



P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (RJIIF): 5.38
IJPESH 2024; 11(3): 331-335
© 2024 IJPESH
<https://www.kheljournal.com>
Received: 25-04-2024
Accepted: 02-06-2024

Nguyen Do Minh Son
Saigon University, Hochiminh
City, Vietnam

Huynh Trong Khai
Hochiminh City University of
Physical Education and Sport,
Hochiminh City, Vietnam

Assessment of student satisfaction participated in physical education courses

Nguyen Do Minh Son and Huynh Trong Khai

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the Saigon University students' satisfaction with physical education courses. A general survey guided by a well-structured questionnaire has been administered across a random sample of 9850 students at Saigon University, the study has built a scale to assess the students' satisfaction after participating in physical education. The current situation of analyzing the satisfaction level of students after participating in physical education courses showed that they got the level of "very dissatisfied" to "normal" in the evaluation factors. In addition, the results also showed that there were differences among types of sports and school years. However, no differences were shown in gender and practice time. In conclusion, students' satisfaction was still low in physical education courses at Saigon University, there needs to be specific solutions for each specific sports and training needs in each year-by-year experience during the learning process.

Keywords: students' satisfaction, physical education, Saigon University, sports courses

1. Introduction

In today's globalized world, the education sector is no exception to the sweeping changes impacting economics, trade, and science and technology. To remain successful and competitive, universities worldwide, including those in Vietnam (Stukalina, 2012) ^[18], must prioritize improving the quality of their educational programs to meet the ever-increasing demands of a constantly evolving society. This necessitates a dynamic approach. As the number and types of professions rapidly expand, universities are strategically broadening the scope and scale of their offerings, attracting a growing student body year after year. This highlights the service-oriented nature of higher education, emphasizing the need to cater to student needs effectively (Tho & Trang, 2007) ^[19]. Educational activities must align with societal labor market demands to equip graduates with the necessary skills to seamlessly adapt and thrive in their chosen careers. A key factor in a university's success today is student satisfaction, which serves as a valuable indicator of service quality (Elliott & Shin, 2002) ^[4]. By prioritizing student satisfaction, universities could not only adapt to better meet student needs but also ensure the ongoing improvement and sustainability of their educational programs, solidifying their position within the competitive landscape of higher education (Stukalina, 2010) ^[17]. Numerous past research efforts have focused on improving educational quality, including increased investment and improved facilities to better equip students for success. However, a crucial element often overlooked is student feedback. As Kotler & Fox (1995) ^[10] suggest, student satisfaction during the learning process serves as a valuable indicator of educational quality. Therefore, evaluating and striving to improve student satisfaction is essential for education in general and physical education specifically.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Participants

The study was collected through a survey administered to 9,850 students (out of 10,080 distributed surveys, 9,850 valid responses were received). This sample size accurately reflects the total number of physical education courses during the 2021-2022 academic year. Participants' characteristics are shown in Table 1. The number of female students (7,127 persons) was higher than male students (2,723 persons). Freshmen (2,687 persons) and

Corresponding Author:
Nguyen Do Minh Son
Saigon University, Hochiminh
City, Vietnam

sophomores (4,997 persons) had the highest percentage of participated physical education courses when compared with juniors (1,671 persons) and seniors (495 persons). Track and field were the highest-registered courses (3178 persons) while

the other sports had an equal number (from 1308 to 1,359 persons). Participants registered for studying in the morning (5,006 persons) equivalent to the number in the afternoon (4,844 persons).

Table 1: Participants' characteristics

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender			Sport courses		
Male	2723	27.6%	Football	1359	13.8%
Female	7127	72.4%	Volleyball	1314	13.3%
School year			Table tennis	1308	13.3%
First	2687	27.3%	Basketball	1339	13.6%
Second	4997	50.7%	Badminton	1352	13.7%
Third	1671	17%	Track and field	3178	32.3%
Fourth	495	5%			
Time of studying					
In the morning	5006	50.8%			
In the afternoon	4844	49.2%			

2.2 Design

The evaluation scale was constructed based on the Swedish customer loyalty model (Fornell, 1992) [5], the American customer satisfaction index model (Fornell, 1995) [6], the European customer satisfaction index model (Dotchin & Oakland, 1994), the Vietnamese customer satisfaction index

model (Huy & My, 2007) [9], the Serqual service quality model (Parasuraman *et al.*, 1988) [15], Kovach's ten-factor motivation model (Kovach, 1987) [11], Chua's research model (Chua, 2004) [2], and previous research works by Nam (2015), Lan & Thai (2017). The study proposed a student satisfaction evaluation model with 7 factors described in Table 2.

Table 2: The study proposed a student satisfaction evaluation model

Variable	Factors	Questions	Assessment method
Classification	Academic year, gender, sport groups		Self-assessment
Students' satisfaction	Facilities	F1-F5	Likert scale with 5 levels from "Very dissatisfied" to "Very satisfied"
	Lecturers	L1-L6	
	Training program	TP1-TP5	
	The implementation	TI1-TI4	
	Support process	SP1-SP5	
	Problem responsiveness	PR1-PR5	
	Expected results	ER1-ER5	

2.3. Statistical analysis

All data were expressed as mean and standard deviation values (mean ± SD). Data collections were analyzed by using SPSS version 24 for Windows. The independent samples t-test was utilized to compare mean differences based on gender and studying time. One-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) was applied to evaluate differences among academic years and sports groups.

3.1. Assess the student's satisfaction in physical education courses

Based on a Likert scale with five levels (very satisfied from 4.21 to 5 points, satisfied from 3.41-4.20 points, normal from 2.61-3.40 points, low satisfied from 1.81-2.60 points, and no satisfied from 1-1.8 points), the students' satisfaction in physical education courses were showed in Table 3. The results from Table 3 showed that the criteria have an evaluation level from "Dissatisfied" to "Normal" (ranging from 2.41 to 3.94 points).

3. Results and discussions

Table 3: Students' satisfaction in physical education courses

N.	Survey questions	Average	Total average
F	Fields adequately meet the training requirements.	2.52±1.47	2.69±1.43
	The equipment and tools are appropriate and safe.	2.53±1.43	
	The lecture rooms are well-equipped and airy.	2.81±1.55	
	The training environment are clean and airy.	2.89±1.6	
	Restrooms are clean and meet learner requirements.	2.74±1.51	
L	Have fair and appropriate specialized knowledge.	3.66±1.2	3.67±1.19
	Understandable teaching skills and methods.	3.63±1.21	
	Be friendly and approachable during training.	3.71±1.24	
	Have appropriate attire for class.	3.65±1.19	
	Evaluate learning outcomes accurately and fairly.	3.72±1.24	
Ensure adherence to class schedules.	3.65±1.2		
TI	The course syllabus is clearly communicated.	2.69±1.5	2.68±1.49
	The variety of teaching methods.	2.68±1.49	
	Employ diverse and appropriate teaching formats.	2.68±1.5	
	A maximum of 40 students per class is appropriate.	2.69±1.52	
TP	The course training content is appropriate.	3.93±1.23	3.92±1.15

	Lecture hours have clear and appropriate content.	3.96±1.22	
	2 lecture & 28 practice sessions were reasonable.	3.94±1.23	
	A 15-week period (one per week) is appropriate.	3.94±1.22	
	The evaluation methods are appropriate.	3.84±1.18	
SP	Learning problems are adequately addressed.	2.78±1.51	2.75±1.46
	Cleaning staff effectively meet training needs.	2.73±1.48	
	Faculty advisors provide clear explanations.	2.77±1.5	
	The storage for equipment and tools is appropriate.	2.69±1.48	
	The university's website effectively support.	2.77±1.51	
PR	The course meets personal expectations.	2.41±1.16	2.63±1.33
	The course meets the needs of health development.	2.62±1.38	
	Course books and materials meet learning needs.	2.69±1.41	
	The uniforms are appropriate for training.	2.69±1.42	
	Organize training suitable for activities.	2.71±1.43	
ER	Improve motor skills in each specific subject.	3.09±1.44	3.15±1.43
	Develop discipline and teamwork during training.	3.23±1.51	
	Have a dynamic and fun training environment.	3.11±1.44	
	Encourage participation in extracurricular training.	3.16±1.47	
	Create connections with new friends.	3.17±1.46	

Notes: F-Facilities, L-Lecturers, TI-The implementation, TP-Training program, SP-Support process, PR-Problem responsiveness, ER-Expected results

The facilities factor got a low level of satisfaction, with an average score of 2.69±1.43 points. The criterion "The training environment is clean and airy" (2.89±1.6 points) was rated as the most satisfied by students. This could be explained by the fact that most of the teaching time for PE courses was spent on the training ground, which was always kept clean and the teachers always chose the cleanest and most airy location to teach (which might change depending on the lesson). The two criteria "Fields adequately meet the training requirements" and "The equipment and tools are appropriate and safe" got the lowest dissatisfaction level (scoring 2.52±1.47 points and 2.53±1.43 points, respectively). Fields were used by many classes at the same time, which could easily lead to confusion before and during training. In addition, equipment and tools in training were damaged and were difficult to repair (must be replaced), such as jump ropes, badminton rackets, and rackets..., which limited the students' experience and led to a lower level of satisfaction. Therefore, this "facilities" factor needs urgent solutions to improve student satisfaction.

The lecturer's factor was one of the highest satisfaction levels (achieved 3.67±1.19 points). Two criteria highly appreciated in this factor were "be friendly and approachable during training" and "evaluate learning outcomes accurately and fairly" (3.71±1.24 points and 3.72±1.24 points, respectively). It indicated that the teaching staff was highly satisfied by students, which is a silent reward for teachers who have made many efforts in teaching year after year. Besides, the training program factor was the highest rating (got 3.92±1.15 points) among all factors affecting student satisfaction when participating in PE courses. All criteria in this factor had a satisfaction rating ranging from 3.84 to 3.96 points (got satisfied level), the cause may stem from changing the content of physical education subjects, distributing more theoretical details, and appropriate testing... due to the epidemic situation.

The implementation factor got a low satisfied rating (2.68±1.49 points). The organization of PE courses with up to 40 students in one class or the teaching plan is sometimes interrupted due to the internship plan. Specialized subjects were compressed into the time of general subjects (including PE courses), even though students have been informed in advance, but problems cannot be avoided when organizing implementation might be the answer to these results. The support process factor only reached the "average" level with a

total average rating of 2.75±1.46 points. The range of ratings scored from 2.69 to 2.78 points. Thus, there needs to be further improvement in the above-mentioned criteria in serviceability to improve satisfaction among students, as well as physical education work in university in general. The "Problem responsiveness" factor had the lowest level of satisfaction assessed by students (2.63±1.33 points), in which the most underrated criterion was "the course meets personal expectations" (2.41±1.16 points), corresponding to the level of "low satisfied". Along with that was the "expected results" factor had a total satisfaction score of 3.15±1.43 points (only at the "normal" level). It indicated that the expected results from learners were still quite low compared to their expectations when participating in training, requiring specific and comprehensive solutions to further improve the results achieved in PE courses soon.

Briefly, the level of student satisfaction when participating in PE courses at Saigon University was not good, in the implementation and problem responsiveness were the lowest level of satisfaction. It needs to be planned by the Department of Physical Education to change with practical and specific solutions to improve student satisfaction as well as ensure better activities in PE courses. Research by Pan (2022) [14] showed that lecturers' capacity greatly affects satisfaction during the learning process of physical education modules, through motivating learners and creating a positive practice environment. from the available subject program content. Thus, the results in the study also showed similar results to the above study. According to Ruffalo (2017) [16], there were five factors that students were most satisfied with at public universities, such as appropriate training programs, dedicated and experienced lecturers, academic advisors and assistants well meet the needs of students, and a safe and reliable learning environment. All factors were represented in our study, although the level of achievement of satisfaction was not as positive as expected. In addition, if we know how to combine many types of implementation organizations, such as the integrated teaching method (Vernadakis *et al.*, 2012) [20] or creating a positive training environment (Aibar *et al.*, 2021) [11] it might increase the level of satisfaction of learners.

3.2. Differences satisfaction levels in students participated in physical education courses at Saigon University

The study evaluated the differences in satisfaction levels

between genders, time of studying, sports courses, and school year were described in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4: Gender, time of studying differences in satisfaction level

Content	Types	Mean ± SD	t	df	p
Gender	Male	3.07±0.45	-0.134	9848	.894
	Female	3.08±0.44			
Time of studying	Morning	3.06±0.44	-1.704	9848	.088
	Afternoon	3.08±0.45			

Results in Table 4 indicated that there were no significant differences between male (3.07±0.45 points) and female students (3.08±0.44 points) ($t=-0.134$, $df=9848$, $p=0.894$), between morning (3.06±0.44 points) and afternoon (3.08±0.45 points) ($t=-1.704$, $df=9848$, $p=0.088$). It led that

Table 5: Sport courses, school year differences in satisfaction level

Content	Codes	Types	Mean ± SD	Levene's test	p	Pairwise comparison
Sport courses	1	Football	3.09±0.46	5.078	.000	1-6***, 2-6**, 3-6***, 4-6***, 5-6**
	2	Volleyball	3.07±0.44			
	3	Table tennis	3.08±0.45			
	4	Basketball	3.11±0.44			
	5	Badminton	3.08±0.46			
	6	Track & field	3.03±0.42			
School year	1	First	3.02±0.41	12.816	.000	1-2***, 1-4*, 2-3**
	2	Second	3.09±0.46			
	3	Third	3.05±0.44			
	4	Fourth	3.11±0.45			

Notes: *, **, ***: significant difference at lower 0.05, 0.01, 0.001

Besides, data in Table 5 showed that there were statistically significant differences among sports courses with $F(5, 3925.79)=9.243$, $p=0.000$ as well as the time of studying with $F(3, 2011.41)=38.191$, $p=0.000$ in terms of satisfaction. A paired comparison among sports courses (using *Post hoc* Tamhane's T2) showed that the track & field course (3.03±0.42 points) had differences with the remaining sports groups such as football (3.09±0.46 points, $p=0.000$), volleyball (3.07±0.44 points, $p=0.017<0.05$), table tennis (3.08±0.45 points, $p=0.001<0.05$), basketball (3.11±0.44 points, $p=0.000<0.05$), badminton (3.08±0.46 points, $p=0.001<0.05$). This result noted that the track and field course got the lowest level of satisfaction among all sports groups. This could be explained by the fact that it was a mandatory prerequisite course in physical education at Saigon University, students had to participate in content implemented in high school, which led to low satisfaction levels from students. Moreover, the basketball course had the highest satisfaction, which might be explained by the fact that it was the only sport that could be practiced under cover and with ventilation in hot conditions.

A paired comparison among school years (using *Post hoc* Tamhane's T2) found that there were differences between school years, in which between the satisfaction level of freshman (3.02±0.41 points) and sophomore (3.09±0.46 points, $p=0.000<0.05$), and senior (3.11±0.45 points, $p=0.001<0.05$); as well as between sophomore and junior (3.05±0.44 points, $p=0.002<0.05$). This result showed that first-year students got the lowest satisfaction, while fourth-year students had the highest satisfaction. Perhaps it came from students' psychological excitement - having just gone through a year of psychologically heavy transfer exams, students who have entered the university from the countryside to the city for studying and with many expectations when entering the university, so satisfaction ratings are lower when

there was no difference in the level of satisfaction between males and females, as well as training in the morning and the afternoon after participating in physical education courses at Saigon University. Gibbons (2009)^[7] indicated that if female learners have a lower level of satisfaction than male learners, therefore if they (female students) do not find value in physical education classes, they will drop out when given the opportunity. However, if we can meet the needs of specific female students and increase activity opportunities for physical development, physical education modules will become a regular part of their lives. However, in the study, Goodarzi *et al.* (2008)^[8] showed that female students at the University of Tehran reported higher physical health, positive cognition, self-efficacy, happiness, and life satisfaction than male students.

compared to another school year when these students have begun to get used to the university life.

4. Conclusion

In short, the level of satisfaction of students when participating in physical education courses at Saigon University was still low in physical education courses at Saigon University. Although there were differences among sports courses and school year, but did not show any gender differences, as well as in time of studying. It suggested that further in-depth studies are needed to be specific solutions for each specific sport and training needs in each year-by-year experience during the student's learning process.

5. References

- Aibar A, Abos A, Garcia-Gonzalez L, Gonzalez-Cutre D, Sevil-Serrano J. Understanding students' novelty satisfaction in physical education: Associations with need-supportive teaching style and physical activity intention. *Eur Phys Educ Rev.* 2021;27(4):779-797. doi:10.1177/1356336X21992791.
- Chua C. Perception of Quality in Higher Education. AUQA Occasional Publication Proceedings. Sydney; c2004.
- Dotchin JA, Oakland JS. Total Quality Management in Services: Part 1: Understanding and Classifying Services. *Int J Qual Reliab Manage.* 1994;11:9-26. doi:10.1108/02656719410056459.
- Elliott KM, Shin D. Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *J High Educ Policy Manage.* 2002;24(2):197-209. doi:10.1080/1360080022000013518.
- Fornell C. A national customer satisfaction barometer: the Swedish experience. *J Mark.* 1992;56(1):6-21. doi:10.2307/1252129.

6. Fornell C. The Quality of Economic Output: Empirical Generalizations About Its Distribution and Relationship to Market Share. *Mark Sci.* 1995;14(3):203–211. doi:10.1287/mksc.14.3.G203.
7. Gibbons SL. Meaningful Participation of Girls in Senior Physical Education Courses. *Can J Educ.* 2009;32(2):222-244.
8. Goodarzi M, Rajabi R, Yousefi B, Mansoor S. A Comparative Study of Happiness among Male and Female Athletes' Students in University of Tehran. *World J Sport Sci.* 2008;1(1):61-64.
9. Huy LV, My NTH. Building a theoretical model and measurement method for customer satisfaction index in Vietnam. *Banking Magazine.* 2007;12:5-10.
10. Kotler P, Fox KFA. *Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; c1995.
11. Kovach KA. What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Bus Horiz.* 1987;30(5):58-65. doi:10.1016/0007-6813(87)90082-6.
12. Lan LC, Thai DD. Assessing the level of student satisfaction with lecturers' teaching activities at Saigon University. Grassroots level project, Vietnam; c2017.
13. Nam PQ. Factors affecting student satisfaction with facilities and equipment at Ho Chi Minh City University of Physical Education and Sports. Master's thesis topic, Ho Chi Minh City University of Physical Education and Sports; c2015.
14. Pan Y. Relationships among teachers' self-efficacy and students' motivation, atmosphere, and satisfaction in physical education. *J Teach Phys Educ.* 2022;33(1):68-92. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2013-0069.
15. Parasuraman A, Zeithaml VL, Berry LL. Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *J Retail.* 1988;64(1):12-40.
16. Ruffalo NL. The 2017 national student satisfaction and priorities report. Cedar Rapids, IA: Ruffalo Noel Levitz. Retrieved from: RuffaloNL.com/Benchmark.
17. Stukalina Y. The management of the integrated educational environment resources: the factors to be considered. *Eur J Educ.* 2010;4:345–361. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2010.01433.x.
18. Stukalina Y. Addressing service quality issues in higher education: the educational environment evaluation from the students' perspective. *Technol Econ Dev.* 2012;18(1):84-98. doi:10.3846/20294913.2012.658099.
19. Tho ND, Trang NTM. *Market research.* Ho Chi Minh City: National University Publishing House; 2007.
20. Vernadakis N, Giannousi M, Tsitskari E, *et al.* A comparison of student satisfaction between traditional and blended technology course offerings in physical education. *Turk Online J Distance Educ.* 2012;13(1):137-147. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tojde/issue/16899/17612>.