Results

The results of the study will be presented in the following sequence:

Part I- Sociodemographic characteristics of study subjects: figures 1-3

Part II- Internship year problems as reported by study subjects: tables 1-16.

Part III- Intern- nurses satisfaction: tables 17 –23.

Part IV- Relationship between internship year problems and intern-nurses satisfaction: table 24.

Figures (1, 2 and 3) show distribution of study subjects according to sociodemographic characteristics. The majority (99.2%, 78.7 %, 76.2% and 82.8%) of the intern-nurses were aged between 21:24 year, single, non-nursing education and lived at their home respectively **figure (1)**.

Regarding to hospital nursing administrators the majority (81.4% and 81.2%) of them were head nurses and had more than 10 year working experience **figure (2)**.

In relation to faculty members the majority (75.9%, 75.9% and 86.2%) of them were aged between 23-30 year, had B.Sc.Nursing degree and had less than 5 year as experience at the internship respectively **figure (3)**.

II- internship year problems:

Table (1) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to internship objectives as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Don't participation in setting objective of internship	122	100.0	29	100.0	16	100.0	0	0
Unclear.	16	13.1	10	34.5	5	31.2	8.96	< 0.01**
Not achieved.	14	11.5	10	34.5	6	37.5	12.99	< 0.001**
Not specific.	0	0.0	4	13.8	7	43.8	•46.96	< 0.001**
Not measurable.	0	0.0	10	34.5	2	12.5	•42.52	< 0.001**
Not discuss.	12	9.8	4	13.8	12	75.0	43.26	< 0.001**

**** highly significant** **•corrected X^2**

Table (1) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to internship year objectives as reported by study subjects. It can be observed that all subjects don't participate in setting objective of internship. Also indicated that (75.0%) of the hospital nursing administrators and (9.8%, 13.8%) of intern-nurses and faculty members had a problem related to objective not discuss respectively. There was highly significant difference (X^2= 43.26, P <0.001).

Table (2) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to collaboration between faculty and hospital members as reported by study subjects.

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Gap between nursing education and nursing practice.	110	90.2	27	93.1	10	62.5	9.94	< 0.001**
Inaccurate basis for supervision	60	49.2	22	75.9	12	75.0	9.29	< 0.001**
Don't identify internship committee	85	69.7	13	44.8	14	87.5	9.86	< 0.001**
No internship manual	101	82.8	20	69.0	11	68.8	3.83	> 0.05
No periodic meeting between faculty and hospital members.	74	60.7	23	79.3	10	62.5	3.56	> 0.05
No periodic reports about intern-nurses.	75	61.5	18	62.1	6	37.5	3.48	> 0.05

**** highly significant**

Table (2) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to collaboration between faculty and hospital members as reported by study subjects. The results revealed that the highest percentage (93.1%, 90.2% and 62.5%) of faculty members, intern-nurses and hospital nursing administrators had a problem related to gap between nursing education and nursing practice respectively. There was highly significant difference ($X^2 = 9.94$, $P < 0.001$).

Table (3) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to intern-nurses' orientation program as reported by intern-nurses and faculty members.

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%		
Appointment. Late announce.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Not announce.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Start date. Early	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Late	72	59.0	16	55.2	0.028	> 0.05
Duration. Short	65	53.3	17	58.6	0.097	> 0.05
Long	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Plan time table. Not written.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Not implemented.	41	33.6	1	3.4	9.165	< 0.001**
Not organized.	50	41.0	6	20.7	3.312	> 0.05
Not achieved.	20	16.4	6	20.7	0.077	> 0.05
Content. General.	21	17.2	6	20.7	0.029	< 0.05*
Simple	66	54.1	2	6.9	19.226	< 0.001**
No hand out	65	53.3	0	0.0	•24.999	< 0.001**
Methods of teaching. Lack of demonstration and redemonstration.	71	58.2	0	0.0	•29.562	< 0.001**
Objectives of orientation program. Internship year objectives not introduce.	12	9.8	0	0.0	•1.900	> 0.05
Duties of the intern-nurses not explain.	49	40.2	0	0.0	•15.459	< 0.001**
Not oriented to hospital	19	15.6	0	0.0	•3.848	< 0.05*
Not oriented to nursing service department	28	23.0	0	0.0	•6.722	< 0.05*

*** significant** **** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (3) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to intern-nurses' orientation program as reported by intern-nurses and faculty members. The result indicated that the highest percentage (59.0% and 55.2%) of intern-nurses and faculty members had a problem related to late start date of orientation program. There was no significant difference (X^2= 0.028, P > 0.05).

Table (4) Percentage distribution of problems as related to faculty members and hospital nursing administrators orientation program as reported by them.

Items \ Study subjects	Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%		
Not hold orientation program.	29	100.0	16	100.0	0	0
Clinical setting objective unknown.	10	34.5	0	0.0	•5.24	< 0.05*
Role related to internship unclear.	11	37.9	0	0.0	• 6.11	< 0.05*
The role of intern-nurse not explained.	12	41.4	2	12.5	2.78	> 0.05
Inability to assess clinical environment	11	37.9	3	18.8	0.99	> 0.05
Importance of intern-nurses conference not explains.	13	44.8	2	12.5	3.5	> 0.05
Methods and frequency of supervision not discuss.	14	48.3	0	0.0	• 9.07	< 0.001**
Methods of evaluation not explain.	14	48.3	3	18.8	2.67	> 0.05

*** significant** **** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (4) shows percentage distribution of problems as related to faculty members and hospital nursing administrators orientation program as reported by them. It illustrated that both faculty members and hospital nursing administrators not hold for them orientation program. In addition, the result indicated that (48.3%) of faculty members had problems related to methods, frequency of supervision and evaluation not discuss.

Table (5) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to clinical setting as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Insufficient number of patients.	14	11.5	10	34.5	0	0.0	• 13.05	< 0.001**
Unavailable resources.	87	71.3	23	79.3	12	75.0	0.672	> 0.05
Unavailable place for intern-nurse conference.	93	76.2	23	79.3	10	62.5	0.16	> 0.05
Unavailable examination space.	85	69.7	18	62.1	8	50.0	2.76	> 0.05
Noisy place.	67	54.9	15	51.7	9	56.2	0.983	> 0.05
Insufficient light.	17	13.9	5	17.2	1	6.2	1.06	> 0.05
Inadequate ventilation.	55	45.1	12	41.4	5	31.2	1.146	> 0.05

**** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (5) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to clinical setting as reported by study subjects. The result revealed that the highest percentage (79.3%, 75.0% and 71.3%) of faculty members, hospital nursing administrators and intern-nurses had problems related to unavailability place for intern-nurses conference and unavailable resources respectively.

Table (6) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to rotation area as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Intensive care unit (I.C.U).								
Long	24	19.7	1	3.4	3	18.8	4.73	> 0.05
Short	14	11.5	4	13.8	2	12.5	0.12	> 0.05
Not needed	7	5.7	2	6.9	0	0.0	•1.070	> 0.05
Coronary care unit (C.C.U)								
Long	3	2.5	2	6.9	4	25.0	14.25	< 0.001**
Short	22	18.0	2	6.9	4	25.0	2.94	> 0.05
Not needed	22	18.0	14	48.3	2	12.5	13.25	< 0.001**
Dialysis unit.								
Long	47	38.5	11	37.9	7	43.8	0.18	> 0.05
Short	9	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	•3.51	> 0.05
Not needed	8	6.6	5	17.2	0	0.0	•5.220	> 0.05
Premature unit								
Long	2	1.6	1	3.4	4	25.0	19.27	< 0.001**
Short	66	54.1	17	58.6	10	62.5	0.53	> 0.05
Not needed	3	2.5	1	3.4	0	0.0	•0.532	> 0.05
Operating room (OR).								
Long	39	32.0	8	27.6	5	31.2	0.21	> 0.05
Short	11	9.0	1	3.4	1	6.2	1.07	> 0.05
Not needed	13	10.7	4	13.8	0	0.0	•2.258	> 0.05
Labor ward and caesarian section.								
Long	19	15.6	0	0.0	3	18.8	•5.45	> 0.05
Short	10	8.2	3	10.3	2	12.5	0.4	> 0.05
Not needed	6	4.9	1	3.4	0	0.0	•0.900	> 0.05
Emergency unit.								
Long	1	0.8	4	13.8	1	6.2	11.75	< 0.001**
Short	62	50.8	2	6.9	6	37.5	18.71	< 0.001**
Nor needed	6	4.9	7	24.1	1	6.2	11.37	< 0.001**
Nursing service administration. Short	11	9.0	6	20.7	7	43.8	15.01	< 0.001**
Nor needed	8	6.6	0	0.0	3	18.8	•5.89	< 0.05*
Short	48	39.3	14	48.3	6	37.5	0.85	> 0.05

*** significant** **** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (6) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to rotation area as reported by study subjects. From this table it can be observed that more than half (54.1%, 58.6% and 62.5%) of intern-nurses, faculty members and hospital nursing administrators had a problem related to short duration of premature unit respectively. There was no significant difference (X^2= 0.53, P > 0.05).

Table (7) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to intern-nurses' clinical experience as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Inability of intern-nurses to :								
Perform complete histories and physical examination.	22	18.0	8	27.6	3	18.8	1.36	> 0.05
Differentiate normal variation and abnormal findings.	18	14.8	17	58.6	9	56.2	31.39	< 0.001**
Develop plan of care.	8	6.6	8	27.6	7	43.8	22.12	< 0.001**
Perform technical procedure.	16	13.1	7	24.1	2	12.5	2.32	> 0.05
Give patient guidance and education	11	9.0	6	20.7	7	43.8	15.01	< 0.001**
Apply administrative experience (drug request, patient discharge,…….)	21	17.2	1	3.4	2	12.5	3.66	> 0.05

Table (7) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to intern-nurses' clinical experience as reported by study subjects. The result revealed that (14.8%, 58.6% and 56.3%) of intern-nurses, faculty members and hospital nursing administrators had a problem related to inability of intern-nurses to differentiate normal variation and abnormal findings respectively. There was highly significant difference ($X^2 = 31.39$, $P < 0.001$).

Table (8) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to faculty and hospital nursing administrator's clinical experience related to internship as reported by them

Items \ Study subjects	Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%		
Incompetence of clinical skills.	15	51.7	0	0.0	•29.55	< 0.001**
Inexperience of dealing with patient care problem.	14	48.3	1	6.2	6.4	< 0.01**
Not coping with advanced technology of devices.	23	79.3	3	18.8	13.12	< 0.001**

**** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (8) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to faculty members and hospital nursing administrators clinical experience related to internship as reported by them. The result revealed that (79.3% and 18.8%) of faculty members and hospital nursing administrators had a problem related to not coping with advanced technology of devices respectively. There was highly significant difference (X^2 = 13.12, P <0.01).

Table (9) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to supervision as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Role of supervisors:								
Lack of orientation to the hospital.	70	57.4	15	51.7	8	50.0	0.54	> 0.05
Ignore criteria of patient selection to intern-nurse that provided opportunities to meet learning objective.	68	55.7	10	34.5	0	0.0	•4.59	> 0.05
Can not deal with unfamiliar situation	80	65.6	10	34.5	7	43.8	10.79	< 0.001**
Lack of feedback.	71	58.2	13	44.8	8	50.0	1.88	> 0.05
Use threaten manner.	71	58.2	14	48.3	5	31.3	3.962	> 0.05
Answer question incomplete.	69	56.6	7	24.1	0	0.0	•24.71	< 0.001**
Don't encourage intern-nurse.	61	50.0	10	34.5	9	56.2	2.755	> 0.05
Inappropriate role model	72	59.0	11	37.9	7	43.8	4.925	> 0.05
Behaved unsupportive manner	76	62.3	11	37.9	8	50.0	6.013	< 0.05*
Unaware of work intern-nurse	51	41.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	•27.08	< 0.001**
Unaware to additional resources	55	45.1	13	44.8	0	0.0	•12.16	< 0.001**
Not follow plan time schedule.	74	60.7	8	27.6	3	18.8	17.57	< 0.001**
Methods of supervision:								
Sporadic supervision	72	59.0	13	44.8	0	0.0	•20.23	< 0.001**
Ward conferences and round not hold.	63	51.6	11	37.9	4	25.0	5.12	> 0.05
Case presentation not used	74	60.7	29	100.0	16	100.0	•24.85	< 0.001**
Rarely Individual conferences	78	63.9	15	51.7	10	62.5	1.48	> 0.05
Lack demonstration of procedure.	77	63.1	14	48.3	9	56.2	2.25	> 0.05
Intern-nurse reporting and recording not seen.	69	56.6	13	44.8	0	0.0	18.361	< 0.001*
Lack of seminar.	75	61.5	15	51.7	16	100.0	•11.14	< 0.001**
Loss of informal contact.	69	56.6	13	44.8	10	62.5	1.69	> 0.05

**** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (9) show percentage distribution of problems regarding to supervision as reported by study subjects. It can be observed that (100%, 100% and 60.7 %) of faculty members, hospital nursing administrators and intern-nurses reported that a case presentation not used, respectively. There was highly significant difference ($X^2 = 24.85$, $P < 0.001$).

Table (10) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to supervision of faculty members and hospital nursing administrators as reported by them

Items \ Study subjects	Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%		
Decrease teacher to intern-nurse ratio.	17	58.6	13	81.2	0.42	> 0.05
Mal distribution of intern-nurses regarding to shifts.	6	20.7	4	25.0	0.002	> 0.05
Roster unknown.	0	0.0	8	50.0	•14.38	< 0.001**
Inaccessibility of supervisor.	14	48.3	0	0.0	9.07	< 0.001**
Insufficient time for supervision.	16	55.2	0	0.0	•18.91	< 0.001**
Inexperience for supervision.	15	51.7	0	0.0	•10.2	< 0.001**
Not update nursing knowledge.	13	44.8	9	56.2	0.18	> 0.05
Don't participation in workshop related to internship year.	18	62.1	10	62.5	0.001	> 0.05

**** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (10) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to supervision of faculty members and hospital nursing administrators as reported by them. The result revealed that the highest percentage (62.5% and 62.1%) of hospital nursing administrators and faculty members had a problem related to not participation in workshop related to internship year. There was no significant difference ($X^2 = 0.001$, $P > 0.05$).

Table (11) Percentage distribution of problems regarding to evaluation as reported by study subjects

Items \ Study subjects	Intern-nurses N = 122		Faculty members N = 29		Hospital nursing administrators N = 16		X^2	P
	Yes		Yes		Yes			
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Sporadic evaluation.	93	76.2	20	69.0	16	100.0	•5.91	< 0.05*
Evaluation at the end of the internship year.	9	7.4	5	17.2	16	100.0	•82.36	< 0.001**
Evaluation tool unknown.	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	100.0	•167	< 0.001**
General evaluation tool ,not specific to each clinical setting	48	39.3	16	55.2	16	100.0	•21.59	< 0.001**
Unclear criteria of evaluation.	46	37.7	14	48.3	16	100.0	•22.24	< 0.001**
Evaluation tool long in content.	32	26.2	15	51.7	16	100.0	•35.96	< 0.001**

*** significant** **** highly significant** **• corrected X^2**

Table (11) shows percentage distribution of problems regarding to evaluation as reported by study subjects. The result indicated that all hospital nursing administrators (100.0%), more than three quarters of intern-nurses (76.2%) and two thirds of faculty members (69.0%) had a problem related to sporadic evaluation. There was significant difference ($X^2 = 5.91$, $P < 0.05$).

.

Table (12) Percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by intern-nurses

Items	Intern-nurses N = 122			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
With patient.				
Culture and value difference.	20	16.4	102	83.6
Unaware with intern-nurse role.	70	57.4	52	42.6
Uncooperative.	16	13.1	106	86.9
Patient family uncooperative during visiting.	15	12.3	107	87.7
Make conflict.	11	9.0	111	91.0
Patient family makes conflict.	11	9.0	111	91.0
With staff nurse.				
Uncooperative.	71	58.2	51	41.8
Unaware with intern-nurse role.	62	50.8	60	49.2
Not introduce consultation when needed.	50	41.0	72	59.0
Treat us with unrespect manner.	59	48.4	63	51.6
Make conflict.	67	54.9	55	45.1
With medical staff.				
Uncooperative.	34	27.9	88	72.1
Unconstructive criticism.	21	17.2	101	82.8
Doctors unaware with intern-nurse role.	34	27.9	88	72.1
Doctors restricted for intern-nurse questions.	23	18.9	99	81.1
Treat us with unrespect manner.	18	14.8	104	85.2
With clinical instructor.				
Restricted for intern-nurse questions.	44	36.1	78	63.9
Unconstructive criticism.	49	40.2	73	59.8
Uncooperative.	37	30.3	85	69.7
Ignore problems that arise during training.	49	40.2	73	59.8

This table (12) shows percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by intern-nurses. More than half (58.2%,57.4% and 54.9%) of intern-nurses had communication problems related to staff nurse uncooperative with intern-nurse, patient unaware with intern-nurse role and staff nurses make conflict with intern-nurse respectively.

Table (13) Percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by faculty members

Items	Faculty members N = 29			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
With intern-nurse.				
Failure to maintain appropriate boundaries.	11	37.9	18	62.1
Uncooperative.	9	31.0	20	69.0
Inability to solve problems that arise during training.	12	41.4	17	58.6
Inability to listen to and consider what intern-nurses have said.	3	10.3	26	89.7
With staff nurse.				
Inability to communicate effectively.	14	48.3	15	51.7
Uncooperative	15	51.7	14	48.3
With medical staff.				
Role conflict.	9	31.0	20	69.0
Unaware with internship objectives.	21	72.4	8	27.6
Uncooperative.	16	55.2	13	44.8

This table (13) shows percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by faculty members. More than half (72.4%) of faculty members had communication problems with medical staff related to doctors unaware with internship objectives.

Table (14) Percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by hospital nursing administrators

Items	Hospital nursing administrators N = 16			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
With intern-nurse.				
Uncooperative.	10	62.5	6	37.5
Not punctuality with appointment at clinical setting.	13	81.2	3	18.8
Go out without permission.	8	50.0	8	50.0
Make conflict.	9	56.2	7	43.8
With faculty member.				
Uncooperative.	6	37.5	10	62.5
Hospital nursing administrator doesn't know faculty members.	9	56.2	7	43.8
Inopportunity for meeting faculty members.	10	62.5	6	37.5

This table (14) shows percentage distribution of communication problems as reported by hospital nursing administrators. The highest percentage (81.3%) of hospital nursing administrators had communication problem with the intern-nurses related to not punctuality with appointment at clinical setting.

Table (15) Percentage distribution of schedule problems as reported by intern-nurses

Items	Intern-nurses N = 122			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Frequency of shift				
Increase numbers of shift (afternoon and evening).	45	36.9	77	63.1
Decrease numbers of shift (morning).	9	7.4	113	92.6
Choice of shift				
Obligatory.	65	53.3	57	46.7
Doctors interfere when making the schedule.	0	0.0	122	100.0
Availability of schedule				
Schedule is not posted in the unit.	47	38.5	75	61.5
Schedule is not posted in the faculty.	37	30.3	85	69.7
Insufficient time to identify schedule before starting the month.	43	35.2	79	64.8

In the above table (15) indicates percentage distribution of schedule problems as reported by intern-nurses. More than half of intern-nurses (53.3%) had a problem related to obligatory schedule.

Table (16) Percentage distribution of personal problems as reported by intern-nurses

Items	Intern-nurses N = 122			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Increase number of transport.	73	59.8	49	40.2
Difficult ways of transport.	60	49.2	62	50.8
Unavailability of alien's home.	67	54.9	55	45.1
Inaccessible dining in shifts.	76	62.3	46	37.7
Lack of place for storage of belongings.	108	88.5	14	11.5

This table (16) shows percentage distribution of personal problems as reported by intern-nurses. The majority (88.5%) of intern-nurses had a problem related to lack of place for storage of belongings.

III- Intern-nurses satisfaction:

Table (17) Number and percentage of satisfied intern-nurses regarding to internship year

Items	Intern-nurses N = 122	
	N	%
Satisfied	52	42.6
Dissatisfied	70	57.4

Table (17) illustrates number and percentage of satisfied intern-nurses regarding to internship year. It can be observed that more than half of intern-nurses were dissatisfied in relation to internship year.

Table (18) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurse

Items	Max score	Intern-nurses score	
		$\bar{X}$ ± SD	%
Internship year objective	**20**	10.10 ± 3.29	50.5
Orientation program	**40**	23.01 ± 6.94	57.52
Clinical setting	**30**	14.09 ± 5.29	46.96
Clinical experience	**85**	49.10 ± 12.17	57.76
Supervision	**55**	26.51 ± 9.95	48.2
Evaluation	**30**	16.10 ± 5.98	53.66
Communication	**55**	31.52 ± 10.51	57.30
Schedule	**30**	18.24 ± 4.98	60.8
Personal	**30**	10.95 ± 5.00	36.5
Total	**375**	**192.34 ± 46.32**	**51.29**

Table (18) shows mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses. It can be observed that the total level of intern-nurses satisfaction (51.29%) was low. While intern-nurses recorded their highest level of satisfaction (60.8%) related to schedule, and their lowest level of satisfaction (36.5%) related to personal.

Table (19) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their marital status

Items	Max. score	Marital status of intern-nurses				t	P
		%	Single N = 96 $\bar{X}$ ± SD	%	Married N = 26 $\bar{X}$ ± SD		
Internship year objective	**20**	49.4	9.88 ± 3.78	46.7	9.34 ± 3.94	0.639	> 0.05
Orientation program	**40**	55.55	22.22 ± 7.79	54.7	21.88 ± 9.80	0.189	> 0.05
Clinical setting	**30**	46.83	14.05 ± 5.90	39.73	11.92 ± 5.72	1.641	> 0.05
Clinical experience	**85**	55.82	47.45 ± 14.54	54.70	46.50 ± 17.86	0.283	> 0.05
Supervision	**55**	46.05	25.33 ± 10.62	47.54	26.15 ± 13.06	0.332	> 0.05
Evaluation	**30**	50.3	15.09 ± 6.23	57.8	17.34 ± 8.13	1.526	> 0.05
Communication	**55**	56.09	30.85 ± 11.84	52.43	28.84 ± 13.04	0.750	> 0.05
Schedule	**30**	58.83	17.65 ± 5.89	57.93	17.38 ± 6.78	0.202	> 0.05
Personal	**30**	35.9	10.77 ± 4.83	38.83	11.65 ± 5.65	0.797	> 0.05
Total	**375**	**51.87**	**194.53 ± 45.03**	**51.13**	**191.75 ± 46.88**	**0.271**	**> 0.05**

Table (19) shows mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their marital status. It can be observed that the almost equal total low level of intern-nurses satisfaction (51.87% and 51.13%) which reported by single and married intern-nurses respectively.

Table (20) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their previous education

Items	Max. score	Previous education of intern-nurses				t	P
		%	Nursing education N = 29 $\bar{X}$ ± SD	%	Non nursing education N = 93 $\bar{X}$ ± SD		
Internship year objective	**20**	49.45	9.89 ± 2.80	48.65	9.73 ± 4.08	0.203	> 0.05
Orientation program	**40**	55.6	22.24 ± 6.45	57.4	22.96 ± 6.62	0.484	> 0.05
Clinical setting	**30**	47.0	14.10 ± 4.73	44.8	13.44 ± 6.26	0.529	> 0.05
Clinical experience	**85**	59.83	50.86 ± 10.14	54.25	46.12 ± 16.39	1.467	> 0.05
Supervision	**55**	53.16	29.24 ± 10.56	44.25	24.34 ± 11.10	2.095	< 0.05*
Evaluation	**30**	56.76	17.03 ± 5.03	50.6	15.18 ± 7.11	1.347	> 0.05
Communication	**55**	62.43	34.34 ± 8.56	53.09	29.20 ± 12.78	2.025	< 0.05*
Schedule	**30**	62.5	18.75 ± 4.94	57.43	17.23 ± 6.35	1.182	> 0.05
Personal	**30**	37.03	11.11 ± 5.02	34.8	10.44 ± 5.01	0.628	> 0.05
Total	**375**	**51.98**	**194.93 ± 47.86**	**51.07**	**191.53 ± 46.07**	**0.343**	**> 0.05**

*** significant**

This table (20) illustrates mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their previous education. It can be observed that the almost equal total low level of intern-nurses satisfaction (51.98 % and 51.07 %) which reported by nursing and non-nursing education intern-nurses' respectively. In the other hand there were significant difference related to supervision and communication ($t = 2.095$, $p < 0.05$ and $t = 2.025$, $p<0.05$) respectively.

Table (21) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their living

Items	Max. score	Living of intern-nurses				t	P
		%	Home N = 101 X ± SD	%	Aliens' home N = 21 X ± SD		
Internship year objective	**20**	48.95	9.79 ± 3.87	48.3	9.66 ± 3.56	0.137	> 0.05
Orientation program	**40**	56.35	22.54 ± 8.45	50.7	20.28 ± 6.82	1.147	> 0.05
Clinical setting	**30**	45.23	13.57 ± 6.05	45.7	13.71 ± 5.29	0.098	> 0.05
Clinical experience	**85**	55.54	47.21 ± 15.26	55.78	47.42 ± 15.49	0.057	> 0.05
Supervision	**55**	46.72	25.70 ± 11.64	44.67	24.57 ± 8.42	0.422	> 0.05
Evaluation	**30**	51.0	15.30 ± 6.70	56.16	16.85 ± 6.76	0.963	> 0.05
Communication	**55**	54.14	29.78 ± 12.15	60.92	33.51 ± 11.49	1.295	> 0.05
Schedule	**30**	58.8	17.64 ± 6.32	57.93	17.38 ± 4.77	0.180	> 0.05
Personal	**30**	38.08	11.42 ± 5.28	29.03	8.71 ± 2.39	2.29	> 0.05
Total	**375**	**51.93**	**194.75 ± 46.92**	**48.20**	**180.76 ± 42.48**	**1.262**	**> 0.05**

This table (21) shows mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their living. It can be observed that intern-nurses reported a low level of satisfaction however; total level of intern-nurses satisfaction that lived at their home reported a higher satisfaction level (51.93%) as compared to intern-nurses satisfaction that lived at aliens' home (48.20%).

Table (22) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their governorate

Items	Max. score	Governate of intern-nurses				t	P
		%	Kalyubia N = 49 $\bar{X}$ ± SD	%	Other governorate N = 73 $\bar{X}$ ± SD		
Internship year objective	**20**	47.95	9.59 ± 3.88	49.45	9.89 ± 3.77	0.423	> 0.05
Orientation program	**40**	58.65	23.46 ± 9.01	53.17	21.27 ± 7.57	1.453	> 0.05
Clinical setting	**30**	44.66	13.40 ± 5.39	45.73	13.72 ± 6.26	0.290	> 0.05
Clinical experience	**85**	55.45	47.14 ± 15.47	55.67	47.32 ± 15.18	0.060	> 0.05
Supervision	**55**	47.21	25.97 ± 11.75	45.8	25.19 ± 10.77	0.382	> 0.05
Evaluation	**30**	51.26	15.38 ± 15.69	52.3	15.69 ± 6.75	0.250	> 0.05
Communication	**55**	55.16	30.34 ± 12.14	55.4	30.47 ± 12.13	0.059	> 0.05
Schedule	**30**	61.7	18.51 ± 6.57	56.6	16.98 ± 5.66	1.365	> 0.05
Personal	**30**	34.4	10.32 ± 4.46	37.93	11.38 ± 5.32	1.145	> 0.05
Total	**375**	**49.90**	**187.14 ± 47.56**	**51.98**	**194.93 ± 47.86**	**0.343**	**> 0.05**

This table (22) shows mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their governorate. It can be observed that intern-nurses reported a low level of satisfaction however, total level of intern-nurses satisfaction that lived at governorate other Kalyubia reported higher satisfaction level (51.98%) as compared to intern-nurses satisfaction that lived at Kalyubia governorate (49.90%).

Table (23) Mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their transportation

Items	Max. score	Transportation of intern-nurses						F	P
		%	< 15 minutes N = 25 X ± SD	%	15 – 30 minutes N = 16 X ± SD	%	> 30 minutes N = 81 X ± SD		
Internship year objective	**20**	54.0	10.80 ± 3.22	43.4	8.68 ± 3.82	48.3	9.66 ± 3.93	1.608	> 0.05
Orientation program	**40**	58.2	23.28 ± 7.26	49.825	19.93 ± 8.82	55.6	22.24 ± 8.38	0.819	> 0.05
Clinical setting	**30**	49.6	14.88 ± 5.27	37.7	11.31 ± 5.30	45.5	13.65 ± 6.13	1.813	> 0.05
Clinical experience	**85**	60.84	51.72 ± 14.90	50.95	43.31 ± 18.38	54.88	46.65 ± 14.72	1.691	> 0.05
Supervision	**55**	49.74	27.36 ± 9.62	41.81	23.00 ± 11.37	46.23	25.43 ± 11.54	0.750	> 0.05
Evaluation	**30**	60.93	18.28 ± 6.48	48.33	14.50 ± 6.77	49.83	14.95 ± 6.634	2.6560	> 0.05
Communication	**55**	65.01	35.76 ± 9.90	48.63	26.75 ± 12.37	53.63	29.50 ± 12.25	3.554	< 0.05*
Schedule	**30**	60.93	18.28 ± 4.80	52.06	15.62 ± 6.79	59.23	17.77 ± 6.25	1.040	> 0.05
Personal	**30**	32.13	9.64 ± 3.52	35.6	10.68 ± 4.61	38.03	11.41 ± 5.42	1.239	> 0.05
Total	**375**	**51.97**	**194.91 ± 47.17**	**49.88**	**187.06 ± 44.73**	**49.97**	**187.4 ± 45.69**	**0.367**	**> 0.05**

***significant**

Table (23) shows mean score and percentage distribution related to internship year satisfaction as reported by intern-nurses according to their transportation. It can be observed that intern-nurses reported a low level of satisfaction however; total level of intern-nurses satisfaction that took less than 15 minutes in their transportation reported a higher level of satisfaction (51.97%) as compared to intern-nurses that took 15–30 minutes in their transportation (49.88%) or the intern-nurses that took.

more than 30 minutes in their transportation (49.97%). There was significant difference related to communication (F=3.554, $p < 0.05$)

V- Relationship between internship year problems and intern-nurses satisfaction

Table (24) correlation coefficient between internship year problems and intern-nurses satisfaction

Internship year problems	Intern-nurses satisfaction	
	r	P
	- 0.291	< 0.001**

The relationship between the internship year problems and intern-nurses satisfaction is presented in table (24). It can be observed that there was weak negative correlation, which was statistically significant between problems and satisfaction. This means when problems decreased satisfaction increased.