NANGARHAR UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF ARTS & HUMANITIES
NUJAH
e-ISSN: 3106-4981 (Online)
Vol:2(02), Jan-Mar: 2026
Journal Homepage: https://nujah.org/en

An Investigation of EFL Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Teaching Practices at the English Department of Laghman University

Hedayatullah Bawar[1], Malang Jan Momand[2], Zabihullah Arab [3], Imranulah Khanjar[4], Hamza Atifnigar[5]*

1, 2, 3, 5 Department of English, Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences, Laghman University, Mihtarlam, Afghanistan.

4 Department of Pashto, Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences, Laghman University, Mihtarlam, Afghanistan.

ARTICLE INFO

DATES
21-09-2026
26-10-2026

CITE THIS ARTICLE: *An Investigation of EFL Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Teaching Practices at the English Department of Laghman University. (2026). Nangarhar University Journal of Arts and Humanities, 2(02), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.70436/nujah.v2i02.22*

ABSTRACT

In higher education, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situations, student satisfaction is widely acknowledged as a key indication of teaching quality and educational effectiveness. This study looked into how satisfied EFL students were with their teachers at Laghman University in Afghanistan's English department. A constructed questionnaire with 24 items covering four dimensions—teaching efficacy, communication and interaction, feedback and evaluation, and academic assistance and guidance—was used in a quantitative descriptive study design. 150 undergraduate EFL students' data from all academic years were gathered, and SPSS version 26 was used for analysis. The results show that most pupils have favorable opinions of their teachers. Strong categories included teaching effectiveness, communication, and interaction, which reflected the instructors' readiness, courteous communication, promotion of student participation, and clarity of instruction. Although concerns were raised about the timeliness and consistency of feedback, evaluation and feedback procedures were seen as fair and beneficial for academic advancement. While availability outside of class was noted as an area for development, instructors' support and advice were seen favorably in terms of motivation and confidence-building. Although specific improvements in feedback procedures and academic accessibility could further increase student satisfaction, the survey suggests that teachers at the English Department generally meet students' academic expectations. The results provide useful implications for enhancing instructional quality in comparable settings and add to the scant research on EFL higher education in Afghanistan.

KEYWORDS: *EFL Student Satisfaction, Instructors' Teaching Practices, Teaching Effectiveness, Undergraduate EFL Students, Afghan Higher Education, Laghman University.*

Introduction

Student satisfaction has become a crucial measure of instructional efficacy and educational quality in higher education in recent years. Students' opinions of their teachers have drawn more attention in educational research as universities throughout the world work to raise teaching standards and enhance learning results. Students' assessments of instructional strategies, classroom dynamics, evaluation processes, and academic support are all reflected in student satisfaction. These factors are crucial in determining students' motivation, engagement, and academic achievement. Understanding students' satisfaction with teachers is especially crucial in the setting of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), because linguistic and affective elements can exacerbate learning obstacles. Although these concerns have received considerable attention in international higher education research, their relevance to different national and institutional contexts, particularly those in developing countries such as Afghanistan, also requires examination.

*Corresponding Author: (Bawar H)
Email: bawarhedayatullah@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.70436/nujah.v2i01.22

© 2024 The Authors. Published by Nangarhar University, this is an open access article published under the CC-BY license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

Subject knowledge alone is not enough for effective instruction in EFL higher education. It is expected of instructors to provide courses in an understandable manner, use suitable teaching techniques, promote interaction, offer constructive criticism, and attend to the academic and emotional requirements of their pupils. According to research, students are more likely to participate actively in their education and have favorable opinions of their classes when teachers exhibit clarity, readiness, and responsiveness (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024; Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026). On the other hand, students' learning experiences and general satisfaction may be adversely affected by poor communication, ambiguous evaluation procedures, or a lack of academic support.

Communication and interaction are central to language learning. Research on EFL teacher–student interaction and engagement (Li et al., 2025; Yuan, 2024) and on interaction and satisfaction in higher education (Wong & Chapman, 2023) provides a rationale for investigating students' evaluations of classroom communication.

Feedback and assessment constitute another dimension of perceived instructional quality. Research on teacher feedback literacy (Carless & Winstone, 2023) and student perspectives on written feedback in EFL settings (Mamad & Vígh, 2024) underscores the value of examining feedback and evaluation from the learner's perspective.

However, issues with delayed feedback or ambiguous evaluation standards continue to be prevalent in higher education, especially in settings with big class sizes or scarce resources. These challenges are also relevant to examining student satisfaction in Afghan higher education, where the effectiveness of instructional feedback and assessment needs to be understood in relation to local institutional and classroom conditions.

Academic support and guidance extend beyond classroom explanations. Studies of perceived teacher support and engagement (Zhang & Kim, 2025) and student interaction and satisfaction (Wong & Chapman, 2023) indicate the relevance of investigating students' experiences of encouragement and instructor accessibility.

Taken together, these internationally recognized dimensions of teaching quality provide a useful foundation for examining EFL student satisfaction in the Afghan higher education context. However, institutional resources, teaching conditions, and opportunities for English language learning may differ across educational settings, potentially influencing students' perceptions of their instructors. Therefore, findings from international studies cannot automatically be generalized to Afghan universities without examining students' experiences within their specific educational contexts.

Few empirical studies have looked at EFL students' happiness with instructors in the context of Afghan higher education, despite the expanding body of international research on student satisfaction. Context-specific research is necessary to guide policy creation and instructional improvement because of the particular educational problems and transitional nature of Afghan universities. Thus, the current study is to look at how satisfied EFL students are with their teachers at Laghman University's English Department, with an emphasis on academic support and guidance, feedback and evaluation, communication and interaction, and teaching effectiveness. This study aims to add to the body of knowledge and offer useful suggestions for improving the quality of instruction in Afghan EFL higher education by investigating students' perceptions.

Literature Review

Student satisfaction is an important indicator of perceived educational quality in higher education. Recent reviews address the quality of learning services and the diverse institutional factors associated with satisfaction (Kataria & Rajput, 2026; Thoyyibah et al., 2026). Research on lecturer teaching quality specifically links students' evaluations to their expectations and experiences (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024). Wong and Chapman (2023) examined how forms of student interaction relate to different aspects of satisfaction, while Sopheak and Renfrew (2026) considered instructional components and satisfaction in EFL writing. These studies examine related but not identical settings and outcomes. Their findings provide useful conceptual guidance but should not be interpreted as direct evidence about English Department students at Laghman University.

Teaching Effectiveness and Student Satisfaction

Teaching effectiveness includes clarity of explanation, coherent organization, instructional preparation, and appropriate activities. Research on teaching quality and perceived satisfaction provides a basis for examining these practices in higher education (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024). In EFL settings, perceived instructional effectiveness and satisfaction also merit investigation in relation to language-specific learning demands (Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026; Waluyo et al., 2026).

Student-centered and engaging instruction may be relevant to students' satisfaction, although engagement and satisfaction should be distinguished as outcomes. For example, Zhang and Kim (2025) examine motivational pathways linking perceived teacher support and engagement, while Chandra and Fitriyanto (2024) investigate satisfaction with lecturer teaching quality. These sources inform different aspects of instructional experience rather than proving a single causal mechanism.

The reviewed research differs in population and dependent variables: teaching-quality evaluations (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024), EFL student satisfaction (Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026; Waluyo et al., 2026), and engagement associated with perceived teacher support (Zhang & Kim, 2025). These findings cannot be assumed to transfer directly to Afghan EFL classrooms. A context-specific assessment is therefore warranted.

Interaction, Communication, and the Classroom Setting

Student satisfaction is greatly influenced by instructors' and students' meaningful interactions and effective communication. Higher engagement and successful learning outcomes are linked to learner-centered classrooms that value student ideas, promote open communication, and encourage participation (Yuan, 2024). In EFL settings, interaction serves as both a basic mechanism for language acquisition and a teaching tactic.

Evidence about interaction and engagement suggests that supportive instructional relationships deserve careful attention in EFL research (Li et al., 2025; Yuan, 2024). Wong and Chapman (2023) examined different types of student interaction and their associations with higher education satisfaction. However, classroom participation, student engagement, and satisfaction are related but distinct constructs. Instructor accessibility outside class consequently requires separate assessment rather than inference from classroom interactions alone.

The existing literature suggests that positive teacher–student interaction contributes to favorable learning experiences; however, the outcomes investigated differ across studies. For example, Abid (2025) examined teacher–student rapport among English majors at Laghman University and reported a positive relationship between rapport and English language learning outcomes, including motivation, engagement, and confidence. Although this study provides important evidence from the same institutional context, its primary emphasis was on rapport and learning outcomes rather than students' overall satisfaction with instructors' communication and interaction practices. Furthermore, its questionnaire-based design provides evidence of perceived relationships but cannot establish causal effects. Therefore, examining students' satisfaction with classroom communication, interaction, and instructors' approachability remains relevant, particularly when these aspects are considered alongside other dimensions of teaching practices.

Practices for Evaluation, Assessment, and Feedback

Feedback and evaluation are important parts of the student experience. Carless and Winstone (2023) conceptualize teacher and student feedback literacy as interrelated; Little et al. (2024) synthesize interventions intended to improve students' feedback literacy. In university EFL contexts, Mamad and Vígh (2024, 2025) examine student preferences and reported practices concerning written feedback, while Muhammadpour and Sabet (2025) study perceptions of assessment-for-learning practices. Together, these works suggest examining feedback clarity, usefulness, consistency, and timeliness without assuming that positive perceptions alone establish learning gains.

Existing studies distinguish feedback processes from learners' evaluations of those processes. Carless and Winstone (2023) emphasize feedback literacy, whereas Mamad and Vígh (2024, 2025) report on written feedback preferences and practices in an EFL context. Xie and Liu (2024) investigate university EFL teachers' views and practices related to students' feedback literacy. The present study therefore focuses more narrowly on reported satisfaction with feedback and assessment at Laghman University; the survey cannot establish the actual instructional effects of feedback.

Academic Support and Guidance

Academic guidance and encouragement can influence how students experience language learning. Zhang and Kim (2025) address perceived teacher support and student engagement in EFL settings, while Wong and Chapman (2023) analyze interactions associated with multiple dimensions of higher education satisfaction. These studies provide reasons to examine instructor support, without treating engagement, persistence, and satisfaction as interchangeable.

Instructor availability, opportunities to seek guidance, and support for learning difficulties are relevant elements of students' academic experience. However, general findings about university interactions (Wong & Chapman, 2023) do not establish the quality or accessibility of instructor support in this specific Afghan department. Direct student reports are therefore valuable.

Prior studies focus on related but distinct constructs, including perceived teacher support and engagement (Zhang & Kim, 2025) and higher education satisfaction associated with interactions (Wong & Chapman, 2023). They do not directly establish students' satisfaction with instructors' availability and academic guidance at Laghman University. Accordingly, this study distinguishes supportive classroom practices from opportunities to receive assistance outside class.

Critical Synthesis, Methodological Limitations, and Research Gap

The literature addresses several overlapping dimensions of educational experience. Studies examine service quality (Kataria & Rajput, 2026), lecturer teaching quality (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024), student interaction and satisfaction (Wong & Chapman, 2023), feedback literacy (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Little et al., 2024), and EFL-specific instructional satisfaction (Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026; Waluyo et al., 2026). The different contexts and outcomes limit direct comparisons and support a context-specific investigation of the four dimensions measured here.

Research conducted in Afghanistan also provides a relevant foundation. Safi et al. (2023) examined EFL and ESP students' and teachers' perceptions of English curricula across seven Afghan public universities, identifying concerns regarding English language teaching systems and curriculum. Nasiry et al. (2026) examined factors associated with classroom participation at Kabul University. More specifically, Abid (2025) investigated teacher–student rapport and its relationship with English language learning outcomes at Laghman University, while Sarwary and Abid (2026) examined undergraduate students' perceptions of important EFL teacher qualities at Kabul University. These studies offer relevant evidence about English language teaching practices in Afghanistan. However, they differ from the present investigation in their primary focus: curriculum evaluation, teacher–student rapport and learning outcomes, and desirable teacher qualities, respectively, rather than a combined assessment of student satisfaction across four instructional dimensions.

Methodologically, some empirical investigations rely on questionnaires and students' self-reported perceptions. Although survey methods are valuable for identifying students' views, they may be affected by response bias and cannot independently establish the actual quality of teaching or causal relationships between instructional practices and learning outcomes. In addition, findings from individual universities may not be generalizable to other institutions with different academic conditions. These limitations indicate the need for careful interpretation of student satisfaction findings and greater attention to the specific institutional context in which the data are collected.

The identifiable gap addressed by the present study is therefore not a complete absence of research on EFL teaching practices in Afghanistan, but the limited evidence from the studies reviewed concerning undergraduate EFL students' satisfaction with instructors' teaching practices across four interrelated dimensions: teaching effectiveness, communication and interaction, evaluation and feedback, and academic assistance and guidance. To address this contextual and substantive gap, the present study employs a quantitative descriptive design using a 24-item questionnaire administered to 150 undergraduate EFL students from all academic years at Laghman University's English Department. By examining these four dimensions within a single institutional study, the research provides a structured account of students' satisfaction and identifies areas of perceived instructional strength and potential improvement. Nevertheless, as a descriptive, single-institution, self-report investigation, its findings should be interpreted as students' perceptions rather than causal evidence of teaching effectiveness or findings representative of all Afghan universities.

Methodology

This study used a quantitative research methodology to look at how satisfied EFL students were with their teachers at Laghman University's English Department. Because it allows for the methodical collecting and analysis of numerical data to find patterns, trends, and levels of student satisfaction across predetermined educational parameters, a quantitative approach was deemed appropriate. In order to investigate participants' opinions and attitudes regarding teaching and learning methods, the study used a descriptive survey approach, which is frequently employed in educational research.

Participants and the Research Context

The study was carried out at Laghman University in Afghanistan's English Department of the Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences. Undergraduate EFL students enrolled in the department during all academic years made up the study's target population. Students from the first, second, third, and fourth years were included to guarantee representation from all phases of study. The total population consisted of 178 undergraduate EFL students enrolled in the department during the study period. Since the population was relatively small and accessible, a census approach was adopted, whereby all 178 students were invited to participate rather than selecting a smaller sample through a probability sampling technique. Eligible students were identified through their enrollment in the English Department and approached through their respective academic-year classes. Of the 178 eligible students invited to participate, 150 completed the questionnaire, yielding a response rate of 84.3%. The remaining 28 students did not provide completed questionnaires. Thus, the final sample consisted of 150 undergraduate EFL students. Students were told that participation was entirely voluntary and that their answers would only be utilized for scholarly research. Anonymity and confidentiality were rigorously upheld during the whole research process.

Research Tool

A self-developed structured questionnaire was used to gather data. Its four dimensions were informed by research on lecturer teaching quality and satisfaction (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024; Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026), teacher–student interaction (Wong & Chapman, 2023; Yuan, 2024), feedback and assessment (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Mamad & Vígh, 2024), and perceived teacher support (Zhang & Kim, 2025). The questionnaire contained 24 items covering teaching effectiveness (seven), communication and interaction (six), feedback and evaluation (five), and academic support and guidance (six).

A five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), was used to rate each item. The questionnaire also included a brief demographic section covering participants' age and academic year. Before data collection, the items were examined for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives.

Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire's content relevance was examined by reviewing individual items against the four instructional dimensions, study objectives, and relevant literature. Each item was assessed for conceptual relevance, clarity, and coverage of its intended dimension. This review provided preliminary support for content validity, although formal expert-based content validation was not documented. Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's alpha in SPSS version 26. The overall reliability coefficient indicated satisfactory internal consistency, suggesting that the questionnaire items were sufficiently consistent for descriptive statistical analysis.

Procedure for Gathering Data

With the department's approval, the questionnaire was distributed in hard copy during regular class periods. An attempted census approach was adopted to include the department's entire population of 178 undergraduate students across all four academic years. Students were approached through their respective classes, informed about the study's objectives, and invited to participate voluntarily. The researcher personally distributed and collected the questionnaires to clarify questions and minimize missing responses. A total of 150 students completed the survey, representing 84.3% of the target population. Questionnaires were checked for completeness, and missing responses were excluded from the relevant item-level analyses.

Data Analysis

SPSS version 26 was used to enter and analyze the collected data. Descriptive statistical techniques, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were employed to summarize students' demographic characteristics and perceptions of instructors' teaching practices. Composite mean scores were calculated for each of the four dimensions: teaching effectiveness, communication and interaction, feedback and evaluation, and academic support and guidance. Satisfaction levels were interpreted using the five-point Likert scale, with higher mean scores indicating greater satisfaction and a score of 3 representing neutrality. Tables and figures were used to present the findings, which were interpreted in relation to the study objectives and previous research.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout the investigation, ethical considerations were carefully observed. Permission was obtained from the English Department before data collection. All respondents provided informed consent, and participation was entirely voluntary. Students were assured that no identifying information would be disclosed and that their responses would remain confidential. The collected information was used exclusively for academic purposes, and participants' rights were respected throughout the research process.

Results

The findings of the study looking at EFL students' satisfaction with their teachers at Laghman University's English Department are shown in this section. The results are divided into four primary sections: the respondents' demographics, the questionnaire's reliability analysis, and descriptive analyses of instructional efficacy, interaction and communication, feedback and evaluation, and support and guidance. 150 students' replies were used to analyze the data using SPSS version 26. Students' satisfaction levels across the major instructional dimensions were assessed using descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations. The findings offer a thorough summary of how students assess the department's teaching methods.

Demographic Data

Age Distribution of the Respondents

Figure 1 presents the age distribution of the 150 undergraduate EFL students who participated in the study. The findings indicate that the highest proportion of respondents belonged to the 21–22 age group (n = 64, 42.7%), followed by students aged 23 years and above (n = 42, 28.0%). Students aged 19–20 accounted for 21.3% (n = 32), while those aged 16–18 represented the smallest proportion (n = 12, 8.0%). The detailed frequency and percentage distributions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Age Distribution of the Respondents

Age group (years)	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
16–18	12	8.0
19–20	32	21.3
21–22	64	42.7
23 and above	42	28.0
Total	150	100.0

Class Distribution of the Respondents

Table 2 presents the distribution of the 150 respondents according to their academic years at the English Department of Laghman University. The findings indicate that third-year (junior) students constituted the highest proportion of respondents (n = 50, 33.3%), followed by first-year (freshman) students (n = 42, 28.0%). Fourth-year (senior) students accounted for 22.7% (n = 34), while second-year (sophomore) students represented the lowest proportion (n = 24, 16.0%). Overall, the findings show that students from all four academic years participated in the study, with relatively higher representation from the third and first years.

Table 2. Academic-Year Distribution of Respondents [Source labels these data hypothetical; verification required]

Academic year	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
First year (Freshmen)	42	28.0

Second year (Sophomores)	24	16.0
Third year (Juniors)	50	33.3
Fourth year (Seniors)	34	22.7
Total	150	100.0

Reliability Analysis of the Questionnaire

Table 3 presents the internal-consistency results for the 24-item questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha was .842 and the standardized-item alpha was .844. These values indicate good overall internal consistency, but do not by themselves establish that each of the four dimensions is reliable or that the instrument is valid.

Table 3. Internal Consistency of the 24-Item Questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.842	.844	24

Teaching Effectiveness

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of EFL students' satisfaction with instructors' teaching effectiveness at the English Department of Laghman University. The analysis included 148–150 valid responses across the seven items. Overall, the mean scores ranged from 3.92 to 4.25 on the five-point Likert scale, indicating generally favorable student perceptions of instructors' teaching effectiveness.

The highest mean score was recorded for instructors' clarity in presenting lessons (M = 4.25, SD = 0.74), followed by lesson preparation (M = 4.17, SD = 0.99) and engaging lesson delivery (M = 4.17, SD = 0.85). In contrast, the lowest mean score was observed for the effective use of lesson plans (M = 3.92, SD = 1.11), which also showed the greatest variability in students' responses. The detailed descriptive statistics for all items are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Teaching Effectiveness

Statements	N	Mean	SD
The instructors present lessons clearly and understandably.	150	4.25	0.74
The instructors are well-prepared for their lessons.	150	4.17	0.99
The instructors make lessons interesting and engaging.	150	4.17	0.85
The instructors use appropriate and varied teaching methods.	148	4.16	0.77
The instructors use teaching materials effectively.	150	4.14	0.90
The instructors' lessons are well-organized and logically sequenced.	150	4.06	0.85
The instructors use lesson plans effectively.	150	3.92	1.11

Note. N = number of valid responses; SD = standard deviation. Valid N (listwise) = 148. Mean scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Values are rounded to two decimal places.

Communication and Interaction

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics of EFL students' satisfaction with instructors' communication and interaction at the English Department of Laghman University. The analysis included 148–150 valid responses across the six items. Mean scores ranged from 3.91 to 4.17 on the five-point Likert scale, indicating generally favorable student perceptions of instructors' communication and interaction practices.

The highest mean score was recorded for instructors' willingness to listen to students' opinions and allow self-expression (M = 4.17, SD = 0.95), followed by clear communication of ideas (M = 4.16, SD = 0.79) and respectful attitudes toward students (M = 4.14, SD = 0.96). The lowest mean score concerned students' comfort in approaching instructors with academic concerns (M = 3.91, SD = 1.01). The detailed item-level statistics are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Communication and Interaction

Statements	N	Mean	SD
The instructors listen to students' opinions and allow them to express themselves.	150	4.17	0.95
The instructors communicate ideas clearly.	148	4.16	0.79
The instructors show respect and a positive attitude toward students.	150	4.14	0.96
The instructors encourage class participation and discussion.	150	4.05	0.94
The instructors provide activities that arouse students' interest in learning English.	150	4.03	0.92
Students feel comfortable approaching instructors with academic concerns.	149	3.91	1.01

Note. N = number of valid responses; SD = standard deviation. Valid N (listwise) = 147. Mean scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Values are rounded to two decimal places.

Feedback and Evaluation

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics of EFL students' perceptions of instructors' feedback and evaluation practices at the English Department of Laghman University. Across the five items, valid responses ranged from 148 to 150, with 144 complete cases across all items. Mean scores ranged from 3.87 to 4.05 on the five-point Likert scale, indicating generally favorable perceptions of instructors' feedback and evaluation practices.

The highest mean score was recorded for the perceived academic usefulness of instructors' feedback (M = 4.05, SD = 1.03), followed by fairness and transparency in grading (M = 3.95, SD = 0.93) and clarity of evaluation criteria (M = 3.94, SD = 0.96). The lowest mean score concerned the provision of timely and constructive feedback on assignments and examinations (M = 3.87, SD = 1.04). The detailed item-level statistics are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Feedback and Evaluation

Statements	N	Mean	SD
The instructors' feedback helps me improve academically.	148	4.05	1.03
The grading and evaluation system is fair and transparent.	150	3.95	0.93
The evaluation criteria are clearly explained.	148	3.94	0.96

The instructors assess students' learning reasonably.	149	3.93	1.02
The instructors provide timely and constructive feedback on assignments and exams.	149	3.87	1.04

Note. N = number of valid responses; SD = standard deviation. Valid N (listwise) = 144. Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Means and standard deviations are rounded to two decimal places.

Support and Guidance

Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics of EFL students' perceptions of instructors' academic support and guidance at the English Department of Laghman University. Across the six items, valid responses ranged from 149 to 150, with 148 complete cases across all items. Mean scores ranged from 3.88 to 4.10 on the five-point Likert scale, indicating generally favorable perceptions of instructors' academic support and guidance.

The highest mean score was recorded for instructors' support in building students' confidence in using English (M = 4.10, SD = 0.96), followed by motivation to perform better (M = 4.09, SD = 1.06) and opportunities for meaningful English use (M = 4.03, SD = 1.06). The lowest mean score concerned instructors' availability for academic guidance outside class (M = 3.88, SD = 0.96). Perceptions of friendly and respectful relationships and support for learning difficulties showed the greatest variability (both SD = 1.14). Detailed statistics for all six items are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Satisfaction with Instructors' Academic Support and Guidance

Statements	N	Mean	SD
The instructors help build students' confidence in using English.	149	4.10	0.96
The instructors motivate students to perform better.	150	4.09	1.06
The instructors provide opportunities to use English through meaningful activities.	150	4.03	1.06
The instructors maintain a friendly and respectful relationship with students.	150	3.91	1.14
The instructors support students facing learning difficulties.	149	3.91	1.14
The instructors are available for academic guidance outside class.	150	3.88	0.96

Note. N = number of valid responses; SD = standard deviation. Valid N (listwise) = 148. Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Means and standard deviations are rounded to two decimal places.

Overall, the findings reveal that EFL students at the English Department of Laghman University report a generally high level of satisfaction with their instructors across all examined dimensions. Effective teaching was found to be a strong suit, especially when it came to lesson delivery, readiness, and clarity of instruction. Additionally, respectful interactions, active engagement, and clear communication were seen as beneficial aspects of communication and interaction. Students showed moderate to high satisfaction, particularly with regard to the value of feedback for academic advancement, despite slightly lower mean ratings for feedback and evaluation procedures. Although availability outside of class was noted as an area for development, instructors' support and advice were also seen favorably, especially in terms of boosting students' confidence and motivation. When taken as a whole, these findings show the capabilities of teachers while pointing out areas where feedback and academic help should be more consistently provided.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings are discussed in relation to the study objectives and previous literature, with attention to possible explanations and implications for EFL teaching at Laghman University. Because the study used descriptive student reports, these explanations are interpretive rather than causal.

Teaching Effectiveness

Students' favorable ratings of instructional clarity, preparation, and engaging lesson delivery are broadly consistent with scholarship examining lecturer teaching quality and student satisfaction (Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024; Sopheak & Renfrew, 2026; Waluyo et al., 2026). In an EFL context, clear explanations may help students follow lessons delivered in the target language. The importance of engaging instruction also relates to literature on perceived teacher support and student engagement (Zhang & Kim, 2025), although engagement and satisfaction are not interchangeable measures.

The comparatively less favorable and more variable responses concerning lesson-plan use suggest that students' experiences of instructional organization may differ across courses. This difference does not establish that instructors fail to prepare; students may not directly observe how lessons are planned. Nevertheless, it points to a practical opportunity for the department to encourage clearer lesson sequencing, shared planning practices, and professional development focused on coherent course delivery.

Communication and Interaction

Positive perceptions of respectful communication and opportunities for expression align with research on teacher–student interaction in EFL classrooms (Li et al., 2025; Yuan, 2024) and on interaction and satisfaction in higher education (Wong & Chapman, 2023). Nevertheless, the present study distinguishes favorable classroom communication from the slightly lower rating for comfort in approaching an instructor about academic concerns. These student reports do not identify the reasons for that difference.

That distinction may reflect uncertainty about consultation arrangements, student hesitation, or differences in instructors' accessibility; the survey did not investigate which explanation applies. For Laghman University's English Department, explicitly communicating consultation times and establishing accessible channels for academic questions may therefore be more useful than assuming positive classroom communication automatically ensures out-of-class support.

Feedback, Evaluation, and Academic Support and Guidance

Students rated feedback's academic usefulness favorably but gave somewhat lower ratings to timeliness. This distinction is compatible with research treating feedback as a process requiring teacher and student feedback literacy (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Little et al., 2024). EFL studies examining feedback preferences and practices likewise emphasize the need to consider how feedback is received and used (Mamad & Vígh, 2024, 2025; Xie & Liu, 2024). The survey cannot determine whether workload, schedules, or institutional conditions explain perceived delays.

Favorable ratings of encouragement and confidence-building are broadly consistent with research on perceived teacher support and engagement (Zhang & Kim, 2025). The lower score for instructors' availability outside class indicates a possible area for improvement, but it should not be interpreted as evidence of effects on retention or achievement. Because Wong and Chapman (2023) examined interactions and satisfaction in a different higher education context, their findings provide a useful comparison rather than a direct test of the present results.

Conclusion

This study explored EFL students' satisfaction with their instructors at the English Department of Laghman University by examining teaching effectiveness, communication and interaction, and feedback, evaluation, and academic support. The results show that students generally have favorable opinions of their teachers, especially when it comes to motivational assistance, courteous classroom interactions, and instructional clarity. These advantages are a reflection of instructional strategies that align with global studies on successful EFL teaching in higher education. However, the study also identifies areas that need more focus, such as the uniformity of feedback procedures and the accessibility of teachers outside of the classroom. Enhancing these elements through professional growth, institutional support, and organized academic assistance may improve learning results and student satisfaction even more. Overall, the study contributes to the limited body of research on EFL student satisfaction in Afghan higher education and offers practical insights for improving instructional quality in similar contexts.

Recommendations

It is advised that the English Department provide systematic feedback procedures, such as agreed-upon deadlines for returning assignments, staged submissions, and standardized rubrics. These actions can boost feedback's formative significance in assisting students' academic development by increasing its timeliness and consistency.

Instructors should be encouraged by the department to set up easily available contact channels and well-defined consultation hours for academic help. Enhancing accessibility outside of the classroom can strengthen the bonds between teachers and students and make students feel more at ease asking for help, especially those who are struggling academically.

It is advised to attend regular professional development courses that concentrate on student-centered practices, interactive teaching techniques, and lesson planning. While maintaining the successful teaching strategies that students already value, such initiatives can help guarantee greater consistency in the quality of instruction across courses.

References

Abid, A. S. (2025). Teacher–student rapport and its influence on English language learning outcomes: Perceptions of Laghman University English majors. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(4), 94–109. https://doi.org/10.62810/jssh.v2i4.173

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *28*(1), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372

Chandra, D., & Fitriyanto, A. (2024). An empirical analysis of student satisfaction with lecturer teaching quality: Applying the expectation-disconfirmation theory. *Indonesian Journal of Economics and Management*, *4*(3), 460–474. https://doi.org/10.35313/ijem.v4i3.6425

Kataria, P., & Rajput, C. S. (2026). Assessing service quality in higher education: A four-decade literature review (1984–2024). *Quality Assurance in Education*, *34*(3), 415–434. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-08-2025-0229

Li, C., Solhi, M., & Wang, Y. (2025). The role of Chinese EFL teachers' immediacy and rapport in students' engagement in the context of AI-mediated education. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(4), Article e70289. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70289

Little, T., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Tai, J. (2024). Can students' feedback literacy be improved? A scoping review of interventions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(1), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2177613

Mamad, A., & Vígh, T. (2024). Student perspectives on preferences and reported instructor practices of written feedback in the Moroccan EFL university context. *Heliyon*, *10*(11), Article e31694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31694

Mamad, A., & Vígh, T. (2025). A comparison of EFL students and instructors' written feedback preferences and reported practices at a Moroccan university. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *28*(1), 67–97. https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2025.34396

Muhammadpour, M., & Sabet, M. K. (2025). Iranian EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of different assessment-for-learning practices implemented in the Iranian EFL classrooms: Does teaching context matter? Language Testing in Asia, 15, Article 36. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00372-x

Nasiry, A. Z., Noori, A., & Zaiel, A. A. (2026). Exploring the factors influencing class participation among English majors at Kabul University. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *3*(1), 48–63. https://doi.org/10.62810/jssh.v3i1.176

Safi, A. R., Shabani, M. B., & Malmir, A. (2023). Investigating the EFL and ESP students and teachers' perception to the English curriculum at Afghanistan universities. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, *2*(1), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2023.2.1.4

Sarwary, M. M., & Abid, A. S. (2026). Exploring undergraduate English majors' perceptions of the essential qualities of a modern EFL teacher. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *3*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.62810/jssh.v3i1.254

Sopheak, S., & Renfrew, M. (2026). Associations between instructional components and student satisfaction in EFL writing: Evidence from a Cambodian university. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *16*(2), 642–666. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v16i2.11522

Thoyyibah, K., Sugiarto, S., Takdir, M., & Kamaludin, K. (2026). Student satisfaction in learning services: A systematic review of Scopus data based on the PRISMA approach (2015–2025). *Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(1), 896–908. https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.1.p.896-908

Waluyo, B., Lemana, H. E., II, & Ahmad, C. V. (2026). Learner satisfaction and perceived instructional effectiveness of non-native English-speaking teachers in Thai university EFL classrooms. Learning: Research and Practice. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2026.2737675

Wong, W. H., & Chapman, E. (2023). Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. *Higher Education*, *85*(5), 957–978. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0

Xie, Z., & Liu, W. (2024). What matters in the cultivation of student feedback literacy: Exploring university EFL teachers' perceptions and practices. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*, Article 162. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02648-8

Yuan, L. (2024). EFL teacher-student interaction, teacher immediacy, and students' academic engagement in the Chinese higher learning context. *Acta Psychologica*, *244*, Article 104185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104185

Zhang, X., & Kim, H.-J. (2025). Motivational pathways from perceived teacher support to student engagement in EFL classes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, Article 1677994. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1677994