Contents lists available at Science-Gate

International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.science-gate.com/IJAAS.html

Nursing students' satisfaction with the academic program: A cross-sectional study

Naglaa A. E. A. M. El Seesy [1,*], Maram Banakhar [2], Faten S. A. E. F. Kandil [3]

[1]Department of Nursing Administration, Alexandria University, Alexandria, Egypt
[2]Department of Public Health Nursing, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[3]Department of Medical Surgical, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 21 June 2021
Received in revised form
21 August 2021
Accepted 29 August 2021

Keywords:
Psychological state
Students' expectations
Learning environment
Professional fulfillment

ABSTRACT

In higher education, students' satisfaction is viewed as an indicator of program success, and higher satisfaction levels among students are correlated with better intellectual and social achievements. This study aimed to assess nursing students' satisfaction with the academic program at one academic institution. A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted. A convenience sampling method was used to include 328 students using the Undergraduates Nursing Students Academic Satisfaction Scale (UNSASS) to assess the level of nursing students' satisfaction with the academic program. The overall mean score of satisfaction was 51.72 out of 100 (SD=14.63). The highest score was observed regarding the program design and delivery dimension (mean±SD score=53.91±18.51), while the lowest satisfaction score was attributed to the support and resources dimension (49.62±18.13). The study recommends conducting a comprehensive and consistent evaluation to measure student satisfaction and expectations in resources and facilities in order to guide decision-making and improve the effectiveness of students' educational programs. It is suggested that the UNSASS may expand its applicability to master students and evaluate programs that are not accredited by international accreditation in future studies.

1. Introduction

Students' satisfaction has been assessed in different academic and non-academic settings (Eyck et al., 2009). In the 1960s, the first study conducted on academic satisfaction was originated from occupational satisfaction. Academic satisfaction is regarded as the subjective evaluation of the whole educational experience and is defined as a psychological state that results from the confirmation or not of the students' expectations regarding their academic reality. Academic satisfaction is considered a dynamic process that can be affected by different factors such as the institution's characteristics, educational context, students' perception, and learning environment (Ali, 2012; Tsurkan, 2020).

It is the role of the educational and training institutions to assess nursing students' satisfaction regarding the undergraduate program to enhance effective learning among candidates and improve the overall success of the institution. Satisfied students show generally more willingness and effort in attending the classes and being involved within the coursework and the institution commitments and diverse activities (Al-Kuwaiti et al., 2014). Such evaluation provides valuable indications for strategic planning and is part of the pedagogic actions aiming to ensure the best learning experience for students to enable them to acquire beneficial knowledge and achieve professional fulfillment (Delaram and Hosseini, 2014; Dovhopola, 2019). Thus, students' satisfaction surveys and their outcomes are good indicators of the quality and competitiveness among colleges and universities and their level of fulfillment of their respective missions. Further, published results of such surveys are useful for recruiters and employers to target the best-qualified graduates, with the most adequate curricula (Al-Kuwaiti et al., 2014). Furthermore, academic satisfaction constitutes an effective method to promote interaction between students and professors, and scholars, thus offering the opportunity to share ideas

* Corresponding Author.
Email Address: el-seesy@kaiost.cn (N. A. E. A. M. El Seesy)
https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2021.11.007
Corresponding author's ORCID profile:
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2343-5333

and experiences and enriching the intellectual debate at the theoretical and practical levels (Abouelfettoh and Mumtin, 2015; Tovkanets, 2019).

A review of the literature shows a lack of research studies that investigated satisfaction among nursing students (Papastavrou et al., 2016). In Saudi Arabia, a study investigated factors affecting nursing student's satisfaction with e-learning experience in King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia; it revealed that learners 'attitude toward electronic resources, anxiety, flexibility, technology quality, and learner perceived interaction with others are the critical factors affecting learners' perceived satisfaction (Ali, 2012). The lack of such studies could be a major impediment to the planning and improvement of institutional services and educational programs and teaching methods, which altogether qualify the educational process. Hence, we conducted this study to assess the levels of satisfaction among undergraduate nursing students toward their academic programs at King Abdul-Aziz University. We also investigated the sociodemographic factors associated with academic satisfaction.

This study aimed to assess nursing students' satisfaction with the academic program at one academic institution.

2. Materials and methods

A cross-sectional study was conducted at the Faculty of Nursing at one academic institution in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The sample of this study incorporates 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year undergraduate nursing students. The inclusion criteria involved all nursing students who were registered at the faculty and pursuing any of the nursing specialties provided by the faculty including medical and surgical, critical care, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, community health, geriatrics, psychiatry and mental health, and administration.

The study used the Undergraduates Nursing Students Academic Satisfaction Scale (UNSASS), adapted from Dennison and El-Masri (2012) to assess participants' satisfaction with the faculty's academic program. The scale consists of 48 items grouped into the following four dimensions: in-class learning experience (16 items); clinical teaching (15 items); program design and delivery (12 items); and support and resources (five items). For each item, responses were assessed using a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). A score was calculated for each dimension by adding up the corresponding item scores, and an overall satisfaction score was calculated with a higher score indicating greater satisfaction with the academic program. The UNSASS was validated by five specialized faculty staff including assistant and associate professors. The survey was completed by collecting nursing students' socio-demographic characteristics, such as age, marital status, number of children, permanent residence, and academic year.

The ethical approval was obtained from the University's institutional review board. At the end of the activity time all 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year nursing students were informed about the study. All participants were informed that their participation was fully voluntary, that they have the right to freely withdraw at any time of the interview, and that their privacy and confidentiality will be fully respected. Prior to administering the questionnaire, implied consent for participation in this study was obtained by filling the questionnaires. Each participant was allowed 20 minutes to complete it. Data collection was conducted between 01 March and 31 May 2018.

The questionnaire was piloted among a sample of 30 eligible students. The clarity of the items was assessed, and the overall reliability of the UNSASS tool was tested and showed Cronbach's alpha=0.967, indicating high internal consistency of the tool in the study population. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS software package version 20.0. Categorical variables were presented using number and percent, while numerical ones were presented using range, mean, and standard deviation (SD). The significance of the obtained results was judged at the 5% level. The used tests were Student t-test for normally distributed quantitative variables, to compare between two studied groups and F-test (ANOVA) for normally distributed quantitative variables, to compare between more than two groups. A p-value<0.05 was considered for statistical significance.

3. Results and discussion

Table 1 demonstrates the characteristics of the study sample. A total of 328 undergraduate nursing students successfully completed the questionnaire, with a response rate=96.5%. Of the total participants, 145 (44.2%) were in the second year, 120 (36.6) in the third year, and 63 (19.2%) in the fourth year. All undergraduate nursing students were below 30 years old. Moreover, 98.8% were single, and 68.9% were living with their families, while 22.6% lived on the campus.

Table 2 shows mean satisfaction scores regarding the different questionnaire subscales as well as the overall scores. The mean±SD overall satisfaction score was 51.72±14.63 out of 100. Regarding subscales, participants were most satisfied with program design and delivery (mean±SD score=53.91±18.51), while they were least satisfied with support and resources (49.62±18.13). Bivariate correlations between the subscale scores showed moderate to high correlations with Pearson's correlation coefficients ranging from 0.581 (p<0.001), between In-class Teaching and Support and Resources scores, to 0.756 (p<0.001) between Clinical Teaching and Program Design and Delivery subscale score. The second highest correlation was between In-class Teaching and Clinical Teaching with Pearson's correlation coefficient=0.737 (p<0.001). Reliability testing showed very high internal consistency for all subscales (Cronbach's

alpha 0.811-0.945) and overall scale (Cronbach's alpha=0.967) construct.

Table 1: Number and percentage of the socio-demographic study sample

Demographic characteristics	No.	%
Age (years)		
<30	328	100.0
30 – 40	0	0.0
>40	0	0.0
Marital status		
Single	324	98.8
Married	4	1.2
Widow	0	0.0
Number of children		
None	325	99.1
1	2	0.6
+3	1	.3
Residence		
Campus	74	22.6
Alone	28	8.5
With family	226	68.9
Your current undergraduates' program		
2nd year	145	44.2
3rd year	120	36.6
4th year	63	19.2

Table 2: Mean scores percentages of nursing students' academic satisfaction dimensions at the Faculty of Nursing, king Abdul-Aziz University

Scale/Statistics	Cronbach's Alpha (No. items)	Raw score	% Score
In-class Teaching	0.910 (16)		
Min.–Max.		26.0–77.0	15.63–95.31
Mean±SD.		49.13±9.50	51.76±14.85
Clinical Teaching	0.923 (15)		
Min.–Max.		17.0–72.0	3.33–95.0
Mean±SD.		45.37±9.74	50.61±16.24
Program Design and Delivery	0.945 (12)		
Min.–Max.		12.0–60.0	0.0–100.0
Mean±SD.		37.88±8.89	53.91±18.51
Support and Resources	0.811 (5)		
Min.–Max.		5.0–25.0	0.0–100.0
Mean±SD.		14.92±3.63	49.62±18.13
Overall	0.967 (48)		
Min.–Max.		60.0–225.0	6.25–92.19
Mean±SD.		147.3±28.09	51.72±14.63

Table 3 presents the percentage of the mean±SD score of the underlying items of in-class teaching dimension, which ranged from 2.89±1.01 regarding detailed feedback received on student's work and written assignments to 3.34±0.81 regarding Faculty members' efforts to assist students when asked. The next two highest satisfaction scores were observed regarding the ability to express academic and other concerns to faculty members (3.32±0.78) and easiness to approach faculty members (3.31±0.81).

Table 3: Satisfaction of nursing students regarding in-class teaching

No.	Subscale item	Satisfaction score		
		Mean	SD.	Rank
Q1	I can freely express my academic and other concerns to faculty members	3.32	0.78	2
Q2	Faculty members are easily approachable	3.31	0.81	3
Q3	Faculty members make every effort to assist students when asked	3.34	0.81	1
Q4	Faculty members make an effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my coursework	3.10	0.91	5
Q5	Faculty members are usually available after class and during office hours	3.03	0.95	8
Q6	I can freely express my academic and other concerns to the administration	3.02	0.98	10
Q7	Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students	3.03	1.01	8
Q8	Faculty members provide adequate feedback about students' progress in a course	3.04	0.99	7
Q9	I receive detailed feedback from faculty members on my work and written assignments	2.89	1.01	16
Q10	Channels for expressing students' complaints are readily available	2.92	0.93	14
Q11	Faculty members are good role models and motivate me to do my best	2.96	0.92	13
Q12	The administration shows concern for students as individuals	3.00	0.95	11
Q13	Faculty members demonstrate a high level of knowledge in their subject area	3.06	0.87	6
Q14	Faculty members take the time to listen/discuss issues that may impact my academic performance	2.98	0.90	12
Q15	Faculty members create a good overall impression	3.20	0.80	4
Q16	I am generally given enough time to understand the things I have to learn	2.92	0.91	14

Table 4 shows mean satisfaction scores regarding clinical teaching among nursing students. For this dimension, mean±SD satisfaction scores ranged from 2.84±0.98 regarding clinical instructors giving verbal and written feedback concerning students' clinical experience to 3.17±0.94 regarding clinical instructors' openness to discussions and differences in opinions. The next two highest satisfaction scores

were observed regarding clinical instructors' level of knowledge and clinical expertise (3.14±0.95) and consistency of instructions among different clinical and lab instructors (3.14±0.95).

Table 4: Satisfaction of nursing students regarding clinical teaching

No.	Subscale item	Satisfaction score		
		Mean	SD.	Rank
Q17	Clinical instructors are approachable and make students feel comfortable about asking questions	3.04	0.93	9
Q18	Clinical instructors provide feedback at appropriate times and do not embarrass me in front of others (classmates, staff, patients, and family members)	3.05	0.97	8
Q19	Clinical instructors are open to discussions and differences in opinions	3.17	0.94	1
Q20	Clinical instructors give me sufficient guidance before I perform technical skills	2.91	0.91	12
Q21	Clinical instructors view my mistakes as part of my learning	2.94	0.95	11
Q22	Clinical instructors give me clear ideas of what is expected from me during a clinical rotation	2.99	0.93	10
Q23	Clinical instructors facilitate my ability to critically assess my client's needs	3.06	0.93	7
Q24	Clinical instructors assign me to patients that are appropriate for my level of competence	2.90	0.93	13
Q25	Clinical instructors give me verbal and written feedback concerning my clinical experience	2.84	0.98	15
Q26	Clinical instructors demonstrate a high level of knowledge and clinical expertise	3.14	0.95	2
Q27	Clinical instructors are available when needed	2.89	0.93	14
Q28	Clinical instructors provide enough opportunities for independent practice in the lab and clinical sites	3.10	0.95	5
Q29	Clinical instructors encourage me to link theory to practice	3.08	0.93	6
Q30	Instructions are consistent among different clinical and lab instructors	3.14	0.90	2
Q31	Faculty members behave professionally	3.12	0.93	4

Table 5 presents mean satisfaction scores among nursing students' regarding program design and delivery. The mean±SD satisfaction scores in this dimension ranged from 3.08±0.96 satisfaction score regarding overall reasonability and achievability of the program to 3.26±0.91 regarding the contribution of the program courses in overall student's personal development.

Table 5: Satisfaction of nursing students regarding academic program design and delivery

Q	Subscale item	Satisfaction score		
		Mean	SD.	Rank
Q32	This program provides a variety of good and relevant courses	3.24	0.86	2
Q33	The program enhances my analytical skills	3.21	0.88	3
Q34	Most courses in this program are beneficial and contribute to my overall professional development	3.26	0.91	1
Q35	The quality of instruction I receive in my classes is good and helpful	3.11	0.93	9
Q36	I usually have a clear idea of what is expected of me in this program	3.10	0.96	10
Q37	The program is designed to facilitate teamwork among students	3.20	0.96	4
Q38	The program enhances my problem solving or critical thinking skills	3.16	0.97	5
Q39	There is a commitment to academic excellence in this program	3.12	0.89	8
Q40	As a result of my courses, I feel confident about dealing with clinical nursing problems	3.09	0.95	11
Q41	Going to class helps me better understand the material	3.16	1.02	5
Q42	I am able to experience intellectual growth in the program	3.16	0.95	5
Q43	Overall, the program requirements are reasonable and achievable	3.08	0.96	12

Table 6 shows the mean scores of nursing students' satisfaction regarding academic support and resources. Scores ranged from 2.86±1.00 regarding facilities' appropriateness to facilitate students' learning to 3.11±0.96 regarding secretaries' professionalism.

Table 6: Satisfaction of nursing students regarding academic support and resources

Q	Subscale item	Satisfaction score		
		Mean	SD.	Rank
Q44	The secretaries are caring and helpful	3.09	0.97	2
Q45	The secretaries behave professionally	3.11	0.96	1
Q46	Support at the clinical and computer labs is readily available	2.98	0.95	3
Q47	Computer and clinical labs are well equipped, adequately staffed, and are readily accessible to meet	2.89	0.93	4
Q48	The facilities (classrooms, clinical, and computer labs) facilitate my learning	2.86	1.00	5

Table 7 compares overall academic satisfaction across the different sociodemographic factors of the participating nursing students. Students living with their family had greater academic satisfaction (mean ± SD overall satisfaction score=54.16±14.82) compared with those living alone (49.46±11.71) and those living on campus (45.12±12.89), and the difference was statistically significant ($p<0.001$). Additionally, overall satisfaction scores were highest among 2nd year students (56.38±15.31) and lowest among 3rd year ones (44.41±10.70), $p<0.001$. No statistically significant difference in mean overall satisfaction scores was observed across students' marital status or the number of children. The associations of the different subscales' scores with the demographic factors are also depicted in Table 7, showing significant differences in all subscale scores by residency and academic year.

Students' satisfaction is a complex and multifactorial concept that provides valuable data for colleges and universities to make their curriculum more responsive to the needs of a changing marketplace (Witowski, 2008; Eyck et al., 2009; Papathanasiou et al., 2014; Liba et al., 2019). The assessment of nursing students' satisfaction in the current study showed moderate overall satisfaction with higher levels regarding the program design and delivery, where student were

relatively more students perceived courses to be beneficial in enhancing their overall professional development and analytical skills and were satisfied with the variety and relevance offered by the faculty's program. On the other hand, relatively lower levels of satisfaction were observed regarding academic support and resources by the faculty to the student, highlighting concerns about the suitability of the facilities to learning as well as about accessibility and equipment of computer and clinical labs.

Table 7: Overall academic satisfaction among nursing students as a function of their demographic characteristics

Parameter	Overall		In-class Teaching		Clinical Teaching		Program Design and Delivery		Support and Resources	
	mean ± SD	Test of sig. (P)	mean ± SD	Test of sig. (P)	mean ± SD	Test of sig. (P)	mean ± SD	Test of sig. (P)	mean ± SD	Test of sig. (P)
					Marital status					
Single	51.65 ±14.63	t=0.784 (.433)	51.67±14.80	t=1.032 (.303)	50.53±1624	t=0.802 (.423)	53.88±18.59	t=0.310 (.756)	49.57±18.13	t=0.458 (.647)
Married	57.43 ±15.37		59.38±1926		57.08±17.07		56.77±12.19		53.75±20.56	
					Number of children					
None	51.68±14.67	t=0.518 (.605)	51.72 ±14.89	t=0.526 (.600)	50.56±16.27	t=529 (.597)	53.88±18.57	t=0.285 (.776)	49.57±18.18	t=0.516 (.606)
1+	56.08±10.43		56.25 ±9.38		55.5±14.94		56.95±13.39		55.00±13.23	
					Residence					
Campus	45.12 ±12.89	F=11.736* (<.001)	47.78±13.77	F=3.900 (.021*)	43.45±13.98	F=11.414* (<.001)	44.14±15.80	F=15.991* (<.001)	43.92±13.78	F=6.029* (.003)
Alone	49.46 ±11.71		50.56±12.96		47.80±13.1		51.34±13.67		46.43±13.46	
With family	54.16 ±14.82		53.22±15.20		53.30±16.55		57.43±18.71		51.88±19.42	
					Academic year					
2nd year	56.38 ± 15.31	F=27.718* (<.001)	59.19±15.62	F=14.666* (<.001)	55.02±17.10	F=20.464* (<.001)	58.94±18.03	F=45.003* (<.001)	54.90±18.61	F=13.308* (<.001)
3rd year	44.41 ± 10.70		46.67±12.19		43.49±11.95		42.80±13.11		43.83±13.47	
4th year	54.91 ± 14.15		21.29±14.63		54.02±16.79		63.53±18.20		48.49±21.21	

Note: * Statistically significant difference (p<0.05)

The overall level of academic satisfaction was significantly associated with students' residency mode, as those living with their families displayed the highest levels of satisfaction versus those living on campus. Furthermore, a significant drop in satisfaction level was observed in the 3rd academic year, followed by a re-increase in the 4th year.

Satisfaction about the dimension relating to the program design and delivery encompasses students' critical appraisal of the quality of the scientific and technical content of the program proposed by the faculty and the efficiency of the overall learning methodology. This dimension entailed the highest satisfaction scores in the present study with minor variance across its 12 items, as the mean item scores ranged between 3.08 and 3.26. Students' ratings reflected the perceived benefit and appropriateness of the curriculum with respect to the goals and capacities. Several authors highlighted the relationship between the student's overall academic satisfaction and academic development, which is perceived by the student as the acquirement of new intellectual and practical skills. It was further demonstrated that higher satisfaction levels were closely associated with students' confidence in faculty members' knowledge of the subject matter, along with setting clear goals to students and offering quality teaching with an appropriate workload (Wiers-Jenssen et al., 2002; Hessler and Humphreys, 2008; Salamonson et al., 2010). These observations stress the importance of balancing intellectually stimulating teaching, including subject variety and analytical skills, with reasonably achievable goals that consider students' aptitude and baseline skills. Such balance is vital to maintain students' motivation to learn while reinforcing their self-confidence. Of note, although not significant, the relatively lower satisfaction score regarding reasonability and achievability of overall program requirements that were observed in the present study is probably the content volume and workload during the academic year, which is directly correlated to the item. A conducted study reported higher satisfaction among nursing students in relation to clearly described syllabus and content relevance to current nursing practice. In addition, this may also be explained by the English syllabus while the majority of students have an exclusively Arabic instruction background (i.e. primary and secondary) (Chen and Lo, 2015; Chajka, 2018).

The present study also showed the lowest satisfaction regarding the support and resources dimension, specifically concerning the suitability of the facilities, including classrooms, clinical and computer labs, to students' learning. By looking at the issue, a probable explanation might be inadequate lab supplies and equipment, lack of maintenance of simulated manikins and audiovisual materials, and inadequate number and size of classrooms and clinical labs with regards to the growing number of students. Comparable observations of such dissatisfaction were reported that students were less satisfied with equipment in the nursing lab, noting that equipment was not always up-to-date, sufficient for their use, and in good repair. By contrast, a study conducted for nine years in a mid-sized Midwestern U.S. university, reported the highest satisfaction levels among 5.223 students regarding the class size of major courses, which was positively correlated with satisfaction with the major curriculum as well as with ten other factors of satisfaction such as course availability,

quality of instruction, program variety, and overall college experience (Tessema et al., 2012). In these terms, a study demonstrated that simple measures to enhance the convenience of computing facilities such as availability of computers with a high-speed internet connection, behavior of lab attendants, labs timings, and availability of e-journals may be important determinants of student's satisfaction Abbasi et al. (2011). Further, regular evaluation and maintenance of the resources, facilities, and services of the nursing laboratory and library have an impact on sustaining overall student satisfaction (Ansari, 2002).

In-class teaching had the second highest satisfaction score in the present study, with faculty members' accessibility, availability, and efforts to assist students and listen to their concerns as being the best-rated items. In the same line, it was stated earlier that the social integration factor could predict the overall nursing student satisfaction level (Freeman-Gibb et al., 2017). The student satisfaction scale used in a study further demonstrated the importance of social interaction between faculty members and students, which is perceived as a mark of respect for the student as an individual Baykal et al. (2005). These conclusions are supported in further studies by Ojeda et al. (2011), Rowbotham (2010), and Zafrir and Nissim (2011), who suggested that social interaction between faculty and students is crucial in developing a positive learning environment, which leads to student satisfaction.

By comparison, the lowest item score in the In-class teaching dimension was observed regarding feedback on students' work and written assignments. This may be explained in the light of the high students-to-academic staff ratio and excessive assignments required from students, resulting in lack of time and mismanagement of personalized feedbacks. This finding is consistent with another study which reported that less than one-third of students were satisfied with the general feedback they received from teachers, with even fewer students being satisfied with examination feedback Hall et al. (2012).

Another important finding in the clinical teaching dimension is the relatively low score regarding the availability of clinical instructors per student need. This represents an important issue as clinical learning constitutes one of the pillars and specific features of the nursing curriculum. In our institution, such findings may be due to the shortage of staff in relation to increasing students' number, which results in clinical instructors being committed to multiple mentoring responsibilities simultaneously, and in various clinical areas. A comparable point of view showed that the majority of students in clinical training had little satisfaction with mentorship and the methods for clinical education used by trainers Hakim (2013). Another aspect of such dissatisfaction may be related to the severe and scrutinizer attitude of some instructors that may be aversive to students. Students should not feel being constantly scrutinized and subject to criticism opportunity (Abouelfettoh and Mumtin, 2015). This emphasizes the importance of recruiting experienced instructors who have confirmed competency and skills in clinical teaching, as both academic and pedagogic quality of the teacher and mentor are crucial determinants of student satisfaction (Jokelainen et al., 2011; Hendricks et al., 2013; Ramos et al., 2015).

With respect to students' sociodemographic status, the present study has not evidenced a significant association of the levels of academic satisfaction with students' age, gender, or marital status and number of children. This is consistent with a study finding. However, residence mode was a significant factor of satisfaction, and students living on campus had the lowest overall satisfaction scores, by comparison to those living with their families. Students living with their families have the advantage of receiving material and psychological support from their families to cope with the academic requirements and stress, along with being in a suitable environment for learning; whereas students living on campus are disadvantaged. Students at the university experience a high level of stress-related to worry about successes, availability of time, and engagement in patient care (Mohamed and Ahmed, 2012); and residence was demonstrated to be a good predictor for transference as a coping behavior (Shdaifat et al., 2018).

Intriguingly, overall academic satisfaction was significantly decreased among 3rd year nursing students, while 2nd year ones had the highest overall academic satisfaction scores. This decline in academic satisfaction was previously reported as students' progress through the program and academic years (Lee et al., 2009; Papastavrou et al., 2016). However, explaining this may warrant further qualitative investigations.

4. Conclusion

This study provides a detailed evaluation of nursing students' appraisal regarding in-class teaching, clinical teaching, program design and delivery, and facilities and resources provided within the BSN program by the faculty of nursing, and identifies areas of students' satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The study found greater satisfaction about program design and delivery and in-class teaching, which are essential components to enhance student satisfaction with their education and overall curriculum. It is recommended to regularly evaluate and improve nursing programs in order to build a safe, caring, trusting, and respectful learning environment for students using modern and efficient teaching methods and tools, thereby enabling the best learning experience and improving the faculty's reputation. Nursing educators are encouraged to conduct a comprehensive and consistent evaluation to measure students' satisfaction and expectations in resources and facilities in order to guide decision-making and improve the effectiveness of their educational programs. It is suggested that the NSSS may expand its applicability to Master students and

evaluate programs that are not accredited by the ACEN in future studies.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Abbasi MN, Malik A, Chaudhry IS, and Imdadullah M (2011). A study on student satisfaction in Pakistani universities: The case of Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan. Asian Social Science, 7(7): 209-219. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n7p209

Abouelfettoh A and Al Mumtin S (2015). Nursing students' satisfaction with their clinical placement. Journal of Scientific Research and Reports, 4(6): 490-500. https://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2015/12046

Ali WGM (2012). Factors affecting nursing student's satisfaction with e-learning experience in King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia. Dimension, 5: 13-18.

Al-Kuwaiti A, Maruthamuthu T, and Al Kuwaiti A (2014). Factors influencing student's overall satisfaction in course evaluation surveys: An exploratory study. International Journal of Education and Research, 2(7): 661-674.

Ansari E (2002). Student nurse satisfaction levels with their courses: Part II- effects of academic variables. Nurse Education Today, 22(2): 171–180. https://doi.org/10.1054/nedt.2001.0683 **PMid:11884198**

Baykal U, Sokmen S, Korkmaz S, and Akgun E (2005). Determining student satisfaction in a nursing college. Nurse Education Today, 25(4): 255-262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2004.11.009 **PMid:15885856**

Chajka IP (2018). Study concept "Quality of education in higher educational agency". Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University: Series "Economy", 2(10): 42–49. https://doi.org/10.31339/2313-8114-2018-2(10)-42-49

Chen HC and Lo HS (2015). Nursing student satisfaction with an associate nursing program. Nursing Education Perspectives, 36(1): 27-33. https://doi.org/10.5480/13-1268 **PMid:29194153**

Delaram M and Hosseini S (2014). Comparison of the students' satisfaction about the performance of academic advisors before and after the Advisor Project in Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences. Journal of Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism, 2(1): 6-11.

Dennison S and El-Masri MM (2012). Development and psychometric assessment of the undergraduate nursing student academic satisfaction scale (UNSASS). Journal of Nursing Measurement, 20(2): 75-89. https://doi.org/10.1891/1061-3749.20.2.75 **PMid:22988780**

Dovhopola LI (2019). Interviews as an interactive method of professional training of students-biologists in the process of pedagogical practice. Bulletin of Mukachevo State University: Series "Pedagogy and Psychology", 2(10): 33–37. https://doi.org/10.31339/2413-3329-2019-2(10)/2-33-36

Eyck RPT, Tews M, and Ballester JM (2009). Improved medical student satisfaction and test performance with a simulation-based emergency medicine curriculum: A randomized controlled trial. Annals of Emergency Medicine, 54(5): 684-691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2009.03.025 **PMid:19394113**

Freeman-Gibb L, Jones B, Rehman S, and Ragier J (2017). Collaborative baccalaureate programs: Preliminary data on Canadian undergraduate nursing students' satisfaction. Journal of Nursing Education, 56(7): 420-424. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20170619-06 **PMid:28662258**

Hakim A (2013). Nursing students' satisfaction. International Journal of Nursing, 2(2): 36-42.

Hall M, Hanna LA, and Quinn S (2012). Pharmacy students' views of faculty feedback on academic performance. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76(1): 5-12. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7615 **PMid:22412204 PMCid:PMC3298403**

Hendricks SM, Wallace LS, Narwold L, Guy G, and Wallace D (2013). Comparing the effectiveness, practice opportunities, and satisfaction of the preceptored clinical and the traditional clinical for nursing students. Nursing Education Perspectives, 34(5): 310-314. https://doi.org/10.1097/00024776-201309000-00006 **PMid:24245381**

Hessler K and Humphreys J (2008). Student evaluations: Advice for novice faculty. Journal of Nursing Education, 47(4): 187-189. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20080401-03 **PMid:18468297**

Jokelainen M, Turunen H, Tossavainen K, Jamookeeah D, and Coco K (2011). A systematic review of mentoring nursing students in clinical placements. Journal of Clinical Nursing, 20(19-20): 2854-2867. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2010.03571.x **PMid:21429055**

Lee CY, White B, and Hong YM (2009). Comparison of the clinical practice satisfaction of nursing students in Korea and the USA. Nursing and Health Sciences, 11(1): 10-16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2018.2008.00413.x **PMid:19298303**

Liba NS, Martseniuk MO, and Medvid LI (2019). Empirical study of the nervous-psychic resistance of students of humanities and economic specialties. Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University: Series "Economy", 2(12): 33–39. https://doi.org/10.31339/2313-8114-2019-2(12)-33-39

Mohamed BM and Ahmed ES (2012). Perception of nursing students towards clinical stressors in the faculty of applied medical sciences–Al Jouf University-Saudia Arabia. Journal of American Science, 8(12): 608–617.

Ojeda L, Flores LY, and Navarro RL (2011). Social cognitive predictors of Mexican American college students' academic and life satisfaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58(1): 61-71. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021687 **PMid:21114357**

Papastavrou E, Dimitriadou M, Tsangari H, and Andreou C (2016). Nursing students' satisfaction of the clinical learning environment: A research study. BioMed Central Nursing, 15(1): 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-016-0164-4 **PMid:27436992 PMCid:PMC4949757**

Papathanasiou IV, Tsaras K, and Sarafis P (2014). Views and perceptions of nursing students on their clinical learning environment: Teaching and learning. Nurse Education Today, 34(1): 57-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.02.007 **PMid:23481172**

Ramos AM, Barlem JGT, Lunardi VL, Barlem ELD, Silveira RSD, and Bordignon SS (2015). Satisfaction with academic experience among undergraduate nursing students. Texto and Contexto-Enfermagem, 24: 187-195. https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-07072015002870013

Rowbotham MA (2010). Teacher perspectives and the psychosocial climate of the classroom in a traditional BSN program. International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.2202/1548-923X.1808 **PMid:20196760**

Salamonson Y, Halcomb EJ, Andrew S, Peters K, and Jackson D (2010). A comparative study of assessment grading and nursing students' perceptions of quality in sessional and tenured teachers. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 42(4): 423-429. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01365.x **PMid:21091625**

Shdaifat E, Jamama A, and Al Amer M (2018). Stress and coping strategies among nursing students. Global Journal of Health Science, 10: 33–41. https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v10n5p33

Tessema T, Ready K, and Yu W (2012). Factors affecting college students' satisfaction with major curriculum: Evidence from nine years of data. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2(2): 34–44.

Tovkanets GV (2019). Improvement of the pedagogical training of future teachers as a condition for the implementation of the European educational strategy. Bulletin of Mukachevo State University: Series "Pedagogy and Psychology", 2(10): 24–28. https://doi.org/10.31339/2413-3329-2019-2(10)/2-24-27

Tsurkan MV (2020). Interactive methods of teaching the Ukrainian language to foreign medical students. Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University: Series "Pedagogy and Psychology", 1(11): 173–177. https://doi.org/10.31339/2413-3329-2020-1(11)-173-177

Wiers-Jenssen J, Stensaker B, and Grogaard JB (2002). Student satisfaction: Towards an empirical deconstruction of the concepts. Quality in Higher Education, 8(2): 183–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/1353832022000004377

Witowski LL (2008). The relationship between instructional delivery methods and student learning preferences: What contributes to student satisfaction in an online learning environment? Ph.D. Dissertation, Capella University, Minneapolis, USA.

Zafrir H and Nissim S (2011). Evaluation in clinical practice using an innovative model for clinical teachers. Journal of Nursing Education, 50(3): 167-171. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20101130-04 **PMid:21117534**