



*Journal of Advances and
Scholarly Researches in
Allied Education*

*Vol. VII, Issue No. XIII,
January-2014, ISSN 2230-
7540*

**AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON IMPACT OF
PREBRIEFING ON COMPETENCY
PERFORMANCE IN SIMULATION**

AN
INTERNATIONALLY
INDEXED PEER
REVIEWED &
REFEREED JOURNAL

An Experimental Study on Impact of Prebriefing on Competency Performance in Simulation

Ms. Bemina J. A.^{1*} Dr. Ajay Kumar Katiyar²

¹ Associate Professor, ESIC College of Nursing, Gulbarga

² Consultant General Medicines at Rama Hospital and Research Center, Mandhana, Kanpur

Abstract – Prebriefing is the early on period of the simulation procedure, in any case, small nursing instruction look into is accessible on this part of recreation. Reflection hypothesis and concept mapping educated a model-based organized prebriefing movement to get ready students for significant reproduction learning. An trial assemble randomized outline was utilized as a part of this examination; the intercession amass who got organized prebriefing was contrasted with the control group. The contemplate was led at a college school of nursing in Kanpur.

Competency, prebriefing background of those members accepting organized prebriefing and those getting customary prebriefing exercises, were looked at. The connection between simulation performance and students' self-evaluated prebriefing background was likewise inspected. Scores from the Creighton Competency Assessment Instrument and the Prebriefing Background Scale were investigated utilizing parametric and non-parametric statistics. A factually noteworthy contrast was shown between bunches for competency performance ($p < 0.001$), clinical judgment ($p < 0.001$) and prebriefing knowledge ($p < 0.001$). No relationship was found between impression of prebriefing background and students' reproduction performance.

Keywords: Prebriefing, Competency Performance, In Simulation, Nursing Student

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

In spite of the fact that simulation explore has picked up prevalence in nursing training in the course of the most recent decade (Johnson et al., 2012; Rhodes and Curran, 2005), it stays indistinct if or how parts of the recreation procedure are viable for nursing understudy learning (Benner, Sutphen, Leonard, and Day, 2010). The simulation procedure includes three segments: the prebriefing or educations stage, the recreated rehearse situation, and the questioning stage (Rhodes and Curran, 2005). While understudy performance amid the situation and the questioning stages have been broadly considered and recognized for their hugeness in getting the hang of, prebriefing as a vital part of simulation has not been very much archived for its part in nursing understudy learning.

In simulation, conventional prebriefing exercises help students by presenting situation targets, and regularly incorporate correspondence of the patient introduction, member parts, errands, time assignment, and an introduction to hardware and to the general condition (Meakim et al., 2013). Regardless of this practical and specialized concentration, prebriefing is said to set up the procedure for and culture of learning, and is

essential for coordinating and assessing results (Riley, 2008). Subsequently, the level of accomplishment in recreation as a learning apparatus might be affected before the real situation and questioning happen, through prebriefing. In any case, this has not been observationally tried.

OBJECTIVE

Is there a distinction in competency performance amid a clinical simulation situation between nursing student in a conventional baccalaureate program who take an interest in an organized prebriefing mediation and the individuals who take an interest in customary prebriefing exercises?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Writing that examines the concepts of prebriefing, competency performance, clinical judgment, and student experiences as far as concept mapping and guided appearance in organized prebriefing, will be blended and assessed. So as to arrange these concepts inside the setting of the proposed examine, bolster from hypothetical systems identified with

constructivism and intelligent practice will initially be verbalized.

In light of the constrained consideration prebriefing has had in the writing, and regardless of its acknowledgment as a period of the simulation procedure, prebriefing has not been considered for its part in the advancement of competency amid clinical simulation.

Surely, the term competency has been recognized as hard to characterize in nursing (Giro, 1993), and the writing has been found to "need accord, being packed with contention, vagueness, perplexity and logical inconsistency" (Cowan, Norman, and Coopamah, 2007, p. 23). Competency has been portrayed as spreading over numerous areas of nursing practice (Benner, 2001), and as including the aptitude of expecting future potential outcomes (Benner, Leather treater, and Chesla, 2009). So also, the properties of prebriefing reflect intellectual exercises, as well as, on the grounds that prebriefing is arranged toward the start of the simulation procedure, fundamentally incorporate a reckoning of full of feeling and psychomotor parts of care to be conveyed.

Competency is characterized as the "learning, aptitude, capacity and judgment required for protected and moral nursing practice" (School of Medical attendants of Ontario, 2014, p. 4). Legitimate meanings of competency are recognized as relevant and identify with what a sensible and judicious specialist with comparable levels of information and experience would do under similar conditions; competency works as a kind of perspective for assessing the standard of tend to enrolled attendants (School of Medical caretakers of Ontario, 2014). As an objective of nursing practice in training settings, notwithstanding, competency remains a particular focal point of the simulation procedure and nursing understudy learning. For the reasons for this proposed think about, competency as characterized by Hayden et al. is the: capacity to watch and assemble data, perceive deviations from expected examples, organize information, understand information, keep up an expert reaction manner, give clear correspondence, execute viable intercessions, perform nursing abilities effectively, assess nursing mediations, and self-reflect for performance change inside a culture of security (2014, p. 244). The performance of competency, or competency performance, will be considered in that capacity in this proposed think about, with regards to learning. Since competency is multifaceted, it has been a test to gauge (Benner, 1982; Tilley, 2008). Giro stated that if competency is worried about the "capacity to arrange intellectual, full of feeling and psychomotor abilities, in the doing of nursing exercises" (1993, p. 84), or performance, at that point appraisals should address such numerous components. Cowan and partners (2007) reasoned that a comprehensive origination of competency would most precisely outline the multifaceted nature of insight, performance, abilities, qualities and mentalities

as interconnected. Be that as it may, prebriefing has not been investigated from the point of view of affecting competency performance as a needy variable, which adds to an absence of comprehension of this present stage's part in getting the hang of amid recreation of complex clinical practice encounters, as opposed to single errands.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This examination utilized an experimental; assemble randomized piece design, with organized prebriefing as the single mediation. Student in every one of the fall (seventh) and winter (6th) terms of a Baccalaureate of Science in Nursing (BScN) program, were at that point enlisted in one of two segments of the restorative surgical course focused by this investigation. Groups were randomized by course area, in obstructs (each term). Subsequently each term, the two areas of student taking this course, who assented to take an interest, were arbitrarily relegated to either the test or control group.

Setting, Population and sampling

Setting

The investigation was led at a vast college school of nursing in kanpur, in the nursing simulation focus (NSC). This middle was furnished with SimMan® mannequins, one of which was utilized as a part of the investigation's recreation encounters. Recreation focus bolster staff were accessible to help with specialized parts of the simulations, yet were not engaged with leading the investigation or in group information.

Population

Members were enlisted from a huge accommodation test of 379 BScN student selected in a fourth-year medicinal surgical, clinical nursing course amid the 6th and seventh term of a conventional 4-year program. This population was chosen in light of the prerequisite for these student to perform ably at the course level, and to create clinical judgment abilities amid the upper years of the program. All student in this focused on course: met a similar program confirmation criteria; were enlisted from a similar 4-year program compose; had a similar measure of medicinal surgical clinical and recreation encounter because of introduction to the same curricular structure and content; and, met a similar essential necessities for the fourth-year restorative surgical course. The capacity to peruse, talk, and write in English is a prerequisite for program affirmation, so all student could communicate in English.

Assurance of sample size

Since there was minimal earlier information investigated the concept of prebriefing, traditional rules

for deciding example estimate (Cohen, 1988) were connected to a from the earlier power examination utilizing G*Power (Faul, Buchner, Erdfelder, and Lang, 2009). A two-followed t-test set at $p = .05$ with an energy of 80% and a medium impact size of $d = .5$ recommended that 64 members were required in each of the exploratory and control groups, for an aggregate example size of 128.

Instruments

Two instruments were utilized to gather information. The members' simulation exercises were surveyed utilizing the Creighton Competency Assessment Instrument (CCEI), this present instrument's Clinical Judgment subscale (CCEI-CJ), and the Prebriefing Experience Scale (PES). The member scores from the trial aggregate on these estimations were contrasted with those scores from the control group.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

IBM SPSS Form 22.0 Premium programming was utilized for every single quantitative examination. Preparatory investigations were directed to survey missing information, exceptions, ordinariness and homogeneity, to decide suppositions and the determination of inferential measurable tests, before tending to the exploration questions.

Preparatory Outcomes

Before tending to the exploration questions, homogeneity of fluctuation was tried to help the plan of joining the fall and winter terms each into the trial and control groups. Add up to scores were inspected for conceivable contrasts between terms ($fu = 31$, $n_{winter} = 45$) on the factors of age, past simulation encounter, and the scores for the Creighton Competency Assessment Instrument (CCEI), the CCEI Clinical Judgment subscale (CCEI-CJ), and the Prebriefing Experience Scale (PES).

Table 1

Sample Description	Age (years)	Simulation Experience (number of high fidelity exposures)	CCEI Scores (%)	CCEI-CJ Scores (%)	PES Scores (out of 100)
Overall sample (N = 80)	$M = 26.0$ $SD = 6.8$	$M = 2.9$ $SD = 1.8$	$M = 71.2$ $SD = 14.3$	$M = 77.2$ $SD = 18.6$	$M = 92.2$ $SD = 7.7$
Fall (seventh) term (n = 31)	$M = 27.0$ $SD = 7.0$	$M = 2.9$ $SD = 1.8$	$M = 74.1$ $SD = 13.6$	$M = 79.7$ $SD = 19.9$	$M = 92.5$ $SD = 8.4$
Winter (sixth) term (n = 45)	$M = 25.3$ $SD = 6.7$	$M = 2.9$ $SD = 1.8$	$M = 69.2$ $SD = 14.5$	$M = 75.4$ $SD = 17.7$	$M = 92.0$ $SD = 7.2$

DESCRIPTIVE OUTCOMES

Sample description based on experimental group. The accumulation of statistic information included: sex, age, and number of past simulation encounters. The

general member test was illustrative of the understudy populace selected in this nursing program. The larger part of members were female (92%; $n = 70$). The extent of male members was practically identical to the extent of guys enlisted in the course areas (10%), and at the school. Members extended in age from 20 to 49 years, with a normal age of 26.0 years ($SD = 6.8$).

The trial group ($n = 44$), who were presented to organized prebriefing, were involved 91% female ($n = 38$), and 9% male ($n = 4$) members. The ages for the test gather ran from 20-43 years, and arrived at the midpoint of 26.0 years ($SD = 6.4$). Half of the control amass members revealed having between 2-4 past simulation encounters (half).

The control group ($n = 36$), who were not presented to organized prebriefing, was contained 94% female ($n = 32$), and 6% male ($n = 2$) members. The ages for the control amass went from 20-49 years, and found the middle value of 25.9 years ($SD = 7.5$). Most control amass members revealed having between 2-4 past simulation encounters (55.9%). In this way, the socioeconomics were spoken to comparatively in the exploratory and control groups.

Table 2 descriptive outcome

		Scores (% of items assessed)														
Whole Sample (N = 80)		Experimental (n = 44)										Control (n = 36)				
Instrument/Subscales	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	
CCEI (23 items)	71.2	38.1	95.7	14.3	(68.0, 74.5)	79.9	63.6	95.7	8.81	(77.2, 82.6)	60.5	38.1	91.3	12.4	(56.2, 64.8)	
CCEI Assessment (3 items)	71.0	0	100	30.0	(64.4, 77.7)	83.3	0	100	24.7	(75.6, 91.0)	55.9	0	100	26.9	(46.5, 65.3)	
CCEI Communication (5 items)	68.9	20	100	16.5	(65.2, 72.7)	72.9	60.0	100	11.5	(69.3, 80.5)	64.1	20	100	20.2	(57.1, 71.2)	
CCEI Clinical Judgment	77.2	37.5	100	18.6	(72.9, 81.4)	89.1	55.6	100	10.6	(85.8, 92.4)	62.5	37.5	88.9	15.7	(57.0, 68.0)	
(9 items)																
CCEI Patient Safety (6 items)	63.4	16.7	100	21.4	(58.5, 68.3)	69.8	33.3	100	20.9	(63.3, 80.4)	55.4	16.7	100	19.6	(48.6, 62.2)	

Table 3 descriptive outcome group for PES

		Scores														
Whole Sample (N = 80)		Experimental (n = 44)										Control (n = 36)				
Instrument/Subscales	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	M	Min	Max	SD	95% (CI-L, CI-U)	
PES (out of 100)	92.2	70.0	100	7.7	(90.4, 93.9)	95.7	83.0	100	4.5	(94.3, 97.1)	87.8	70.0	100	8.6	(84.8, 90.8)	
PES-ATF (out of 20)	18.1	11.0	20.0	1.8	(17.7, 18.5)	18.9	17.0	20.0	1.0	(18.6, 19.2)	17.1	11.0	20.0	2.2	(16.4, 17.9)	
PES-LC (out of 40)	36.4	25.0	40.0	3.6	(35.6, 37.3)	37.9	31.0	40.0	2.3	(37.2, 38.6)	36.6	25.0	40.0	4.1	(33.2, 36.0)	
PES-FS (out of 25)	23.6	18.0	25.0	1.7	(23.2, 24.0)	24.3	21.0	25.0	1.3	(23.9, 24.7)	22.7	18.0	25.0	1.8	(22.1, 23.4)	
PES-FG (out of 15)	14.1	9.0	15.0	1.5	(13.7, 14.4)	14.6	12.0	15.0	.82	(14.4, 14.9)	13.4	9.0	15.0	1.8	(12.8, 14.0)	

PES-ATF: Analyzing Thoughts and Feelings subscale

PES-LC: Learning and Making Connections subscale

PES-FS: Facilitator Skill in Conducting the Prebriefing subscale

PES-FG: Appropriate Facilitator Guidance subscale

ANALYSIS

The main inquiry, "Is there a distinction in competency performance amid a clinical recreation situation between nursing students in a conventional baccalaureate program who take part in an organized prebriefing mediation and the individuals who partake in customary prebriefing exercises?" was investigated utilizing an autonomous examples t-test to think about the mean aggregate Creighton Competency Assessment Instrument (CCEI) scores between the trial assemble presented to organized prebriefing, and the control gather which got the customary prebriefing. The information uncovered that, all things considered, CCEI scores for the exploratory group who were presented to organized prebriefing ($M = 79.9$, $SD = 8.8$), and for the control group ($M = 60.5$, $SD = 12.4$), were distinctive by -19.4 , 96% CI $[-24.4, -14.3]$. This distinction was huge $t(57.5) = -7.70$, $p < .001$, and spoke to a substantial impact, $d = 1.8$ (Cohen, 1988) (utilizing <http://www.uccs.edu/~lbecker/>). Post hoc control was evaluated at 1.0, utilizing G*Power investigation (Faul et al., 2009).

Since information was gathered from members more than two terms (6th versus seventh term), and on the grounds that length of enlistment in a program as a prior condition might be a potential effect on contrasts in competency performance, an extra balanced examination was led. An ANCOVA was utilized to inspect the CCEI scores between the exploratory and control groups, while controlling for the covariate of term. No communication was clear amongst term and group enrollment (trial, control), as an indicator of CCEI scores, $F(1,75) = .46$, $p = .50$, fractional $q_1 = .01$. An ANCOVA, at that point, uncovered that the covariate of term was not essentially identified with CCEI scores, $F(1,73) = .62$, $p = .43$, $q_2 = .01$. There was a noteworthy impact of group participation on the CCEI scores, $F(1,73) = 59.9$, $p < .001$, fractional $q_2 = .45$, while controlling for the impact of term. The extensive impact estimate was noted (fractional $q_2 = .45$). Watched control was 1.0 ($\alpha = .05$). Levene's test for homogeneity of fluctuation in this ANCOVA was $F(1,74) = 5.43$, $p = .023$, showing critical contrasts in bunch changes. In any case, the difference proportion was 1.98, which is under 2, thus change was not viewed as dangerous (Polit, 2010). In this manner, a factual contrast was clear in competency performance between the exploratory group that got the organized prebriefing, and the control aggregate that got a conventional prebriefing, with a huge impact. In this occasion, organized prebriefing unequivocally influenced competency performance of members amid a simulation.

CONCLUSION

Fundamentally higher scores in competency performance for BScN students were noted in the test bunch that got an organized prebriefing, with a vast impact, contrasted with the control group. Nursing students' capacity to perform skillfully is a particular focal point of recreation training. Prebriefing, as a recognized part of the simulation procedure, had not been plainly connected with learning results of simulation. The discoveries from this investigation give confirmation of a relationship of organized, instead of conventional, prebriefing exercises, with better competency performance.

Current writing is steady of these outcomes. The significance of prebriefing is "obvious in the performance of the simulation" (Brackney and Priode, 2015, p. 135). Waxman (2010) stipulated that simulation readiness of nursing understudy students ought to incorporate psychological competency exercises, for example, case design or planning sheets to expand aptitudes, learning and thinking capacities. Preliminary activities including prioritization and planning for nurturing the recreated understanding were apparent in examines, where competency or simulation performance were surveyed in any case, prebriefing exercises had not been explicitly assessed for their relationship to competency performance.

This present examination's organized prebriefing action was not intended for the scientist to give members replies, or to disclose to them which activities ought to be attempted amid the recreation, however was equipped to demonstrate reflection-before-activity and the intelligent cycle, and to encourage an concept mapping-type work out, in view of the Organized Prebriefing Model (Figure 2). Student ID of suitable plans for reproduced understanding consideration, utilizing signs and direction from the recreation facilitator, is a critical part of prebriefing, and was supported through this present investigation's outline. This investigation additionally adds to a hypothesis based group of simulation learning that has been under-spoken to in the present writing.

REFERENCES

- Ashley, J., and Stamp, K. (2014). Figuring out how to have a similar outlook as a medical caretaker: The improvement of clinical judgment in nursing students. *Diary of Nursing Training*, 53(9), pp. 519-525. doi:10.3928/01484836-20140821-14
- August-Brady, M. M. (2005). The impact of a metacognitive intercession on way to deal with and self-direction of learning in baccalaureate nursing students. *Diary of Nursing Training*, 44(7), pp. 297-304.

- Ausubel, D. (1978). *Instructive brain science: A subjective view* (second ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ausubel, D., Novak, J. D., and Hanesian, H. (1978). *Instructive brain research: A subjective view* (second ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bambini, D., Washburn, J., and Perkins, R. (2009). Results of clinical simulation for beginner nursing students: Correspondence, certainty, clinical judgment. *Nursing Instruction Points of view*, 30(2), pp. 79-82.
- Benner, P. (1982). Issues in competency-based testing. *Nursing Standpoint*, 30, pp. 303-309.
- Benner, P. (2001). *From beginner to master: Perfection and power in clinical nursing practice*. Upper Seat Waterway, NJ: Prentice Lobby.
- Cant, R. P., and Cooper, S. J. (2010). Reproduction based learning in nurture training: Methodical audit. *Diary of Cutting edge Nursing*, 66(1), pp. 3-15. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05240.x
- Deckers, C. (2011). *Planning high devotion recreation to amplify understudy enrolled nursing basic leadership capacity* (Unpublished doctoral paper). Pepperdine College, Malibu, CA.
- Eggenberger, T., Keller, K., and Locsin, R. C. (2010). Esteeming minding practices inside reenacted rising nursing circumstances. *Global Diary for Human Minding*, 14(2), pp. 23-29.
- Faul, F., Buchner, An., Erdfelder, E., and Lang, A. (2009). Factual power examinations utilizing G*Power 3.1: Tests for relationship and relapse examinations. *Conduct Exploration Strategies*, 41, pp. 1149-1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149
- Fiery remains, S. L., and Clayton, P. H. (2004). The explained taking in: A way to deal with guided reflection and evaluation. *Imaginative Advanced education*, 29(2), 137-154. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.authenticate.library.duq.edu/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000048795.84636.4a>
- Garrett, B. M., MacPhee, M., and Jackson, C. (2011). Actualizing high-loyalty recreation in Canada: Reflections on 3 years of training. *Medical attendant Instruction Today*, 31(7), p. 671.
- Hyland, J. R., and Hawkins, M. C. (2009). High-devotion human reproduction in nursing training: A survey of writing and guide for performance. *Showing and Learning in Nursing*, 4(1), pp. 14-21.
- Irby, B. J., Darker, G., Lara-Alecio, R., and Jackson, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of instructive hypotheses*. Charlotte, NC: Data Age.
- Leather expert, C. A. (2006). Adopting the thought process of a medical caretaker: An examination based model of clinical judgment in nursing. *Diary of Nursing Training*, 45(6), pp. 204-211.
- Mariani, B., Cantrell, M. A., Meakim, C., Prieto, P., and Dreifuerst, K. T. (2013). Organized questioning and students' clinical judgment capacities in recreation. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 9(5), pp. e147-e155. doi:10.1016/j.ecns.2011.11.009
- Page-Cuttrara, K. (2014). Utilization of prebriefing in nursing recreation: A writing audit. *Diary of Nursing Training*, 53(3), pp. 136-141. doi:10.3928/01484836-20140211-07
- Rourke, L., Schmidt, M., and Garga, N. (2010). Hypothesis based research of high devotion simulation use in nursing training: A survey of the writing. *Global Diary of Nursing Training Grant*, 7(1), 14p. doi:10.2202/1548-923X.1965
- Sportsman, S., Bolton, C., Bradshaw, P., Close, D., Lee, M., Townley, N., and Watson, M. N. (2009). A territorial recreation focus association: Joint effort to enhance staff and understudy competency. *Diary of Proceeding with Training in Nursing*, 40(2), pp. 67-73.
- Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Utilizing multivariate insights* (sixth ed.). Upper Seat Waterway, NJ: Pearson Training.
- Wagner, D., Bear, M., and Sander, J. (2009). Transforming recreation into reality: Expanding understudy ability and certainty. *Diary of Nursing Training*, 48(8), pp. 465-467. doi:10.3928/01484836-20090518-07

Corresponding Author

Ms. Bemina J. A.*

Associate Professor, ESIC College of Nursing, Gulbarga

E-Mail – djoy143@gmail.com