

# The effect of simulation-based education on student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric patients: An observational study

Judith Hough (✉ [judyhough@hotmail.com](mailto:judyhough@hotmail.com))

Australian Catholic University <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4264-9823>

**Daniel Levan**

Australian Catholic University

**Michael Steele**

Australian Catholic University

**Kristine Kelly**

Queensland Health

**Megan Dalton**

Australian Catholic University

---

## Research article

**Keywords:** Simulation, paediatrics, physiotherapy

**Posted Date:** July 23rd, 2019

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.11836/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published on December 16th, 2019. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1894-2>.

# Abstract

The Australian Physiotherapy Council mandates that physiotherapy clinical education be sufficient to produce graduates who are competent to practice across the lifespan. Due to a lack of opportunities for paediatric clinical placements, there is a risk of graduates not having the opportunity to develop competency in paediatric physiotherapy. To address this risk, simulation-based education (SBE) has been proposed as an additional educational strategy, and despite encouraging evidence for its use in physiotherapy education, there is limited evidence supporting its use specifically in paediatric populations. The aims of this research were to investigate the effect of SBE on student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric clients, and to determine student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy. Three interactive SBE sessions were run during the undergraduate paediatric physiotherapy unit at the campus of one Australian university. Self-efficacy was surveyed before and after each session, to determine confidence in clinical skills, clinical decision-making, treatment preparation and planning, communication skills; evaluating and modifying interventions, and interprofessional practice. Student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy was surveyed after the final SBE session. For the 164 participants included in this study, self-efficacy survey response rate varied from 77-96% for each session. Significant increases in mean student self-efficacy were recorded for all questions ( $p < 0.001$ ). A total of 139 (85%) responded to the questionnaire with 78.6% indicating they were very satisfied with SBE as a learning strategy. Written comments from 41 participants identified 'experience' as the primary theme. Conclusion: SBE had a significant positive effect on student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric clients. Students also perceived SBE to be a valuable learning experience. Future research is needed to investigate whether SBE improves student performance and how SBE compares to standard educational methods.

## Background

In physiotherapy undergraduate courses, clinical education constitutes approximately a third of the program, with students spending between 900–1000 hours in supervised clinical time with patients. This professional practice component is required for program accreditation by the Australian Physiotherapy Council (APC).(1)

Clinical education relies on the availability of a diverse range of patients, however the scenarios students are exposed to vary depending on the patients present during the placement.(2) Individual learning experiences vary in this model, creating learning environments which may be opportunistic, unstructured and disparate.(3) Furthermore, students may get inadequate exposure to higher risk patients, resulting in additional missed learning opportunities.(4)

In addition to these challenges, paediatric placements are limited due to a lack of suitably qualified paediatric physiotherapists to act as educators.(5) Students may therefore not have the opportunity to develop competency in paediatric physiotherapy practice prior to registration as a physiotherapist, despite the APC's requirement for development of competency across the lifespan.(1)

To address the limitations of clinical education in general, and more specifically in paediatric physiotherapy education, simulation-based education (SBE) has been proposed as an additional educational strategy. SBE attempts to replicate real-life experiences through simulated scenarios, environments or patients, creating a safe environment where clinical confidence and competence can be developed.(6, 7) With SBE, learning experiences can be tailored to specific learning objectives and can be set up on demand, eliminating the dependence on patient availability.(2) If implemented successfully, SBE can guarantee provision of consistent and diverse learning experiences and include exposure to scenarios that are clinically uncommon, promoting a more equitable learning experience for all students.

SBE has been shown to be an effective method for learning a range of physiotherapy skills, including hands-on (2, 8–19) and interdisciplinary skills (including teamwork and communication).(20–27) Up to 25% of clinical placement experiences may be replaced by SBE without compromising student learning.(28, 29) Changes to student attitudes have also been reported following SBE,(30–33) including improved motivation to learn (30) and improved awareness of physiotherapy core values.(32, 33) Students have generally viewed SBE as a positive learning experience (2, 15, 20, 25, 34–40) and while this does not equate to an actual learning effect, it may influence motivation to learn.(41)

Improved levels of student self-efficacy have also been demonstrated with SBE,(28, 29, 32, 36–40, 42, 43) where self-efficacy is defined as an individual's personal judgment in their own ability to successfully accomplish a task.(44) Self-efficacy is a key attribute in professional practice as there is a demonstrated relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance, such as performance in clinical environments.(45)

Despite this encouraging evidence for the use of SBE in physiotherapy education, there is insufficient evidence supporting the use of SBE specifically in paediatric populations. Considering the limited clinical learning opportunities available in paediatric physiotherapy, it is important for alternative methods of education to be considered. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to investigate the effect of SBE on student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric clients. A secondary aim of this study was to determine student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy.

## Methods

This study was a prospective, observational study using self-efficacy questionnaires and a reactionnaire to survey student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy.

## Participants

Students studying physiotherapy at an Australian university campus were eligible for admission to the study if there were enrolled in the Paediatric Physiotherapy Practice unit of study in 2014 or 2018 and consented to participate. Students who have previously attended any classes in the Paediatric Physiotherapy Practice unit (or equivalent) were excluded from the study.

Written consent was obtained prior to commencement of the first scenario. Human Research Ethics clearance was obtained through the institute HREC committee (2018–56E).

## Outcome Measures

The primary outcome measured in this research project was student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric patients. Student self-efficacy was measured using a self-efficacy questionnaire currently used throughout Queensland by the Simulated Learning in Paediatric Allied Health (SLIPAH) team. This questionnaire was developed in 2010 by SLIPAH in collaboration with Clinical Skills Development Service (CSDS), a Queensland Government training provider. The questionnaire was designed to evaluate the efficacy of SBE against the second level (learning) of Kirkpatrick-Phillips' model of training evaluation, an established framework for the evaluation of training programs.<sup>(46)</sup> The second level of *learning* refers to changes in knowledge, skills or attitudes and is often described as a transfer of knowledge. It does not include behavioural changes or practical application resulting from these changes in knowledge, skills or attitudes.<sup>(46)</sup>

Student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy was the secondary outcome of this project and was measured using a reactionnaire. This reactionnaire was adapted by the SLIPAH team from designs initially published by Leslie Rae, <sup>(47)</sup> and was intended to establish student levels of engagement with SBE. This evaluates the first level (reaction) of Kirkpatrick-Phillip's model of training evaluation, which refers to how trainees reacted to the training.<sup>(46)</sup> Both questionnaires used a Likert 5-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (not at all confident/learning nothing) to 4 (totally confident/learned a lot). The reactionnaire also gave participants the opportunity to add comments to provide additional feedback on their experience.

## Study Procedure

This study was run over 2 separate years, 2014 and 2018. Interactive SBE sessions using paediatric human patient simulators were run during the Paediatric Physiotherapy Practice practical classes in weeks 4, 8 and 12 of a 12-week semester (Figure 1). The scenario for each SBE session specifically targeted one of the primary clinical domains of paediatric physiotherapy and was delivered with the corresponding modules of the unit. All SBE sessions were designed and conducted by the SLIPAH group in consultation with university teaching staff and form part of the regular unit curriculum.

Self-efficacy questionnaires were completed by participants in the first 5 minutes of each session and were collected prior to commencement of the scenario. A second, identical questionnaire was given to each participant at the completion of the SBE scenario. At the completion of the final SBE session the reactionnaire was also given to participants and collected as students left the session. All questionnaires were given in paper format.

# Statistical Analysis

To analyse the pre-post differences in self-efficacy for each of the three scenarios, a Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test and a descriptive statistics report was undertaken using IBM SPSS Version 25 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY, USA). A p-value of 0.05 was considered significant.

To report student satisfaction with SBE, descriptive statistics were used to report on quantitative data and a thematic analysis with Leximancer software Leximancer (Leximancer Pty Ltd, Brisbane, Australia) was used to report qualitative data.

## Results

From the cohort of ninety-two (92) students enrolled in the Paediatric Physiotherapy Practice unit in 2018, 1 student was excluded due to previous enrolment and 1 student declined to participate, 86/90 students (96%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for SBE scenario 1, 82/90 students (91%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for scenario 2, 77/90 students (86%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for scenario 3, and 77/90 students (86%) completed the learning reactionnaire.

From the cohort of seventy-four (74) students enrolled in the Paediatric Physiotherapy Practice unit in 2014, 70/74 students (95%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for SBE scenario 1, 67/74 students (91%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for SBE scenario 2, 57/74 students (77%) completed both pre and post SBE questionnaires for SBE scenario 3, and 62/74 (84%) students completed the learning reactionnaire.

## Self-efficacy

Significant increases in mean student self-efficacy were recorded for all questions in each scenario ( $p < 0.001$ ) with improvements in mean self-efficacy scores ranging from 0.73–0.97 for all questions across all scenarios (Tables 1–3). Question 2 (clinical decision-making) had the largest mean improvement to self-efficacy in 2 out of the 3 scenarios (musculoskeletal and cardiorespiratory) as well as the largest mean improvement overall (0.93), while question 4 (maintaining communication with nurse, carer and child) had the lowest mean improvement in 2 out of the 3 scenarios (musculoskeletal and cardiorespiratory) as well as the lowest mean improvement overall (0.77). Questions 4 and 7 had the highest pre and post SBE scores in all 3 scenarios, and respectively had the highest pre (1.99, 1.91) and post (2.76, 2.72) scores overall. Question 2 had the lowest pre and post SBE scores in every scenario and overall (pre = 1.48, post = 2.41).

In every question, participants who reported an increase in self-efficacy post SBE (positive ranks) outnumbered participants who reported a decrease (negative ranks) or no change (ties). For all questions

across all scenarios: positive ranks ranged from 62.8–80.8% of respondents; negative ranks ranged from 0–2.6% of respondents; and ties ranged from 19.2–34.6% of respondents. Question 1 (preparation for treating paediatric patients) and Question 2 (clinical decision-making) had the highest number of positive ranks recorded in 2 out of the 3 scenarios (musculoskeletal and cardiorespiratory), while Question 4 (maintaining communication) had the highest number of negative ranks and ties in 2 out of the 3 scenarios (cardiorespiratory and neurological). Question 4 also had the highest number of total negative ranks (10) and ties (147) recorded across all scenarios (Table 4).

## Student Satisfaction with SBE as a Learning Strategy

There was a total of 139 responses to the questionnaire, 62 (83.8%) in 2014 and 77 (85.6%) in 2018 (Table 5). Most student responses (78.6%) indicated that the SBE scenarios were an effective model for promoting learning in the field of paediatric physiotherapy. Mean responses ranged from 2.76 to 3.12 for all questions. The mean rating for Question 2 (promotion of self-directed learning) of 2.76 was substantially lower than the other questions, which ranged from 3.01–3.12. For the entire questionnaire, there was only 1 response with a rating of 0 (0.1%) and 14 recorded ratings of 1 (1.7%).

Of the 62 questionnaire responses submitted in 2014, there were 20 (32.3%) written comments, and for the 77 in 2018, there were 21 (27.3%) written comments. The primary theme identified was experience (reported in 13 (32%) comments) and was mentioned alongside the concepts of skills, practical, helped, information, and simulated. Other themes mentioned included learning (7), thank (5), need and groups (3), and love (2). (Figure 4)

## Discussion

Significant improvements in student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric clients was found with SBE, demonstrating that students felt improved confidence in clinical skills, clinical decision-making, treatment preparation and planning, communication skills, evaluating and modifying interventions and interprofessional practice. These improvements mirror previous research conducted in an adult physiotherapy context.(36, 37, 42)

Students showed the largest improvements in Question 2, indicating that students perceived the greatest improvements to their clinical decision-making skills. Interestingly, this question had the lowest pre and post SBE scores in all scenarios, demonstrating that despite the improvement, students remained least confident in their clinical decision-making skills. Students have had limited opportunities to develop their clinical decision-making skills at this stage of their learning, which is a possible explanation for their lower initial levels of confidence. Given this lack of experience, it is reasonable that a small amount of experience (such as a single SBE session) would be sufficient to cause a significant increase in confidence.

Conversely, Questions 4 and 7 had the highest pre and post SBE scores, while having the smallest overall improvements to self-efficacy. Students were most confident in their communication and inter professional skills and perceived the least amount of improvements to these skills. Previous research has also shown students to have higher levels of confidence in their communication skills compared to their confidence in treatment and hazard awareness.(43) It is likely that students were more confident with their communication and interpersonal skills prior to SBE as they have had the opportunity to develop these skills throughout the early years of their program of study. Furthermore, it is possible that additional learning experiences may be required to realise changes in these more well-developed skills. It is also possible that these smaller improvements to communication and interpersonal skills can be explained by a ceiling effect, given students' higher initial levels of confidence.

A lack of confidence working with children has been reported to be a barrier to graduates seeking employment in paediatric physiotherapy, and evidence suggests confidence in graduate paediatric physiotherapists is directly related to competence in communication skills.(48) Therefore, confidence in communication is particularly important for graduates seeking employment as a paediatric physiotherapist. Although the questions relating to communication skills (4 and 7) had the smallest improvements in self-efficacy, they were still statistically significant and the majority of students (64.9%) reported scores of 3 or higher after SBE, indicating that they had at least "a lot" of confidence in their communication and inter professional skills. It seems that the SBE has provided a level of confidence in communication skills which may aid reduction of the barriers to working in a paediatric context.

## **Student Satisfaction with SBE**

The secondary aim of this research project was to determine student satisfaction with SBE as a learning strategy. The response was positive, with most students considering that SBE met their style of learning, promoted self-directed learning, delivered evidence-based principles of paediatric physiotherapy, assisted in retention of paediatric physiotherapy, provided an ideal learning environment, and provided incentive for further skill development in paediatric physiotherapy. Only one student thought that SBE provided no incentive at all for further skill development in paediatric physiotherapy. These findings are consistent with two systematic reviews, which concluded that SBE is generally well received by students and an experience valuable to learning.(2, 8) The positive findings observed in the quantitative results were reflected by students' comments. The thematic analysis identified that students found SBE to be a beneficial and enjoyable learning experience.

Overall, the student response to SBE was positive, and if students respond well to this method of learning, it could suggest they are more likely to be engaged with the learning experience and be more motivated to learn.(41)

## **Translation to Performance**

While the improvements to self-efficacy observed in this study are significant, these improvements may not translate to an improved level of clinical performance. The self-efficacy questionnaires provide a measure of perceived confidence in students' knowledge, skills and attitudes, demonstrating that they have achieved a degree of *learning*, according to the Kirkpatrick-Phillips' model of training evaluation.(46) The questionnaires give no indication whether participants have applied what they've learned through changes in *behaviour*, the next tier in the Kirkpatrick-Phillips' model.(46) There are well-established links between self-efficacy and work-related performance (45) so it is reasonable to suggest that students who demonstrated improvements in self-efficacy following SBE would have improved performance following SBE. Previously, SBE has led to significant improvements in student performance, (28, 43) improved patient care and better patient outcomes,(49) strengthening the suggestion that these improvements to self-efficacy may translate to improved performance with real patients. However, students who receive SBE also may be more likely to overestimate their ability (50) and are likely to be less realistic in their self-evaluation in a simulated environment.(32) Therefore translation to improved performance should not be assumed based on these self-reported measures alone.

To measure performance, student behaviour would need to be evaluated in a standardised or clinical environment. There are established instruments for measuring performance, such as the validated Assessment of Physiotherapy Performance (APP) (51) or the Physical Therapy Clinical Performance Instrument (PT CPI).(52) The APP is currently used by Australian universities to evaluate the performance of students on clinical placement and has been used in other studies examining the efficacy of SBE.(28, 29, 43, 50, 53) In two previous studies, students who participated in SBE achieved superior grades, measured through their performance in the APP.(28, 43) It would be beneficial to conduct a follow-up study to determine if there are similar differences in student performance for this student group.

## Limitations

Although clear improvements to student self-efficacy following SBE were observed in this study, there is no comparison to standard educational methods. Without this comparison, it is not possible to determine whether the educational benefit gained from SBE differs from standard curriculum. This is especially important given the high cost of SBE, which is often a barrier to its implementation.(54)

Students completed their self-efficacy questionnaires immediately after the SBE scenarios ended, meaning that the results only reflect the short-term effect of SBE. Although some students commented that they felt SBE improved their retention of paediatric physiotherapy, without further investigation it is not possible to determine if SBE had any long-lasting effects. There is also no measure on actual student performance.

By comparing APP results of paediatric placements, we could investigate if there is any difference between the performance of students who participated in SBE and those who received standard curriculum, as well as gain information on the long-term effects of SBE, as clinical placements occur months after the SBE ends.

There is no information on whether SBE changed students desire to work in paediatric physiotherapy in the future. Results from reactionnaire Question 6 (incentive to develop skills further in paediatric physiotherapy) offers some support for this, with 82% responses recorded as “a lot” or “totally”, demonstrating that students had incentive to further develop paediatric physiotherapy skills following SBE. However, this does not mean students would pursue paediatric physiotherapy opportunities. To get a better indication of this, it would be beneficial to ask students if SBE has increased the likelihood of them pursuing a career in paediatric physiotherapy or requesting a paediatric placement in future research in this area.

Only undergraduate university students were included in this study, so results should not be extrapolated and applied to other populations such as junior, employed physiotherapists. Furthermore, participants were all from one campus of one Australian university and may not accurately represent students of other campuses or Australian universities.

## Conclusion

The results of the self-efficacy questionnaire were clearly positive, with significant improvements to student self-efficacy post SBE recorded for every question, indicating that SBE has a positive effect on student self-efficacy in the physiotherapy assessment and management of paediatric clients. Students also reported that they found SBE to be a valuable learning experience.

## Abbreviations

*ACU*: Australian Catholic University

*APC*: Australian Physiotherapy Council

*APP*: Assessment of Physiotherapy Performance

*CSDS*: Clinical Skills Development Service

*HREC*: Human Research Ethics Committee

*PT CPI*: Physical Therapy Clinical Performance Instrument

*SBE*: Simulation-based education

*SE*: Self-efficacy

*SLIPAH*: Simulated Learning in Paediatric Allied Health

## Declarations

## **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Ethical clearance was obtained through the ACU Human Research Ethics Committee (ACU HREC). Ethics Register Number: 2018–56E. Written consent was received for all participants through physical consent forms prior to research commencement.

## **Consent for publication**

All participants of this study provided written consent through the abovementioned form to the possible publication of their data.

## **Availability of data and materials**

**The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.**

## **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

## **Funding**

There was no funding received for this research project.

## **Authors' contributions**

All authors (JH, DL, MS, KK, MD) participated in the data analysis and in the development and revision of the manuscript. In addition, DL conducted the data collection.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would also like to acknowledge the SLIPAH team for developing the questionnaires and accommodating researchers in the SBE sessions.

## **Tables**

**Table 1:** Change in self-efficacy after SBE scenario 1 (musculoskeletal) for combined 2014 and 2018 cohort, where 0="not at all", 1="a little", 2="moderately", 3="a lot" and 4="totally" confident.

Question	Mean Pre Score	Mean Post Score	Mean Difference	P-Value	Negative Ranks	Positive Ranks	Ties	Total
Q1	1.54 ± 0.57	2.48 ± 0.62	0.94	< 0.001	0 (0%)	126 (80.8%)	30 (19.2%)	156
Q2	1.48 ± 0.61	2.45 ± 0.66	0.97	< 0.001	1 (0.6%)	122 (78.7%)	32 (20.6%)	155
Q3	1.71 ± 0.65	2.66 ± 0.62	0.95	< 0.001	1 (0.6%)	116 (74.8%)	38 (24.5%)	155
Q4	2.04 ± 0.72	2.77 ± 0.71	0.73	< 0.001	4 (2.6%)	99 (63.5%)	53 (34%)	156
Q5	1.67 ± 0.69	2.54 ± 0.62	0.86	< 0.001	3 (1.9%)	109 (69.9%)	44 (28.2%)	156
Q6	1.56 ± 0.70	2.48 ± 0.61	0.92	< 0.001	2 (1.3%)	118 (75.6%)	36 (23.1%)	156
Q7	2.01 ± 0.76	2.78 ± 0.66	0.76	< 0.001	4 (2.6%)	98 (62.8%)	54 (34.6%)	156

**Table 2:** Change in self-efficacy after SBE scenario 2 (cardiorespiratory) for combined 2014 and 2018 cohort, where 0="not at all", 1="a little", 2="moderately", 3="a lot" and 4="totally" confident.

Question	Mean Pre Score	Mean Post Score	Mean Difference	P-Value	Negative Ranks	Positive Ranks	Ties	Total
Q1	1.55 ± 0.61	2.43 ± 0.63	0.88	< 0.001	1 (0.7%)	110 (73.8%)	38 (25.5%)	149
Q2	1.49 ± 0.61	2.38 ± 0.65	0.89	< 0.001	2 (1.3%)	107 (71.8%)	40 (26.8%)	149
Q3	1.67 ± 0.64	2.52 ± 0.62	0.85	< 0.001	2 (1.4%)	107 (72.3%)	39 (26.4%)	148
Q4	1.98 ± 0.72	2.76 ± 0.67	0.78	< 0.001	3 (2%)	97 (65.1%)	49 (32.9%)	149
Q5	1.60 ± 0.63	2.45 ± 0.67	0.85	< 0.001	0 (0%)	107 (71.8%)	42 (28.2%)	149
Q6	1.58 ± 0.63	2.40 ± 0.69	0.81	< 0.001	3 (2%)	102 (68.5%)	44 (29.5%)	149
Q7	1.85 ± 0.70	2.71 ± 0.64	0.86	< 0.001	0 (0%)	104 (69.8%)	45 (30.2%)	149

**Table 3:** Change in self-efficacy after SBE scenario 3 (neurological) for combined 2014 and 2018 cohort, where 0="not at all", 1="a little", 2="moderately", 3="a lot" and 4="totally" confident.

Question	Mean Pre Score	Mean Post Score	Mean Difference	P-Value	Negative Ranks	Positive Ranks	Ties	Total
Q1	1.55 ± 0.58	2.41 ± 0.66	0.86	< 0.001	2 (1.5%)	98 (73.1%)	34 (25.4%)	134
Q2	1.47 ± 0.61	2.40 ± 0.65	0.93	< 0.001	2 (1.5%)	101 (75.4%)	31 (23.1%)	134
Q3	1.67 ± 0.64	2.56 ± 0.63	0.89	< 0.001	1 (0.7%)	96 (71.6%)	37 (27.6%)	134
Q4	1.96 ± 0.67	2.74 ± 0.68	0.79	< 0.001	3 (2.2%)	86 (64.2%)	45 (33.6%)	134
Q5	1.67 ± 0.56	2.44 ± 0.61	0.77	< 0.001	1 (0.8%)	90 (68.7%)	40 (30.5%)	131
Q6	1.56 ± 0.62	2.51 ± 0.73	0.95	< 0.001	2 (1.5%)	100 (74.6%)	32 (23.9%)	134
Q7	1.86 ± 0.67	2.67 ± 0.68	0.81	< 0.001	1 (0.7%)	92 (68.7%)	41 (30.6%)	134

**Table 4:** Change in self-efficacy for all sessions combined, where 0="not at all", 1="a little", 2="moderately", 3="a lot" and 4="totally" confident.

Question	Mean Pre Score	Mean Post Score	Post scores $\geq 3$	Mean Difference	P-Value	Negative Ranks	Positive Ranks	Ties	Total
1	1.55 $\pm$ 0.59	2.45 $\pm$ 0.63	196 (44.6%)	0.90	< 0.001	3 (0.7%)	334 (76.1%)	102 (23.2%)	439
2	1.48 $\pm$ 0.61	2.41 $\pm$ 0.65	192 (43.8%)	0.93	< 0.001	5 (1.1%)	330 (75.3%)	103 (23.5%)	438
3	1.68 $\pm$ 0.64	2.58 $\pm$ 0.62	240 (54.9%)	0.90	< 0.001	4 (0.9%)	319 (73%)	114 (26.1%)	437
4	1.99 $\pm$ 0.71	2.76 $\pm$ 0.69	293 (66.7%)	0.77	< 0.001	10 (2.3%)	282 (64.2%)	147 (33.5%)	439
5	1.65 $\pm$ 0.64	2.48 $\pm$ 0.63	195 (44.7%)	0.83	< 0.001	4 (0.9%)	306 (70.2%)	126 (28.9%)	436
6	1.57 $\pm$ 0.65	2.46 $\pm$ 0.68	204 (46.5%)	0.89	< 0.001	7 (1.6%)	320 (72.9%)	112 (25.5%)	439
7	1.91 $\pm$ 0.72	2.72 $\pm$ 0.66	277 (63.1%)	0.81	< 0.001	5 (1.1%)	294 (67%)	140 (31.9%)	439

**Table 5:** Summary of questionnaire responses for combined 2014 and 2018 cohort

Question	Score 0 (Not at all)	Score 1 (A little)	Score 2 (Moderately)	Score 3 (A lot)	Score 4 (Totally)	Range	Mean	Total
Q1	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	27 (19.6%)	80 (58%)	30 (21.7%)	3	3.01 ± 0.67	138
Q2	0 (0%)	7 (5.1%)	38 (27.5%)	74 (53.6%)	19 (13.8%)	3	2.76 ± 0.75	138
Q3	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	27 (19.6%)	64 (46.4%)	46 (33.3%)	3	3.12 ± 0.74	138
Q4	0 (0%)	2 (1.5%)	26 (19%)	75.5 (55.1%)*	34.5 (25.2%)*	3	3.03 ± 0.71	137
Q5	0 (0%)	2 (1.5%)	22 (16.1%)	72 (52.6%)	41 (29.9%)	3	3.11 ± 0.71	137
Q6	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	23 (16.7%)	74 (53.6%)	39 (28.3%)	4	3.08 ± 0.74	138
<b>Total</b>	1 (0.1%)	14 (1.7%)	163 (19.7%)	439.5 (53.1%)	209.5 (25.3%)	4	3.02 ± 0.73	827

\*1 participant submitted a score of 3.5 for question 4.

## References

1. Australian Physiotherapy Council. Accreditation Standard for Physiotherapy Practitioner Programs December 2016 [cited 2017 14/05/2017]. Available from: <https://physiocouncil.com.au/media/1241/accreditation-standard-final-16122016.pdf>.
2. Pritchard SA, Blackstock FC, Nestel D, Keating JL. Simulated Patients in Physical Therapy Education: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Physical therapy*. 2016;96(9):1342–53.
3. Weller JM, Nestel D, Marshall SD, Brooks PM, Conn JJ. Simulation in clinical teaching and learning. *The Medical Journal of Australia*. 2012;196(9):594-.
4. Blackstock FC, Jull GA. High-fidelity patient simulation in physiotherapy education. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2007;53(1):3–5.


5. Queensland Physiotherapy Placement Collaborative. Queensland Physiotherapy Placement Collaborative—Clinical Network Reports (2009–2016). Brisbane, Australia; 2016.
6. Clerihew L, Rowney D, Ker J. Simulation in paediatric training. *Archives Of Disease In Childhood Education And Practice Edition*. 2016;101(1):8–14.
7. Ryall T, Judd BK, Gordon CJ. Simulation-based assessments in health professional education: a systematic review. *Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare*. 2016;9:69–82.
8. Mori B, Carnahan H, Herold J. Use of Simulation Learning Experiences in Physical Therapy Entry-to-Practice Curricula: A Systematic Review. *Physiotherapy Canada*. 2015;67(2):194–202.
9. Anson E, Cook C, Camacho C, Gwilliam B, Karakostas T. The Use of an Educational Model in the Improvement of Student Reliability in Finding R1. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy*. 2003;11(4):204–12.
10. Chang JY, Chang GL, Chien CJC, Chung KC, Hsu AT. Effectiveness of two forms of feedback on training of a joint mobilization skill by using a joint translation simulator. *Physical Therapy*. 2007;87(4):418–30.
11. Gann N, Rogers C, Dudley A. A comparison of physical therapy students with and without instructions in ultrasound pressure application. *Journal of Allied Health*. 2002;31(2):103–5.
12. Hassam M, Williams M. Education via simulation: Teaching safe chest percussion for pre-term infants. *Hong Kong Physiotherapy Journal*. 2003;21:22–8.
13. Hewson K, Friel K. A Unique Preclinical Experience: Concurrent Mock and Pro Bono Clinics to Enhance Student Readiness. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*. 2004;18(1):80–6.
14. Hila J, Ellis E, Holmes W. Feedback withdrawal and changing compliance during manual hyperinflation. *Physiotherapy Research International*. 2002;7(2):53–64.
15. Keim Janssen SA, VanderMeulen SP, Shostrom VK, Lomneth CS. Enhancement of anatomical learning and developing clinical competence of first-year medical and allied health profession students. *Anatomical Sciences Education*. 2014;7(3):181–90.
16. Lee M, Moseley A, Refshauge K. Effect of feedback on learning a vertebral joint mobilization skill. *Physical therapy*. 1990;70(2):97–102.
17. Sanders BR, Ruvolo JF. Mock clinic. An approach to clinical education. *Physical Therapy*. 1981;61(8):1163–7.
18. Snodgrass SJ, Odelli RA. Objective concurrent feedback on force parameters improves performance of lumbar mobilisation, but skill retention declines rapidly. *Physiotherapy*. 2011;98(1):47–56.

- 19.van Zoest GGJM, Staes FFGM, Stappaerts KH. Three-Dimensional Manual Contact Force Evaluation of Graded Perpendicular Push Force Delivery by Second-Year Physiotherapy Students During Simple Feedback Training. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 2007;30(6):438–49.
- 20.Buckley S, Hensman M, Thomas S, Dudley R, Nevin G, Coleman J. Developing interprofessional simulation in the undergraduate setting: experience with five different professional groups. *Journal Of Interprofessional Care*. 2012;26(5):362–9.
- 21.King J, Beanlands S, Fiset V, Chartrand L, Clarke S, Findlay T, et al. Using interprofessional simulation to improve collaborative competences for nursing, physiotherapy, and respiratory therapy students. *Journal Of Interprofessional Care*. 2016;30(5):599–605.
- 22.Rossler KL, Kimble LP. Capturing readiness to learn and collaboration as explored with an interprofessional simulation scenario: A mixed-methods research study. *Nurse Education Today*. 2016;36:348–53.
- 23.Seefeldt TM, Mort JR, Brockevelt B, Giger J, Jordre B, Lawler M, et al. A pilot study of interprofessional case discussions for health professions students using the virtual world Second Life. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*. 2012;4(4):224–31.
- 24.Shoemaker MJ, de Voest M, Booth A, Meny L, Victor J. A virtual patient educational activity to improve interprofessional competencies: A randomized trial. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2015;29(4):395–7.
- 25.Shoemaker MJ, Platko CM, Cleghorn SM, Booth A. Virtual patient care: an interprofessional education approach for physician assistant, physical therapy and occupational therapy students. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2014;28(4):365–7.
- 26.Solomon P, Salfi J. Evaluation of an interprofessional education communication skills initiative. *Education for Health: Change in Learning & Practice*. 2011;24(2):10p-p.
- 27.Wamsley M, Staves J, Kroon L, Topp K, Hossaini M, Newlin B, et al. The impact of an interprofessional standardized patient exercise on attitudes toward working in interprofessional teams. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2012;26(1):28–35.
- 28.Blackstock FC, Watson KM, Morris NR, Jones A, Wright A, McMeeken JM, et al. Simulation can contribute a part of cardiorespiratory physiotherapy clinical education: two randomized trials. *Simulation in healthcare: journal of the Society for Simulation in Healthcare*. 2013;8(1):32–42.
- 29.Watson K, Wright A, Morris N, McMeeken J, Rivett D, Blackstock F, et al. Can simulation replace part of clinical time? Two parallel randomised controlled trials. *Medical Education*. 2012;46(7):657–67.
- 30.Dennis D, Furness A, Parry S. Challenging conversations with simulated patients. *The Clinical Teacher*. 2017;14(6):397–400.

- 31.Hale LS, Lewis DK, Eckert RM, Wilson CM, Smith BS. Standardized patients and multidisciplinary classroom instruction for physical therapist students to improve interviewing skills and attitudes about diabetes. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*. 2006;20(1):22–7.
- 32.Hayward LM, Blackmer B. A model for teaching and assessing core values development in doctor of physical therapy students. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*. 2010;24(3):16–26.
- 33.Hayward LM, Blackmer B, Markowski A. Standardized patients and communities of practice: a realistic strategy for integrating the core values in a physical therapist education program. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*. 2006;20(2):29–37.
- 34.Bishop KL, Sharp J, Ohtake PJ. A Hybrid Simulation-Based Pre-Professional Physical Therapist Intensive Care Unit Course. *Journal of Acute Care Physical Therapy*. 2017;8(2):65–75.
- 35.Giesbrecht EM, Wener PF, Pereira GM. A mixed methods study of student perceptions of using standardized patients for learning and evaluation. *Advances In Medical Education And Practice*. 2014;5:241–55.
- 36.Mandrusiak AM, Isles R, Chang AT, Choy NLL, Toppenberg R, McCook D, et al. Senior physiotherapy students as standardised patients for junior students enhances self-efficacy and satisfaction in both junior and senior students. *BMC Medical Education*. 2014;14(1):105-.
- 37.Ohtake PJ, Lazarus M, Schillo R, Rosen M. Simulation Experience Enhances Physical Therapist Student Confidence in Managing a Patient in the Critical Care Environment. *Physical Therapy*. 2013;93(2):216–28.
- 38.Shoemaker MJ, Riemersma L, Perkins R. Use of high fidelity human simulation to teach physical therapist decision-making skills for the intensive care setting. *Cardiopulmonary Physical Therapy Journal*. 2009;20(1):13–8.
- 39.Silberman NJ, Panzarella KJ, Melzer BA. Using human simulation to prepare physical therapy students for acute care clinical practice. *Journal Of Allied Health*. 2013;42(1):25–32.
- 40.Smith BM, Scherer BS, Jones BL, Weis-Rodriguez BJ. An Intensive Care Unit Simulation for Patients With Neurologic Disorders. *Neurology Report*. 1996;20(1):47–50.
- 41.Kirkpatrick DL. *Evaluating training programs: the four levels*. 2nd ed. San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco, Calif.: Berrett-Koehler Publishers; 1998.
- 42.Nithman RW, Spiegel JJ, Lorello D. Effect of high-fidelity ICU simulation on a physical therapy student’s perceived readiness for clinical education. *Journal of Acute Care Physical Therapy*. 2016;7(1):16–24.


43. Wright A, Moss P, Dennis DM, Harrold M, Levy S, Furness AL, et al. The influence of a full-time, immersive simulation-based clinical placement on physiotherapy student confidence during the transition to clinical practice. *Advances in Simulation*. 2018;3:3.
44. Gallagher MW. Self-Efficacy. In: Ramachandran VS, editor. *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*. 4. 2nd ed. Burlington: Burlington: Elsevier Science; 2012.
45. Stajkovic AD, Luthans F. Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*. 1998;124(2):240–61.
46. Phillips JJ. *Return on investment in training and performance improvement programs*: Routledge; 2012.
47. Rae L. *Using Evaluation in Training and Development*: Kogan Page; 1999.
48. Black LL, Jensen GM, Mostrom E, Perkins J, Ritzline PD, Hayward L, et al. The first year of practice: an investigation of the professional learning and development of promising novice physical therapists. (Research Report). *Physical Therapy*. 2010;90(12):1758–73.
49. McGaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Cohen ER, Barsuk JH, Wayne DB. Does simulation-based medical education with deliberate practice yield better results than traditional clinical education? A meta-analytic comparative review of the evidence. *Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. 2011;86(6):706–11.
50. Jones A, Sheppard L. Self-efficacy and clinical performance: A physiotherapy example. *Advances in Physiotherapy*. 2011;13(2):79–83.
51. Dalton M, Davidson M, Keating J. The Assessment of Physiotherapy Practice (APP) is a valid measure of professional competence of physiotherapy students: a cross-sectional study with Rasch analysis. *Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2011;57(4):239–46.
52. Roach KE, Frost JS, Francis NJ, Giles S, Nordrum JT, Delitto A. Validation of the Revised Physical Therapist Clinical Performance Instrument (PT CPI): Version 2006. *Physical therapy*. 2012;92(3):416–28.
53. Jones A, Sheppard L. Use of a human patient simulator to improve physiotherapy cardiorespiratory clinical skills in undergraduate physiotherapy students: a randomised controlled trial. *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences & Practice*. 2011;9(1):1–11.
54. Paparella-Pitzel S, Edmond S, DeCaro C. The Use of Standardized Patients in Physical Therapist Education Programs. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*. 2009;23(2):15–23.

## Figures



**Figure 1**

Timeline of study procedure



**Figure 2**

Leximancer concept map illustrating the main concepts identified by the students in the questionnaire and how they interrelate with each other.