

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Factors affecting psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of nurse academics: A cross-sectional study

Cevriye Ozdemir RN, PhD, Assistant Professor  | Ali Kaplan RN, PhD, Assistant Professor 

Incesu Ayse and Saffet Arslan Health Services Vocational School, Department of Medical Services and Techniques, University of Kayseri, Kayseri, Turkey

Correspondence

Cevriye Ozdemir, Department of Medical Services and Techniques, Incesu Ayse and Saffet Arslan Health Services Vocational School, University of Kayseri, Kayseri, Turkey.

Email: cevriyeozdemir@kayseri.edu.tr

Abstract

Aim: The study aimed to determine the factors affecting psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction in nurse academics.

Background: Nurse academics follow an emotionally and mentally intense career path, along which they are required to balance many different roles and responsibilities, including teaching, research and guidance. However, in some cases, this equilibrium is disrupted and may cause functional disruptions; in achieving this balance, resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction play important roles.

Methods: The data of this cross-sectional study were collected between January and April 2023, and 446 nurse academics were included in the study. The Descriptive Characteristics Information Form, Brief Psychological Resilience Scale (BPRS), General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) were used to collect the research data. We adhered to the STROBE checklist for reporting.

Results: A significant positive relationship was found between general self-efficacy levels and psychological resilience and job satisfaction levels. There is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction levels and age, total years of service, psychological resilience and general self-efficacy levels. In addition, it has been noted that family relationships, friend relationships and academic title factors were effective on the nurse academics' psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels.

Conclusion: Managers can play an important role in increasing the psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels of nurse academics by developing strategies for these effective factors.

Implications for nursing and nursing policy: Governments need to ensure that nurse academics have an appropriate career framework that enables them to balance the competing demands on their time and that they have adequate mentoring and support in the early stages of their careers to enable them to adapt to working life as a nurse academic.

KEYWORDS

Academics, job satisfaction, nursing, nursing education, psychological resilience, self-efficacy

INTRODUCTION

Although the main purpose of the educational process is teaching, it is known that educators' psychological well-being, psychological resilience, self-efficacy, job satisfaction and well-being have a significant impact on educational outcomes (Ortan et al., 2021). The education of nurses is predominantly done through the higher education sector all over

the world. The nurse academics workforce consists of staff who play a variety of roles such as teaching, research and other professional roles, as well as play a key role between universities and healthcare facilities (Massey et al., 2019). Nurse academics who assume such an important role progress through an emotionally and mentally intense career path (Singh et al., 2020). In this career path, they are confronted with situations such as continuous self-improvement, project

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2024 The Author(s). *International Nursing Review* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of International Council of Nurses.

financing, increasing workloads and ineffective time management, all the while seeking tenure. This situation can often cause academics to experience stressful situations (Chen et al., 2023).

Nurse academics, who contribute to nursing science and train nurses of the future, need to work in comfortable and institutionally appropriate conditions. However, as with all individuals, nursing academics can be affected by many particularized and professional factors (increasing workloads, seeking tenure, ineffective time management, etc.). When these factors cannot be managed effectively, it may lead to deterioration of physical and mental health, competence and work performance in academics (Arian et al., 2018). It is thought that if the individual and professional problems experienced by nurse academics are not identified and resolved, negative consequences may be encountered in many areas such as nursing education and the scientific process of the profession. To increase academics' psychological resilience and reduce professional burnout, it is suggested that it may be useful to implement training programmes to increase self-efficacy (Galindo-Domínguez et al., 2020). Therefore, this study aimed to examine the factors related to psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction in nurse academics.

BACKGROUND

In today's world, individuals are expected to perform their work in a timely and competent manner, and often at an even higher level. These expectations, found in all sectors and organizations, likewise apply to academics (Bas et al., 2019). Universities, whose numbers are increasing rapidly, are expected to show high performance to raise the quality standards in higher education. Factors such as academics' personal characteristics, psychological resilience, social support and job satisfaction have an impact on meeting these expectations. In this context, it can be said that the academic profession involves a high level of intrinsic motivation and satisfaction of high-level needs, such as achievement, responsibility, self-actualization, self-esteem, autonomy and self-efficacy (Bas et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2020).

There has been a shift in the field of mental health in recent years, from focusing on an individual's deficiencies to focusing on their strengths. This approach is reflected in numerous studies investigating positive psychological constructs such as resilience, optimism and happiness (Compas et al., 2017; Vella & Pai, 2019). In psychological studies, exposure to life events such as poverty, job loss, serious injury and bereavement is seen as a strong indicator of impairments in psychological functioning (Bonanno et al., 2015; Sisto et al., 2019; Troy et al., 2023). The impact of such challenging events on life activities and how people respond to them varies from one individual to another (Bonanno et al., 2015; Galindo-Domínguez et al., 2020). Some persons experience severe long-term disruptions, while others experience little or no disruption and in the present context, better-than-expected outcomes are referred to as psychological resilience (Troy et al., 2023). Psy-

chological resilience has a strong mediating effect on the relationship between organizational stress and job satisfaction of academics (Chen et al., 2023; Erdogan & Ak, 2021) and its importance cannot be understated in the academic workforce.

Individual characteristics are an important factor in the psychological resilience of individuals. Self-efficacy, one of these characteristics of the individual, is defined as people's beliefs in their ability to organize and execute the necessary actions to achieve certain gains (Bonanno et al., 2015). An individual's self-efficacy can affect their academic motivation and behaviour (Morris et al., 2017). Instructors with a strong sense of efficacy generally use more effective teaching strategies, are less susceptible to burnout and are more committed to the profession (Morris et al., 2017; Zee & Koomen, 2016). It can be stated that academics' self-efficacy directly affects job satisfaction.

In many countries around the world, the academic reported to have suffered serious disruptions following the introduction of managerial reforms focused on performance-based management, budget cuts and efficiency-oriented management (Escardíbul & Afcha, 2017; Webber, 2019). Nursing as an academic profession has been dealing with increasing workloads as a result of the massification policies emerging in many parts of the world (Chen et al., 2023; Mgaiwa & Hamis, 2022). In this context, individual and institutional strategies should be developed to identify and improve the factors that negatively affect the job satisfaction levels of nurse academics. To improve these factors, institutional managers should first be sensitized to the issue, take the necessary measures and develop guidelines and strategies if necessary. These measures will prevent the loss of labour and increase productivity, as well as the quality of services and education (McConkey et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2020). Studies can guide the development of strategies to be implemented to realize these achievements.

The following questions were sought to be answered in the study:

- What are the factors affecting the psychological resilience of nurse academics?
- What are the factors affecting nurse academics' self-efficacy?
- What are the factors affecting nurse academics' job satisfaction?
- Is there a relationship between nurse academics' psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction?

METHODS

Design and sample

A cross-sectional descriptive design was used in this study. The population consisted of 1,611 academics working in nursing departments of public and foundation universities in Turkey. In sample selection, it was aimed to reach the entire population. Emails were sent to 1,566 academics who met the inclusion criteria and whose e-mail addresses could be

obtained; responses were received from 446 nurse academics. The criteria for inclusion were both working as a permanent academic in the nursing department of the university and having a bachelor's degree in nursing. Being temporarily assigned at the university was determined as the exclusion criterion. Finally, the study adhered to the STROBE checklist for reporting.

A post-hoc power analysis was performed to calculate the power of the research, and the mean score of the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale was used in the G*Power program. The test family used *t* tests, the statistical test used difference from constant (one sample case) and the type of power analysis used post-hoc options. The nurse academics Brief Psychological Resilience Scale score average ($X = 18.72$) was entered in Mean H1, the nurse academics Brief Psychological Resilience Scale standard deviation ($SD = 4.93$) was entered in the standard deviation, and the average score (18) according to the minimum and maximum scores that could be obtained in the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale was entered in Mean H0. As a result of this calculation, the effect size was 0.14. As a result, the study power was determined as 92% due to the post-power analysis that took the effect size: 0.14, $n = 446$, and $\alpha = 0.05$.

Data collections tools

The Descriptive Characteristics Information Form, Brief Psychological Resilience Scale (BPRS), General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) were used to collect the research data.

Descriptive Characteristics Information Form

The Descriptive Characteristics Information Form was developed by the authors after a literature review. The form consists of 17 questions including descriptive information (age, gender, marital status, academic title, smoking and alcohol use, the institution of employment, years of employment, etc.) (Dall'Ora et al., 2015; Ortan et al., 2021; Yenen & Carkit, 2023; Yildirim & Ilhan, 2010).

Brief Psychological Resilience Scale

The scale consisted of six items in a 5-point Likert-type form (strongly disagree = 1, strongly agree = 5) (Akin et al., 2014). The second, fourth and sixth items were reverse coded. After the reverse coded items of the scale were reverse coded, the psychological resilience score was obtained by summing the scores obtained from all items and the possible score range that can be obtained from the scale varied between 6 and 30. High scores obtained from the scale indicate high psychological resilience. The Cronbach alpha value of the original scale was calculated as 0.66. In this study, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.84.

General Self-Efficacy Scale

The scale, which evaluates the belief in the ability to cope with new and difficult tasks, consisted of 17 questions in a 5-point Likert type. Items 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 were reverse scored. The total score of the scale varies between 17 and 85 and the higher the score, the higher the self-efficacy belief. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.80 (Yildirim & Ilhan, 2010). In the study, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.87.

Job Satisfaction Scale

The scale consisted of five questions in 5-point Likert type and was scored as minimum 1 and maximum 5. A decrease in the average score obtained from the scale indicates a decrease in the level of job satisfaction, while an increase indicates an increase in the level of job satisfaction. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated as 0.92 (Basol & Comlekci, 2020). In the study, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was determined as 0.89.

Data collection

The data were collected between January and April 2023 and prior to starting the data collection, the list of all public and foundation universities in Turkey with nursing departments was obtained from the web page of the Turkish Council of Higher Education. The academic staff was identified from the web pages of the nursing schools of the universities included in the list. Within the scope of the study, approximately 1,566 (97.20% of the population) academics were e-mailed and informed about the study, in which was included the data collection form, created on Google Form, was sent to the academics via e-mail. The 'Informed Voluntary Consent Form' checkbox was made mandatory in the Google Form. While creating the form, standardization was ensured by limiting one answer per IP address so that academics could only respond once.

Data analysis

The data obtained from the study were evaluated using the IBM SPSS 27 Statistics (IBM Corp., Armonk, New York, USA) package program. Frequency and percentage analyses were used to determine the descriptive characteristics of the nurses participating in the study, and mean and standard deviation statistics were used to analyse the scale. The normality of the data was evaluated using the Shapiro-Wilk test. In two independent group comparisons, the Independent Sample *t*-test or Mann-Whitney *U* test was used, according to the normality of the data. In the comparison of three or more independent groups, the one-way analysis of variance or Kruskal-Wallis test was used according to the normality of

TABLE 1 Sociodemographic characteristics of nurse academics ($n = 446$).

Characteristics	<i>n</i> (%)	Characteristics	<i>n</i> (%)
Age (mean $\pm$ SD)	38.87 $\pm$ 9.20	Total years of service (mean $\pm$ SD)	16.39 $\pm$ 9.87
Gender		Years of service in the same institution (mean $\pm$ SD)	8.32 $\pm$ 7.20
Female	412 (92.4)	Family relations	
Male	34 (7.6)	Good	367 (82.3)
Marital status		Middle	79 (17.7)
Married	303 (67.9)	Friend relationships	
Single	143 (32.1)	Good	359 (80.5)
Family type		Middle	87 (19.5)
Nuclear family	432 (96.9)	Academic title	
Extended family	14 (3.1)	Research assistant	124 (27.8)
Financial situation		Lecturer	62 (13.9)
Income less than expenses	39 (8.7)	Assistant professor	143 (32.1)
Income matches expenses	304 (68.2)	Associate professor	65 (14.6)
Income more than expenses	103 (23.1)	Professor doctor	52 (11.7)
Cigarette smoking		Working institution	
Yes	70 (15.7)	Public	371 (83.2)
No	376 (84.3)	Foundation	75 (16.8)
Alcohol use		Working in an institution with a bachelor's degree	
Yes	85 (19.1)	Yes	96 (21.5)
No	361 (80.9)	No	350 (78.5)
Chronic disease		Planned use of annual leaves	
Yes	102 (22.9)	Yes	354 (79.4)
No	344 (77.1)	No	92 (20.6)
Hobby status			
Yes	320 (71.7)		
No	126 (28.3)		

the data. The post-hoc test was applied to the significant data as a multiple comparison test. In addition, the Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the scales and the direction of this relationship. In all comparisons, $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

In the literature review on the topics investigated in the study, descriptive characteristics that may affect this issue were investigated and characteristics of the academics were thus extracted; these are presented in Table 1. The mean age of the academics was 38.87 ± 9.20 , 92.4% were female, 67.9% were married, 96.9% had a nuclear family, 68.2% had an income equal to their expenses, 15.7% smoked, 19.1% used alcohol, 22.9% had chronic diseases and 71.7% had hobbies. In addition, the average years of service of academics were 16.39 ± 9.87 , the average years of service in the same institution were 8.32 ± 7.20 , 82.3% had good family relations, 80.5% had good friend relations, 32.1% were assistant professors, 83.2% worked in a public institution, 21.5% worked in

the institution where the undergraduate degree was completed and 79.4% used annual leave as planned.

The comparison between the descriptive characteristics of the academics included in the study and the scales is given in Table 2. It was found that males, those with good family and friends' relationships, those with hobbies, those who used their annual leaves as planned, and those with academic titles of Associate Professor and Professor, had statistically significantly higher scores on the BRPS ($p < 0.05$). There was a statistically significant relationship between the financial status, family and friends' relationship status, hobby status and academic titles of the academics and their mean scores on the GSES ($p < 0.05$). In addition, there was a statistically significant relationship between the mean scores of JSS and academics' financial status, family and friends' relationship status, academic titles, working status in the institution where the undergraduate degree was completed and planned use of annual leaves ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3 shows the correlation analysis between the academics' personal characteristics with some numerical data and their scale mean scores. There was a significant positive correlation between the mean score of the psychological

TABLE 2 Comparison of descriptive characteristics of academics and scales ($n = 446$).

Characteristics	BPRS		GSS		JSS	
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test
Gender						
Female	18.56 $\pm$ 4.97	$t: -2.482$	67.48 $\pm$ 9.32	$U: 0.163$	3.87 $\pm$ 0.79	$U: -1.913$
Male	20.73 $\pm$ 4.06	$p = 0.013$	66.85 $\pm$ 10.10	$p: 0.870$	4.11 $\pm$ 0.87	$p: 0.056$
Marital status						
Married	18.98 $\pm$ 5.11	$U: 1.655$	67.77 $\pm$ 9.77	$t: 1.128$	3.89 $\pm$ 0.77	$U: -0.406$
Single	18.18 $\pm$ 4.51	$p: 0.098$	66.70 $\pm$ 8.46	$p: 0.260$	3.88 $\pm$ 0.86	$p: 0.684$
Family type						
Nuclear family	18.70 $\pm$ 4.96	$t: -0.485$	67.47 $\pm$ 9.41	$t: 0.466$	3.89 $\pm$ 0.80	$t: 1.374$
Extended family	19.35 $\pm$ 4.12	$p: 0.628$	66.28 $\pm$ 8.43	$p: 0.642$	3.60 $\pm$ 0.74	$p: 0.170$
Financial situation						
Income less than expenses	18.74 $\pm$ 5.99	$F: 0.015$	66.79 $\pm$ 10.28 ^a	$KW: 10.453$	3.57 $\pm$ 1.02 ^a	$KW: 13.262$
Income matches expenses	18.70 $\pm$ 4.92	$p: 0.986$	66.74 $\pm$ 8.96 ^{a,b}	$p: 0.005$	3.84 $\pm$ 0.80 ^b	$p < 0.001$
Income more than expenses	18.79 $\pm$ 4.58		69.71 $\pm$ 9.92 ^{a,c}		4.13 $\pm$ 0.64 ^c	
Cigarette smoking						
Yes	18.91 $\pm$ 5.02	$t: 0.346$	69.05 $\pm$ 9.59	$U: 1.848$	3.82 $\pm$ 0.82	$U: -0.590$
No	18.69 $\pm$ 4.92	$p: 0.729$	67.13 $\pm$ 9.31	$p: 0.065$	3.90 $\pm$ 0.80	$p: 0.555$
Alcohol use						
Yes	17.45 $\pm$ 5.48	$U: -1.920$	67.37 $\pm$ 9.73	$t: -0.064$	3.76 $\pm$ 0.85	$U: -1.686$
No	19.02 $\pm$ 4.76	$p: 0.055$	67.44 $\pm$ 9.30	$p: 0.949$	3.92 $\pm$ 0.79	$p: 0.092$
Chronic disease						
Yes	18.49 $\pm$ 4.97	$t: -0.550$	67.58 $\pm$ 10.73	$U: 0.778$	3.94 $\pm$ 0.87	$U: 1.129$
No	18.79 $\pm$ 4.93	$p: 0.583$	67.33 $\pm$ 8.95	$p: 0.436$	3.87 $\pm$ 0.78	$p: 0.259$
Family relations						
Good	19.03 $\pm$ 4.94	$t: 2.845$	68.09 $\pm$ 9.31	$U: 3.282$	3.93 $\pm$ 0.81	$U: 2.799$
Middle	17.30 $\pm$ 4.65	$p: 0.005$	64.35 $\pm$ 9.12	$p: 0.001$	3.69 $\pm$ 0.74	$p: 0.005$
Friend relationships						
Good	18.99 $\pm$ 4.91	$t: 2.332$	68.05 $\pm$ 9.14	$U: 2.585$	3.94 $\pm$ 0.80	$U: 3.579$
Middle	17.61 $\pm$ 4.93	$p: 0.020$	64.86 $\pm$ 9.99	$p: 0.010$	3.64 $\pm$ 0.76	$p < 0.001$
Hobby status						
Yes	19.32 $\pm$ 4.77	$t: 4.130$	68.27 $\pm$ 9.14	$U: 2.711$	3.91 $\pm$ 0.82	$U: 1.263$
No	17.21 $\pm$ 5.04	$p < 0.001$	65.29 $\pm$ 9.65	$p: 0.007$	3.83 $\pm$ 0.74	$p: 0.206$
Academic title						
Research assistant	16.67 $\pm$ 4.61 ^a	$F: 26.137$	65.44 $\pm$ 8.96 ^a	$F: 8.058$	3.62 $\pm$ 0.84 ^a	$KW: 27.406$
Lecturer	16.54 $\pm$ 4.56 ^a	$p < 0.001$	65.91 $\pm$ 9.95 ^a	$p < 0.001$	3.95 $\pm$ 0.74 ^{b,c}	$p < 0.001$
Assistant professor	18.77 $\pm$ 4.48 ^b		66.55 $\pm$ 9.34 ^a		3.89 $\pm$ 0.83 ^b	
Associate professor	21.64 $\pm$ 4.00 ^c		70.81 $\pm$ 8.59 ^b		4.04 $\pm$ 0.69 ^{b,c}	
Professor doctor	22.42 $\pm$ 4.42 ^c		72.19 $\pm$ 8.19 ^b		4.23 $\pm$ 0.64 ^c	
Working institution						
Public	18.61 $\pm$ 4.97	$t: -1.090$	67.11 $\pm$ 9.13	$t: -1.615$	3.87 $\pm$ 0.81	$U: -0.819$
Foundation	19.29 $\pm$ 4.72	$p: 0.276$	69.02 $\pm$ 10.42	$p: 0.107$	3.96 $\pm$ 0.76	$p: 0.412$
Working in an institution with a bachelor's degree						
Yes	18.00 $\pm$ 4.93	$t: -1.630$	66.18 $\pm$ 9.12	$t: -1.473$	3.70 $\pm$ 0.83	$U: -2.503$
No	18.92 $\pm$ 4.92	$p: 0.104$	67.77 $\pm$ 9.42	$p: 0.141$	3.94 $\pm$ 0.78	$p: 0.012$

(Continues)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Characteristics	BPRS		GSS		JSS	
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test	Mean $\pm$ SD	Test
Planned use of annual leaves						
Yes	19.04 $\pm$ 4.79	<i>t</i> : 2.692	67.77 $\pm$ 9.04	<i>U</i> : 1.525	3.98 $\pm$ 0.72	<i>U</i> : 5.101
No	17.50 $\pm$ 5.29	<i>p</i> : 0.007	66.10 $\pm$ 10.50	<i>p</i> : .0128	3.50 $\pm$ 0.97	<i>p</i> <0.001

Abbreviations: *U*: Mann–Whitney *U* test, *t*: Independent sample *t*-test, KW: Kruskal–Wallis test, F: one-way ANOVA.

Note: The superscripts a, b, c indicate a difference within a group, and the same letters indicate that there is not an in-group difference and different letters indicate an in-group difference.

TABLE 3 Correlation table (*n* = 446).

	Age	Total years of service	Years of service in the same institution	BRPS	GSES	JSS
Age	1	0.971**	0.609**	0.091	0.008	0.108*
Total years of service	0.971**	1	0.604**	0.102*	0.035	0.105*
Years of service in the same institution	0.609**	0.604**	1	0.055	−0.092	−0.016
BRPS	0.091	0.102*	0.055	1	0.350**	0.268**
GSES	0.008	0.035	−0.092	0.350**	1	0.354**
JSS	0.108*	0.105*	−0.016	0.268**	0.354**	1

* *p* < 0.05; ** *p* < 0.001; *r* = Spearman correlation analysis.

resilience scale and the mean scores of total years of service, GSES and JSS. There was also a significant positive correlation between the mean score of the GSES and the mean scores of the BRPS and JSS. This was also the case between the mean score of the JSS and the mean scores of age, total years of service, BRPS and GSES (*p* < 0.05).

DISCUSSION

Very few studies have been conducted on nurse academics in the literature (Bittner & Bechtel, 2017). Nurse academics have numerous responsibilities in many areas, including conducting scientific research, training professional and qualified nurses, as well as protecting and improving public health (Singh et al., 2022). For this reason, it was essential to contribute to the literature on nurse academics. It was therefore aimed in this study to determine the level of psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction in nurse academics, as well as the factors affecting these issues; the findings were examined in light of the existing literature.

Stress levels in academic institutions are higher than in many other institutions (Singh et al., 2022). Increasing psychological resilience in nurse academics is predicted to be important for coping with the stressful aspects of the profession and preventing the perception of burnout (Aquino et al., 2018). Therefore, it is important to recognize the factors affecting psychological resilience. In the study, a positive significant relationship was determined between the psychological resilience levels of nurse academics and their job

satisfaction and self-efficacy levels. In addition, it was determined that other factors affecting the psychological resilience of academics are gender, family and friend relationship, hobby, planned annual leave use and academic title. In the current literature review, no studies examining the psychological resilience of nurse academics were found. However, in a study conducted on bank employees, a significant relationship between psychological resilience and job satisfaction was found (Cetin & Basim, 2011). Nurse academics may experience burnout and occupational stress due to their increasing workload and great responsibilities (Singh et al., 2020). Psychological resilience in academics is defined as a dynamic process that uses existing internal and external resources to produce positive outcomes in response to different contextual, environmental and developmental challenges (de los Reyes et al., 2022). This definition emphasizes the relational aspect of resilience, rather than focusing on the individual and positive outcomes. Therefore, it is thought that academics with good family and friends' relationships have higher psychological resilience as a result of stronger support mechanisms. Psychological resilience is also interpreted as the ability to recover from trauma, stress or deprivation (Sisto et al., 2019). Taking planned annual leave and engaging in a hobby can also be seen as a method of stress relief, thus academics who use these methods may also have higher psychological resilience. The reason why associate professors and professors have higher psychological resilience may be that they have better problem-solving skills as a result of their professional experience. The reason why research assistant and lecturer academics, who find themselves at the beginning of their career, have the lowest psychological resilience may be because they both gen-

erally pursue postgraduate studies and carry out the work of the department they find themselves in; thus, it may be the result of their higher workload. To prevent this situation from affecting the performance of academics in their roles, further research and remedial intervention studies are recommended.

A significant positive relationship was found between the general self-efficacy levels of the academics included in the study and their job satisfaction and psychological resilience levels. In addition, general self-efficacy levels of academics with good financial status, good family and friend relations, hobbies, associate professors and professors were significantly higher. In another study conducted on nurse academics, the general self-efficacy levels of academics with the titles of professor and associate professor were similarly higher than other academics (Cayir & Ulupinar, 2021). This may be due to the challenging stages that associate professors and professors go through in obtaining the title. At the same time, it is thought that the experience gained over the years may also affect this situation. In another context, the better economic situation of associate professors and professors may also have an effect. Studies also emphasize that there is an important relationship between socio-economic status and self-efficacy (Alves et al., 2019; Arian et al., 2018; Han et al., 2014); this situation supports our study findings. Self-efficacy belief is also affected by the social support perceived by the individual from family, friends and other important individuals (Yenen & Carkit, 2023). Therefore, those with good family and friend relationships may have higher self-efficacy levels. According to these results, it is recommended to determine the educational needs of nurse academics regarding self-efficacy levels and to provide training according to these needs.

Job demands and the resources available at work differ specifically in each profession, and professional and personal factors have an impact on job satisfaction (Shrestha, 2019). In this study, the factors affecting the job satisfaction of nurse academics were investigated. It was found that the financial status of academics, family and friend relationships, academic title, working in the institution where the undergraduate degree was completed and using annual leaves in a planned manner had positive effects on job satisfaction. In addition, there was a significant positive relationship between academics' job satisfaction and their psychological resilience and self-efficacy levels. In fact, the most interesting of these findings is that the job satisfaction of academics working in the institution where they completed their undergraduate degree is significantly lower. The reason for this may be that these academics do not get out of the student role because they work with the academics from their student years. In a study conducted on academics regarding job satisfaction, job satisfaction levels of academics with the titles of associate professor and professor were similarly higher than the lower titles (Akbaba & Demir, 2018; Hesli & Lee, 2013). It is emphasized that the wage received and perceived social support are also effectual in job satisfaction (Bas et al., 2019). In addition, in a systematic review on job satisfac-

tion of nurse educators, it was found that job satisfaction can be affected by personal, organizational, managerial, academic, professional and economic factors (Arian et al., 2018); these results support our research findings. Self-efficacy, job satisfaction and psychological resilience of nurse academics can be increased with strategies to be made according to all these data obtained.

Limitations

The study also has some limitations, namely, the fact that it included data based on the participants' own statements and that its collection was carried out electronically, as a result of challenges related to access. Furthermore, the findings obtained may be limited because the data were collected in a single country (within the sample frame), although the internal consistency reliability coefficient of the BPRS scale used is 0.66 and that the coefficient of the scale in our study was established at 0.84. The authors found these values acceptable and the use of the scale in research would make significant contributions.

The greatest strength of the study was that nearly all nurse academics in Turkey were implicated and its results would contribute to the literature, where limited studies exist on nurse academics. As nursing education is predominantly provided through the higher education sector, we believe that the outputs of the study will contribute to the international literature.

CONCLUSIONS

Psychological resilience of nurse academics is affected by self-efficacy, job satisfaction, total years of service, gender, family and friend relationship, hobby status, academic title and planned use of annual leave. Academics' job satisfaction, psychological resilience level, financial status, family and friend relationship, hobby status and academic title affect their self-efficacy levels. In addition, academics' job satisfaction levels are affected by psychological resilience, self-efficacy, age, total years of service, financial status, family and friend relationship, academic title, working status in the institution where they completed their undergraduate degree and planned use of annual leaves.

Nurse academics are among the key professionals who train the nurses of the future, contribute to the socialization of the profession and shape the nursing profession. Therefore, improvement strategies regarding the factors affecting the psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of these nurse academics should be implemented; nursing school administrators and education policymakers have a great responsibility in this regard. In addition, it is recommended to investigate further the issues affecting nurse academics, which may have an important impact on the nursing profession.

Implications for nursing and health policy

Nurse academics follow an emotionally and mentally intense career path. Psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction are among the important factors affecting the career process of nurse academics. Measures and strategies based on the results of the study may prevent the loss of nurse academics workforce, increase productivity, service and education quality. Thus, academics may continue to create qualified nursing services by enabling nursing graduates to receive a competent education and practice their profession successfully.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Cevriye Ozdemir and Ali Kaplan. **Methodology:** Cevriye Ozdemir and Ali Kaplan. **Validation:** Cevriye Ozdemir and Ali Kaplan. **Formal analysis:** Cevriye Ozdemir and Ali Kaplan. **Investigation:** Cevriye Ozdemir and Ali Kaplan. **Writing-review and editing:** Cevriye Ozdemir. **Visualization:** Cevriye Ozdemir. **Project administration:** Cevriye Ozdemir. **Writing-original draft:** Ali Kaplan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank all the academicians who participated in this study and the experts who supported the research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

ETHICAL STATEMENT

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of a local university (ref: 39714), which was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants were informed via e-mail and the necessary explanations regarding the study were included in the online form sent to the nurse academics, where they were presented with the option to participate or not.

ORCID

Cevriye Ozdemir RN, PhD  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9401-0044>

Ali Kaplan RN, PhD  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8242-0110>

REFERENCES

- Akbaba, A. & Demir, S. (2018) The Relationship Between Occupational Motivation and Job Satisfaction of The Academicians. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, 15(1), 1256–1286. <https://doi.org/10.23891/efdyu.2018.104>
- Akın, A., Turan, M.E., Sahranc, U., Akın, U. & Ercengiz, M. (2014) Brief Psychological Resiliency Scale Turkish Form. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Yayınları*, 108(7), 273–277.
- Alves, P.C., de Fatima Oliveira, A. & da Silva Paro, H.B.M. (2019) Quality of life and burnout among faculty members: how much does the field of knowledge matter? *PLoS ONE*, 14(3), e0214217. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214217>
- Aquino, E., Lee, Y.-M., Spawn, N. & Bishop-Royse, J. (2018) The impact of burnout on doctorate nursing faculty's intent to leave their academic position: a descriptive survey research design. *Nurse Education Today*, 69, 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.06.027>
- Arian, M., Soleimani, M. & Oghazian, M.B. (2018) Job satisfaction and the factors affecting satisfaction in nurse educators: a systematic review. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 34(5), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2018.07.004>
- Bas, M., Aksu, M., Unubol, H. & Hizli Sayar, G. (2019) Investigation of the relationship between job satisfaction and perceived social support in academicians. *Üsküdar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 9, 135–165. <https://doi.org/10.32739/uskudarsbd.5.9.62>
- Basol, O. & Comlekci, M.F. (2020) Adaptation of the Job Satisfaction Scale: validity and reliability study. *Kırklareli University Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 17–31.
- Bittner, N.P. & Bechtel, C.F. (2017) Identifying and describing nurse faculty workload issues: a looming faculty shortage. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 38(4), 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000000178>
- Bonanno, G.A., Romero, S.A. & Klein, S.I. (2015) The temporal elements of psychological resilience: an integrative framework for the study of individuals, families, and communities. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(2), 139–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2015.992677>
- Cayir, A. & Ulupinar, S. (2021) The relationship among educational skills, general self-efficacy perceptions and performance in nursing instructors. *Nurse Education Today*, 107, 105129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.105129>
- Cetin, F. & Basim, N. (2011) The role of resilience in the attitudes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. "Is, Guc" *The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal*, 13(3), 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.4026/1303-2860.2011.184.x>
- Chen, Y., Nasrawi, D., Lakeman, R. & Massey, D. (2023) Reflections on transitioning from senior nurses to novice nurse academics. *Contemporary Nurse*, 59(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10376178.2023.2166548>
- Compas, B.E., Jaser, S.S., Bettis, A.H., Watson, K.H., Gruhn, M.A., Dunbar, J.P., Williams, E. & Thigpen, J.C. (2017) Coping, emotion regulation, and psychopathology in childhood and adolescence: a meta-analysis and narrative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(9), 939–991. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000110>
- Dall'Ora, C., Griffiths, P., Ball, J., Simon, M. & Aiken, L.H. (2015) Association of 12 h shifts and nurses' job satisfaction, burnout and intention to leave: findings from a cross-sectional study of 12 European countries. *BMJ Open*, 5(9), e008331. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008331>
- de los Reyes, E.J., Blannin, J., Cohns, C. & Mahat, M. (2022) Resilience of higher education academics in the time of 21st century pandemics: a narrative review. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 44(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1989736>
- Erdogan, P. & Ak, M. (2021) The Mediating Role of between Organizational Stress and Job Satisfaction: A Study on Academicians. *Journal of Social Sciences of Mus Alparslan University*, 9(2), 433–442. <https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.819651>
- Escardíbul, J.-O. & Afcha, S. (2017) Determinants of the job satisfaction of PhD holders: an analysis by gender, employment sector, and type of satisfaction in Spain. *Higher Education*, 74(5), 855–875. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0081-1>
- Galindo-Domínguez, H., Pegalajar, M. & Uriarte, J.-D. (2020) Mediator and moderator effect of resilience between self-efficacy and burnout amongst social and legal sciences faculty members. *Revista de Psicodidáctica (English Ed.)*, 25(2), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicoe.2020.04.001>
- Han, J., Chu, X., Song, H. & Li, Y. (2014) Social capital, socioeconomic status and self-efficacy. *Applied Economics and Finance*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/aef.v2i1.607>
- Hesli, V.L. & Lee, J.M. (2013) Job satisfaction in academia: why are some faculty members happier than others? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 46(2), 339–354. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513000048>

- Massey, D., Ion, R. & Jackson, D. (2019) Top tips when starting a career in academic nursing. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 28(19–20), 3371–3373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14933>
- McConkey, R.W., Kelly, T., Dalton, R., Rooney, G., Healy, M., Murphy, L. & Dowling, M. (2023) Developing a culture of nursing research through clinical-academic partnership. *International Journal of Urological Nursing*, 17(1), 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijun.12339>
- Mgaiwa, S.J. & Hamis, Y.J. (2022) School principals versus teachers' expectations: the interplay between school leadership and teachers' job satisfaction in rural Tanzania. *SN Social Sciences*, 2(12), 262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-022-00578-3>
- Morris, D.B., Usher, E.L. & Chen, J.A. (2017) Reconceptualizing the sources of teaching self-efficacy: a critical review of emerging literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29, 795–833. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9378-y>
- Ortan, F., Simut, C. & Simut, R. (2021) Self-efficacy, job satisfaction and teacher well-being in the K-12 educational system. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(23), 12763. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182312763>
- Shrestha, I. (2019) Influence of demographic factors on job satisfaction of university faculties in Nepal. *NCC Journal*, 4(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nccj.v4i1.24738>
- Singh, C., Cross, W., Munro, I. & Jackson, D. (2020) Occupational stress facing nurse academics—a mixed-methods systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 29(5–6), 720–735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15150>
- Singh, C., Jackson, D., Munro, I. & Cross, W. (2022) Job experiences, challenges, revelations and narratives of nurse academics: a qualitative study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 78(8), 2622–2633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15232>
- Sisto, A., Vicinanza, F., Campanozzi, L.L., Ricci, G., Tartaglini, D. & Tambone, V. (2019) Towards a transversal definition of psychological resilience: a literature review. *Medicina*, 55(11), 745. <https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina55110745>
- Troy, A.S., Willroth, E.C., Shallcross, A.J., Giuliani, N.R., Gross, J.J. & Mauss, I.B. (2023) Psychological resilience: an affect-regulation framework. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 74(1), 547–576. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020122-041854>
- Vella, S.-L. & Pai, N. (2019) A theoretical review of psychological resilience: defining resilience and resilience research over the decades. *Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences*, 7(2), 233. https://doi.org/10.4103/amhs.amhs_119_19
- Webber, K.L. (2019) Does the environment matter? Faculty satisfaction at 4-year colleges and universities in the USA. *Higher Education*, 78(2), 323–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0345-z>
- Yenen, E.T. & Carkit, E. (2023) Fear of COVID-19 and general self-efficacy among Turkish teachers: mediating role of perceived social support. *Current Psychology*, 42(3), 2529–2537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02306-1>
- Yildirim, F. & Ilhan, I.O. (2010) The validity and reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale-Turkish Form. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 21(4), 301–308.
- Zee, M. & Koomen, H.M.Y. (2016) Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801>

How to cite this article: Ozdemir, C. & Kaplan, A. (2025) Factors affecting psychological resilience, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of nurse academics: A cross-sectional study. *International Nursing Review*, 72, e13007. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.13007>