Nursing Students’ Satisfaction of the Clinical Learning Environment in Saudi Arabia

Abeer Alatawi, Aida A. Domantay, Maha ALatawi, Sarah Qawwadi, Mawahib ALhiri, Thuraya ALbalawi, Latifah Majrashi, Hajar ALatawi

Department of Nursing, Faculty of Applied Medical Sciences, Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia.

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.15520/ijnd.v10i06.2999](https://doi.org/10.15520/ijnd.v10i06.2999)

Abstract: Background: Nurses’ clinical practice is of a huge importance as it making ready them to become eligible practitioners. Learning in the clinical practice is a important part in nursing education because of the fact that nursing profession chiefly based on practice. Clinical learning environments are the primary places to provide a quality clinical experience. The quality of clinical learning usually reflects the quality of the curriculum structure. Nursing students' satisfaction is an important part to make any reforms that aim to improve the learning effectiveness and the results within the clinical settings.

Aim: To investigate Nursing students’ satisfaction with the clinical learning environment.

Method: This study used a quantitative research design. It was a correlational study conducted February to May 2019. The researchers identified the relationship between the nursing students' level of satisfaction of the Clinical Learning Environment (CLE) and their personal characteristics. Study participants were students of the Nursing Department from different levels, 3th, 4th and interns’ students in University of Tabuk using questionnaire CLES + T scale

Results: Nursing students were highly satisfied with the clinical learning environment and their satisfaction has been positively related to all clinical learning environment constructs namely the pedagogical atmosphere, the Ward Manager’s leadership style, the premises of Nursing in the ward, the supervisory relationship (mentor) and the role of the Nurse Teacher. Most of the respondents belong to 3rd Year Level; female; and well distributed among the medical and surgical units. There is a very strong relationship between the satisfaction level of the Nursing Students and their profile.

Conclusion: Supervision methods are a significant factor influencing student evaluation of their clinical placement environment. The study offers a valuable insight into the analysis of factors contributing to improvements in clinical learning environment and models of clinical or workplace training.

Keywords: Nursing education, Clinical environment, Nurse Teacher, Student satisfaction, Experiential-learning theory, Clinical supervision.

BACKGROUND

Nurses form an integral part of any healthcare delivery system and play a pivotal role in a country’s national development. Nurses who must be scientifically and clinically prepared to address the healthcare needs of the country deliver the primary, secondary and tertiary healthcare services, that constitute the healthcare delivery system. Student nurses enter the clinical area as novices and have little understanding of contextual meaning of theories in textbooks and practical learning. Clinical education has a major role to play in nursing education and form more than half part of nursing curriculum.

All the educational and learning activities during the clinical placements of nursing students could be compound into a broader concept, the Clinical Learning Environment (CLE) [1]. There is considerable evidence supporting the CLE as extremely beneficial in familiarizing students with clinical judgment and decision–making, in stimulating their critical thinking, in challenging students to recognize the consequences of their mistakes, exposing them to various socio-cultural, biological, psychological and mental aspects of patient’s care in their learning and advancing clinical skills, in achievement of learning outcomes/objectives, in linking theory to practice [2].

However, from the nursing students’ point of view, CLE is “the most anxiety-provoking component of nursing education” as they have to satisfy a dual role, that of the learner and that of the worker. In many recent studies, students’ satisfaction has been consistently identified as an important factor of a “good” clinical learning environment. Students view hospital practice areas as more meaningful and educative because they provide them with opportunities of clinical practice and linking the theoretical aspect of their studies [3].

Clinical Learning Environment:

To achieve a good learning environment within each clinical placement requires close co-operation between nursing education staff, clinical staff and the ward manager [3]. The student is a part of the nursing team, and the other members of the team need to be aware that the student is in need not only of academic learning but also of practical learning. The pedagogical atmosphere in the clinical setting is essential, and in this respect they have a responsibility towards the student. Another study [1] on the other hand mentioned that student evaluation of clinical environment and supervision were reflected in their assessment of the sub-dimensions of clinical learning. Supervision method was confirmed as a significant determinant. A study [4] concluded in her study that preceptor ship positively impacts on the clinical competence among nursing interns. Through efficient mentoring and quality preceptor-relationships, preceptor
ship facilitates the translation of theory into practice, which is essential in enhancing the clinical competence of the nursing students in definite settings.

**The Importance of Clinical Rotation and Experiential Learning:**
In [5], four elements sum up these clinical learning experiences: the appreciation and support the students received, the quality of mentoring and patient care, and students’ self-directedness. Student nurses’ valued clinical practice and the possibilities it offered in the process of growing to become a nurse and a professional. A good clinical learning environment was established through good cooperation between the school and the clinical staff. This was why collaboration between nurse mentors and nurse teachers was considered very necessary.

**The Role of Clinical Supervisor:**
The study by [6] showed that nursing students viewed as positive and beneficial the supervision from both preceptors and teachers and that supervision contributed to the fulfillment of intended learning outcomes to a large extent. Supervision by teachers was, to some extent, in this respect estimated to be higher. The supervision provided by the group of facilitators helped students to fulfill their learning outcomes to a large extent [7]. When preceptors and clinical lecturers were compared, preceptors as facilitators were rated as displaying more supportive behavior in their supervision than the clinical lecturers, and clinical lecturers as displaying more challenges in their supervision than the preceptors. The supervisory relationship between students and mentor and NT was found to be a crucial variable in the context of this study [8]. The collaboration between mentors, NT, and nursing staff is viewed positively, and is beneficial in influencing positive clinical learning. There is no published study has been done regarding Nursing students’ satisfaction with the clinical learning environment at the University of Tabuk, Tabuk city in Saudi Arabia.

**Materials and Methods:**
The current study aims to investigate Nursing students’ satisfaction with the clinical learning environment.

**Research design:**
This study used a quantitative research design. It was a correlational study conducted February to May 2019. The researchers identified the relationship between the nursing students’ level of satisfaction of the Clinical Learning Environment (CLE) and their personal characteristics.

**Study Population and Sampling Method:**
This study used the universal sampling for the third year and fourth year of nursing students for both male and female, including the student interns. The Respondents was 162, the inclusion criterion for students ‘participation was: the students’ informed consent and practicing in hospitals and not in community settings. Three of the questionnaires were removed from the data analysis as they were not properly completed and so the final sample consisted of 159 nursing students 105 female 54 male.

**Instrument:**
The Clinical Learning Environment, Supervision and Nurse Teacher tool (CLES + T) used in this study that designed to measure the nursing students’ perceptions of their satisfaction of clinical education in higher nursing education. The CLES+T is a self-report questionnaire which consists of 39 items classified into 3 dimensions: pedagogical atmosphere on the ward; supervision relationship; leadership style of the ward manager; premises of nursing on the ward; and role of the Nurse Teacher in clinical practice.

**Data collection:**
The researchers themselves floated the survey questionnaire to all Nursing students online thru Google forms. Permission was sought from the Department Head and Female Supervisor to conduct the study.

**Ethical consideration:**
Participants were made clear about the objectives and plan of the study. All participants have singed the consent for their participations. Participants were informed that they have the right to not participate in the study or withdraw from the study at any time. Care was taken to preserve their identity and not to disclose them to respect their choice to retain them, and information was provided about the benefits to participants.

**Statistical Analysis:**
Descriptive and correlation statistics used to answer the research questions and data analyses to reach the result. Descriptive statistics namely, frequency and percentage, used to describe the complete set of data, organization and classification properties of the subject. Weighted mean shall be computed to describe the level of satisfaction of nursing students with the Clinical Learning Environment. To test the relationship between the variables and student satisfaction with the Clinical Learning Environment, the following tests of bivariate relationships shall be used. For the Year level having an ordinal-level data, the appropriate coefficient of correlation is Spearman’s rho (rs). To correlate the dichotomous variable gender (male and female), phi coefficient shall be used to compute with nominal-level data. Cramer’s V as an index of relationship applied to crosstabs tables larger than 2 x 2 shall be used to compute with nominal-level data of clinical area assigned. IBM SPSS Statistics (SPSS) used to test the hypostheses [35].

**RESULTS**
This section presents the findings of the study as well as a description of participant characteristics. The 159 participants who took part in this study were distributed throughout the week in two different clinical areas setting at Tabuk city.
Table 1. Demographic Data

| Variable                  | n = 159 | f  | %  |
|---------------------------|---------|----|----|
| Year Level                |         |    |    |
| Third year                | 64      | 40.3|    |
| Fourth year               | 53      | 33.3|    |
| Intern                    | 42      | 26.4|    |
| Gender                    |         |    |    |
| Male                      | 54      | 34.0|    |
| Female                    | 105     | 66.0|    |
| Clinical Area Assigned    |         |    |    |
| Male medical ward         | 13      | 8.2 |    |
| Male surgical ward        | 15      | 9.4 |    |
| Female medical ward       | 27      | 17.0|    |
| Female surgical ward      | 26      | 16.4|    |
| Intensive care unit       | 26      | 16.4|    |
| Cardiac Care Unit         | 8       | 5.0 |    |
| BURN UNIT                 | 5       | 3.1 |    |
| Emergency Department      | 39      | 24.5|    |

Table 1. shows that the sample’s demographics, Academic years third year students 64 students (40.3%), fourth year students 53 (33.3%), and intern students 42 (26.4%) which cumulatively represented 89% of the total population of third year, fourth year and intern students enrolled by the in University of Tabuk. Gender Females accounted for 66% of the respondents (105 students) and males 54%, which were 34.0, the students. The participants Clinical Area assigned are distributed as 24.5% Emergency Department, 17.0% Female medical ward, 16.4% Female surgical ward, 16.4% Intensive care unit, 9.4% Male surgical ward, 8.2% male medical ward, 5.0% Cardiac care unit and 3.1% Burn unit.

Table 2.1. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Pedagogical Atmosphere

| Pedagogical Atmosphere                                                                 | Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. The staffs were easy to approach                                                    | 3.74 |
| 2. I felt comfortable going to the ward at the start of my shift                       | 3.96 |
| 3. During staff meetings (e.g. before shifts) I felt comfortable taking part in the discussions | 4.13 |
| 4. There was a positive atmosphere on the ward                                        | 3.90 |
| 5. The staffs were generally interested in student supervision                         | 3.82 |
| 6. The staff learned to know the student by their personal names                        | 2.93 |
| 7. There were sufficient meaningful learning situations on the ward                    | 3.98 |
| 8. The learning situations were multi-dimensional in terms of content                  | 4.09 |
| 9. The ward can be regarded as a good learning environment                              | 4.04 |
| WM:                                                                                    | 3.84 |

Table 2.1. Shows level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Pedagogical Atmosphere. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.13) from the students’ point of view is that they feel comfortable taking part in the discussions during staff meetings (e.g. before shifts), and the lowest satisfied mean (2.93) from the students’ point of view is that The staff learn to know the student by their personal names, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Pedagogical Atmosphere (3.84).

Table 2.2. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Leadership Style of the Ward Manager

| Leadership Style of the Ward Manager                                                  | Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. The WM regarded the staff on her/his ward as a key resource                          | 3.81 |
| 2. The WM was a team member                                                            | 3.84 |
| 3. Feedback from the WM could easily be considered as a learning situation              | 3.92 |
| 4. The effort of individual employees was appreciated                                 | 4.03 |
| WM:                                                                                    | 3.90 |

Table 2.2. Shows level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Leadership Style of the Ward Manager. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.03) from the students’ point of view is the appreciation of individual employees’ efforts, and the lowest satisfied mean (3.81) from the students’ point of view is that the Ward Manager regarded the staff on her/his ward as a key resource, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Leadership Style of the Ward Manager (3.90).

Table 2.3. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Nursing Care on the Ward

| Nursing Care on the Ward                                                               | Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. The wards nursing philosophy was clearly defined                                  | 3.80 |
| 2. Patients received individual nursing care                                         | 4.14 |
| 3. There were no problems in the information flow related to patients’ care           | 4.12 |
| 4. Documentation of nursing was clear (e.g. nursing plans, daily recording of nursing procedures etc.) | 4.30 |
| WM:                                                                                    | 3.98 |
Table 2, 3. Shows level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Nursing Care on the Ward. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.30) from the students’ point of view is the clear documentation of nursing (e.g. nursing plans, daily recording of nursing procedures etc.), and the lowest satisfied mean (3.80) from the students’ point of view is that the wards nursing philosophy was clearly defined, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Nursing Care on the Ward (3.98).

Table 3.1. Occupational Title of Supervisor

| Occupational title of supervisor | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Nurse                            | 117       | 73.6    |
| Head Nurse                       | 42        | 26.4    |

Table 3.1. Shows the occupational title of supervisor. It shows that (73.6%) of the supervisors are nurses, and (26.4%) of the supervisors are Head Nurses.

Table 3.2. Occurrence of Supervision

| Occurrence of Supervision                                                                 | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| A personal supervisor was named, but the relationship with this person did not work during the placement | 10            | 6.3            |
| Same supervisor had several students and was a group supervisor rather than an individual supervisor | 7             | 4.4            |
| A personal supervisor was named and our relationship worked during this placement         | 14            | 89.3           |

Table 3.2. Shows the occurrence of Supervision. It shows that (89.3%) of the occurrence of supervision is a personal supervisor was named and the relationship work during this placement.

Table 3.3. Frequency of separate private unscheduled supervision with the supervisor

| How often did you have separate private unscheduled supervision with the supervisor (without clinical Instructor)? | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Not at all                                                                                                           | 139       | 87.4    |
| Once or twice during the course                                                                                     | 2         | 1.3     |
| About once a week                                                                                                    | 3         | 1.9     |
| More often                                                                                                          | 15        | 9.4     |

Table 3.3. Shows the frequency of separate private unscheduled supervision with the supervisor, and expressed that (87.4%) of the respondents reported that they are not at all have separate private unscheduled supervision with the supervisor (without clinical Instructor)

Table 3.4. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Supervisory Relationship according to the Content

| The Content of Supervisory Relationship                                                                                   | Mean |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. My supervisor showed a positive attitude towards supervision                                                         | 3.72 |
| 2. I felt that I received individual supervision                                                                         | 3.81 |
| 3. I continuously received feedback from my supervisor                                                                   | 3.94 |
| 4. Overall, I am satisfied with the supervision I received                                                               | 4.06 |
| 5. The supervision was based on a relationship of equality and promoted my learning                                      | 3.92 |
| 6. There was a mutual interaction in the supervisory relationship                                                         | 3.97 |
| 7. Mutual respect and approval prevailed in the supervisory relationship                                                  | 3.99 |
| 8. The supervisory relationship was characterized by a sense of trust                                                     | 3.83 |
| WM:                                                                     | 3.90 |

Table 3.4. Shows level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Supervisory Relationship according to the Content. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.06) from the students’ point of view is that the overall they are satisfied with the supervision they received, and the lowest satisfied mean (3.72) from the students’ point of view is that the supervisor showed a positive attitude towards supervision, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Supervisory Relationship according to the Content (3.90).
Table 4.1. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Role of the Nurse Teacher as Enabling the Integration of Theory and Practice

| Nurse Teacher as Enabling the Integration of Theory and Practice | Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. In my opinion, the clinical Instructor was capable to integrate theoretical knowledge and everyday practice of nursing | 4.39 |
| 2. The clinical Instructor was capable of operational sing the learning goals of this clinical placement | 4.22 |
| 3. The clinical Instructor helped me to reduce the theory-practice gap | 4.43 |
| WM: | 4.12 |

Table 4.1 shows the level of satisfaction of nursing students on the role of the nurse teacher as enabling the integration of theory and practice. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.43) from the students’ point of view is that the clinical Instructor helped them to reduce the theory-practice gap, and the lowest satisfied mean (3.73) from the students’ point of view is that the clinical Instructor is capable of operational sing the learning goals of this clinical placement, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the role of the nurse teacher as enabling the integration of theory and practice (4.12).

Table 4.2 Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Role of the Nurse Teacher according to Cooperation between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher

| Cooperation Between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher | Mean |
|------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. The clinical Instructor was like a member of the nursing team | 4.35 |
| 2. The clinical Instructor was able to give his or her pedagogical expertise to the clinical team | 4.39 |
| 3. The clinical Instructor and the clinical team worked together in supporting my learning | 4.43 |
| WM: | 4.39 |

Table 4.2 shows the level of satisfaction of nursing students on the role of the nurse teacher according to Cooperation between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.43) from the students’ point of view is that the 3. The clinical Instructor and the clinical team worked together in supporting my learning, and the lowest satisfied mean (4.35) from the students’ point of view is that the clinical Instructor was like a member of the nursing team, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the role of the nurse teacher according to cooperation between placement staff and nurse teacher (4.39).

Table 4.3. Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Role of the Nurse Teacher according to Relationship Among Student, Mentor and Nurse Teacher

| Relationship Among Student, Mentor and Nurse Teacher: | Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. The common meetings between myself, mentor and clinical Instructor were comfortable experience | 4.22 |
| 2. In our common meetings I felt that we are colleagues | 4.30 |
| 3. Focus on the meetings was in my learning needs | 4.08 |
| WM: | 4.20 |

Table 4.3 shows the level of satisfaction of nursing students on the role of the nurse teacher according to relationship among student, mentor and nurse teacher. It expresses that the most apparent satisfied mean (4.30) from the students’ point of view is that the in their common meetings they feel that they are colleagues, and the lowest satisfied mean (4.08) from the students’ point of view is that the focus on the meetings is in their learning needs, with weighted mean of level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the role of the nurse teacher according to relationship among student, mentor and nurse teacher (4.20).

Table 5. Level of Satisfaction of Students on the Clinical Learning Environment (CLE)

| Level of Satisfaction of Students | AWM | Interpretation |
|----------------------------------|-----|----------------|
| 1. Clinical Learning Environment | 3.91 | Agree To Some Extent |
| 2. Supervisory Relationship | 3.91 | Agree To Some Extent |
| 3. Role of the Nurse Teacher | 4.24 | Fully Agree |
| Overall WM: | 4.02 | Agree To Some Extent |

Table 5 presents the Level of Satisfaction of Students on the Clinical Learning Environment (CLE). It shows that the respondents “Fully Agree”(4.24) on the Role of the Nurse Teacher, and of the respondents “Agree To Some Extent” (3.91) about the Clinical Learning Environment and the

Table 6.1. Relationship of CLE Satisfaction of Students with their Personal Characteristics

| Variables | Statistical Tool | Clinical Learning Environment Value | Correlation | Supervisory Relationship Value | Correlation | Role of the Nurse Teacher Value | Correlation |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Year Level | Pearson r        | 0.206                             | Not Significant | 0.203                        | Not Significant | 0.02                          | Significant |
| Gender    | Chi Square       | 0.0                               | Significant  | 0.001                        | Significant  | 0.0                           | Significant |
| Clinical Area | Chi Square | 0.0                               | Significant  | 0.0                           | Significant  | 0.0                           | Significant |
Table 6 explains the relationship of CLE Satisfaction of Students with their Personal Characteristic. It shows no significant relationship between the Clinical Learning Environment and Year Level of the students with r=0.206, but there is high significant relation with Clinical Learning Environment and Gender of the students and the clinical area with p<0.00. Concerning the Supervisory Relationship, there is no significant relationship with the year level, but there is high statistical significant relation between gender of the students and the clinical area with p<0.001. Concerning Role of the Nurse Teacher, there is statistical significant relationship with the year level, gender of the students, and clinical area.

| Variables               | Statistical Tool | Clinical Environment | Learning Environment | Supervisory Relationship | Role of the Nurse Teacher |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
|                         | Value            | Correlation          | Value                | Correlation              | Value                     | Correlation              |
| Year Level              | Spearman’s Rho   | -                    | -                    | -                        | 0.091                     | Very Weak               |
| Gender                  | Phi Coefficient  | 0.803                | Very Strong          | 0.522                    | Very Strong               | 0.705                    | Very Strong             |
| Clinical Area           | Cramer’s V       | 0.719                | Very Strong          | 0.613                    | Very Strong               | 0.659                    | Very Strong             |

Regarding Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Leadership Style of the Ward Manager and Nursing Care on the Ward; The current study shows that the most apparent satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that they feel comfortable taking part in the discussions during staff meetings (e.g. before shifts), and the lowest satisfied mean from the students' point of view is that The staff learn to know the student by their personal names. In the same line [11] in their study found that student nurses reported high levels of satisfaction and enhanced learning, when they perceived they were treated with respect and felt they were part of the team. Also, [12] reported that the highest ranking of the clinical learning environment as perceived by the participating nursing students is that the clinical teacher helps the student who is having trouble with the work.

DISCUSSION

Clinical environment is the arena of clinical education in which undergraduate nursing students have the opportunity to improve vital application skills. The current study shows that two-fifths of the studied students are studying at the third year, followed with one-third studying at the fourth year and one-quarter are intern’s students. The same table shows that two-thirds of the participants are female. The participants Clinical Area assigned are distributed on the ER, FMW, FSW, ICU, MSW, MMW, CCU, burn unit respectively. And the highest Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students is on the Role of the Nurse Teacher according to Cooperation between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher.

In the same line [9] in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, reported that around one quarter of the studied students are studying at the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th level with the highest number of the studied student localized in the 6th levels. And the highest Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students is that the clinical placement is interesting. The results of the current study contradict with [10] who reported that all the entire sample was female, study at the second year, and Type of Nursing Ward Of Last Clinical Placement is the surgical ward by one-third of the sample followed with the medical word by slightly less than one-quarter. And the Student nurses were highly satisfied in the area of leadership style.

Regarding Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Clinical Learning Environment according to Pedagogical Atmosphere; The current study shows that the most apparent
of the supervisors are nurses, and slightly more than one-quarter of the supervisors are Head Nurses. The majority of the occurrence of supervision is a personal supervisor was named and the relationship work during this placement. The majority of the respondents reported that they are not at all having separate private unscheduled supervision with the supervisor (without clinical Instructor). In the same line [16] that assessed the level of satisfaction of student nurses with their clinical learning environment found that the student nurses were having least satisfaction in the area of student nurse relationship.

With regard to Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Supervisory Relationship according to the Content; The current study shows that the most apparent satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the overall they are satisfied with the supervision they received, and the lowest satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the supervisor showed a positive attitude towards supervision. In the [17] study, students associated the quality of clinical practice with the quality of mentorship and the quality of patient care. The feeling of being welcome as students was manifested by the way the nursing staff approached them.

With regard to Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Role of the Nurse Teacher as Enabling the Integration of Theory and Practice and Role of the Nurse Teacher according to Cooperation between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher; The current study shows that the most apparent satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the clinical Instructor helps them to reduce the theory-practice gap and the clinical Instructor and the clinical team worked together in supporting their learning. The lowest satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the clinical Instructor is capable to integrate theoretical knowledge with everyday practice of nursing and the clinical Instructor was like a member of the nursing team.

The results of the current study is consistent with [18] who studied Nursing Students’ Satisfaction with Clinical Learning Environment, and found that nursing students were found to be highly satisfied with the clinical learning environment and this was related to the level of motivation and the nursing care delivery by the effective cooperation between Placement Staff and Nurse Teacher, the supervisory relationship with the mentor in clinical practice by reducing the theory-practice gap.

With regard to Level of Satisfaction of Nursing Students on the Role of the Nurse Teacher according to Relationship Among Student, Mentor and Nurse Teacher; The current study shows that the most apparent satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the in their common meetings they feel that they are colleagues, and the lowest satisfied mean from the students’ point of view is that the focus on the meetings is in their learning needs. In the same line a study by [19] whom studied Nursing students’ satisfaction of the clinical learning environment; reported that the highest satisfaction was found among those students who had a named mentor with whom their relationship was effective, while the lowest was reported by those who did not have a named supervisor. Students who had frequent meetings with their mentor had a higher level of satisfaction.

With regard to level of satisfaction of students on the clinical learning environment; the current study shows that the respondents are fully agree about role of the nurse teacher, and agree to some extent about the clinical learning environment and the supervisory relationship; with overall agree to some extent about level of satisfaction of students on the clinical learning environment. Also, [20] who assessed the nursing student’s experiences and satisfaction toward their clinical learning environment, found good satisfaction level? The findings of the present study are similar to what was reported by [21] who examined nursing students’ satisfaction with their clinical learning environment and found that, the total mean score of CLEI was more than medium which indicate good satisfaction. The highest satisfaction level was found for those with successful supervision; this is what stated by the results of [22].

The current study shows no significant relationship between the Clinical Learning Environment and Year Level of the students, but there is high significant relation between Clinical Learning Environment and Gender of the students and the clinical area with p<0.00. Concerning the Supervisory Relationship, there is no significant relationship with the year level, but high statistical significant relation present with gender of the students and the clinical area with p<0.001. Concerning Role of the Nurse Teacher, there is statistical significant relationship with the year level, gender of the students, and clinical area.

In the same line, a study by [23] studied the Nursing students’ perspectives on clinical education, and its results reported that Male and female students had different perspectives in learning objectives (p=0.001), instructor (p=0.046), how to deal with students in clinical settings (p=0.005), clinical environment (p=0.001), evaluation and supervision (p=0.005). The perspective of clinical education did not differ by age or work experience. But, nursing students had differed perspective on educational objectives, (p=0.039), monitoring/evaluation (p<0.001), and interacting with students (p=0.032) according to the duration of their work. The mean of supervision and evaluation decreased with increase in the work experience (p=0.002).

The current study shows very weak correlation between role of the nurse teacher and year level of the students, but there is a very strong correlation with Gender and Clinical Area. Also, there is a very strong correlation between clinical learning environment and gender of the students, in addition to the clinical area. Moreover, there is very strong correlation between Supervisory Relationship and gender of the students, in addition to the clinical area. Also, a study by [24], reported significant Correlations between the total students’ satisfaction and CLES dimensions. There is weak correlation (r = 0.381 p < 0.001) between students’ satisfaction and both of the CLE dimensions Role of the NT and leadership style of the ward manager, showed that the supervision models of ward placements may have led ward managers not to place students’ education within the priorities of the ward.

Moreover, a study by [25], reported that significant differences were found in frequency of supervision sessions.
in relation to the job title of supervisors (Pearson’s chi-square test = 52.7; p = 0.001). Students working under mentorship of managers or divisional nurses indicated higher frequency of supervision sessions. Within the CLES+T tool, the individual methods of supervisory relationship could be identified and the students could choose from six alternatives. [26] results indicated that satisfaction had a statistically significant correlation with age. (P = .000), result indicated that satisfaction had a statistically significant correlation with Stream (P = 0.000). Also, There were significant differences between the first and third year students, both on the total scale and on several CLEI subscales. Overall, first year students perceived the clinical learning environment significantly more positively than third year students. Students in the age group 25 - 29 scored significantly lower on the total scale (p = 0.043) and on the satisfaction subscale (p = 0.017) than the youngest students [27].

LIMITATIONS

Some limitations should be noted when drawing firm inferences from the findings of this study due to the relatively short periods of time spent in specific ward environments, specifically from two days per week during a period of seven to eight weeks for each hospital “short clinical rotations, these may not provide sufficient time to build mutual understanding and familiarity within the specific CLE. With the results of the current study, the researchers therefore recommend the following; improve the clinical learning environment and take advantage of tremendous learning opportunities and link clinical environment learning with theoretical learning at the university to increase student satisfaction.[13] Supervisors can promote strategies to develop the theoretical knowledge underlying their application of nursing, care and efficiency to implement them in the form of a highly effective nursing practice.

CONCLUSION

Clinical learning is one of the most important of all students’ nursing experiences. The result of this study that two-fifths of the studied students are studying at the third year, followed with one-third studying at the fourth year and one-quarter are intern’s students. Supervision methods are a significant factor influencing student evaluation of their clinical placement environment and is an important factor influencing student perception of clinical learning environment the study offers a valuable insight into the analysis of factors contributing to improvements in clinical learning environment and models of clinical or workplace training. Organizing clinical learning environment to gain more opportunities for innovation and excellence by student to increase quality of clinical experience.[11] [12]
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