



The Effects on Caring Behavior of Nursing Students with Different Phases of Clinical Practice in a 5-year Junior College in Southern Taiwan

Chao An-Na¹, Ho Hsueh-Jen², Yu Ching-Len³, Chang Ai-Ping⁴

MSN, RN, Lecturer, Department of Nursing, National Tainan Institute of Nursing, Taiwan^{1,2,4};
Assistant Professor, Department of Environmental Engineering Kun Shan University, Taiwan³

Purpose

The aim of this study was to compare the caring behaviors and related factors among nursing students with the initial and final phase of clinical practice in a 5-year Junior College.

Methods

Methodologically, a cross-sectional survey with a self-administered structured questionnaire in the first and the final phase of clinical practice during practicum was implemented for this purpose. Subjects of this survey were recruited from students of one 5-year Junior College located in Southern Taiwan. A total of 123 subjects were recruited. Cronbach's Alpha and content validity were conducted to assess the reliability and validity of scales. Collecting questionnaire data was anonymous. The data was analyzed by descriptive and inferential statistics.

Results

As presented in Table 1, most of participants were female (n=120; 97.56%). Average age of them was 19.73 years at final stage in clinical practice; 102(82.9%) had religion; 68(55.3%) was introvert personality; 108(87.8%) had no work part time; 92(74.8%) had no after-school class. Most of the participants were interested in nursing courses (n=65; 52.8%) and in clinical practice (n=80; 65%). There were significant difference in being interested in nursing courses ($p<.05$) and in clinical practice ($p<.01$) at final stage of the practicum. Table 2 summarized comparisons between first and final stage of clinical practice in Caring Behavior Scale (CBS), support from the clinical workplace, teachers' characteristics, and clinical teaching strategies. The mean score of CBS in the first and final phase was 50.78 and 54.68 separately. Results also showed that there were differences between both phases of clinical practicum were found in caring behavior ($p<.01$) and support from the clinical workplace ($p<.001$). Hence, the significant predictors of the caring behavior score among subjects in the final phase included interest in nursing practicum and support from clinical workplace. The total amount of variance could be explained 34.0%.

Conclusion

The findings demonstrate that the caring behavior of nursing students has been promoted through continuous clinical practicum program. Nursing faculty and nursing practitioner should inspire the students to learn the caring behaviors with diverse teaching strategies and be set up as an example of a role model.

KEY WORDS : caring behavior, teaching strategy, clinical practicum, nursing students
E-mail: chao@mail.ntin.edu.tw

Table 1:
Demographics and First-Final CBS of the Study Population (N=123)

Variable	N(%) / M \pm SD	First-CBS		Final-CBS	
		M \pm SD	t/F	M \pm SD	t/F
Age	19.73 \pm .62				
Religion			t=-1.58		t=0.17
Yes	102(82.9)	51.59 \pm 12.76		54.62 \pm 9.87	
No	21(17.1)	46.85 \pm 10.82		55.00 \pm 7.73	
Characteristics			t=-1.47		t=-3.78
Introvert	68(55.3)	49.29 \pm 12.44		51.91 \pm 9.06	
Extrovert	55(44.7)	52.64 \pm 12.53		58.10 \pm 9.00	
Work part time			t=-1.47		t=.93
No	108(87.8)	49.91 \pm 12.09		54.98 \pm 9.01	
Yes	15(12.8)	57.13 \pm 14.26		52.53 \pm 12.75	
After-school class			t=.34		t=.57
No	92(74.8)	51.01 \pm 13.21		54.97 \pm 10.20	
Yes	31(25.2)	50.13 \pm 10.44		53.84 \pm 7.19	
Hospital grade			t=-.65		t=2.38*
Region	71(57.7)	50.15 \pm 12.18		56.39 \pm 9.43	
Area	52(42.3)	51.65 \pm 13.08		52.35 \pm 9.20	
Interested in nursing courses			F=.59		F=.59*
Usually	65(52.8)	51.50 \pm 11.69		56.65 \pm 9.11	
ordinary	49(39.8)	50.59 \pm 13.80		52.79 \pm 8.48	
A little	9(7.3)	46.67 \pm 11.67		50.78 \pm 14.65	
Interested in practicum			F=.30		F=5.29**
Usually	80(65)	51.44 \pm 11.68		56.65 \pm 8.49	
ordinary	33(26.8)	49.57 \pm 14.54		50.76 \pm 10.07	
A little	10(8.1)	49.60 \pm 13.04		51.90 \pm 11.54	
Academic performance			F=.29		F=2.27
Above 80	68(55.3)	51.54 \pm 12.79		56.31 \pm 9.27	
70-79	47(38.2)	49.74 \pm 12.70		52.63 \pm 9.69	
60-69	8(6.5)	50.50 \pm 9.91		52.87 \pm 8.91	

PS: * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Table 2:
Comparisons of CBS, Support from Workplace, Teachers' Characteristics, Teaching Strategies Between First and Final Phase in Clinical Practice

Variable	M \pm SD	Pair-t	
		M \pm SD	t
CBS2-CBS1		3.89 \pm 14.19	3.04**
CBS2	54.68 \pm 9.51		
CBS1	50.78 \pm 12.54		
Support2-Support1		-3.62 \pm 6.26	-6.42***
Support2	34.62 \pm 4.85		
Support1	38.24 \pm 4.53		
T. Charac2-T. Charac1		-.74 \pm 6.52	-1.26
T. Charac2	34.15 \pm 4.83		
T. Charac1	34.89 \pm 4.98		
T. Strategies2- T. Strategies1		-.21 \pm 7.57	-.31
T. Strategies2	43.78 \pm 5.01		
T. Strategies1	44.00 \pm 6.06		

PS: 1. CBS2: Final-CBS; CBS1: First-CBS; Support2: Final Phase-Support from Clinical Workplace; Support1: First Phase-Support from Clinical Workplace; T. Charac2: Final Phase-Teachers' Characteristics; T. Charac1: First Phase-Teachers' Characteristics; T. Strategies2: Final Phase-Teaching Strategies; T. Strategies1: First Phase-Teaching Strategies.
2. * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$