Introduction

Sri Lanka is a country known for organ donation. However the gap between supply and demand still leads to significant deaths. Healthcare professionals are in an ideal position to promote the practice of organ donation and therefore it is of value that we assess the prevailing knowledge and attitudes towards organ donation among our future medical professionals.

Objectives

To assess the knowledge and attitudes towards the organ donation among medical students of Faculty of Medicine, Ragama

Method

Study design: Descriptive cross sectional study  
Study setting: Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya  
Study population: Medical students of chronological 1st to 5th year  
Sample size: 408.  
Study instruments - Self administered validated questionnaire in English medium (morgan and miller 2002).  
Data collection The questionnaire was given before a lecture and collected after a lecture in a sealed envelope at the sites of study.  
Data analysis Inferential statistics were used to analyze correlations using the statistical software programme (SPSS application version 20.0).

Results

Total sample was 408 with 58% (N=236) being females and 42% (N=172) being males.  
43% (N=234) of students had above average knowledge and 57% (N=174) had below average knowledge.

Figure 1 - Overall knowledge of organ donation

98% (N= 401) of students had positive attitudes. And 2% (N=7) students had negative attitudes. (Figure 2)

Figure 2 - Attitudes towards organ donation

82% (N=334) of students were willing to donate organs. and 18% (N=74) were not. (Figure 3)

Figure 3 - Willingness to donate organs

98% (N=397) of students were positive for altruism while 3% (N=11) were negative (Figure 4)

Figure 4 - Altruism

Analysis of Variance showed that the effect of year of study on level of knowledge was statistically significant F(247,4877)=5.1, p=0.001

Figure 5 - Mean Knowledge Vs year of study

An analysis of variance showed that the effect of year of study on level of attitude was statistically significant. F(45.6,1075.7)=4.275, p=0.002

Figure 6 - Mean Attitude Vs year of study

There was a significant difference in the scores of knowledge for Female (M=2.86,SD=.66) and Males (M=3.57,SD=1.85) ; t(406)=4.33, p=0.000 (p<0.05) (Table 1)

Table 1 - Knowledge Vs Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>18 (3.58)</td>
<td>10 (2.08)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>42 (84.6)</td>
<td>74 (14.8)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant difference in the scores of attitude for Females (M=33.01, SD= 3.46) and Males (M=34.17, SD=3.57); t(406)=-3.29, p = 0.001 (p<0.05) (Table 1)

Table 2 - Attitude Vs Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>173 (88.8)</td>
<td>134 (86.6)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude</td>
<td>21 (11.2)</td>
<td>20 (13.4)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

- Of overall knowledge of organ donation a majority (57%) of students did not have above average knowledge.
- Of overall attitudes to organ donation a majority (98%) of students had positive attitudes.
- Majority of 82% students showed willingness to donate organs.
- Majority of 98% of students showed positive altruism.
- There is a statistically significant difference between knowledge and attitudes with year of study.
- There is a statistically significant difference between knowledge and attitudes with gender. With males scoring higher than females

Recommendations

The research findings suggest the need to assess all medical faculty’s knowledge about organ donation and if lacking, to improve knowledge so that they are better equipped to promote organ donation among patients and general public in the future.
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