

## CHAPTER VII

### RESULT

The study included those students who are studying in second and third year certificate level programmes on all nursing campuses in Nepal. The total number of participants was 250. The study yielded a sample of 234 students for the academic year 1991. The findings were based on completed questionnaires of 234 participants. The participating sample accounted for 94 percent of the random sample.

The following are the descriptive statistics presented. Category 1. The student demographic information was computed in frequency and percentage. The average level of teacher-student interpersonal relationship as perceived by nursing students were computed in Mean, Standard Deviation (SD), Standard Error Mean (SEM.) and 95% Confidence Interval (CI). The one way ANOVA test was performed for comparison of a Mean score on different campuses. A multiple range test showed the components of relationship significant on each nursing campus. Category 2. The correlation between components of teacher-student relationship and the students' academic achievement.



## CATEGORY 1 (A). DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

The summary of the demographic information of all seven nursing campuses were included in this result. There were 234 nursing students in this study. There were (N=120), 51% of second year and (N=114), 49% of third year students. A high percentage of students came from Brahmin family (N=90), 38.5% and others were Rai, Limbu, Newar and Chhetri. Most of the students were female (N=200), 85.5% and male (N=34), 14.5%. However male student involvement was low compared to female student involvement. Their ages were in the range of 16-20 years (N=138), 59.1%, mostly young students. More than half (N=150), 64% of students' birth places were in rural areas (village). According to the religion quarry, most of them were Hindu (N=204), 87%. Most of students are unmarried (N=187), 79.9%. (N=205), 88% of students stay in a hostel and only 29 (12%) stayed outside hostel, maybe their home. Most of students who enter the nursing campus have an educational status of school leaving certificate (SLC) (N=200), 90%. Only (N=34), 10% studied certificate level. Most of the students' (N=112), 47.9% fathers' occupations were farmer (N=112), 47.9% and only (N=60), 25.7% were government service. Their mother's (N=178), 78%

occupation was housewife. The detailed demographic information is presented in the appendix.

CATEGORY 1 (B). THE AVERAGE LEVEL OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT.

Table 7.1. shows the average level of relationship as perceived by the entire sample (N=234). There are five components: trust, support system, open communication, effective class room teaching, and characteristics of a clinical teacher. There are eight items of questions in each component and each component of questions are on a 5 point scale. However, each component has of score 40. This mean score was obtained from a total score of 40 in each component. The result of effective class room teaching showed that among the component of teacher-student relationship the effective class room teaching score Mean was high. Mean 27.28, SD 7.03 and 95% CI 26.37 - 28.18. Second high was support system, Mean 26.53, SD 7.34 and 95% CI 25.58 - 27.48. The low Mean score was open communication Mean 24.66, SD 7.33 and 95% CI 23.71 - 25.60.

Table 7.1. Descriptive statistics, mean score of components of teacher-student interpersonal relationship as perceived by all student (N=234).

Components of relationship	Total score 40 in each components.		
	Mean score	SD	95% C I
Trust	24.81	6.46	23.98-26.64
Support system	26.53	7.34	25.58-27.48
Open communication	24.66	7.33	23.71-25.60
Effective classroom teaching	27.28	7.03	26.37-28.18
Characteristics of clinical teacher	25.40	7.17	24.48-26.33

Table 7.2 and 7.3. The average level of relationship were summarized between second year and third year students. The same descriptive statistics procedure was applied in both groups. The effective classroom teaching were high Mean score in both groups. The mean score of second year students was 27.32, SD 6.89 and 95% CI 26.07 - 28.57 and in third year student Mean 27.23, SD 7.21 95% CI 25.29 - 26.57. Third year students obtained high Mean score 26.63 in support system compare to second year student. The second year student obtained Mean score 24.44.

Table 7.2. Descriptive statistics, mean score of components of teacher-student relationship perceived by second year student (N=120).

Components of relationship.	Total score 40 in each components.		
	Mean score	SD	95% CI
Trust	24.75	6.51	23.57-25.93
Support system	24.44	7.04	25.16-27.71
Open communication	24.64	7.25	23.33-25.95
Effective classroom teaching	27.32	6.89	26.07-28.57
Characteristics of clinical teacher.	25.03	6.93	23.77-26.28

Table 7.3. Descriptive statistics, mean score of components of teacher-student relationship as perceived by third year student (N=114).

Components of relationship	Mean score 40 for each components		
	Mean score	SD	95% CI
Trust	24.87	6.43	23.68-26.07
Support system	26.63	7.68	25.20-28.05
Open communication	24.68	7.45	23.30-26.06
Effective class room teaching	27.23	7.21	25.89-26.57
Characteristics of clinical teacher.	25.79	7.17	24.41-27.17

CATEGORY 1 (C). THE RESULT OF ONE WAY ANOVA AND MULTIPLE RANGE TEST.

The average level of components of relationship were tested by one way ANOVA to present the difference between Mean score in seven nursing campuses. The result of the one way ANOVA showed that all seven nursing campuses were significantly different at P-value  $<0.001$ . After that Multiple Range Test was performed. Table 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8. The Multiple Range Test was used to indicates which campuses have significant differences in the components of teacher-student relationships. Table 7.4. Nepalgunj Campus and Maharajgunj Campus students obtained higher Mean scores in the trust component compared to Pokhara Nursing Campus. These Campuses are significantly different at P-value  $<.050$  level.

Table 7.4. Multiple Range Test on difference between components of trust relationship in different campuses (N=234).

	Pok	Bir	Big	Lali	Bira	Maha	Nepa
Mean	20.72	20.86	23.60	24.25	25.05	27.24	28.40
Pokhara	-	2.14	2.88	4.13	4.33	6.52*	7.68*
Bir Hospital		-	0.74	1.99	2.19	4.38	5.54
Birgung			-	1.25	1.45	3.64	4.80
Lalitpur				-	0.20	2.39	3.55
Biratnagar					-	2.19	3.35
Maharajgunj						-	1.16

Remark : \* Denotes pairs of campuses significantly different at the .050 level.



Table 7. 5. This indicates that in the component of support system, Mean scores obtained from the students at Nepalgunj and Maharajgunj campus in compared significantly at P-value  $<.050$  level to students from Lalitpur and Pokhara campuses.

Table 7.5. Multiple Range Test on difference between components support system relationship in different campuses (N=234).

	Pok	Lali	Bir	Bira	Big	Maha	Nepa
Mean	21.82	23.82	24.80	26.83	26.86	29.37	32.46
Pokhara	-	2.00	2.98	4.98	5.04	7.55*	10.64*
Lalitpur		-	0.98	3.01	3.04	5.55*	8.64*
Bir Hospital			-	2.03	2.06	4.57	7.66
Biratnagar				-	0.03	2.54	5.66
Birgung					-	2.51	5.60
Maharajgunj						-	3.09

Remarks: \* Denotes pairs of campuses significantly different at the .050 level.

Table 7.6. The results of the component of open communication indicated that between Maharajgunj, Pokhara, and Birgung campuses, Maharajgunj campus Mean scores high. The Nepalgunj campus scored highly compared to the 4 campuses of Pokhara, Bir Hospital, Birgung, and Biratnagar. It was significantly different at P-value  $<.050$  level.

Table 7. 6. Multiple Range Test on difference between component of relationship of open communication in different campus (N=234).

	Pok	Bir	Big	Bira	Lali	Maha	Nepa
Mean	21.07	21.80	22.66	23.03	23.67	27.95	31.13
Pokhara	-	0.73	1.59	1.96	2.60	6.88*	10.06*
Bir Hospital		-	0.86	1.23	1.87	6.15	9.33*
Birgung			-	0.37	1.01	5.29*	4.48*
Biratnagar				-	0.64	4.92	8.10*
Lalitpur					-	2.24	7.46
Maharajgunj						-	3.18

Remarks: \* Denotes pairs of campuses significantly different at the .050 level.

Table 7.7. In the component of effective classroom teaching, Nepalgunj campus, Maharajgunj campus, and Birgung campus students obtained higher Mean scores than Pokhara campus. Those campuses are significantly different at P-value  $<.050$  level.

Table 7. 7. Multiple Range Test on difference between component of effective classroom teaching (N=234).

	Pok	Bir	Bira	Lali	Big	Maha	Nepa
Mean	21.85	26.26	26.86	26.88	27.72	29.72	32.33
Pokhara	-	4.41	5.01	5.03	5.87*	7.87*	10.48*
Bir Hospital		-	0.60	0.62	1.46	3.46	6.07
Biratnagar			-	0.02	0.86	2.86	5.47
Lalitpur				-	0.84	2.84	5.45
Birgung					-	0.20	4.61
Maharajgunj						-	2.61

Remarks: \* Denotes pairs of campuses significantly different at the .050 level.

Table 7. 8. The results for the component of characteristics of clinical teachers show that Pokhara campus students obtained a low Mean score compared to Lalitpur campus, Maharajgunj campus, and Nepalgunj campus. Those campuses are significantly different at P-value  $< .050$  level.

Table 7. 8. Multiple Range Test on difference between components of characteristic of clinical teacher (N=234).

	Pok	Bira	Big	Bir	Lali	Maha	Nepa
Mean	20.52	24.13	24.46	24.73	26.32	27.97	28.66
Pokhara	-	3.61	3.94	5.21	5.80*	7.43*	8.14*
Biratnagar		-	0.33	1.60	2.19	3.82	4.53
Birgung			-	1.27	1.86	3.49	4.20
Bir Hospital				-	0.59	2.22	2.93
Lalitpur					-	1.63	2.34
Maharajgunj						-	0.71

Remarks: \* Denotes pairs of campus significantly different at the .050 level.

CATEGORY 1 (E). THE RESULT OF A ONE WAY ANOVA FACTOR WHICH AFFECTS COMPONENTS OF TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP.

Table 7. 9. The result of a one way ANOVA showed that sex was one of the factors affecting the component of trust in teacher--student relationships. Female students had better trust relationships with teachers than males. It was significantly different P-value <.010.

Table 7. 9. Factor affecting to component of relationship trust.

Factor	NO	Mean	SEM.	P-value
Sex				
Male	34	22.20	1.1256	.010
Female	200	25.26	.4495	

Table 7.10. It indicates that in support systems, there was a significant difference between males and females,  $F$ -value  $< .001$ . Sex was one factor affecting the support system.

Table 7. 10. Factor affecting the component of relationship support system.

Factor	NO	Mean	SEM.	P-value
Sex				
Male	34	22.91	1.2548	.001
Female	200	27.15	.5087	

Table 7.11, 7.12 and 7. 13. The results of this table indicate that sex and fathers' occupations were two of the main factors affecting open communication, effective class room teaching, and characteristics of the clinical teacher. These factors are significantly different between male and female, and fathers, occupation. Occupations are government service and other jobs such as farmer or private job. Each table 7. 11, 7. 12, and 7. 13 presented results of a one way ANOVA test. In comparison, female students obtained higher Mean scores than males. Female students whose fathers' work in government service, obtained higher Mean scores than those students whose fathers' work in other jobs.

**Table 7.11. Factors affecting the open communication component of relationships.**

Factor	NO	Mean	SEM.	P-value
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	34	22.26	1.3722	.039
Female	200	25.07	.5061	
<b>Father occupation</b>				
Government service	60	26.48	.8856	.020
Other farmer, pvt job	173	23.93	.5595	

Table 7. 12. Factors affecting the component of effective class room teaching.

Factor	NO	Mean	SEM.	P-value
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	34	24.76	1.2799	.023
Female	200	27.71	.4872	
<b>Father occupation</b>				
Government service	60	28.78	.8856	.045
Other farmer,pvt,job	173	26.68	.5314	

Table 7.13. Factors affecting the component of characteristics of clinical teachers.

Factor	NO	Mean	SEM.	P-value
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	34	22.61	1.3156	.014
Female	200	25.88	.4950	
<b>Father occupation</b>				
Government service	60	26.91	1.0113	.048
Other farmer,pvt,job	173	24.80	.5193	



CATOGORY 2. THE RESULT OF UNIVARITE ANALYSIS  
CORRELATION (PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION  
COEFFICIENT).

Category 2: Univarite analysis (Pearson product moment) correlation was done to identify, which components of relationships related to student academic achievement. Table 7.14, 7.15 and 7.16 showed that most correlation coefficient R value were lower than .25. This result indicates that there was no correlation between components of teacher-student relationships and student academic achievement. Academic achievement was measured by total theory marks, total clinical marks and total marks. Components of teacher-student relationships include trust, support system, open communication, effective classroom teaching, and characteristics of clinical teacher.

Table 7.14. Univariate analysis (Pearson product moment) correlation coefficient between components of relationships and theory marks.

Variables	R	P-value
Trust	- .017	.399
Support system	- .002	.488
Open communication	.038	.284
Effective classroom teaching	.062	.171
Characteristics of clinical teacher	.019	.385

Table 7. 15. Univariate analysis (Pearson product moment) correlation coefficient between components of relationships and total clinical marks.

Variable	R	P-value
Trust	- .038	.282
Support system	- .012	.424
Open communication	- .066	.150
Effective class room teaching	- .032	.310
Characteristics of clinical teacher	.039	.274

Table 7.16. Univariate analysis (Pearson product moment) correlation coefficient components of relationships and total marks.

Variables	R	P-value
Trust	- .039	.275
Support system	- .010	.437
Open communication	- .021	.375
Effective class room teaching	.042	.367
Characteristics of clinical teacher	.042	.261

Remarks: P-value < .050.