

- Dhakane, M.K. & Afrah, N. A. (2016). Satisfaction of Students and Academic Performance in Benadir University. *Journal of Education and Practice*. [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.7, No.24
- El-Masri, Maher M.; Dennison, Susan. (2012) Development and Psychometric Assessment of the Undergraduate Nursing Student Academic Satisfaction Scale (UNSASS). Honor Society of Nursing, Sigma Theta Tau International <http://hdl.handle.net/10755/201680>.
- Irfan Mushtaq, Shabana Nawaz Khan (2012). Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* Volume 12 Issue 9 Version 1.0 June 2012 Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA) Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853
- Kimani, G.N., Kara, A.M. & Njagi, L.W. (2013) Teacher Factors Influencing Students' Academic Achievement In Secondary Schools In Nyandarua County, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 1 No. 3 March 2013
- Korobova, N. & Starobin, S.S. (2015). A Comparative Study of Student Engagement, Satisfaction, and Academic Success among International and American Students. ISSN: 2162-3104 Print/ ISSN: 2166-3750 Online Volume 5, Issue 1 (2015), pp. 72-85 ©Journal of International Students <http://jistudents.org/>
- Ko, Wen-Hwa & Chung Feng-Ming (2014). Teaching Quality, Learning Satisfaction and Academic Performance among Hospitality Students in Taiwan. *World Journal of Education* Vol.4, No. 5. Published by Sciedu Press. ISSN 1925-0746 E-ISSN 1925-0754
- Li, I. W., & Carroll, D. (2017). Factors Influencing University Student Satisfaction, Dropout and Academic Performance: An Australian Higher Education Equity Perspective. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE), Perth: Curtin University.
- Lipa, C. J., et. al. (2017). Correlation of Demographic Profile and Selected Indicators on the Academic Performance of the Office Management Students of PUP- Parañaque Campus. *European Academic Research* Vol. Iv, Issue 10/ January 2017
- Martirosyan, N.M. et.al (2014). Student Satisfaction and Academic Performance in Armenian Higher Education. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* Vol. 4
- Remali, A.M. et.al (2013). Understanding Academic Performance Based On Demographic Factors, Motivation Factors And Learning Styles. Special Issue: International Conference on Teaching and Learning in Education, 2013 *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2013, 3(9):1938-1951.
- Williams, F. I. et. al (2013) Incivility in Academe: What if the Instigator is a High Performer? Georgia Southern University. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice* vol. 14(1)
- WHO. Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Nursing and Midwifery Educational Institutions [Internet]. India; 2008. Available from: [http://apps.searo.who.int/PDS\\_DOCS/B3156.pdf](http://apps.searo.who.int/PDS_DOCS/B3156.pdf)

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

### **Recommendations**

With respect to the findings of the study, topics which are of interest to quality education of the student nurses and the academic staff were raised. Generally all the level of interpretations are on the “agree” however it also revealed the implications for nursing education, specific to support and services of the institution. These were discussed within the facts and circumstances of student nurses’ academic satisfaction which are issues of teaching and learning in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing in the selected school. Specific topics for further investigations are the indicators of the ‘support and services’ of the Faculty of Nursing: ‘the facilities like classrooms, clinical laboratories and library to facilitate student learning’, ‘computer and clinical laboratory equipment, adequate staff and accessibility to meet learning needs’ and ‘the secretaries professional behavior’. Then again, the lowest among all the indicators of the academic satisfaction which are issues of concern are: ‘channels for expressing students’ complaints availability’ and ‘open expression of academic and other concerns to the administration’ under the domain of in-class teaching and lastly the ‘clinical instructors to provide feedback at appropriate times, not to embarrass the students in front of others like classmates, staff, patients and family members’ on the clinical teaching domain. These all suggests that there are more struggles on how to satisfy the students in terms of the indicators mentioned.

### **Acknowledgment**

The researchers acknowledge the following for the realization of the study: authors of the UNSASS, without them the study would be nothing, to the administration of the Faculty of Nursing who made the study smooth and feasible, and to the student participants, who put their trust and confidence in expressing their satisfaction level and lastly, to all of us researchers who burn our midnight candles and to those people who are helpful in the dissemination of the study.

### **References**

- Alhajraf, N.M. & Alasfour, A.M. (2014). The Impact of Demographic and Academic Characteristics on Academic Performance. *International Business Research*; Vol. 7, No. 4; 2014 ISSN 1913-9004 E-ISSN 1913-9012 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education
- Alos, S.B., Caranto, L.C & David, J.J.T. (2015) *International Journal of Nursing Science*, 5(2): 60-65 DOI: 10.5923/j.nursing.20150502.04

correlated with the domains along program design and delivery; and support and services. Similarly, significant relationships is noted on both domain, program design and delivery with support and services. Hence, the overall academic satisfaction of the participants is significantly correlated with the specific domains on in-class teaching; program design and delivery; and support and services. All computed *p-values* along these areas of evaluations were below 0.05 level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

7. All domains of the participants' academic satisfaction (except for clinical teaching) were significantly related to their academic performance for both major subjects and RLE. The computed *p-values* along these areas were below the level of significance at 0.05, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

### **Conclusions**

Based from the significant findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The 242 research participants were from 2<sup>nd</sup> semesters to 8<sup>th</sup> semester of the cited school, with the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester having the most populated students and 8<sup>th</sup> semester as the least populated participants.
2. The academic satisfaction of the participants was generally on the "agree" level.
3. The academic performance of the participants was on the "Passed, Good" level.
4. Program Design and Delivery was significantly given the highest rate than other domains of the participants' academic satisfaction.
5. Students' academic performance in both major subjects and RLE was significantly increasing as the semester was also toward the higher semesters.
6. All domains of the academic satisfaction of the student participants (except clinical teaching) were significantly correlated with each other.
7. The domains of the participants' academic satisfaction (except for clinical teaching) were significantly related to their academic performance for both major subjects and RLE.

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

as the highest at 4.03.

3. Academic performance of the participants computed as 125.02 for major subjects with a qualitative description of Passed, Fairwhile 143.05 for RLE and qualitatively described as Passed, Good. Students from the 8<sup>th</sup> semester showed the highest level of academic performance for both major subjects and RLE showing the average grade of 135 (Passed, Good) and 154.48 (Passed, Very Good) respectively.
4. No significant difference was computed on participants' academic satisfaction along in-class teaching and the other 3 domains (clinical teaching, program design and delivery); all *p-values* computed for these areas were higher than 0.05 ranged from 0.166 to 0.179, thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Meanwhile, clinical teaching with program design and delivery versus support and services showed significant differences showing *p-values* lower than the significance level of 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

5. Significant differences were noted along the respondents' academic performance in their major subjects of the second semester versus grades of the students in 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> semesters; for students major subject grades in the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester versus those students from 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters; 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> semester major grades versus those students' grades in the 8<sup>th</sup> semester. All showed *p-values* lower than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

On the other hand, there were also significant differences on the participants' academic performance as measured by their RLE grades from 3<sup>rd</sup> semester to 8<sup>th</sup> semester, thus the null hypothesis rejected since the *p-values* were lower than 0.05 level of significance. RLE grades of the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester significantly differed with those RLE grades in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters while RLE grades for the 4<sup>th</sup> semester significantly varied from the student grades in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters. Fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) semesters' grades in RLE vitally differed with the students grades from 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters. Students' on the 6<sup>th</sup> semester also significantly varied from those in the 8<sup>th</sup> semester.

6. Significant relationships were shown among the domains of the participants' academic satisfaction. In-class teaching is significantly



*Legend:*

*S – Significant*

*VS – Very Significant*

*NS – Not Significant*

*r-values with \* are significant at 0.05 and those r-values with \*\* are very significant at 0.01.*

Table 7 gives details on the significant relationships of the students' academic satisfaction with their combined academic performance. As shown in the said table, there is no significant correlation found on the participants' academic satisfaction along domain on clinical teaching with the participants' grades in major subjects and RLE. This showed the *r* values of 0.020 and 0.112 with subsequent *p-values* of 0.118 and 0.210, thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that the participants' academic satisfaction along clinical teaching does not vitally relate to their academic performance neither in major subjects nor RLE.

Meanwhile, all other domains of the participants' academic satisfaction were significantly correlated with their academic satisfaction which showed *r* values ranging from 0.197 to 0.620 and corresponding *p-values* lower than the significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected in line with this context.

The findings signify that participants' academic satisfaction (except clinical teaching domain) is vitally linked with their academic performance as specified in their grades in major subjects and RLE.

### **Summary of Findings**

1. The total participants of the study is equal to 242 who were distributed along the seven identified semesters from 2<sup>nd</sup> semester to 8<sup>th</sup> semester, with percentage distribution ranging from 10% to almost 18% of the total population. The most populated semester was by the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester with 17.36% and the least populated semester was the students in the 8<sup>th</sup> semester with 10.33% percentage share.
2. The general academic satisfaction of the participants slated at 3.93, with verbal interpretation of "agree". The student participants from the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester gave the highest rate at 4.23 with a qualitative description of "strongly agree". On the other hand, the specific domains all rated on the "agree" level of satisfaction with program and delivery domain

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

delivery; and support and services. This was evident in the *p-values* which lower than the significant level at 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, This then suggests that the overall academic satisfaction of the participants is highly linked on the participants specific regards distinctly on in-class teaching; program design and delivery; and support and services.

**Table 7** Summary on the Relationships between Participants' Academic Satisfaction and Academic Performance

(0.05 level of significance)

Variables being evaluated	df	r-value	p-value	Decision
In-class Teaching vs. Major Subjects	1,240	0.197*	0.014	S
Clinical Teaching vs. Major Subjects	1,240	0.020	0.118	NS
Program Design and Delivery vs. Major Subjects	1,240	0.423**	0.008	VS
Support and Resources vs. Major Subjects	1,240	0.283*	0.012	S
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. Major Subjects	1,240	0.277*	0.013	S
In-class Teaching vs. RLE	1,198	0.206*	0.024	S
Clinical Teaching vs. RLE	1,198	0.112	0.210	NS
Program Design and Delivery vs. RLE	1,198	0.244*	0.013	S
Support and Resources vs. RLE	1,198	0.226*	0.017	S
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. RLE	1,198	0.229*	0.017	S
In-class Teaching vs. Overall Academic Performance	1,240	0.299**	0.004	VS
Clinical Teaching vs. Overall Academic Performance	1,240	0.125*	0.096	NS
Program Design and Delivery vs. Overall Academic Performance	1,240	0.620**	0.002	VS
Support and Resources vs. Overall Academic Performance	1,240	0.528**	0.003	VS
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. Overall Academic Performance	1,240	0.526**	0.003	VS

Domains being evaluated	df	r-value	p-value	Decision
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. Clinical Teaching	1,6	0.380	0.140	NS
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. Program Design and Delivery	1,6	0.891**	0.001	VS
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. In-class Teaching	1,6	0.999**	0.000	VS

*Legend:*

*S – Significant*

*VS – Very Significant*

*NS – Not Significant*

*r-values with \* are significant at 0.05 and those r-values with \*\* are very icant at 0.01.*

The study also evaluated the correlations among the domains of the students' academic satisfaction specifically the in-class teaching; clinical teaching; program design and delivery; and support and services.

As manifested in table 6, only clinical teaching had no significant relationship as computed. This is manifested by the computed *p-values* in this area of evaluation with lower than the level of significance at 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Meaning the participants' academic satisfaction and clinical satisfaction is not significantly linked with their academic satisfaction with the other domains.

Meanwhile, for the domain of in-class teaching, it showed significant connections with the domains on program design and delivery; and support and services. The computed r-values on both areas were 0.804 and 0.861 correspondingly with the *p-values* of 0.006 and 0.03. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. This suggests that participants' point-of-view on their academic satisfaction is highly correlated along with the domains of in-class teaching distinctly both program design and delivery and support and services.

Still, significant correlation is also shown along the domain on program design and delivery with support and services showing the r value of 0.894 and *p-value* of 0.001. Again, the null hypothesis is rejected on this context. This denotes that the academic satisfaction of the student participants is highly correlated between domains on program design and delivery and support and services.

In general, the overall participants' academic satisfaction was specifically correlated with the domains particularly on in-class teaching; program design and

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

shown in Table 5b, students grades in the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester have significant difference in the students' grades in 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters showing the t-values of (-)3.605, (-)5.03, (-)6.512, and (-)9.421 and *p-values* which are lower than the significance level of 0.05. It also shows in the table that RLE performance of the students in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter is significantly varied with the RLE grades of the students in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters showing the t values of (-)2.972 and (-)5.232 respectively. Also, the students RLE grades from 5<sup>th</sup> semester were also significantly differed with the RLE grades of the students in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters with the t values slated at (-)2.505, (-)4.049, and (-)6.296 and subsequent *p-values* of 0.015, 0.000, and 0.000. Lastly, the RLE grades of the students in the 6<sup>th</sup> semester were also significantly differed with the RLE grades of the students in 8<sup>th</sup> semester with the t value of (-)2.405 and *p-value* of 0.21. These findings rejected the statement of the null hypothesis.

Consequently, the findings in table 5b denote that RLE grades were higher from the higher semesters than in the early semesters. However, the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters' RLE performance of the students were of the same level.

**Table 6 Summary on the Relationships of Participants' Academic Satisfaction among the identified domains**

(0.05 level of significance)

Domains being evaluated	df	r-value	<i>p-value</i>	Decision
In-class Teaching vs. Clinical Teaching	1,6	0.283	0.219	NS
In-class Teaching vs. Program Design and Delivery	1,6	0.804**	0.006	VS
In-class Teaching vs. Support and Services	1,6	0.861**	0.003	VS
Clinical Teaching vs. Program Design and Delivery	1,6	0.206	0.306	NS
Clinical Teaching vs. Support and Services	1,6	0.380	0.141	NS
Program Design and Delivery vs. Support and Resources	1,6	0.894**	0.001	VS
Overall Academic Satisfaction vs. In-class Teaching	1,6	0.858**	0.003	VS

that students' from the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters have significantly higher grades in their major subjects than among the semesters along 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> semesters; and those students' from 8<sup>th</sup> semester have higher grades in their major subjects than those in 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> semesters.

**Table 5b Summary on the Differences of Participants' Academic Performance when grouped according to Semester Enrolled (RLE)**  
(0.05 level of significance)

Semesters being evaluated	Df	t-value	p-value	Critical t	Decision
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 4 <sup>th</sup> Semester	74	(-)3.605**	0.001	1.993	VS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 5 <sup>th</sup> Semester	72	(-)1.243	0.218	1.992	NS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	60	(-)5.03**	0.000	2.000	VS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	67	(-)6.512	0.000	1.996	VS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	58	(-)9.421*	0.015	2.002	S
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 5 <sup>th</sup> Semester	72	1.243	0.218	1.993	NS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	56	(-)1.506	0.138	2.003	NS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	65	(-)2.972**	0.004	1.997	VS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	56	(-)5.232**	0.000	2.003	VS
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	60	(-)2.505*	0.015	2.000	S
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	67	(-)4.049**	0.000	1.996	VS
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	55	(-)6.296**	0.000	2.004	VS
6 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	54	(-)0.992	0.326	2.005	NS
6 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	40	(-)2.405*	0.021	2.021	S
7 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	48	(-)1.618	0.112	2.011	NS

*Legend:*

*S – Significant*

*VS – Very Significant*

*NS – Not Significant*

*t-values with \* are significant at 0.05 and those t-values with \*\* are very significant at 0.01.*

The participants' grades in related learning experience (RLE) were also differentiated using t-test starting from 3<sup>rd</sup> semester to 8<sup>th</sup> semester. From the data

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

Semesters being evaluated	df	t-value	p-value	Critical t	Decision
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	67	(-)3.260**	0.002	1.996	VS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	50	(-)4.304**	0.000	2.010	VS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 5 <sup>th</sup> Semester	71	1.853	0.068	1.994	NS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	48	1.872	0.067	2.011	NS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	63	(-)0.143	0.886	1.998	NS
4 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	56	(-)0.780	0.439	2.003	NS
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	55	0.373	0.710	2.004	NS
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	67	(-)1.896	0.062	1.996	NS
5 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	52	(-)2.825**	0.007	2.007	VS
6 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	50	(-)1.919	0.061	2.010	NS
6 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	36	(-)2.551*	0.015	2.028	S
7 <sup>th</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	45	(-)0.546	0.588	2.014	NS

*Legend:*

*S – Significant*

*VS – Very Significant*

*NS – Not Significant*

*t-values with \* are significant at 0.05 and those t-values with \*\* are very significant at 0.01.*

Table 5a gives details on the differences of the participants' academic performance on major subjects as grouped according to their semesters' enrolled. Among the said semesters, participants' major subject grades were significantly differed along second semester versus 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> semesters with the computed t-values of (-)3.017 and (-)4.451 with the subsequent *p-values* of 0.004 and 0.000. Still, the participants' grades in the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester were also significantly differentiated with their grades in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> semesters showing the t values of (-)3.260 and (-)4.304 and corresponding *p-values* of 0.002 and 0.000. Also, the participants' grades in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> semesters were both significantly differed with the students' grades during the second semesters computing the t values of (-)2.825 and (-)2.551 and *p-values* of 0.007 and 0.015. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected in these areas of evaluation.

It can be inferred from the significant findings shown in the above table

among the domains of the participants' perceptions on their academic satisfaction: in-class teaching versus all other domains (clinical teaching; program design and delivery; and support and resources); and clinical teaching with support and resources showed no significant difference. Each of the said evaluation enlisted a *p-value* which is lower than the significance level at 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is accepted in this context. This means that the participants' perceptions along with the identified domains of academic satisfaction are of the same level.

On the other hand, a very significant findings were identified along clinical teaching with program design and delivery; and program design and delivery with support and resources with t-values of (-)6.418 and 7.574 and *p-values* at 0.000 subsequently. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected in these areas.

In terms of clinical teaching and program design and delivery – the second variable/domain (program design and delivery) is relatively higher than clinical teaching. This connotes that the participants are more satisfied in the domain along clinical teaching. Hence, the participants were significantly satisfied along program design and delivery than support and resources of the cited Nursing School.

**Table 5a Summary on the Differences of Participants' Academic Performance when grouped according to Semester Enrolled (Major Subjects)**  
(0.05 level of significance)

Semesters being evaluated	df	t-value	<i>p-value</i>	Critical t	Decision
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester	71	0.723	0.472	1.994	NS
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 4 <sup>th</sup> Semester	71	1.853	0.068	1.994	NS
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 5 <sup>th</sup> Semester	49	(-)0.331	0.742	2.009	NS
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	67	(-)3.017**	0.004	1.996	VS
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 7 <sup>th</sup> Semester	61	(-)4.451**	0.000	1.200	VS
2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester vs. 8 <sup>th</sup> Semester	74	(-)0.906	0.368	1.993	NS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 4 <sup>th</sup> Semester	68	(-)3.272**	0.002	1.995	VS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 5 <sup>th</sup> Semester	74	(-)1.454	0.150	1.993	NS
3 <sup>rd</sup> Semester vs. 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester	60	(-)0.866	0.390	2.000	NS

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

The overall academic performance of the research participants differs slightly. From the major lecture subjects of 125.02 interpreted as “Passed, Fair” the Related Learning Experience (RLE) shows another level higher to “Passed, Good” with average weighted mean of 134.03

**Table 4** Summary on the Differences of Participants’ Academic Satisfaction along with the identified domains

(0.05 level of significance)

Domains being evaluated	df	t-value	<i>p-value</i>	Critical t	Decision
In-class Teaching vs. Clinical Teaching	29	1.377	0.179	2.045	NS
In-class Teaching vs. Program Design and Delivery	26	(-)1.767	0.089	2.056	NS
In-class Teaching vs. Support and Resources	19	1.440	0.166	2.093	NS
Clinical Teaching vs. Program Design and Delivery	25	(-)6.418**	0.000	2.060	VS
Clinical Teaching vs. Support and Resources	18	1.402	0.178	2.101	NS
Program Design and Delivery vs. Support and Resources	15	7.574**	0.000	2.131	VS

*Legend:*

*S – Significant*

*VS – Very Significant*

*NS – Not Significant*

*t-values with \* are significant at 0.05 and those t-values with \*\* are very significant at 0.01.*

As stipulated in table 4, there were four areas in evaluating the relationships



**Table 3a.2 Summary of Participants' Academic Performance in RLE when grouped according to Semester**

	Categorization	Academic Performance in RLE		
		AWM	VI	R
<b>Academic Semester</b>	Three	129.36	Passed, Fair	6
	Four	140.89	Passed, Good	4
	Five	136.76	Passed, Good	5
	Six	146.53	Passed, Good	3
	Seven	150.26	Passed, Very Good	2
	Eight	154.48	Passed, Very Good	1
<b>Total Mean</b>		<b>143.05</b>		
<b>Description</b>		<b>Passed, Good</b>		

The academic performance of the enrolled students in terms of RLE was “Passed, Very Good” for the average weighted mean of 143.48. Topped by semester Eight with AWM of 154.48, followed by semester Seven with AWM of 150.26, both have the same verbal interpretation of “Passed, Very Good”. Next is the semester Six with 146.53 AWM with verbal interpretation of “Passed, Good”.

On the contrary, the least AWM then again is of semester Three with AWM of 129.36 interpreted as “Passed, Fair”. Shadowed by semesters Five and Four with AWM of 136.76 and 140.89 correspondingly, have the same verbal interpretation of “Passed, Good”.

**Table 3b Participants' Academic Performance when grouped according to lecture and skills performance**

<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
Major Lecture subjects	125.02	Passed, Fair	2
Related Learning Experience	143.05	Passed, Good	1
<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>134.03</b>	<b>Passed, Good</b>	

Legend:

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

the participants are more satisfied together with the components of how the teachers of the cited school manage classroom learning.

Consequently, the third domain with highest rate was on clinical teaching with the mean of 3.87 described as “agree”. Thus, the student participants also have high regard on the competency, handling skills and behaviors of their clinical instructors.

The least rated domain was of support and services showing the mean of 3.82 and verbally interpreted as 3.82. This denotes that the student participants are less confident of the services and support system of the nursing curriculum of the cited school.

**Table 3a.1**

**Summary of Participants’ Academic Performance in Major Subjects when grouped according to Semester**

	Categorization	Academic Performance in Major Subjects		
		AWM	VI	R
<b>Academic Semester</b>	Two	118.05	Passed, Fair	6
	Three	114.03	Failed	7
	Four	132.42	Passed, Good	3
	Five	122.68	Passed, Fair	4
	Six	120.17	Passed, Fair	5
	Seven	132.77	Passed, Good	2
	Eight	135.00	Passed, Good	1
<b>Total Mean</b>		<b>125.02</b>		
<b>Description</b>		<b>Passed, Fair</b>		

As shown, the total mean of the academic performance in major subjects of the participants is 125.02 described as “Passed, Fair”. The highest average weighted was of the semester eight participants with 135.00 followed by semester seven with 132.77 then semester four with 132.42 all verbally interpreted as “Passed, Good”.

Contrary to expectations are the semesters with the lowest academic performance in major subjects. Semester Three have the average weighted mean of 114.03 interpreted as “Failed”, semester Two with 118.05 and semester Six with 120.17, both with verbal interpretations of “Passed, Fair”.

To be specific, there are items with the highest rates. Item #44: “The secretaries are caring and helpful” (3.88 – agree); followed by item #46: “Support at the clinic and computer labs are really available” (3.86 – agree). Item #45: “The secretaries behave professionally” (3.82 - agree); item #47: “Computer and clinical labs are well equipped, adequately staffed and are readily accessible to meet (3.79 – agree); and lastly item #48: “The facilities like classrooms, clinical labs and library facilitate learning (3.76 – agree).

**Table 2b.5**

**Summary on the Participants’ Academic Satisfaction**

<b>Domains</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
In-Class Teaching	3.94	A	2
Clinical Teaching	3.87	A	3
Program Design and Delivery	4.03	A	1
Support and Resources	3.82	A	4
<b>Total Mean</b>	3.93	Agree	

Legend:

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

In summary, table 2b.5 gives details on the combined rates of the student participants on their academic satisfaction along with the domains on in-class teaching; clinical teaching; program design and delivery; and support and services. As seen, the total computed mean is 3.93 with a verbal interpretation of “agree”. This means that the participants are all agreeing that they are satisfied in each of the given domain as to elucidate their academic satisfaction for the nursing curriculum of the cited school.

Among the said domains, the top rated was program design and delivery showing the mean of 4.03 (agree). This suggests that the participants gave higher regard on the curriculum structure of nursing education and its’ implementation by the cited school.

Next domain is the in-class teaching with mean of 3.94 verbally interpreted as “agree”. It infers that next to the program design and delivery,

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

Contrariwise, there were three least rated items. Item #32: “This program provides a variety of good and relevant courses” (3.90 – agree); item #39: “There is a commitment to academic excellence in this program (4.00 – agree); and items #33 and #40: “The program enhances my analytical skills” and “As a result of my courses, I feel confident about dealing with clinical nursing problems” respectively (4.01 – agree). Similarly, the students have lesser regard on the specified items as to elicit their academic satisfaction on the school’s program design and delivery.

Overall, the participants’ academic satisfaction along program design and delivery is at 4.03, verbally interpreted as “agree”.

**Table 2b.4**

**Participants’ Academic Satisfaction on the Support and Services Domain**

<b>Subscale IV: Support and Resources</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
44 The secretaries are caring and helpful	3.88	A	2
45 The secretaries behave professionally	3.82	A	3
46 Support at the clinical and computer labs is readily available	3.86	A	1
47 Computer and clinical labs are well equipped, adequately staffed, and are readily accessible to meet	3.79	A	4
48.The facilities (class rooms, clinical labs and library) facilitate my learning.	3.76	A	5
<b>Total Mean</b>	3.82	Agree	

Legend:

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

Table 2b.4 gives data on the participants’ academic satisfaction along with the five-item indicators on support and services domain. Generally, all items were rated at a level of agree showing the total mean of 3.82. Thus, the participants are generally confident in terms of support and services given by the school for their nursing education.

<b>Subscale III: Program Design and Delivery</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
37 The program is designed to facilitate team work among students	4.07	A	3
38 The program enhances my problem solving or critical thinking skills	4.01	A	8
39 There is a commitment to academic excellence in this program	4.00	A	10
40 As a result of my courses, I feel confident about dealing with clinical nursing problems	4.01	A	8
41 Going to class helps me better understand the material	4.12	A	1
42 I am able to experience intellectual growth in the program	4.05	A	3
43 Overall, the program requirements are reasonable and achievable	4.04	A	4
<b>Total Mean</b>	4.03	Agree	

Legend:A

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

The data in table 2b.3 gives details on the participants' academic satisfaction in the program design and delivery based on the nursing curriculum of the cited school. This domain presented 12 specific item indicators to describe how the participants were satisfied along with the said aspect.

In detail, the three highest rated items: item #41: "Going to class helps me better understand the material (4.12 – agree); item #35: "the quality of instruction I receive in my classes is good and helpful" (4.08 – agree); and item #37: "The program is designed to facilitate team- work among students" (4.07 – agree). All three items were on the "agree" level of academic satisfaction. This suggests that the participants of this study are generally confident on the how the school give learning materials for the nursing curriculum; the caliber of nursing instruction; and how the school motivates its students to work in converge among themselves.

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

Clinical Teaching, which gave the overall mean of 3.87 with a verbal interpretation of “agree”. This means that the participants of this study are generally agreeing on the 15 specified items to describe their academic satisfaction together with clinical aspect of teaching.

Specifically, the top three rated item indicators: item #29: “Clinical Instructors encourage me to link theory to practice” (4.00 – agree); item #26: “Clinical instructors demonstrate a high level of knowledge and clinical expertise” (3.98 – agree); and item #17: “Clinical instructors are approachable and make students feel comfortable about asking question” (3.92 – agree). This means that the participants gave high consideration on how the clinical instructors help the students in turning theoretical concept to practical settings; how the clinical instructors display expertise; and how they make a conducive learning environment to their learners.

On the contrary, there were three items with least rates. Item #18: “Clinical instructors provide feedback at appropriate times, and do not embarrass me in form in front of others (classmates, staff, patients and family members); item #23: “Clinical instructors facilitate my ability to critically assess my client’s needs” (3.78 – agree); and item #24: “Clinical instructors assign me to patients that are appropriate to my level of competence” (3.80 – agree). These three items were still on the level of “agree” satisfaction, however, the finding in table 2b.2 signifies that the participants are lesser confident in terms of these aspects of the clinical teaching of their academic satisfaction.

**Table 2b.3 Participants’ Academic Satisfaction on the Program Design and Delivery Domain**

<b>Subscale III: Program Design and Delivery</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
32 This program provides a variety of good and relevant courses	3.90	A	11
33 The program enhances my analytical skills	4.01	A	8
34 Most courses in this program are beneficial and contribute to my overall professional development	4.03	A	5
35 The quality of instruction I receive in my classes is good and helpful	4.08	A	2
36 I usually have a clear idea of what is expected of me in this program	4.02	A	5

<b>Subscale II: Clinical Teaching</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
19 Clinical instructors are open to discussions and difference in opinions	3.85	A	9.5
20 Clinical instructors give me sufficient guidance before I perform technical skills	3.85	A	3
21 Clinical instructors view my mistakes as part of my learning	3.84	A	11
22 Clinical instructors give me clear ideas of what is expected from me during a clinical rotation	3.88	A	6
23 Clinical instructors facilitate my ability to critically assess my client's needs	3.78	A	14
24 Clinical instructors assign me to patients that are appropriate for my level of competence	3.80	A	13
25 Clinical instructors give me verbal and written feedback concerning my clinical experience	3.87	A	7.5
26 Clinical instructors demonstrate a high level of knowledge and clinical expertise	3.98	A	2
27 Clinical instructors are available when needed	3.85	A	9.5
28 Clinical instructors provide enough opportunities for independent practice in the lab and clinical sites	3.82	A	12
29 Clinical instructors encourage me to link theory to practice	4.00	A	1
30 Instructions are consistent among different clinical and lab instructors	3.87	A	7.5
31 Faculty members behave professionally	3.89	A	5
<b>Total Mean</b>	3.87	Agree	

Legend:

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

Table 2b.2 gives details on the participants' academic satisfaction in terms of

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

Legend:

WM = Weighted Mean

VI = Verbal Interpretation

R = Rank

Table 2b.1 shows the participants satisfaction in terms of in-class teaching domain wherein item indicator #13: “Faculty members demonstrate a high level of knowledge in their subject area got the highest mean of 4.17, verbally interpreted as agree. Followed by the item indicator #15: “Faculty members create a good impression” and item #11: “Faculty members are good role models and motivate me to do my best” with mean of 4.13 and 4.11 respectively – both were being qualitatively described “agree”. The findings justify that the participants are therefore satisfied in terms of the knowledge level of the faculty members of the cited school. Hence, participants are also satisfied in terms on how these faculty members make impression and motivate their learners.

Meanwhile, still on the “agree” level of interpretations – the three least rated items: item #10: “I received detailed feedback from faculty members on my work and written assignments” (3.52); item #6: “I can freely express my academic and other concerns to the administration” (3.72); and item #7: “Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students” (3.77). Thus, this suggests that there are more struggle on how to satisfy the students in terms of giving feedback; expressing students’ ideas; and treatment of students.

The overall mean computed at 3.94, verbally interpreted as “agree”, means that the participants’ satisfaction in terms of in-class teaching is generally at a considerable level.

**Table 2b.2 Participants’ Academic Satisfaction on the Clinical Teaching Domain**

<b>Subscale II: Clinical Teaching</b>	<b>AWM</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
17 Clinical instructors are approachable and make students feel comfortable about asking questions	3.92	A	4
18 Clinical instructors provide feedback at appropriate times, and do not embarrass me in front of others (classmates, staff, patients and family members)	3.73	A	15



**Table 2b.1 Participants' Satisfaction on the In-class Teaching Domain**

<b>Subscale I: In-class Teaching</b>		<b>VI</b>	<b>R</b>
1 I can freely express my academic and other concerns to faculty members	4.09	A	5
2 Faculty members are easily approachable	3.90	A	11
3 Faculty members make every effort to assist students when asked	3.97	A	8
4 Faculty members make an effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my course work.	3.92	A	9
5 Faculty members are usually available after class and during office hours	3.98	A	7
6 I can freely express my academic and other concerns to the administration	3.72	A	15
7 Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students	3.77	A	14
8 Faculty members provide adequate feedback about students' progress in a course	3.81	A	13
9 I receive detailed feedback from faculty members on my work and written assignments	4.01	A	6
10 Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily available	3.52	A	16
11 Faculty members are good role models and motivate me to do my best	4.11	A	3
12 The administration shows concern for students as individuals	3.85	A	12
13 Faculty members demonstrate a high level of knowledge in their subject area	4.17	A	1
14 Faculty members take the time to listen/discuss issues that may impact my academic performance	3.91	A	10
15 Faculty members create a good overall impression	4.13	A	2
16 I am generally given enough time to understand the things I have to learn	4.10	A	4
<b>Total Mean</b>	3.94	Agree	

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

16.11% and 15.29% respectively). Largely were enrolled in the course (BSN) as their first choice (57.44%), new students (72.2%) from 5 different departments, 48.76% from Basic Nursing, the rest from four different specializations namely Critical Care Nursing (16.94%), Operating Theater (15.29%), General Nursing (14.05) to Midwifery and Neonatology Nursing (4.96%). Most of them were exposed in Mitiga Hospital (26.03%), the least in Tripoli Medical Center (3.31%) being Skills Laboratory as preparatory skills and training aspect before hospital exposure done inside the college laboratory rooms.

**Table 2a Summary of the Participants' Academic Satisfaction when grouped according to Semester Enrolled**

	Categorization	Academic Satisfaction		
		AWM	VI	R
Academic Semester	Two	4.23	Strongly Agree	1
	Three	3.88	Agree	5
	Four	3.93	Agree	4
	Five	4.00	Agree	3
	Six	3.79	Agree	6
	Seven	3.62	Agree	7
	Eight	4.01	Agree	2
Total Mean		3.93		
Description		Agree		

The table gives detailed information on the participants' academic satisfaction when grouped according to their enrolled semester. In general the participants showed the rate of 3.93 qualitatively described as agree. This means that the participants are generally agreeing with the domains presented for their academic satisfaction.

Specifically, participants from the second semester gave the highest rate at 4.23 with qualitative description of strongly agree, which denotes that this group of research participants have higher regard with their academic satisfaction than the other participants from 3<sup>rd</sup> semester to 8<sup>th</sup> semester.

Demographic Profile	Categorization	F	%
	<i>Total</i>	242	100
1.4 Choice Of Nursing	First choice	139	57.44
	Second choice	103	42.56
	<i>Total</i>	242	100
1.5 Kind Of Student	Transferee	66	27.27
	New	176	72.73
	<i>Total</i>	242	100
1.6 Specialization Or Department	Basic	118	48.76
	Critical Care Nursing	41	16.94
	General Nursing	34	14.05
	Midwifery and Neonatology	12	4.96
	Operating Theater	37	15.29
	<i>Total</i>	242	100
1.7 RLE Exposure Or Institution of Exposure	Skills Lab	52	21.49
	Abusaleem Hospital	37	15.29
	Aljalaa Hospital	41	16.94
	Mitiga Hospital	63	26.03
	Tripoli Central Hospital	41	16.94
	Tripoli Medical Center	8	3.31
	<i>Total</i>	242	100

Shown in the above table are the demographic variables of the participants (242). Mostly were within 21-24 years old (67.77%), more than half females (54.42%), composed mostly from Basic department: semesters two, three and four (17.36%),

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

numbers 6 and 7 are statistically treated with Pearson-r correlation coefficient to determine the relationship of the extraneous variables or independent variables to the dependent variables of the study. All statistical computations were set at 0.05 level of significance.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Prior to participation in the study, student nurses were advised to read the consent form which explained the purpose of the study that their participation is voluntary and they can refuse to participate without undue penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured indicating that any information they will provide will not be known. Though the questionnaires were provided with names and student numbers, the questionnaires bears only the codes to guarantee confidentiality. On top of that only the research team has the access to the data, encoded and stored in a hard drive of the research team.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Table 1 Demographic Profile of the Participants**

<b>Demographic Profile</b>	<b>Categorization</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
1.1 Age	17-20 years old	55	22.73
	21-24 years old	164	67.77
	25-28 years old	23	9.50
	<i>Total</i>	<i>242</i>	<i>100</i>
1.2 Gender	Male	74	30.58
	Female	168	54.42
	<i>Total</i>	<i>242</i>	<i>100</i>
1.3 Semester	Two	42	17.36
	Three	39	16.11
	Four	37	15.29
	Five	38	15.70
	Six	30	12.40
	Seven	31	12.81
	Eight	25	10.33

support and services (Denisson, El Masri 2012). The level of agreeableness of the Likert Scale used in scaling the responses of the participants, interpreted as follows:

Verbal interpretation	Scale
Strongly Disagree	1.00 – 1.79
Disagree	1.80 – 2.59
Somewhat Disagree	2.60 – 3.39
Agree	3.40 – 4.19
Strongly Agree	4.20 – 5.00

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

The study took place between May to July 2018. The researchers first obtained the total population of the enrolled students in the program from the college registrar. From that the total number of sample was determined. Participants were selected using the purposive sampling technique, with the inclusion criteria in mind. Subsequent to the approval by the corresponding administrators, the researchers distributed the questionnaires during the break-time of the student nurses. With the response rate of 85% the total number of participants reached 242. The researchers then retrieved the participants' over-all grades in major lecture subjects and related learning experience from the Studies and Examination Department. In terms of major subjects, Fundamentals of Nursing 2 for semester 2, Maternal and Child Nursing (MCN) 221 for semester 3, MCN 222 for semester 4, Medical-Surgical Nursing (MSN) 321 for semester 5, MSN 322 for semester 6, MSN 423 for semester 7 and MSN 424 for semester 8. For the Related Learning Experience (RLE), semester 3 has RLE 221 specifically, for semester 4 RLE 222, semester 5 has RLE 323, RLE 324 for semester 6, RLE 425 for semester 7 and for semester 8 RLE 426 and Intensive Nursing Practice grade. Both the major subject in lecture and RLE grade are averaged to get the grade in academic performance.

### **Statistical Treatment of Data**

This quantitative study uses both descriptive and inferential statistics where in the percentage and frequency suited statement of the problem number 1. Weighted mean was used to treat the statement of the problems 2 and 3. Numbers 4 and 5, independent and dependent t-test were used to enlighten the significant difference among extraneous and independent variables. Whereas statements of the problems

■ **Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour**

2. There is no significant difference on the participants' academic performance when grouped according to their semester enrolled.
3. There is no significant relationship between and among the domains of the participants' academic satisfaction.
4. There is no significant relationship between the participants' academic satisfaction and academic performance.

The main objective of the study is to clearly enumerate the strengths and weaknesses of the academic satisfaction of the participants based on the indicators of the four domains. The end goal is the strategic academic planning which will be based on the result of the domains' summary scale, detail scale and the top overall student satisfaction.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This study utilized the quantitative-descriptive, both comparative and correlational design. The researchers used the survey method in the conduct of the study.

The sample consists of the 242 officially enrolled student nurses for the spring semester of 2017-18. They are student nurses from semester 2 to semester 8 of the Faculty of Nursing University of Tripoli Libya, distributed as: 42 from semester 2, 39 in semester 3, 37 in semester 4, 38 from semester 5, 30 from semester 6, 31 from semester 7 and 25 from semester 8, with 74 males and 168 females.

As to the locale of the study, the study was conducted at the Faculty of Nursing, University of Tripoli, Tripoli, Libya. With 14 full time teaching staff, composed of one Libyan, one Jordanian, the rest are Filipinos and 8 part time teachers, all Libyans. It is located in the first building of the college of medicine, with administration, lecture and laboratory rooms on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floor, adjacent to the medical technology department.

The research instrument used in this study has three parts. The first part of the questionnaire is the consent form which indicates agreement of the participants, second part is the demographic profile, whereas the third part is the psychometric assessment of the Undergraduate Nursing Student's Academic Satisfaction Scale (UNSASS). This is a valid and reliable questionnaire to assess the satisfaction of student nurses with their academic program. This is divided into four domains namely: in-class teaching, clinical teaching, program support and delivery and

Student nurses of this college will earn a degree of Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program if they pass all their subjects and submit the requirements for graduation. The researchers strive to upgrade the quality of graduates predicted by academic performance which in turn is predicted by student satisfaction. With this respect, the study explored the relationship between the academic satisfaction (AS) and academic performance (AP) of the student nurses in the Faculty of Nursing, University of Tripoli. It specifically answers the following questions:

1. How are the participants classified along semester enrolled?
2. How do the participants perceived their academic satisfaction in terms of:
  - a. Semester enrolled?
  - b. Domains:
    - b.1 in-class teaching
    - b.2 clinical teaching
    - b.3 program support and delivery; and
    - b.4 support and services?
3. How are the participants classified along with their academic performance in terms of
  - a. major subjects; and
  - b. RLE?
4. Is there a significant difference among the domains of the participants' academic satisfaction?
5. Is there a significant difference on the participants' academic performance when grouped according to their semester enrolled?
6. Is there a significant relationship between and among the domains of the participants' academic satisfaction?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the participants' academic satisfaction and academic performance?

**Hypotheses:**

The following null hypotheses were measured by the study.

1. There is no significant difference among the domains of the participants' academicsatisfaction

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

are the in-class teaching, clinical teaching, program design and delivery; and support and services (Dennison and El-Masri 2012). The undergraduate Nursing Student Academic Satisfaction Scale (UNSASS) is multidimensional in nature. Each of the four domains can be used as a stand-alone measure of its respective concept. It is a valid and reliable questionnaire specifically designed to assess student nurse's satisfaction with their academic programs. It is a 48-item questionnaire that can be completed in 15 - 20 minutes. Validity and reliability information were published at the Journal of Nursing Measurement (J Nurs Meas. 2012; 20 (2):75-89).

There are several existing studies that have investigated student satisfaction and student performance (grades). While some argue against the use of grades as a measure of the quality of education, in practice all educational institutions use grades. To this day, an important criterion for employment is grades (Ko and Chung 2014). As grades are a direct measure of the students' knowledge, it is common to use grades to estimate student performance. According to Mustaq and Khan (2012), Galiher (2006) and Darling (2005) used grade point average (GPA) to measure student performance because their main focus is on the student performance for the particular semester. Some other researchers used test results or previous year result since they are studying performance for the specific subject or year (Hijazi and Naqvi, 2006 and Hake, 1998). Cited by Simeos, Matos, Tome, Ferreira and Chainho (2010), school performance is associated to a variety of school-related factors, including school satisfaction and positive school climate. In this study, academic performance is the average score of two major subjects in the second semester spring 2017-2018. One is the major lecture subject versus the related learning experience of the student nurses in different teaching hospitals. The following are the scaling of the major subject and related learning experience grades of the program:

Verbal Interpretation/Remarks	Grades
Failed, Weak	119 and below
Passed, Fair	120 - 129
Passed, Good	130 - 149
Passed, Very Good	150 – 169
Passed, Excellent	170 - 200



healthcare demand of this country. The first students enrolled in the Faculty of Nursing, University of Tripoli 2009/2010 were only 14. They were also the first graduates, 2013/2014, total of nine from different specializations and now are better off in Tripoli and beyond, in accord to places they are needed the most. Being supervisors, teacher assistants waiting for their scholarship abroad, to charge nurses and being plain housewives the BSN graduate is an asset in the health care sector of this country not to mention as a product of passing the qualification and requirements for graduation.

Today, the latest number of enrollees in the Faculty of Nursing University of Tripoli reached 620. The rate improved, be it of different reasons and motivations of the students while studying the course. Students strive for education while teachers themselves struggle to improve quality. With professional accountability in mind, the researchers put emphasis in this study the quality of learning and teaching while gaining insight into student satisfaction to increase, improve and enhance academic performance. Needless to say, the nursing education team of this faculty, though of shortage in ratio to the number of students, are currently working on ways to improve the quality of their educational provision and increase the satisfaction of their students. Hence, understanding of the student satisfaction in their educational program in relation to their academic performance is explored.

Understanding of the student satisfaction is fundamental for greater awareness of educational process and quality. This is to evaluate not only student's knowledge levels but also the effectiveness of the teachers own teaching processes, and, perhaps provide a gauge of student satisfaction (Martirosyan, Saxon and Wanjohi 2014). Student satisfaction has been proven to have association to academic performance (Abdullah, Alsagoff, Ramlan and Sabran 2014, Dhaqane and Afrah 2016; Korobovah and Starobin 2015, Martirosyan et.al 2014). Student satisfaction is student's short term attitude, derived from the evaluation of the received education service (Alsagoff et. al). Students' satisfaction data helps colleges and universities make their curriculum more responsive to the needs of a changing marketplace. In making curriculum more effective and responsive, it is important to evaluate effectiveness measures concerning the curriculum of each college, department, and program (Dhaqane and Afra 2016). To assess undergraduate student nurses' academic satisfaction, the four domains remain to be important. These

■ Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta , Amjed Altaher Shaktour

performance in both major subjects and related learning experience was significantly increasing as the semester was toward graduation. The findings raise topics which are of interest to quality education of the student nurses and the academic staff. It also revealed the implications for nursing education with regard to support and services of the institution. These were discussed within the facts and circumstances of student nurses' academic satisfaction which are issues of teaching and learning in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing in the selected school.

## INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance (QA) is one of the mechanisms established by education institutions to guarantee that graduates achieve adequate standards of education and training. In the era of quality orientation, human rights, and a consumer- driven society, Nursing and Midwifery Education Institutions (NMEI) are expected to produce qualified graduates who will meet the needs and expectations of society (WHO 2008).

Nursing schools, colleges and universities have no worth without student. Students are the most essential asset for any educational institution (Ifrañ 2012). When they are educated, they help any society fashion and model individuals to function well in their environment. The social and economic development of the country is directly linked with student academic performance. The students' academic performance has been a vital sign of the students' progress in education (Ali et. al 2009). Academic performance serves as indicator of how student is performing in his studies (Lipa, et. al 2017). Academic performance plays an important role in producing best quality graduates who will become great leaders and manpower for the country thus responsible for the country's economic and social development (Alos et. al 2015). In this study, the student nurses refer to semesters 2 to 8 students, termed as participants.

These days, the place of nursing education in Libya has become firmly established in the higher education. Academic year 2009/2010 witnessed the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program integrated into the university sector. The course was appropriated into different specializations to increase efficiency in nursing care and management. From Midwifery and Neonatology Nursing (MN), Critical Care Nursing and Anesthesia Specialization (CCNAS), Operating Theater Nursing and Surgery (OTNS) and General Nursing (GN), the graduates were well equipped, competitive and skilled, meeting the growing

---

# **Interplay Between Nursing Students Academic Satisfaction and Academic Performance in the Faculty of Nursing: Basis of Strategic Academic Planning**

---

■ **Ma. Liza P. Tingzon , Jefferson Galiguís , Lamour Laureta ,  
Amjed Altaher Shaktour**

---

● **Faculty of Nursing , University of Tripoli**

---

## **Abstract**

**Most Libyan students** perceived Nursing as a low quality education. Therefore, the researchers conducted this study to find out whether it's only their perception or is there evidence in reality which concerns the academic performance and the academic satisfaction. Coherent with this principle, the purpose of this study was to explore student nurses' academic satisfaction and its relationship with their academic performance. Academic satisfaction such as in-class teaching, clinical teaching, program support and delivery; and support and services were studied as potential determinants of academic performance (major lecture subjects and related learning experience). The 242 student nurses enrolled in semesters 2 to 8 at Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) University of Tripoli during the academic 2017-2018 Fall semester were the participants of the study. Descriptive statistics, dependent and independent T-tests, Pearson-r correlation coefficient were used. The study found that in contrast to in-class teaching, program support and delivery and support and services, the clinical teaching domains are not significantly related with their academic performance. The findings also suggested that student satisfaction must be given attention specific on support and services domain. The Program design and delivery was significantly given the highest rate than other domains of the participants' academic satisfaction. Moreover, student's academic