

## EVALUATING STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT IN NURSING ADMINISTRATION COURSE

<sup>1</sup> Ibrahim Abd El Latif Ibrahim<sup>2</sup> Wafaa Fathi Sleem,

*1,2Nursing Administration, faculty of Nursing, Mansoura University*

*E-mail: dr\_ibrahim1987@yahoo.com*

### Abstract:

**Background:** Recent years policymakers, educators, and researchers are focusing more on student engagement as the key to addressing low achievement, student boredom and alienation, and high dropout. **Aim of the study:** The aim of this study was to evaluate students' engagement in nursing administration course. **Subjects and Methods:** A descriptive cross sectional design was utilized to attain the aim of the present study. The subjects of this study was included all students (n=251) who were studied nursing administration course during the first term of academic year 2015/2016 at faculty of nursing, Mansoura university. Data was collected by using students' engagement questionnaire which was consisted of 42 statement categorized into five domains. **Results:** students' engagement level regarding academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student - staff interaction, enriching educational experiences and supportive learning environment was unsatisfactory as reported by the studied sample and there was no relation between students' engagement and their demographic characteristics. **Recommendations:** Advanced teaching methods should be implemented in nursing administration course as problem based learning, Team based learning. Course content should be modified to improve higher thinking skills among students. Teaching staff should provide students feedback frequently.

**Key words:** nursing administration course, students, student engagement.

### Introduction:

In recent decades, researchers, educators, and policymakers are focusing more on student engagement as the key to addressing low achievement, student boredom and alienation, and high dropout rates<sup>(1)</sup>.

Student engagement is "the time and energy students devote to educationally sound activities inside and outside the classroom and the policies and practices that institutions use to encourage students to participate in these activities" .Student engagement can be assessed by the extent to which college students were engaging in educationally effective practices<sup>(2)</sup>. Student engagement is complex; it includes many factors that interact in multiple ways to enhance engagement such as students and teachers.<sup>(3)</sup>

Student engagement is simply characterized as participation in effective educational practices, both outside and

inside the lecture hall, which leads to a range of measurable outcomes<sup>(4)</sup>. Engagement is more than involvement or participation – it requires feelings, sense making and activity. Acting without engaged feeling is just involvement or even compliance; dissociation is feeling engaged without acting<sup>(5)</sup>.

There are three dimensions of student engagement, (I) Behavioral engagement: Students who are behaviorally engaged would typically comply with behavioral norms, such as attendance and involvement, and would demonstrate the absence of disruptive or negative behavior. (II) Emotional engagement: Students who engage emotionally would experience affective reactions such as interest, enjoyment, or a sense of belonging. (III) Cognitive engagement: Cognitively engaged students would be invested in their learning, would

seek to go beyond the requirements, and would relish challenge <sup>(6)</sup>.

Student engagement has been found as a robust predictor of student achievement and behaviors. High levels of engagement are associated with higher attendance and test scores, even performance improvement. In contrast, students with low levels of engagement are at risk of disruptive behaviors in class, absenteeism, and dropping out. Enhancing student engagement may help prevent these poor student outcomes <sup>(7)</sup>.

**Significance of the study:**

Engaged students arrived to lecture on time, prepared to learn, participated in discussion, complete their assignment, and achieved higher grades. Student engagement has been found as a robust predictor of student achievement and effective behavior. High levels of engagement are associated with higher attendance and test scores, even performance improvement. In contrast, students with low levels of engagement are at risk of disruptive behaviors in class, absenteeism, and dropping out. So this study was aimed to evaluate students' engagement in nursing administration course.

**Aim of study**

The aim of this study is to evaluate students' engagement in nursing administration course.

**Research Questions:**

**RQ1:** what is the level of students' engagement in nursing administration course?

**RQ1:** Is there a relation between level of students' engagement and their personal characteristics?

**Subjects and Methods**

**1- Research Design:**

A descriptive cross sectional design was used to carry out this study.

**2- Setting:**

The study was conducted at faculty of nursing, Mansoura University. The

faculty of nursing was established at 1994, it consists of eight academic nursing departments namely; nursing administration department, community health nursing department, critical care nursing department, psychiatric nursing department, medical-surgical nursing department, maternity and gynecological nursing department, pediatric nursing department, and gerontological nursing department.

**3- Subjects**

The subjects of the present study was included all available students (n=251) who were studied nursing administration course during the first term of academic year 2015/2016.

**4- Tool of data collection**

**Students' engagement questionnaire:**

This tool was aimed to assess quality and extent to which students engaged effectively in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development. It was developed by the researcher based on review literature <sup>(8, 9, 10, 11)</sup>. It was consisted of two parts as follows:

The first part was concerned with personal characteristics of the students such as: age, gender, marital status, residence during studying, current level of the study, and previous academic achievement. The second part was concerned with assessing students' engagement; the tool was included 42 items categorized into five domains namely as follows: Academic challenge, Active and collaborative learning, student-staff interaction, enriching educational experiences, supportive learning environment.

**Scoring system:**

The responses for the items were on 4 point likart scale ranging from never, very little or have not decide to very often, very much or done, these items were scored respectively from 1 to 4. The responses for academic challenge's items (8 –12) were

on 4 point ranging from zero to  $\geq 11$ , these items were scored respectively from 0 to 3. The responses for supportive learning environment's items (4-6) were 8 point ranging from not available to excellent, these items were scored respectively from 0 to 7 (8,9,10,11). The total score was computed out of 172 classified into two categories as follow unsatisfactory student engagement level  $< 75\%$ . Satisfactory student engagement level  $\geq 75\%$ .

#### Methods:

Review of literature related to the aim of this study; tool of data collection was translated

into Arabic by the researchers. Then it was reviewed by three experts. It was tested for its reliability by using Cronbach alpha test which indicated that students' engagement questionnaire, Cronbach alpha =0.8. Pilot study was conducted on 29 student who were studying nursing administration course during the first term of academic year 2015/2016, After the development tool of data collection , pilot study was conducted before starting data collection to determine the clarity and applicability of the designed tool, it was conducted on 29 student were studying nursing administration course during the first term of academic year 2015/2016, to identify potential problems and obstacles that may be faced during period of data collection, also it assisted to estimate the needed time to complete the questionnaire, it was filled within 15 to 20 minutes by every student. Students included in pilot study were excluded from the total studied students. Data obtained from pilot study were analyzed.

#### Ethical Considerations

- Ethical approval was obtained from the research ethics committee of the Faculty of Nursing – Mansoura University.
- An official permission from the dean of the faculty of nursing to conduct this study.

- Privacy and confidentiality of the collected data were assured.
- Participation in research is voluntary and Participants were assured that withdrawing from the study will be at any stage without responsibility.

#### Statistical analysis

Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22 was used for analyzing collected data after coded and summarization. The qualitative data were showed as numbers (n) and percentages (%). Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) was used to find the correlation between variables of qualitative data. P- Value  $\leq 0.05$  and  $\leq 0.01$  were reflected as statistically significant.

#### Results

**Table (1): personal characteristics of the study subjects.** This table shows personal characteristics of the studied students, according to the table, total studied nurses were 251 student, the majority of the studied students (96.0%) were aged from 20 to 22 years, female (79.3%), single (98.0%), muslim (100.0%), at 3rd level of the study (92.8%), slightly more than half of them (57.4) residence in rural during academic year, and more than half of them having good degree in previous academic achievement.

**Table (2): Students' engagement related to academic challenges as reported by the studied students (n=251).** This table describes students' engagement related to academic challenges. According to the table the twelve items comprising academic challenges, the highest agreement by the students was upon the item "spending a significant amounts of time on studying and academic work" (59.8%) whereas the lowest agreement was upon the item "Preparing lecture" (4.4%).

**Table (3): Students' engagement related to active and collaborative learning as reported by the studied students (n=251).**

This table describes students' engagement related to active and collaborative learning. According to the table the eight items comprising active and collaborative learning, the highest agreement by the students was upon the item "worked with my colleagues to prepare assignments outside the theater" (42.2%) whereas the lowest agreement was upon the item "explain course material to other students" (3.6%).

**Table (4): Students' engagement related to Student - staff interactions as reported by the studied students (n=251).**

This table describes students' engagement related to student - staff interactions. According to the table the five items comprising student - staff interactions, the highest agreement by the students was upon the item "discussed grades or assignments with teaching staff" (19.4%) whereas the lowest agreement was upon the item "worked with teaching staff on activities other than coursework" (4.8%).

**Table (5): Students' engagement related to enriching educational experience as reported by the studied students (n=251).** This table describes students' engagement related to enriching educational experiences. According to the table the eleven items comprising enriching educational experiences, the highest agreement by the students was upon the item "used an online learning

system to discuss or complete assignments" (45.0%) whereas the lowest agreement was upon the item "participated in study abroad" (0.4%).

**Table (6): Students' engagement related to supportive learning environment as reported by the studied students (n=251).** This table describes students' engagement related to supportive learning environment.

According to the table the six items comprising supportive learning environment, the highest agreement by the students was upon the item "quality of relationship with colleagues" (66.9%) whereas the lowest agreement was upon the item "quality of relationship with administrative staff" (7.6%).

**Table (7): Student engagement domains level (n=251).** This table shows student engagement domains level as reported by the studied students. According to the table student engagement domains level was unsatisfactory as reported by the studied students.

**Table (8): Relation between total student engagement score and personal characteristics the studied students.** This table shows relation between total student engagement score and demographic characteristics of the studied students. According to the table there was no statistically significant relation between student engagement score and demographic characteristics of the studied students

**Table (1):** Personal characteristics of the studied subjects (n=251).

Characteristics	The studied students		Characteristics	The studied students	
	No	%		No	%
<b>Age (years)</b> • 18- • 20-22	10 241	4.0 96.0	<b>Residence during academic year</b> • Urban • Rural	107 144	42.6 57.4
<b>Gender</b> • Male • Female	52 199	20.7 79.3	<b>Current level of the study</b> • Second level • Third level	18 233	7.2 92.8
<b>Marital status</b> • Single • Married	246 5	98.0 2.0	<b>Previous academic achievement</b> • Excellent • Very good • Good • Acceptable	6 17 168 60	2.4 6.8 66.9 23.9
<b>Religion</b> • Muslim	251	100.0			

**Table (2):** Students' engagement related to academic challenges as reported by the studied students (n=251).

I: Academic challenges	Never (1)		Sometimes (2)		Often (3)		Very often (4)	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1. Working hard to understand difficult lectures	5	2.0	22	8.8	103	41.0	121	48.2
2. Preparing lecture	81	32.3	87	34.7	72	28.7	11	4.4
3. spending a significant amounts of time on studying and academic work	7	2.8	45	17.9	49	19.5	150	59.8
4. analyzing an idea or theory in depth	43	17.1	83	33.1	79	31.5	46	18.3
5. synthesizing ideas, information into new	41	16.3	72	28.7	81	32.3	57	22.7
6. evaluate decision or information source	68	27.1	72	28.7	74	29.5	37	14.7
7. applying theories or concepts to solve practical problems or in new situations	66	26.3	78	31.1	76	30.3	31	12.4
8. Number of assigned books you read during current academic year	<b>None (0)</b>		<b>1-4 (1)</b>		<b>5-10 (2)</b>		<b>≥ 11 (3)</b>	
	24	9.6	59	23.5	154	61.4	14	5.6
9. Number of books you read on your own for enjoyment or academic achievement during current academic year	10 2	40.6	119	47.4	15	6.0	15	6.0
10. Number of written papers 20 pages or more which you wrote during current academic year	80	31.9	82	32.7	43	17.1	46	18.3
11. Number of written papers between 5 and 19 pages which you wrote during current academic year	67	26.7	111	44.2	32	12.7	41	16.3
12. Number of written papers fewer than 5 pages which you wrote during current academic year	45	17.9	120	47.8	44	17.5	42	16.7

**Table (3):** Students' engagement related to active and collaborative learning as reported by the studied students (n=251).

II: Active and collaborative learning	Never (1)		Sometimes (2)		Often (3)		Very often (4)	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1. Asked questions or contributed to course discussions	28	11.2	64	25.5	118	47.0	41	16.3
2. made a presentation for lecture	138	55.0	62	24.7	35	13.9	16	6.4
3. Worked with my colleagues on assignment inside the theater	30	12.0	46	18.3	85	33.9	90	35.9
4. Worked with my colleagues to prepare assignments outside the theater	22	8.8	38	15.1	85	33.9	106	42.2
5. Explain course material to other students	203	80.9	23	9.2	16	6.4	9	3.6
6. discussed ideas which I taught with others	18	7.2	46	18.3	97	38.6	90	35.9
7. complete readings or assignments before coming to the theater	53	21.1	99	39.4	63	25.1	36	14.3
8. prepared two or more drafts of assignment before turning it in	59	23.5	83	33.1	55	21.9	54	21.5

**Table (4):** Students' engagement related to Student - staff interactions as reported by the studied students (n=251).

III: Student - staff interactions	Never (1)		Sometimes (2)		Often (3)		Very often (4)	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1. discussed my grades or assignments with teaching staff	68	27.1	62	24.7	72	28.7	49	19.5
2. talked about my career plans with teaching staff	148	59.0	47	18.7	40	15.9	16	6.4
3. discussed ideas from your readings or lecture with teaching staff	113	45.0	61	24.3	58	23.1	19	7.6
4. received timely feedback from staff on academic performance	124	49.4	56	22.3	56	22.3	15	6.0
5. worked with teaching staff on activities other than coursework	177	70.5	33	13.1	29	11.6	12	4.8

**Table (5):** Students' engagement related to enriching educational experience as reported by the studied students (n=251).

IV: Enriching educational experiences	Never (1)		Sometimes (2)		Often (3)		Very often (4)	
	N o	%	N o	%	N o	%	N o	%
1. communicated with students from different ethnic group	166	66.1	40	15.9	32	12.7	13	5.2
2. had conversations with students who are very different in terms of religious beliefs, political opinions or personal values	102	40.6	58	23.1	59	23.5	32	12.7
3. used an online learning system to discuss or complete assignments	14	5.6	30	12.0	94	37.5	13	45.0
4. Participated in Community service	46	18.3	86	34.3	78	31.1	41	16.3
<b>Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your faculty?</b>	<b>Have not decide (1)</b>		<b>Do not Plan to do (2)</b>		<b>Plan to do (3)</b>		<b>Done (4)</b>	
5. Studied a foreign language	26	10.4	7	2.8	160	63.7	58	23.1
6. Participated in a learning community	97	38.6	61	24.3	73	29.1	20	8.0
7. Independent study or self-designed major	61	24.3	47	18.7	132	52.6	11	4.4
8. Participated in study abroad	54	21.5	42	16.7	154	61.4	1	0.4
9. Culminating final degree (honours, etc.)	31	12.4	23	9.2	185	73.7	12	4.8
10. encouraged contact among students from different economic, social and ethnic backgrounds	62	24.7	53	21.1	98	39.0	38	15.1
11. participated in co-curricular activities	90	35.9	86	43.3	46	18.3	29	11.6

**Table (6):** Students' engagement related to supportive learning environment as reported by the studied students (n=251)

V : Supportive learning environment	Never (1)		Sometimes (2)		Often (3)		Very often (4)									
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%								
1. Learning environment supports us to achieve success academically	50	19.9	61	24.3	73	29.1	67	26.7								
2. Learning environment Provides support to socialize	33	13.1	61	24.3	92	36.7	65	25.9								
3. Learning environment helps us to cope with non-academic responsibilities	42	16.7	61	24.3	78	31.1	70	27.9								
quality of relationship with	0		1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4. Colleagues	0	0.0	2	0.8	0	0.0	7	2.8	17	6.8	22	8.8	35	13.9	168	66.9
5. teaching staff	6	2.4	42	16.7	18	7.2	25	10.0	33	13.1	61	24.3	28	11.2	38	15.1
6. administrative staff	24	9.6	89	35.5	22	8.8	29	11.6	32	12.7	18	7.2	18	7.2	19	7.6

**Table (7):** Student engagement domains level as reported by the studied students (n=251).

Student engagement domains	(Min-Max)	Total score & level				Mean(SD)
		Unsatisfactory (< 75)		Satisfactory (≥ 75)		
		No	%	No	%	
▪ Academic challenges	7-43	239	95.2	12	4.8	24.6(5.1)
▪ Active and collaborative learning	8-32	216	86.1	35	13.9	19.5(3.8)
▪ Student - staff interactions	5-20	228	90.8	23	9.2	9.3(3.3)
▪ Enriching educational experiences	11-44	227	90.4	24	9.6	26.3(4.7)
▪ Supportive learning environment	3-33	178	70.9	73	29.1	21.2(5.4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>34-172</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>95.6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>101.1(15.6)</b>

**Table (8):** Relation between total student engagement and their personal characteristics of the studied students

Characteristics	Total student engagement				X <sup>2</sup>	P*
	Unsatisfactory (< 75)		Satisfactory (≥ 75)			
	No	%	No	%		
<b>Age (years)</b>						
• 18-	10	100.0	0	0.0	0.4	1.0
• 20-	230	95.4	11	4.4		
<b>Gender</b>					0.04	1.0
• Male	50	96.2	2	3.8		
• Female	190	95.5	9	4.5		
<b>Marital status</b>					0.23	1.0
• Single	235	95.5	11	4.5		
• Married	5	100.0	0	0.0		
<b>Residence during academic year</b>					0.03	1.0
• Urban	102	95.3	5	4.7		
• Rural	138	95.8	6	4.2		
<b>Current level of the study</b>					0.88	0.6
• Second level	18	100.0	0	0.0		
• Third level	222	95.3	11	4.7		
<b>Previous academic achievement</b>					2.42	0.5
• excellent	5	83.3	1	16.7		
• very good	16	94.1	1	5.9		
• good	161	95.8	7	4.2		
• Acceptable	58	96.7	2	3.3		



### Discussion

Student engagement is considered to be important and necessary for performance, learning, retention, persistence, experience and achievement. Students who are engaged are more likely to achieve higher grades and higher test scores, and have lower level of dropout rates<sup>(12,13)</sup>. In contrast, students with low levels of engagement are at risk for different adverse consequences, including disruptive classroom behavior, absenteeism, and high dropout level<sup>(14)</sup>.

The present study was revealed that the majority of students had unsatisfactory level of engagement in nursing administration course, this may be due to teaching method was not effective, students did not prepare lectures before coming to faculty, time of lecture did not appropriate for students, students had previous experience about nursing administration course, it is difficult to retain course content during lecture. These results agreed with **Radloff (2011)**<sup>(15)</sup> who reported that New Zealand students are far less engaged in their studies than USA undergraduate students during both their first year and later year of study.

**Concerning academic challenges domain**, students are doing everything according to his ability to provide academic effort as reading, writing, studying and preparing for lectures<sup>(16)</sup>. The present study was revealed that the majority of students had unsatisfactory level regarding academic challenges domain and this may be due to students did not work hard to understand difficult lecture or they was spent much time on activities other than academic work. These results agreed with **Radloff (2011)**<sup>(15)</sup> who reported that New

Zealand students have unsatisfactory level regarding academic challenge.

These results disagreed with **NSSE (2013)**<sup>(25)</sup> which was reported that

generally, about fifty five percentage of students at first academic year and sixty one percentage of seniors students were felt strongly agree that their studied courses were challenged them to do the best work, they can do regarding preparing for lecture and students who felt highly challenged by their courses experienced almost twice as much course emphasis on higher order learning than their colleagues who were experienced low levels of course challenge. It also disagreed with **Marton & Säljö (1976, 1997)**<sup>(17,18)</sup> & **Nelson Laird., Shoup & Kuh (2006)**<sup>(19)</sup> who reported that students who were challenged to engage in educational practices, reflective and integrative learning are learning in a deep way, and, gaining knowledge beyond a surface-level understanding.

**Concerning active and collaborative learning domain**, it refers to everything or each effort which the students perform to participate in discussions, work with other learners, and engage in other activities in the lecture hall<sup>(16)</sup>. The present study was revealed that the majority of students had unsatisfactory level regarding active and collaborative learning domain and this may be due to students did not participate in discussion during lecture, time is limited for lecture, teaching method was not effective. These results agreed with **Keyser (2000)**<sup>(20)</sup>; **Margurber (2005)**<sup>(21)</sup>; **Ghani (2009)**<sup>(22)</sup> who reported that traditional lecture approach without student interaction in most cases, it will be not an engaging form of learning simply, there is a need for interaction between students to enhance learning fits with what we know about active learning in the lecture hall. This type of interaction with others will enhance students' development and becoming more knowledgeable /skilled within the content area. Similarly with **Radloff (2011)**<sup>(15)</sup> who reported that New

Zealand students have unsatisfactory level regarding active and collaborative learning. These results disagreed with **NSSE (2013)** <sup>(25)</sup> which reported that higher levels of collaborative learning were achieved by students who were studying students in science fields compared to their colleagues in the social science disciplines.

**Concerning students-staff interactions domain**, it related to frequency and nature of contact that learners have with their faculty. Faculty feedback is the most frequent and immediate type of contact between the student and instructor. Contact between students and faculty includes frequent and immediate feedback and discussion of grades and assignments, ideas, careers, and collaborative assignments <sup>(23)</sup>.

The present study was revealed that the majority of students had unsatisfactory level regarding students-staff interactions domain and this may be due to teaching staff did not provide immediate feedback for students about their performance, students did not discuss ideas from their reading assignment. These results agreed with **Radloff (2011)** <sup>(15)</sup> who reported that New Zealand students have unsatisfactory level regarding students-staff interactions. These results disagreed with **NSSE (2013)** <sup>(25)</sup> which reported that majority students had positive interactions with teaching staff.

**Concerning enriching educational experiences domain**, it involves developing students to learn and work effectively with other learners having different backgrounds and enables them to use of advanced technology to facilitate collaboration <sup>(16)</sup>. The present study was revealed that the majority of students had unsatisfactory level regarding enriching educational experiences domain and this may be due to students did not have conversations or discussion with their colleagues who had different background in terms of religious beliefs, political

opinions or personal values, students did not participate in community service or volunteer work. These results agreed with **Radloff (2011)** <sup>(15)</sup> who reported that South African students have unsatisfactory level regarding enriching educational experiences

These results disagreed with **NSSE (2013)** <sup>(25)</sup> which reported that majority students who were perceived university as a supportive learning environment, they had frequently interaction with diverse colleagues in addition to engagement in more complex learning activities

**Concerning supportive learning environment domain**, a commitment to student success means supporting students in multiple ways across cognitive, social, and physical domains, with this support leading to increased student performance and satisfaction <sup>(24)</sup>. In addition to high quality of instruction in lecture hall, institutions should strive to provide an atmosphere that encourages student growth in numerous areas with sufficient resources and engagement chances <sup>(25)</sup>.

The present study was revealed that two third of students had unsatisfactory level regarding supportive learning environment domain and this may be due to learning environment did not help students to cope with non-academic responsibilities. These results agreed with **Radloff (2011)** <sup>(15)</sup> who reported that South African first year students have unsatisfactory level regarding supportive learning environment. These results disagreed with **NSSE (2013)** <sup>(25)</sup> which reported that majority students who were perceived university as a supportive learning environment, they had frequently interaction with diverse colleagues in addition to engagement in more complex learning activities. **NSSE 2013** <sup>(25)</sup> suggests that majority students who were perceived university as a supportive learning environment, although there were

differences between certain types of students that merit consideration.

Students interact with a variety of individuals on university who participated in their learning and development both during and after college <sup>(24)</sup>. In addition to students in day-to-day social situations, interactions with academic advisors, student services staff, and other administrators all may have a positive influence on outcomes <sup>(25)</sup>.

The present study was revealed that there was no statistically significant relation between student engagement and their age, marital status, residence during academic year, current level of the study and previous academic achievement.

The present study was revealed that there was no statistically significant relation between student engagement and their gender, this may be due to majority of students had the same level of previous achievement. These results agreed with **Howard, James & Taylor (2002)** <sup>(26)</sup> who reported that students' engagement did not influenced by their gender, Similarly with **Fritschner (2000)** <sup>(27)</sup> who reported that there is no difference among male and female <sup>(2000)</sup> <sup>(25)</sup> who reported that there is no difference among male and female students regarding active participation in class.

These results disagreed with **Fullarton (2002)** <sup>(28)</sup> who found that females be more engaged than males in educational practices. It also disagreed with **Mortenson (2006)** <sup>(29)</sup> who reported that female get better grades because they are more engaged than men; that is, they study more hours, interact more often with their lecturer. It also disagreed with **Tannen (1990)** <sup>(30)</sup> and **Fassinger (1995)** <sup>(31)</sup> who reported that male students more frequently participate in class discussions than females students

#### Conclusion

It was concluded from the present study that students' engagement level was

unsatisfactory as reported by the studied sample and there was no relation between students' engagement and their demographic characteristics except their gender.

#### Recommendations

1. Advanced teaching methods should be implemented in nursing administration course as PBL, TBL
2. Course content should be modified to improve higher thinking skills among students
3. Teaching staff should provide students feedback frequently.
4. Students should have opportunities to interact with their peers and discuss their ideas.
5. Supportive learning environment should be established

#### References

1. **Fredricks, J., McColskey, W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., & Mooney, K. (2011)**. Measuring student engagement in upper elementary through high school: a description of 21 instruments. Issues and Answers Report, 098, 26–27. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
2. **Hall, S., & Turi, D. M. (2012)**. The Relationship between Student Engagement and the Development of Character in Mission Driven Faith-Based Colleges and Universities as Measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement.
3. **Shuhui, L. I. N., & Yunchen, H. (2015)**. Examining Teaching Charisma and Its Relation to Student Engagement, *10*(6), 1–8. <http://doi.org/10.3968/5631>
4. **Quaye, S. R. H. S. J. (2009)**. Student Engagement in Higher Education : *theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*.
5. **Trowler, V. (2010)**. Student engagement literature review. *Higher Education*, Retrieved from

- [http://americandemocracy.illinoisstate.edu/documents/democratic-engagement-white-paper-2\\_13\\_09.pdf](http://americandemocracy.illinoisstate.edu/documents/democratic-engagement-white-paper-2_13_09.pdf)
6. **Fredricks, J A , Blumenfeld, P C and Paris, A H (2004).** School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence Review of Educational Research 74 (1), pp 59–109).
  7. **Shuhui, L. I. N., & Yunchen, H. (2015).** Examining Teaching Charisma and Its Relation to Student Engagement, 10(6), 1–8. <http://doi.org/10.3968/5631>
  8. **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (2010).** National Survey of Student Engagement 2010. Available on [http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/US\\_paper\\_10.pdf](http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/US_paper_10.pdf)
  9. **Reeve, J., & Coates, H. B. (2011).** Student Engagement Questionnaire, 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.1037/t21383-000>
  10. **ISSE. (2013).** The Irish survey of student engagement. Retrieved from [http://studentsurvey.ie/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/ISSE\\_Survey\\_final2013.pdf](http://studentsurvey.ie/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/ISSE_Survey_final2013.pdf)
  11. **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (2015).** This is a facsimile of U.S. English version of the online NSSE instrument as it appears to the student. available on the NSSE Web site: [nsse.iub.edu/html/survey\\_instruments.cfm](http://nsse.iub.edu/html/survey_instruments.cfm).
  12. **Appleton, J. J., S. L. Christenson, D. Kim, and A. L. Reschly. 2006.** “Measuring Cognitive and Psychological Engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. “Journal of School Psychology 44 (5): 427–445.
  13. **Bryson, C., and L. Hand. 2008.** “Student Engagement.” In Aspects of student engagement–SEDA special 22, edited by L. Hand and C. Bryson, 13–17. London: Staff and Educational Development Association.
  14. **Klem, A. M & Connell, J. P. (2004).** Engaging Youth in school Adena. [http://www.irre.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdfs/Engaging\\_Youth\\_9-8-04\\_0.pdf](http://www.irre.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdfs/Engaging_Youth_9-8-04_0.pdf)
  15. **Radloff, A. (2011).** Student engagement in New Zealand’s universities. available online: <http://research.acer.edu.au/ausse/14/>
  16. **Kuh, G. D. (2003).** What we are learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. Changes.
  17. **Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976).** On qualitative differences in learning. I: Outcome and process. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 4-11.
  18. **Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1997).** Approaches to learning. In F. Marton, D.J. Hounsell, & N.J. Entwistle (Eds.), The Experience of Learning: Implications for teaching and Studying Higher Education (pp. 36-55). Edinburgh, UK: Scottish Academic Press
  19. **Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., & Kuh, G.D. (2006).** Measuring deep approaches to learning using the National Survey of Student Engagement. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.
  20. **Keyser, M. (2000).** Active learning versus and cooperative learning: Understanding the differences and using both styles effectively. Research Strategies, 17(1), 35–44. Retrieved from <http://escholarshare.drake.edu/bitstream/handle/2092/251/Keyser%2023251.pdf?sequence=1>
  21. **Margurber, D. R. (2005).** Comparing student performance using cooperative learning. International
-

- 
- Review of Economics Education, 4(1), 46–57.
22. **Ghani Ghani, S. A. (2009).** Cooperative learning versus the lecture method of instruction in an introductory statistics course. *Journal Sains dan Matematik*, 1(1), 59–71. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/993985/Cooperative\\_Learning\\_Versus\\_The\\_Lecture\\_Method\\_of\\_Instruction\\_in\\_An\\_Introductory\\_Statistics\\_Course](http://www.academia.edu/993985/Cooperative_Learning_Versus_The_Lecture_Method_of_Instruction_in_An_Introductory_Statistics_Course)
23. **Robinson, C.C. and Hullinger, H. (2008).** New benchmarks in higher education: Student engagement in online learning. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Education for Business*, 84(2), 101-109.
24. **Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (2005).** *How college affects students: Volume 2, a third decade of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
25. **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (2013).** *A Fresh Look at Student Engagement - Annual Results 2013*, 56. Retrieved from [nsse.iub.edu/http://nsse.indiana.edu/nsse\\_2013\\_results/pdf/nsse\\_2013\\_annual\\_results.pdf](http://nsse.iub.edu/http://nsse.indiana.edu/nsse_2013_results/pdf/nsse_2013_annual_results.pdf)
26. **Howard, J. R., James, G. H. III, & Taylor, D. R. (2002).** The consolidation of responsibility in the mixed-age college classroom. *Teaching Sociology*, 30, 214–234.
27. **Fritschner, L. M. (2000).** Inside the undergraduate college classroom: Faculty and students differ on the meaning of student participation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 342–362.
28. **Fullarton, Sue (2002).** Student engagement with school: Individual and school-level influences. *Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth, Research Report No. 27.*
29. **Mortenson, T. (2006).** *The State of American Manhood. Postsecondary Opportunity*, 171.
30. **Tannen, D. (1990).** *You Just Don't Understand.* New York: Harper Collins.
31. **Fassinger, P. A. (1995).** Understanding classroom interaction: Students' and professors' contributions to students' silence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 82–96.