

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

Zeynep ÇiĞdem özcan<sup>1</sup>

1 Istanbul Medeniyet University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for allowing me to review the manuscript entitled, "Assessment of Learner Satisfaction in Secondary School Education". As mentioned in the literature part in the paper the importance of learner satisfaction has been the focus of decades of research and there is a wealth of knowledge on this topic. Although it is a very interesting and important subject, there are some factors that will prevent the article from being a scientific publication. Some of these factors are represented below.

**Title:** The title doesn't represent the research.

**Introduction:** I couldn't understand what the contribution of this research to the literature was. The literature review is not enough. "What gap does this research fill in the literature?" is not clear.

**Method:** I think that the research is quantitative in stead of qualitative as stated in in research design part ("The research adopted a qualitative correlational research design, were data from focus group discussion and semi- structured questionnaires were used to collect views from learners.")

*Instruments:* The most problematics part of this study is about instruments. Instruments that were used in this study are not clearly explained. There is no information about validity and reliability studies about these instruments.

How focused group discussions were done to identify areas of commonality with respect to satisfaction is not clear.

## **Findings**

Although *t* test and regression analysis were conducted in the study there is no information about the assumptions of these test. In addition, the results of these test were not properly stated. For example, in regression analysis the total variance explained by independent variable on dependent variable is important. Whereas there is not information about it.

In the light of these suggestions, I believe that the article should be corrected and re-evaluated.