

An Analysis Regarding the Equality Perceptions of Educational Administrators¹

Gulay Aslan

*Gaziosmanpasa University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences,
Tokat, Turkey*

Telephone: +90 356 252 16 16; E-mail: gulay.aslan@gop.edu.tr

KEYWORDS Educational Equality. Opportunity. Inequality. Administrator. Turkey

ABSTRACT The purpose of the study is to determine the views of the school administrators working at different levels in the Tokat province regarding educational equality and domains of inequality experienced in the field of education in Turkey. It was designed using a phenomenological approach, a qualitative research method, and a purposeful sampling technique was utilized. The study group included 77 school administrators working at different levels in the city of Tokat in the 2013-2014 school year. Data were collected through semi-structured open-ended questions and analyzed by the content analysis technique. School administrators predominantly defined equality within the context of formal equality and mentioned a number of inequality domains existing in education in Turkey. The administrators also mentioned some policies that could be carried out at the macro and micro levels to provide educational equality.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of equality in education was first emanated in the 19th century, when economic developments, specifically the transfer of production from families to factories, changed socialization patterns and promoted the massification of education (Bowles 1977). On the other hand, the organization of education by the governments and its financing by public resources generated discussions concerning equality (Ozsoy 2002: 35).

Precisely defining equality in the historical process has been as difficult as providing it; nevertheless, there is a certain consensus about how to measure equality. In general, four types of equality are mentioned: existential equality, equality of opportunity, equality of condition, and consequential equality (Turner 2007: 35-37).

In terms of equality in education, however, two equality approaches may be considered: *formal* and *substantive* equality. Formal equality means that all individuals should be treated equally and should be provided with the same opportunities, regardless of their conditions and characteristics. When this is realized, the differences between the achievements of individuals receiving education would be because of the natural differences between their talents or predispositions. Substantive equality focuses on the equality of outcomes; the view of different treatment for individuals in different conditions dominates the approach. Substantive equality is based

on the opinion that individuals are not the same because they are different in gender, social and economic status, ethnicity, religion, race, sect, etc., and claims that disadvantaged individuals should be treated differently to provide equality (Eğitim Reform Girişimi (ERG) 2009).

According to Tan (1987), the evolution of equality in education occurred in accordance with an approach steering from the educational inputs to the educational outputs; however, equality in the educational inputs was insufficient to equalize the educational outputs. In many parts of the world, and developing countries in particular, inequalities in education have not been completely eliminated (Torche 2005; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2007; United Nations (UN) 2010; Ünal et al. 2010; World Bank (WB) 2013; Agasisti and Longobardi 2014; Yang et al. 2014). Therefore, equalizing the conditions would not always mean equalizing the results, and that benefits from education would not be equal, even for the individuals receiving the same education, because of features like socio-economic status, social class background of the family, gender roles, composition of the student group, religion, sect, ethnicity, etc. (Tan 1987). Nevertheless, according to Coleman (1968: 7-22, cited in Tan 1987: 249), if the effects of the school are stronger than the out-of-school effects, the achievement levels of the students with different backgrounds would come closer; on the other hand, if the opposite is

true, then the different groups would drift further apart.

There are also views supporting the position that the provision of equality is an issue of the system. According to Marxists, equality in education could be realized with the provision of equality in the social system (Bowles 1977; Greaves et al. 2007; McLaren 2011: 20; Rikowski 2011). Along with the discussions about whether equality is an issue related to the system, research gives evidence that the neo-liberal policies in many parts of the world threaten the right to education and deepen current inequalities (Ercan 1998; OECD 2007; Torche 2010; Gok 2013; Yolcu 2013). With these policies, competitions between schools have been encouraged. Public opinion concerning these schools to be developed and to have higher quality through these interactions has been tried to be created (Apple 2001, 2004; Ball 2007; Hartley 2007; Giroux 2008: 17). Yet, neo-liberal policies have undertaken a function to bring a structural meaning to inequality (Ercan 1998: 10). Owens et al. (Owens 2012, 2014, cited in Reardon and Owens 2014) conducted a study in the USA using data on school-age children, listed according to family incomes, that discrimination between students in public school between districts increased in three-quarters of the 100 largest metropolitan areas during the 1990s and the 2000s. The reason for this increase was mainly because of increased discrimination among middle- and high-income families. According to Carter and Reardon (2014), today, about one-third of Black, Native American, and Latino youth under the age of eighteen live below the poverty line. The states of poverty and other forms of disadvantage they are in will likely to prevent them from accessing quality-schools and living in safe neighborhoods like their more advantaged peers.

Educational equality is a means to access social resources, positions, and other rights. This means equality is one of the most important principles of education. The purpose of this study is to determine the views of the school administrators working at different levels in the Tokat province regarding educational equality and the domains of inequality experienced in the field of education in Turkey. Within the frame of this purpose, three basic questions were asked:

- (i) How do school administrators define equality?

- (ii) According to school administrators, what are the domains of inequality experienced in the field of education in Turkey?
- (iii) What are the solution suggestions of school administrators regarding the elimination of those domains of inequality?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study, aimed to determine the views of the school administrators regarding educational equality and domains of inequality experienced in the field of education in Turkey, was designed utilizing a phenomenological approach, which is a qualitative research method. *Educational equality* was the phenomenon focused on in this research process.

Study Group

In this study, a purposeful sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, was preferred. In the determination of the school administrators, variables, such as title, seniority, gender, age, working at different levels, and working in different towns were taken into account. The study group included 77 school administrators (principal, chief deputy principal, and deputy principal) working at different levels in the city of Tokat in the 2013-2014 school year. Gender, age, seniority, institution worked, and the place worked information are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Features of the study group

		Number	%
<i>Gender</i>	Woman	8	10.4
	Man	69	89.6
	Total	77	100.0
<i>Age</i>	30 – 40 years	47	61.0
	41 and above	30	39.0
	Total	77	100
<i>Title</i>	Principal	31	41.9
	Chief Deputy/Deputy	43	58.1
	Principal		
	Total	74	100.0
<i>Seniority in Administration</i>	1-5 years	37	48.7
	6-10 years	27	35.5
	11 years and more	12	15.8
	Total	76	100.0
<i>Institution Worked</i>	Primary	60	77.9
	Secondary	17	22.1
	Total	77	100.0
<i>Place Worked</i>	City	54	70.1
	Village/Town	23	29.9
	Total	77	100.0

Data Collection

In the study, data were collected through semi-structured open-ended questions. In the development of the data collection tool, literature was reviewed; opinions and suggestions of the school administrators were obtained. Specialists' views and opinions were obtained on the draft form to determine the content validity.

Data Analysis

Data obtained in the study were analyzed by the content analysis technique. Each question was accepted as a theme, and sub-themes were obtained based on the answers. Frequencies and percentages were given to the sub-themes and these were entered into a computer. As the last step of the analysis, the opinion of an expert on educational sciences and qualitative research was obtained on the themes and sub-themes, and inter-coder reliability analysis was performed on the themes obtained. In this process, the formula $\text{Reliability} = (\text{Consensus} / \text{Consensus} + \text{Dis-sensus}) \times 100$ (Miles and Huberman 1994) was used, and the level of inter-coder reliability was calculated as 94.1 percent.

RESULTS

Results Related to the Equality Perceptions of the Educational Administrators

The school administrators were asked how they defined equality, with the reasoning that their perceptions of equality would affect the efforts to provide equality in education in Turkey at both the macro and micro levels. The views of the administrators on this were grouped into two sub-themes under the theme of equality perception (Table 2).

Of the administrators, 80 percent defined equality within the context of *formal equality*; almost all of these administrators emphasized that everybody should receive a quality education. They stated that, to provide this, educational inputs should be equalized and there should not be discrimination because of their features, such as gender, ethnicity, religion, etc.

Twenty percent of the administrators defined equality in the context of true equality through outputs and emphasized the government's responsibilities. It was emphasized that educational inputs being equalized by the government does not mean that educational equality is provided, and that it is necessary to take some specific precautions. One of the administrators indicated that:

In my opinion, what should be understood from the educational equality is not only what is mentioned in the Law Number 1739. It is the evaluating of the factors originated from the socio-economic and socio-cultural levels of the family and where they live, and opportunities which would help developing individual's innate talents, and solving the inequalities arising from these(Y7).

On the other hand, G50, stating that producing policies based on the results is necessary but not enough, emphasized public education. The administrator stated that education is a public right and it is impossible to provide educational equality in a state where it is dependent on meta-relationship.

Administrators who perceived equality within the context of formal equality perceived individuals as homogeneous beings, and stated that the issue could be resolved by equalizing the educational indicators. On the other hand, the others stated that equality before the laws and in the inputs are necessary but not enough, and it is necessary to take precautions toward the disadvantaged groups.

Table2: Views related to the equality perceptions of the educational administrators

<i>Sub-themes</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Participant codes</i>
<i>Formal Equality</i>	61	80.3	(Y1, Y2, Y4, Y5, Y6, Y9, Y10, Y11, Y12, Y13, Y14, Y16, Y19, Y21, Y22, Y23, Y24, Y25, Y26, Y27, Y29, Y30, Y31, Y32, Y33, Y34, Y35, Y37, Y39, Y40, Y41, Y43, Y44, Y45, Y46, Y47, Y48, Y51, Y53, Y54, Y56, Y58, Y61, Y62, Y63, Y65, Y66, Y67, Y68, Y69, Y70, Y71, Y73, Y75, Y76, Y77)
<i>True Equality</i>	15	19.7	(Y3, Y7, Y8, Y15, Y17, Y18, Y20, Y36, Y38, Y42, Y49, Y50, Y52, Y55, Y57, Y59, Y60, Y64, Y72, Y74)
<i>Total</i>	76	100.0	

Results Related to the Inequality Areas that the Educational Administrators Think are Experienced in Education

The school administrators were asked the question “What are the issues that you think restrain educational equality in Turkey?” The views on this topic were grouped in seven sub-themes under the theme of inequality domains. The most emphasized inequality domain was rural-urban and regional inequalities based on the differences originating from *the opportunities of the schools*. In this domain, disparities in the distribution of teachers, differences between the opportunities and school environments, rural-urban differences, regional differences, multi-grade class practice, mobile education, and inequalities experienced in Regional Primary Boarding Schools were mentioned frequently (Table 3).

Another inequality domain thought to occur in education is the inequalities based on the socio-economic and socio-cultural backgrounds of the parents. Administrators emphasized that the socio-economic and socio-cultural attributes are key determinants in a child’s access to education and receiving a quality education. One of the administrators, Y59, indicated that:

In my opinion, the most significant issue restraining equality in education in Turkey is the social and economic status of the student’s parents. Opportunities such as receiving private

tutoring and etude study and attending private teaching institute provided to children by their parents with high economic level create inequalities. Similarly, cultural backgrounds of the families are another factor restraining equality. Children coming from higher cultural backgrounds are well prepared for the school life (Y59).

Some of the administrators emphasized that the policies followed, specifically the populist policies and continuously changing education system, caused inequality, let alone restrained it. They also emphasized the deepening of the inequalities by the present financing activities.

Some of the administrators mentioned that the policies they followed, especially at the secondary school level, increased inequalities. They claimed that with the central examinations, especially at secondary and higher education levels, “academic selectivity” is made and schools are classified and segregated.

Another dimension mentioned was the inequalities based on gender perceptions. All of the administrators focused on social conditions, such as attitudes towards women, traditional roles, and manners and customs, which cause segregation and thus inequality between male and female students. One of the administrators indicated that:

Girls are not benefiting from education sufficiently because of some traditional attitudes.

Table 3: Views related to the inequality areas that the educational administrators think are experienced in education

Sub-themes	f ^e	%	Participant codes
<i>Rural-Urban and Regional Inequalities Stemming from the School Resources and Possibilities</i>	36	29.0	(Y1, Y2, Y3, Y5, Y7, Y11, Y16, Y17, Y20, Y22, Y25, Y26, Y27, Y29, Y34, Y35, Y36, Y37, Y42, Y45, Y48, Y49, Y53, Y54, Y56, Y58, Y60, Y64, Y65, Y67, Y69, Y70, Y72, Y73, Y74, Y75)
<i>Socio-Economic and Socio-cultural Inequalities</i>	33	26.6	(Y2, Y4, Y5, Y6, Y7, Y8, Y9, Y10, Y11, Y12, M14, Y15, Y18, Y19, Y25, Y26, Y28, Y33, Y43, Y49, Y53, Y59, 60, Y61, Y62, Y63, Y67, Y68, Y73, Y74, Y75, Y76, Y77)
<i>Inequalities Created by the Education Policies</i>	19	15.3	(Y2, Y8, Y11, Y13, Y18, Y21, Y23, Y31, Y37, Y38, Y39, Y40, Y41, Y47, Y52, Y54, Y64, Y71, Y75)
<i>Inequalities Concerning Disadvantaged Groups</i>	14	11.3	(Y7, Y8, Y13, Y17, Y18, Y24, Y28, Y35, Y37, Y38, Y44, Y51, Y54, Y64)
<i>Gender Inequality</i>	13	10.5	(Y3, Y7, Y8, Y15, Y25, Y26, Y44, Y54, Y60, Y68, Y75, Y76, Y77)
<i>Inequalities Stemming From Ethnic Differences, Language, Terrorism, and Belief</i>	8	6.5	(Y6, Y19, Y32, Y45, Y52, Y60, Y68, Y75)
<i>Inequalities Stemming From the Commoditization of Education</i>	1	0.8	(Y50)
Total	124	100.0	

Although it differs in different regions, girls' perceptions of being subordinated are common tendency. For example, girls are not sent to school in some places because of the manners and customs or beliefs (Y26).

Administrators stated that there is inequality for the disadvantaged groups in the system. They mentioned different issues, such as: services provided to children with special education needs being temporary and insufficient (Y8, Y13, Y44); the disabled being seen as a burden on the society (Y17); students who need special education, especially inclusive students, being treated as non-existent in the system (Y18, Y38, Y44); and lack of sufficient institutions for the disabled (Y64). Some of the administrators made comments regarding the probability of educational inequalities caused by ethnic and belief-origin differences. Among the administrators, only one made a connection between educational equality and the neo-liberal policies followed. Y50 phrased these as:

The most important issue that I think restrains educational equality is the commoditization of education, and transforming it into a commodity rather than its being a right, a public service. (...) In our country, private schools are supported by the government; people are attracted to private schools by lessening the state school as if they are not efficient.

It is seen that the inequality domains mentioned by the administrators are interlocking processes that support each other. For example, socio-economic levels of families can determine both gender inequalities and inequalities based on schools' opportunities. On the other hand, educational policies can directly affect all inequality domains.

Solution Recommendations of the Educational Administrators Regarding Inequality Areas

In the study, the question "What should be done to eliminate inequalities in education?" was asked of the administrators. The views on this topic were grouped into eight sub-themes under the recommendations theme (Table 4).

Majority of the administrators stated that the present financial structure of the education system should be changed to eliminate educational inequalities. A significant number of administrators emphasized positive discrimination policies for disadvantaged children to be followed by the government. Differentiation of schools in terms of educational inputs was seen as a determining element in the quality of education, and equalization of educational inputs was emphasized. It was stated that public resources should be distributed after accounting for the

Table 4: Solution recommendations of the educational administrators regarding inequality domains

<i>Sub-themes</i>	<i>f^s</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Participant codes</i>
Present financial structure should be changed, and more resources should be allocated to the schools	31	24.6	(Y2, Y6, Y7, Y9, Y10, Y11, Y16, Y19, Y24, Y25, Y27, Y28, Y29, Y31, Y32, Y34, Y35, Y37, Y43, Y45, Y53, Y58, Y59, Y60, Y62, Y69, Y70, Y72, Y74, Y75, Y77)
Policies should be developed and measurements should be taken regarding disadvantaged groups.	30	23.8	(Y1, Y2, Y4, Y5, Y7, Y8, Y13, Y15, Y17, Y18, Y19, Y24, Y25, Y27, Y31, Y32, Y36, Y38, Y44, Y45, Y53, Y54, Y56, Y64, Y67, Y68, Y70, Y74, Y75, Y77)
Inequalities in educational inputs should be eliminated.	22	17.5	(Y2, Y5, Y8, Y11, Y20, Y25, Y29, Y31, Y34, Y35, Y37, Y40, Y43, Y46, Y53, Y54, Y59, Y60, Y69, Y70, Y74, Y77)
Combating inequality should be on the agenda of education.	20	15.9	(Y3, Y5, Y8, Y18, Y20, Y21, Y22, Y27, Y31, Y34, Y38, Y39, Y44, Y45, Y54, Y63, Y71, Y73, Y74, Y76)
Frequent changing of system and new regulations in education should be discontinued.	9	7.1	(Y2, Y12, Y18, Y26, Y38, Y40, Y47, Y59, Y71)
Awareness about education should be raised in parents.	9	7.1	(Y2, Y12, Y18, Y26, Y38, Y40, Y47, Y59, Y71)
Private schools, universities, and private teaching institutions should be shut down.	4	3.2	(Y7, Y28, Y50, Y55)
Transitions to secondary and higher education should be reorganized; diversity in secondary education institutions should be scaled down.	2	1.6	(Y7, Y54)
Total	126	100.0	

differences between schools. Four of the administrators stated that private schools/private universities, and private teaching institutions should be closed in order to provide equality in education. One of the administrators indicated that:

It is necessary to see education as a right; it should be transformed into an equally provided service for every individual making it free from any kind of social and class discriminations. Privatization of education should be ended. Standards of the state schools should be raised; a quality public education should be provided to every individual (Y50).

DISCUSSION

Eighty percent of the educational administrators defined/perceived educational equality within the frame of formal equality, and 20 percent within the frame of true equality. The administrators who defined equality within the frame of formal equality emphasized equalizing the variables, such as opportunities and environments of schools, quality and quantity of teachers, and educational materials. According to Ward (2013), equal access to education does not necessarily mean the provision of educational equality, because along with the costs, such as distance to school, cost of transportation, school fees, uniforms, textbooks, etc., hidden costs, such as children having to work in the field, at a family-run business, or other workplaces to contribute to the family budget, make education inaccessible for many. Thus, as a significant number of administrators stated, equalizing school opportunities may not mean educational equality is ensured.

In the study, administrators pointed out mostly rural-urban and regional inequalities arising from the *opportunities of schools*. According to 2010 Turkey Report of the UN, educational inequalities between regions continue to exist. According to a study conducted by Unal et al. (2010), differences between educational environment and opportunities of schools are gradually increasing; beyond the rural-urban and regional inequalities, inequalities are arising on the basis of school and even between classes. Heyneman and Loxley (1983), in their study conducted using data from twenty-nine countries, thirteen of which were developed and sixteen developing or less developed, found that the effect of family on the student achievement was greater in de-

veloped countries, whereas the school had a higher effect on student achievement in developing countries. Although environment and opportunity differences between schools are among the determining elements/factors of the quality and achievement in education, it cannot be said that equality would be ensured even in the conditions where these are equalized. Coleman (1996, cited in Oral and McGivney 2014) found that school resources have limited effects on academic achievement. Jencks et al. (1972: 96, cited in Kose 2007), in their "Inequality" study that they conducted in the USA, found that eliminating the financial and physical qualities of schools did not have a significant effect on eliminating the existing inequalities. In another study, where the effects of school features and family status on student achievement were examined together, school features were less effective than family status (Parcel and Dufur 2001). According to Rapp (2012), educational equality means not 'exactly the same' but instead, following the same parameters in all schools and equal distribution of financial resources.

Another important inequality domain administrators mentioned is the inequalities based on socio-economic and socio-cultural structures of families. Administrators stated that the socio-economic level of the family determined the achievement of the child; there are research and statistics supporting this finding (Acemoglu and Pischke 2000; Kose 2007; Johanningmeier 2008; WB 2013; Oral and McGivney 2014). On the other hand, in a study that examined the effect of social capital on drop-out rates in Turkey, it was found that, despite the presence of social inequalities, the interaction between students and teachers and the involvement of families in the school helped keep the students in school (Cemalcilara and Goksen 2015).

When one examines the 2012 distribution of household consumption expenditures by quintiles, ordered by income, in Turkey, while the share of the first quintile (the lowest income group) was 2.3 percent in the educational expenditures, the share of the fifth quintile (the higher income group) was 66.8 percent (Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) 2013). This irregularity in educational expenditures is a determining element in the formation of educational inequalities, such as children's access to education, school achievement, school attendance, and quality of education.

There is a positive correlation between children's achievement in science and the educa-

tional materials and computer and internet opportunities they have-which may be considered an indication of socio-economic power (Özer and Anil 2011). In short, the achievement difference between schools has become the criteria for educational inequality; the greater the difference, the greater the inequality becomes (Johanningmeier 2008). According to the OECD report (2012), differences between schools across Turkey continue, both in terms of socio-economic aspect and at the academic achievement level. Dowd (2004) found that the family income was an important indicator of completing undergraduate programs at the higher education level. Gurler et al. (2007) also found that increases in the annual income of the family increased the education demands of their children.

Administrators stated that the education level of parents is important in terms of a child's access to education and school success; studies support this claim. For example, Kose (2008) found that increases in the education level of the father increased the probability of the child to go to a higher-quality school and private education institution. Research on the variables affecting the academic achievements of students reveals that the education levels of parents affects the academic achievement of the child. There are also other studies with results that, especially, the father's education level affects the child's academic success (Alomar 2006; Anil 2009; Ozer and Anil 2011).

Educational policies implemented to eliminate inequality are important. Two dimensions could be mentioned here: the first is removing the provisions from the legal regulations that may potentially cause inequality; and second is avoiding implementations that may cause inequality in the macro or micro level educational policies. Administrators pointed out that the government stopped providing financial support to primary and secondary schools (completely) and high schools (partially). Statistics confirmed that this issue was emphasized by the administrators. The percentage of the MoNE investment budget in the national budget decreased from 19.90 percent in 2000 to 6.32 percent in 2010, its percentage in the consolidated budget went down from 28.35 percent to 8.06 percent, and its percentage in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) went down from 0.40 percent to 0.16 percent (MoNE 2013). A similar concern was mentioned also by Karakütük (2012: 345). Karakütük stated that the most sig-

nificant issue that the educational organizations face, in terms of budget management, was the inadequate budget, confirmed by the international data. Average educational expenditures in the OECD countries in 2004 were 5,832 US Dollars in primary education, 7,276 US Dollars in secondary education and 7,951 US Dollars in higher education. The same data for Turkey are 1,120, 1,808, and 4,231 US Dollars, respectively (OECD 2007). Hayashi et al. (2014) examined the inequalities in expenditures in Indonesia between 2008 and 2010 and concluded that the educational expenditures in rural and urban areas contributed to educational inequality. Yang et al. reported that although there have been significant improvements in decreasing educational inequality and educational attainment, urban-rural and social stratification divisions still remain as factors causing educational inequality (Yang et al. 2014).

Administrators also emphasized the inequalities concerning disadvantaged groups and gender inequalities. According to the Education for All 2012 Global Monitoring Report data, gender discrimination in rural parts of Turkey is significant; while the first years of secondary schools could not be completed by 65 percent of the girls, which was true for only 36 percent for the boys. Gender equality can be observed in terms of educational opportunities in well-off families, but a significant difference is observed in poor families, with 64 percent of boys and 30 percent of girls achieve basic skills (www.unesco.org/tr). Data show that gender perceptions continue to be an obstacle for the education of girls (Arslan 2012). This is not true for Turkey only; only in 59 of the 181 countries from which data could be obtained could gender equality be provided in primary and secondary education (in terms of enrollment rates) (UNESCO 2007). Mollaa and Cuthbertb (2014), in their study conducted at two state universities, found that social gender inequality towards women in Ethiopia still exists. Social gender inequality may also lead to income inequalities. For example, Lutz and McGillivray (2015), in their study titled, "The impact of gender inequality in education on income in Africa and the Middle East", concluded that gender inequality in primary and secondary education negatively affects income. This is a significant indication that social gender inequality nurtures other inequalities.

The commoditization of education, emphasized by some of the administrators, increases

educational inequalities parallel with the diminishing public quality of education and education being subject to market relationships (Ercan 1998; Hill 2003; Foster 2012). Yandell (2013) stated that education today is under greater threat than ever before, especially for the children of the working class.

CONCLUSION

This study showed that there are significant inequalities in the field of education. Educational administrators pointed out inequalities, such as urban-rural and regional inequalities, stemming from school opportunities, socio-economic and socio-cultural disparities, disparities caused by educational policies, inequalities regarding disadvantaged groups, and social gender inequalities. According to the school administrators, disparities between schools can affect the quality of education. Socio-economic levels and social gender perceptions of families and inadequate budgets of the schools were seen as important obstacles to educational equality, especially the social gender perceptions of families, which continue to prevent girls from accessing education in rural areas. On the other hand, the educational administrators defined, to a large extent, the term equality in the context of formal equality, and focused on equalizing the educational inputs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These suggestions could be made in line with the findings of the study: schools should not be obligated to create their own resources; schools should not be dependent on the financial contributions of the parents; the government should provide the necessary budget to all schools; the government should follow a foregrounding program concerning the use of public resources, especially for the schools with various incapacities (teacher, classroom, materials, etc.); and the government should set up a quality standard for schools, and the schools below that standard should be provided with additional resources and necessary support, and arrangements should be made for those schools.

The provision of equality among the regions, provinces, and schools requires setting forth the distribution of current education expenditures and redistribution of educational resources in a

way to correct the current imbalance. To do this, public expenditures in the field of education in Turkey should be analyzed. The increase in the specific expenditures within the general educational expenditures may prevent access to the right to education for the families with low socio-economic status. Therefore, positive discrimination policies should be practiced, eliminating the determinative roles of the parents' socio-economic and socio-cultural levels in education. Additionally, the process of how the educational inequality is generated in schools should be researched, both on a school basis and through the individual schools' stories of the students. This research conducted with school administrators should be repeated with upper-level education administrators who direct education at the macro level.

Some of the administrators stated that educational equality is a utopia. Despite all of the inequalities in Turkey mentioned by the school administrators, and the weakness of faith in the provision of equality, the equality principle, beyond taking place in the legal documents, should direct educational policies and applications.

NOTES

1. This study was presented at the 1st Eurasian Educational Research Congress, 24-26 April 2014, Turkey-Istanbul.
2. Total frequency is more than the number of participants because some of the administrators mentioned more than one inequality area.
3. Total frequency is more than the number of participants because some of the administrators mentioned more than one solution recommendation.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu D, Pischke JS 2000. Changes in the Wage Structure, Family Income, and Children's Education. From <<http://econ.lse.ac.uk/staff/spischke/nels5.pdf>> (Retrieved on 2 July 2013).
- Alomar BO 2006. Personal and family paths to pupil achievement. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(8): 907-922.
- Anil D 2009. Uluslararası öğrenci başarılarını değerlendirme programı (PISA)'nda Türkiye'deki öğrencilerin fen bilimleri başarılarını etkileyen faktörler. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34(152): 87-100.
- Apple MW 2001. Markets, standards, teaching, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(3): 182-196.
- Apple MW 2004. *Neoliberalizm ve Eğitim Politikaları Üzerine Elestirel Yazılar*. (Translated by Fatma Gök et al.). Ankara: Eğitim Sen Yayınları.

- Arslan H 2012. Teachers perceptions of gender discrimination elementary school course books. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 49(A): 311-330.
- Ball SJ 2007. *Education Plc: Understanding Private Sector Participation in Public Sector Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bowles S 1977. Esitsiz egitim ve toplumsal isbolumunun yeniden uretimi. (Translated by Kemal Inal). *Egitimve Yasam*, 99:14-18.
- Carter PL, Reardon SF 2014. Inequality Matters: Framing A Strategic Inequality Research Agenda. California: A William T. Grant Foundation Inequality Paper From <<http://blog.wtgrantfoundation.org>> (Retrieved on 3 April 2015).
- Cemalcilara Z, Goksen F 2015. Inequality in Social Capital: Social Capital, Social Risk and Drop-Out in the Turkish Education System. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(1): 94-114, From <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.740807>> (Retrieved on 1 April 2015).
- Dowd AC 2004. Income and Financial Aid Effects on Persistence and Degree Attainment in Public Colleges. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(21). From <<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n21>> (Retrieved on 13 June 2013).
- Ercan F 1998. *Egitim ve Kapitalizm: Neo-liberal Egitim Ekonomisinin Elestirisi*. Istanbul: Bilim Yayıncılık.
- ERG 2009. *Egitimde Esitlik Politika Analizi ve Oneriler*. Istanbul: Sabanci Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Foster JB 2012. Egitim ve sermayenin yapisal krizi: ABD örneği. *Monthly Review Bagimsiz Sosyalist Dergisi*, 29: 49-88.
- Giroux HA 2008. *Elestirel Pedagojinin Vaadi*. (Trans. U. D. Tuna. Birinci Basim). Istanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Gök F 2013. Türkiye’de elestirel egitimin gündemi. In: N Kurul, T Öztürk, I Metinnam (Eds.): *Kamusal Egitim Elestirel Iazilar*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi, pp. 387-393.
- Greaves NM, Hill D, Maisuria A 2007. Embourgeoisment, immiseration, commodification - Marxism revisited: A critique of education in capitalist systems. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(1): 38-72.
- Gurler OK, Turgutlu T, Kirci N, Ucdoruks 2007. Türkiye’de egitim talebi belirleyicileri. *Finans Politik Ekonomik Yorumlar*, 44(512): 89-101.
- Hartley D 2007. Personalisation: The emerging ‘revised’ code of education? *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(5): 629-642.
- Hayashi M, Kataoka M, Akita T 2014. Expenditure inequality in Indonesia, 2008–2010: A spatial decomposition analysis and the role of education. *Asian Economic Journal*, 28(4): 389–411.
- Heyneman SP, Loxley WA 1983. The effect of primary-school quality on academic achievement across twenty-nine high-and low-income countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88(6): 1162-1194.
- Hill D 2003. Global Neo-liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*.1(1). From <<http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7>>(Retrieved on 15 March 2011).
- Johanningmeier EV 2008. Equality of educational opportunity. *American Educational History Journal*, 35(2): 365-379.
- Karakutuk K 2012. *Egitim Planlamasi*. Birinci Baski, Ankara: Elhan Yayınevi.
- Kose MR 2007. Aile sosyo-ekonomik ve demografik ozellikleri ile okul ve özel dershanelerin liselere giris sinavina katılan öğrencilerin akademik basarıları üzerindeki etkileri. *Egitim Bilim Toplum*, 5(17): 46-77.
- Lutz MB, McGillivray M 2015. The Impact of Gender Inequality in Education on Income in Africa and the Middle East. *Economic Modelling*, 47: 1–11. From <<http://ac.els-cdn.com>> (Retrieved on 1 April 2015).
- McLaren P 2011. *Okulda Yasam Elestirel Pedagojiye Giris*. (Cev. MY Eryaman ve H Arslan). Ankara: Ani Yayıncılık.
- Miles MB, Huberman AM 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2nd Edition. California: Sage Publications.
- Mollaa T, Cuthbert D 2014. Qualitative Inequality: Experiences of Women in Ethiopian Higher Education . *Gender and Education*, 26(7): 759–775. From <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.970614>> (Retrieved on 20 March 2015).
- MoNE 2013. *Milli Egitim Istatistikleri Orgun Egitim 2012-2013*. Ankara: MEB Strateji Gelistirme Basanlığı Yayınları.
- OECD 2007. *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2007*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD 2012. *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Oral I, McGivney EJ 2014. *Türkiye Egitim Sisteminde Esitlik ve Akademik Basari Arastirma Raporu ve Analizi*. Egitim Reformu Girisimi, Istanbul: Sabanci Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- OzerY, Anil D 2011. Öğrencilerin fen ve matematik basarılarını etkileyen faktorlerin yapisal esitlik modeli ile incelemesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 41: 313-324.
- Özsoy S 2002. *Yuksekokretimde Hakkaniyet ve Esitlik Sorunsali: Türkiye’deki Finansal Yapiyla Ilgili Bir Cozumleme*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Parcel TL, Dufur MJ 2001. Capital at home and at school: Effects on student achievement. *Social Forces*, 79(3): 881-911.
- Rapp S 2012. New wine in old bottles? A critique of Sweden’s new national training programme for head teachers: does it strengthen or undermine school equality and students’ educational rights and guarantees? *School Leadership and Management*, 32(2): 159-181. DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2012.666519.
- Rikowski G 2011. *Marksist Egitim Kuramive Radikal Pedagoji*. (Trans. C. Atay). Istanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Tan M 1987. Egitimsel fırsat esitligi. *AÜ Egitim Bilimleri Fakultesi Dergisi*, 20(1-2): 245-259.
- Torche F 2005. Privatization reform and inequality of educational opportunity: The case of Chile. *Sociology of Education*.78: 316-343. DOI: 10.1177/00380470507800403.
- Torche F 2010. Economic crisis and inequality of educational opportunity in Latin America. *Sociology of Education*, 83(2): 85–110. DOI: 10.1177/0038040710367935.

- TUIK 2013. Hanehalki Tüketim Harcamasi, Haber Bulteni, Sayi: 13579, 04 Eylül. From <www.tuik.gov.tr> (Retrieved on 22 March 2014).
- Turner B 2007. *Esitlik*. 2nd Edition. Ankara: Dost Kitapevi.
- UN 2010. Millennium Development Goals Report Turkey 2010. From <http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/upload/Turkey/Turkey_MDG_2010.pdf>(Retrieved on 26 May 2014).
- Ünal LI, Özsoy S, Yildiz A, Gungor S, Aylar E, Cankaya D 2010. *Egitimde Toplumsal Ayrisma*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basimevi.
- UNESCO 2007. *Education for all by 2015: Will We Make It?* Paris: UNESCO.
- Ward TW 2013. Education for Developing Nations: Equality of Educational Opportunities. *Common Ground Journal*,11(1): 20-27 From <www.commongroundjournal.org> (Retrieved on 27 February 2014).
- WB 2013. Promoting Excellence in Turkey's Schools. From <http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default> (Retrieved on 26 May 2014).
- Yandell J 2013. Class and Education: What is to be Done? *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. 11(1). From <http://www.jceps.com/index.php? page ID= articleandarticle ID=279> (Retrieved on 2 March 2014).
- Yang J, Huang X, Liu X 2014. An analysis of education inequality in China. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 37: 2-10.
- Yolcu H 2013. Parents voluntary contributions to primary schools which are not directly monetary. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50: 227-246.