

Original Research Article

**Perceptions of Self-Directed Learning
among Nursing Students at Private
Nursing Institutes in Karachi, Pakistan**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

ABSTRACT

Objective: The objective of this study is to assess the readiness level of nursing students regarding self-directed learning (SDL) currently studying in BSN program in private nursing institutes..

Study design:

Method: This study used descriptive cross-sectional study design.

Place and Duration of the study: Study performed in three institutes of nursing, at Karachi, Pakistan, in duration between May to October 2019.

Methodology: 384 BS Nursing students of I- IV year were selected by stratified random sampling technique, 203 were females and 181 males participants. Mostly (200) aged between 26-30. The data was collected using structured self-administered questionnaire focus on the self-directed learning.

Result:

Out of 384, 200 (52%) participants were between 26-30 years of age, 203 (52.8%) were females. The participants were belong from three different institutes and enrolled in BSN with year I, II, III, IV. The 324 (84.3%) participants showed high level of SDL, which indicates effective SDL abilities in students. All the sub-categories like awareness, evaluation, interpersonal skills, learning strategies and learning activities were applied ANOVA; major difference observed in all sub-categories and participants age and total score with age group with P-value = .05.

Conclusion:

It is evident that there is no difference in male and female learning abilities. SDL may enhance confidence and empowerment among students. SDL can be equally beneficial in education and clinical area. In order to increase SDL various considerations are required like teachers role, involvement in curriculum and other professional or academic bodies that can bring learner-oriented positive teaching learning environment; hence effective learning strategies can enhance the use of SDL.

Key words: Perception, Self-directed learning, Nursing Students, Institutes

UNDER PEER REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

The health profession is changing time by time thus it demands nurses to advance in terms of theoretical knowledge and nursing skills.^[1] Moreover, nursing is a profession where theory and skills are not permanent and changes are taking place dynamically.^[2] To face the challenges of the profession, nurses are required to use self-directed learning (SDL).^[1] The SDL has become a key concept in nursing education and is considered as an essential skill for nursing students and nurses to keep them motivated for lifelong learning, it allows them to stay flexible, open to modify and to maintain their professional growth.^[3] Nursing education is continuously changing; therefore, learners need to update their knowledge. Furthermore, this is necessary for current millennial and generation Z students who learn through student engagement and not through traditional lectures and teacher-centered learning. Knowles describes self-directed learning as “a process in which individuals take the initiative with or without the help of others in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating goals, identifying human and material resources, and evaluating learning outcomes”.^[4] Moreover; Knowles argues that individuals identify their own learning goals and way to achieve them.^[5]

The advantages of SDL comprise autonomy, professional self-regulation, increased opportunities and motivation and empower the students to promote nursing skills, responsibility, obligation and determination, which will increase their significant abilities in their professional life, permitting them to adjust to the dynamic clinical setting.^[6]

Additionally; SDL develops the skills in the learners which are crucial to deal with modern world challenges and sort of learning is different from the conventional learning method since it builds up the abilities required for continuous professional education.^[7] This SDL process includes identifying own education requirements, planning learning objectives, recognizing individual needs, developing measurable effects for learning, and assess learning outcomes.^[8-10] The nursing profession needs professionals to be self-confident, responsible, motivated and able to work and take action independently in an altering health care environment.^[11-14] Therefore, the tendency in nursing education has been changed and is moving towards a mature approach of education in which learner is obliged to be self-directed to meet the new professional challenges.^[2, 15-17] The rationale of the present research study was to investigate the perceptions of nursing learners related to SDL in order to recommend strategies effectiveness in nursing educational institutions.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

A quantitative descriptive cross-sectional study design was used to assess the readiness level of SDL among nursing students in private nursing institutes of Karachi Pakistan. In this research study, the undergraduate nursing students were belonged from the three private nursing institutes of Karachi.

The target population includes more than 400 undergraduates of Generic BS Nursing (BSN) year I, II, III, and IV. To collect the quantitative data stratified random sampling technique was used^[18-19] among both genders, enrolled in BSN degree program with, aged between 18-30 years were included. The total sample size is $n = 384$, calculated by Open Epi software. From whole population subgroups were developed and data was together.^[6]

The following number of BSN participants were included from year-I = 93, year II = 100, year III = 90 and year IV = 101. The lottery method was implemented for subjects' selection; each participant was given number and made the same color and size chits for those numbers. These chits were then collected in a container as the researcher randomly picked chits for the desired sample size.^[20] Followed the stratified random sampling chart which shows the number of total students in the respective institutes and calculated sample size in Table 1.

For quantitative study self-rating scale of self-directed learning SRSSDL_ITA was used which was initially developed by SwapnaNaskar Williamson in its Italian validated version^[8] Williamson S. (2007).^[21] The Italian translation of the SRSSDL has demonstrated good inner consistency (Cronbach's alpha [α] coefficient 0.92).The SRSSDL_ITA consists of 40 items distributed included following factors: 'Awareness', 'Learning Strategies', 'Learning Activities', 'Interpersonal Skills', and Evaluation'. The responses for each item were rated on a five-point Likert scale: 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = never.

The readiness is assessed as a total score ranged from 60 to 300. A high score indicates a high level of readiness; these scores are then converted into bands of readiness. 60 – 140 = Low, which means that “student needs guidance from teacher. Explicit changes needed for improvement and a possible complete re-structuring for the methods of learning”. 141 – 220 = moderate, which indicates that “this is halfway to become a self-directed learner. New avenues for improvement need to be identified. Once these are evaluated, a new approach can be adopted with teacher guidance as necessary”. 221 – 300 = high, which “point to effective SDL. The objective is to ensure continuous advancement by identifying strengths and methods for the continuation of effective SDL for the students”.^[10]

Statistical software named SPSS (Statistical software for social sciences) V.20 was utilized for data entry and statistical analysis. Participants’ characteristics i.e. age; gender, year and institutions were presented with frequency & percentages. Significant results were gained from the assumption of normality test for factors of SDL score i.e., awareness, learning strategies, learning activities, evaluation, interpersonal skills, and total score of SDL as well. Multiple regression tests were run to determine the predictive effect of independent variables over the total SDL score by considering a p-value = .05.

The permission has been sought from institutional ERC.

Research detail briefing was given and written consents were taken from all study participants, also assured to have a right to withdraw from the research at any time.

3. RESULTS

Table1. Represents demographic characteristics of study participants, there were total 384 students participated in this study. Approximately half 200 (52%) of participants were 26-30 years of age, 123 (32.2%) 21-25 years and 61 (15.8%) <20 years old. 203 (52.8%) were females and rest of them were male. Among enlisted participants 199 (51.9%) were from institution II, 134 (34.8%) from institution I and 51 (13.3%) from institution III. One forth participants 101(26.4%) were year-IV students, 100 (26.0%) BSN II, 93(24.2%) BSN I and 90 (23.4%) BSN III.

Table1. 1: Demographic characteristics of Study Participants

Characteristics	N	%
Age		
< 20	61	15.8
21-25	123	32.2
26-30	200	52.0
Gender		
Female	203	52.8
Male	181	47.2
Institutions		
Institution-I	134	34.8
Institution-II	199	51.9
Institution-III	51	13.3
Year		
BSN-I	93	24.2
BSN-II	100	26.0
BSN-III	90	23.4
BSN-IV	101	26.4

Table 2-3: shows the frequency distribution of enrolled participants in levels of SDL. 324 (84.3%) participants had high level of SDL while 60 (15.7%) had moderate level of SDL.

It is evident from the **table 3** that mean scores sub-categories like awareness, learning strategies, learning activities, evaluation and interpersonal skills were lower among participants of age group less than 20 years as compared to age groups between 21-25 and 26-30 years. ANOVA test highlighted that there was a major difference in all sub-scale categories and participants' age and total score between participants of age group < 20 years compared to 21-25 and 26-30 years age group $p = .05$.

Table 2: Frequency distribution of SRSSDL

Self-Rating Scale for SDL	n	%
Moderate Level of SDL	60	15.7
High Level of SDL	324	84.3

Table 3: Comparison of mean score of Self-Rating Scale for SDL sub scale among age group

Age	< 20		21-25		26-30		ANOVA	
SRSSDL subscales	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-test	P-value
Awareness	46.8226	4.67475	49.5122	5.56977	49.0650	6.16203	4.793	.009
Learning Strategies	46.5161	4.43437	49.5285	5.47023	49.4900	6.17499	7.136	.001
Learning Activities	45.6774	5.31553	49.0894	6.31419	49.3850	6.54377	8.583	<0.001
Evaluation	45.9839	5.44267	49.2846	5.71096	49.2450	7.12945	6.708	.001
Interpersonal Skills	46.3871	5.30498	49.8618	5.45822	50.2900	5.96690	11.388	.000

Table 4: showed the internal consistency, for each sub-scale. The comprehensive internal consistency measured with the Cronbach's alpha was 0.885.

Table 4: SRSSDL reliability: Cronbach's alpha coefficients.

SRSSDL subscales	Items (n)	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Awareness	12	0.877
Learning Strategies	12	0.861
Learning Activities	12	0.840
Evaluation	12	0.850
Interpersonal Skills	12	0.874
Total Score	60	0.885

Table 5 showed the comparison of mean score of self-rating for SDL in learning sub-scale among gender.

It is evident that there was no significant difference in mean scores of sub-categories like awareness, learning strategies, learning activities and evaluation between genders. T- test showed that there was significant difference in interpersonal skills category of SDL with P-value = .05.

Table 5: Comparison of mean score of Self-Rating Scale for Self-Directedness in Learning sub scale between gender.

Gender	Female		Male		t-test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value
SRSSDL subscales						
Awareness	48.6502	6.03380	49.0659	5.57283	-.703	.483
Learning Strategies	48.8670	5.81455	49.1978	5.78762	-.559	.577
Learning Activities	48.2020	6.68333	49.2418	6.06656	-1.600	.110
Evaluation	48.3448	6.80705	49.1648	6.23440	-1.234	.218
Interpersonal Skills	48.9507	5.77015	50.1648	5.90489	-2.036	.042

Table 6: shows the univariate analysis of the association of variables age, gender, institute, year of education according to the SRSSDL. Participants who lies between age group 21-25 years were 4.26 times more likely high moderate level of SDL in learning age less than 20 years ($P = .001$). Male participants who were 1.88 times more likely high moderate level of SDL in learning than female ($P = .03$).

Table 6: Logistic Regression of SRSSDL with Age, Gender, Institutes and Year of Education

Characteristics	B	S.E.	Wald	df	P-value	OR	Lower	Upper
Age								
< 20								
21-25	1.451	.436	11.093	1	0.001	4.269	1.817	10.029
26-30	.612	.341	3.217	1	0.073	1.844	.945	3.601
Gender								
Female								
Male	.632	.291	4.701	1	0.030	1.881	1.063	3.331
College Name								
Indus								
Agha Khan	.434	.453	.918	1	0.338	1.544	.635	3.752
Zia Uddin	-.054	.410	.017	1	0.896	0.948	.424	2.118
Discipline								
BSN 4								
BSN 1	1.225	.417	8.651	1	0.003	3.405	1.505	7.705
BSN 2	1.083	.391	7.674	1	0.006	2.952	1.372	6.350
BSN 3	.697	.367	3.595	1	0.058	2.007	.977	4.123
B: Beta coefficient; S.E: Standard Error; Wald: test statistics; df: degree of Freedom; OR: Odds Ratio; C.I: Confidence Interval								

4. DISCUSSION

In current study, most of the nursing students (84.3%) reported High Level of SDL ability and 15.7% in the moderate level and there were no student in the lower level. This indicates effectiveness of SDL. Furthermore, almost study results are parallel to study conducted in China showed 55.4% had high level of SDL ability.^[22]

The current study, most of (51.9%) studied participants average age was between (26-30 years of age). On the other hand, the study carried out in Nigeria, majority of (43.9%) nursing students' average age was found below 22 years of age.^[23] In present study, (52.7%) large numbers of students were females.

These findings are nearly equal to study accomplished in Iran where large number of (56.10%) studies participants were females.^[24]

Similarly, another study has reported the highest mean score (4.08 ± 0.5) of all the three components of the SDLRS followed by self-control (3.9 ± 0.9).^[25] Another study showed that majority of students had high level of readiness toward SDL; the mean score of self-control was higher than self-management and desire for learning.^[26] A study determined that students who were taught with problem-based learning were better toward SDL rather than traditional teaching strategy. SDL is good for students along with teaching strategies.^[27]

Present study findings showed the positive association between age and SDL. These findings are similar in a study conducted in Spain. Furthermore SDL is equally essential for nursing students because it can lead to improve the attitude and skills. It encourages the students to achieve their objectives by own. SDL is a natural process of learning which plays vital role for personal growth and professional success.^[28] In current study, with respect to SRSSDL consistency, comprehensive internal consistency measured with the Cronbach's alpha was 0.88. These results are comparable with a study performed in South Korea, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the SRSSDL consistency was found 0.79.^[29] In this study, awareness sub-scale, mean score of SRSSDL in Learning sub-scale among age group of nursing students were found significant in learning activities (P -value $< .001$), evaluation (P -value $.000$), interpersonal skills (P -value $.001$). These findings were comparable with a study conducted in which also significant mean score of SRSSDL was found sub-scale that was (P -value $.005$).^[30] In our study there was no significant difference in mean scores of sub-categories like awareness, learning strategies, learning activities, evaluation and interpersonal skills between different institutes' participants. But, the lowest mean score was self-management (3.7 ± 0.5). Students are highly motivated about SDL and have self-control. However, they need help to improve their self-management skill.^[11]

The planning and time management are the main component, during which students need extra support for systematic learning.^[31] With respect to gender, the factors of SRSSDL have not been found significantly associated with SDL. This finding is consistent with other study that also reported no significant differences in SDLR on the basis of demographic characteristics. On the contrary, the factors of SRSSDL have been significantly associated with SDL including (awareness P -value $= .000$), (learning strategies P -value $= .000$), (learning method $P=.000$), (interpersonal skills $P=.000$) in a study accomplished in Italy.^[32]

However, Lack of self-management, school environment, may be attributed to insignificant differences. Another study conducted in Lahore Pakistan revealed no significant correlation between SDLR and academic achievement. This is very likely to affect association of SDR factors because most of the students' assessments in Pakistan are based on outdated traditional methods; pen-and-paper is especially prevalent. The key factors that influence learning and achievement are the teachers' competency, teaching methods and quality of learning materials.^[33]

Interpersonal communication and corporation with others in different affairs, such as class group debate and conversation with others, visual strategies, such as practical display including multimedia presentation and mock-up play an imperative role in their learning method.^[30] Personal factors, educational culture, and social factors play role in promoting self-directed learning.^[34] The degree of control the learners are prepared to take over their own learning will depend on their attitude, abilities and personality characteristics.^[35]

5. CONCLUSION

The high level of SDL is found; which is significantly associated with age. It is clear that there is no difference in male and female learning abilities. SDL may enhance confidence and empowerment among students. SDL can be equally beneficial in education and clinical area. In order to increase SDL various considerations are required like teacher's role, involvement in curriculum and other professional or academic bodies that can bring learner oriented positive teaching learning environment hence effective learning strategies can enhance the use of SDL.

CONSENT

As per international standard and hospital protocol, written informed consent has been taken from entire participants for voluntary participation.

REFERENCES

1. Pryce-Miller M. Are first year undergraduate student nurses prepared for self directed learning?. *Nursing times*. 2010 Nov 1;106(46):21-4.
2. Shirazi F, Sharif F, Molazem Z, Alborzi M. Dynamics of self-directed learning in M. Sc. nursing students: A qualitative research. *Journal of advances in medical education & professionalism*. 2017 Jan;5(1):33.
3. Örs M. The self-directed learning readiness level of the undergraduate students of midwife and nurse in terms of sustainability in nursing and midwifery education. *Sustainability*. 2018 Oct;10(10):3574.
4. Knowles MS. *Self-directed learning: a guide for learners and teachers*.
5. du Toit-Brits C. Towards a transformative and holistic continuing self-directed learning theory. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 2018 Sep 1;32(4):51-65.
6. Noh GO, Kim DH. Effectiveness of a self-directed learning program using blended coaching among nursing students in clinical practice: a quasi-experimental research design. *BMC medical education*. 2019 Dec;19(1):1-8.
7. AbuAssi NE, Alkorashy HA. Relationship between learning style and readiness for self-directed learning among nursing students at king Saud university, Saudi Arabia. *International journal of advanced nursing studies*. 2016 Jul 1;5(2):109-16.

8. Cadorin L, Suter N, Saiani L, Naskar Williamson S, Palese A. Self-Rating Scale of Self-Directed Learning (SRSSDL): preliminary results from the Italian validation process. *Journal of Research in Nursing*. 2011 Jul;16(4):363-73.
9. Cadorin L, Ghezzi V, Camillo M, Palese A. The self-rating scale of self-directed learning tool: findings from a confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*. 2017;7(2):31-7.
10. Cadorin L, Bortoluzzi G, Palese A. The self-rating scale of self-directed learning (SRSSDL): a factor analysis of the Italian version. *Nurse Education Today*. 2013 Dec 1;33(12):1511-6.
11. Jouhari Z, Haghani F, Changiz T. Factors affecting self-regulated learning in medical students: a qualitative study. *Medical education online*. 2015 Jan 1;20(1):28694.
12. Cheng SF, Kuo CL, Lin KC, Lee-Hsieh J. Development and preliminary testing of a self-rating instrument to measure self-directed learning ability of nursing students. *International journal of nursing studies*. 2010 Sep 1;47(9):1152-8.
13. Al-Nasseri Y. The Effectiveness Of Self-Directed Learning On The Professional Development Of Pre-Registration Nursing Students: A Systematic Review Of The Literature. *Journal of Kufa for Nursing Science* Vol. 2014;4(1).
14. Shen WQ, Chen HL, Hu Y. The validity and reliability of the self-directed learning instrument (SDLI) in mainland Chinese nursing students. *BMC medical education*. 2014 Dec;14(1):1-7.
15. Huston C. The impact of emerging technology on nursing care: Warp speed ahead. *The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*. 2013 May 31;18(2).

16. Cadorin L, Cheng SF, Palese A. Concurrent validity of self-rating scale of self-directed learning and self-directed learning instrument among Italian nursing students. BMC nursing. 2016 Dec;15(1):1-0.
17. Cadorin L, Rei A, Dante A, Bulfone T, Viera G, Palese A. Enhancing self-directed learning among Italian nursing students: A pre-and post-intervention study. Nurse education today. 2015 Jun 1;35(6):746-53.
18. Houser J. Nursing Research: Reading, Using and Creating Evidence: Reading, Using and Creating Evidence. Jones & Bartlett Learning; 2016 Dec 13.
19. McLeod SA. Qualitative Quantitative Simply Psychology. 2008.
20. Williamson SN. Development of a self-rating scale of self-directed learning. Nurse researcher. 2007 Jan 1;14(2).
21. London M, Smither JW. Empowered self-development and continuous learning. Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management. 1999 Mar;38(1):3-15.
22. Alkorashy HA, Assi NE. Readiness for self-directed learning among bachelor nursing students in Saudi Arabia: A survey-based study. International Journal of Nursing Education and Research. 2016;4(2):187-94.
23. Abedini Z, Parvizy S. The effects of group discussion and self-learning on nursing students' civility. Iranian journal of nursing and midwifery research. 2019 Jul;24(4):268.
24. JIANG M, BAI Q, CHEN CR, XU S. The relationship between self-directed learning ability and clinical communication competence among nursing students during clinical practice. Chinese Journal of Nursing Education. 2016.

25. Nizami R, Latif MZ, Wajid G. Preferred learning styles of medical and physiotherapy students. *Annals of King Edward Medical University*. 2017 Mar 11;23(1).
26. Rascón-Hernán C, Fullana-Noell J, Fuentes-Pumarola C, Romero-Collado A, Vila-Vidal D, Ballester-Ferrando D. Measuring self-directed learning readiness in health science undergraduates: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse education today*. 2019 Dec 1;83:104201.
27. Gebru AA, Ghiyasvandian S, Mohammadi N, Kidane M. A self-directed in learning among undergraduate nursing students' in school of nursing and midwifery, TUMS, Tehran, Iran. *Education Journal*. 2015 Jul 5;4(4):158-65.
28. Oktaviani M, Elmanora E, Doriza S. Students' Self-Directed Learning and Its Relation to the Independent Learning-Independent Campus Program.
29. Behar-Horenstein LS, Beck DE, Su Y. An initial validation study of the self-rating scale of self-directed learning for pharmacy education. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*. 2018 Apr 1;82(3).
30. Darling-Hammond L, Flook L, Cook-Harvey C, Barron B, Osher D. Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*. 2020 Apr 2;24(2):97-140.
31. Cadorin L, Rei A, Dante A, Bulfone T, Viera G, Palese A. Enhancing self-directed learning among Italian nursing students: A pre-and post-intervention study. *Nurse education today*. 2015 Jun 1;35(6):746-53.
32. Ojekou GP, Okanlawon FA. Nursing Students' Readiness for Self-Directed Learning and Its Effect on Learning Outcome in South-West Nigeria. *Open Journal of Nursing*. 2019 Jun 28;9(6):586-601.

33. Mulube SM, Jooste K. First-year learner nurses' perceptions of learning motivation in self-directed learning in a simulated skills laboratory at a higher education institution: part 1: contemporary issues in nursing. South African Journal of Higher Education. 2014 Jan 1;28(6):1776-94.
34. Horntvedt ME, Nordsteien A, Fermann T, Severinsson E. Strategies for teaching evidence-based practice in nursing education: a thematic literature review. BMC medical education. 2018 Dec;18(1):1-1.
35. Nizami R, Latif MZ, Wajid G. Preferred learning styles of medical and physiotherapy students. Annals of King Edward Medical University. 2017 Mar 11;23(1).