RESEARCH





The effect of virtual reality on cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes in nursing staffs: systematic review and metaanalysis

Defi Efendi¹, Renny Wulan Apriliyasari², Juliana Gracia Eka Prihartami Massie³, Cho Lee Wong⁴, Regina Natalia⁵, Bejo Utomo³, Chiyar Edison Sunarya¹, Efa Apriyanti¹ and Kee-Hsin Chen^{6,7,8*}

Abstract

Background In the healthcare systems of the world, reinforcing the competence and professionalism of nurses has become a concern. Gaining clinical nursing competence in the healthcare system requires more effort, and additional training is required. Medical education and training have begun using digital technologies, such as virtual reality (VR). The purpose of this research was to examine the efficacy of VR in terms of cognitive, emotional, and psychomotor outcomes and learning satisfaction in nurses.

Method The study searched eight databases (Cochrane library, EBSCOHost, Embase, OVID MEDLINE, ProQuest, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science) for articles that met these criteria: (i) nursing staff, (ii) any virtual reality technology intervention for education, all levels of immersion, [1] randomized control trial and quasi-experiment study, and (iv) published articles and unpublished theses. The standardized mean difference was measured. The random effect model was applied to measure the main outcome of the study with a significance level of p < .05. The l² statistic assessment was applied to identify the level of heterogeneity of the study.

Results A total of 6740 studies were identified, of which 12 studies with 1470 participants met the criteria for inclusion. The meta-analysis showed a significant improvement in the cognitive aspect (standardized mean difference [SMD] = 1.48; 95% CI = 0.33–2.63; p = .011, $l^2 = 94.88\%$), the affective aspect (SMD = 0.59; 95% CI = 0.34–0.86; p < .001, $l^2 = 34.33\%$), the psychomotor aspect (SMD = 0.901; 95% CI = 0.49–1.31; p < .001, $l^2 = 80.33\%$), and learning satisfaction (SMD = 0.47; 95% CI = 0.17–0.77; p = .002, $l^2 = 0\%$) aspects of the groups that received the VR intervention compared to the control groups. Subgroup analysis found that dependent variables (e.g., level of immersion) did not improve study outcomes. The quality of evidence was low which is affected by major methodological issues.

Conclusions VR may favorable as alternative method to increase nurse competencies. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on larger samples are needed to strengthen the evidence for the effect of VR in various clinical nurse settings. ROSPERO registration number: CRD42022301260.

*Correspondence: Kee-Hsin Chen keehsin@tmu.edu.tw

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Keywords Affective, Cognitive, Learning satisfaction, Nursing staff, Psychomotor, Virtual reality

Background

Reinforcing the competency and professionalism of nurses has become an issue in healthcare systems around the world [2–4]. As professionals with whom patients spend their time the most [5], nurses make essential contributions to the positive experiences of the patients they care for [6]. There has been evidence that competent nurses have the ability to increase the quality of care [7] in terms of safety [8, 9], prevention of physical injury [10], respect toward cultural matters [11, 12], and patient satisfaction [13]. However, guaranteeing nurses' clinical competence in healthcare systems requires more effort [14, 15]. To address this, more training for nursing staffs is necessary [9].

Medical education and training have begun using digital technologies, such as the virtual world [16, 17]. Although the definition of the virtual world varies, its presence and use has become a major component of education technology [18], which uses instructional digital software called virtual reality (VR) [19, 20]. The term VR in this study refers to the virtual world that presents various forms of simulation technology in nurse education [16].

Nurses are different from other medical professionals in terms of the uniqueness of their knowledge and the art they perform in nursing care [21]. There have been studies of the healthcare workforce in general [21-23], but those results do not represent the nursing profession in particular. Studies of the use of VR with nurses are scarce [22], and some studies involved student nurses [16, 23, 24]. The outcomes in terms of knowledge, performance, self-efficacy, and communication skills have been applied only to nursing students [23, 25, 26]. Kyaw and colleagues suggested a study to evaluate VR with outcomes, including attitude, satisfaction, and behavior change, in future research because the findings in those areas are still limited [27]. Hence, a systematic review to measure the effectiveness of VR on professional nurses requires immediate attention. This meta-analysis is deemed the first to be conducted on nursing staffs in clinical service.

Besides the differences in the study background, previous meta-analyses have focused only on measuring knowledge levels as outcomes [25]. Therefore, by involving extracted literature reviews from a large database, this study will contribute additional findings to the previous ones. Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains [28, 29] was applied in this study to identify similar study outcomes. Through the research gap above, this study aims to [30] measured the effect of VR on cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes

Methods

Design, search strategy, and study selection

This study has been reported according to the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [31], and it has been registered with PROSPERO (No: CRD42022301260). Studies were collected from eight databases (CENTRAL from Cochrane library, CINAHL from EBSCOHost, Embase, MEDLINE from OVID, ProQuest, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science). For articles collected, there is no time limit. Articles from inception until May 2022 were collected using keywords combinations presented in Additional File 1. Then, two independent researchers performed the study screening using EndNote X9 software. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Eligibility criteria

The inclusion criteria in this study were: (i) nursing staff, (ii) any virtual reality technology intervention for education, all levels of immersion, [1] randomized control trial and quasi-experiment study, and (iv) published articles. The exclusion criteria consisted of: (i) pre-post test study without control grup,(ii) insufficient data for analyses, and [1] conference proceedings, abstract only, book chapters, reviews, letters, and editorials.

Intervention

The term virtual reality refers to the spatial system that represents the physical world [32]. The computer system in VR consists of input and output devices that separate and connect the user with the virtual world [33, 34]. Isolation in VR can lead to a sense of immersion and presence-concepts that define VR [35]. Immersion in the virtual world is the extent to which users feel part of that world in a multi-dimensional concept that includes telepresence [33]. VR can be displayed on various devices, such as computer monitor and three dimensional (3D) or two dimensional (2D) television [36, 37], and headmounted displays (HMDs) [33]. The keyboard, mouse, and trackball are examples of haptic interfaces in everyday life [33]. Avatars are often used to represent users in such simulations for creating real experiences in a virtual environment [36]. The level of immersion is a technical manipulation that can be applied to a broad range of paradigms [38]. The standardized classification of VR levels is described as VR: low, VR: medium, and VR: high [38, 39]. Comprehensive definition of the VR concepts in this study was summarized in Additional File 2.

Outcomes of the study and operational definitions

Bloom's taxonomy was used as the framework for classifying the learning outcomes from the articles included in this study. Bloom's taxonomy was developed as a tool for educators to classify learning objectives and skills for students (Larkin & Burton, 2008). In this approach, learning is categorized according to three taxonomic domains: the cognitive domain (knowledge), the affective domain (attitudes), and the psychomotor domain (skills) [28]. According to Benjamin Bloom and his colleagues, the cognitive domain refers to the ability to think and solve problems; the affective domain involves attitudes and value systems, and the psychomotor domain represents the ability to do things [40]. To simplify the definition, we use the original version of Bloom's taxonomy Details of the definitions in Bloom's taxonomy are Additional File 2 [28, 40-43].

Data extraction

Two independent investigator (RN, and CE) performed data extraction from the included studies. Information gained from each study included the first author, year of publication, country, participants, education level, age, experience, intervention and control group, results, size, study design, sample size, and key findings. Any discrepancy was resolved through a thorough discussion with the main author of this study.

Risk of bias in individual studies

Risk of bias was assessed using version 2 of the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trial studies. For randomized control trials included, bias from the randomization process, the effect of assignment to intervention, missing outcome data, outcome measurement, and the selection of the results report have been identified following the Cochrane guidelines [44]. Two reviewers independently completed the assessment of the risk of bias. Any conflicts were resolved by a third reviewer. Furthermore, the quality of the quasi-experimental studies used in this study was assessed using the JBI systematic review assessment [45]. The JBI critical assessment checklist for quasi-experimental studies comprises nine questions to assess threats to internal validity, namely on variables, participants included, interventions used, measurements of outcomes, and statistical analysis (Additional File 3).

Synthesis of results

The standardized mean difference was calculated using comprehensive meta-analysis (CMA) V.3 software to measure the main and additional research outputs in this study. The overall effect size was tested with the standardized mean difference (SMD) and determined by calculating the Z-statistic with a significance level of p < .05. A sensitivity analysis of publication bias was performed

[46] to assess the robustness of the studies' results [47]. The I^2 statistical assessment was used to determine the level of heterogeneity of the study [48] and to compare the impact of treatment from different interventions [49]. The Egger test [50] and visual inspection of the funnel plot asymmetry [51] were used to assess publication bias.

Meta-regression analysis of secondary data from factors influencing heterogeneity was performed on subgroups to identify and control for heterogeneity. A subgroup analysis was carried out on factors that were thought to affect the homogeneity of the study. Because the focus of this study was on the benefits of VR interventions, the variables included in the subgroup analysis were the level of immersion, head tracking, study design, and intervention context variables. The level of immersion was coded as high, moderate, or low. Head tracking was categorized into no head tracking and head tracking. Furthermore, randomized clinical trials (RCT) and quasiexperiments are elements of study design and intervention context categorized as emergency response and not emergency response. Meanwhile, the variables of screen resolution, field of view, refresh rate, and stereoscopy/3D were omitted from the subgroup analysis because of insufficient information. Non-visual stimuli and interactivity variables were not analyzed because they showed the same conditions in all studies. The variables of total sessions of interventions and total duration were analyzed in minutes, which is a continuous variable with meta-regression analysis to determine its effect on the main outcome of this study.

Results

Search results

A total of 6772 records were retrieved from 14 databases, and 432 duplicate records were removed using EndNote software. The final sample size was 12 studies comprising 7 RCTs and 5 quasi-experimental studies with full text for the systematic review and meta-analysis. Study screening and selection process shown as Fig. 1 [52].

Study characteristics

Table 1 lists the characteristics of the 12 articles studied, which were published between 2002 [53] and 2021 [54–58]. Of these, four took place in China [53, 56–58], three in Taiwan [54, 55, 59], two in the United States of America [60, 61], and one each in Hongkong [62], Singapore [63], and Korea [64]. The participants in four studies were newly graduated registered nurses (NGRNs) [55, 56, 58, 59], in three they were registered nurses and enrolled nurses [53, 57, 62], and in five they were experienced RNs [54, 60, 61, 63, 64]. There was a total of 1470 nurses in the 12 studies. Brief explanation for VR were presented in the next Chapter (Table 2).



Fig. 1 PRISMA Flowchart diagram of the study selection

VR intervention

Table 2 provides detailed descriptions of the VR training. According to delivering method, three approaches to VR training used web-based simulation [56, 58, 63], seven used computer-based simulation [53, 57, 59–62, 64], and two used spherical video-based virtual reality (SVVR) simulation [54, 55]. The level of immersion of the VR training was low in six approaches [57, 59, 60, 62–64], moderate in three [53, 56, 58], and high in three [54, 55, 61]. The number of sessions ranged from 1 [54, 61, 63, 64] to 4 sessions [62], and the length of each session ranged from 10 min [60] to 4 h [57]. The total duration of training ranged from 1 h [61] to three weeks [59]. Three out of 12 studies had their interventions developed based on theoretical frameworks [54, 56, 58].

Quality assessment

The bias assessment of seven RCT studies using the Cochrane risk of bias 2.0 instrument showed six studies [53, 57, 59–62, 64] were at high risk. These studies lacked detailed reporting of randomized and blind methods, but all studies reported complete data outcomes (Additional file 3). Meanwhile, four quasi-experimental studies using the JBI assessment tool showed that the results of four studies [56, 58, 63] were included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. All four studies reported having fully reported on the quasi-experimental method. Only one study (Green, 2017) did not fully report on follow-up data and similarities. Details of the quality

assessment of quasi-experimental studies are provided in Additional file 3.

Pooled results

The impact of intervention on the cognitive aspect

The effects of VR interventions on the cognitive aspect among nurses were evaluated in five studies, and the pooled effects were statistically significant. As shown in Fig. 2, The effect on the cognitive aspect had a standardized mean difference (SMD) of 1.48 (95% CI=0.33–2.63), and the studies were highly heterogeneous (I^2 =94.88%). Because of the small sample size, the moderator analysis (subgroup) was conducted only for the level of immersion. The moderator analysis showed no significant differences in effect sizes for the nurses' cognitive aspect between the level of immersion (p=.788). The results of Egger's test indicated that there was no publication bias (p=.162).

The impact of intervention on the affective aspect

Figure 3 shows the effects of virtual reality interventions on affective among nurses in seven studies. This study found that the pooled effect size was statistically significant. The effect on affective had an SMD of 0.59 (95% CI, 0.34 to 0.86). The studies were moderately heterogeneous (I²=34.33%, p<.001). The moderator analysis showed no significant differences in effect sizes for nurse's affective aspect between level of immersion (p=.713), study design (p=.060), and interventions context (p=.376). The results of Egger's test indicated no publication bias (p=.462).

1st Author, Yr. (Countrv)	Participants	Study design	<i>n</i> M - Age (SD)	M -Expe (SD)	srience	Procedural Setting	Inter- vention content	Comparator	Outcome	Measure
				_ 	υ					
Pun, 2016 (Hong Kong)	Registered nurse and en- rolled nurses	RCT, 2 arms	- 20	20 -		HD Unit	Proce- dural Skill and Specialty Care	Conventional training	Knowledge; skills competence	Self-developed instrument: HD knowledge test and HD skills competence checklist
Tsai, 2008 (Taiwan)	Novice nurses	RCT, 2 arms	11 22.6 (0.6) (2	12 0 22.7 22.8)	0	Clinic	Proce- dural skills	Classroom teaching	Knowledge; clinical application; satisfaction in experimental group	Self-developed instrumentXXXeteriorons on knowledge, clinical applications, and satisfaction)
Wilfong, 2011 (USA)	Registered nurses	RCT, 2 arms	20 20 36.77 4 (-)	21 10.3 3.64 (-) (-)	17.1 (-)	Large teaching hospital	Proce- dural skills	Traditional method of teaching	Number of tries to successfully insert an IV	Peripheral IV insertion survey
Zhang, 2021 (China)	Registered nurses	RCT, 2 arms	60	- '	I.	Emergency unit	Specialty care	Conventional training for 3 months	Capacity of emergency care; theoretical assessment; technical skills; preparedness for possible pandemic	Self-developed instrument (The emergency care capability rating scale; MCQ test for theoretical assessment; skill assessment tool); DPET
Chang, 2002 (China)	Registered nurses and en- rolled nurses	RCT, 2 arms	<u>-</u>	14 11.71 - (6.22)	10.14 (6.88)	Community	Proce- dural skills	Conven- tional teaching method using a plastic arm	Successful cannulation; anxiety level; intravenous cannulation performance; experience in VR learning	STAI; cannulation checklist; 4-question semi-structured interview to review the learning experience
Huang, 2021 (Taiwan)	Newly gradu- ated registered nurses	Quasi-ex- periment, 2-group	38 26 (-)	36 0 25 (-)	0	Hospital	Proce- dural skill	Conventional flipped learning mode	Decision-making; learning achieve- ment performance; problem- solving tendency; meta-cognition tendency; classroom engagement	Self-developed instrument (MCQ to evaluate knowledge; decision-making test rubric; the problem-solving tendency questionnaire; the meta-cognition tendency questionnaire; the classroom engagement questionnaire)
Liaw, 2015 (Singapore)	Registered nurse	RCT, 2 arms	35 25.58 (3.19)	35 -	I.	Acute nursing care	Specialty care	No intervention	Performance; perception	RAPIDS; questionnaire survey on perception
Roh, 2013 (Korea)	Nurses	RCT, 2 arms	. 8 '		1	Hospital	Specialty care	Mannequin- based simulation with SimMan®	Know-ledge; self-efficacy; satisfaction	MCQs based on AHAACLFCQ; self-devel- oped instrument to measure self-efficacy and satisfaction
Chang, 2021 (Taiwan)	Nursing staff	Quasi-ex- periment, 2-group	39	37 8.6 - (-)	8.8	Chemotherapy unit	Specialty care	Traditional train- ing approach	Learning achievement; learning attitudes; learning satisfaction; problem-solving skill	Self-developed instrument (learning achievement test, learning attitudes ques- tionnaire, learning satisfaction questionnaire and eight cases for problem-solving skill test)

(2023) 22:170

st	Participants	Study	4	Σ		Procedural	Inter-	Comparator	Outcome	Measure
Author, Yr. Country)		design	M - Agé (SD)	e (SD	() ()	Setting	vention content			
			_	_ _	υ					
sreen, 2017	Registered	Quasi-ex-	17	15 -	I	Neonatal unit	Proce-	Live neonatal	Performance and retention of	The scoring tool for adherence to neonatal
USA)	nurse	periment,	ı	·			dural	resuscitation	the neonatal resuscitation skills	resuscitation guidelines
		2-group					skill	simulations	include: group function, prepara-	
									tion, communication,	
									oxygen administration, ventilation,	
									and chest compressions	
uo, 2021	Newly gradu-	Quasi-ex-	16	14 0	0	Hospital	Specialty	Case study	Clinical judgment; self-confidence;	Lasater clinical judgment rubric (LCJR);
China)	ated registered	periment,	21.94	22.31			care		satisfaction	student self-confidence in learning scale;
	nurses	2-group	(1.29)	(0.70)						simulation design scale (SDS)
'hong,	Newly regis-	Quasi-ex-	43	43 0	0	Emergency	Specialty	Traditional learn-	Emergency response ability; self-	AQCFCN-NED; RSSLCN
021	tered nurses	periment,	22.05	21.79		unit	care	ing methods	directed learning ability	
China)		2-group	(0.82)	(0.72)						

Table 1 (continued)

Figure 4 describes the effects of VR interventions among nursing staffs. The pooled results from nine studies indicated a statistically significant effect of VR intervention on the psychomotor aspect. The effect on psychomotor had an SMD of 0.901 (95% CI, 0.49 to 1.31). The studies were highly heterogeneous (I^2 =80.33%, p<.001). The moderator analysis showed no significant differences in effect sizes for nurses' psychomotor ability between the level of immersion (p=.934). The results of Egger's test indicated no publication bias (p=.462).

The impact of intervention on learning satisfaction

The effects of VR interventions on learning satisfaction among nurses were evaluated in four studies, and the pooled effect size was statistically significant. The effect on satisfaction had an SMD of 0.47 (95% CI, 0.17 to 0.77). Significant heterogeneity in the effect sizes of satisfaction was not found (see Fig. 5). the moderator analysis was not performed in this section.

Table 3 describes the effect of the level of immersion, study design, use of head tracking, and the intervention context on cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes. Subgroup analysis concluded that there was no effect of those independent variables on the study outcomes (p>.05). Meta-regression using a random effect model, in the Table 4, was used to examine the effect of total session and total minutes' duration of intervention on the effect size of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects. Table 4 shows that those two covariates had no effect on the outcomes of the study (p>.05).

Sensitivity analysis

To assess the robustness of the results of the meta-analysis comparing the changes in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects and learning satisfaction, sensitivity analyses were conducted by excluding one study at a time. No results were significantly altered, indicating the robustness of our results.

Discussion

Summary of key findings

This meta-analysis showed that all three domains of Bloom's taxonomy, comprising cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects, were improved to a statistically significant level by the application of VR for training the nursing workforce. A significantly higher score for learning satisfaction in the VR groups also was revealed. In terms of moderator analysis, the level of immersion, study design, use of head tracking, and the intervention context, our moderator analysis found no significant difference in the effect sizes of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects in nurses. Finally, meta-regression also showed that interventions comprising total sessions and total minutes' duration did not affect cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes.

Quality assessment

This VR study can be used as a reference with a low quality of evidence. Though the Egger's test indicated no publication bias, high risk of bias was found in the reporting of RCT studies. Information on blinding or masking between the intervention and control groups was not available. The report of the randomization allocation technique was also not explained by the researchers. Not all RCT study protocols registered, leading to a lack of information for risk assessment of reporting bias. Prospective registration of clinical trials is important because of the issue of publication bias and selective reporting [65]. The publication status of the listed RCTs would provide clarity for readers to assess the research report [65]. The result of I² also performed substantial heterogeneity among two outcomes. This may due to the variation of intervention, duration, and media used. Furthermore, this review also includes the four quasi-experimental studies which may interfer internal validity of the data pooling.

Virtual reality and cognitive improvement

VR training considerably raised the cognitive level of the nursing staffs. Although they did not assess the cognitive aspect based on Bloom's categories, previous studies have evaluated the effect of VR on knowledge outcomes as one part of the cognitive domain [43, 66]. This result is consistent with earlier reviews and meta-analyses that examined the impact of VR training and reported an increase in the applied knowledge of registered nurses and nursing students [67]. In addition, other studies focusing on nursing students revealed the same result [25, 68, 69]. The realism and immersion of the simulated VR world boosted pupil comprehension. Students believed that the ability to modify an avatar's viewpoint enhanced their ability to learn [70]. On the other hand, VR showed more efficacy in nursing than conventional or other simulation-based education modalities. Virtual patients helped students to understand better the ideas taught and how to apply their new knowledge [71].

As evidenced by the previous study, Bloom's taxonomy has provided a basis for learning in a VR environment [70]. Bloom's taxonomy helps examine the process by which VR promotes knowledge acquisition. Bloom's taxonomy has been extensively used in educational contexts to help students think and solve problems through the learning process. VR presents educational ideas of higher-level thinking in Bloom's cognitive domains, such as creative and critical thinking, problem-solving, and multiple intelligences [70, 72]. It is also directly related to technological integration [70]. Bloom's theory proposes that the acquisition of cognitive knowledge will proceed in three ways: comprehension, application, and analysis [43]. During VR simulations, the participants comprehend how to handle the problem in the most applicable method feasible, and they assess whether their knowledge is adequate to provide this clinical care [73]. VR programs may be essential for enhancing learning material as a supplement to conventional training [74].

Virtual reality and affective improvement

Pooled data showed the effectiveness of VR in improving nurses' affective aspect, compared to other traditional methods. This result is in line with a systematic review investigating the impact of VR intervention on nursing students' and registered nurses' emotional skills compared to other training method [75]. VR has the potential to foster empathy and help nurses visualize situations from the perspective of patients and in an affective domain [76]. Ouzouni and Nakakis [77] concluded that a nurse's empathy is a two-pronged term that encompasses both emotional and mental reactions. Thus, using VR in education can improve nurses' ability to detect another person's emotions, comprehend their significance, and respond appropriately. A benefit of VR for influencing human emotions is that it simulates complex real-world situations [78].

According to Bloom's taxonomy, in the affective domain, the behaviors of receiving and reacting must be used throughout the pre-simulation, pre-briefing or briefing, and participation phases [73, 79]. Previous research uncovered gaps and deficiencies in developing nursing students' emotional domains for trust, decision-making, and patient care. The clinical simulation approach was planned and supported using Bloom's taxonomy for competence building. The simulation linked with Bloom's taxonomy might transcend the learning of cognitive and psychomotor domains, producing congruence between knowledge and the affective and psychomotor aspects in the nursing student [73, 80]. The affective domain is established during the first phases of the clinical simulation, when the person's determination and drive to learn are appreciated and heightened during debriefing, which includes all the behaviors described by Bloom's taxonomy throughout the reflective process. This supports the significance of debriefing for the development of clinical nursing competence [73].

Virtual reality and psychomotor improvement

Though the included articles comprised a range of participants and types of psychomotor skills, this metaanalysis showed that VR intervention could improve the psychomotor domain in nurses. These results support the findings of several studies [67, 81, 82]. On the other hand, in a meta-analysis that encompassed nursing student

Table 2 D	escription of VR system.	s and inter	ventions							
1st Author, Yr.	Intervention	Immer- sion level	Intervention context	Device	Stereoscopy/3D	Head tracking	Non- visual	Interven- tion time	Number of sessions	Theory using
Pun, 2016 (Hong Kong)	Web-based virtual training system	Low	Knowledge and skills compe- tence about hemodialysis (HD)	Personal computer using internet browser connected with seven major catheter-access HD		°Z	Audio	15 min	4 sessions	2
Tsai, 2008 (Taiwan)	Virtual reality computer simulation	Low	Learning Port-A Cath injection	3D computer graphicXXX- 3D computer graphicXXX- enteriorateive circumscribed and external hardware controls linking to the desktop computer	Yes	0 N	Audio	40 min	6 sessions	0 Z
Wilfong, 2011 (USA)	Virtual intravenous and patient simulator training	High	IV catheterization	Virtual IV Task Trainer and Nursing Anne Simula- tor (Laerdal Pry Ltd) with heptic interface		ON	Haptic	4	1 session	0 2
Zhang, 2021 (China)	Combination virtual reality simulation train- ing and technical skills training	Low	Emergency response of respira- tory infectious disease	Virtual scene of different layout of zone and work- ing environment		No	Audio	4 C	12 Sessions	N
Chang, 2002 (China)	Computer-based intra- venous virtual training system (CathSim ITS)	Moderate	Training on intravenous cannulation	Computer, AccuTouch Tactile Feedback Device	,	No	Audio	User determined	User deter- mined (in 1 week)	No
Huang, 2021 (Taiwan)	SVVR-EFL	High	Blood transfusion safety training	3D glasses, earphones, stereos	Yes	Yes	Audio	NR	NR	No
Liaw, 2015 (Singapore)	Web-based virtual simulation	Low	(30) understanding the underlying physiological signs of patient deterioration, (2) recognizing and managing deteriorating patients, and (3) communicating effectively about patient deterioration.	Web-based simulation of rescuing a patient in deteriorating situations (e-Rapids)		0 Z	Audio	e ط	1 session	°Z
Roh, 2013 (Korea)	Computer based virtual simulation with MicroSim [®]	Low	Medical emergencies and ad- vanced resuscitation training	Micro5im (Laerdal, Stavan- ger, Norway) in-hospital self-directed learning system		No	Audio	4 L	1 session	OZ
Chang, 2021 (Taiwan)	Experiential learning- based VR environment	High	The chemotherapy drug leak- age accident protection	VR glass, Uptale VR Composer	Yes	Yes	Audio	50 min	1 session	Expe- riential learning theory

Table 2 (continued)									
1st Author, Yr. (Country)	Intervention	Immer- sion level	Intervention context	Device	Stereoscopy/3D	Head tracking	Non- visual stimuli	Interven- tion time (min)	Number of sessions	Theory using
Green, 2017 (USA)	 Independent computer-based virtual simulation scenario (eSim[®]) 	Low	Neonatal resuscitation skills including airway, chest com- pressions, pulse oximetry, and communication	eSim® practice case	-	0 N	Audio	10 min	4 sessions	NO
Luo, 2021 (China)	Web-based high-fideli- ty virtual simulator	Moderate	Simulation related to acute myocardial infarction, fracture of the lower leg, chronic obstruc- tive pulmonary disease, and intestinal obstruction	SimMan 3G, vSim		oz	Audio	د -	User determined	NLN Jeffries simulation theory
Zhong, 2021 (China)	Flipped learning format combined with virtual simulation	Moderate	Emergency response abil- ity training in nursing care of patients with anaphylactic shock, cardiac arrest, asphyxia, hypoglycemic coma	Obsim software		0 Z	Audio	240 min	4 sessions	Self- regulated learning and socio- construc- tivist theories

participants, VR was not more effective than traditional methods in improving nursing skills [23]. This finding is consistent with other reviews that VR was not proven to influence skill development in nursing students and registered nurses [16]. From this point, it can be argued that the conclusions of some recent studies are inconsistent. This might be because there were various participant characteristics, such as years of experience and level of education. It cannot be overlooked that these variables affect the clinical skills of nurses.

In Bloom's taxonomy, the psychomotor aspect is in the second phase of clinical simulation, which is initiated by the cognitive and affective domains in the first phase [83]. In other words, the performance of psychomotor skills is affected by the pre-knowledge and motivation of nurses, and these aspects are gained from the experience of environment exposure. Our analysis of the studies showed that VR significantly improved nurses' cognitive and affective aspects. Thus, initiating psychomotor improvement in nursing staffs by the affective and cognitive aspects is guaranteed in this study. The role of VR is imperative to help nurses get closer to the real environment [84]. Thus, VR is presumed to provide positive benefits in improving clinical skills.

Virtual reality and learning satisfaction

This review concluded that VR could significantly improve nursing staff's learning satisfaction compared to other training modalities. Compared to the three domains of Bloom's taxonomy, the number of included studies on learning satisfaction was relatively small. Nonetheless, the four included studies were remarkably similar. This finding is not supported by Chen, Leng [68] who found no significant increase in learning satisfaction among students of nursing and other health professions. However, it is essential to consider the homogeneity of immersion levels across studies, which is likely to influence the results.

Researchers have shown strong positive associations between student motivation and academic performance [85, 86]. Based on anatomical arrangement, Moro, Štromberga [87] discovered that one-third of participants found the VR approaches disorienting and annoying. Using VR may result in cybersickness, including nausea, dizziness, and headache. Thus, future research should concentrate on the detrimental impacts of VR, such as impaired vision and confusion [85, 88].

Moderator analysis

The statistical test of moderator analysis of the subgroups of the categorical and continuous variables in the metaanalysis and meta-regression showed that there was no significant difference in the effectiveness of VR at various levels of attenuation (high, moderate, or low), the

Std diff in means Standard error Lower Variance Upper limit Z-Value p-Value Chang, 2021 0.277 0.231 0.053 -0.175 0.729 1.203 0.229 Huang, 2021 3.250 0.354 0.125 2.556 3.944 9.175 0.000 Pun, 2016 2.874 0.451 0.203 1.990 3.758 6.375 0.000 Stai, 2008 0.762 0.432 0.187 -0.085 1.609 1.763 0.078 Chang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 Stai, 2008 1.482 0.586 0.343 0.334 2.630 2.531 0.011	Study name				Statistics f	or each :	study				Std diff in	Std diff in means a	Std diff in means and 95% Cl			
Chang, 2021 0.277 0.231 0.053 -0.175 0.729 1.203 0.229 Huang, 2021 3.250 0.354 0.125 2.556 3.944 9.175 0.000 Pun, 2016 2.874 0.451 0.203 1.990 3.758 6.375 0.000 Tsai, 2008 0.762 0.432 0.187 -0.085 1.609 1.763 0.078 Zhang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 Total studies: 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		Std diff in means	Std diff in means	Standard error	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value							
Huang, 2021 3.250 0.354 0.125 2.556 3.944 9.175 0.000 Pun, 2016 2.874 0.451 0.203 1.990 3.758 6.375 0.000 Tsai, 2008 0.762 0.432 0.187 -0.085 1.609 1.763 0.078 Zhang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 Total studies: 5 5	Chang, 2021	0.277	1 0.277	0.231	0.053	-0.175	0.729	1.203	0.229	1		🖶	🖶	🖶	🖶	🖶
Pun, 2016 2.874 0.451 0.203 1.990 3.758 6.375 0.000 Tsai, 2008 0.762 0.432 0.187 -0.085 1.609 1.763 0.078 Zhang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 1.482 0.586 0.343 0.334 2.630 2.531 0.011	Huang, 2021	3.250	1 3.250	0.354	0.125	2.556	3.944	9.175	0.000				-#	│ │ │ │-∰-		
Tsai, 2008 0.762 0.432 0.187 -0.085 1.609 1.763 0.078 Zhang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 1.482 0.586 0.343 0.334 2.630 2.531 0.011 Total studies: 5	Pun, 2016	2.874	2.874	0.451	0.203	1.990	3.758	6.375	0.000							
Zhang, 2021 0.396 0.184 0.034 0.034 0.757 2.146 0.032 1.482 0.586 0.343 0.334 2.630 2.531 0.011 Total studies: 5	Tsai, 2008	0.762	0.762	0.432	0.187	-0.085	1.609	1.763	0.078				│ │ ├───│		│ │ ├┲─│ │	│ │ ├─ड──│ │
1.482 0.586 0.343 0.334 2.630 2.531 0.011 Total studies: 5	Zhang, 2021	0.396	0.396	0.184	0.034	0.034	0.757	2.146	0.032							
Total studies: 5		1.482	1.482	0.586	0.343	0.334	2.630	2.531	0.011							
	Total stue	lies: 5	udies: 5							-4.00	-4.00 -2.00	-4.00 -2.00 0.00	-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00	-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4	-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.0	-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4.00
Test for heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94.88\%$	Test for h	eterogene	heterogene	ity: $I^2 = 94$	4.88 %	11)				c	Control Grou	Control Group	Control Group VR Group			



	9	Statistics fo	or each s	study				Std diff in	means an	d 95% Cl	
Std diff in means	Standard error	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
0.004	0.378	0.143	-0.737	0.744	0.010	0.992					
1.009	0.244	0.059	0.532	1.487	4.141	0.000			-	┣╴│	
0.483	0.236	0.056	0.021	0.946	2.048	0.041			┝╋╴		
0.421	0.370	0.137	-0.304	1.146	1.138	0.255			_∔∎	-	
1.280	0.402	0.161	0.493	2.067	3.188	0.001			-	ਰ⊸∤	
0.519	0.330	0.109	-0.129	1.166	1.570	0.116				-	
0.479	0.185	0.034	0.116	0.842	2.589	0.010					
0.597	0.134	0.018	0.335	0.859	4.470	0.000			•		
es: 7 teroger erall eff	neity: l ² =	34.33 % 4.47 (p <	% < 0.00 ⁻	1)			-4.00	-2.00 Control Group	0.00 Int	2.00 ervention Gro	4.00
	Std diff n means 0.004 1.009 0.483 0.421 1.280 0.519 0.479 0.597 es: 7 terogen erall eff	Std diff n means Standard error 0.004 0.378 1.009 0.244 0.483 0.236 0.421 0.370 1.280 0.402 0.519 0.330 0.479 0.185 0.597 0.134 es: 7 terogeneity: I ² = erall effect: Z = 4	Statistics for Stad diff Standard error Variance 0.004 0.378 0.143 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.421 0.370 0.137 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.519 0.330 0.109 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.597 0.134 0.018 es: 7 terogeneity: $I^2 = 34.33$ % terall effect: $Z = 4.47$ (p	Statistics for each service Stad diff n means Standard error Variance Lower limit 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335	Statistics for each study Stad diff n means Standard error Variance Lower limit Upper limit 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 0.744 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 1.487 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.946 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.146 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 2.067 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 1.166 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.842 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335 0.859	Statistics for each studyStd diff n meansStandard errorLower VarianceUpper limitZ-Value0.0040.3780.143-0.7370.7440.0101.0090.2440.0590.5321.4874.1410.4830.2360.0560.0210.9462.0480.4210.3700.137-0.3041.1461.1381.2800.4020.1610.4932.0673.1880.5190.3300.109-0.1291.1661.5700.4790.1850.0340.1160.8422.5890.5970.1340.0180.3350.8594.470errogeneity: I ² = 34.33 %errogeneity: I ² = 34.33 %	Statistics for each study Stad diff n means Standard error Lower Variance Upper limit Z-Value p-Value 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 0.744 0.010 0.992 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 1.487 4.141 0.000 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.946 2.048 0.041 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.146 1.138 0.255 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 2.067 3.188 0.001 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 1.166 1.570 0.116 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.842 2.589 0.010 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335 0.859 4.470 0.000	Statistics for each studyStd diff n meansStandard errorLower VarianceUpper limitZ-Valuep-Value0.0040.3780.143-0.7370.7440.0100.9921.0090.2440.0590.5321.4874.1410.0000.4830.2360.0560.0210.9462.0480.0410.4210.3700.137-0.3041.1461.1380.2551.2800.4020.1610.4932.0673.1880.0010.5190.3300.109-0.1291.1661.5700.1160.4790.1850.0340.1160.8422.5890.0100.5970.1340.0180.3350.8594.4700.000error service: I ² = 34.33 %	Statistics for each study Std diff in Std diff Standard Lower Upper Z-Value p-Value 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 0.744 0.010 0.992 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 1.487 4.141 0.000 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.946 2.048 0.041 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.146 1.138 0.255 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 2.067 3.188 0.001 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 1.166 1.570 0.116 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.842 2.589 0.010 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335 0.859 4.470 0.000	Statistics for each study Std diff in means an Std diff Standard error Lower Upper limit Z-Value p-Value 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 0.744 0.010 0.992 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 1.487 4.141 0.000 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.946 2.048 0.041 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.146 1.138 0.255 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 2.067 3.188 0.001 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 1.166 1.570 0.116 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.842 2.589 0.010 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335 0.859 4.470 0.000	Statistics for each study Std diff in means and 95% CI Std diff Standard Lower Upper Z-Value p-Value 0.004 0.378 0.143 -0.737 0.744 0.010 0.992 1.009 0.244 0.059 0.532 1.487 4.141 0.000 0.483 0.236 0.056 0.021 0.946 2.048 0.041 0.421 0.370 0.137 -0.304 1.146 1.138 0.255 1.280 0.402 0.161 0.493 2.067 3.188 0.001 0.519 0.330 0.109 -0.129 1.166 1.570 0.116 0.479 0.185 0.034 0.116 0.842 2.589 0.010 0.597 0.134 0.018 0.335 0.859 4.470 0.000 2.00 centrol Group control Group control Group

Fig. 3 Forest plot of individual and combined effects from intervention reporting affective outcomes

presence or absence of head tracking, study design (RCT or quasi-experimental), intervention context (emergency or not emergency), total sessions of interventions, and total minutes' duration. The cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains showed the same results from the moderator analysis. This finding is consistent with a previous meta-analysis, which reported that content covariates, level of immersion, length of sessions, and the number of sessions did not affect knowledge outcome scores [25]. However, it cannot be concluded that there is no effect of covariate variables on the effectiveness of VR because the studies included in this meta-analysis were mostly conducted on small samples, and the bias of most studies was assessed as high risk. According to Woon, a low to medium level of immersion is more effective in providing a learning environment than a high level of immersion [25]. Further exploration is needed to determine the effect of VR on the levels of immersion, interactivity [27], VR devices, and intervention context.

Strengths and limitations

As far as the authors know, this study is the first to evaluate the effectiveness of VR in nursing staff populations. There was no publication bias from the 12 studies. This work provides three outcomes of VR intervention, which are inspired by Bloom's taxonomy. The cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains are deemed to be the pedagogic mechanism for the development of nursing competence in clinical settings [83]. Moreover, this work conducted a sensitivity analysis that showed the

Study name			Statistics for	or each :	study				Std diff in	n means a	nd 95% Cl	
	Std diff in means	Standard error	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Chang, 2002	0.254	0.379	0.144	-0.490	0.998	0.670	0.503				-	
Chang, 2021	1.361	0.255	0.065	0.862	1.860	5.344	0.000				-8-1	
Green, 2017	0.152	0.355	0.126	-0.544	0.847	0.427	0.669			-#	.	
Huang, 2021	0.509	0.236	0.056	0.046	0.972	2.155	0.031				-	
Liaw, 2015	1.209	0.260	0.068	0.700	1.719	4.651	0.000			-	╉╴│	
Pun, 2016	1.752	0.372	0.138	1.023	2.481	4.711	0.000					
Wilfong, 2011	1.119	0.336	0.113	0.461	1.778	3.331	0.001			-	╉-	
Zhang, 2021	0.220	0.183	0.034	-0.139	0.579	1.201	0.230			- H		
Zhong, 2021	1.543	0.246	0.060	1.062	2.025	6.282	0.000				-88-1	
	0.901	0.208	0.043	0.494	1.308	4.339	0.000			◀		
Total st	udies: 9)						-4.00	-2.00	0.00	2.00	4.00
Test for Test for	hetero overall	geneity: effect: 2	l ² = 80.3 Z = 4.11	33 % (p < (0.001)	1		С	ontrol Grou	ıp	VR Group	

Fig. 4 Forest plot of individual and combined effects from intervention reporting psychomotor outcomes



Fig. 5 Forest plot of individual and combined effects from intervention reporting satisfaction outcomes

robustness of the results. However, risk of bias was high in most of the study included. The heterogeneity among two outcomes were considered substantial. In addition, the quasi-experiment method was still included in this review because of the lack of studies focused on nursing staffs. The other shortcomings were the exclusion of potential appropriate study related engineering area due to the conference proceedings were excluded in this study.Lastly, most of the analyzed studies were conducted on small sample sizes. Therefore, the analysis of study bias should be treated with careful caution.

Impact on clinical practice training

This work strengthened the prospect of involving VR in training nurses and improving their nursing competency. There is high confidence in the effectiveness of VR in increasing the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor dimensions of nurses' knowledge, which can lead to improved patient safety and increased patient satisfaction. Nevertheless, using VR has been presumed to be expensive and demanding. Fortunately, the literature has shown that VR has lower costs than traditional simulation [89]. Therefore, cost should not be a major concern of hospital management. However, technological issues may be a challenge for nursing departments. The use of

Table 3	Moderator	anal	ysis: Su	ibgroup	anal	ysis
				/ /		

	, 515. 5	abgioup		
Variable	n	SMD	95% CI	р
Cognitive				
Level of immersion	2	1.75	-1.16 to 4.67	0.239
High	3	1.31	-0.12 to 2.73	0.072
Low				
Between sub-group p value	=0.78	8		
Head tracking	2	1.75	-1.16 to 4.67	0.239
Yes	3	1.31	-0.12 to 2.73	0.072
No				
Between sub-group p value	=0.78	8		
Psychomotor				
Level of immersion	3	0.98	0.43 to 1.53	< 0.001
High	2	0.93	-0.33 to 2.19	0.028
Moderate	4	0.81	0.09 to 1.53	0.148
Low				
Between sub-group p value	= 0.93	4		
Between sub-group p value	=0.57	2		
Head tracking	2	0.93	0.095 to 1.764	0.029
Yes	7	0.89	0.381 to 1.403	0.001
No				
Between sub-group p value	=0.94	0		
Affective				
Level of immersion	3	0.74	0.23 to 1.26	0.005
High	3	0.58	-0.16 to 1.23	0.129
Moderate	2	0.49	0.17 to 0.81	0.002
Low				
Between sub-group p value	=0.71	2		
Study design	4	0.43	0.19 to 0.68	0.001
RCT	3	0.91	0.48 to 1.35	< 0.001
Quasi-experiment				
Between sub-group p value	=0.06	0		
Intervention context	4	0.73	0.39 to 1.08	< 0.001
Emergency response	3	0.34	-0.08 to 0.74	0.105
Not emergency response				
Between sub-group p value	=0.37	6		
Head tracking	2	0.74	0.23 to 1.26	0.005
Yes	5	0.51	0.19 to 1.84	0.002
No				
Between sub-group p value	=0.46	4		
RCT=randomized controlled t	rias			

Table 4 Moderator ana	lysis	: Meta-regressio	n analysis	
Variable	n	β Coefficients	95% Cl	р
Cognitive				
Total sessions of	5	-0.104	-0.454 to	0.561
interventions	5	-0.001	0.246	0.789
Total duration in minutes			-0.004 to	
			0.003	
Psychomotor				
Total sessions of	9	-0.054	-0.157 to	0.309
interventions	9	-0.001	0.049	0.063
Total duration in minutes			-0.002 to	
			0.000	
Affective				
Total sessions of	7	-0.007	-0.076 to	0.839
interventions	7	-0.002	0.061	0.578
Total duration in minutes			-0.001 to	
			0.001	

VR should be understood comprehensively by the users so that the equipment is run properly. In addition, regular updates and maintenance of the programs are necessary to avoid glitches [90]. Thus, the existence of a special team that handles such technology is required.

Conclusion and recommendations

This study provides evidence that VR is an effective alternative for improving nurses' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects and their learning satisfaction. Furthermore, this work found that there was no significance in effect size among dependent variables (e.g., level of immersion) did not improve study outcomes for all four outcomes. However, the possibility of heterogeneity and the risk of bias among studies cannot be ignored. Thus, the quality of evidence from this review was classified as low. Further RCTs with larger samples and robust methods based on the guidelines of the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) are needed to ensure straightforward investigation of cause-effect relationships within the internal and external validity [91]. An evaluation of cost-effectiveness and technological feasibility is needed to guarantee the applicability of VR in settings with low resources. Further study should address the impact of VR technology on nurses' clinical performance in real-world work settings.

Abbreviations

Virtual Reality
Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
Meta-Analyses
Comprehensive Meta-Analysis
Standardized Mean Difference
Randomized Controlled Trial
Head-Mounted Displays
Field of View
three dimensions
two dimensions
Confidence Interval
Hemodialysis
Not Report:IV:Intravenous
Disaster Preparedness Evaluation Tool
Multiple-Choice Questions
CathSim Intravenous Training System
The State Trait Anxiety Inventory
Spherical Video-Based Virtual Reality Based Experiential
Flipped Learning
Rescuing a Patient in Deteriorating Situation
American Heart Association Advanced Cardiac Life Support Course Questionnaire
Spherical Video-Based Virtual Reality
High-Fidelity Simulation
Virtual Simulation
Lasater Clinical Judgment Rubric
Simulation Design Scale
Assessment Questionnaire of Clinical First-aid Capability of Nurses in Non-emergency Department
Rating Scale of Self-directed Learning Competence for Nurses
Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s12912-023-01312-x.

Supplementary Material 1	
Supplementary Material 2	
Supplementary Material 3	
Supplementary Material 4	
Supplementary Material 5	

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our colleagues for the use of their databases to support our study and all the authors of our included studies. We also acknowledge Liya Arista, RN and Dr. Mei-Yu Lin for helping us to handle technical issue during study.

Authors' contributions

B.U., C.E., C.L.W., D.E., E.A., and J.G.M. conceptualization. D.E., R.N., and R.W.A. methodology. R. W. A software and formal analysis. B.U., C.E., E.A., J.G.M., and R.N. data curation. D.E., and C.L.W. validation. B.U., C.E., D.E., E.A., R.N., J.G.M., and R.W.A. writing - original draft. D.E., K.H.C., and C.L.W. writing – review and editing. D.E. supervision, and funding acquisition.

Funding

This research is funded by Directorate of Research and Development, Universitas Indonesia under Hibah PUTI 2022 (Grant No. NKB-743/UN2.RST/ HKP.05.00/2022).

Data availability

The supplementary materials for this study can be found in Additional file 1–5. Further inquiries should be directed to the corresponding author, and data from this study will be made available upon reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interest

We declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Author details

¹Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Indonesia & Nursing Department -Universitas Indonesia Hospital, Jl. Prof. Bahder Djohan, UI Campus, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

²Institut Teknologi Kesehatan Cendekia Utama Kudus, Jl. Lingkar Timur No.Km.5, Jepang, Kec. Mejobo, Kabupaten Kudus, Central Java, Indonesia ³Nursing Department, Universitas Indonesia Hospital, Jl. Prof. Bahder Djohan, Ul Campus, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

⁴The Nethersole School of Nursing - The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

⁵School of Nursing, Mitra Bunda Health Institute, Jl. Raya Seraya Nomor No.1, Tlk. Tering, Kec. Batam Kota, Batam, Kepulauan Riau, Indonesia ⁶Post-Baccalaureate Program in Nursing, College of Nursing, & Cochrane Taiwan, Taipei Medical University, No. 250 Wuxing Street, Xinyi District, 11031 Taipei City, Taiwan

⁷Department of Nursing, Evidence-based Knowledge Translation Center, & Research Center in Nursing Clinical Practice, Wan Fang Hospital, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

⁸School of Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Taylor's University, Subang Jaya, Malaysia

Received: 17 September 2022 / Accepted: 18 April 2023

Published online: 19 May 2023

References

- Stahl ST, Smagula SF, Rodakowski J, Dew MA, Karp JF, Albert SM, et al. Subjective Sleep Quality and Trajectories of Interleukin-6 in older adults. Am J Geriatric Psychiatry. 2021;29(2):204–8.
- Jokiniemi K, Pietila AM, Mikkonen S. Construct validity of clinical nurse specialist core competency scale: an exploratory factor analysis. J Clin Nurs. 2020;30(13–14):1863–73.
- Karami A, Farokhzadian J, Foroughameri G. Nurses' professional competency and organizational commitment: is it important for human resource management? PLoS ONE. 2017;12(11):e0187863.
- 4. Global strategic. directions for nursing and midwifery 2021–2025 [press release]. 2021.
- Westbrook JI, Duffield C, Li L, Creswick NJ. How much time do nurses have for patients? A longitudinal study quantifying hospital nurses' patterns of task time distribution and interactions with health professionals. BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11:319.
- Teng CI, Hsiao FJ, Chou TA. Nurse-perceived time pressure and patientperceived care quality. J Nurs Manag. 2010;18(3):275–84.
- Gaalan K, Kunaviktikul W, Akkadechanunt T, Turale S. Factors predicting quality of nursing care among nurses in tertiary care hospitals in Mongolia. Int Nurs Rev. 2019;66(2):176–82.
- Di Muzio M, De Vito C, Tartaglini D, Villari P. Knowledge, behaviours, training and attitudes of nurses during preparation and administration of intravenous medications in intensive care units (ICU). A multicenter italian study. Appl Nurs Res. 2017;38:129–33.
- Simone ED, Giannetta N, Auddino F, Cicotto A, Grilli D, Muzio MD. Medication errors in the emergency department: knowledge, attitude, behavior, and training needs of nurses. Indian J Crit Care Med. 2018;22(5):346–52.
- 10. Cho SM, Choi J. Patient safety culture associated with patient safety competencies among registered nurses. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2018;50(5):549–57.
- Huh A, Shin JH. Person-centered care practice, patient safety competence, and patient safety nursing activities of nurses working in geriatric hospitals. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(10).
- 12. Lee SE, Lee MH, Peters AB, Gwon SH. Assessment of patient safety and cultural competencies among senior baccalaureate nursing students. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(12).
- Nobahar M. Competence of nurses in the intensive cardiac care unit. Electron Physician. 2016;8(5):2395–404.
- 14. Afshar M, Sadeghi-Gandomani H, Masoudi Alavi N. A study on improving nursing clinical competencies in a surgical department: a participatory action research. Nurs Open. 2020;7(4):1052–9.
- Ajuebor O, McCarthy C, Li Y, Al-Blooshi SM, Makhanya N, Cometto G. Are the global strategic directions for strengthening nursing and midwifery 2016–2020 being implemented in countries? Findings from a cross-sectional analysis. Hum Resour Health. 2019;17(1):54.
- Shorey S, Ng ED. The use of virtual reality simulation among nursing students and registered nurses: a systematic review. Nurse Educ Today. 2021;98:104662.
- 17. Remtulla R. The Present and Future Applications of Technology in Adapting Medical Education amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. JMIR Med Educ. 2020;6(2):e20190.
- Girvan C. What is a virtual world? Definition and classification. Education Tech Research Dev. 2018;66(5):1087–100.
- Barrie M, Socha JJ, Mansour L, Patterson ES, editors. Mixed reality in medical education: A narrative literature review. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Human Factors and Ergonomics in Health Care; 2019.
- Mangina E. 3D learning objects for augmented/virtual reality educational ecosystems. 23rd International Conference on Virtual System & Multimedia (VSMM)2017.
- Olsen PR, Gjevjon ER, Perspectives. European academy of nursing science debate 2016: are there any aspects unique to nursing? J Res Nurs. 2017;22(3):247–55.
- 22. Radianti J, Majchrzak TA, Fromm J, Wohlgenannt I. A systematic review of immersive virtual reality applications for higher education: Design elements, lessons learned, and research agenda. Comput Educ. 2020;147.

- Chen F-Q, Leng Y-F, Ge J-F, Wang D-W, Li C, Chen B, et al. Effectiveness of virtual reality in nursing education: Meta-analysis. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(9):e18290.
- Plotzky C, Lindwedel U, Sorber M, Loessl B, König P, Kunze C, et al. Virtual reality simulations in nurse education: a systematic mapping review. Nurse Educ Today. 2021;101:104868.
- Woon APN, Mok WQ, Chieng YJS, Zhang HM, Ramos P, Mustadi HB, et al. Effectiveness of virtual reality training in improving knowledge among nursing students: a systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression. Nurse Educ Today. 2021;98:104655.
- Kim SK, Eom MR, Park M-H. Effects of nursing education using virtual reality: a systematic review. J Korea Contents Association. 2019;19(2):661–70.
- Kyaw BM, Saxena N, Posadzki P, Vseteckova J, Nikolaou CK, George PP, et al. Virtual reality for health professions education: systematic review and metaanalysis by the digital health education collaboration. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(1):e12959.
- 28. Hoque ME. Three domains of learning: cognitive, affective and psychomotor. J EFL Educ Res. 2016;2(2):45–52.
- Nascimento JdSG, Siqueira TV, Oliveira JLGd, Alves MG, Regino DdSG, Dalri MCB. Development of clinical competence in nursing in simulation: the perspective of Bloom's taxonomy. Rev Bras Enferm. 2021;74(1):e20200135.
- Burhan E, Susanto AD, Nasution SA, Ginanjar E, Pitoyo CW, Susilo A et al. Pedoman Tatalaksana Covid-19. In: (PDPI) PDPI, (PERKI) PDSKI, (PAPDI) PDSPDI, Indonesia PDAdTI, (PERDATIN), (IDAI) IDAI, editors. 2 ed. Jakarta2020.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
- 32. Dollinger N, Wienrich C, Latoschik ME. Challenges and opportunities of Immersive technologies for mindfulness meditation: A systematic review. Front Virtual Real. 2021;2.
- 33. Human factors in. Simulation and training. New York: CRC Press; 2008.
- Zhong MH, Jiang JX, Zhang H, Duan X. Combination of flipped learning format and virtual simulation to enhance emergency response ability for newly registered nurses: a quasi-experimental design. Interact Learn Environ.14.
- Lee H-G, Chung S, Lee W-H. Presence in virtual golf simulators: the effects of presence on perceived enjoyment, perceived value, and behavioral intention. New Media & Society. 2012;15(6):930–46.
- Shin H, Rim D, Kim H, Park S, Shon S. Educational characteristics of virtual simulation in nursing: an integrative review. Clin Simul Nurs. 2019;37:18–28.
- Hepperle D, Weiß Y, Siess A, Wölfel M. 2D, 3D or speech? A case study on which user interface is preferable for what kind of object interaction in immersive virtual reality. Computers & Graphics. 2019;82:321–31.
- Miller HL, Bugnariu NL. Level of immersion in virtual environments impacts the ability to assess and teach social skills in autism spectrum disorder. Cyberpsychology Behav Social Netw. 2016;19(4):246–56.
- Kardong-Edgren S, Farra SL, Alinier G, Young HM. A call to unify definitions of virtual reality. Clin Simul Nurs. 2019;31:28–34.
- Campos PRBd, Neto EdBC, Moreno UF. Proposal of a new taxonomy of the psychomotor domain for the engineering laboratory. 3rd International Conference of the Portuguese Society for Engineering Education (CISPEE)2018.
- Bloom BS, Engelhart MD, Furst EJ, Hill WH, Krathwohl DR. Taxonomy of educational objectives (handbook one). David McKay Company. Inc; 1956.
- 42. Savickiene I. Conception of learning outcomes in the bloom's taxonomy affective domain. Qual High Educ. 2010;7(7):37–59.
- Armstrong P. Bloom's taxonomy: Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching; 2010 [Available from: https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/ blooms-taxonomy/.
- 44. Higgins JP, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JA. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial. updated February 2022. In: Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 63 [Internet]. Cochrane. Available from: www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
- Tufanaru C, Munn Z, Aromataris E, Campbell J, Hopp L, Chapter. Systematic reviews of effectiveness. Volume 3. JBI manual for evidence synthesis: JBI; 2020.
- Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ. Sensitivity analysis for publication bias in metaanalyses. J R Stat Soc Ser C Appl Stat. 2020;69(5):1091–119.
- Marušić MF, Fidahić M, Cepeha CM, Farcaş LG, Tseke A, Puljak L. Methodological tools and sensitivity analysis for assessing quality or risk of bias used in systematic reviews published in the high-impact anesthesiology journals. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2020;20(1):121.
- Sedgwick P. Meta-analyses: heterogeneity and subgroup analysis. BMJ: Br Med J. 2013;346:f4040.

- Borenstein M, Higgins JPT. Meta-analysis and subgroups. Prev Sci. 2013;14(2):134–43.
- 50. Egger M. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315:629.
- Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in metaanalyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. 2011;343:d4002.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. 2021;372:n71.
- Chang KK, Chung JW, Wong TK. Learning intravenous cannulation: a comparison of the conventional method and the CathSim Intravenous Training System. J Clin Nurs. 2002;11(1):73–8.
- Chang C-C, Hwang G-J. An experiential learning-based virtual reality approach to fostering problem-resolving competence in professional training. Interact Learn Environ. 2021:1–16.
- Huang H, Hwang G-J, Chang S-C. Facilitating decision making in authentic contexts: an SVVR-based experiential flipped learning approach for professional training. Interact Learn Environ. 2021:1–17.
- Luo Y, Geng C, Chen X, Zhang Y, Zou Z, Bai J. Three learning modalities' impact on clinical judgment and perceptions in newly graduated registered nurses: a quasi-experimental study. Nurs Health Sci. 2021;23(2):538–46.
- Zhang D, Liao H, Jia Y, Yang W, He P, Wang D, et al. Effect of virtual reality simulation training on the response capability of public health emergency reserve nurses in China: a quasiexperimental study. BMJ Open. 2021;11(9):e048611.
- Zhong M, Jiang J, Zhang H, Duan X. Combination of flipped learning format and virtual simulation to enhance emergency response ability for newly registered nurses: a quasi-experimental design. Interact Learn Environ. 2021:1–14.
- Tsai S-L, Chai S-K, Hsieh L-F, Lin S, Taur F-M, Sung W-H, et al. The use of virtual reality computer Simulation in Learning Port-A Cath Injection. Adv Health Sci Educ. 2008;13(1):71–87.
- 60. Green DA, editor. The Effect of Independent Computer-Based Simulation on Neonatal Resuscitation Skills2017.
- Wilfong DN, Falsetti DJ, McKinnon JL, Daniel LH, Wan QC. The effects of virtual intravenous and patient simulator training compared to the traditional approach of teaching nurses: a research project on peripheral i.v. catheter insertion. J infusion nursing: official publication Infusion Nurses Soc. 2011;34(1):55–62.
- Pun SK, Chiang VC, Choi KS. A Computer-Based Method for Teaching Catheter-Access Hemodialysis Management. Computers, informatics, nursing: CIN. 2016;34(10):476–83.
- Liaw SY, Wong LF, Chan SW, Ho JT, Mordiffi SZ, Ang SB, et al. Designing and evaluating an interactive multimedia web-based simulation for developing nurses' competencies in acute nursing care: randomized controlled trial. J Med Internet Res. 2015;17(1):e5.
- Roh YS, Lee WS, Chung HS, Park YM. The effects of simulation-based resuscitation training on nurses' self-efficacy and satisfaction. Nurse Educ Today. 2013;33(2):123–8.
- 65. Harriman SL, Patel J. When are clinical trials registered? An analysis of prospective versus retrospective registration. Trials. 2016;17(187):1–8.
- Bloom BS, Engelhart MD, Furst EJ, Hill WH, Krathwohl DR. Taxonomy of educational objetives: the classification of educational goals: handbook I: cognitive domain. New York, US: D. Mckay; 1956.
- 67. Sim JJM, Rusli KDB, Seah B, Levett-Jones T, Lau Y, Liaw SY. Virtual Simulation to enhance clinical reasoning in nursing: a systematic review and Meta-analysis. Clin Simul Nurs. 2022;69:26–39.
- Chen FQ, Leng YF, Ge JF, Wang DW, Li C, Chen B, et al. Effectiveness of virtual reality in nursing education: Meta-Analysis. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(9):e18290.
- 69. Rourke S. How does virtual reality simulation compare to simulated practice in the acquisition of clinical psychomotor skills for pre-registration student nurses? A systematic review. Int J Nurs Stud. 2020;102:103466.
- Chen Y-L. The Effects of virtual reality learning environment on student cognitive and linguistic development. Asia-Pacific Educ Researcher. 2016;25(4):637–46.
- Forsberg E, Ziegert K, Hult H, Fors U. Assessing progression of clinical reasoning through virtual patients: an exploratory study. Nurse Educ Pract. 2016;16(1):97–103.
- 72. Campos PRBd, Neto EdBC, Moreno UF, editors. Proposal of a new taxonomy of the psychomotor domain for to the engineering laboratory. 2018 3rd

International Conference of the Portuguese Society for Engineering Education (CISPEE); 2018 27–29 June 2018.

- Nascimento J, Siqueira TV, Oliveira JLG, Alves MG, Regino D, Dalri MCB. Development of clinical competence in nursing in simulation: the perspective of Bloom's taxonomy. Rev Bras Enferm. 2021;74(1):e20200135.
- 74. Lange AK, Koch J, Beck A, Neugebauer T, Watzema F, Wrona KJ, et al. Learning with virtual reality in nursing education: qualitative interview study among nursing students using the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology Model. JMIR Nurs. 2020;3(1):e20249.
- Shorey S, Ng ED. The use of virtual reality simulation among nursing students and registered nurses: a systematic review. Nurse Educ Today. 2021;98:104662.
- Saab MM, Hegarty J, Murphy D, Landers M. Incorporating virtual reality in nurse education: a qualitative study of nursing students' perspectives. Nurse Educ Today. 2021;105:105045.
- 77. Ouzouni C, Nakakis K. An exploratory study of student nurses' empathy. Health Sci J. 2012;6(3):534.
- Marín-Morales J, Llinares C, Guixeres J, Alcañiz M. Emotion recognition in immersive virtual reality: from statistics to affective computing. Sensors. 2020;20(18):5163.
- Stephens M, Ormandy P. An evidence-based Approach to Measuring Affective Domain Development. J Prof Nurs. 2019;35(3):216–23.
- Krautscheid LC. Embedding Microethical Dilemmas in High-Fidelity Simulation scenarios: preparing nursing students for ethical practice. J Nurs Educ. 2017;56(1):55–8.
- Kyaw BM, Saxena N, Posadzki P, Vseteckova J, Nikolaou CK, George PP, et al. Virtual reality for health professions education: systematic review and metaanalysis by the digital health education collaboration. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(1):e12959.
- Rourke S. How does virtual reality simulation compare to simulated practice in the acquisition of clinical psychomotor skills for pre-registration student nurses? A systematic review. Int J Nurs Stud. 2020;102:103466.

- Nascimento JdSG, Siqueira TV, Oliveira JLGd, Alves MG, Regino DdSG, Dalri MCB. Development of clinical competence in nursing in simulation: the perspective of Bloom's taxonomy. Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem. 2021;74.
- Chavez B, Bayona S, editors. Virtual reality in the learning process2018:Springer.
 Zhao J, Xu X, Jiang H, Ding Y. The effectiveness of virtual reality-based
- Zhao J, Xu X, Jiang H, Ding T. The effectiveness of virtual reality-based technology on anatomy teaching: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. BMC Med Educ. 2020;20(1):127.
- Kim K-J, Frick TW. Changes in Student Motivation during Online Learning. J Educational Comput Res. 2011;44(1):1–23.
- Moro C, Štromberga Z, Raikos A, Stirling A. The effectiveness of virtual and augmented reality in health sciences and medical anatomy. Anat Sci Educ. 2017;10(6):549–59.
- Rebenitsch L, Owen C. Review on cybersickness in applications and visual displays. Virtual Reality. 2016;20(2):101–25.
- Haerling KA. Cost-utility analysis of virtual and mannequin-based simulation. Simul Healthc. 2018;13(1):33–40.
- Chang TP, Weiner D. Screen-based simulation and virtual reality for pediatric emergency medicine. Clin Pediatr Emerg Med. 2016;17(3):224–30.
- Spieth PM, Kubasch AS, Penzlin Ai K, Siepmann T. Randomized controlled trials – a matter of design. Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment. 2016;12:1341-9.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.