

# Student Perspectives on the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP)

Kari Nilsen PhD<sup>1</sup>, Paul Callaway MD<sup>2</sup>, Greg Unruh MD<sup>3</sup>, Anne Walling MB ChB<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Family and Community Medicine, KUSM-W, <sup>2</sup>Wichita Center for Graduate Medical Education, <sup>3</sup>Graduate Medical Education Kansas City



# Introduction

- Evolving match process has resulted in escalating burdens on medical students, residency programs, and medical schools
- Pressure National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) reform
- Large amounts of data regarding strategic ways to apply to residencies, but students are not willing to risk their future based on data alone
- In order to better understand student beliefs, motivations, and experiences of the NRMP, qualitative studies are needed

# **Research Questions**

- How do MS4s feel about the NRMP process?
- How would they suggest changing the NRMP?
- What advice do they have for future students?

# Method

- Ten video-recorded focus groups conducted with students who participated in the 2017 and 2018 NRMP (N = 53)
- Recordings independently analyzed for thematic categories by two researchers, then reviewed by members of the research team
  - 4<sup>th</sup> year medical students
  - Residents
  - Graduate medical education faculty
  - Advisory faculty
  - Academic and student affairs faculty

# Results

 Five focus groups with 24 MS4s in 2017, and five groups with 29 MS4s in 2018

Table 1. Participants		
	Male N (%)	Female N (%)
Primary Care <sup>1</sup>	7 (13.2%)	18 (34.0%)
Non-Primary Care <sup>2</sup>	14 (26.4%)	14 (26.4%)
Total	53	

1. Primary Care: students matched in Family Medicine, Internal Medicine, Pediatrics, and Medicine/Pediatrics

2. Non-primary care: students matched in Anesthesiology, Emergency Medicine, Obstetrics/Gynecology, Orthopedic Surgery, Pathology, Plastic Surgery, Psychiatry, Radiology, Rehabilitation Medicine, and Surgery.

## **Table 2. Thematic Categories**

Major Overall Categories

The match is extremely important

The match is expensive and inefficient

The match is stressful and challenging

Applicants have a personal responsibility to succeed

#### Selecting Programs for Application

The match had complex paperwork & technical issues
Received non-specific information from programs
Lack of specific advice for individual needs
Applicants sought diverse sources of advice
Competing with other students

#### Accepting and Scheduling Interviews

Waiting is overwhelming and challenging
Students are hyper-vigilant about invitations
Students accept all offers and cancel later if necessary
Students schedule strategically for peak performance
There is a lot of uncertainty during the process

# Influences on the Interview Experience

Assistance in arranging visit

Transparency about process

Organization/preparation of interview day

Perceived interest in applicant

Used time outside interview to get to know applicants

Meeting a wide range of residents and faculty

Perceived engagement and caring at the program Innovative interviewing strategies

Uncertainty about post-interview communication

# Discussion

- Understanding student perspective is essential in any attempt to improve the match process
- Students recommend utilizing current residents for the best advice and information
  - Online groups with other applicants are also heavily utilized
- Data from 2018 is showing similar categories

## Limitations

- Single institution with those who matched
- Perspectives could have been influenced by the generally positive outcomes, as well as recall bias
- This may have impact on the focus group discussions and the freedom of students to express contrary views

## Conclusion

- The match is a high-stakes experience in which the "over-apply, over-accept" strategy is dominant
- Students recognize that they are investing excessive time and resources, but they will not leave anything to chance
- This study illuminates the areas of concern for students and perspectives on best practices

#### Contact

Kari M. Nilsen, PhD Assistant Professor, Dept. of Family & Community Medicine KU School of Medicine- Wichita 1010 N. Kansas, Wichita, KS 67214 knilsen@kumc.edu

This study was generously funded by the University of Kansas School of Medicine Academy of Medical Educators (AME) Medical Education Grant