

# Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Virtual Reality Simulation versus In-person Simulation Using a Standardized Patient Among Undergraduate Nursing Students as a Method of Educational Instruction: A Comparative Study Jessica Seich MSN, RN, CPN, CHSE, Shelly Curran PhD, APRN-CNS CRRN Byers School of Nursing; Walsh University, North Canton OH 44720

## Introduction/Background

Simulation has been used in nursing education for many years as a way to augment traditional methods of educational instruction. The method of providing simulation experiences has changed over the years as technology has advanced. Simulation using case studies, and low-fidelity mannequins became more commonly used in the early 2000s, followed by the introduction of standardized patients, high-fidelity mannequins and more recently, the use of virtual reality (VR) simulation.

Simulation is an interactive teaching method that promotes learning through practice that can be transferred to the clinical setting. It is also useful in providing a safe space for students to learn and make mistakes, and allow for opportunities to care for uncommonly seen cases, or high-risk patients.

This study will focus on understanding student perceptions of the effectiveness of two different types of simulation experiences (VR versus simulation using a standardized patient).

## Purpose

The purpose of this study is to compare virtual reality simulation versus in-person simulation using a standardized patient as a method of educational instruction for undergraduate nursing students.

## **Research Questions**

- 1. Are undergraduate nursing student's "perception of effectiveness" ratings of educational sessions using simulation better for students in the VR group or standardized patient group?
- 2. Do "perception of effectiveness" ratings for each group (VR group versus in-person simulation with a standardized patient simulation group) differ based on demographic characteristics?

## Methods/Procedures

**Design**: Quasi-experimental, comparative post-test design. Setting: Walsh University Beyers School of Nursing simulation lab. Sample: A convenience sample of students enrolled in the Families II pediatric course will be recruited. **Inclusion criteria**: 18 years and older, undergraduate nursing students enrolled in Families II (Pediatrics) course at Walsh University.

**Exclusion criteria**: Students who verbalize they are unable to tolerate the VR simulation experience.

- **Procedures:** Students are assigned to either in-person simulation using a standardized patient or VR simulation followed by completion of the Standardized Effectiveness Tool – Modified (SET-M).
- Measures: Demographic characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity) Perception of the effectiveness of simulation experience using the SET-M, a 19 question 3 poin Likert scale survey, The survey includes 3 sections: pre-brief (2-questions), scenario (12-questions), and debrief (5- questions). Higher scores indicate higher perceptions of effectiveness.

**Lesson Title: Caring for a Pediatric Patient Experiencing Pain** Objectives:

- . Interpret vital signs for a pediatric patient
- 2. Perform an appropriate pain assessment for a pediatric patient
- 3. Safely administer analgesics to a pediatric patient using accurate math calculations
- 4. Tailor therapeutic communication for a pediatric patient
- 5. Encourage non-pharmacological pain interventions

Both simulation experiences included a pre-brief, learning session, debrief, and post evaluation

| Demographic Data & Experience    | e with Simulation              |                           |   |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Variable                         | Standardized Patient<br>n = 23 | Virtual Reality<br>n = 29 |   |
| Age                              | 26.57 (7.84)                   | 24.48 (5.73)              | - |
| Gender                           |                                |                           |   |
| Female                           | 18 (78.3%)                     | 24 (82.8%)                |   |
| Male                             | 5 (21.7%)                      | 5 (17.2%)                 |   |
| Ethnicity                        |                                |                           |   |
| White                            | 20 (87.0%)                     | 26 (89.7%)                |   |
| Black                            | <u>2 (</u> 8.7%)               | 1 (3.4%)                  |   |
| Asian                            | 1 (4.3 <u>%)</u>               | 1 (3.4%)                  |   |
| Hispanic                         |                                | 1 (3.4)                   |   |
| Times participated in            | 2.05 (4.21)                    | 1.50 (1.26)               |   |
| VR in learning environment       |                                |                           |   |
| Times participated in VR         | 1.32 (1.96)                    | 1.36 (2.15)               |   |
| for entertainment                |                                |                           |   |
| Times participated in Simulation | 3.67 (2.54)                    | 4.93 (3.52)               |   |
| With Standardized Patient        |                                |                           |   |



### **Perceptions of Effective**

Survey Question

### Prebriefing

Prebriefing increased confic Prebriefing beneficial

### Scenario

Prepared for changes in pat Understanding of pathophys Confidence in assessment s Empowered to make clinica Better understanding of me Opportunity to practice clin Confidence in prioritizing ca **Confidence** communication Confidence to teach patient Confident in ability to repor Confident in providing inter Confident in using EBP to pi

### Debriefing

Contributed to learning Allowed communication of

Valuable in helping improve Provided opportunities to se Constructive evaluation of

## **Comments from Students Participating in the VR Simulation:**

- It was great!

| veness of Simulation Based on (SET-M) |                  |                 |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Stan                                  | dardized Patient | Virtual Reality |  |  |
|                                       | <i>n</i> = 23    | <i>n</i> = 29   |  |  |
| idence                                | 2.83 (.49)       | 2.59 (.57)      |  |  |
|                                       | 2.87 (.34)       | 2.72 (.53)      |  |  |
| atient condition                      | 2.78 (.42)       | 2.55 (.63)      |  |  |
| ysiology                              | 2.70 (.56)       | 2.41 (.78)      |  |  |
| skills                                | 2.83 (.39)       | 2.62 (.56)      |  |  |
| al decisions                          | 2.65 (.49)       | 2.52 (.57)      |  |  |
| edications                            | 2.52 (.67)       | 2.34 (.77)      |  |  |
| nical skills                          | 2.96 (.21)       | 2.76 (.58)      |  |  |
| care & interventions                  | 2.91 (.29)       | 2.59 (.63)      |  |  |
| n with patient                        | 2.96 (.21)       | 2.41 (.73)      |  |  |
| nts re illness/interventions          | 2.57 (.59)       | 2.34 (.77)      |  |  |
| ort to healthcare team                | 2.74 (.45)       | 2.41 (.78)      |  |  |
| erventions to foster safety           | 2.83 (.39)       | 2.55 (.63)      |  |  |
| provide care                          | 2.74 (.45)       | 2.52 (.57)      |  |  |
|                                       | 3.00 (.00)       | 2.86 (.34)      |  |  |
| f feelings before focusing on sce     |                  | 2.76 (.58)      |  |  |
| ve my clinical judgement              | 2.91 (.29)       | 2.86 (.44)      |  |  |
| self-reflect on performance           | 2.96 (.21)       | 2.79 (.56)      |  |  |
| the simulation                        | 2.96 (.21)       | 2.83 (.54)      |  |  |
|                                       |                  |                 |  |  |

I honestly feel like using a live person or even a mannequin is more practical than trying to familiarize yourself to the realm of VR. Some people may pick up on it quick, and others may never truly grasp the full potential.

I feel that with more practice VR Sim would be extremely beneficial! The VR simulation is pretty easy to use and allows you to gain experience without physically being in the clinical rotation. Also the debriefing is very valuable and contributed to the majority of my education for the experience.

Great simulation and learning experience, a little disorienting though.

**Comments from Students Participating in the Standardized Patient Simulation:** Really enjoyed interacting with a real patient

The real in person rather than a "dummy" was more beneficial. I prefer to do a simulation on a person rather than virtual