Psychosocial Barriers Facing Nursing Students in their Academic Career

[1] **Salma Abd el Nasser Berry, Ghada Mohamed Mourad,[3] Fatma Ata abdelsalheen.**

[1] Nursing Specialist at Technical Institute of Nursing, Sohag University,
[2] Professor of Psychiatric Nursing at Faculty of Nursing,
[3] Assist.Professor of Psychiatric Nursing at Faculty of Nursing [2,3]Ain Shams University.

Abstract

Background: University students face numerous stressors and academic demands as study, family and work commitments which contribute to exacerbation of mental health problems. Developmental challenges including increased freedoms, decision making, challenging family beliefs engaging in risky behaviors, or pressure to do well. **This study aimed to:** Assess psychosocial barriers facing nursing students in their academic career. **Design:** A descriptive design was used to conduct this study. **Setting:** This study was conducted at faculty of nursing in Suhag University. **Subjects:** A purposive sample of 112 students **Tools of data collection:** First tool: socio demographic sheet questionnaire. Second tool: A-psychological barriers questionnaire. B- social barriers questionnaire. **Results:** the present study show that 65.2% of the studied nursing students their age ranged between 20-22 years with mean 20.46 and, 56.3% of them agreed about want to stop studying nursing due to its requirements and 70.5% of them agreed that personal problems effect on their studies Also, 75.9% of them can exchange ideas with their colleagues about how to improve their study. **Conclusion:** there were positive correlation and significant relation between the total score of Psychological Barriers and total score of Social Barriers. Also, age, gender, social status, residence, level of education, living in university housing and living with both parents as factors that affect the students in their academic career.. **Recommendation:** conducting Training sessions and workshops should be organized to overcome psychological and social barriers and orientation program should b done to help student in their study.

Key wards: psychosocial, barriers, students.

Introduction:

The college students are adult learners, who want to apply what they have learned, by participating in the learning process through problem solving. As adult learners, they value feedback as one of the components used to evaluate their progress. Such as, faculty staff must match their teaching skills to the student's level of understanding and experience. Students' relationships are important for learning.

Students support each other, share knowledge, skills and behaviors which help them to be socialized into the profession **(Tinto, 2017).**

Nurse students are usually excited about spending time in the faculty. Nursing faculty needs to capitalize on this excitement and provide the students with the best learning opportunities available during their experience. Students need the setting to acquire the knowledge, practice

and attitude that is gained from classes, readings, group discussion, skills labs and other learning experiences **(Permzadian and Credé, 2016).** A barrier is a problem that prevents two people or groups from agreeing, communicating, or working with each other **(Dickinson, Abrams and Tokar, 2017).**

Psychological barriers are barriers maintained by people with disabilities themselves. They exist when individuals have learned to believe that they are not capable. Social/attitudinal barriers represent attitudes or personal beliefs of members of our society that are based on prejudice regarding a particular disability or people with disabilities in general **(Beer and Lawson, 2018).**

Numerous factors affect the academic progress and learning performance of students: age, gender, school education, residential area students come from, medium of instruction in schools, tuition trends, daily study hours, accommodation and the socio-economic background of the parents or guardians. According to available literature, there are some impediments to good academic performance by student nurses **(Jan, 2015).**

They include excessive homework assignments for the students, poor facilities, inadequate provision of basic needs by parents and inappropriate student perceptions. Poor teaching, misunderstanding of academic questions and time constraints when students have to read the question, translate it into the home language and then choose the correct answer are some more. In contrast, social and emotional lecturer–student relationships, a cohesive school atmosphere, a welcoming atmosphere and students with higher-level entry qualifications are some predictors of students' good academic performance. Moreover, a proper clinical education and

an appropriate learning environment can lead to an adequate clinical performance **(Birt et al., 2016).**

Students can face difficulty in learning due to the factors related with internal classroom. Some of these factors are physical aspects. These can have negative or positive impact on students' ability to learn. The physical aspects of a classroom are made up of temperature, size, timetable, and acoustics of a classroom **(Barbé, Kimble, Belluryand Rubenstein, 2017).** If these factors are unsatisfactory, then they could hinder students from proper learning. For instance, if a classroom is too warm or too cold students will face difficulty to concentrate. As for size, merging two classes into one may have a very strong negative impact, in addition to the background noises of the classroom and its surrounding environment that may also have a bad influence on students' mood as supported in. When there is a negative impact on students' mood, then the learning facilities are no more favorable to study inText Books and Exam Systems Exam systems could have their share of negative impact on quality performance of students as they often result in a huge amount of stress **(Woo et al., 2017).**

There should be services from universities and a supporting structure in place that would enable students to be more included more active in social life. Universities should also make some efforts to create more events, in which students can join and interact with others **(Beer and Lawson, 2017b).**

Significance of the study:

College students are at a critical period where they will enter adulthood as they are expected to be the elites in the society. They need to not only adapt themselves to the new life and new

environment but also be familiar with many new people, events, and things. There are many students are less competent in interpersonal relationship due to the lack of social interaction before college life. And other students, who were outstanding in their high school, now lose superiority against the numerous rivals in colleges. Poor academic performance can lead to absenteeism or feelings of hopelessness that interfere with effective study habits and then further weaken academic achievement.

In this context, it was observed by the researcher that students who are experiencing psychological and social barriers facing student in managing their academic performance. Psychological stability is indeed an important predictor that could contribute to high academic achievement. Hence, it is very much crucial determine psychosocial barriers for facing nursing students in their academic career..

Aim of this study:

This study aimed to assess psychosocial barriers facing nursing students in their academic career.

Research Question:

What are the psychosocial barriers facing nursing students in their academic career ?

SUBJECT and METHODS:

Study design:

A descriptive study was used to conduct this study.

Settings:

This study was conducted at the Faculty of Nursing at Sohag University.

Sample:

purposive sample

Subject:

The subjects of this study included 112 student from 448 of total number of students, fulfilling the following inclusion criteria:

- Age: 18 - 25 years.
- Sex: both sexes (male and female). agree to participate in this study.

Tools for data collection:

Two tools were designed by researcher to collect the basic data needed for this study after reviewing the current relevant literature. The tools were designed by the researcher in simple Arabic form, which included the following:

First tool: Predesigned Self-administered Questionnaire Sheet was used in this study .

1. Socio-demographic sheet

The researcher designed this sheet to student's characteristics in their academic career. It contains the following items: Sex, age, residence, social status, years of education and where do you live, have you ever failed, living with parents, marital statues and economic /physical condition.

2.Second tool: Interview questionnaire

This tool developed by researcher to assess psychosocial barriers facing student in their academic career. It consists of two sheets

a.Psychological barriers Questionnaire):

Is a valid and reliable questionnaire that is specifically designed to assess psychological barriers of undergraduate nursing students with their academic career, It contained (46) statements and grouped under (3) categories. **The first category was regarding to Factors for student himself**:. It consists of (14) questions to elicit information about student own self as like study, relations with others. have self-confident and accept others attitudes and opinions,

▪ **The second category was regarding Barriers to study.** It consists of (11) questions to elicit information about activating guidance role, difficult in studying in English and depriving from enough time for studying.

▪ **The third category was regarding Barriers for lecturers and scientific material.** It consists of (21) questions to elicit information about academic lectures, lectures style in evaluation and marking exams.

❖ **Scoring System of Psychological Barriers:**

The scoring system was adopted with rating ranging from 2 (agree) to 1 (disagree) point for each item.

Score % = (the observed score / the maximum score) × 100

The total score was from 50-100 grades:

▪ Mild barriers <50%
▪ Moderate barriers 50-75%
▪ Severe barriers >75%

   b. Social barriers:

This sheet was designed by the researcher to assess social barriers facing nursing student in their academic career. It consist of 4 category.

▪ **The first category was regarding environmental factors and physical** including (15) questions to elicit information about environmental learning condition and physical facilities as financial problems. books and references founded

▪ **The second category was regarding family factors:** - including (11) questions to elicit information about family relations as family commitments and parents helping in study.

▪ **The third category was regarding factors related to colleagues and friends**: including (9) questions to elicit information about nursing career and their affecting on study.

▪ **The fourth category was regarding Professional and community factors**: including (9) questions to elicit information about nursing career and its important in society**.**

❖ **Scoring System of Social Barriers:**

The scoring system was adopted with rating ranging from 2 (agree) to 1 (disagree) point for each item. Each question response was either agree (2 grade) and disagree (1 grade).

Score % = (the observed score / the maximum score) × 100

The total score was from 39-78 grades:

▪ Mild barriers <50%
▪ Moderate barriers 50- 75%
▪ Severe barriers >75

Operational design:

Preparatory phase:

The current and international related literature using books, periodicals, journals, magazines and internet reviewed by the researcher to be more acquainted with the research problem and to help in tool designing.

Content and face validity:

The tools were tested and evaluated for their face and content validity, and reliability by jury group consisting of fifth experts from faculty members in psychiatric mental health nursing department at faculty of nursing-Ain Shams University. They were from different academic categories, i.e. professor and assistant professor. To ascertain relevance, clarity, and completeness of the tools experts elicited responses were either agree or disagree for the face validity and for content reliability. The required corrections and modifications were done. The items on which 85% or more of the experts have agreed were included in the proposed tool .Internal consistenc of the study questionnaires was assessed with the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.00 indicates no reliability and a coefficient of 1.00 indicates perfect reliability. However, a reliability coefficient of 0.70 is acceptable (Burns and Grove 2007). Cronbach'salpha .result for psychological barriers questionnaire was 0.804 & social barriers questionnaire was 0.801

Pilot study:

A pilot study was performed after the researcher was granted official permissions from the Dean of Faculty of Nursing of Sohag University.

The pilot study was carried out in February 2018 before data collection on a group of 10% (12) students to test and evaluate the clarity, feasibility and applicability of the research tools, in order to estimate the time needed to collect data. According, to the pilot study results, the necessary modifications were done, some question was restated in the Arabic language translation.

Field work:

The researcher reviewed the current and past, local and international literature in the various aspects acquainted with in-depth information about the study, in order to design the study tools. The tools of this study developed by the researcher were reviewed by a jury group of 5 experts in the nursing field to evaluate face and content validity, and reliability.

The actual fieldwork for the process of the data collection has consumed 3months. beginning from march 2018 completed by the end of may 2018, through the following **First step**: Before starting the data collection, the researcher met with the students after introducing herself, she explained the nature and purpose of the study to gain their oral consent and cooperation. Data were collected daily for 3 days/week during morning for 10-20 minutes. Confidentiality of any obtained information was assured, and the subjects were informed about their right to participate or not in the study. The participants were also assured about anonymity, and that data will only be used for the purpose of the study.

Second step:

The researcher divided students to (3) groups according to their academic year, (34) student from second year, 53 student from third year and (25) sudent from forth year.
Researcher met student 3 days /week one group weekly, on Saturday, Sunday,

and Monday from 10:00 am to 11:00 pm and the researcher collecting the data from each group in an organized time and date. The researcher was present to assure that all questions were completed. Filling the tools lasts from 10-20 minutes for each subject included in the study sample. Collecting data was done in teaching class in the first floor.

Third step:

The researcher after collecting the answered sheets from the students, repeat the same previous steps to another group next day until completion of the process of data collection.

Ethical consideration:

The research approval was obtained from scientific research ethical committee Faculty of Nursing, Ain Shams University before starting the study. Verbal consent was obtained from each student before inclusion in the study sample and after explanation of the study aim in simple and clear manner. Clear and simple clarification of the study nature and its expected outcomes was explained. They secured that all data collected was treated in confidentiality and anonymity. All the study subjects had the right to withdraw at any time from the study.

Administrative design:

An official permission letter was obtained from the dean of faculty of nursing, sohag University, in which the study was conducted to obtain permission for data collection during their academic year 2017-2018. It ensured confidentiality of the information obtained.

Statistical design:

The statistical analysis of data was done by using the Computer Software for Excel Program and Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 16.0. Data were presented using descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and percentage for categorical data and the arithmetic mean (X) and standard deviation (SD) for quantitative data. Qualitative variables were compared using chi square test $(X)^2$ and P-value to test association between two variables. The validity and reliability test was confirmed by using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient test. Degrees of significance of results were:

- P-value > 0.05 Not significant (NS)
- P-value ≤ 0.05 Significant (S)
- P-value ≤ 0.001 Highly Significant (HS)

Results:

Table (1): reveals that, 65.2% of studied students are in the age group <20-22 years with a mean age 20.46±5.77 and nearly 73.2% were male, while 56.2% were single and, according to the residence 50% of them were rural –urban gradient Meanwhile, 66.1% were in high school and 57.1% and living in university housing ,also 93.8 living with both parents, and 83% were had adequate economic/physical condition.

Figure (1): show that, 28.6% of studied student had mild level of psychological barriers, 29.5%of them had moderate level of psychological barriers and 42% of them had severe level of psychological barriers.

Figure (2): It is clear that, 34.8% of studied student had mild level of social barriers, 27.7% of them had moderate level of social barriers and37.5%of them had severe level of social barriers.

Table (2): shows that, there were highly statistically significant relations between the studied students' psychological barriers and their age (years), residence, level of education, where do you live, and have you ever failed with p-value (p<0.001).

Table (3): Illustrate that, there was highly statistically significant relations between the studied student's level of social barriers and their age (years), residence, level of education, where do you live, and have you ever failed, with p-value (p<0.001).

Table (4): this table shows that there were highly statistically significant relations between the studied student level of psychological barriers and their social barriers, with p-value (p<0.001).

Table (1): as regard the distribution of studied student according to their socio demographic data (n=112).

Demographic Data	No.	%
sex		
Male	82	73.2
Female	30	26.8
Age (years)		
≤20 years	23	20.5
20-22 years	73	65.2
>22 years	16	14.3
Mean±SD	20.46±5.77	
Social status		
Single	63	56.2
Married	49	43.8
Residence		
Urban	56	50.0
Rural	56	50.0
Level of Education		
High school	74	66.1
Nursing Institute	34	30.3
Schools	4	3.6
Where do you live		
University Housing	64	57.1
With the family	48	42.9
The level of academic year		
Second	34	30.4
Third	53	47.3
Fourth	25	22.3
Demographic Data	**No.**	**%**
Have you ever failed?		
Yes	14	12.5
No	98	87.5
The parents live with each other		
Yes	105	93.8
No	7	6.2
Economic / physical condition		
Adequate	93	83.0

Figure (1): distribution of student according to their total psychological barriers.

Figure (2): Percentage distribution of student according to their total social barriers

Table (2): Relation between students' socio- demographic characteristic and psychological barriers (n=112).

Demographic Data	Psychological Barriers						Chi-square test	
	Mild barriers (N=32)		Moderate barriers (N=33)		Severe barriers *(N=47)*			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	x2	p-value
sex								
Male	23	71.9	22	66.7	37	78.7	1.478	0.478
Female	9	28.1	11	33.3	10	21.3		
Age (years)								
≤20 years	7	21.9	13	39.4	3	6.4		
20-22 years	11	34.4	18	54.5	44	93.6	49.113	<0.001**
>22 years	14	43.8	2	6.1	0	0.0		
Social status								
Single	17	53.1	17	51.5	17	36.2	2.033	0.362
Married	15	46.9	16	48.5	30	63.8		
Residence								
Urban	23	71.9	21	63.6	12	25.5	19.835	<0.001**
Rural	9	28.1	12	36.4	35	74.5		
Level of Education								
High school	29	90.6	24	72.7	21	44.7		
Nursing Institute	3	9.4	8	24.2	23	48.9	18.998	0.008*
Nursing School diploma	0	0.0	1	3.0	3	6.4		
Where do you live								
University Housing	9	28.1	16	48.5	39	83.0	24.823	<0.001**
With the family	23	71.9	17	51.5	8	17.0		
The level of the faculty								
Second	10	31.3	11	33.3	13	27.7		
Third	15	46.9	17	51.5	21	44.7	1.773	0.773
Fourth	7	21.9	5	15.2	13	27.7		
Have you ever failed?								
Yes	11	34.4	3	9.1	0	0.0	21.065	<0.001**
No	21	65.6	30	90.9	47	100.0		
The parents live with each other								
Yes	32	100.0	32	97.0	41	87.2	6.123	0.047*
No	0	0.0	1	3.0	6	12.8		
Economic / physical condition								
Adequate	27	84.4	31	93.9	35	74.5	5.275	0.039*
Insufficient	5	15.6	2	6.1	12	25.5		

Table (3): Relation between students' demographic data and their social barriers (n=112).

Demographic Data	Mild barriers (n=39)		Social Barriers Moderate barriers (n=31)		Severe barriers (n=42)		Chi-square test	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	x2	p-value
sex								
Male	27	69.2	22	71.0	33	78.6	1.010	0.603
Female	12	30.8	9	29.0	9	21.4		
Age (years)								
≤20 years	3	7.7	12	38.7	8	19.0		
20-22 years	23	59.0	17	54.8	33	78.6	25.462	<0.001**
>22 years	13	33.3	2	6.5	1	2.4		
Social status								
Single	23	59.0	13	41.9	20	47.6	0.415	0.813
Married	16	41.0	18	58.1	22	52.4		
Residence								
Urban	27	69.2	21	67.7	8	19.0	25.768	<0.001**
Rural	12	30.8	10	32.3	34	81.0		
Level of Education								
High school	30	76.9	23	74.2	21	50.0		
Nursing Institute	8	20.5	7	22.6	19	45.2	7.861	0.033*
Nursing School diploma	1	2.6	1	3.2	2	4.8		
Where do you live								
University Housing	8	20.5	17	54.8	39	92.9	43.310	<0.001**
With the family	31	79.5	14	45.2	3	7.1		
The level of the faculty								
Second	10	25.6	11	35.5	13	31.0		
Third	17	43.6	16	51.6	20	47.6	3.239	0.518
Fourth	12	30.8	4	12.9	9	21.4		
Have you ever failed?								
Yes	9	23.1	4	12.9	1	2.4	7.926	0.019*
No	30	76.9	27	87.1	41	97.6		
The parents live with each other								
Yes	33	84.6	30	96.8	42	100.0	8.838	0.012*
No	6	15.4	1	3.2	0	0.0		
Economic / physical condition								
Adequate	37	94.9	24	77.4	32	76.2	5.970	0.049*
Insufficient	2	5.1	7	22.6	10	23.8		

Table (4): Relation between student Psychological Barriers and their Social Barriers (n=112).

Social Barriers	Psychological Barriers Mild barriers		Moderate barriers		Severe barriers		Total		Chi-square test	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	x2	p-value
Mild barriers	27	24.1	8	7.1	4	3.6	39	34.8		
Moderate barriers	3	2.7	22	19.6	6	5.4	31	27.7	19.682	<0.001**
Severe barriers	2	1.8	3	2.7	37	33.0	42	37.5		
Total	32	28.6	33	29.5	47	42.0	112	100.0		

* Statistically significant at P < 0.05.   ** High statistically significant at P <.01.

Discussion:

Faculty is a new special period and exciting time for students during which students are mature physically and their views towards life and world are not stable enough. Though they don't have enough experience with particular self-indulgence and confusion, they may have various ambivalences easily **(AlGamal, Alhosain, and Alsunaye, 2018).**

Students growing opportunities available in a college environment may lead to unhealthy levels of stress which hinder students' abilities to socialize and achieve their academic goals. Recognizing the sources of stress is important in preventing it from becoming unmanageable or debilitating *(***Bhurtun, Azimirad, Saaranen, and Turunen, 2019)**.

Therefore, this study aimed to assess psychosocial barriers facing nursing students in their academic career. The study was conducted at the faculty of nursing affiliated to Sohag University.

Regarding to the demographic characteristics, the finding of the current study revealed that, nearly two third of the studied nursing students their age ranged between 20-22 years with mean 20.46 year. These results might be due to age of college students ranges between 18-25. These results similar with the result of study performed by **Lawal, Weaver, Bryan, and Lindo (2016)** which entitled "Factors that influence the clinical learning experience of nursing students at a Caribbean school of nursing", who indicated that the mean age of the studied nursing students was 20.82 year.

In relation to sex and marital status of the studied nursing students, the results of the current study indicated that slightly less than three quarters of them were male and more than half of them were single. These results might be due to customs and traditions in Upper Egypt that allow marriage at a young age. These results approved with the study performed by **Cruz et al. (2018)** which entitled "Quality of life of nursing students from nine countries" who stated that more than two third of the studied nursing students were male. However, these results disagreement **Makki Abadi, Tabbodi, and Rahgozar (2015)** who carried out their study in to assess the relationship between spiritual well-being and academic achievement of nursing students and found that the majority of students were female and more than half of them were single.

Related to **the residence** of the studied students, the results of the current study indicated that half of them were from equal urban and rural areas. And more than half of them live in university housing and These results may be due to the faculty of nursing located far away from their place of residence". These results supported with the study done by **Collie, Martin, Papworth, and Ginns (2016)** about "Students' interpersonal relationships, personal best (PB) goals, and academic engagement", who mentioned that half of them were from equal urban and rural areas.and less than two third of the studied students live in university housing.

In the current study, the majority of the studied students their parents live with each other. Also more than four fifth of them their economic/physical condition were adequate. This results approved with the study performed by **McLaren, Fidler, and McGeorge (2018)** which entitled "Prevalence and predictors of stress and anxiety among college students", who indicated that the majority of the studied students their parents live with each other. Also, these results similar with the result

of study performed by **Geok, Yusof, Lam, Japar, and Fauzee (2018)** who carried out a study in Malaysia to assess Physical activity and health-promoting lifestyle of student nurses and indicated that more than four fifth of student nursing students their economic/physical condition were adequate.

Regarding to the **total Psychological Barriers**, the finding of the current study showed that, more than one quarter of the studied students had mild level of barriers. Also more than one quarter of them had moderate level of barriers. While nearly two fifth of them had severe level of barriers. These results similar with the results of study performed by **Vungkhanching, Tonsing, and Tonsing (2017)** about Psychological distress, coping and perceived social support in social work students, who stated that less than half of the students had severe level of Psychological distress. Psychological condition of the students is very much crucial to be reviewed and studied. This is because students who are psychologically stable can perform well in academic life. In other words, those who are experiencing psychological problems such as depression, anxiety and stress may face problems in managing their academic performance. Psychological stability is indeed an important predictor that could contribute to high academic achievement.

Regarding to the total social barriers, the finding of the current study showed that, slightly more than one third of the studied student had mild level of social barriers. Also more than one quarter of them had moderate level of social barriers. While less than two fifth of them had severe level of social barriers. In contrary to these findings a study done by **Safan and Ebrahim (2018)** about Problems and Barriers Facing Nursing Interns and Its Relation to Their Performance at Clinical Setting, who discovered that less than half of the students had severe level of social problems.

Regarding to the relation between psychological barriers and their social barriers. The present study revealed that, there were highly statistical significant relation between the psychological barriers of the studied student and their social barriers. These results in line with study done on Italy by **Arkan et al. (2018)** who stated that psychological barriers had a significant effect on students' social status.

Conclusion:

Based on the results of the present study, this study concluded that, more than one quarter of the studied students had mild level of barriers. Also more than one quarter of them had moderate level of barriers. While nearly two fifth of them had severe level of barriers., slightly more than one third of the studied student had mild level of social barriers. Also more than one quarter of them had moderate level of social barriers. While less than two fifth of them had severe level of social barriers In addition, there was statistically significant positive correlation between total score of Psychological Barriers and total score of Social Barriers. Also, Age, gender,social status, residence,level of education, living in university housing and living with both parents as factors that affect the students'in their academic career.

Recommendations:

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1- Orientation program should be done for students in the beginning of every academic year regarding clinical and

theoretical courses of the program, staff and support andresources in the faculty

2- Periodicaly meeting with group of students in order to discuss most common psychological and social problems facing students regarding their program, class and clinical teaching and support andresources.

References:

Al-Gamal, E., Alhosain, A., and Alsunaye, K. (2018). Stress and coping strategies among Saudi nursing students during clinical education. Perspectives in psychiatric care, 54(2), 198-205.

Arkan, B., Ordin, Y., and Yılmaz, D. (2018). Undergraduate nursing students' experience related to their clinical learning environment and factors affecting to their clinical learning process. Nurse education in practice, 29, 127-1321), 70-86.

Barbé, T., Kimble, L. P., Bellury, L. M., and Rubenstein, C. (2017): Predicting student attrition using social determinants: Implications for a diverse nursing workforce. Journal of Professional Nursing.

Beer, C., and Lawson, C. (2017b): The problem of student attrition in higher education: An alternative perspective. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 41(6), 773-784.

Beer, C., and Lawson, C. (2018): Framing attrition in higher education: a complex problem. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 42(4), 497-508.

Bhurtun, H., Azimirad, M., Saaranen, T., and Turunen, H. (2019). Stress and coping among nursing students during clinical training: An integrative review. Journal of Nursing Education, 58(5), 266-272

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., and Walter, F. (2016): Member checking. Qualitative Health Research, 26, 1802-1811.

Collie, R., Martin, A., Papworth, B., and Ginns, P. (2016). Students' interpersonal relationships, personal best (PB) goals, and academic engagement. Learning and Individual Differences, 45, 65-76**.**

Cruz, J., Felicilda-Reynaldo, R., Lam, S., Contreras, F., Cecily, H., Papathanasiou, I., and Colet, P. (2018). Quality of life of nursing students from nine countries: A cross-sectional study. Nurse education today, 66, 135-142.

Dickinson, J., Abrams, M. D., and Tokar, D. M. (2017): An examination of the applicability of social cognitive career theory for African American college students. Journal of Career Assessment, 25, 75-92.

Geok, S., Yusof, A., Lam, S., Japar, S., and Fauzee, M. (2015). Physical activity and health-promoting lifestyle of student nurses in Malaysia. Journal of Biosciences and Medicines, 3(03), 78.

Jan, S. K. (2015): The relationships between academic self-efficacy, computer self-efficacy, prior experience, and satisfaction with online learning. American Journal of Distance Education, 29(1), 30-40.

Lawal, J., Weaver, S., Bryan, V., and Lindo, J. (2016). Factors that influence the clinical learning experience of nursing students at a Caribbean school of nursing. Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 6(4), 32.

Makki Abadi, M., Tabbodi, M., and Rahgozar, H. (2015): The relationship between spiritual well-being and academic achievement. European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings, 2(3), 3440.

McLaren, K., Fidler, J., and McGeorge, L. (2018). Prevalence and predictors of stress and anxiety among college students. Community mental health journal, 52(8), 984-992.

Permzadian, V., and Credé, M. (2016): Do first-year seminars improve faculty grades and retention? A quantitative review of their overall effectiveness and an examination of moderators of effectiveness. Review of Educational Research, 86(1), 277-316

Safan, S., and Ebrahim, R. (2018). Problems and Barriers Facing Nursing Interns and Its Relation to Their Performance at Clinical Setting: A Comparative Study. American Journal of Nursing, 7(6), 304-313

Tinto, V. (2017): Through the eyes of students. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 19(3), 254-269.

Vungkhanching, M., Tonsing, J., and Tonsing, K. (2017). Psychological distress, coping and perceived social support in social work students. British Journal of Social Work, 47(7), 1999-2013.

Woo, H., Lu, J., Henfield, M. S., and Bang, N. (2017): An exploratory study of career intentions in academia: Doctoral students in counselor education programs in the U.S. Journal of Asia Pacific Counseling, 7(1) 79-93