



Examining the Correlation between the School Satisfaction Levels and Academic Achievement Scores of Faculty of Health Sciences Students Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Okuldan Memnuniyet Düzeyleri ve Akademik Başarı Puanları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Kıymet Koç¹, Burcu Arkan²

¹Bursa Uludag University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing, Bursa, Turkey.

²Bursa Uludag University Faculty of Health Sciences, Psychiatric Nursing Department, Bursa, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study has been performed to determine the school satisfaction levels of nursing students and to investigate the relationship between academic success mean and school satisfaction mean.

Method: After obtaining the necessary permissions for Research, Faculty of Health Sciences of the Uludag University in Bursa 2018-2019 studying in fall semester, which volunteered to participate in the study and complete fill out forms that are made with 413 nursing students. In the data collection method, it was used Socio-demographic Form and Student Satisfaction Scale Form. The academic success mean was gathered from student information system after all grades data were entered into the system. To analyze the data, Shapiro-Wilk test, t-test, one dimensional variance analysis and Pearson correlation factor analysis were used.

Results: The total score obtained from student satisfaction scale form is 181,18±29,55 (minimum 65, maximum 265 points). When analyzed on the basis of sub-scales; the scores are decisional involvement scale (3,54±0,64), instructor (3,51±0,61) and educational quality (3,43±0,64), school management (3,36±0,66), scientific, social and technical facilities (3,28±0,67), respectively. According to statistical analysis results, there is not a statistically significant relationship between student academic success scores and student satisfaction scores (p>0,05).

Conclusion: As a result; the satisfaction level of the students was found to be slightly above the middle level and it was not associated with academic achievement.

Keywords: academic success, nursing students, satisfaction, student satisfaction

ÖZ

Giriş: Bu çalışma sağlık bilimleri fakültesi hemşirelik bölümü öğrencilerinin okuldan memnuniyet durumlarını belirlemek ve memnuniyet durumları ile akademik başarı puanları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek amacıyla tanımlayıcı olarak yapılmıştır.

Yöntem: Araştırma için gerekli izinlerden alındıktan sonra, sağlık bilimleri fakültesinde 2018-2019 güz yarısında öğrenim gören, araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan ve formları eksiksiz dolduran 413 hemşirelik öğrencisi ile yapılmıştır. Veri toplamı aracı olarak Sosyodemografik Veri Formu ve Öğrenci Doyum Ölçeği-Kısa Formu kullanılmıştır. Akademik başarı puanları ise 2018-2019 yılı güz döneminin tüm not girişleri yapıldıktan sonra öğrenci bilgi sisteminden alınmıştır. Verilerin incelenmesinde; Shapiro-Wilk testi, t-testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi, Pearson korelasyon katsayısı yöntemleri kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Öğrenci doyum ölçeği kısa formundan alınan toplam puan 181,18±29,55'tir. Alt ölçekler bazında değerlendirildiğinde; en yüksek puan ortalamasını kararlara katılım alt ölçeği (3,54±0,64) almıştır ve sırasıyla öğretim elemanları (3,51±0,61), eğitim ve öğretimin niteliği (3,43±0,64), okul yönetimi (3,36±0,66), bilimsel sosyal ve teknik olanaklar (3,28±0,67) alt ölçekleri takip etmektedir. Yapılan istatistiksel analiz sonucunda öğrencilerin akademik ortalamaları ile öğrenci doyum ölçeğinden aldıkları puanlar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır (p>0,05).

Sonuç: Öğrencilerin memnuniyet durumları orta düzeyin biraz üzerinde tespit edilmiştir ve akademik başarıları ile ilişkisi bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: akademik başarı, hemşirelik öğrencileri, memnuniyet, öğrenci doyum, öğrenci memnuniyeti

Başvuru Tarihi: 07.04.2021 **Kabul Tarihi:** 16.09.2021

Correspondence: Burcu Arkan, Bursa Uludag University Faculty of Health Sciences, Psychiatric Nursing Department, Bursa, Turkey.

E-mail: arkanburcu@yahoo.com

Kocaeli Medical Journal published by Cetus Publishing.



Kocaeli Medical Journal 2021 <https://kocaelimj.org>

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial International License.

INTRODUCTION

Today the increase of the number of universities has caused the interuniversity competition environment to attach a greater importance to studies aiming to provide quality education and student satisfaction, in order to be chosen by students (1). In addition the increasing need for qualified students who can meet the needs of business life in the competition environment which has formed in the global market, has increased the importance of investments made in universities, quality education and satisfaction studies (2-3). It is because the graduates of universities providing a quality education service are assumed to be more qualified and can be employed more easily. Thus it is assumed that students will choose universities providing more quality education (4-5).

Quality development processes in universities and their results are tried to be determined via the supervision of external audit institutions and internal audit studies. Internal audit studies comprise stages which begin with receiving opinion from university groups (situation determination) and continue with interpreting the data acquired (making judgement) and development studies according to the results obtained (4). As students who are the receiver of education services comprise the largest group in universities, the universities which attach importance to quality in education studies care about how they are evaluated by students. Students' evaluation is sure not the only source of information in determining the quality of education; however, it provides useful information and is more reliable and valid than many other indicators (4).

As in many areas, medical institutions sustain the studies of developing quality standards due to needs such as increased use of the developing technology in the area of human health and increasing needs of medical service. In this case medical institutions desire to work with nurses who work harder to achieve their goals and projects, use their skills and knowledge, think critically, evaluate and implement necessary analysis and synthesis and reveal their success accordingly (6-7). On these

grounds nursing schools should train nurses who have these characteristics and qualities and have higher success levels (6-7). The success, competence and quality of nursing students are associated with the competence, effectiveness and quality of services provided by schools. Creating a learning environment to meet learning needs in the best manner and meeting the expectations and needs of students are the responsibilities of schools (5). This need has conducted universities into quality studies in order to provide more quality education (4).

Although there are many studies individually investigating the concepts of student satisfaction and academic achievement, which are the two most important concepts of quality studies; the studies examining the correlation of these concepts both in the world literature and in Turkey are not adequate in number. In addition we have encountered many scales used for evaluating student satisfaction in the literature; however, there is no study conducted using the Student Satisfaction Scale-Short Form (SSS-SF) and comparing the correlation with academic achievement.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Design and Sample

The study was conducted as a cross-sectional and descriptive study to examine the correlation between the satisfaction levels and academic achievement scores of faculty of health sciences students.

The target population of the study comprised a total of 802 nursing students; 180 students from grade one, 224 students from grade two and 169 students from grade three, receiving education in Bursa Uludağ University Faculty of Health Sciences Department of Nursing. Without using any sampling methods, the study sample comprised 413 (51.49%) nursing students chosen among the students comprising the population, who agreed to take part in the study after hearing the necessary explanations about the study and completed the study forms.

In examining the correlation between the school satisfaction levels and academic achievement scores

of faculty of health sciences students, the influence quantity was 0.11, significance level was $\alpha=0.05$ and necessary sample size for 80% power was 408.

The study was carried out with the students receiving education in Bursa Uludağ University Faculty of Health Sciences Department of Nursing between 10.12.2018-28.12.2018. Prior to conducting the study ethics committee approval (Decree No: 2018-07) was received from the Bursa Uludağ University Health Research and Publication Ethical Committee. After informing the students who agreed to take part in the study about the study and receiving their verbal consent, the researcher distributed sociodemographic data form and Student Satisfaction Scale-Short Form to the students and asked them to answer the questions. Also academic achievement scores were obtained from the student information system of the university on 30.01.2019 at the end of the 2018-2019 academic year fall term, after making grade point entries for all courses taken by the students through out the term.

Data Collection Tools

Sociodemographic Data Form

Prepared by the researcher in line with the literature knowledge and included 13 questions about grade, age, gender, number of siblings, number of family members, high school of graduation, state of choosing the department willingly, accommodation, incomestatus, employment, place lived longest and parents' educational background(4-5-6-8-9).

Student Satisfaction Scale-Short Form

Shortened and revised version (2011) of the 'Student Satisfaction Scale', which was developed by Baykal, Sokmen and Korkmaz (2002) to determine the satisfaction levels of nursing students(10). The Student Satisfaction Scale has 53 items. Each item is answered using a five-point likert measurement option as "1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Uncertain, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree". The lowest and highest possible scores to be obtained from the scale are 53 and 265, respectively. As a result of the statistical analyses of the Student Satisfaction Scale-Short Form; the total item correlation values

of the 53-item scaleranged from 0.42 to 0.73 and were reliableby time in the test-retest analysis ($t = 1.283$, $p = 0.208$; $r = 0.87$ $p = 0.000$); the CFA fit statistics were satisfactory in the five-subfactor distribution of the scale; and the Cronbach's alpha coefficients were highly reliable in the subscales as 0.88 for quality of education, 0.83 for participation in decisions, 0.91 for instructors, 0.85 for school management, 0.84 for scientific-social and technic possibilities and 0.97 for the total scale. Also the Cronbach's alpha coefficients acquired from our study were; 0.898 for quality of education, 0.784 for participation in decisions, 0.887 for instructors, 0.874 for school management, 0.860 for scientific-social and technic possibilities and 0.961 for the total scale. In the scale scoring the item score averages were used. When the average score approached one in the total scale and in subscales, it was evaluated as student dissatisfaction and when the score approached five, it was evaluated as student satisfaction.

Statistical analysis of the data was performed in the SPSS 23.0 (IBM Corp. Released 2015. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) statistics package program. For the quantitative data the descriptive statistics were indicated as mean and standars deviation. For the qualitative data the descriptive statistics were indicated as frequency and percentage. In order to determine whether the data was normally distributed or not, the Shapiro-Wilk test was used. For the normally distributed data, the t-test was used in two-group comparisons and the one-way analysis of variance in multiple-group comparisons. The correlations between the variables were examinedviathe Pearson's correlation coefficient. The significance level was determined to be $\alpha=0.05$.

RESULTS

Meanage of the students who were included in the study was 20.15 ± 1.72 (17-29) years and 30.8% of them were from grade one, 31% were from grade two, 20.8% were from grade three and 17.4% were from grade four. Of the participants, 78.2% were female, 67.1% were Anatolian-science high school graduate and 69% had chosen the department

willingly. The average number of siblings was three and the average number of family members was five. Of the students, 39.2% lived with their family, 69.7% stated that they had equal income to expenditure and 90.1% were unemployed at the present. 50.6% of the students stated that the place they lived longest was a metropolitan. 32.7% of the students indicated that their father was primary school graduate and 49.9% indicated that their mother was primary school graduate (Table 1).

Satisfaction score obtained by all the students who took part in the study from the SSS-SF was 181.18 ± 29.55 . In the analysis which was performed on the basis of subscales; the instructors subscale obtained 3.51 ± 0.61 points, school management subscale obtained 3.36 ± 0.66 points, participation in decisions subscale obtained 3.54 ± 0.64 points, scientific-social and technic possibilities subscale obtained 3.28 ± 0.67 points and the quality of education subscale obtained 3.43 ± 0.64 points (Table 2).

Comparing the academic averages of the students according to grades; the grade one students had higher “school management” subscale and “total” scale scores than the grade three students ($p < 0.05$). As a result of apaired comparison conducted for the “scientific-social and technic possibilities” and “quality of education” subscales; the grade three students had lower subscale scores than the grade one and two students ($p < 0.05$) (Table 1).

Comparing the academic averages of the students according to gender; the male students had higher academic scores ($p < 0.001$) (Table 1).

Comparing the academic averages of the students according to high school of graduation; the students graduating from a regular high school had the lowest academic average, while the students graduating from a vocational high school had the highest academic average ($p < 0.001$) (Table 1).

Comparing the academic averages of the students according to present accommodation; the students living in a house with their friends had lower academic averages than the students staying in state

and private dormitories ($p < 0.001$) (Table 1).

Comparing the academic averages, Student Satisfaction Scale total score and subscale scores of the students according to income status; only the “participation in decisions” subscale score was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) (Table 1).

Examining the correlation between age, academic average and the Student Satisfaction Scale scores; a significant correlation was found only with the “school management” subscale score (Table 3). However, examining the correlation between ($r = -0.10$; $p = 0.040$); a reverse-directional and insignificantly weak correlation was observed.

There was no statistically significant correlation between academic average and the Student Satisfaction Scale scores ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

All the students who took part in the study obtained a satisfaction score of 181.18 ± 29.55 from the Student Satisfaction Scale-Short Form (SSS-SF). Considering that the lowest and highest possible scores to be obtained from the scale are 53 and 265, respectively; it is possible to state that the students’ satisfaction level was a little over the ‘medium’ level. Also some other studies which were conducted using the same scale, found that the students had medium levels of satisfaction (8-9-11-12). A part of the studies which were conducted using the long form of the Student Satisfaction Scale found that the students had low levels of general satisfaction (3-5-13-14).

The studies which were conducted using scales outside the Student Satisfaction Scale that was used in our study, found the satisfaction score averages to be medium and above medium, which is in agreement with the results of our study (15-21). The study conducted by Espeland and Indrehus (2003) determined that the students were satisfied with the clinical practice; however, they were dissatisfied with the nursing program in general (22).

Table 1: The student Satisfaction Scale Score Averages and Academic Averages of the Students according to some Sociodemographic Variables

| | | n | % | Academic Averages | | Satisfaction Scale Subscale Averages | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Satisfaction Scale Score Averages | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----|------|-------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---|-----------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------|----------|
| | | | | | | Instructors | | | School Management | | | Participation in Decisions | | | Scientific-Social and Technic Possibilities | | | The Quality of Education | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Meant±sd | F/t | p | Meant±sd | F/t | p | Meant±sd | F/t | p | Meant±sd | F/t | p | Meant±sd | F/t | p | | | | Meant±sd |
| GRADE | 1.Grade | 127 | 30.8 | 2.66±0.8 | F=2.27 | 0.08 | 3.55±0.57 | F=0.881 | 0.451 | 3.44±0.66 | F=2.689 | 0.046 | 3.63±0.64 | F=1.127 | 0.338 | 3.37±0.67 | F=5.1 | 0.002 | 3.49±0.63 | F=4.344 | 0.005 | 184.63±29.39 | F=3.008 | 0.030 |
| | 2.Grade | 128 | 31.0 | 2.8±0.55 | | | 3.55±0.58 | | | 3.38±0.62 | | | 3.49±0.63 | | | 3.38±0.61 | | | 3.54±0.58 | | | | | |
| | 3. Grade | 86 | 20.8 | 2.87±0.54 | | | 3.43±0.61 | | | 3.19±0.67 | | | 3.5±0.56 | | | 3.06±0.66 | | | 3.25±0.59 | | | | | |
| | 4. Grade | 72 | 17.4 | 2.79±0.54 | | | 3.48±0.72 | | | 3.40±0.68 | | | 3.51±0.74 | | | 3.22±0.74 | | | 3.35±0.77 | | | 179.08±34.07 | | |
| Gender | Female | 323 | 78.2 | 2.43±0.64 | t=-5.924 | <0.001 | 3.56±0.68 | t=0.92 | 0.358 | 3.35±0.78 | t=-0.157 | 0.875 | 3.55±0.71 | t=0.096 | 0.924 | 3.38±0.70 | t=1.541 | 0.124 | 3.48±0.67 | t=0.774 | 0.439 | 183.49±31.77 | t=0.839 | 0.402 |
| | Male | 90 | 21.8 | 2.86±0.61 | | | 3.5±0.59 | | | 3.37±0.63 | | | 3.54±0.62 | | | 3.25±0.66 | | | 3.42±0.63 | | | 180.53±28.91 | | |
| HIGH SCHOOL OF GRADUATION | Regular high school | 53 | 12.8 | 2.35±0.74 | F=18.649 | <0.001** | 3.63±0.54 | F=2.201 | 0.112 | 3.4±0.66 | F=0.627 | 0.535 | 3.58±0.55 | F=0.409 | 0.665 | 3.36±0.62 | F=0.597 | 0.551 | 3.52±0.55 | F=1.967 | 0.141 | 185.30±25.70 | F=1.481 | 0.229 |
| | Vocational high school | 83 | 20.1 | 3.01±0.72 | | | 3.58±0.66 | | | 3.42±0.68 | | | 3.58±0.63 | | | 3.3±0.73 | | | 3.52±0.66 | | | 184.44±31.29 | | |
| | Anatolian-science high school | 277 | 67.1 | 2.78±0.55 | | | 3.47±0.6 | | | 3.34±0.65 | | | 3.52±0.66 | | | 3.26±0.66 | | | 3.39±0.65 | | | 179.45±29.66 | | |
| STATE OF CHOOSING THE DEPARTMENT WILLINGLY | Yes | 285 | 69.0 | 2.79±0.66 | t=1.163 | 0.245 | 3.52±0.59 | t=0.415 | 0.678 | 3.36±0.65 | t=-0.137 | 0.891 | 3.55±0.62 | t=0.264 | 0.792 | 3.28±0.66 | t=-0.233 | 0.816 | 3.46±0.62 | t=1.473 | 0.142 | 181.77±28.73 | t=0.601 | 0.548 |
| | No | 128 | 31.0 | 2.72±0.60 | | | 3.49±0.66 | | | 3.37±0.69 | | | 3.53±0.68 | | | 3.27±0.71 | | | 3.36±0.68 | | | 179.87±31.35 | | |
| CURRENT ACCOMMODATION | House with family | 162 | 39.2 | 2.71±0.67 | F=5.336 | 0.001 | 3.53±0.67 | F=0.204 | 0.893 | 3.39±0.69 | F=0.419 | 0.74 | 3.59±0.68 | F=0.602 | 0.614 | 3.32±0.73 | F=0.834 | 0.476 | 3.51±0.66 | F=1.186 | 0.315 | 183.40±32.06 | F=0.6 | 0.615 |
| | House with friends | 49 | 11.9 | 2.51±0.77 | | | 3.53±0.57 | | | 3.28±0.66 | | | 3.51±0.52 | | | 3.36±0.55 | | | 3.38±0.63 | | | 180.82±24.67 | | |
| | State dormitory | 136 | 32.9 | 2.9±0.51 | | | 3.48±0.57 | | | 3.35±0.65 | | | 3.49±0.65 | | | 3.23±0.67 | | | 3.38±0.68 | | | 178.79±29.95 | | |
| | Private dormitory | 66 | 16.0 | 2.83±0.63 | | | 3.52±0.57 | | | 3.4±0.61 | | | 3.55±0.6 | | | 3.23±0.6 | | | 3.4±0.51 | | | 180.89±25.51 | | |
| INCOME STATUS | Bad | 96 | 23.2 | 2.67±0.53 | F=2.11 | 0.123 | 3.57±0.59 | F=0.68 | 0.507 | 3.44±0.67 | F=1.103 | 0.333 | 3.67±0.6 | F=3.179 | 0.043 | 3.35±0.65 | F=0.835 | 0.435 | 3.51±0.59 | F=1.044 | 0.353 | 185.22±28.40 | F=1.278 | 0.28 |
| | Middle | 288 | 69.7 | 2.79±0.66 | | | 3.49±0.59 | | | 3.35±0.64 | | | 3.51±0.61 | | | 3.26±0.66 | | | 3.41±0.63 | | | 180.22±28.51 | | |
| | Good | 29 | 7.1 | 2.91±0.78 | | | 3.52±0.8 | | | 3.24±0.83 | | | 3.38±0.92 | | | 3.2±0.86 | | | 3.38±0.89 | | | 177.41±41.15 | | |
| CURRENT EMPLOYMENT | Employed | 41 | 9.9 | 2.74±0.58 | t=-0.307 | t=0.759 | 3.42±0.76 | t=-1.020 | 0.308 | 3.23±0.76 | t=-1.340 | 0.181 | 3.49±0.69 | t=0.480 | 0.632 | 3.19±0.81 | t=-0.912 | 0.362 | 3.28±0.76 | t=-1.588 | 0.113 | 175.51±35.60 | t=1.295 | 0.196 |
| | Unemployed | 372 | 90.1 | 2.77±0.65 | | | 3.52±0.59 | | | 3.38±0.65 | | | 3.55±0.63 | | | 3.29±0.65 | | | 3.45±0.63 | | | 181.80±28.79 | | |
| PLACE LIVED LONGEST | Village | 62 | 15.0 | 2.7±0.7 | F=0.651 | 0.522 | 3.53±0.59 | F=0.520 | 0.595 | 3.25±0.6 | F=1.846 | 0.159 | 3.53±0.59 | F=0.068 | 0.934 | 3.35±0.69 | F=0.939 | 0.392 | 3.45±0.65 | F=0.694 | 0.5 | 181.37±29.65 | F=0.574 | 0.564 |
| | District | 142 | 34.4 | 2.81±0.6 | | | 3.55±0.58 | | | 3.44±0.61 | | | 3.56±0.56 | | | 3.31±0.63 | | | 3.48±0.59 | | | 183.37±27.12 | | |
| | Metropolis | 209 | 50.6 | 2.76±0.65 | | | 3.48±0.64 | | | 3.35±0.71 | | | 3.53±0.7 | | | 3.24±0.69 | | | 3.4±0.68 | | | 179.74±31.12 | | |

| | Mean | SD | Minimum | Maksimum |
|--|--------|-------|---------|----------|
| Instructors | 3.51 | 0.61 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| School Management | 3.36 | 0.66 | 1.22 | 5.00 |
| Participation in Decisions | 3.54 | 0.64 | 1.29 | 5.00 |
| Scientific-Social and Technic Possibilities | 3.28 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| The Quality of Education | 3.43 | 0.64 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| Total | 181.18 | 29.55 | 65 | 265 |

| | n | Mean | SD | Age | |
|--|-----|--------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | r | p |
| Academic Average | 413 | 2.77 | 0.64 | -0.076 | 0.121 |
| Instructors | 413 | 3.51 | 0.61 | -0.039 | 0.428 |
| School Management | 413 | 3.36 | 0.66 | -0.101 | 0.040 |
| Participation in Decisions | 413 | 3.54 | 0.64 | -0.034 | 0.485 |
| Scientific-Social and Technic Possibilities | 413 | 3.28 | 0.67 | -0.064 | 0.195 |
| The Quality of Education | 413 | 3.43 | 0.64 | -0.045 | 0.360 |
| Total | 413 | 181.18 | 29.55 | -0.064 | 0.193 |

| | Academic Average | |
|--|------------------|-------|
| | r | p |
| Instructors | -0.048 | 0.333 |
| School Management | 0.004 | 0.935 |
| Participation in Decisions | -0.039 | 0.432 |
| Scientific-Social and Technic Possibilities | -0.091 | 0.066 |
| The Quality of Education | -0.030 | 0.542 |
| Total | -0.050 | 0.310 |

The study conducted by Lee et al. comparing the clinical experiences of nursing students in Korea and the United States, found that the American students had higher satisfaction levels (23). Comparing with other satisfaction studies, it is possible to state that the student satisfaction acquired in our study was higher compared to schools.

Assessing the total scale scores obtained in our study according to grades; the grade one students had the highest satisfaction scores, while the grade three students had the lowest scores. Similar results were observed in the studies conducted by Ozdelikara and Babur (2016) and Wildey et al. (2014) (11-24). Accordingly satisfaction scores were highest in grade one and lowest in grade three. Also other studies found that satisfaction scores were lowest in grade four and / or grade three and highest in grade one (8-9). The study conducted by Kantek and Kazanci determined that the grade one students had the highest satisfaction (25). However, some studies obtained totally different results from our study. For example some studies found that the grade two students had the highest satisfaction scores 3-13, while the grade one students had the lowest scores (5-14). The study conducted by Tastekinet al. (2016) found that the grade one and three students had higher satisfaction scores than the grade two and four students (15).

Making a generalization in studies measuring the satisfaction status; students have a higher satisfaction in the first years and their satisfaction level tend to decrease in advancing years, which is associated with the increasing responsibility of students due to doing clinical practice and attending school at the same time together with the inclusion of clinical practices in the curriculum. In addition the increase of course subjects may also be decreasing their satisfaction. Fact that the results of various studies on satisfaction vary according to grades, may be associated with factors such as practices in their universities and instructors giving the lectures.

In the comparison which was performed on the basis of the Student Satisfaction Scale subscales, the highest score average was observed in the

participation in decisions subscale, which was respectively followed by instructors, quality of education, school management and scientific-social and technic possibilities subscales. The study conducted by Yangin and Kirca (2013) found that the participation in decisions subscale showed a satisfaction above the medium level, while the scientific-social and technic possibilities subscale showed a satisfaction a little below the medium level, which is in agreement with our study(8). However, in the study conducted by Egelioglu et al. (2011) the participation in decisions subscale obtained lower scores, while the sociocultural possibilities subscale obtained higher scores, which is in total disagreement with the results of our study (5). Also in some studies conducted, the participation in decisions subscale obtained lower scores, which is in disagreement with the findings of our study (9-12-14). The literature has studies in which the scientific-social and technic possibilities subscale obtained lower scores, which is in agreement with the results of our study (3-11). Considering in terms of our faculty; it is thought scientific-social and technic possibilities are not adequate and various satisfaction statuses obtained from other universities arise from the differences in management and practices of every school.

Comparing the academic averages and Student Satisfaction Scale scores of the students according to present accommodation; the students living in a house with their friends had lower academic averages than the students staying in state and private dormitories ($p<0.05$). The study conducted by Egelioglu et al. (2011) found that the students living with their family had higher academic achievement scores (5). Students living with their family have fewer responsibilities outside school compared to other students and they can spare more time for themselves, which might have increased the academic achievement scores. On the other hand, fact that students staying in state dormitories share lesson notes and exchange opinions, might have increased the academic achievement scores.

The study which was conducted to examine the correlation between the academic achievement

scores and school satisfaction status of the students, found no statistically significant correlation between the Student Satisfaction Scale scores and academic achievement scores of the students. However, the study conducted by Egelioglu et al. (2011) indicated that there was a weak but significant correlation between the Student Satisfaction Scale scores and academic averages (5). The study conducted by Sahin et al. (2017) with high school students, found significant correlations between school satisfaction and academic achievement. Also the study conducted by Guler and Emec (2006) determined that as satisfaction with the department increased, academic achievement scores increased (19). The study conducted by Umbach and Porter (2002) determined that the students with higher grade point averages were more satisfied with school (16). Also the study conducted by Hilali et al. (2015) found that the students with a higher satisfaction had a higher academic achievement (26). The study conducted by Dhaqane and Afrah (2016) examining academic achievement and satisfaction indicated that satisfaction predicted achievement (27). The study conducted by Martirasyon et al. (2014) found that the students who reported a better satisfaction with their school experience had higher grade point averages than the students with a lower satisfaction (28). Also the study conducted by Ansari and Oskrochi (2004) stressed that the decreasing satisfaction was significantly correlated with students' lower grade points (20). The study conducted by Korobov (2012) evaluating the satisfaction status and academic achievement of the international and American students, found that both student groups assessed their educational experience as good or excellent and their academic achievement ranged from B+ to A+(29). However, the study conducted by Antičević et al. (2018) determined that the students with better matura (an exam type) results had a lower educational satisfaction (30). In the literature the study conducted by Kantek and Kazanci (2012) found no significant correlation between academic achievement and satisfaction, which is in agreement with the finding of our study(26), which may be associated with different expectations of the students from school and their sociodemographic characteristics.

CONCLUSION

The student satisfaction score average being a little over the medium level indicates a satisfaction with services provided; however, there is a need for more enhancement studies. As the scientific-social and technic possibilities subscale had the lowest score, studies to be conducted on this matter are important. It is recommended to conduct research to determine the expectations of students and carry out necessary enhancement studies. In the competition environment which has arisen in higher education institutions, meeting the expectations of students in the best manner will increase the preferability of institutions in the competition environment and the quality of education they provide.

According to the study results, the satisfaction status of students should be measured regularly and the areas to make enhancement should be determined in line with the results obtained. In order to increase the satisfaction levels of students on the basis of the total scale and subscales, activities should be carried out with students that may introduce school and instructors, enable adaptation and coalescence, take students' complaints or feedback into consideration and determine their expectations. Activities should be arranged in such a way that all students, instructors and school management can participate.

Acknowledgement: We would like to thank the students who participated in this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Source of Funding

No support was received for this study.

Informed Consent

Informed consent was obtained from the nursing students who participated in this study.

Ethics Approval: Ethical approval was obtained by the Bursa Uludağ University (02-11-2018 2018-6)

REFERENCES

1. Owlia MS, Aspinwall EM. Quality in higher education- a survey. *The TQM Journal* 1996;7(2):161-172.
2. Ramsden P. *Learning to teach in higher education*. Routledge. Oxon, RoutledgeFalmer, 2003, Chapter 1.
3. Ulusoy H, Arslan Ç, Öztürk N, Bekar M. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin eğitimleriyle ilgili memnuniyet düzeylerinin saptanması. *Maltepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Bilim Ve Sanatı Dergisi* 2010;3(2):15-24.
4. Ekinci E, Burgaz B. Hacettepe üniversitesi öğrencilerinin bazı akademik hizmetlere ilişkin beklenti ve memnuniyet düzeyleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 2007;33:120-134.
5. Egelioglu N, Arslan S, Bakan G. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin memnuniyet durumlarının akademik başarıları üzerine etkisi. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi* 2011;13(1):14-24.
6. Ansari WE. Student nurse satisfaction levels with their courses: part 1 effects of demographic variables. *Nurse Educ Today* 2002;22(2):159-169.
7. Şahin İ, Kaya S, Kablan Z. Okul memnuniyeti ile akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies* 2017;12(18):577-590.
8. Yangın HB, Kırca N. Antalya sağlık yüksekokulu hemşirelik öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyleri ve etkileyen faktörler. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2013;2(1):78-94.
9. Görgen Ö, Bingöl G. Amasya üniversitesi sağlık yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Balıkesir Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2016;5(3):116-122.
10. Baykal Ü, Harmancı AK, Eşkin F, Altuntaş S, Sökmen S. Öğrenci Doyum Ölçeği - Kısa Form Geçerlik-Güvenirlilik Çalışması. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2011;14:4
11. Özdelikara A, Babur S. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin öğrenimlerine ilişkin doyum düzeyi ve etkileyen faktörler. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi* 2016;9(1):2-8.

12. Ekiz T, Özdere BN, Şentürk E. Sağlık yönetimi bölümü öğrencilerinin öğrenimlerine ilişkin doyum düzeyinin saptanmasına yönelik bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Yönetim ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2019;(6)11:188-129.
13. Bülbül T, Ateş D, Öztürk S. Sağlık bilimleri fakültesi hemşirelik bölümü öğrencilerinin lisans düzeyinde aldıkları hemşirelik eğitimi ile ilgili memnuniyetlerinin belirlenmesi. *Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2017;26(2):133-139.
14. Kaynar A, Şahin A, Bayrak D, Karakoç G, Ülke F ve Öztürk H. Karadeniz teknik üniversitesi Trabzon Sağlık Yüksekokulu Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Doyum Düzeyleri. *CÜ Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi* 2006;10(3):12-19.
15. Taştekin A, Türkdönmez B, Güler M, Yılmaz A, Erşahan T. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin klinik ortamdaki doyum düzeyleri ve etkileyen faktörler. *FlorenceNightingaleHemşirelik Dergisi* 2016; 24(1):24-29.
16. Umbach PD, Porter SR. How do academic departments impact student satisfaction? Under standing the contextual effects of departments. *Research in HigherEducation* 2002;43(2): 209-234.
17. Chen HC, Lo HS. Nursing student satisfaction with an associate nursing program. *NursingEducationPerspectives* 2015;36(1):27-33.
18. Ansari WE, Oskrochi R. What 'really' affects health professions students' satisfaction with their educational experience? Implications for practice and research. *NurseEduc.Today* 2004;24(8):644-655.
19. Güler BK, Emeç H. Yaşam memnuniyeti ve akademik başarıda iyimserlik etkisi. *D.E.Ü.İ.İ.B.F.Dergisi* 2006; 21:129-149.
20. Ansari WE, Stock C. Is the health and well being of university students associated with their academic performance? Cross sectional findings from the United Kingdom. *International Int. J. Environ. Res. PublicHealth* 2010;7:509-527.
21. Kayıkçı K, Sayın Ö. Ortaöğretim kurumlarında öğrenim gören öğrencilerin okuldan memnuniyet düzeyleri. *Milli EğitimDergisi* 2010;40(187):207-224.
22. Espeland V, Indrehus O. Evaluation of students' satisfaction with nursing education in Norway. *J AdvNurs.* 2003;42(3):226-236.
23. Lee CY, White B, Hong YM. Comparison of the clinical practice satisfaction of nursing students in Korea and the USA. *NursHealthSci* 2009;11(1):10-16.
24. Wildey KM, Kenny P, Parmenter G, Hall J. Educational preparation for clinical nursing: The satisfaction of students and new graduates from two Australian universities. *NurseEduc. Today* 2014;34(4):648-654.
25. Kantek F, Kazancı G. An analysis of the satisfaction levels of nursing and midwifery students in a health college in Turkey. *ContempNurse*2012;42(1):36-44.
26. Hilali NE, Al-Jaber S, Hussein L. Students' satisfaction and achievement and absorption capacity in higher education. *ProcediaSocBehavSci.* 2015;177:420-427.
27. Dhaqane MK, Afrah NA. Satisfaction of students and academic performance in Benadir University. *Journal of EducationandPractice* 2016;7(24):59-63.
28. Martirosyan NM, Saxon DP, Wanjohi R. Student satisfaction and academic performance in Armenian higher education. *Am. Int. J. Contemp. Res.* 2014;4(2):1-5.
29. Korobova NA. Comparative Study Of Student Engagement, Satisfaction, And Academic Success Among International And American Students. *Lowa state university, Ames, Iowa, 2012.*
30. Antičević V, Kardum G, Klarin M, Sindik J, Barač I. Academic achievement and study satisfaction: the contribution of high school success and personality. *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opće društvene nauke* 2018;27(2):243-260.