

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

Maite Zubillaga-Olague¹

¹ Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

First of all, I would like to congratulate you on the development of the research and the contribution made to the research community with the results obtained in this study. After reviewing the manuscript, here are some suggestions for improvement and some aspects to be taken into account for future research. The review is presented following the structure of the sections presented in the study:

Abstract

On the positive side, the abstract follows the IMRD structure (Introduction, proposal or objectives, methodology, results and discussion). Regarding the methodology, it is not understood what is meant by a stratified random sampling mixture. Regarding the participants, when reference is made to the 87 participants who are 18 years old, the 87 should be removed, as it is already indicated with the % presented in parentheses, the same happens with the grade. In this aspect, it should be detailed with greater precision aspects related to the participants, indicating the number of participants, number of participants according to academic level, etc., depending on what is intended to be analyzed in the study. More details should be provided on the methodology (type of methodology used to carry out the study, instrument used to collect information). The most relevant results of the research should be presented.

Introduction

The literature review is scarce. The issues of the study are not clearly described. The authors have not been able to state the need and importance of carrying out the study and why it is relevant to develop this research for the community or the context studied. Likewise, the theory that supports the problem investigated is poorly presented. It is recommended that the authors analyze and present more information on the importance of student satisfaction as a key element for the development of effective learning. The introduction should be written in a logical and deductive order, from the general to the particular. It is recommended that the authors should present the issues of the study in the general educational context and then elaborate specifically on how these issues affect their particular context in Kenyan schools. Results from previous articles and previous research on this topic should also be included in order to contextualize the study and present the relevance of the study. The objectives should be linked to this need and presented as a consequence of it.

The objectives are not clearly formulated. It is recommended that the objectives be formulated more precisely, using

numerical formulas for this purpose. This makes them easier to follow and the reader can relate the sub-objectives to the main objective. The following proposal is made:

The general objective of this research is to analyze whether the satisfaction about the teaching-learning process perceived by students influences their academic performance. To address this objective, three specific objectives are proposed: (i) To identify the level of satisfaction of secondary school students in Kisumu with the different aspects of the teaching-learning process in their classrooms; (ii) To analyze the relationship between the level of student satisfaction with the teaching-learning process and the academic performance of secondary school students in Kisumu East County.

Methodology

The research design used is not clear. What does "structured questionnaire" mean (semi-structured questionnaire? open-ended? closed-ended?)? A qualitative research design is proposed, however, the instruments and analyses carried out correspond to a quantitative research design. In addition, reference is made to focus groups as a method of collecting information; however, no information on the procedure and information collected from these focus groups appears later on.

The aspects related to the specific locations where the schools are located do not provide relevant information for the study; the data could be omitted.

It is recommended that more precise information be provided on the characteristics of the study participants (number of participants by educational level, average age of participants, subjects taken, etc.). It is recommended that this information be collected and presented in a table.

The procedure for the development of the research is poorly written. There is no information on the instruments used to collect information. If a questionnaire was used, what kind of questionnaire is it; how many items does it have; what aspects does it analyze; etc. Likewise, there is no information on how the questionnaire was distributed (online or in person, etc.) and how the information was collected. The discussion groups are mentioned again, but there is no information about them (how they were formed, what was discussed in them, who participated, etc.).

Regarding data analysis, it is not clear what type of analysis tests were used to analyze the study data (were parametric tests such as the Student's t-test or anova?, Or, nonparametric tests such as the Manwhitney U-test or the Kursal Wallis H-test). These should be specified. Similarly, in this section the authors refer to a group comparison between students with higher and lower satisfaction. This is not in accordance with the objectives previously stated; previously, at any moment it has not been specified or stated that these differences are going to be analyzed. In this sense, it is recommended to the authors to review the objectives, as they should be in accordance with the results presented.

The information reported in the "investigator's role" section should be included in the procedure section.

Results

It is recommended that the tables be revised. The results section should be followed by an introduction to the table,

highlighting the most relevant and significant results of the study. The first table presented (Table 1. Demographic information) should be included in the methodology section as it collects information on the study participants, not on the results per se. On the other hand, it is recommended that the authors present the information related to the age of the participants grouped by ranges or by academic year. The same in case related to qualifications.

Table 2 only gathers descriptive characteristics for each variable. However, it does not provide information on the difference between the two groups studied (which is what is aimed to be studied according to the authors of the study). In the table the authors indicate the mean and standard deviation of each variable for each group studied, but there is no information on if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups or not. The table includes a column relating the statistical significance applied ($p < .001$). It is recommended that the authors eliminate this column and include this information with an * and a sentence at the end of the table (e.g., * the statistical significance applied to the study was $p < .001$).

The graphic used does not report relevant information for the study, it also includes 22 questions (Q1-Q22), what do these questions refer to?, are they the same items presented in the previous table?, because if so, the number of questions does not coincide, being 23 in the first case and 22 in the second. On the other hand, if the objective is the comparison between groups, this cannot be presented in the form of a graphic, the information that determines whether there are differences or not is missing, the graphic only provides descriptive information, not comparative. In addition, it is recommended that the authors use the same method of presentation of results or table or graphic, which facilitates the interpretation of results for the reader.

Regarding the regression analysis, it is recommended that it be more precisely detailed and related to the table previously presented. It is not clear what the results are trying to show or what they refer to.

The authors do not indicate any aspect related to the discussion groups and the results obtained through them.

Discussion and conclusions

It is recommended that the authors write the discussion following the order of the research objectives. It is recommended to present the results as a % or to include the standard deviation next to the means. Likewise, the results obtained should be discussed in more detail with those of previous studies.

Regarding the conclusions, it is recommended that the authors mention the benefits and limitations of the studies and the prospective and future lines of research.

Bibliographic references

It is recommended that the authors review some of the references and adapt them to the APA Standards 7th Edition. Many of the references cited are missing the number, pages, DOI, etc.