

Satisfaction on Clinical Learning Environment among Students in Selected Nursing Colleges, Kathmandu

Kalpna Neupane¹, Mandira Onta², Gayetri Darshandhari (Kapali)³

Author(s) Affiliation

¹Asian College for Advanced Studies

²Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences

³Women's Health and Development Department, Maharajgunj Nursing Campus

Corresponding Author: gayetrins9@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Clinical learning is an essential component of nursing studies. Satisfaction with clinical placements may improve students' learning outcomes as well as their retention in nursing studies. The objective of this study was to find out the satisfaction regarding the clinical learning environment among students in selected nursing colleges, in Kathmandu.

Methods: Descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted among 92 nursing students studying in three Tribhuvan University Affiliated nursing colleges in Kathmandu. Respondents were selected by using the total enumeration method. Data were collected using a structured self-administered questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS version 16 and analysis was done by using descriptive and inferential statistics.

Results: The findings of the study showed that only 30.4% of respondents had a high level of satisfaction on clinical learning environment. There was a significant difference between students' satisfaction with age ($p=0.030$) and areas of clinical practicum ($p=0.0001$). According to domain highest satisfaction was obtained in nursing care on the ward (3.89 ± 0.51) and the lowest satisfaction was obtained in supervisory relationships with students (3.46 ± 0.59).

Conclusion: Satisfaction level of students needs to be increased because this study reveals that only one third of the nursing students have a high level of satisfaction with their clinical placement. A significant difference was found between age and areas of clinical practicum.

Keywords: Clinical Learning Environment, Nursing students, Students' Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Nursing education is a process that includes theoretical knowledge, practical learning, and skills. During the educational process, nursing students practice various methods and techniques for preparing their future roles. This part of the education is a significant experience for nursing students.¹ Clinical placement is a vital part of nursing education.²

The clinical learning environment (CLE) is the conditions of the clinical setting of any hospital that influence students' learning experiences. A good climate for learning experiences in clinical placements depends on supervision and

innovative teaching and learning activities from ward nurses and clinical teachers. Planned and organized learning activities, including specific patient allocation, contribute to students' learning outcomes.³ CLE considers the first place of professional practice for nurses and students' opinion contributes to its improvement.²

The clinical learning environment has great influence in the development of the knowledge, attitude, skills, and problem-solving ability of students. CLE plays a vital role especially during the clinical training of student nurses, as they face the reality of their function. The outcomes of clinical field placement may be improved by

matching the students' satisfaction and their clinical learning environment.²

A study done in Saudi Arabia showed that (75.6%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statements rating their satisfaction with the clinical placement. Students were dissatisfied with the short clinical exposure, the staff nurse role and the evaluation process from the clinical instructors. Students need more support from the clinical staff. They play a major role in influencing the nature of the practice environment and support provided in the learning experience, this support fosters students' interdependence and self-reliance. These ultimately affect the quality of and competency of the newly graduated nurses.⁴

A study conducted in Nepal to find clinical learning environment of colleges affiliated to Purbanchal University revealed that (88%) of respondents were satisfied with the clinical learning environment, (91%) agreed that student nurses learn more from nursing staff, (87%) agreed receives individual care. Students (81%) are able to reach equipment adequately for providing nursing care to the patients. The majority of the respondents (93%) have been found to agree that their supervisor encourages them to be innovative in their work.⁵

A study was conducted in private nursing colleges of Nepal found that students' practicum satisfaction level at government hospital was significantly higher than those in private hospital ($t_{260}=4.50, p<0.001$), the percentage of subjects who were very unsatisfied was 5(3.7%), no students in government hospital reported this level of dissatisfaction. Students undertaking their practicum in private hospitals evaluated their clinical placements significantly more negatively on most sub-dimensions than those in government hospitals.⁵

Nursing students represent the future nursing workforce; thus nursing education is important for quality nursing care. During a preregistration program students are systematically prepared to reach the minimum standards of competencies on knowledge skills and attitudes, during their clinical learning in order to be certified for

their professional capability.⁶ The theoretical aspects in colleges as well as practical aspects in hospitals are important for nurses for quality service.⁷ So, the researchers were interested in finding out the student's satisfaction regarding the clinical learning environment in selected nursing colleges, Kathmandu.

METHODS

A descriptive cross-sectional study was done in three Tribhuvan University affiliated nursing colleges in Kathmandu. The study population was all B.Sc. Nursing 2nd year students. Total 92 samples were selected by total enumeration techniques from respective colleges. Semi-structured questionnaire and Clinical Learning Environment and Nurse Teacher Scale (CLES+T) was used as research instrument. It consists of three parts, a demographic questionnaire, student satisfaction with the clinical placement standard tool (CLES+T) a Likert scale which was used after getting permission from (Saarikoski et.al., 2008) which consists of structured 32 items covering the following areas: Learning environment on the ward (Pedagogical atmosphere) 8 items, nursing care on the ward (6 items), student's nurse supervisory relationship (6 items) and role of the nurse teacher in clinical practice with students (12 items). Each items given 1 score. So among 32 items minimum score was 32 and maximum score was 160. The first items were summed up and the total divided in three levels. The scoring was done on the basis of the percentile. If the obtained score was less than 50% it was given as low level of satisfaction, if the score obtained 50-75% it was given the medium level and if their obtained score was 75% and above it was given as high level of satisfaction.

The content validity of the instrument was established by literature review, and consulting with subject and research experts. Ethical approval was taken from the Institutional Review Board of Tribhuvan University, Institute of Medicine in which reference number was 134 (6-11-E). Formal permission was taken from the concerned authority of three Nursing colleges by submitting a written request letter. A self-administered questionnaire was used to

collect data which took half an hour to fill out the instrument. The purpose of conducting the study was explained and written informed consent was taken from each respondent. Confidentiality was maintained by keeping information in such a way that only the researcher could access them and also assure that the information obtained was used for research purpose only. Anonymity was maintained by coding the questionnaire and not mentioning the name of colleges and name of students in the questionnaire. Respondents were given liberty to withdraw from the study if they wished. Data was collected during September 2018. Data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (Kruskal Wallis and Mann Whitney U test).

RESULTS

Table 1: Students' Satisfaction Level on Ward Learning Environment (n=92)

Statements	SD n(%)	D n (%)	U n (%)	A n (%)	SA n (%)	Mean \pm SD
Well oriented about daily activities	1(1.1)	1(1.1)	5(5.4)	45(48.9)	40(43.0)	4.32 \pm 0.72
Staffs are easy to approach	4(4.3)	12(13)	49(53.3)	19(20.7)	8(8.7)	3.16 \pm 0.91
Go to the ward easily in shift duty	0	3(3.3)	8(8.7)	48(52.2)	33(35.9)	4.20 \pm 0.73
Take part in the discussion if required	0	7(7.6)	14(15.2)	53(57.6)	18(19.6)	3.89 \pm 0.80
The staffs are friendly	7(7.6)	34(37.0)	22(23.9)	25(27.2)	4(4.3)	2.83 \pm 1.05
Sufficient and adequate well-functioning equipment in ward	7(7.6)	32(34.8)	27(29.3)	21(22.8)	5(5.4)	2.83 \pm 1.04
Get chance to learn different procedures	2(2.2)	11(12)	17(18.5)	40(43.5)	22(23.9)	3.75 \pm 1.02
Cooperation between staff/nurse teachers and students.	2(2.2)	7(7.6)	17(18.5)	61(66.3)	5(5.4)	3.65 \pm 0.579

Score range: 8-40, Mean and SD 3.58 \pm 0.55.

Nearly half 48.9% of the respondents had agreed that students were well-oriented about daily activities to be done in the respected clinical areas. Similarly, more than half (53.3%) of respondents had given uncertain responses the staff are easy to approach most of the time and very few of them had strongly disagree on it. Similarly, 34.8% of respondents had also disagreed regarding there are sufficient and adequate well-functioning equipment in ward and equipment are available as required and only 7.6% of the respondents had strongly disagreed on it. 43.5% of respondents had agreed on they get chance to learn different procedures in the ward and very few 2.2% respondents had disagreed on it. Finally, highest mean score (4.32 \pm 0.72) was found in well oriented about daily activities to be done in the respected clinical areas and lowest in the staffs are friendly calls students by name during duty time as required (2.83 \pm 1.05) and there are sufficient and adequate well-functioning equipment in ward (Table 1).

Table 2: Students' Satisfaction Level in Nursing Care on the Ward (n=92)

Statements	SD n (%)	D n (%)	U n (%)	A n (%)	SA n (%)	Mean ±SD
The assignment of nursing care is clearly defined	1(1.1)	6(6.5)	20(21.7)	48(52.2)	17(18.5)	3.80±0.85
Patients received individual nursing care	2(2.2)	12(13.0)	26(28.3)	35(38.0)	17(18.5)	3.57±1.00
Procedure are clearly defined to the patient before doing nursing care	0	4(4.3)	26(28.3)	37(40.2)	25(27.2)	3.90±0.85
After doing nursing care documentation was maintained	1.1%	3(3.3)	7(7.6)	53(57.6)	28(30.4)	4.13±0.77
There are enough opportunities to learn in every shift	0	6(6.5)	25(27.2)	37(40.2)	24(26.1)	3.85±0.88
Opportunity to develop skills, knowledge, confidence and behaviors necessary for practice	0	1(1.1)	15(16.3)	49(53.3)	27(29.3)	4.10±0.70

Minimum 6, Maximum 30, Mean and SD (3.89±0.51).

More than half 52.2% of the respondents had agreed with the assignment of nursing care is clearly defined whereas only 1.1% respondents strongly disagreed on it. Likewise, few 38.0% of the respondents had agreed on patients received individual nursing care whereas very few 2.2% of respondents had strongly disagreed on it. Similarly, few 40.2% of the respondents had also agreed there were enough opportunities to learn in every shift whereas very few 6.5% had disagreed on it. Comparably, 53.3% of the respondents had agreed on the opportunity to develop skills, knowledge, confidence and behaviors necessary for practice and very few 1.1% of respondents had disagreed on it. Finally, mean score was highest (4.13±0.77) on after doing nursing care documentation was maintained (Table 2).

Table 3: Students' Satisfaction Level on Supervisory Relationship (n=92)

Statements	SD n (%)	D n (%)	U n (%)	A n (%)	SA n (%)	Mean ±SD
Ward supervisions providing positive attitude towards supervision	3(3.3)	13(14.1)	27(29.3)	41(44.6)	8(8.7)	3.41±0.70
Students received individual supervision by teacher /ward staff/ward manager	3(3.3)	15(16.6)	24(26.1)	38(41.3)	12(13.0)	3.44±1.02
The supervision is based on a relationship of equality	3(3.3)	6(6.5)	25(27.2)	47(51.1)	11(12.0)	3.62±0.89
Students and teacher ratio is well managed.	3(3.3)	17(18.5)	22(23.9)	42(45.7)	8(8.7)	3.38±0.99
There is a mutual interaction in the supervisory relationship	11(14.1)	25(27.2)	52(56.5)	2(2.2)	2(2.2)	3.46±0.76
Overall students were satisfied with the supervision	0	8(8.7)	25(27.2)	53(57.6)	6(6.5)	3.62±0.73

Note: S.D- strongly disagree, D- disagree, U- Uncertain, A- agree, SA- strongly agree, n- number, SD - standard deviation, highest mean value indicates higher satisfaction

Less than half 44.6% respondents had agreed on ward supervisions providing positive attitude towards supervision whereas very few of the respondents had strongly disagreed on it. Likewise, 41.3% of the respondents had agreed on students received individual supervision by teacher /ward staff/ward manager and very few 3.3% of the respondents had strongly disagreed on it. More than half 51.1% of the respondents had agreed the supervision is based on a relationship of equality and very few 3.3% respondents had disagreed on it. Likewise, 45.7% of the respondents had agreed on students and teacher ratio is well managed whereas 3.3% of the respondents had strongly disagreed on it. Similarly, 56.5% students had uncertain satisfaction regarding there is a mutual interaction in the supervisory relationship whereas 2.2% respondents had agreed on it. Finally, mean score was highest in two statements like the supervision is based on a relationship of equality (3.62 ± 0.89) and overall students were satisfied with the supervision (3.62 ± 0.73) (Table 3).

Table 4: Students' Satisfaction Level on Role of Clinical Teacher (n=92)

Statements	SD n (%)	D n (%)	U n (%)	A n (%)	SA n (%)	Mean \pm SD
Capable to integrate theory and practical	0	4(4.3)	5(5.4)	67(72.8)	16(17.4)	4.03 \pm 0.63
Gives information regarding learning objective	0	2(2.2)	7(7.6)	58(63.0)	25(27.2)	4.15 \pm 0.64
Helped students to reduce the theory-practice gap	3(3.3)	3(3.3)	10(10.9)	55(59.8)	21(22.8)	3.95 \pm 0.87
Able to give his/her clinical expertise to the students	0	2(2.2)	13(14.1)	57(62.0)	20(21.7)	4.03 \pm 0.67
CT and clinical team are working together in supporting students	0	5(5.4)	23(25.0)	48(52.2)	16(17.4)	3.81 \pm 0.78
Provides supportive work environment to the students	1(1.1)	5(5.4)	28(30.4)	44(47.8)	14(15.2)	3.70 \pm 0.83
Availability of teacher in the clinical setting as required	1(1.1)	5(5.4)	22(23.9)	49(53.3)	15(16.3)	3.78 \pm 0.82
Pre and post conferences was held	2(2.2)	9(9.8)	26(28.3)	38(41.3)	17(18.5)	3.64 \pm 0.96
Gives appreciation to students	3(3.3)	6(6.5)	21(22.8)	46(50.0)	16(17.4)	3.71 \pm 0.94
Feedback was constructive, timely	3(3.3)	6(6.5)	10(10.9)	57(62.0)	16(17.4)	3.83 \pm 0.90
Overall satisfaction on CLE						68.40 \pm 11.

Minimum score 12 max. Score 60

The majority, 72.8% of respondents agreed that the nurse teacher is capable of integrating theoretical knowledge to a practical setting. In the statement mean score was highest (4.15 \pm 0.64) on the teacher gives information regarding learning objective of the clinical setting and mean score was lowest (3.64 \pm 0.96) on pre and post conferences was held by teacher to meet their learning needs.

Table 5: Overall Level of Students' Satisfaction on Clinical Learning Environment

Level of satisfaction	Number	Percentage
Low ($\leq 50\%$)	4	4.3
Medium (50-75%)	60	65.2
High ($\geq 75\%$)	28	30.4
Total	92	100

Table 5 shows that the majority (65.2%) of the respondents had medium level of satisfaction in clinical learning environment.

Table 6: Students' Satisfaction among Different Dimensions on CLES+T (n=92)

Clinical learning environment dimensions	Minimum	Maximum	Mean \pm SD
Ward learning environment	8	40	3.58 \pm 0.55
Nursing care on the ward	6	30	3.89 \pm 0.51
Supervisory relationship with students	6	30	3.46 \pm 0.59
Role of clinical teacher	12	60	3.88 \pm 0.52
Overall	32	160	14.81 \pm 2.17

Table 6 shows that the different dimensions clinical learning environment of students the highest satisfaction score was obtained by nursing care on the ward (3.89 \pm 0.51) followed by role of clinical teacher (3.88 \pm 0.52). On the other hand, the lowest satisfaction score was obtained on supervisory relationship with students (3.46 \pm 0.59).

Table 7: Difference in Mean Satisfaction level of Clinical Learning Environment According to Selected Socio-demographic Variables (n=92)

Characteristics	Number	Mean %	SD	p value
Age				
Up to 20 years	75	69.28	11.84	0.030 ^m
Above 20 years	17	64.52	8.67	
Areas of clinical practicum				
Government hospital	29	76.23	6.37	<0.001 ^{**}
Government and private	26	68.62	1.89	
Private hospital	37	62.09	1.97	

*P value significant ≤ 0.05 ** Mann Whitney U test,

Table 7 shows that there was significant difference in students' satisfaction in CLE with age where p value=0.030 and highly significant with areas of clinical practicum p value 0.0001 and where age up to 20 years had higher satisfaction (69.28 ± 11.84) than above 20 years (64.52 ± 8.67) likewise, in the areas of clinical practicum, students' practical area from government hospital had higher satisfaction (76.23 ± 6.37) than private hospital (62.09 ± 1.97) but there was no significant difference with other variables.

DISCUSSION

In this study, findings show that more than half (65.2%) of the respondents had a medium level of satisfaction nearly one third (30.4%) of the respondents had a high level of satisfaction. Very few (4.3%) had a low level of satisfaction in the clinical learning environment. The mean score of students' satisfaction was 3.4. The above findings were very similar to study done in Sohang University shows that the majority of respondents 72.2% were moderately satisfied, 13.5% were extremely and 14.13% were poorly satisfied⁸. This finding was in contrast with the findings of the study done in Menoufia University where the mean score of the total CLEI scale was (118.90 ± 54.86) and students had a medium level of satisfaction with CLE². Similarly, contrast with the study done in three universities of Cyprus where mean score of students satisfaction was 4.1 and students had a medium level of satisfaction on CLE.⁹ Likewise, study findings was contrast with the findings of the study conducted where students had little satisfaction with their instructor, communication with colleagues, and nursing management.¹⁰

Regarding nursing care on the ward mean score was highest (4.13 ± 0.77) on after doing nursing care documentation was maintained and lowest in patients received individual nursing care (3.57 ± 1.00). So, this study reveals that there should be maintained individualized nursing care. In the context of Nepal nurse and patient ratio is not maintained.

Regarding the supervisory relationship, mean score was highest in two statements like the

supervision is based on a relationship of equality (3.62 ± 0.89) and overall students were satisfied with the supervision (3.62 ± 0.73). The overall mean score on the supervisory relationship (3.46 ± 0.59). This finding was in contrast to the study in all Cyprus Universities¹¹, where the mean score was (4.18 ± 0.98) and similarly contrast finding showed to the study in Shiraj Medical School¹² where the mean score (was 4.73 ± 0.53). These contrast findings could be due to different settings. Similarly, consistent findings were shown in the study of Nepal Health Research Council in 2018 where the mean score was 3.64 for supervisory relationship and the mean score among CLES+T dimensions ranged from 2.92-3.64.¹³

Regarding the role of the clinical teacher mean score was highest (4.15 ± 0.64) on the teacher gave information regarding the learning objective of the clinical setting and the mean score was lowest (3.64 ± 0.96) on pre and post-conferences held by a teacher to meet their learning needs. The total mean score on the role of the clinical teacher was 3.88 ± 0.52 . This finding is similar to other studies where clinical teacher enabling integration of theory and practice mean (4.07 ± 1.04) cooperation between placement staff and nurse teacher relationship between student, mentor and clinical teacher (3.97 ± 1.12).¹¹ The present study shows that there is a statistical difference between age and students' satisfaction where p -value of 0.03 and mean satisfaction with age up to 20 years and above 20 years was (69.28 ± 11.84) and (64.52 ± 8.67) respectively. Similarly contrast findings show Brynildsen, Bjørk, Berntsen & Hestetun¹⁴ there was a significant difference between age of the students and students' satisfaction age was older students (>29 years). In the present study there is a significant difference between students' satisfaction and area of clinical practicum where ($p=0.0001$). This finding is similar to the study done by Nepal et al. where the means of all sub-dimensions varied across hospitals.¹⁵

CONCLUSION

Clinical learning environments is an important bridge between academic learning and the workplace which provide enormous opportunities

for enhancing learning experiences. The study concluded that only one third of respondents had a high level of satisfaction. According to domain highest satisfaction was obtained in nursing care in the ward and lowest satisfaction was obtained in supervisory relationship with students.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: NONE

REFERENCES

1. Suliman M, Warshawski S. Nursing students' satisfaction with clinical placements: The contribution of role modeling, epistemic authority, and resilience-a cross-sectional study. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2022; 115:105404.
2. Mokadem N, Ibraheem S.. Nursing students' satisfaction with their clinical learning environments. *AMJ. Nurs*. 2017; 5(4): 104–108.
3. Berntsen K, Bjork IT, Brynildsen G. Nursing students 'clinical learning environment in Norwegian nursing homes lack of innovative teaching and learning strategies. *Open J Nurs*.2017;8(7): 949-961.
4. Abouelfetoh A, Mumtin S. Nursing students' satisfaction with their clinical placement. *J. Sci Res*. 2016;4(6): 490-500.
5. Neupane N, Pandey N, Sah SK. Perception of clinical learning environment among nursing students. *Int. J. Adv Microbiol Health*. 2018; 2(1): 36-41.
6. Papastavrou E, Dimitriadou M, Tsangari H. Psychometric testing of Greek version of the clinical learning environment teacher (CLES+T), *Glob J Health Sci*. 2016;8 (5).
7. Rai DS. Growth of nursing education sector and its effects on professionalization of nurses in Nepal *Nurs Health Sci.*, 2014; 3(4):34–39.
8. Ali G, Ali NM. Clinical learning environment and the influential factors from nursing students' perspective. *KJNS* 2015; 7(2): 65-80.
9. Papastavrou E, Dimitriadou M, Tsangari H, Andreou C. Nursing students' satisfaction of the clinical learning environment: A research study, *BMC Nursing*. 2016;15(1):44.
10. Kurian RN, James MM. Assessment of level of satisfaction of student nurses with their clinical learning environment in selected nursing colleges. *Int J Curr Res*.2017;9 (12): 62589-62592.
11. Dimitriadou M, Papastavrou E, Efstathiou G, Theodorou M. Baccalaureate nursing students' perceptions of learning and supervision in the clinical environment. *Nursing Health Sci*. 2015; 17: 236–42.
12. Rezaee R, Emrahimi S. Clinical learning environment at Shiraz Medical School in the educators and residents viewpoints. *IRCM*. 2013; 15(6): 532-533.
13. National Health Research Council. Perception of students in clinical learning environment. *Advancing evidence for changing health systems in Nepal fourth national of health and population, Government of Nepal*. 2018; 95.
14. Brynildsen G, Bjørk IT, Berntsen K, Hestetun M. Improving the quality of nursing students' clinical placements in nursing homes an evaluation study. *J Nursing Educ. Pract*. 2014; 14(6):722-8.
15. Nepal B, Taketomi K, Ito Y M. et al. Nepalese undergraduate nursing students' perceptions of the clinical learning environment supervision and nurse teachers a questionnaire survey. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2016; 39: 181–188.