Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS   Check for updates

Erratum

Tang F, Chen C, Zhu Y, et al. Comparison between flipped classroom and lecture-based classroom in ophthalmology clerkship. Med Educ Online. 2017;22(1):1395679.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2017.1395679

When the above article was first published online, the tables were published without footnotes. This has now been corrected in the online version as below.

Table 1. Demographic information of medical students who participated in an ophthalmology clerkship study.

	FG	TG	Statistics	df	P value
Number of students	48	47			
Gender					0.752[a]
Male	25 (52.1%)	26 (55.3%)	$X^2 =0.1$	1	
Female	23 (47.9)	21 (44.7%)	(df =1)		
Age (years old)	22.3 ± 0.6	22.6 ± 0.4	t=−1.23 (df=93)	93	0.223[b]

FG: flipped classroom group, TG: traditional lecture-based classroom group, df = degrees of freedom
[a]The two groups were compared using the Pearson Chi-Square test.
[b]The two groups were compared using Independent samples t test.

Table 2. Comparison of students' perspectives between flipped classroom and traditional lecture-based classroom in ocular trauma clerkship

Items	Group	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Statistics	P value[a]	Effect size[b]
The course improves my learning motivation.	FG	0 (0%)	12 (29.2%)	29 (70.8%)	U=511.5	0.012*	0.60
	TG	1 (2.8%)	19 (54.3%)	15 (42.9%)			
The course is helpful for understanding the course material.	FG	0 (0%)	22 (48.8%)	21 (51.2%)	U=536.5	0.029*	0.51
	TG	3 (8.6%)	23 (65.7%)	9 (25.7%)			
The course is helpful for the final examination.	FG	1 (2.4%)	20 (48.8%)	20 (48.8%)	U=443	0.001**	0.70
	TG	4 (11.4%)	26 (74.3%)	5 (14.3%)			
I am satisfied with the course.	FG	0 (0%)	18 (43.9%)	23 (56.1%)	U=675	0.610	0.10
	TG	1 (2.9%)	16 (45.7%)	18 (51.4%)			
I like this teaching method.	FG	0 (0%)	18 (43.9%)	23 (56.1%)	U=622.5	0.253	0.23
	TG	0 (0%)	20 (57.1%)	15 (42.9%)			
I would like this teaching method to be applied in the future ophthalmology curriculum.	FG	1 (2.9%)	21 (51.2%))	18 (43.9%)	U=638.5	0.351	0.19
	TG	1 (2.9%)	15 (42.8%)	19 (54.3%)			
This course gives me too much burden and pressure.	FG	8 (19.5%)	23 (56.1%)	10 (24.4%)	U=483.0	0.007**	0.58
	TG	15 (42.9%)	18 (51.4%)	2 (5.7%)			
This course occupies too much of my spare time.	FG	9 (22.0%)	24 (58.5%)	8 (19.5%)	U=601.5	0.169	0.28
	TG	11 (31.4%)	21 (60.0%)	3 (8.6 %)			
I need to spend a lot of energy on this course.	FG	16 (39.9%)	25 (60.1%)	0 (0%)	U=669.5	0.559	0.12
	TG	16 (45.7%)	19 (54.3%)	0 (14.3%)			

FG: flipped classroom group, TG: traditional lecture-based classroom group
Students' answers to the survey questions were quantified using a three-point Likert scale (-1, disagree; 0, neutral; 1, agree). Data presented indicate the number (percentage) of students that chose the answer.
[a]The two groups were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. *P<0.05, **P<0.01
[b]Cohen's D effect sizes were calculated with the Effect size calculator for non-parametric tests (40)

Table 3. Comparison of students' self-perceived competence after flipped classroom methods and traditional lecture-based classroom in ocular trauma clerkship

Items	Group	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Statistics	P value[a]	Effect size[b]
The course improves my communication ability.	FG	1 (2.4%)	20 (48.8%)	20 (48.8%)	U=544	0.037*	0.42
	TG	2 (5.7%)	24 (68.6%)	9 (25.7%)	(Z=-2.087)		
The course improves my clinical thinking ability.	FG	1 (2.4%)	11 (26.8%)	29 (70.7%)	U=555.5	0.049*	0.40
	TG	2 (5.7%)	16 (45.7%)	17 (48.6%)	(Z=-1.971)		
The course improves my ability to acquire knowledge.	FG	0 (0%)	12 (29.3%)	29 (70.7%)	U=654.5	0.446	0.15
	TG	1 (2.9%)	14 (40%)	20 (57.1%)	(Z=-0.762)		
The course improves my ability to give presentations and express my opinions.	FG	0 (0%)	21 (51.2%)	20 (48.8%)	U=705.5	0.886	0.03
	TG	0 (0%)	22 (62.9%)	13 (37.1%)	(Z=-0.143)		
The course improves my ability in scientific thinking.	FG	2 (4.9%)	22 (53.6%)	17 (41.5%)	U=660.5	0.500	0.14
	TG	1 (2.8%)	17 (48.6%)	17 (48.6%)	(Z=-0.675)		

FG: flipped classroom group, TG: traditional lecture-based classroom group.

Students' answers to the survey questions were quantified using a three-point Likert scale (-1, disagree; 0, neutral; 1, agree). Data presented indicate the number (percentage) of students who chose the answer.

[a]The two groups were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. *P<0.05.

[b]Cohen's D effect sizes were calculated with the Effect size calculator for non-parametric tests (40)