.