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**Context**

- For the past 20 years Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) has been increasingly emphasised as an effective approach and goal in health care (Upton & Upton, 2006). However, research has identified a number of barriers to its adoption and implementation (Sandström et al., 2011).
- Most research in this area has focused upon the practice of registered nurses (e.g. Brown et al., 2009), or newly qualified practitioners (e.g. Maben et al., 2006).
- Little research has focused on nurses’ initial pre-registration training, particularly on the impact EBP teaching delivery method on adoption and implementation of EBP throughout the learning process.

**Aim of the study**

The study represents an on-going educational audit exploring the impact of teaching delivery method (embedded vs. modular) on undergraduate pre-registration nursing students' self-reported EBP implementation, attitudes, and knowledge and skills.

**Design**

- A longitudinal, cross-sectional survey collecting data from September 2011 until February 2015.

**Method**

- Two cohorts of undergraduate nursing students were opportunistically recruited for the study: cohort one (N= 57, response rate= 90.1%) were being taught EBP modularly, but cohort two (N= 68, response rate= 63.8%) had EBP embedded across their modules.
- Data was collected every 6 months, using the Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire (EBPQ; Upton & Upton, 2006): a 24-item self-report measure with three subscales (practice of, attitude towards, and knowledge and skills in EBP).

**Results**

- The initial results identified no statistically significant differences between the cohorts on the practice of EBP (U= 2,138.00, Z= -0.13, p=.894; embedded group Md= 5.00, modular group Md= 5.00, see figure 1).
- However, statistically significant differences between the two cohorts were identified on EBP attitudes (U= 1,852.00, Z= -2.43, p<.015), and knowledge and skills (U= 2,802.00, Z= -3.68, p<.001). Students on the modular curriculum displayed slightly higher attitude scores (Md= 6.33) than those on the embedded curriculum (Md= 5.67), although both cohorts demonstrated positive attitudes toward EBP (see figure 2). Conversely, the embedded curriculum cohort students displayed slightly higher scores on EBP knowledge and skills (Md= 4.89) than the modular cohort students (Md= 4.29; see figure 3).

**Conclusion & implications**

- Although the project is still in its infancy, preliminary findings raise important questions about the relationship between EBP attitudes, practice and skills.
- The embedded cohort’s lower attitude scores may reflect social-desirability effects: modules dedicated to EBP may instil greater importance of displaying positive EBP attitudes.
- Embedding EBP may provide an effective means of developing students’ practice, knowledge and skills, without requiring dedicated modules, thereby reducing resource demands.
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