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ABSTRACT

Background

Despite increased numbers of dental specialists, around 90% of dentists in the UK continue to work in general practice. Previous research shows that undergraduate students indicate interest in specialty careers, however few studies have explored which specialties are of interest, when and why. The aim of this study was to explore whether Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) undergraduates attending Glasgow Dental School (GDS) indicate a desire to pursue a specialty career, why, and the extent to which they feel prepared in this regard.

Method

We conducted an internet-based survey (response rate 81%; n=331) of all GDS students between October and November 2016.

Results

186 students (56%) had decided to specialise. 78% of these students cited enjoyment of that service, or types of patient seen, as the single most influencing factor on their choice. Oral surgery was the most popular choice where one was indicated (35%), followed by orthodontics (26%). Just 14% of BDS4-5 students felt sufficiently exposed to cases in their chosen specialty. A large majority (88%) said they would like information regarding specialty pathways at BDS3 or before.

Conclusions

Educators should provide undergraduate students with information about specialties in a structured way, so that they can consider available options.
INTRODUCTION

Postgraduate dental training in the UK

Dental graduates in the UK undertake Vocational (Foundation) Training (VT) which is a mandatory one year programme for those wishing to be eligible to work in the General Dental Service (GDS) or Public Dental Service (PDS). Dental Core Training (DCT) is a further period of postgraduate development that extends from the end of VT to the start of general practice or other career options, one of which is to enter further specialty training, and there are over 400 trainees across 13 specialities at any given time.¹

The number of specialists registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) in the UK has increased from 3,168 at the end of 2007 to 4,347 at the end of 2014 ² with steady growth across a range of disciplines.³⁴ Similar rises have been reported internationally.⁵⁻⁷ Specialty training periods vary from 3-5 years; in Scotland there are current programmes in Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology, Dental Public Health, Endodontics, Oral and Maxillofacial pathology, Oral Medicine, Oral Surgery, Orthodontics, Paediatric Dentistry, Restorative Dentistry and Special Care Dentistry.

Despite these growing opportunities, around 90% of UK dentists work in general practice. This contrasts markedly with the consistently high proportion of dental undergraduates (figures as high as 92% have been reported worldwide)⁸ who express early interest in specialising, far outstripping their eventual uptake of specialty posts.

Undergraduate provision

Undergraduate experience is known to be an important part of the progression to specialty employment and graduates may already have a clear idea of which specialty they wish to enter.⁹ However, there are reports that undergraduate exposure, for example in such areas as orthodontics and oral surgery is lacking.¹⁰ Relatively little is known about the views of dental undergraduate students around future specialty training possibilities after VT, the stage at which interest emerges, or the key factors that influence specialty choice.¹¹ It has been posited in the literature that understanding such factors is important “to enhance mentoring and counselling efforts for students about career pathways and help postgraduate program directors attract the most suitably matched candidates for available positions”¹².
A longitudinal survey in the USA suggests that financial considerations, enjoyment of particular types of clinical care, and exposure to educational role models/mentors may be the main factors that drive dental undergraduates’ specialty preferences.\textsuperscript{13}

A number of studies of medical undergraduates in relation to Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (OMFS) describe a need for increased emphasis on teaching at undergraduate level.\textsuperscript{14} Jarosz et al. found that student perceptions, for example as to what procedures OMFS specialists would carry out, changed over time, with implications for OMFS and periodontal rotations.\textsuperscript{15}

**Aims**

The aim of this paper was to fill a gap in the literature by gathering data on the stage at which UK dental undergraduates indicate a wish to specialise (or otherwise), the reasons for their choices, and their reported preparedness for future specialty training they might undertake so as to make recommendations for curricular design. A further aim was to examine if there were any interactions with regard to gender, reported ethnicity or undergraduate year/ stage.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Design**

This study was a single site, anonymized, cross sectional online survey of the undergraduate population (Bachelor of Dental Surgery [BDS] years 1-5) at Glasgow Dental School, undertaken between October and November 2016.

**Study site**

Established in 1879, Glasgow Dental Hospital and School delivers a modern, integrated Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) programme over five years to an undergraduate population of approximately 400 students. This is the second largest Dental School in the UK, and also provides postgraduate research opportunities and taught postgraduate programmes in a range of subjects.

**Procedures**

An internet-based survey programme (Google Forms) was used to deliver the survey. We collected basic participant information including gender, age group, class year, time taken between college/high school and dental school, and self-reported ethnicity. All registered undergraduates were sent an email containing the survey link, together with a covering letter explaining the purpose of the study and a statement ensuring confidentiality. A follow up
email was sent after one week to encourage participation, after which no further contact was made.

Participants could leave blank any question they did not wish to answer, and fully anonymous responses were permitted. Students were given the opportunity to provide a contact email to enter a prize draw, in which case responses were potentially identifiable, but all were dis-identified on transfer to databases for analysis, with participants allocated a unique study ID to ensure confidentiality.

**Analysis**

Data from returned survey forms were transferred to IBM SPSS v22.0 for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics are reported for nominal variables, with one-sample Chi square tests for equality of proportions. Chi square tests of association were performed for contingency tables providing all expected cell frequencies were >5.

**RESULTS**

A total of n=331 students completed the online survey, a response rate of 81%. Demographic information and key responses are shown in Table 1.

----------------------------------------------------------

**INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**

----------------------------------------------------------

Table 1 shows students were split equally between male and female, and a good spread of class groups and younger/older students were represented. The majority of students were white (p =.000) and had come straight from school (p=.000); which is representative of the general cohort of UK dental students.

A small majority (56%; p=.024) indicated a preference for specialising. However most of these students (72%) reportedly did not have knowledge regarding the career path that leads to their indicated speciality or were not sure (p= .027). Responses from students in final years of dental school (BDS4/5) showed 62% felt insufficiently exposed to the complex and multidisciplinary cases treated in their preferred specialty with another 25% not sure (p= .000).
There were no differences in levels of decision to pursue a specialty in either students coming to study straight from School versus gap years/second degrees, nor across ethnic grouping.

Figure 1 shows year group responses for the question of pursuing speciality training.

Specialty preference was highest in BDS 1 (63%) and BDS 5 (69%), and somewhat lower in BDS2-4 though not significantly so (range 49-53%; \(X^2 7.5; p=.113\)). For age group, decision to specialise was indicated at 52% of 16-20 yr olds, 62% of 21-25 year olds and 33% of those over 26 (\(X^2 6.69; p=.035\)).

**Speciality choices**

Overall, 63% of males (104/163) and 49% of females (82/168) surveyed said they had decided to specialise, or pursue a career in specialty training (OR = 1.85; CI 1.19-2.87). Specific choices by gender are shown in Table 2.

Almost half of students (78/185; 42.2%) indicating a specialty decision said they were not sure what specialty to pursue. Females were relatively more likely to state an interest in Special Care Dentistry (6.2% to 1% of males) and Paediatric Dentistry (14.8% to 7.7% of males), and males in Orthodontics (16.3% to 13.6% of females) and Oral Surgery (22.1% to 17.3% of females) though the latter was also the most common choice for females. There were very low indications towards Oral Medicine, Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology, and academic dentistry.

Students indicating a specialty choice were asked when they had begun to develop an interest in that specialty. Around half (48%; 88/184; 2 missing) said they had made this decision before University (Table 1). There were no significant interactions with gender or ethnicity in
this regard, though female students (44%, to 51% of males) and white students (47%, to 53% of other ethnic groups) were slightly less likely to have decided prior to commencing undergraduate study.

Whilst numbers are relatively small, there was a difference across year groups. Orthodontics was the top choice for BDS1 (23% of those choices) and BDS2 (19%), and Oral Surgery for BDS 3-5 (21%, 23% and 24% respectively). This may reflect exposure in the undergraduate curriculum (see discussion). For Orthodontic interest, 75% (21/28) indicated this began before university whilst for Oral Surgery this figure was 35% (13/37; OR 2.74; CI 1.35-5.5]. The main factors influencing undergraduate choice are shown in figure 2.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Figure 2 shows that 78% of students choosing to pursue a specialty (145/185; 1 missing) cited “enjoyment of providing that type of specialty service” or “types of patient seen in that specialty service” as the single most influencing factors on their choice. All other reasons were cited by fewer than 10% of students, including exposure prior to dental school (8%), staff influence (7%) or future salary (5%).

Exposure to specialty information and preparedness

Figure 3 shows male and female responses to the question of when information on specialty careers should be introduced to undergraduates.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The majority of students (89%; 294/331) said they felt they should first be exposed to ‘information and background knowledge regarding specialty pathways’ at BDS3 or before. Once more there was a gender effect, as 41% of male students felt exposure should start at BDS1 compared with just 24% of females. This was reversed in BDS2 (33% of females and 15% of males) with proportions for BDS3 and above being similar ($X^2 = p=.001$).
Of the 186 students indicating specialty preference, 53 (28%) thought they had knowledge of the career path to that specialty, with 55 (29%) saying no, and 80 (43%) not sure (Table 1; P<.05).

As indicated in Table 1 responses from students in BDS 4/5 reveal just 14% of students said they have been sufficiently exposed to the complex and multidisciplinary cases treated in that specialty (p= .000). This group were also asked how well prepared they felt in that specialty ‘currently or upon graduation’ (on a scale of 1-5 from ‘not prepared at all’ to ‘very well prepared’). No students scored 5/5 on the preparedness scale (mean 2.54; SD .77), and just 9 students scored 4/5. 66 students (84% of 79, two missing) scored either 2/5 (47%) or 3/5 (37%).

DISCUSSION

Our data show a majority of undergraduate students indicated a wish to pursue specialty training. The proportion (highest at 69% in BDS5) is not as high as sometimes reported, however this still far outstrips the eventual number that will take up training places. This reflects a difference between societal need (and subsequent provision to match that need), and student early career interest, as has been previously pointed out in medicine.16

Even though referral rates to dental specialists have increased greatly in recent years and are likely to continue, it is not certain in the future if there will be growth of specialist care in the private sector. Primary Care ‘generalists’ provide most dental care. Additionally however a significant amount of secondary care is provided by non-consultants outside of hospitals, and indeed some ‘routine’ work, without referral, can be considered relatively specialised (e.g. in orthodontics and endodontics).17

Specialty interest is relatively (though not significantly) high upon entry (BDS1, 63%), and exit (BDS5, 69%), and lower in the intervening years (49-53% in BDS 2-4). Further investigation is necessary to explore this, but it is plausible that the pressures of undergraduate study lead this to be set aside somewhat during the middle years.

The increase in dental specialties registered with the GDC is reportedly highest in orthodontics and oral surgery,2 which matches the most commonly indicated preferences in our data. There was also a shift in specialty interests from orthodontics in BDS1/2 to oral surgery in BDS3-5. It is likely that this reflects the curriculum, as GDS exposes
undergraduate dental students to oral surgery from BDS2 onwards. Students attributed their choices to many factors, including but not limited to personal factors (including familial exposure), mentoring and staff influence, and future projected salaries and working life factors. However, it is clear that (enjoyment of) exposure to relevant material and cases was a key driver. Persistent exposure and guidance in a certain subject, besides allowing students to grasp a deeper understanding and nature of the specialty, is a significant factor in sparking student’s interests in that particular field.18

Not a single student in the present cohort indicated interest in specialties: prosthodontics; endodontics; periodontics; dental public health; dental and maxillofacial radiology; or oral microbiology. Exposure to (and interest in) some of these specialties will of course develop after graduation. As well as Vocational Training, Dental Core Training in Scotland involves 6 months in the Public Dental Service and 6 months in Hospital Service. Trainees may also undertake examination towards Membership of the Faculty of Dental Surgery (MFDS) or Membership of the Joint Dental Faculties (MJDF), which are desirable for those pursuing specialty pathways.

It has been noted that specialty knowledge in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery is reportedly higher in dental undergraduates in the UK, compared to their medical counterparts.19 20 Our highest preference towards specialty training was seen in BDS5 students, yet these students felt mainly unprepared and under exposed across all specialties. This may be important to address because it is known that dental students already feel high stress levels at their final year of dental school or at the transitioning phase to clinics.21

Undergraduate educators in the UK should ensure students have realistic career expectations, and should make it clear most will work in General Practice. Nevertheless, the majority of our students indicated that early exposure to knowledge about specialty pathways is desirable. Financial implications should be discussed with students, who it is estimated may be up to approximately £45,000 in debt upon graduation. Unless a competitive NHS specialist training post is secured, they will have to incur further debt to train as a specialist.22 There have been various predictions for some time of shortages, including in the USA of prosthodontists over the coming years,23 and it seems to follow that, at least, undergraduate students should be informed about, and involved in discussing, when specialty- specific exposure might be expected. It is otherwise possible that we are missing an opportunity to engage the students who may ultimately be best suited to particular career paths.24
We also reported gender differences that may be of some interest, with paediatric dentistry and special care dentistry being relatively more favoured by female undergraduates (males are more likely to pursue orthodontics or oral surgery). This is consistent with previous work done with medical students in Israel which found that paediatric work appeals more to females.\textsuperscript{25}

It is not of course surprising that students reported interest in areas they have enjoyed. It has previously been pointed out that faculty perceive themselves to be strong influencers of student specialty choices via their enthusiasm, which may of course influence student enjoyment somewhat.\textsuperscript{26} A wider ‘career mentor’ role at undergraduate level could complement direct exposure by: helping students to explore information and guidance available;\textsuperscript{13} or facilitating contact with specialty trainees and consultants as a platform for students to ask questions and to obtain advice from the specialists themselves.\textsuperscript{27}

Dental schools could also involve wider stakeholders such as the BDA, Royal Colleges and Specialist Societies to enhance advice given to students. It has been noted that the GDC, together with Government Health Departments, need to adapt to possible changes in the skill mix necessary for a modern dental workforce, focused on both treatment and prevention across the dental team, which has implications for specialists, generalists, and interdisciplinary care alike.\textsuperscript{28 29}

As dental provision dynamically responds to changing population needs such as an aging population with increased needs for complex dental treatment, facilitating more undergraduate student knowledge of this landscape of provision, in what is a highly competitive environment,\textsuperscript{30} seems worthy of consideration.\textsuperscript{31}

**Strengths and limitations**

The survey had a high response rate across the school, and missing data were minimal. The population- sample of BDS1-5 allowed for some tracking across the years, albeit between-groups. The main limitation is that this was a cross sectional survey. It would be worthwhile carrying out a longitudinal study with a student cohort through to post-VT employment to determine if/when choices emerge, what factors/ exposures influence such, and how these change over time. The psychological impact of unfulfilled specialty ambition could also then be examined. In addition, these results are from a single site. We could also have asked about student knowledge and/or anticipation of developments whereby other dental team members will increasingly deliver routine primary dental care, and whether this factored in their
choices. Finally, future work could compare results from different institutions, curricula or international criteria for qualification.

**Conclusion**

This survey, one of the few to date to explore UK dental undergraduate perceptions around specialty careers, found that a majority showed interest in specialty training, yet felt under-exposed to relevant cases and said they had a lack of knowledge of the specialty career progression. Many specialties were under-represented in choices, with Orthodontics in early years, and Oral Surgery in later years, the most commonly cited by all, and more so by males. Enjoyment was the main influencing factors, following from exposure to cases and procedures. Educator mentoring roles offer the potential to engage students in exploring knowledge of other specialties in a structured way, so that they enter vocational training with a rounded idea of the available options.
Figure 1  Students indicating a preference for speciality training by BDS year group

Figure 2  Single most influencing factor on students’ speciality preferences
Single most influencing factor impacting specialty choices:

- Enjoyment of providing that type of specialty: 5.01%
- Types of patient seen in the specialty service: 8.11%
- Exposure prior to dental school: 10.81%
- Faculty influence: 4.94%
- Cost of programme: 6.14%
- Future salary as a professional specialist: 7.01%
- Length of programme: 0.54%
Figure 3  Preference for stage of exposure to specialty information by gender
Table 1  Participating students (n= 331) and responses to the main survey items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response item</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
<th>X²; df (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>163 (49%)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 152 (46%)</td>
<td>&gt; 21 179 (54%)</td>
<td>2.20; 1 (.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class year</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>BDS1 62 (19%)</td>
<td>BDS2 60 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>White 258 (78%)</td>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken between college/high school and dental school</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Straight from school 267 (81%)</td>
<td>Gap before GDS 64 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you decided to specialise or wish to pursue a career in specialty training?</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Yes 186 (56%)</td>
<td>No 145 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did you begin to develop an interest in that specialty?</td>
<td>184*</td>
<td>Before university 88 (48%)</td>
<td>During university 96 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At which stage do you feel you should first be exposed to information and background knowledge regarding the different types of specialties and their pathways?</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>BDS1 108 (32%)</td>
<td>BDS2 80 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Those indicating speciality choice] Do you have knowledge regarding the career path that leads to the field of specialty you are interested in?</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Yes 53 (28%)</td>
<td>Not sure 80 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[BDS4/5 students indicating speciality choice] Do you feel you have been sufficiently exposed to the complex and multidisciplinary cases treated in that specialty?</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Yes 11 (14%)</td>
<td>Not sure 20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2 missing

Table 2  Speciality choices by gender

15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Care Dentistry</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (6.2%)</td>
<td>6 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Dentistry</td>
<td>6 (5.8%)</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>9 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paediatric Dentistry</td>
<td>8 (7.7%)</td>
<td>12 (14.8%)</td>
<td>20 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodontics</td>
<td>17 (16.3%)</td>
<td>11 (13.6%)</td>
<td>28 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Surgery</td>
<td>23 (22.1%)</td>
<td>14 (17.3%)</td>
<td>37 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Medicine</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and maxillofacial pathology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but not sure what</td>
<td>46 (44.2%)</td>
<td>32 (39.5%)</td>
<td>78 (42.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic dentistry</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>185*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 missing
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