

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

Vanja Erčulj<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Maribor

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

Dear Authors,

Bellow are some recommendations how to improve your paper. I hope you will find them useful.

## *Research design*

The research adopted a qualitative correlational research design. According to the description of the research design this is a mixed method research design with quantitative phase conducted first and afterwards followed by a qualitative phase (look for example a book from Creswell & Creswell, 2018 Research design 5<sup>th</sup> Edition).

I would like to see a bit more description of the stratified sampling.

## *Procedures*

What is a semi – questionnaire? Do the authors mean semi-structured questionnaire?

Were all the children included also in the qualitative phase – focus group discussions?

How was the questionnaire constructed? Was it adopted from some other research? Has the questionnaire's validity been tested? Is the questionnaire indeed unidimensional? Cronbach's alfa should be calculated on a unidimensional scales.

Some of the items are comprised of two statements in one (regarding the library for example).

## *Data analysis*

Was normality of distribution per group tested – otherwise Mann-Whitney U test would be better? How were low and high satisfaction groups formed? Based on a single question or scale score? In the Introduction the researchers state that also gender has an important role in study performance. I would recommend doing multiple linear regression analysis, including also gender as a control variable in the analysis. Did the authors corrected p-values for multiple testing. What was a significance level at which they performed their statistical analysis – should be stated.

## *Results*

Table 2 – explanation of abbreviations HSG, LSG, MD.

The researchers compute overall satisfaction score – not stated in the Method description. It should be checked whether

all the items indeed measure customer satisfaction. The same applies to the level of importance. Fig 1 – it would be clearer to show frequencies and percentages of very important and Important responses OR a dot plot or box plot with original answers.

Quadrant analysis should be explained also in Data analysis section. Some kind of a perception mapping would be better here or PCA with both importance and satisfaction.

I miss the results obtained by the focus groups.

The chapter: *Learner satisfaction and its influence on academic achievement* would be better suited in the Introduction or Literature Review section before the method description.

### *Discussion*

I recommend showing standard deviations beside the means. Poor rating of libraries really shows learner's are not aware of the usefulness of the library? The question is whether the libraries are indeed poorly equipped or it is true what the authors' state – learners are not aware of the usefulness of the library.

Minor:

Reference in the Introduction (Rajabalee & Santally, 2021; Virtanen et al., (2017).

The phrase: Filled **in** the questionnaire

"Once the learners had filled the questionnaires, focused group discussions were done to identify areas of commonality with respect to satisfaction." I believe it is correct: Focus group discussions were done.

The last sentence in Data analysis section - grammatical error.

I believe showing the data with 2 decimal places would be better, not giving a reader a notion that the data is very prices – as it is not.