

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Parents' Perception of Educational Quality for Primary Schools

Reyhan Geçdoğın Yılmaz¹ 

Dr., Teacher, Ankara, Turkey

Correspondence:

Reyhan Geçdoğın Yılmaz,
Email: r.gecdogan@hotmail.com

Submitted: 26.01.2021

Revision Requested: 28.02.2021

Revision Received: 15.03.2021

Published Online: 06.06.2021

Citation: Geçdoğın Yılmaz, R. (2021). Parents' perception of educational quality for primary schools. *Political Economy and Management of Education*, 2(1), 32-52.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine and determine parents' perception of educational quality for primary schools. 30 primary school parents were the subjects in conducting this research; these subjects were selected using stratified sampling methods. The data was collected with a semi-structured interview questionnaire form. According to the research findings; parents' perception of teacher quality was the highest one among the input variables related to educational quality. Additionally, among the process variables, especially curriculum and method are regarded essential for a quality education. Finally, parents' expectations as the output of a quality education are good citizens, self-confident individuals, qualified students and cultured people. According to two strata of parents, teacher was described as the most important factor for educational quality, while for the third strata it was qualified person. In addition, given the fact that parents classified 17, 18 and 16 different concepts having primary, secondary and tertiary importance respectively for educational quality, it is clear that parents have different perceptions of educational quality.

Keywords: *Quality in education, parent, perception.*

Introduction

It is difficult to educate and train ideal, qualified and good people that are desired by the education system. According to our society, one of the most difficult tasks to achieve is effective teaching. Individuals that were educated in a quality education generally stay away from activities that harm them and add value to their societies (Glasser, 1999). In this age of globalization, countries were forced to make alterations and innovations in their educational policies; this was

mainly due to the changing world conditions and the diminishing resources, various programs were implemented to increase the quality of education (Akgündüz and Ertepinar, 2015). Thanks to the educational quality, quality professions, quality products and quality services become reachable (Kayadibi, 2001). The human factor is by far the prominent factor affecting the quality in educational organizations. The lack of qualified human education, which is the desired output of education, will affect not only the subject individual but also other organizations with manpower input. Therefore, educational organizations are organizations that we should be most sensitive to, in regards to the quality (Bursalioğlu, 2015). Quality education not only improves the ability of individuals to secure and sustain their employment in an age of competition, but also nurtures citizens who can contribute to the economic and social development of a nation (Moss and Pence, 1994). In this context, it is clear that the human quality, which depends on the quality of the education, will affect this person's environment in particular and the whole society in general. In short, a prosperous society would consist of quality individuals. As the society's demand for qualified people increases, parents have tended to prefer institutions that provide quality education. Educational institutions, which are centered at the most critical points of the society, should be able to respond to the demanded quality, through taking their stakeholders into consideration.

Educational institutions, like any other organizations producing goods or services, are exposed to the conditions of competition, and they struggle improve the quality of education they provide (Hesapçioğlu, 2006). Quality is a subjective concept as it is perceived differently by each individual and varies a lot from one person to another (Mandal, 2007). Individuals try to organize and interpret their impressions in order to make sense of their surroundings. Sometimes the perceived world can be different from the concrete reality and behaviors are shaped according to how the reality is perceived (Robins and Judge, 2015). Some consumers evaluate the physical properties, durability of a product and how much this product serves their purpose and then interpret their findings as quality, while according to some others, being expensive is an indication of quality (Başanbaş, 2013). Real quality and perceived quality are not the same, perceived quality is the perception of consumers. Judgment of what is important to consumers plays a dominant role in perceived quality, and in fact this by far is more important than real quality. The reason is that, no matter how high quality you provide, your service is as qualified as attributed by your consumers (Şener, 2016). Service quality is defined as the difference between the expectation and perception of quality according to the individual, and the perceived service quality has a positive relationship with satisfaction (Okumuş and Duygun, 2008).

Defining the concept of quality in education is an important issue. There is an ongoing debate on how to organize a better education system in an environment where the Ministry of Education, administrators, teachers and parents have different definitions of quality (Adams, 1998). Since the definition of quality is relative in nature, explaining and measuring quality of an education poses a problem (Eroğlu, 2004). In order to be able to talk about the quality of education in general, it is necessary to have universal standards that can be accepted by everyone. Various countries of the world set different quality standards in order to measure and evaluate the quality of their education and to make comparisons with the education systems of other countries (Göksoy, 2014). Being classified under the service sector, it is difficult to determine the quality of education because the output of education is not a concrete product, unlike manufactured goods (Karaca, 2008). Education quality consists of many different dimensions and even these dimensions are

subjective rather than objective (Aksoy, 2001). The main goal of education is to improve human quality (Peker, 1994). Educational quality can be assessed as to whether the outputs are desired according to some criteria and norms (Bakioğlu and Baltacı, 2010). The quality of education is the degree to which goals aimed by education are achieved (Karslı, 1997). The degree which educational services meet the expectations of the society can be defined as the quality in education as well (Çelik, 1996). Another interpretation of quality in education could be; there should be no defects in educated people, the satisfaction of the students and parents from the education should be really high, and finally the employer of the individual that is the output of the system should be more than gratified by this employee, i.e., the educated individual (Peker, 1996).

Factors affecting quality in education could be categorized as internal factors (administrator, teacher, student, educational programs, methods, educational environment, other employees) and external factors (service areas, industrial production areas, technological developments, social needs, families, higher educational institutions) (Ünal, 1997). For a quality education; input variables (teacher qualifications, physical conditions and competence, educational materials, etc.), process variables (curriculum, teaching methods, techniques and strategies, process management, educational supervision, planning, etc.) and output variables (knowledge development, attitudes and behavioral improvement, preparation for the next education level, finding a job, reintegration, etc.) should all be improved (Eleren, 2007). Quality in education includes many factors that should generate synergy (Sahney, Banwet and Karunes, 2008). Some concrete factors such as students, teachers, administrative staff, physical facilities and infrastructure, teaching method, learning outcomes, curriculum and extracurricular activities in education are among the most relevant criteria of the study and improvement approach towards the pursuit of excellence in education (Crissien-Borrero, Velásquez-Rodríguez, Neira -Rodado and Turizo-Martnez, 2019). It should be highlighted that the higher the synergy between the elements of education, the more the reflection of this synergy on the quality of education.

Human is an important element in achieving quality in education, because a quality education requires qualified administrators, teachers and students (Cafıođlu, 1996). Increasing the quality in education depends on the balance between quality and diversity of human resources, educational services, environment, technology used in education, physical resources and cooperation of stakeholders (Temel, 1999). Quality concern is a feeling that should be shared by all stakeholders rather than an issue that concerns only teachers and management (Uluđ, 2003). Gökçe (2010) reported that according to the auditors, the efforts of teachers and students are not sufficient for achieving quality in education. Quality school should extend from management to teacher and to parent involvement, learning should grow in a collaborative atmosphere in school. A warm environment should be created among all the staff of the school and increased communication should be ensured (Glasser, 1999). Quality in education can be realized with the sincere belief and leadership of the top management (Çelik and Taşar, 2012). Quality teachers are the backbone of the education system and they are the most important element in realization of learning (World Bank, 2011). Teacher quality is the most important factor affecting students' success (OECD, 2009). Quality in education comes from teacher's fulfillment of the expected roles from him/her. A contemporary teaching requires more than an old-fashioned teacher; nowadays a teacher is a guide and class leader who organizes the learning-teaching processes, respects the student as an individual, and establishes a personal contact with the student when necessary (Ulutaş Özşen, 2014).

In order to achieve quality in education, the meaning attributed to quality education by all stakeholders in this process should at least be based on a common ground. It is important to determine the perceptions of parents regarding quality education, who are among the stakeholders of education. Differences or even conflicts among each stakeholder's perception of the quality education could be a major source of problems. Once the quality perception of the parents is measured and analyzed, the areas where the quality is low or high according to this perception can be determined, thus time and resources would not be wasted in making improvements for sufficient and successful areas, and this in return would create an opportunity to improve the insufficient or unsuccessful areas. The quality level of the schools can be inspected and increased according to this well-defined quality perception of the parents. It is one of the basic principles of quality schools to meet the expectations of students, teachers, parents and the environment, who are regarded as customers of schools, with the awareness that they are both customers and suppliers in quality schools, and to cooperate with parents in order to increase the performance of the school and to consult the students to benefit from education at the highest level (Uryan, 2002). School management and parents should be aware of each other's expectations, and mutually show an effort to determine their counterpart's needs (Şişman, 2002). When information is provided to the stakeholders of education, when the voices of stakeholders are heard more, and when the favorable or problematic parts of the system are better known, all of these could contribute to the improvement of the quality in education (World Bank, 2011). In order to identify and develop a quality education, the opinions and views of all of the stakeholders such as parents and students, aka the customers of the school, society, individuals and the state should be taken into consideration (Erdoğan, 2002). Given the fact that increasing the quality in education depends on the service quality perception of the stakeholders and increasing this perception level, it is important to determine the quality perception of the parents. This research aims to provide benefits to policy makers, school administrations and teachers in improving the quality of education by revealing parents' perceptions of education quality. In addition, this research aims to contribute to the improvement of parents' quality perceptions if there is a problem and to increase the educational quality perceptions of parents.

Method

Research Model

This research was conducted using a phenomenological design. People's perceptions and experiences can be examined through qualitative research (Ekiz, 2003). Phenomenology design aims to reveal the perception, experience, and meanings attributed to a phenomenon that we are aware but we do not have the power to understand in detail and in depth (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). Social phenomena such as quality in education can reveal the underlying condition of the phenomenon in more depth thanks to the phenomenological design.

Participants

The participant group of the study consists of 30 primary school parents who have been determined based on the purpose of the study. Participants were determined using the stratified purposeful sampling method. With the purposeful sampling, it was aimed to present richer data

and to examine the subject in depth (Büyüköztürk, 2012). In line with the stratified purpose sample, it was aimed to determine how the quality in education is perceived according to the education levels of the parents, and the participants or primary school parents were partitioned into 7 subgroups as (illiterate, primary school degree, secondary school degree, high school degree, associate degree, university degree and post-graduate degree). The number of parents to participate in the study was determined using the disproportionate stratified sampling method. The number of parents to participate was determined using the disproportionate stratified sampling method. In the disproportionate stratified sampling method, an equal number of samples are taken from each stratum, regardless of its actual ratio. When a meaningful and necessary representation of each stratum in the universe is desired in the sample, a disproportionate stratified sample is appropriate (Sencer and Sencer 1978). Regardless of their related proportions of 7 subgroups in the universe, it was decided to include at least 3 parents for each subgroup in the study. In order to represent each one of the 7 subgroups with at least 3 parents; while determining the parents, communication was established with one of the units of the universe and through this unit we reached other units, and the sample size was increased by means of these units that were contacted (Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004). As a result, 30 parents consisted of 3 illiterate, 5 primary school degrees, 4 secondary school degrees, 4 high school degrees, 3 associate degrees, 8 university degrees and 3 post graduate degree parents. Table 1 contains information on the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants

Code	Gender	Age	Education Level	Student's Grade Level	Code	Gender	Age	Education Level	Student's Grade Level
P1	Female	41-50	Primary School	4th Class	P16	Female	41-50	Illiterate	4th Class
P2	Female	31-40	Primary School	3rd Class	P17	Female	31-40	Associate degree	4th Class
P3	Female	31-40	Primary School	2nd Class	P18	Female	31-40	University Degree	1st Class
P4	Female	31-40	Secondary School	2nd Class	P19	Female	31-40	University Degree	3rd Class
P5	Female	41-50	Primary School	4th Class	P20	Female	31-40	High School	3rd Class
P6	Female	31-40	Secondary School	2nd Class	P21	Male	41-50	High School	1st Class
P7	Female	31-40	Primary School	2nd Class	P22	Male	31-40	University Degree	1st Class
P8	Female	41-50	Illiterate	1st Class	P23	Male	31-40	Post-Graduate	1st Class
P9	Female	18-30	Secondary School	3rd Class	P24	Female	31-40	Post-Graduate	1st Class
P10	Male	31-40	Illiterate	2nd Class	P25	Male	41-50	University Degree	1st Class
P11	Male	31-40	University Degree	4th Class	P26	Female	31-40	High School	3rd Class
P12	Male	31-40	University Degree	4th Class	P27	Male	41-50	Post-Graduate	3rd Class
P13	Male	41-50	Secondary School	4th Class	P28	Male	18-30	Associate Degree	4th Class
P14	Male	41-50	University Degree	3rd Class	P29	Female	18-30	Associate Degree	4th Class
P15	Male	41-50	High School	4th Class	P30	Female	41-50	University Degree	4th Class

In Table 1, as it is not considered ethically appropriate to give the identities of the parents participating in this research, the parents are abbreviated as P1, P2... P30.

Data Collection Tool

In this study, a semi-structured interview form was used as a data collection tool. About the semi-structured interview form; It is a preferred data collection tool because it is standard and flexible, it enables to collect information in depth, provides access to multiple participants, and facilitates data collection and analysis (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). During the preparation process of the form, open-ended questions were prepared by searching the literature. In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the questions, we have consulted an expert in the field of educational administration and supervision. There are 2 open-ended questions in the interview form. These questions are as follows:

1. What do you understand when it comes to quality education/educational quality?
2. For quality education/educational quality, prioritize the 3 subjects or concepts that are most important to you.

Data Collection

The most common method in phenomenological research is interview (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). In this regard, the data in this study were collected by face-to-face interview technique. In order to prepare the interview questions, the literature was reviewed and we consulted three faculty members who are experts in their fields. After their valuable input and doing suggested corrections, the semi-structured questions were asked to the participants, there was no time limit and the answers were recorded in the semi-structured form. With the interview form, our aim was increasing the validity and reliability of the interview and a smooth execution of the whole research. In the interviews, in order to ensure impartiality and not to influence the participant, we avoided expressing our own views (Kuş, 2003). For external reliability of the study, the research group, which is also the data source, has been clearly defined (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). In order to determine the internal consistency of the themes and categories that emerged as a result of the analysis of the data, we again consulted aforementioned three experts.

Data Analysis

Content analysis and digitization were performed for the data collected from the interviews. In content analysis; relationships can be detected by collecting similar data in certain concepts and themes (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). Content analysis enables the collected data to be examined subjectively and systematically (Tavşancıl and Aslan, 2001). The open-ended questions of the study were accepted as the main theme, and sub-themes were obtained from the answers given by the participants to these open-ended questions. The data obtained from the participants were categorized in these themes, taking into account that they are similar or different from each other and their relationships within each other. The data were digitized by taking the frequencies of the opinions of the participants (Balçı, 2009). By digitizing the data, it is aimed to make comparisons between categories, reduce bias and increase reliability (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011).

Findings and Interpretation

In this section, the findings obtained from the participants are presented in tables and then we interpret these findings. The findings of the research were discussed under two main titles as “perception of quality in education” and “first three priorities for quality education” based on the interview questions.

Participants’ Perception of Quality in Education

The first question in the interview form in order to determine the participants' views on the perception of quality in education is “What do you understand when it comes to quality education/educational quality?” In response to this question, the participants expressed their opinions on the themes of "input, process and output" variables. Table 2 summarizes the response of the participants on the perception of quality in education.

Table 2. Findings on the perception of quality in education among the participants

Themes	Categories	Codes	Frequency	Total Frequency
Input Variables	Teacher	Qualification	8	26
		Personal characteristics	7	
		Communication skills	4	
		Teacher-student harmony	4	
		Enthusiasm	3	
	Student	Personal characteristics	4	6
		Qualification	2	
	Equipment and Materials	Textbook quality	3	5
		Technology	2	
	Parent	Parent support	3	3
		Competence	1	
	Physical Conditions	Safe environment	1	2
		Organization of Education	Established education system	
Process Variables	Curriculum	Values and moral education	6	15
		Life-centered	4	
		Far from memorization	3	
		Need-based	1	
		Purposeful	1	
	Method	Endearing and fun	6	15
		Productive	2	
		Non-oppressive	2	
		Egalitarian	2	
		Contemporary	1	
		Student oriented	1	
		Thought-provoking	1	
	Classroom Management	Disciplined	4	14
		Love-respect-trust	4	
		Teacher-student-parent collaboration	4	
Planned/organized person		2		

		Good citizen	6	
		Self-confident individual	4	
		Qualified student	4	
		Cultured/knowledgeable person	4	
		Success in life	3	
Output Variables	Results of Instruction	Satisfaction	2	28
		Adaptation to society	1	
		Productive society	1	
		Labor skills/Job security	1	
		Well-behaved	1	
		Happy individual	1	

In Table 2, considering the codes related to the perception of quality in education among participants, the most repeated response in input variables is the teacher (f = 26), in process variables these are the curriculum (f = 15) and the method (f = 15) and in the output variables it is the good citizen (f = 6), participants' views on these themes are given below.

When a teacher does a fine job, teacher's enthusiasm motivate students and the quality of education increases. Parents play a great role in increasing the quality of education as well. In addition, standard curriculum books do not contain the same detailed information as the reference books, and the quality of the textbooks is also important for quality in education (P1).

When it comes to quality education, attitudes of teachers really matter. Teachers and students should both be disciplined, teachers should understand students, and students should understand teachers (P3).

The lecture books being in accord with the reference books, the enthusiasm of the teachers, the effort of the student and the support of the parents, the success of the student are all meant in classy and quality education. The quality of education would automatically increase if everyone does their part carefully and meticulously (P5).

When it comes to quality education; I think of a private school, tutors and privileged people. Quality education produces cultured, qualified and highly educated individuals (P7).

I understand that my child will get his degree and have a profession. Being a good person, being someone who get on well with their friends, family and relatives can only be accomplished through a quality education (P8).

Having a better knowledge and understanding of the place and the society where one lives can be the aim of quality education. My understanding from quality education is being a man/woman of wisdom in both personal relations and being knowledgeable (P10).

In addition to being beneficial, preparing an environment where learning is fun for the student have to be essential parts of quality education. Also, without boring or overloading the student too much, quality education should ensure that what the student learns is everlasting as well (P12).

Quality education should be student-oriented. Raising students who can really understand what they read and who can comprehend what is being taught should be aimed. It can be said that an education system that teaches the information required by contemporary world is of high

quality. The most important element in quality education would be knowledgeable teachers with self-confidence. Quality education guides students to areas where they are and will be successful and happy. The education system is of high quality if it can raise individuals who are beneficial to their country and nation regardless of the profession (P13).

Bringing up people who are beneficial to the country and the nation in terms of moral and educational aspects is a quality education. Quality education should have dedication, care and attention (P16).

The education in which what is taught have practical applications in the daily life is a quality education. The education system, which students are fond of, are curious of, one that does not implement proper meaning of obligation no more than a lower level, is of high quality (P19).

Quality is multidimensional. Quality in education does not have single aspect. It happens with the mutual understanding and selfless behavior of the school, teacher and student (P21).

Quality cannot be accomplished with school and teacher alone, so parents should be motivated and informed for quality. All the essential legs should be firmly on the ground and there should be no hitches. For a true success, talented students must be well guided and motivated (P23).

An education in which the students are happy, enjoy going to school and curious about what they learn is a quality education. An education that prepares the student for life, an education where both the student and the parents are satisfied, where the teacher and the student getting to know each other, and are in synchrony and are mutually respectful is a quality education (P24).

In order to have a quality education, there has to be a well-established education system that is known by excellent educators focused on teaching. The physical facilities of the school should be sufficient for quality education. Quality education would emerge with the hard work of altruistic educators and teachers as well as administrators who make the best use of these opportunities without hurting our children, whom we will entrust our future with (P27).

Any education is a quality education as long as it can encourage or even provoke the students to think. It is important to educate students at the point of generating new ideas and thoughts rather than an education based on memorization of knowledge and nothing else. I think a student who lacks self-confidence will not be happy and successful throughout his/her life. Building self-confidence in students is also a part of quality education. I think an education system devoid of national and moral values cannot build a healthy and quality future (P28).

For a quality education, the educator or teacher must first of all endear him/herself to students. Teacher must be extremely patient and tolerant. He/she should be a good listener and avoid impolite behavior. Education should focus primarily on moral education, and should avoid any form of memorization. Grades should be of secondary importance (P30).

Regarding the perception of quality education among the participants; they all underline quality and qualifications of the teacher, personality of the teacher and enthusiasm of the teacher. It is not an unexpected finding that the teacher, who is considered the most important element of quality education, is primarily mentioned regarding the quality in education. However, it is striking that the participants did not mention the school management regarding quality education; it is also worth mentioning really low number of times the parental support is expressed. It is seen

that the participants accept the teacher instead of the manager as the quality leader, and it is also conclusive that the parents, who play an important role in the education process, are not sufficiently aware of their own crucial functionality in the execution of the higher quality education process. Among the process variables, the participants' expectation of the curriculum to be life-oriented, far from memorizing and endearing education; and the expectation of raising good citizens as an outcome of education are in accordance with the ultimate goal of our education system. At this point, the perceptions of the participants about quality education meet on a common ground with the aims of other stakeholders of the education system.

Participants' Views on Top Three Priorities for Quality Education

The second question in the interview form regarding the top three priorities of the participants for quality education is stated as: "For quality education/educational quality, prioritize the 3 subjects or concepts that are most important for you". In Table 3, the responses of the participants regarding the top three priorities for quality education are presented by categorizing them in order of priority.

Table 3. Findings regarding the top three priorities of the participants for quality education

Categories	Codes	Frequency	Total Frequency
First priority for quality education	Teacher	10	30
	Good people	3	
	Love-respect	2	
	Teacher-student-parent Collaboration	2	
	Quality textbook	1	
	Planned education	1	
	Private school	1	
	Discipline	1	
	Safety	1	
	Technology	1	
	Success	1	
	Qualified education	1	
	Productive society	1	
	Endearing education	1	
	Sensitive parent-student	1	
	Self-confidence	1	
	Curriculum	1	
Second priority for quality education	Teacher	5	30
	Qualified education	4	
	Discipline	3	
	Physical environment	3	
	Quality textbook	2	
	Learning by living	2	
	Understanding	2	
	Equality	1	
	School-teacher-student-parent cooperation	1	
	Guidance	1	
	Feedback	1	
	Values education	1	
	Planned education	1	
Self-confidence	1		

	Far from memorization	1	
	Quality curriculum	1	
	Qualified person	5	
	Physical environment	3	
	Administration	3	
	Teacher	2	
	Student qualification	2	
	Moral education	2	
	Parents	2	
	Love	1	
Third priority for quality education	Opportunity Equality/Egalitarianism	1	30
	Planned education	1	
	Responsibility	1	
	Workshop	1	
	Non-oppressive	1	
	Communication	1	
	Social activities	1	
	Suitable for level	1	
	Justice	1	
	Learning Professional Skills	1	

In Table 3, the participants' responses are listed; the 1st priority category gives teacher (f = 10), 2nd priority category also gives teacher (f = 5) and 3rd priority category gives qualified people (f = 5). All the responses of the participants regarding these categories are given below:

1. Educational staff should be qualified.	1. Education must be qualified.
2. Textbooks must be of good quality	2. Education must be planned.
3. The student should be willing to learn (P2).	3. The teacher should make the lesson fun by endearing it (P4).
1. Quality education should raise good people.	1. Both family and teachers should be disciplined.
2. Quality education should raise qualified people.	2. Everyone is treated equally in quality education.
3. Quality education should raise cultured people (P6).	3. Teachers should teach with interest and enthusiasm (P9).
1. The physical environment of the school should be safe and education secure.	1. It should achieve success as a result of quality quality
2. Quality teacher.	2. The education system should provide feedback to the student.
3. Education must be qualified (P11).	3. It should provide equality of opportunity for everyone in education (P15).

1. He/she must be a good teacher.	1. The teacher-student and parent must work together.
2. The school environment should be perfect.	2. Spiritual/moral values should be emphasized in education.
3. Responsive/sensitive school management is essential (P25).	3. Education should be provided according to the age of the student (P20).

1. The teacher must be enthusiastic.	1. Love and respect.
2. Mutual trust between student and teacher	2. School-teacher-student-parents should work in cooperation.
3. Parent's support and attention (P26).	3. Must raise good people (P14).

1. Love and respect.	1. Productive society.	1. Teacher.
2. Discipline.	2. A school where they can learn by living.	2. School.
3. Responsibility (P17).	3. Workshops to provide practice (P18).	3. Parents (P22).

1. The teacher loves the student and has sufficient communication.
2. Lessons should be fun and endearing, should not be boring.
3. The teacher should focus on the moral aspect of the student rather than the grades and he/she should have high moral values (P29).

The fact that participants are giving the first two priorities to teachers for a quality education and the expectation of qualified people as an output of quality education are the points that attract attention. Participants regard teachers in the center of a quality education, but express the educational system, physical structure and parent support in lower numbers as the input variables. This finding suggests that the participants are not aware of the balance of other variables and attribute the quality of education to the teacher. In addition, the absence of a common view apart from a few concepts about quality education shows that parents' perceptions of quality are highly different. In this regard, the differentiation of the participants' perceptions of quality education may result in a decrease in the satisfaction levels of the education by differentiating the expectations of the participants. All of the concepts expressed by the participants are essential for a quality education, however the differentiation among the priorities of participants is due to the subjective nature of the quality. What is more, this differentiation can be considered natural since it may be affected by very different variables such as the psychological, cultural, socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the participants.

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In this study, where participants' perceptions of quality education are investigated; participants perceive teacher quality at the highest rate among input variables related to quality education. The main task of the teacher in achieving quality in education is to prepare the learning and teaching environment and to provide a mediating, consulting and guidance service by planning the teaching-learning process (Şişman, 1999). The teacher is the main actor of quality and successful education; and the priority of countries that want to provide quality education is to train qualified teachers (Kayadibi, 2001). Studies show that teachers are the most important factor of student learning in schools and these students who have access to highly skilled teachers achieve a higher rate of success regardless of other factors (Jusuf, 2005). In addition, among the process variables; curriculum and teaching method are deemed necessary for a quality education. Finally, the participants expect raising good citizens, self-confident individuals, qualified students and cultured people as the outcome of a quality education. Turkish Ministry of National Education states that (2002) a teacher should have "Teaching-Training Competencies", "General Culture Knowledge and Skills" and "Special Field Knowledge and Skills". In Taşkaya (2012), trainee teachers stated that a qualified teacher should be understanding, egalitarian, continuously improving him/herself, knowledgeable in his/her field, have good communication and classroom management skills. İhtiyaroğlu (2014) determined that, according to students' perceptions, the most important professional characteristic of a qualified teacher is having sufficient field knowledge and teaching the course by using an appropriate method. Dedebeal, Kubat and Dursun (2018) reported that, according to the perceptions of the faculty members working in school of educations, the characteristics of a qualified teacher are as follows: has knowledge of the field, can communicate efficiently, apply appropriate teaching and methods adapted for the student, shows professional development and is a role model. Bakay (2012) report that most of the teachers are cold-minded to quality practices, behave reluctantly at the point of participation, do not adopt such a philosophy, and think that these practices do not contribute to the education system in its current form. Akan and Savaş (2014) stated that quality practices are simply sham; these are practiced partially or on paper, teachers do not have full knowledge about quality practices; what is more schools are suffering from lack of material, equipment, building, qualified staff for quality practices; on top of that parents' indifference, employees not given adequate training on quality practices are also reasons of this sham. In this regard, it can be stated that the qualifications of the teachers who are responsible for managing the educational process can directly affect the quality in education. The relationship with the teacher starts from the first moment parents communicate with the school and this process continues throughout the education. Teacher's quality, personality, attitude towards the profession and communication with stakeholders can directly affect the quality of education. For this reason, it is assumed that parents first expressed the teacher regarding the quality of education. In addition, the fact that parents express the concepts of curriculum and classroom management related to quality education suggests that they have awareness of the process of education, and they know the importance of educational content and student acquisition methods. Eskicumalı, Gür Erdoğan and Arslan (2010) found that parents have information about the primary education program, and their sources of information are teachers and media. Since the skill of the teacher is the basis of classroom management, it is important that teachers have acquired managerial skills as well as their teaching skills (Demirtaş, 2005).

According to the Fundamental Law of National Education (1973) general objectives of education are as follows; raising individuals that practice Atatürk nationalism, based on the values of the Turkish nation, family, country; raise citizens who love and try to glorify, who know their human rights and duties and responsibilities towards the Republic of Turkey; raise healthy good behaving citizens with ideal physical, mental, moral, balance in spirit and sense. It is also expressed as raising individuals with a sophisticated personality and character, preparing the individual for life by developing their interests, aptitudes and abilities, and making a profession that will make the individual happy and contribute to the happiness of the society. Sezer (2020) determined that teacher trainees think that the general objectives of the Turkish Education System are not realized at a high level; however, they think the sub-dimension of raising good citizens is at a high level, the sub-dimension of raising good people is at a medium level and the sub-dimension of preparing for a profession is at a low level. Küçük and Polat (2013) found that primary school administrators expect an individual who has gained a love of homeland, nation, and desired behavioral change from education. The ultimate aim of our education system is to raise good citizens. Parents' expectation of good people as an output from quality education is in accordance with the purpose of our national education. The fact that parents' expectations from quality education are in line with the purpose of education shows that the quality perceptions of stakeholders meet on a common ground.

According to parents, the first three concepts and subjects that are important for a quality education are teachers, teachers and qualified people, respectively. In addition, the fact that parents expressed different concepts primarily for quality education shows that parents do not have a common view on quality education and have different expectations from quality education. Different perception of the concept of quality may be related to the psychological state of people, the social layer they belong to, their feelings of satisfaction or their culture (Kutlu, 2007). When parents expressed their first priority for a quality education; they itemized similar concepts in terms of raising good people by collaborating with parents and students within the framework of teacher quality and love and respect. Teacher quality is the key word to ensure the quality of education indicated by the quality of output and outcome, and it is impossible to build a high-quality education without qualified teachers (Jusuf, 2005). The teacher is the main actor in transforming raw human resources into qualified individuals in education; and education, which is the act of unlocking talents, refers to a complex process that is not limited to mechanical information exchange, but is based on the interaction between the personality of the model and the personality of the student (Kayadibi, 2001). Teachers are the backbone of a nation in quality education and they play a critical role in shaping the future and destiny of this nation because they teach lifestyles, channel youth power and shape their character (Kamlesh, 2015). In this context, when the participants are asked to express the first three priorities that are important for quality education, their expressing the quality of the teacher in the first two places shows that they focus on the teacher for quality education and they are aware of the key role of the teacher for quality education. When parents expressed the second priority for a quality education; again, they itemized similar concepts in the point that qualified teachers should provide a qualified education by doing-living in a disciplined and understanding manner, with quality textbooks and in physical environments suitable for education. In the Ministry of National Education Regulation on Secondary Education Institutions, classroom management and order include; preparing the physical and psychological environment required for education and training, conveying the

program, method and technique to the students, using education and training techniques and technological resources that will enable students to learn by research, doing and living are all mentioned as teachers' responsibilities. In this regard, given the fact that the concepts parents mention for quality education almost exactly coincide with the duties and responsibilities of teachers; it is clear that the duties and responsibilities assigned to the teacher are parallel to the priorities of parents for quality education. When parents express the third priority for a quality education; they stated that quality education can be provided by means of moral education with the cooperation of administration, students, teachers and parents in a suitable physical environment with qualified manpower. Büyükşahin and Şahin (2017) reported that according to teachers, for quality education, it is necessary to improve the financial and physical conditions of the school, raise awareness of the parents, and also the teacher should love his/her profession and students, and be a social and patient guide. Physical environment refers to the physical variables of the environment reserved for educational activities such as temperature, light, color scheme, tools used and empty spaces (Aydın, 2000). As the physical environment can be a learning environment that can facilitate or prevent learning, the teacher should pay great attention to planning and organization (Cohen, Manion, Morrison and Wyse, 2004). Due to the positive correlation between the educational environment and student performance, designing safe and comfortable educational environments for teachers and students should be the responsibility of all stakeholders interested in education (Al Şensoy, 2019). At this point, considering that parents express the physical environment after qualified manpower for quality education, and school is the place where the students spend the most time after home, parents want an appropriate education environment for their children. Creating the physical environment in a way that supports learning seems to be primarily the responsibility of the teacher. Physical environments should be arranged by considering the following factors; leaving spaces in the classroom in a way that does not restrict the ability of students to move, seating arrangement, class temperature, light, color, etc. For a quality education, all internal and external stakeholders of the school must be willing to cooperate and take responsibility. In this regard, the wishes and expectations of the administration, teachers, students, parents and the school environment for a quality education should be evaluated.

Yüzgeç (2008) report that parents expect a hygienic environment, respect for people and safety in school from administrators; on the other hand, they expect respect to human beings, tolerance and trustworthiness from teachers. On the same matter Şahan (2011) reports that parents expect a safe school and a hygienic environment from administrators; and their expectation from teachers is respect for people, students. Observing the satisfaction and satisfaction of both the teachers and students, who are the internal stakeholders of the organization, and the social environment, which are its external stakeholders, is an important aspect of ensuring quality (President & Aydın, 2000). Ünal, Yıldırım and Çelik (2010) report that principals and teachers perceive parents as unconcerned, not cooperating with the school and being protective, and also, they do not consider parents as a part of education. Karadağ (2010) and Gülcemal (2012) report that primary school parents saw the quality of service inadequate. Şentürk and Türkmen (2009) report that administrators find quality practices in primary schools to be partially successful, whereas teachers find it completely inadequate. Considering the necessity of meeting the views of stakeholders at least on a common ground in ensuring quality in education, it can be stated that

there is an accord between the perception of quality education of primary school parents and the human profile that our education system wants to raise, and they meet on a common ground.

For any school to be a quality school, the different expectations of the ministry of education, teachers, parents and other stakeholders should all be merged in a common strategy (Ministry of Education, 2007). For a quality school environment, all stakeholders should be involved (Büyükşahin and Şahin, 2017). Zigarelli (1996) states that in a quality school, teachers should be qualified, leaders should be effective, school culture has to be focused on success, teacher satisfaction should be high, relations with senior management should be good and parents' participation in the school should be abundant. It is a striking point that the role of the management in quality education was expressed very little in the related research. An organization cannot achieve quality just on its own. In order to achieve quality, management must also focus on quality. At this point, it is worrisome that education administrators are not associated with quality in perceptions of parents. What is more, parents tend to express necessity of their own support for quality education in really low levels. This result can be interpreted as most of the parents, an important group of actors in ensuring quality in education, are not aware of their responsibilities and obligations for a quality education. Erdogan and Demirkasımoğlu (2010) report that according to the administrators and teachers, most of the families were reluctant and passive in participating in the education process. Aykol (2019) report that parents' participation in education is moderate, according to teachers and parents. Koç (2019) reports that, according to the primary school teachers, parent participation is important in achieving success, in establishing healthy communication by removing prejudices in parent-teacher relationship, following homework, and receiving parent support when problems arise. Hatipoğlu and Kavas (2016) concluded that parents' positive and informative approaches increase teacher performance. Quality education is a process that makes sense to the extent that parents and students cooperate in this process as much as it requires a qualified teacher and the sincere participation of all stakeholders in the process is indispensable. The differentiation of participants' priorities for quality education is a natural result, considering the subjective nature of the concept of quality and the diversity of factors affecting perception. At this point, it is seen that the concepts that the participants prioritize are related to and affect the quality of education. More importantly, between the aims of our educational system and participants, the only difference is in terms of priorities and nothing else. The quality perceptions of the participants and the aims of our education system are in line; however, it is clear that responsibilities for quality education attributed to the teacher, the manager, the parents and the student, who are other important stakeholders are far from balance. At this point, it can be suggested that parents should be informed about the importance of parent participation for a quality education in our educational institutions and we need to make them a part of the education process. Furthermore, the reasons why managers are considered at lower levels in quality education process in parents' quality perceptions may be investigated. Further research on teacher quality, which parents regard primarily responsible for quality in education, can be conducted as well. In addition, studies can be arranged in order to compare the perceptions of administrators, teachers, parents, and students regarding quality education, who are the main stakeholders and actors of education.

References

- Adams, D. (1998). Defining educational quality: Educational planing. (N. Cemaloğlu, Çev.). *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 4 (14), 68-81.
- Akan, D. & Savaş, M. (2014). İlkokullarda toplam kalite yönetimi uygulamaları üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Anadolu Eğitim Liderliği ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 2 (1), 1-11.
- Akgündüz, D. & Ertepinar, H., Ed. (2015). *STEM eğitimi Türkiye raporu: Günün modası mı yoksa gereksinim mi?*. İstanbul: İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi.
- Aksoy, H. H. (2001). Eğitimde kalitenin kalite sistemleri, eşitlik ve küreselleşmeye ilişkin boyutları. Türkiye Kalite Derneği Ankara Şubesi Eğitimde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Paneli, ODTÜ Kongre ve Kültür Merkezi, Ankara, 21 Şubat.
- Al Şensoy, S. (2019). Mekân ve öğrenme ilişkisi üzerine üreten bir mimar: Herman Hertzberger. *Mimarlık Dergisi* 405, Ocak-Şubat, 40-46.
- Aydın, A. (2000). *Smuf yönetimi*. İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Aykol, B. G. (2019). *Öğretmen ve veli görüşlerine göre ailenin eğitime katılımı*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Ortak Yüksek Lisans Programı, İstanbul.
- Bakan, M. E. (2012). *Öğretmen algılarına göre okullarda kalite kültürü (İzmir ili örneği)*. (Doktora Tezi), Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Eğitim Yönetimi Denetimi Planlaması ve Ekonomisi Bilim Dalı, Denizli.
- Bakioğlu, A ve Baltacı, R. (2010). *Akreditasyon, eğitimde kalite*. Ankara : Nobel Yayınları.
- Balcı, A. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma. yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Başanbaş, Ş. (2013). Algılanan kalite ile müşteri tatmini arasındaki ilişki: Filtre kullanıcıları üzerine yapılan amprik bir çalışma. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 34, 1-21.
- Başkan, G. & Aydın, A. (2000). Eğitim sisteminde insan unsuru ve toplam kalite yönetimi anlayışı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18, 51-55.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2015). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Büyükşahin, Y. & Şahin, A.E. (2017). Öğretmenlerin gözünden eğitimde kalite sorunsalı. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6 (3),1134-1152.
- Cafoğlu, Z. (1996). *Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi*. İstanbul: Serçe Yayınevi.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. & Wyse, D. (2010). *A guide to teaching practise*. (Revised fifth edition). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Crissien-Borrero, T.J., Velásquez-Rodríguez, J., Neira-Rodado, D. & Turizo-Martnez, L.G. (2019). Measuring the quality of management in educaton. *El Profesional De La Información*, 28 (6), e280604. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.nov.04>

- Çelik, V. (1996). *Eğitim örgütlerinde örgütsel kültür ve kalite*. 5. Ulusal Kalite Kongresi Kitabı (347-350). İstanbul: TÜSİAD-KAL-DER Yayınları.
- Çelik, M. & Taşar, H. (2012). Eğitimde toplam kalite bilinci üzerine bir inceleme: Adıyaman örneği. *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (2), 1-12.
- Dedebal, N.C., Kubat, U. & Dursun, F. (2018). Hiçbir eğitim sisteminin kalitesi öğretmenin kalitesini aşamaz. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(27), 531-546.
- Demirtaş, H. (2005). *Sınıf yönetiminin temelleri*. H. Kıran (Ed.), Etkili sınıf yönetimi (1. Baskı) (1-34). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Dünya Bankası (2011). *Türkiye’de temel eğitimde kalite ve eşitliğin geliştirilmesi zorluklar ve seçenekler*. The World Bank: USA.
- Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metotlarına giriş*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Eleren, A. (2007). Eğitim başarısının artırılmasında süreç geliştirme yöntemlerinin kullanılması ve bir uygulama. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, IX (II), 1-25.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2002). *Eğitimde değişim yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Erdoğan, Ç. & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2010). Ailelerin eğitim sürecine katılımına ilişkin öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 16 (3), 399-431.
- Eroğlu, E. (2004). *Yüksek öğretimde hizmet kalitesi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Eskicumalı, A., Gür Erdoğan, D. & Arslan, S. (2010). Velilerin yeni ilköğretim programına ilişkin görüşleri. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19, 30-45.
- Glasser, W. (1999). *Okulda kaliteli eğitim* (U. Kaplan, Çev.). İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları (1999,2016).
- Gökçe, F. (2010). Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin gösterdikleri davranışların kaliteli eğitim açısından değerlendirilmesi (Denetçi görüşleri). *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23 (2), 415-432.
- Göksoy, S. (2014). Eğitim sistemlerinde kalite standartları ve kalite standart alanları. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum Dergisi*, 3 (7), 85-99.
- Gülcemal E. (2012). *İlköğretim okullarında hizmet kalitesinin veli görüşlerine göre ölçülmesi*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Hatipoğlu, A. & Kavas, E. (2016). Veli yaklaşımlarının öğretmen performansına etkisi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(4), 1012-1034.
- Hesapçoğlu, M. (2006). Eğitim kurumlarında kalite olgusu ve kalite güvence sistemleri. *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, sayı: 23, 143-160.
- İhtiyaroğlu, N . (2014). Öğrenci algılarına göre öğretmen, öğrenci ve öğretim etkinliğinde kalite ölçütleri . *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi* , 4 (10) , 33-39 .
- Jusuf, H. (2005). Improving teacher quality, a keyword for improving education facing global challenges. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET*, 4(1), 33-37.
- Kamlesh, K. (2015). Role of teacher in quality education. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities (IJELLH)*, 3 (10), 226-233.

- Karaca, E. (2008). Eğitimde kalite arayışları ve eğitim fakültelerinin yeniden yapılandırılması. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21, 61-77.
- Karadağ, E. (2010). İlköğretim okullarında hizmet kalitesi: Veli algılarına dayalı bir araştırma. *Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi / Teori ve Uygulama*, 1, 19-42.
- Karşlı, M. D. (1997). Teknik eğitimin yönetimi ve kalite. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 2, 207-218.
- Kayadibi, F. (2001). Eğitim kalitesine etki eden faktörler ve kaliteli eğitimin üretime katkısı. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3, 72-94.
- Koç, M. H. (2019). Veli katılımı hakkında sınıf öğretmenleri ne düşünüyor? Fenomenolojik bir çalışma. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(29), 53-74.
- Kuş, E. (2003). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma teknikleri nitel mi, nicel mi?*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Kutlu, H. A. (2007). Kaliteyi algılamadaki farklılıklar üzerine kafkas üniversitesi öğrencileri arasında bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 21 (1), 247-262.
- Küçük, Z. A. & Polat, S. (2013). İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin eğitime ve eğitimin amaçlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 239-255.
- LeCompte, M. D. & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in educational research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(2), 31-60.
- Mandal, A. (2007). Quality and cost-effectiveness. *Burns: An International Journal*, 33, 414-417.
- Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu (1973, 14 Haziran). *Resmî Gazete* (Sayı: 14574). Erişim: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/14574.pdf>
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (2002). *Öğretmen yeterlilikleri*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (2007). *Eğitimde kalite ödülü el kitabı*. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Yayınları.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Ortaöğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği (2013, 7 Eylül). *Resmî Gazete* (Sayı: 28758). Erişim: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/09/20130907-4.htm>
- Moss, P. & Pence, A. (Eds.). (1994). *Valuing quality in early childhood services: New approaches to defining quality*. London: Sage Publication.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. Paris: OECD
- Okumuş, A. & Duygun, A. (2008). Eğitim hizmetlerinin pazarlanmasında hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü ve algılanan hizmet kalitesi ile öğrenci memnuniyeti arasındaki ilişki. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 17-38.
- Peker, Ö. (1994). Toplam kalite yönetiminin eğitim sistemine uygulanabilirliği. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 27 (2), 63-78.
- Peker, Ö. (1996). Eğitimde kalite ve akreditasyon. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 29 (4), 19-32.
- Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational Behaviour*. (İ. Erdem, Çev. Ed.). 14. Basım Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

- Sahney, S., Banwet, D. K. & Karunes, S. (2008). An integrated framework of indices for quality management in education: A faculty perspective. *The TQM Journal*, 20(5), 502-519. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17542730810898467>.
- Sezer, Ş. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının görüşlerine göre türk milli eğitiminin genel amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyi. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi (OPUS)*, 15 (24), 2269-2296. DOI: 10.26466/opus.619531
- Şahan, M. A. (2011). *İlköğretim okullarında öğrencisi olan velilerin yönetici ve öğretmenlerden beklentileri*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İlköğretim Anabilim Dalı Sınıf Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı, Denizli.
- Şener, F. (2016). Kaliteli olmak yetmez kaliteli olarak algılanmak gerekir. *Kobitek*. Erişim: 29.11.2016. <http://kobitek.com/kalitenin-pazarlama-boyutu>
- Şentürk, H. & Türkmen, Ö. (2009). İlköğretim okullarındaki yönetici ve öğretmenlerin toplam kalite uygulamalarına ilişkin algıları. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12, 128-142.
- Şişman, M. (1999). Toplam kalite yönetiminin okulda uygulanması. Kamu Yönetiminde Kalite 1. Ulusal Kongresi. Ankara: TODAİE, 26-27 Mayıs.
- Şişman, M. (2002). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı etkili okullar*. Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.
- Taşkaya, S. M. (2012). Nitelikli bir öğretmende bulunması gereken özelliklerin öğretmen adaylarının görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 33, 283-298.
- Tavşancıl, E. & Aslan, E. (2001). *İçerik analizi ve uygulama örnekleri*. İstanbul: Epsilon Yayınları.
- Temel, A. (1999). Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 144. Erişim: 25.11.2016. http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/144/temel.htm
- Uluğ, F. (2003). Okul kalite sistemi modeli. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 36 (4), 69-82.
- Ulutaş Özşen, A. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin liderlik stilleri ile toplam kaliteye ilişkin tutumlarının incelenmesi*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul.
- Uryan, B. (2002). Toplam kalite yönetimi. *Mevzuat Dergisi*, sayı: 55. Erişim: 07.03.2021. <https://www.mevzuatdergisi.com/2002/07a/02.htm>
- Ünal, S. (1997). Eğitim-kalite-istihdam. *Anahtar Gazetesi*, 9 (105), 5-9.
- Ünal, A., Yıldırım, A. & Çelik, M. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdür ve öğretmenlerinin velilere ilişkin algılarının analizi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23, 261-272.
- Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *Spss uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, A. & H. Şimşek. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yüzgeç, M. E. (2008). *İlköğretim kurumlarının 4. ve 5. sınıfında öğrencileri bulunan velilerin, yönetici ve öğretmenlerden beklentileri*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Bilim Dalı, İstanbul.

Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-110.