

# Review of: "Assessment of Learner Satisfaction in Secondary School Education"

Andrea Manfrin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Central Lancashire

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

**Peer review** (29.07.2023)

**General comments:** Dear Editor and Authors, thank you for allowing me to review this interesting article titled *Assessment of Learner Satisfaction in Secondary School Education*

I summarised my comments in the following points:

- 1) Add references to support statements; otherwise, they could appear unsubstantiated;
- 2) The method section requires further clarification; data analysis requires clarifications, e.g. the assumption is the normality of data, please revise and justify this approach;
- 3) The result section includes information that should be moved to the method section (e.g. the use of regression analysis etc);
- 4) The paper needs a clear structure. It would be better, for example, to follow the STROBE guidelines even if this is not an epidemiology study; this will strengthen the paper.

A detailed summary is attached below

Section and page	Reviewer comments	Authors reply
Title	Clear	
ABSTRACT		
Background	Clear	
Aim	Clear	
Method	A mix of stratified random sampling was used to determine 303 respondents.  How was the sample calculated?	
Results	Overall learner satisfaction was 4.08 (1.147),  showing learners were generally satisfied with teaching and learning.	

	This statement needs to be clarified: what were the score boundaries, e.g. 1-5?	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Clear	
<b>Protocol registration</b>	NA	
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>According to a review of the literature, no study has been done to assess the level of learner satisfaction with teaching and learning in public secondary schools in Kenya.</p> <p>This appears to be an unsubstantiated statement. The authors should provide a more robust statement such as a literature review conducted by the authors including the last 20 using the following inclusion criteria X &amp; Y did not identify .....</p>	
<b>Research questions</b>	Need to be provided. Please consider including the key research questions	
<b>Aim and objectives</b>	Clear	
<b>Material and methods</b>		
<b>Research instrument</b>	<p>Conceptual framework.</p> <p>Please revise this section because as it stands, there are several unsubstantiated statements.</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>How did you develop the semi-questionnaire?</p> <p>Did you assess face validity?</p>	
<b>Sample size</b>	<p>Did you implement the questionnaire after piloting?</p> <p>If the answers are no to the above questions, please justify.</p>	
<b>Stratification</b>	<p>Please provide details supporting the sample calculation, e.g. mean, d, alpha, beta, etc.</p> <p>Please provide the number of strata and their characteristics</p>	
<b>Statistics</b>	<p>An Independent sample t-test was used to compare the means.</p> <p>This assumes that the data was normally distributed.</p>	

<b>Learning</b>	Did the author assess for normality?	
	Learning was not defined, and the score was not clearly explained	
	Academic achievement should be defined, and the score should be clearly explained.	
	The academic grade: range, please	
	Is B better than C? Please provide the information	
<b>Academic achievement</b>	These are two critical variables which require careful consideration.	
	Should be introduced in the method sections	
<b>Likert scale questions</b>	The coefficient of determination needs to be provided, please review and amend it.	
	I suggest adding a figure with the line clearly showing the influence of X on Y.	
<b>Regression analysis</b>		
	This section follows the results of the regression analysis.	
	Consider moving this section into the background/introduction and bringing some concepts of this section into the discussion.	
<b>Learner satisfaction and its influence on academic achievement</b>	Clear	
<b>Discussion</b>		
<b>Missing parts</b>	Inclusion and exclusion criteria	
	Strengths and limitations	