

# Perceived Satisfaction of Prince Sultan University Graduates and Faculty from Health and Physical Education Program (HPEP)

Marshal C. Defensor

Health and Physical Education Department, Prince Sultan University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Received January 13, 2022; Revised February 24, 2022; Accepted March 15, 2022

## Cite This Paper in the following Citation Styles

(a): [1] Marshal C. Defensor, "Perceived Satisfaction of Prince Sultan University Graduates and Faculty from Health and Physical Education Program (HPEP)," *International Journal of Human Movement and Sports Sciences*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 207 - 216, 2022. DOI: 10.13189/saj.2022.100211.

(b): Marshal C. Defensor (2022). *Perceived Satisfaction of Prince Sultan University Graduates and Faculty from Health and Physical Education Program (HPEP)*. *International Journal of Human Movement and Sports Sciences*, 10(2), 207 - 216. DOI: 10.13189/saj.2022.100211.

Copyright©2022 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

**Abstract** An increasing interest in examining the Health and Physical Education Program (HPEP) has become evident to higher education institutions. However, the studies on the satisfaction of university stakeholders from the said program remain scarce. This study, therefore, examines the perceived satisfaction of university stakeholders from HPEP, including its distinct aspects/ areas and program offerings in an international higher education institution. Validated instruments such as a survey that received an overall mean score of 4.85 ( $SD=0.34$ ) and an interview protocol with a mean score of 4.89 ( $SD=0.23$ ) obtained data from university graduates/ alumni ( $n=250$ ) and faculty members ( $n=10$ ) between 2010 and 2018. The survey data indicated that alumni respondents evaluated the HPEP educational services (4.12 [ $SD=0.96$ ]), learning environment (4.26 [ $SD=0.88$ ]), and facilities (4.19 [ $SD=0.92$ ]) with a high level of satisfaction. The adequacy of skills learned (3.80 [ $SD=1.16$ ]), adequacy of HPEP as a program (4.08 [ $SD=0.08$ ]), and relevance of the HPEP (4.11 [ $SD=0.07$ ]) received a high-level satisfaction. On the other hand, the interview data revealed faculty members' satisfaction with some recommendations for improving the general aspects of the HPEP. While both alumni and faculty members were satisfied based on their understanding and experience of HPEP, discipline-centric activities, and infrastructure, there remains a need for consistency in the services offered, maintenance of facilities and equipment, and demand for strengthening

values and transferable skills developed by HPEP. This study is of relevance to health and physical education scholars and practitioners. It may likewise serve as a lens to revisit the HPEP for program improvement.

**Keywords** Health and Physical Education Program, Satisfaction, Faculty, Graduates

---

## 1. Introduction

Education institutions regard the Health and Physical Education Program (HPEP) as a vital curricular offering. The history of schooling and education seems arguably incomplete in essence without the HPEP. Health and Physical Education specialists and scholars examined the high and low performing PE programs [1]; implications on PE in constructivist learning [2]; status of online PE classes [3]; its roles in public health [4]; and integrating PE with social and emotional learning program [5]. The significant role that the HPEP plays in academic institutions established its essential part in the school curricula [20]. Lynch and Soukup [6] asserted that HPEP remains an "all-encompassing health-dimensional" subject that becomes a vital part of the education system across countries (p. 3). Its inclusion in the curricula has positively contributed to students' whole person and well-being. Studies on HPEP have extended beyond determining

yielded benefits brought by PE and its curriculum [7]. Kohl and Cook [8] found that an increased engagement in students' physical fitness and physical activity directly affected their academic performance. Increased physical activity engagement enhanced the students' fundamental cognitive functions like attention and memory. It is, however, suggested ensuring frequent physical activity with appropriate breaks. Corresponding to this study, Knaus, Lechner, and Reimers [9] found similar improvements in low-income students' motor skills and academic achievements, implying that HPEP could foster education equality. However, they observed that PE could adversely affect the non-cognitive skills among boys regarding peer relations, increasing bullying in HPEP class. Contrasting to this finding, Felfe, Lechner, and Steinmayr [10] highlighted the importance of physical activities to foster children's participation in physical activities. One good exploratory question pertains to how the students or faculty members experience good peer relations in the HPEP. While studies, as mentioned earlier, significantly discussed HPEP as an academic discipline that could positively contribute to a school program and students, studies examining the satisfaction of university alumni and faculty members who had the HPEP program experience remained under-researched. This kind of study can provide important data for improving the HPEP as a servicing program in Prince Sultan University (PSU), an international higher education institution. The PSU HPEP offers a wide range of curricular and extracurricular activities. It incorporates health, fitness, sports, recreation, and wellness programs that create equal opportunities and access to diverse learners. A few offerings include sports clubs, intramurals, interscholastic tournaments, fitness sessions, PE week events, lunchtime activities, faculty and staff sports activities, and health and fitness program. While the university sees the beneficial impacts of the HPEP on the PSU graduates, there is a glaring absence of empirical study proving this observation. This study, therefore, intends to determine if the HPEP, specifically the curricular and extracurricular activities, yields positive satisfaction from alumni and faculty members of the PSU. It further seeks to elicit perceptual responses concerning their program experiences, assessing its relevance and adequacy while evaluating aspects to retain, modify, or improve. Subscribing to Satisficing Theory (ST) helps the researcher understand the PSU alumni and faculty members' perceived satisfaction from the HPEP. While Simon [11] formally discussed ST in scientific writing, it first appeared in his "Administrative Behavior" published in 1947. ST involves both satisfaction and suffice. It theorizes that consumers, such as alumni and faculty members, can evaluate a program with a 'good' evaluation result rather than give a perfect rating. In other words, ST means a decision-making strategy that aims for a satisfactory outcome with a fair rating rather than a solution with higher evaluation results [21]. ST explains the alumni and the faculty members' ratings under

situations/contexts where their immediate decision becomes necessary in evaluating a program experience.

This study primarily sought to examine the satisfaction of the Prince Sultan University (PSU) graduates and faculty members from 2010 to 2018 with their experience of the Health and Physical Education Program. It likewise sought to assess the various aspects and offerings of the program. More specifically, it attempted to elicit data regarding PSU alumni's perceived satisfaction levels with the Health and Physical Education Program's educational services, learning environment, facilities, curricular and extracurricular programs, including the program's adequacy and relevance.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The researcher employed descriptive research, utilizing surveys and personal interviews [12] to elicit pertinent data that are substantial in addressing the identified problems. Choosing this design is crucial to objectively determine the university stakeholders' satisfaction from the Health and Physical Education Program. Descriptive research can produce results that might be instrumental in proposing some essential inputs for improving the HPEP as a servicing discipline or department. On the one hand, the survey determined the level of satisfaction of PSU alumni on the HPEP's educational services, learning environment, and facilities, including the level of adequacy and relevance of the skills that the program offers. On the other hand, the interview explored the perceptual information of selected faculty members regarding their experiences of the program and the activities it offered.

### 2.1. Study Area and Duration

The researcher conducted this study at the Prince Sultan University (PSU) in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 2019-2022. Among other international universities, PSU has been offering the HPEP for preparatory year level called Primary Years Programme (PYP) and University Year Level (UYL). This study covers the HPEP that promises to provide students and faculty members with a wide range of curricular and extracurricular activities to meet the global demands of developing optimal well-being.

### 2.2. Participants

Prince Sultan University graduates/ alumni ( $n=250$ ) and faculty members ( $n=10$ ) participated in this study. The researcher contacted the alumni who agreed to answer the online survey at a particular schedule, while the faculty members attended the scheduled one-on-one interview. The researcher oriented both survey respondents and interview participants on the nature and scope of this study.

The interview participants who dealt with a more personal, in-depth process of exploring their experiences received and signed informed consent.

### 2.3. Instruments

Three (3) content and research experts in sports education, sports management, and research instrumentation validated the two (2) instruments, such as survey and interview protocol, using the 9-point criteria: purpose, clarity wordiness, overlapping words, balance, the jargon used, appropriateness of response, technical language, and applicability of the instruments. The survey tool received an overall mean score of 4.85 (SD=0.34) with an interpretation of “very acceptable.” On the other hand, the interview protocol received a mean score of 4.89 (SD=0.23) with an interpretation of “very acceptable.” Both instruments had received a Fleiss’ kappa value of 0.707 with an interpretation of “substantial agreement” among the expert evaluators. The researcher followed the comments and suggestions of the expert evaluators in the instrument revision process.

### 2.4. Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The researcher first identified Prince Sultan University (PSU) alumni who served as survey respondents and recruited faculty members as the interview participants. Before data collection, the researcher secured necessary permits to conduct the study and sent invitation letters to interview participants. Agreeing on a feasible schedule, the researcher conducted a survey to selected alumni using random sampling and interviewed the eligible

faculty members based on the following criteria: (1) Seasoned PSU faculty members with a minimum of 5-year HPEP teaching in the university; (2) Had personal experience and participated in the HPEP educational services, learning environment, and facilities; (3) Had children who enrolled in PSU and experienced the HPEP educational services, learning environment, and facilities. The researcher analyzed all collected data and interpreted them separately and independently. For the quantitative data, the researcher utilized descriptive statistics, specifically mean and standard deviation, to describe and summarize the data measures of PSU alumni/ graduates’ satisfaction from their experience of the HPEP. Ahktar [13] argued that this statistical treatment could describe the phenomenon as it existed or the condition of a variable. It could help this research identify and obtain information about the perceived satisfaction of PSU alumni. For the measures of the survey instrument on the level of alumni’s satisfaction on HPEP educational services, learning environment, and facilities used and related to the HPEP, this research used the corresponding verbal interpretation.

For the qualitative data, the researcher transcribed the interview and conducted textual coding and thematic analysis to establish an in-depth understanding of the experience and found the similarities or patterns among datasets from PSU faculty members. The coding categorizes the responses to generate patterns of experiences of the participants. All study procedures, including the instruments, were approved by the PSU Institutional Ethics Review Board.

**Table 1.** Modal/Adjectival Interpretation of Results

Range	Rating	Interpretations		
4.50– 5.00	5	Very High Level of Satisfaction	Very High Level of Adequacy	Very High Level of Relevance
3.50 – 4.49	4	High Level of Satisfaction	High Level of Adequacy	High Level of Relevance
2.50 – 3.49	3	Moderate Level of Satisfaction	Moderate Level of Adequacy	Moderate Level of Relevance
1.50 – 2.49	2	Fair Level of Satisfaction	Fair Level of Adequacy	Fair Level of Relevance
1.00 – 1.49	1	Low Level of Satisfaction	Low Level of Adequacy	Low Level of Relevance

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Survey Results

##### 3.1.1. Satisfaction level on Health and Physical Education Program educational services, learning environment, and facilities

The PSU HPEP involves three major components, namely educational services, learning environment, and facilities. Each component encompasses specific aspects that HPEP officially offers to university students and faculty members. The fact that university stakeholders recognized and experienced these component and particular aspects compelled this study to include them as measures/ criteria, as shown in table 2.

Table 2 indicates that all listed Health and Physical Education Program educational services, learning environment, and facilities with their particular aspects have received a high level of satisfaction from the respondents.

The data culled from education services depict that the student support with a mean of 4.26 ( $SD=.87$ ), the faculty assistance garnering a mean of 4.24 ( $SD=.83$ ), and

extracurricular activities with a mean of 4.18 ( $SD=.96$ ) had all the highest mean values. Among the aspects/ areas, the research mentoring received the lowest mean of 3.90 ( $SD=1.13$ ), suggesting the need to look closely at the factors influencing the findings.

Concerning the satisfaction of the respondents with the learning environment/ climate of the HPEP, the data show that among the variables, they rated promoting positive peer relations with the highest mean value of 4.35 ( $SD=.78$ ), followed by knowledge of content with a mean of 4.32 ( $SD=.81$ ), and interaction with students with 4.30 ( $SD=.84$ ). Conversely, the creativity in teaching had the lowest mean of 4.16 ( $SD=.98$ ), delivery skills/ teaching methods, with a mean of 4.21 ( $SD=.95$ ), and instructional materials items that had only a mean of 4.21 ( $SD=.95$ ).

The general conditions of the buildings and recreational facilities had the highest mean values regarding the facilities. The former had a mean of 4.28 ( $SD=.80$ ), while the latter had a mean of 4.27 ( $SD=.86$ ), denoting the respondents' high contentment on these physical facilities built for the HPEP implementation. The high results may likewise imply that the established physical structures for the HPEP provided students with a conducive and comfortable activity place.

**Table 2.** Alumni Level of Satisfaction from HPEP Educational Services, Learning Environment, and Facilities

Educational Services	M (SD)	Interpretation
HPEP program assistance for admissions	4.09 (.92)	High Level of Satisfaction
Student support	4.26 (.87)	High Level of Satisfaction
Faculty assistance	4.24 (.83)	High Level of Satisfaction
Academic advising	4.10 (1.04)	High Level of Satisfaction
Research mentoring	3.90 (1.13)	High Level of Satisfaction
Health and fitness counseling	4.09 (1.03)	High Level of Satisfaction
Extension/ Outreach/ Community involvement	4.12 (.94)	High Level of Satisfaction
Extracurricular activities	4.18 (.96)	High Level of Satisfaction
Co-curricular activities	4.15 (.95)	High Level of Satisfaction
-----		
Learning Environment/ Climate		
Teaching staff	4.29 (.87)	High Level of Satisfaction
Knowledge of Content	4.32 (.81)	High Level of Satisfaction
Interaction with students	4.30 (.84)	High Level of Satisfaction
Creativity in teaching	4.16 (.98)	High Level of Satisfaction
Delivery skills/ teaching methods	4.21 (.89)	High Level of Satisfaction
Instructional materials	4.21 (.95)	High Level of Satisfaction
Promoting positive peer relations	4.35 (.78)	High Level of Satisfaction
-----		
Facilities		
HPEP equipment	4.11 (1.00)	High Level of Satisfaction
Classroom	4.23 (.86)	High Level of Satisfaction
Clinic	4.09 (.98)	High Level of Satisfaction
Recreational facilities	4.27 (.86)	High Level of Satisfaction
General conditions of buildings and gymnasium	4.28 (.80)	High Level of Satisfaction

### 3.1.2. Level of the adequacy of learned skills from the Health and Physical Education Program

The PSU HPEP cultivates the development of students' 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, which refer to the core learning skills, life skills, and literacy skills that continue to be essential for the students. The specific skills shown below thrive within the framework for the 21<sup>st</sup> century learning. The HPEP integrates the skills into the learning experience and serves as the core of the instruction.

Table 3 presents the level of adequacy of the skills learned from the Health and Physical Education Program. All listed skills learned have mean values with the same interpretation of a high level of adequacy. More specifically, information and communication technology garnered the highest mean of 3.86 ( $SD=1.15$ ) and the human relations skills with a mean of 3.85 ( $SD=1.08$ ). The research skills had the lowest mean value of 3.64 ( $SD=1.14$ ).

### 3.1.3. Level of adequacy and relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program

The following evaluation statements stem from the HPEP curriculum and learning prospectus. They involve curricular aspects, teaching strategies and approaches, and expected learning outcomes, to name a few. The researcher with the help of the HPEP coordinator carefully deliberated the selection and construction of the statements, as shown in table 4.

Table 4 presents the adequacy and relevance of the HPEP as perceived by PSU alumni. The respondents' ratings revealed high levels of adequacy and relevance of the HPEP as identified in all evaluation statements.

The following statements had the highest mean values: "Extracurricular activities are managed and plan by experts in the field of sports, physical activity, and recreation," "Facilities and equipment are updated, maintained, and well-management by the university and

HPEP Department," and "Extracurricular activities help in the promotion of balance and a healthy lifestyle for students, faculty and staff." On the other hand, the statements "Use theories and principles of body movements in evaluating human performance in physical activity, fitness, and sports," and "Conduct a research study that generates a new body of knowledge for Health, Physical Education, and Sports" had the lowest mean values in terms of adequacy of the HPEP. Similarly, the statements "Use theories and principles in reviewing, designing, or developing a desired curriculum for Health and Physical Education" and "Incorporate the use of technology in the preparation of instructional materials" had the lowest mean values in terms of the relevance of the HPEP.

**Table 3.** Level of the Adequacy of the Skills Learned

21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills Learned	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Interpretation
Learning Skills		
Communication skills	3.81 (1.19)	High Level of Adequacy
Critical thinking skills	3.82 (1.16)	High Level of Adequacy
Life Skills		
Problem-solving skills	3.78 (1.15)	High Level of Adequacy
Leadership skills	3.78 (1.20)	High Level of Adequacy
Human relations skills (social)	3.85 (1.08)	High Level of Adequacy
Literacy Skills		
Information and communication technology skills	3.86 (1.15)	High Level of Adequacy
Research skills (information literacy)	3.64 (1.24)	High Level of Adequacy
Instructional and assessment skills	3.82 (1.12)	High Level of Adequacy
Content-based skills	3.83 (1.16)	High Level of Adequacy

**Table 4.** Level of Adequacy and Relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program

Statements	Adequacy		Relevance	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	Interpretation	<i>M (SD)</i>	Interpretation
Use theories and principles of body movements in evaluating human performance in physical activity, fitness, and sports	3.94 (1.06)	High Level	4.03 (.93)	High Level
Use theories and principles in reviewing, designing, or developing a desired curriculum for Health and Physical Education	4.01 (1.04)	High Level	4.01 (.97)	High Level
Incorporate the use of technology in the preparation of instructional materials	4.01 (.97)	High Level	4.00 (1.02)	High Level
Explore a variety of teaching strategies for better and more effective teaching of Health and Physical Education	4.10 (.97)	High Level	4.11 (.100)	High Level
Utilize management principles in organizing and implementing Health and Physical Education programs and activities.	4.05 (.97)	High Level	4.06 (1.00)	High Level
Update Health and Physical Education Program with the current trends to address issues and problems related to the field or discipline.	4.05 (1.02)	High Level	4.14 (.93)	High Level
Conduct a research study that generates a new body of knowledge for Health, Physical Education, and Sports.	4.00 (1.11)	High Level	4.11 (.98)	High Level
Update knowledge on the latest trends and approaches in Health and Physical Education, physical activity, fitness, and sports to develop lifelong skills.	4.05 (1.02)	High Level	4.11 (.94)	High Level
Conduct extracurricular activities are utilizing the theories and principles of sports management and organization.	4.06 (.96)	High Level	4.09 (.96)	High Level
Perform an effective leadership role in health and physical education instruction, management, and extension services.	4.01 (.99)	High Level	4.05 (1.06)	High Level
Use theories and principles of sports management to analyze the program's impact on student development.	4.05 (.93)	High Level	4.10 (.95)	High Level
Use theories and principles in reviewing, designing, or developing a desired extracurricular program to attain Health and Physical Education objectives.	4.07 (.94)	High Level	4.07 (1.02)	High Level
Use extracurricular activities in balancing the physical, mental, social, mental, and spiritual development of students.	4.16 (.97)	High Level	4.14 (.99)	High Level
Experts manage and plan extracurricular activities in sports, physical activity, fitness, and recreation.	4.25 (.88)	High Level	4.24 (.87)	High Level
Facilities and equipment are updated, maintained, and well-managed by the university and HPEP Department.	4.21 (.91)	High Level	4.23 (.93)	High Level
The extracurricular activity program is updated and kept abreast of the current trends, issues, and trajectories related to the discipline.	4.12 (.93)	High Level	4.12 (.94)	High Level
Extracurricular activities contribute to students' transition from PYP to the UYP program.	4.16 (.98)	High Level	4.14 (.96)	High Level
Extracurricular activities offer a variety of programs and activities that foster students' holistic growth and development.	4.16 (.94)	High Level	4.19 (.92)	High Level
Extracurricular activities help promote balance and a healthy lifestyle for students, faculty, and staff.	4.21 (.95)	High Level	4.27 (.86)	High Level

**Table 5.** Perceived Levels of Satisfaction, Adequacy, and Relevance of Health and Physical Education Program

Criteria of the Evaluation	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Level of Satisfaction on Educational Services	4.12	0.96	High Level
Level of Satisfaction on Learning Environment/ Climate	4.26	0.88	High Level
Level of Satisfaction on Facilities	4.19	0.92	High Level
Level of Adequacy on Skills Learned	3.80	1.16	High Level
Level of Adequacy of the HPEP	4.08	0.08	High Level
Level of Relevance of the HPEP	4.11	0.07	High Level

### 3.1.4. Overall perceived levels of satisfaction, adequacy, and relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program

Table 5 summarizes the PSU alumni's satisfaction from the HPEP. The data revealed that alumni had a high level of satisfaction, adequacy, and relevance on the set of criteria

employed in this study. More specially, they have a high level of satisfaction on the "Learning Environment/ Climate" with a mean value of 4.26 ( $SD = 0.88$ ). While the level of adequacy on the skills learned had a high level of interpretation, it had the lowest mean value of 3.80 ( $SD = 1.16$ ) among the data.

### 3.2. Interview Data Results

#### 3.2.1. General Themes

Table 6 illustrates the general themes generated from the interview transcripts of the faculty members. Some areas of concerns have been underscored, namely educational services, research, content knowledge, activities, and maintenance of HPEP facilities.

**Table 6.** General Themes from the Faculty Members' Perceived Satisfaction

Themes	Descriptions
Theme 1: Consistency for better educational services	Deals with issues on consistency as a loophole for better education services
Theme 2: Improving research culture	Pertain to issues on learning environment of Health and Physical Education (HPEP)
Theme 3: Content knowledge but teach beyond books	
Theme 4: Health and fitness agenda through activities	Refer to HPEP activities in promoting a healthy body and mind
Theme 5: Consistency in maintenance	Refers to the participants' suggestion on ensuring quality experience on facilities through consistent maintenance

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Satisfaction Level on Health and Physical Education Program Educational Services, Learning Environment, and Facilities

#### 4.1.1. Educational services

Among the nine (9) aspects/ areas of the HPEP educational services, the student support, faculty assistance, and extracurricular activities received the high means. Only the research mentoring had the lowest mean values among the datasets. However, the nine aspects received a no less than 4.09 mean rating, suggesting that alumni should have a high level of satisfaction in these areas during their stay at the university. Further interpretation revealed that alumni were highly satisfied with them since they could experience the services, as satisficing theory explains. The research mentoring low rating boils down to the infrequent experience of the alumni with it. Existing research findings revealed that there had been less attention to mentoring in HPEP [14, 15, 16], more specifically, in research. Faculty members are much concerned with the idea of mentoring of the physical and tangible. Bywater [17] found that almost all HPEP mentors reported much interest in mentoring mentees in gymnastics and dance. The present low data on research mentoring suggests the need to intensify this service/ program and make it more visible/

available to students.

#### 4.1.2. Learning environment

The highest score on promoting positive peer relationships in HPEP affirmed the earlier findings of Felfe, Lechner, and Steinmayr [10] that physical activities in HPEP could foster students' participation and positive peer relation. However, this finding contradicts what Reimers (2020) found that HPEP could increase bullying among boys. Regarding the lowest mean of creativity in teaching in the HPEP, this finding contrasts with what Pickard and Maude [18] promoted. They said researchers advised against not being creative in HPEP since they found students were likely to learn due to their direct involvement in an active, innovative, and engaging manner. All low values may be considered a wake-up call to revisit these aspects and provide varied creative and authentic instructional deliveries that afford more meaningful teaching-learning discourse in the HPEP. On the other hand, all high values may indicate a strong sense of contentment as perceived by the respondents. These results generally suggest that the university provide a student-friendly learning atmosphere.

#### 4.1.3 Facilities for Health and Physical Education Program

The high ratings for the physical facilities supported the call for making fields and gym space available for students in the HPEP [8]. Conversely, the lowest rating was received by the HPEP clinic, with a mean of 4.09 ( $SD=.98$ ). This low finding must be a call to revisit this aspect since the quality service denotes a quality Health and Physical Education Program. Le Masurier and Corbin [19] discussed ten (10) measures for quality HPEP programs. Among the measures, clinics' presence and quality service are more necessary since students are engaged in physical activities where health-related measures are always in place. These results suggest the need to improve and update these facilities to provide a more favorable physical environment that may promote more engaging and meaningful academic services.

### 4.2. Level of Adequacy on Skills Learned from the Health and Physical Education Program

The values for the level of adequacy imply the significant capacity provided by the HPE to teach and develop students' skills. Human relations skill is relatively new since the HPEP is more concerned about health, fitness, and sports. The supplementary online activities that the program extended to its students may affect the information and communication technology satisfaction ratings. However, human relation is not a surprising finding since it supports the earlier results of this research regarding the positive peer relations in the HPEP classes. Both findings suggested that PSU afford academic experiences for students to enhance these skills. These skills are highly relevant in the actual and modern

employment environment, where digital and kinship competencies are considered critical components for higher productivity and quality services.

This lowest rating on research skills supported the early result that students found less satisfaction from the research mentoring in the HPEP. While it may have been valid to think that research seems not the core of HPEP, research remains necessary for personal, curricular, and policy barriers to ensure a quality and successful HPEP [8]. The finding implies the need for the university to provide students with more research mentoring or advising sessions. It is also significant for the students to acquire these skills due to the fast changes and high demands in the professional landscape. It is essential in conceptualizing and implementing innovative programs and interventions in actual professional scenarios.

#### 4.3. Level of Adequacy and Relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program

The highest values denote the strong perception of the respondents in describing the capacity and significance of the offerings of the HPEP.

The high level of adequacy and relevance of the HPEP indicate the high degree of sufficiency and importance as recognized by the respondents. These statements *“Extracurricular activities are managed and plan by experts in the field of sports, physical activity, and recreation,” “Facilities and equipment are updated, maintained, and well-management by the university and HPEP Department,”* and *“Extracurricular activities help in the promotion of balance and a healthy lifestyle for students, faculty and staff”* emphasized how students acknowledge the expertise of the HPEP faculty members in planning and implementing extracurricular activities that promote a healthy lifestyle among different stakeholders of the university. The respondents also recognized how the HPEP Department properly maintains the facilities often utilized for academic and extracurricular programs. These results imply that the HPEP educational program and extracurricular activities support the holistic development of the students and the other members and affiliates of the university. These results also support the findings presented in Table 2 (facilities).

On the other hand, the statements with the lowest mean values in terms of adequacy of the HPEP suggest that respondents perceived that there is a need for “knowledge transfer” on the theories and principles in assessing physical activities, fitness, and sports performances, as well as in promoting and capitalizing on varying levels of research undertaking in the field of health, physical education and sports. Similarly, the statements *“Use theories and principles in reviewing, designing, or developing a desired curriculum for Health and Physical Education”* and *“Incorporate the use of technology in the preparation of instructional materials”* had the lowest mean values in terms of the relevance of the HPEP,

denoting the need for the university to undertake curriculum evaluation and refinement. The refinement may involve curriculum quality auditing processes. In addition, the respondents’ views also suggest the need for technology integration, especially in the current situation of distance learning and online instruction attributed to the Covid-19 pandemic. These results support the findings presented in Table 2 (learning environment/ climate).

#### 4.4. Overall Perceived Levels of Satisfaction, Adequacy, and Relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program

The results for the overall perceived satisfaction levels, adequacy, and relevance of the Health and Physical Education Program garnered a high level of satisfaction. While the lowest mean for the level of adequacy on the skills learned suggests the need to ensure that the co-curricular activities that would improve students’ essential skills to become more prepared for the actual professional status are enough.

#### 4.5. Interview Data Results

Theme 1: Consistency for better educational services

The interview participants have shared the need for a sense of “consistency,” particularly on some aspects of educational services (Fac. 1). While they think that the HPEP has offered a wide range of educational services, they call for steady and coherent management and offers. Fac. 6 stated that “research mentoring should have been one of the best practices since faculty members are doctoral degree holders whose research experiences are impeccable.” However, the faculty members for the HPEP have the slightest attention to research mentoring because, as observed, “research appears not the core of the discipline” (Fac. 3). Fac. 4 shared that the HPEP has a generous effort to provide this for students regarding student support. However, there remains a need for a more “structured assistance program with a specific schedule for those who have issues on their academic” (Fac. 4). For Fac. 1, the Physiotherapy support is “just okay,” indicating that there is still space to improve the support delivery. On the other hand, several interview participants have hailed the faculty assistance service, dubbing it as “a practice that should be retained” (Fac. 1, 2, 8, and 10). As stakeholders experienced assistance whenever they needed the HPEP facilities or equipment for the extracurricular activities, a faculty member commented that the assistance “was very much alive to provide opportunities for the faculty members and students for their professional growth in an academic and extracurricular program” (Fac. 2). Though these activities are likewise perceived benefits for students, faculty members demanded consistency of delivery to ensure a “holistic impact on students, especially that health is the priority of the PSU community” (Fac. 5).

### Theme 2: Improving research culture

The slightest attention that the HPEP gave to research skills seems another concern among the participants. However, in response to this concern, another faculty-participant stated that the “HPEP acknowledges the importance of research, but it is not the core competency to develop among students” (Fac. 10). It is understood that the majority of the participants knew the need for improving the research culture in the HPEP since they believed “it is a necessity for any graduate” (Fac. 3, 6, 7). While it is not the core competency, Fac. 8 argued that “it should not be taken for granted and not considered.” Fac. 1 seconded Fac. 8 statement, affirming the need for research skills since many faculty members required students to conduct their research-based or research-informed assignments. The research mentoring, for example, can be improved if the HPEP has an “improved research culture among its members” (Fac. 8 and 9).

### Theme 3: Content knowledge but teach beyond books

When asked about the learning students could acquire from the program, Fac. 5 shared that since the HPEP has updated academic offerings and certified teachers with good academic standing, the students learned well and enjoyed their learning experience. The content knowledge about health and physical education is very much observed because students were “provided with equal opportunities to grow, learn and value health and physical education to achieve their goals” (Fac. 2). While mastering content knowledge was an exemplary aspect of the program, the participants also reiterated the need to go beyond the books, especially now that knowledge evolves in seconds. Acknowledging the reasons behind the excellent content knowledge that the HPEP provides boils down to the faculty members who reached the highest level of their academic attainment. In addition, the HPEP follows the “academic quality and standards required by the university quality assurance and National Commission in Academic Assessment and Accreditation in Saudi Arabia” (Fac. 2).

### Theme 4: Health and fitness agenda through activities

The participants shared affirmative responses towards their experiences of the health and physical activities that HPEP offered and conducted. Fac. 1 stated that “we all enjoyed and benefitted from the various sports and recreational facilities for health, fitness, and wellness program and activities.” Supporting this statement, Fac. 3 shared that “we acquired health and fitness information due to various activities, thus becoming more conscious about our health.” Fac. 5 specified that “the short activity like the 30-minute to 1 hour of moderate to vigorous physical activity for students, faculty, and staff during lunch break” was one good program. However, it needed consistent management and implementation. He further noted a need to ensure the continuation of these activities since he observed that “there was no after-school program where students could still be active or be encouraged to be

healthy.” Linking to how university stakeholders experienced the program, Fac. 2 confirmed that both faculty and students experienced all the “facilities and equipment like basketball, volleyball, tennis, table tennis, soccer and squash courts in excellent or good conditions.” The faculty commended the HPEP health and fitness agenda through the activities and due to the facilities.

### Theme 5: Consistency in maintenance

While the facilities and equipment are “free of use” (Fac. 1), there is still a need for “consistent maintenance” (Fac. 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8). They are not even much comparable to other equipment of “known private fitness and recreational sports club such as fitness time, body masters, golds gym and fitness first” (Fac. 1). Still, they function at their best as the university “consistently and regularly maintain them” (Fac. 8 and 10).

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The responses on the satisfaction on educational services, both survey and interview data, shared favorable evaluation results. However, the interview data have underscored the need for consistency in implementing and managing these services. The survey and interview data results have identified a need to reinforce the research mentoring through a positive research culture among members of the HPEP and the PSU in general. The participants highly commended the learning environment, among other aspects of the HPEP, since they significantly experienced how the program nurtured them with positive values and situated them at the center of the teaching and learning process. HPEP promoted positive peer relations and content knowledge. However, the survey found a need to improve other essential skills for the students to be more prepared for the actual professional status. Concerning the adequacy and relevance of the HPEP in general, both data results are determined by significant high-level results. While the results are positive, there should be consistency in offering the services, maintaining the facilities and equipment, and deepening values and transferable skills, namely discipline, giving importance to health, volunteerism, sociability, team player, and good habits. All these results imply that while the HPEP is a good program, some aspects require special attention, and there is still space for improvement. The program’s presence heavily informed the participants’ satisfaction based on the satisficing theory. While it is good enough for them, alumni and faculty still feel the need to improve the program for the real-world application of learned skills.

## Compliance with Ethical Standards

### Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

### Ethical Approval

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants followed the ethical standards of the institutional research committee of Prince Sultan University and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

### Acknowledgments

I am highly indebted to Prince Sultan University for funding this study.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Darla C, J. E. Rink, "A comparison of high and low-performing secondary physical education programs," *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, vol. 22, no. 5, p. 512, 2003. [https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=pedu\\_facpub](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=pedu_facpub)
- [2] Ang C, Robert M, Haichun S, E. Catherine, "Is in-class physical activity at risk in constructivist physical education," *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 500–509, 2007. DOI: 10.1080/02701367.2007.10599449
- [3] David D, B. Craig, "The status of high school online physical education in the United States," *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 86–100, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.31.1.86>
- [4] James S, M. Thomas, "Physical education's role in public health," *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 124–137, 1991. DOI: 10.1080/02701367.1991.10608701
- [5] Allyson W, Glenn H, Karen G, Laura M, H. Carolyn, "Merging social and emotional learning with comprehensive school physical activity programming in an elementary school," *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp. 36–40, 2020. DOI: 10.1080/07303084.2020.1768180
- [6] Timothy L, S. Gregory, "Physical education, health, and physical education, physical literacy, and health literacy: Global nomenclature confusion," *Cogent Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2016. DOI: 10.1080/2331186x.2016.1217820
- [7] Michelle K, Jenna L, N. Francis, "An analysis of Canadian physical education curricula," *European Physical Education Review*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 23–46, 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1356336X15586909>
- [8] Harold K, C. Heather, "Educating the student body: Taking physical activity and physical education to school. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18314>.
- [9] Michael K, Michael L, R., Amme, "For better or worse? The effects of physical education on child development," *Labour Economics*, vol. 67, no. 101904, pp. 1–95, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2020.101904>
- [10] Christina F, Michael L, S. Andreas, "Sports and child development," vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 1–23, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151729>
- [11] Herbert S, "Rational choice and the structure of the environment," *Psychological Review*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 129–138, 1956. DOI: 10.1037/h0042769
- [12] Eunsook K, L. Willis, "Descriptive Research and Qualitative Research." In: *Introduction to Nutrition and Health Research*, pp. 219–248, 2000. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1401-5\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1401-5_12)
- [13] Md Inaam A, "Research Design," *Research in Social Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 70–84, 2016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2862445>
- [14] Susan K, O. Virginia, "Scholarly productivity as a function of graduate training, workplace, and gender," *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–21, 1996. DOI: 10.1123/wspaj.4.2.1
- [15] Hallie S, Rashelle K, L. Rose, "Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities," *College Teaching*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 21–24, 2004. DOI: 10.3200/ctch.52.1.21-24
- [16] Stephen S, "The role of teaching in the preparation of future faculty," *Quest*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 72–81, 2003. DOI: 10.1080/00336297.2003.10491790
- [17] Amy B, "The effectiveness of mentoring in physical education and school sport; within one Welsh school sport partnership," *Doctoral dissertation, University of Wales Institute Cardiff, Cardiff, United Kingdom, 2011. <https://repository.cardiffmet.ac.uk/handle/10369/3621>*
- [18] Angela P, M. Patricia, "Teaching physical education creatively," 2nd ed, Routledge, 2021.
- [19] Guy M, C. Charles, "Top 10 reasons for quality physical education," *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 44–53, 2013. DOI: 10.1080/07303084.2006.10597894
- [20] Kurkova, P, Nanci S, J. Stelzer, "Health and physical education as an important part of school curricula: A comparison of schools for the deaf in the Czech Republic and the United States," *American Annals of the Deaf*, vol. 155, no. 1, pp. 78–95, 2010. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26235019>.
- [21] Frankenfield, K., "Satisficing," Investopedia, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/satisficing.asp> (accessed February 18, 2022).