

TÖMER Student Satisfaction Survey

Evaluation of Findings and Recommendations for Institutional Development

Purpose and Results of the Study

This report was prepared to present student evaluations regarding language teaching activities, instructor performance, administrative services, and social amenities, and to identify priorities for institutional improvement. The study includes responses from 29 participants.

The findings indicate that students generally evaluated their educational experience positively. The instructors' communication skills, constructive attitude, and classroom management are notable strengths. Institutional communication, physical conditions, and the development of language skills-focused activities are priority areas for improvement.

Key indicator	
Overall satisfaction and recommendation item	4.61 / 5; 28 valid responses
Respondents who answered positively to this item	24 people; 85.7%
Highest field average	Instructor rating: 4.49 / 5
Lowest item average	Website and announcements: 3.89 / 5
Priority in data verification	Survey No. 13 is largely incomplete

When reviewing the results

Since zero codes fall outside the 1–5 response scale, they were not included in the score calculations. Whether the zeros represent blank responses or data entry errors must be verified using the original forms. Attention control items and theme codes for open-ended responses were not included in the satisfaction scores.

The report presents, in order, data and methods, participant profile, quantitative findings, qualitative findings, data quality, recommendations for improvement, and the results for all items.

Data Sources and Calculation Method

Items Included in the Scoring

Of the 30 items from M1 to M30, M11 and M19 are attention control items. When these two items are excluded, 28 satisfaction items remain. M31 is the categorical code for open-ended responses and is not a numerical scale score.

Valid item responses are the values 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. A positive response is defined as 4 or 5, an undecided response as 3, and a negative response as 1 or 2. The percentage of positive responses was calculated by dividing the sum of responses 4 and 5 for the relevant item by the number of people who provided valid responses to that item.

Field Averages

Program area: M1–M8; language skills: M9, M10, M12, and M13; instructional area: M14–M18 and M20–M24; administrative services, physical facilities, and social activities: M25–M29. Item M30 in the fourth group of the survey was separated from this domain average to present the overall evaluation separately.

First, the average of valid responses for each participant in the relevant domain was calculated, followed by the arithmetic mean of these individual averages. To calculate a domain score, the condition that at least

80% of the items in that area must have received valid responses. This is an analytical criterion selected for this report; it is not the scale’s validated scoring standard. The requirement of 28 participants was met for each area.

Scope of the Interpretation

The results are descriptive in nature. The validity and reliability of the domains were not tested in this report, and no significance tests were conducted between groups. Mean differences should not be interpreted as statistically proven differences or causal relationships.

Participant Profile and Representativeness

Variable	Category	Number	Percentage
Language proficiency level	C1	22	75.9%
Language proficiency level	B2	6	20.7%
Language proficiency level	Code 0	1	3.4%
Gender	Male	16	55.2%
Gender	Female	13	44.8%
Age	18–25	28	96.6%
Age	26–30	1	3.4%
Education	High school	26	89.7%
Education	Bachelor's Degree	3	10.3%

The denominator for these percentages is 29 participants. The space at the end of the “High School” entry in the education field was removed during analysis, and this entry was counted together with the high school category. The value 0 in the language proficiency field is not a valid course category.

Distribution by Country

Kazakhstan: 14 people (48.3%), Azerbaijan: 6 people (20.7%), Afghanistan and Mali: 2 people each (6.9%), and Indonesia, Palestine, Iran, Uzbekistan, and the “Ahiska Turks” category: 1 person each (3.4%). The Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan categories together account for 69.0% of the group.

Since “Ahiska Turk” is not a category of the same type as a country name, the classification of the country variable is inconsistent. While preserving the source response, the country and identity information should be organized as separate variables if necessary.

Who Do the Findings Represent?

The study primarily reflects the experiences of students aged 18–25 who are high school graduates and at the C1 level. Since there were no participants at the A1, A2, or B1 levels, no conclusions can be drawn regarding the satisfaction of beginner and intermediate-level students.

The age and education groups are highly unbalanced. There are only 6 participants in the B2 language proficiency group. Therefore, numerical differences observed between groups should be handled with caution; in particular, no generalizations should be made about single-person or very small subgroups.

Since the total number of students, the number of people invited, and the sampling method are unknown, the participation rate and representativeness cannot be calculated. The results apply primarily to the students who responded.

Detailed Analysis of Quantitative Findings

Evaluation Area	Number of Participants	Average
Instructor Evaluation	28	4.49
Program, materials, and scheduling	28	4.27
Administrative services, physical and social facilities	28	4.23
Language skills development activities	28	4.09

Instructor Evaluation

The instructor received the highest evaluation, with an average score of 4.49. For the item on classroom management and effective communication (M21), the average score was 4.71, with a positive response rate of 92.9%. The instructor’s constructive attitude (M17) and effective use of class time (M24) both had an average of 4.61. These results indicate that students found the instructor’s approach and class management to be strong.

The average for the “motivation and engagement” item (M16) was 4.33, and the average for the “regular feedback” item (M20) was 4.39. These items were also evaluated positively; however, initiatives to

could be enhanced through initiatives that increase student participation and the implementation of personalized feedback. High satisfaction, on its own, is not proof of objective learning success.

Program and Materials

The average for the “Program” category is 4.27. The reinforcing effect of in-class activities and homework stands out in Item M8 with a score of 4.57. Daily lesson planning scored 4.37 in Item M3, and the total course duration scored 4.28 in Item M2. Students generally evaluate the organization of the classes and the benefits of practical exercises positively.

The average score for textbook exercises (M6) is 4.07. This result does not indicate inadequacy; however, the higher ratings for practical exercises and homework suggest that supplementing textbook exercises with additional activities tailored to student needs could be beneficial.

Activities Focused on Language Skills

Speaking activities have an average of 4.04; writing, 4.07; listening, 4.11; and reading and vocabulary activities, 4.14. The differences between the skills are small. The positive response rate for speaking activities is 75.0%. Pair work, small-group tasks, and lesson arrangements that provide every student with an opportunity to speak can be considered.

These items reflect perceptions of classroom activities rather than measured progress in skills. To evaluate learning outcomes, performance at the beginning and end of each course must be compared using appropriate criteria.

Institutional Services and Overall Satisfaction

Institutional Communication

Regarding the website and announcements, M25 has the lowest item average at 3.89. Of the 27 valid responses, 20 were positive (74.1%), 4 were undecided (14.8%), and 3 were negative (11.1%). This distribution indicates a need for improvement regarding the timeliness, clarity, and accessibility of information to students.

Since M25 evaluates multiple characteristics together, the source of the problem cannot be directly identified. The timeliness, accessibility, and comprehensibility of announcements can be examined through separate short questions.

Physical Conditions and Administrative Approach

The average score for M28 regarding physical conditions is 4.04, with a positive response rate of 71.4%. Of the 28 respondents, 4 were undecided and 4 expressed negative opinions. Since lighting, cleanliness, temperature, classroom size, and technological equipment are all included in the same item, each category should be evaluated separately.

The solution-oriented and courteous approach of administrative staff received an average score of 4.50 on M27, while information regarding registration and documentation received an average score of 4.37 on M26. This suggests that the relationship established with staff was evaluated more positively than that conveyed through institutional communication channels. The significance of these differences has not been tested.

Social and Cultural Activities

In M29, the contribution of activities to language practice and adaptation was positively evaluated with an average score of 4.36. Of the 28 respondents who provided valid responses, 24 (85.7%) expressed positive opinions. Reports of inadequacies observed in open-ended comments necessitate a separate evaluation of the benefits of the activities versus their number or variety.

Overall Satisfaction and Recommendation

M30 Response	Number	Percentage of Valid Responses
Strongly Agree	23	82.1%
I agree	1	3.6%
Undecided	3	10.7%
I disagree	0	0.0%
I strongly disagree	1	3.6%

The M30 average is 4.61; the positive response rate is 85.7%. One record with a zero code was excluded. In addition to the high overall satisfaction, one student's clearly negative evaluation and three students' indecision should also be taken into account. Since item two contains two judgments, satisfaction and the willingness to recommend are not considered to have been measured separately.

Evaluation of Qualitative Comments

M31 is the variable in which open-ended comments are recorded using theme codes ranging from 1 to 10. The numbers do not indicate magnitude or level of satisfaction. Therefore, the mean, standard deviation, and similar scale statistics for M31 should not be interpreted.

Code	Theme	Number
1	Positive teacher attitude	7
2	Negative teacher attitude	1
3	Positive administrative attitude	3
4	Negative management attitude	1

Code	Theme	Issue
5	Course materials are sufficient	0
6	Course materials are insufficient	1
7	Physical environment is adequate	0
8	Physical environment is inadequate	2
9	Social activities are sufficient	1
10	Social activities are insufficient	4
0	Not defined in the coding key	9

Interpretation Along with Quantitative Findings

A positive teacher attitude is the most frequently observed theme, appearing in 7 entries, and is consistent with high scores in the instructional domain. Of the 20 entries other than zero, 11 fall under positive themes and 9 under negative themes. This distribution does not represent the overall satisfaction rate; the open-ended question's request for suggestions and complaints may have led to a concentration of improvement expectations here.

The M29 responses for the four entries that found social activities insufficient were 5, 2, 5, and 3. Two participants rated the contribution of the activities as very positive but assigned a negative theme code regarding their adequacy. A possible explanation is that the activities were found to be useful but insufficient in terms of number or variety; this cannot be confirmed without specific statements.

Limitations of Coding

Since there is no original open-ended text in Excel, the accuracy of the theme assignments cannot be verified. A single code was assigned to each participant. If a response contains more than one topic, multiple coding should be performed. It must be clarified whether code 0 represents a blank response or an uncodable statement. The absence of a positive theme does not necessarily indicate a lack of satisfaction regarding that topic.

Data Quality and Robustness of Results

Code 0 and Missing Responses

Of the 812 possible responses across 28 satisfaction items, 34 (4.2%) are coded as zero. Twenty-six of these belong to a participant coded as 13. This participant appears to have responded only to M1 and M2. The remaining six participants accounted for a total of eight zero codes. This distribution indicates that most of the missing responses were concentrated in a single survey.

Item statistics were calculated using the valid responses for each item. Therefore, there are 29 valid responses for M2, 28 for most items, 27 for some items, and 26 for M18. Due to the 80% completion rule, the record with code 13 is not included in the field averages. This record should not be completely deleted without reviewing the source form.

Attention Control Responses

Six participants marked M11, three marked M19; two marked both. The codes of the seven participants who marked at least one control item are 6, 9, 17, 25, 26, 27, and 29. The participants who checked both items are those with codes 9 and 17. This indicates a failure to follow the instructions, but does not, on its own, prove that all responses are invalid.

Comparison for M30	Valid n	Mean	Positive
Total valid responses	28	4.61	85.7%
Excluding those who selected the control item	21	4.76	90.5

The second calculation is solely a sensitivity analysis. The overall positive trend persists when seven participants are excluded; however, participants should not be excluded to obtain a higher mean. Exclusion criteria must be clearly justified, and both analyses should be presented together.

Other Limitations

Three participants rated all 28 satisfaction items as 5. This pattern may reflect strong satisfaction or a tendency to respond positively; it is not, in and of itself, a reason to exclude data. A concentration of high scores may make it difficult to detect smaller differences in experience.

The sample is small, and the groups are unbalanced. The scale's reliability, factor structure, and construct validity have not been assessed. The fact that all items are positively worded and some are constructed with multiple judgments also limits the interpretations. It cannot be concluded from this study that teaching methods lead to success.

Recommendations for Improvement and Conclusion

First, Complete the Data Structure

The original form of the survey coded as “13” should be reviewed; the definition of zeros should be specified in a written data dictionary. Attention control items should be separated from satisfaction scores, and decisions to exclude participants should be documented. The original texts of qualitative interviews should be matched with codes, and multiple-theme coding should be performed if necessary.

Institutional Communication and Physical Conditions

Responsibility for regular updates to the website and announcements must be defined. Information regarding registration, course schedules, exams, documents, and events must be presented in an easily accessible and understandable manner. In subsequent assessments, students' ability to locate and comprehend this information can be tracked separately.

Classroom temperature, lighting, cleanliness, capacity, and technological equipment should be monitored under separate headings. Students should be asked to specify which conditions hinder their learning, and improvements should be linked to this feedback.

Learning Activities and Social Activities

In speaking activities, pair and small-group work that increases the active time allocated to each student can be evaluated. In writing assignments, concrete feedback can be provided; in listening activities, a variety of materials can be used; and in reading, a variety of age-appropriate texts can be offered. Examples of successful practices and assignments can be shared among instructors.

For social activities, contributions, frequency, variety, and accessibility should be assessed separately. Any scheduling or access issues that limit participation should be investigated. Not only the number of activities but also student participation and the perceived benefits should be monitored.

Survey Development

Phrases such as “extremely,” “completely,” and “to the highest degree” should be simplified; each item should ask for a single judgment. Overall satisfaction and willingness to recommend should be separated into two items. In relevant questions, the option “I have not experienced this / Not applicable” should be provided, and these responses should be kept separate from the scale score. Comprehensibility should be tested with students at different language proficiency levels.

Overall Evaluation

The research indicates that participants evaluated their institutional experience positively and that the relationship established with the instructor was strong. From an institutional development perspective, the priority is to enhance communication channels, the physical environment, and opportunities for practical application while maintaining this strength. Positive contributions to social activities should be addressed alongside expectations regarding competence. The findings should be reported after the data codes have been validated, specifying the characteristics of the participant group and the limitations of the study.

Appendix A: Item Results—Program and Skills

Item headings have been abbreviated for readability. Scores are on a 1–5 scale. The positive response rate is the percentage of valid responses rated 4 or 5. Zero codes were excluded from the calculations.

Item	Characteristic Assessed	n	Mean	Positive
M1	Adequacy of the weekly class schedule	28	4.29	82.1%
M2	Appropriateness of the total course duration	29	4.28	82.8%
M3	Daily class hours and durations	27	4.37	85.2%
M4	Adequacy of break durations	28	4.21	75.0%
M5	Alignment of the textbook with the level	28	4.21	75.0%
M6	Reinforcing nature of textbook exercises	28	4.07	75.0%
M7	Additional printed and digital materials	28	4.21	78.6%
M8	Contribution of exercises and assignments	28	4.57	89.3%
M9	Speaking activities	28	4.04	75.0%
M10	Writing activities	28	4.07	75.0%
M12	Reading and vocabulary exercises	28	4.14	82.1%
M13	Listening activities	28	4.11	78.6%

Calculation Example

In M9, the sum of the 28 valid responses is 113. The average was calculated as $113 / 28 = 4.04$. The proportion of the 21 people who gave a score of 4 or 5 is $21 / 28 \times 100 = 75.0\%$. Responses coded as zero were not included in the average or the denominator of valid responses.

Items M11 and M19 are intentionally omitted from these tables. These two items were used to verify compliance with the instruction to leave the item blank.

Appendix B Item Results: Instructor and Institution

Item titles have been abbreviated for readability. The scale ranges from 1 to 5. The positive response rate is the percentage of valid responses rated 4 or 5. Zero codes were excluded from the calculations.

Item	Feature Assessed	n	Mean	Positive
M14	Notification at the start of the session	28	4.54	82.1%
M15	Instructor's Preparation	28	4.46	82.1%
M16	Motivation and engagement	27	4.33	77.8%
M17	Positive and constructive teaching attitude	28	4.61	85.7
M18	Clear and understandable answers to questions	26	4.54	88.5
Item	Feature evaluated	n	Avg.	Positive

M20	Feedback on language development	28	4.39	78.6%
M21	Classroom management and effective communication	28	4.71	92.9%
M22	Use of Methods and Educational Tools	27	4.37	88.9%
M23	Equal and fair approach	28	4.39	82.1%
M24	Making Effective Use of Class Time	28	4.61	89.3%
M25	Website and announcements	27	3.89	74.1%
M26	Registration and certification information	27	4.37	77.8%
M27	Attitude of administrative staff	28	4.50	85.7%
M28	Physical conditions of classrooms	28	4.04	71.4%
M29	Contribution of social activities	28	4.36	85.7%
M30	Overall satisfaction and recommendation	28	4.61	85.7%