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Abstract

Research objective: The objective of this study is to identify whether the users of municipal public education and the teachers of these schools converge in terms of expectations related to the services developed in the Elementary School I units.

Theoretical framework: The study discusses the concept of the 5 Gaps Model, theoretical concepts of managing expectations in organizations, the family-school relationship and educational marketing.

Methodology: The research has a cross-sectional, descriptive and quantitative approach, with data obtained through the application of structured questionnaires to two types of participants: for the families (parents or guardians) of students in the 1st year of Elementary School and for the teachers of the 10 investigated public schools. These questionnaires were designed based on the 5 Gaps Model. Data analysis was performed based on the characterization of the profile of each group, as well as a comparison of the means for each of the variables contained in the instruments applied. Comparisons of means for independent samples (t test) and multiple linear regression were performed together with the tests of sample validation. As a support tool, the IBM® SPSS® software, version 27 was used.

Results: The study identified that there are, in fact, differences in expectations between the students’ families and the faculty of the investigated schools. The four most significant themes for families were: good physical structure, demanding level of education, access to student information and freedom of thought and expression; while for the teachers, the five most significant themes were: degree of teaching demand, clear and defined bureaucratic processes, pleasant and conducive environment for learning, general expectation about the school’s teaching and general expectation about the school. These data point to important lines of action that can be carried out by managers in the educational area.

Originality: This study raises the expectations of families that use public basic education and analyzes them from the perspective of school marketing. There are no academic articles, published on the internet, that present applications of educational marketing principles to Brazilian public elementary schools.

Theoretical and practical contributions: The research contributes to discussions related to the perceptions of families and teachers about the services provided in public basic education schools in Brazil, thus, it can assist in decision-making by the managers of basic education in the municipality, aiming at expanding the satisfaction of users of public services.

Keywords: Perception Gap, Expectations in Organizations, Family – Schools Relationship, Educational Marketing.

Resumo

Objetivo de pesquisa: O objetivo deste estudo é identificar se os usuários da educação pública municipal e os docentes dessas escolas convergem em termos de expectativas relacionadas aos serviços desenvolvidos nas unidades de Ensino Fundamental I.
Enquadramento teórico: El estudio discute el concepto del Modelo de los 5 Gaps, conceitos teóricos de gerenciamento de expectativas en organizaciones, a relación familia – escuela y el marketing educacional.

Metodología: La pesquisa possui uma abordagem quantitativa, descritiva e con corte transversal, con dados obtidos por meio da aplicação de questionários estruturados para dois tipos de participantes: para as familias (pais ou responsáveis) dos alunos do 1º ano do Ensino Fundamental e, outro para los docentes das 10 escolas públicas investigadas. Esses questionários foram elaborados baseando-se no Modelo dos 5 Gaps. A análise dos dados foi realizada a partir da caracterização do perfil de cada grupo, bem como de uma comparação das médias para cada uma das variáveis constantes dos instrumentos aplicados. Foram realizadas comparações de médias para amostras independentes (t-test) e regresión linear múltiple en conjunto con los restes da validação da amostra. Como ferramenta de apoio foi utilizado o software IBM® SPSS®, versión 27.

Resultados: El estudio identificó que existen, de hecho, diferencias de expectativas entre los familiares dos alunos y el cuerpo docente de las escuelas investigadas. Los cuatro temas más significativos para las familias fueron: buena estructura física, nivel educativo exigente, acceso a la información de los estudiantes y libertad de pensamiento y expresión; mientras que para los docentes los cinco temas más significativos fueron: grado de exigencia docente, procesos burocráticos claros y definidos, ambiente agradable y propicio para el aprendizaje, expectativa general sobre la enseñanza de la escuela y expectativa general sobre la escuela. Estos datos apuntan a importantes líneas de acción que pueden llevar a cabo los directivos del área educativa.

Originalidad: Este estudio plantea las expectativas de las familias usuarias de la educación básica pública y las analiza desde la perspectiva del marketing escolar. No existen artículos académicos, publicados en Internet, que presenten aplicaciones de los principios del marketing educativo a las escuelas primarias públicas brasileñas.

Contribuciones teóricas y prácticas: La investigación contribuye a discusiones relacionadas con las percepciones de familias y profesores sobre los servicios prestados en las escuelas públicas de educación básica en Brasil, por lo tanto, puede auxiliar en la toma de decisiones de los gestores de educación básica en el municipio, con el objetivo en ampliar la satisfacción de los usuarios de los servicios públicos.


Resumen

Objetivo de la investigación: El objetivo de este estudio es identificar si los usuarios de la educación pública municipal y los docentes de estas escuelas convergen en cuanto a las expectativas relacionadas con los servicios desarrollados en las unidades de la Enseñanza Básica I.

Marco teórico: El estudio discute el concepto del Modelo de las 5 Brechas, conceitos teóricos de la gestión de expectativas en las organizaciones, la relación familia-escuela y el marketing educativo.

Metodología: La investigacion tiene un enfoque quantitativo, descritivo y transversal, con datos obtenidos a través de la aplicación de cuestionarios estructurados a dos tipos de participantes: para las familias (padres o tutores) de los estudiantes del 1º año de la Enseñanza Fundamental y, otro para los docentes de las 10 escolas públicas investigadas. Estos cuestionarios fueron diseñados en base al Modelo de las 5 Brechas. El análisis de datos se realizó a partir de la caracterización del perfil de cada grupo, así como la comparación de medias para cada una de las variables contenidas en los instrumentos aplicados. Junto con las pruebas de validación de muestras se realizaron comparaciones de medias para muestras independientes (prueba t) y regresión lineal múltiple. Como herramienta de apoyo se utilizó el software IBM® SPSS®, versión 27.

Resultados: El estudio identificó que existen, de hecho, diferencias en las expectativas entre las familias de los alumnos y el cuerpo docente de las escuelas investigadas. Los cuatro temas más significativos para las familias fueron: buena estructura física, nivel educativo exigente, acceso a la información de los estudiantes y libertad de pensamiento y expresión; mientras que para los docentes los cinco temas más significativos fueron: grado de exigencia docente, procesos burocráticos claros y definidos, ambiente agradable y propicio para el aprendizaje, expectativa general sobre la enseñanza de la escuela y expectativa general sobre la escuela. Estos datos apuntan a importantes líneas de acción que pueden llevar a cabo los directivos del área educativa.

Originalidad: Este estudio plantea las expectativas de las familias usuarias de la educación básica pública y las analiza desde la perspectiva del marketing escolar. No existen artículos académicos, publicados en Internet, que presenten aplicaciones de los principios del marketing educativo a las escuelas primarias públicas brasileñas.

Contribuciones teóricas y prácticas: La investigación contribuye a discusiones relacionadas con las percepciones de familias y profesores sobre los servicios prestados en las escuelas públicas de educación básica en Brasil, por lo tanto, puede auxiliar en la toma de decisiones de los gestores de educación básica en el municipio, con el objetivo en ampliar la satisfacción de los usuarios de los servicios públicos.

Palabras clave: Brecha de Percepción; Expectativas en las Organizaciones; Relación Familia – Escuela; Mercadotecnia Educativa.
1 INTRODUCTION

Improving the provision of services an organization involves properly managing the expectations of the teams and the public served (Lima, 2015; Silva et al., 2017; Ferraz, et al. 2018). In schools, private or public, knowing how the teaching staff and the families that use educational services think can contribute to decision-making by managers with a view to increasing the satisfaction and quality of deliveries, in terms of permanence of students with academic success (Reschke et al., 2018; Silva, 2016).

Studies that investigate ‘expectations management’ in schools are usually addressed in the field of marketing (Kotler & Fox, 1994; Moorthi, 2002; Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmons, 2014). In this direction, Kotler and Fox (1994) stand out, who claim that an educational institution should strive to meet the needs of its public. In this sense, the authors propose the individualization of relationships, which presupposes having a different look at each student, taking into account their expectations, difficulties and strengths, which will result in a better overall satisfaction of needs, desires and preferences.

According to Lahire (1997, p. 38), “family and school establish a network of interdependence in which social relations are more or less harmonious and contradictory”. Authors such as Nogueira (2006), Lomônaco and Garrafa (2009) and Silva (2009), also highlight the complexity of the relationship between these two institutions. However, when analyzing the works of the aforementioned authors, it is clear that the different forms of relationship between family and school often result from the social origin of the former. In this way, there is a rupture between what the popular class child brings as culture apprehended in their traditions and what the school determines as the dominant and determining standard of knowledge.

López (2008, p. 330) states that the school, in the figure of the teacher, designs and aims for a perfect student model. However, in the classroom, he is faced with something very different, that is, the teacher “assumes a child with a set of predispositions developed before entering school”.

In the same direction, this author clarifies that the school idealizes a representation of the ideal family, in which the monitoring of duties, participation in events and agreement with the actions promoted by the school are fundamental. From the family idealized by the school, a certain way of dressing, speaking, behaving and, why not say, living is also expected.

In other words, the family is configured as the ‘center of the scene’ and, in addition to providing its children with healthy conditions for survival, it must provide a social and cultural background, compatible with what is required by the school, placing them in “favorable conditions before school requirements” (Nogueira & Nogueira, 2002, p. 18).

According to Diambo and Branco (2021), the family-school relationship is essential for the success of students and educational organizations, contributing to decision-making in school management. Oplatka and Hemsley-Brown (2012) argue that, at school, efficient guidance is present when its members understand well the students and families that make up the school community. In this sense, the school must innovate and implement improvements for future and current students, based on their anticipated needs (quality teaching, adequate physical structure, good quality teaching material, good relationship between the school community and trained teachers).

In this sense, although Brazilian public education is not evaluated by the principles of Educational Marketing, the national educational system, through its guiding and regulatory documents and its evaluation tools, shows that the family-school relationship is also a preponderant factor for the student learning success. Therefore, it is up to each education system to develop ways to assess the quality of its services, through instruments based on education quality indicators.

These quality indicators, for Elementary Education, include: educational environment, pedagogical practice and assessment, teaching and learning of reading and writing, democratic school management, training and working conditions, physical school environment and access and permanence of students in school (INEP/MEC, 2004). Mainly, in the indicators educational environment, democratic school
management and access and permanence of students in school, the effective participation of the family in the school life of the child/adolescent and in school decisions is paramount.

In this context, knowledge about educational marketing can play an important managerial role for those managers who are concerned with improving the quality of the educational service provided, both in the private and public spheres. To generate trust, the school needs to transmit an image of competence to families and other interested parties, the stakeholders - city hall, education department, school councils, directors, teachers, administrative staff, students, families, community/neighborhood where the school is located (Mainardes et al., 2013), encouraging school organizations to rethink their management strategies (Marques & Romão, 2021). However, studies on the use of school marketing in public basic education in Brazil are rare. In a survey carried out on the Google Scholar scientific article search platform in 2022, we did not find research with this focus.

There are also gaps in studies on the expectations of educational service users (students), and more work on the subject is needed (Borghi et al., 2016). In public basic education, the lack of investigations on this topic is even greater. In this sense, Mainardes and Domingues (2010) proposed to know if there is a difference between what the student expects from the educational institution and what the institution’s professor thinks the student expects. The present study follows this line, raising and discussing expectations about Brazilian public education. Given the above, the objective of this work is to identify whether, in Elementary School I, families and teachers converge in terms of expectations related to the services provided by public schools. In a complementary way, the work seeks to identify which are the factors that influence the expectations of family members in relation to the teaching of the school and about the school in general.

The information in this research contributes to the improvement of the decision-making process in public elementary schools, aiming at increasing satisfaction with the services provided, including seeking new work methodologies, training for families and teachers. From an academic point of view, this study intends to contribute to discussions related to the perceptions of families and teachers, with a specific focus on public basic education schools in Brazil. Furthermore, the present study provides results that can be used as points of comparison for future studies in the area.

2 THEORETICAL REFERENCE

2.1 Educational Marketing

Kotler and Fox (1994) state that even some private schools do not pay attention to marketing, because they think that it refers only to cases of buying and selling products or financial profit. Marketing encompasses much more than that, as it involves programming the institution’s offers to meet the needs and desires of service users, being able to use effective communication and distribution means to inform, motivate and serve this public. In this sense, it should be clarified that educational marketing comprises processes of analysis, planning, implementation and control of programs designed to promote voluntary exchanges of values with the public served to achieve organizational objectives (Kotler & Fox, 1994).

The authors Marques and Romão (2021) identify what they call the myopic perception of what educational marketing is due to the deficit in the recognition and effectiveness of practices associated with marketing, even in institutions that use institutional evaluations and satisfaction of the public served. In fact, some of these institutions are so strongly tied to traditional programs that they do not realize that students’ needs and desires change over time (Kotler & Fox, 1994). These same authors clarify that, on the other hand, some managers consider that marketing is incompatible with the educational mission, as they think that it goes in the opposite direction to the values of education, mainly, of the public school. They interpret that marketing only has the purpose of making money, not knowing that its principles apply to generating satisfaction in the served public.

Listening to the user of the educational service is essential to generate this satisfaction. This user can be the student or his/her family, in the case of young students. In addition to paying attention to the
expectations of this public, the school must also listen to its teachers, since they are the ones who awaken in students an interest in learning, the main objective of the school. Listening to these actors is an important strategy to ensure the quality of the process. According to Reschke et al., (2018), the interest in listening to what families and teachers have to say contributes to decision-making by managers, with a view to improving the educational quality provided to citizens. The 5 Gaps model is very effective in this sense, as it identifies the level of satisfaction of the public served through the difference between their expectations and what managers perceive about this expectation.

The 5 Gaps Model, also called 5 Quality Gaps, is an instrument that aims to identify the origin of service quality problems and thus improve them. The model is composed of:

Gap 1: comprises the difference between customer expectations and managers’ characteristics regarding these expectations.

Gap 2: Relate the difference between managers’ characteristics regarding customer expectations with service quality specifications.

Gap 3: understands the service quality specifications compared to what is actually provided to the customer.

Gap 4: address the gap between the service actually provided and external communications promises about that service.

Gap 5: covers the difference between customer expectations and the perception of the performance of the service provided, expressed as the sum of the other gaps. (Parasuraman et al., 1985, p. 44).

Thus, this model of analysis of the Quality Gaps, although designed for private organizations, can also provide public administration institutions with a measure of quality. Parasuraman et al. (1985) argue that it is important to measure and know the differences in perceptions to minimize discrepancies and thus pursue an adequate standard of quality, as well as pointing out the need to carry out more studies in the area of quality in educational institutions and its main stakeholders, and thereby improve the quality of service and update it for the future.

Stakeholder demands and expectations regarding service quality vary according to their attitudes, needs and experiences (Kieling, Souza, Lyra, & Boeing, 2021). In order to meet the expectations of the interested parties, it is necessary to identify the perception of each one of them about the quality of the services provided. The quality of the service provided is an important aspect of user satisfaction (Marimuthu & Ismail, 2012; Violin, 2021) and satisfaction is formed by several factors, often intangible, not being easy to measure.

According to Freire (1979) it is ideal that all those who make up the school community (managers, teachers, students, parents or guardians...) participate, democratically, in the elaboration and decision-making processes of the direction of public school management. This process not only improves the quality of teaching, but also contributes to the human development of all those involved.

When students are enrolled in a certain school, their expectations and those of their families (parents or guardians) are many and must be observed by all those who work in the school space, especially the expectations regarding the role of teachers in the teaching-learning process. In order for this expectation to be met, teachers need to know the desires of these citizens, but also need to expose what they think and expect from their students. This difference between what the public served expects and what the professor thinks he expects, is the investigation suggested by Mainardes and Domingues (2010) on the Gap of relationships.

According to their specificities, the services provided at the school are extremely dependent on the students and/or their families, as this service is consumed at the same time as it is produced, in the interaction between teacher and student. For these reasons, understanding stakeholder expectations can contribute to better organizational performance (Ferraz et al., 2018). Investing in the quality of basic education means reducing public costs, minimizing dropout rates and improving learning rates.
2.2 Family – School Relationship

For a long time, the family was solely responsible for the education of children, which occurred only in the family environment. Only in the 19th century, with the advent of public education in Brazil, this task was transferred to the school, as an entity provided with specific competences to promote teaching (Silva, 2009). In the middle of the 20th century, new social trends promoted different forms and ways in family/school relationships (Nogueira, 2006). According to the authors, since then, family and school have shared the commitment to educate children in the best possible way. Even though school and family are different institutions, with different rules and objectives, both share the most noble task: that of educating (Diambo & Branco, 2021).

Paulo Freire, one of the great names of Brazilian education, public manager in São Paulo in 1989 and 1992, highlighted in his works the importance of an open dialogue between family and school for the alignment of expectations about formal education. He argued that, only in this democratic perspective, the child could have an environment conducive to the full development of learning. Corroborating with this author, it is believed that the success of the relationship between school and family is related to the ability to keep children and adolescents in schools and manage to guarantee them the achievement of quality education, making the public educational system more egalitarian.

Lahire (1997) and Silva (2009) draw attention to the existing interdependence between the family and the school, in the task of teaching children. Thus, the relationships between family and school can influence the results obtained by students in school subjects, sometimes with gains, sometimes with losses, thus showing the balance or imbalance of this social relationship.

School success can be conceived through the perspective of educability, whose notion must be understood as the relationship between the mechanisms that the child has (acquired in the family) and the expectation that the school has of it. Therefore, it is an adaptation between two cultures, educational and parental. It is about a division of tasks in relation to the children’s education; it is as if there were a pact between family and school, in which it is up to the family to provide primary education on which formal education is based (López, 2008). And the aforementioned author goes on to explain that education is not a simple transfer of knowledge that places the student in the condition of an inert learner, but is a construction that involves learning experiences, where students and teachers have different attributions and expectations. The school expects its students to come to it with a set of resources, aptitudes and predispositions and puts the family at the center of the scene (López, 2008).

But this is not always possible due to the social conditions that a given family finds itself. In Brazil, this reality is latent in public schools. The expectation of the school system can be so different from the reality of the family that it can also contribute to school dropout, where both the family and the student find themselves in a condition where they cannot reach that expectation. That is why the expectation of the public education system cannot fail to consider the precarious situation in which many students live, who have to leave their studies aside to help support their homes, for example.

In the research carried out by Marques and Romão (2021, p. 218) in schools in Portugal, two interesting aspects can be observed regarding expectations. The first is that “the socioeconomic context of the school’s surroundings” is another factor for external analysis in marketing practices and the “social support given by the school to families” highlights the social responsibility of the school”; and the second concerns “the social support given by the school to the families”, where it was possible to perceive that there are a series of social responsibility actions practiced and taught by the schools that end up influencing and resulting in benefits for the families, among them the separation of garbage, practices of environmental responsibility/sustainability, collecting toys, among other actions that reverberate in changes of positive attitudes in the families.

For López (2008), therefore, there is a gap between what the child has and what the school expects, a distance that is evident in the public educational system. The Gap is evident when the school persists in aspiring an attitude and commitment from the families on occasions when they cannot offer it. This is the
The great importance of listening to the family, as they visualize a school that always has a lot to say and little to hear (Silva, 2009).

The theme “strategy to promote school success” is found in numerous studies, such as Franco (2001), Soares and Collares (2006) and Diambo and Branco (2021). These studies present results of educational evaluations, demonstrating that the family’s involvement in the child’s school life positively interferes with their academic development, contributing to the drop in school dropout rates.

Knowing what the family expects from the school and also making it clear to the family what the school expects of them, the school has the possibility of providing opportunities for students to improve their learning, enhancing dreams of a better, more peaceful life with the minimum of human dignity (Lomônaco & Garrafa, 2009).

In a survey of schools in Lebanon on student-teacher interaction, one of the research questions was whether “teachers’ reports of their own practices and attitudes in the classroom are in line with students’ perceptions of these practices and attitudes and with the researcher’s observations” (Hashash, Abouchedid, & Abourjeily, 2018, p. 3). Thus, it is observed that the practice consists of studies related to the school context to the detriment of parents’ expectations regarding teaching.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

This section presents the methods used for data collection and analysis for this research, as well as information about the studied population and sample.

The study is quantitative, descriptive, using primary data and cross-sectional, obtained through the application of structured questionnaires in February 2022. These questionnaires were delivered in printed form to families and teachers, and also to were socialized through whatsapp groups, via a form prepared in Google Forms, for a period of up to 90 days to be returned or answered, respectively.

For data analysis, Student’s t tests were applied, complemented by Linear Regressions, in addition to the use of the Likert measurement scale with five categories of responses, ranging from “totally disagree” to “totally agree” and the sixth category Does not know/Does not answer. Two types of questionnaires were applied: one for users of the public school (represented by the students’ parents/guardians) and another for the teachers responsible for the 1st year classes and area teachers (art, physical education, special education, religious teaching, music and educational technology). These professionals and group of family members were chosen due to the fact that this is the first school year in Elementary School for these students, with no way (the teachers) to make comparisons with previous years related to the school and (the family members) to expectations they bring, respectively.

The survey was applied to teachers and families of students entering the 1st year of Elementary School in the year 2022, in 10 (ten) schools that provide Elementary School I (Initial Years) of the Municipal Network of Vila Velha, State of Espírito Santo, for the author’s job opportunity, associated with the fact that the municipality has one of the largest networks of municipal schools in the State.

It should be noted that these schools are part of Administrative Region 2 of the city of Vila Velha, formed by 21 neighborhoods, where there are 11 Elementary Schools (of which 07 serve only Elementary School I, 03 that serve Elementary School I and II and 01 that serves only Elementary School II). These school units were chosen because they are located in the region where the schools with the highest scores in Greater Vitória are located in external evaluations, such as the Basic Education Development Index (IDEB). In recent years, three of the schools that participated in this research take turns in the 1st place in this evaluation for the 5th year. It is worth mentioning that, generally, the student who enrolls in the 1st year in an institution of Elementary Education I tends to remain until the 5th year. In addition, two of the schools surveyed received the “School Award”, which ranks them among the top 50 in the state of ES in terms of literacy, in the years 2021 and 2022.

The structured questionnaires used come from the 5 Gaps Model, proposed by Parasuraman et al. (1985) and other literature. An approach similar to that used in the questionnaires created by Margotto (2014) and replicated by Lacerda (2016) was employed, which measured the model’s Gap 1, which
comprised the difference between customer expectations (students from the Technical Education Schools and Superior Schools) and the teachers. This section presents the methods used for data collection and analysis for this research, as well as information about the studied population and sample.

In view of this, there was a need to adapt the original questions in terms of nomenclature, changing “higher education students” to “elementary school students – 1st year.” In addition, questions number 5 (which deals with financial support), 19 (which addresses volunteer work and social causes), 24 (which deals with a postgraduate course) and 29 (which mentions a higher number of practical classes) because they do not make sense for the teaching level studied.

The population of this study was made up of 112 teachers (26 head teachers: initial grades and 86 area teachers: art, physical education, special education, religious teaching, music and educational technology) and 650 families of students in the 1st year of Elementary School, freshmen in the year 2022. The 10 schools investigated correspond to 19% of the municipal schools in Vila Velha that offer 1st year of Elementary School I.

It should be noted that the instruments were subject to a pilot test, from which it was observed that there was no need for adjustment in any of the questions. The pilot test was carried out in one of the schools in the studied region and had the participation of 13 teachers and 41 families.

Data analysis was carried out from the characterization of the profile of each group, as well as a comparison of the averages for each of the constant variables of the instruments applied to each public. Comparisons of means for independent samples (t test) and multiple linear regression were performed in conjunction with tests of sample validity. As a support tool, the IBM® SPSS® software, version 27 was used.

4 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 Comparison of the means of each variable in the sample of students’ families and the sample of faculty

With the aim of detecting whether the responses of respondents classified by their role in the institution (teachers and family members) present means with statistically significant differences, comparisons were made using Student’s statistics (t). Data were individually analyzed and compared with each variable selected for the present study, as well as confronted with general expectations about the quality of teaching at the school and general expectations about the school.

In order to allow the performance of the t-test, the complete sample was divided into two independent groups (Hair Jr. et al., 2005). In this sense, it is intended to achieve the central objective of this work, that is, to verify if there are differences in expectations between the two groups surveyed (teachers and family members) in public elementary schools I of Administrative Region 2 of the Municipality of Vila Velha. In other words, an attempt is made to find an eventual perception gap between these two groups. Table 1 presents the results.
Table 1: Comparison of sample means of students’ families and faculty sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Mean standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Degree of teaching requirement**</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.7607</td>
<td>1.11281</td>
<td>0.07849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.1833</td>
<td>0.86358</td>
<td>0.10795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good future school performance</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.4686</td>
<td>0.74019</td>
<td>0.05221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>0.63621</td>
<td>0.07953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friendships and lively school life</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.6974</td>
<td>0.62108</td>
<td>0.04381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6875</td>
<td>0.46718</td>
<td>To be continued 0.05840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classes with current content and aligned with social reality*</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.5842</td>
<td>0.71468</td>
<td>0.05041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3594</td>
<td>0.89739</td>
<td>0.11217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New and rich personal and educational experiences*</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.7056</td>
<td>0.65163</td>
<td>0.04596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.4844</td>
<td>0.73446</td>
<td>0.09181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Good physical structure</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.3109</td>
<td>0.93099</td>
<td>0.06567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3016</td>
<td>1.16340</td>
<td>0.14542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Services tailored to the student’s needs</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.4595</td>
<td>0.82446</td>
<td>0.05815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6250</td>
<td>0.72375</td>
<td>0.09047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal and educational growth and development</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.7245</td>
<td>0.60466</td>
<td>0.04265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6719</td>
<td>0.56497</td>
<td>0.07062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers available, attentive and motivated</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.7259</td>
<td>0.60497</td>
<td>0.04267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.7813</td>
<td>0.51851</td>
<td>0.06481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communicating with honesty, respect and authenticity</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.7641</td>
<td>0.62108</td>
<td>0.04381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6349</td>
<td>0.78278</td>
<td>0.09785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clear and defined bureaucratic processes**</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.4056</td>
<td>0.94179</td>
<td>0.06643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6984</td>
<td>0.63333</td>
<td>0.07917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Access to student information*</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.0392</td>
<td>1.07649</td>
<td>0.07593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.4262</td>
<td>1.36229</td>
<td>0.17029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Access to up-to-date technologies</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.1242</td>
<td>1.02839</td>
<td>0.07254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>School’s connection to the community</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.1563</td>
<td>1.04226</td>
<td>0.13028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.2027</td>
<td>0.88859</td>
<td>0.06268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Freedom of thought and expression</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3770</td>
<td>0.80008</td>
<td>0.10001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.2937</td>
<td>0.84754</td>
<td>0.05978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Understanding of the disciplines of the following years</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3443</td>
<td>0.85236</td>
<td>0.10654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.2011</td>
<td>0.88871</td>
<td>0.06268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Expansion of personal capabilities with the acquired knowledge</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.4219</td>
<td>0.77264</td>
<td>0.09658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.5846</td>
<td>0.73944</td>
<td>0.05216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pleasant environment conducive to learning**</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3770</td>
<td>0.80008</td>
<td>0.10001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.5773</td>
<td>0.77891</td>
<td>0.05494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Conducting learning events</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6026</td>
<td>0.68322</td>
<td>0.04819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>0.59094</td>
<td>0.07387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wide use of available resources by teachers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6889</td>
<td>0.58557</td>
<td>0.04130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.6094</td>
<td>0.65749</td>
<td>0.08219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Adequacy of class sizes*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.4663</td>
<td>0.91186</td>
<td>0.06432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>1.12687</td>
<td>0.14086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Appropriate evaluation and complaints procedures</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5484</td>
<td>0.81020</td>
<td>0.10128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.6235</td>
<td>0.63208</td>
<td>0.04458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pleasant and interesting classes</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.7273</td>
<td>0.59620</td>
<td>0.04205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.7188</td>
<td>0.54827</td>
<td>0.06853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>General expectation about EDUCATION at the school**</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5179</td>
<td>0.56318</td>
<td>0.07040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.0609</td>
<td>0.73236</td>
<td>0.05166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>General expectation about the SCHOOL**</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.4655</td>
<td>0.62273</td>
<td>0.07784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2022).

*Explanatory note n. 1: Among the means of the variables observed with statistically significant differences, the variable (4): Classes with current content and aligned with social reality (F = 4.5842; CD = 4.3594), the variable (5): New and rich personal and educational experiences (F = 4.7056; CD = 4.4844), the variable (12): Access to student information (F = 4.0392; CD = 3.4262) and the variable (21): Adequacy of class sizes (F = 4.4663; CD = 3.6000), show higher averages in the grades distributed by families when comparing them to the average grades of the faculty. Thus, families expect more than teachers project that they expect.
**Explanatory note n. 2:** On the other hand, the averages of the variable (1): Degree of teaching demand (\(F = 3.7607; CD = 4.1833\)), of the variable (11): Clear and defined bureaucratic processes (\(F = 4.4056; CD = 4.6984\)), of the variable (18): Pleasant environment conducive to learning (\(F = 4.5773; CD = 4.8281\)), of the general variable (24): General expectation about EDUCATION at the school (\(F = 4.0816; CD = 4.5179\)) and the variable (25): General expectation about the SCHOOL (\(F = 4.0609; CD = 4.4655\)), indicated that families have lower expectations compared to what the teachers believe that families expect.
Thus, significant differences were detected (p value <0.05), noting that the two groups responded differently in relation to the expectations of the students’ parents/guardians. Of the 25 variables surveyed, statistically different means were detected in 09.

In view of the results, in which parents and guardians granted higher averages when related to the average grades of the faculty, it is evident that it is necessary to pay attention to the demands of interested parties (families). These data reveal a lack of knowledge on the part of teachers, pointing to the presence of Gap 1, which comprises the difference between what users (families) think and what school representatives (teachers) believe the public served expects. In a survey on expectations, knowledge and involvement of parents, carried out with Chinese immigrants in Washington in the United States, it was shown that the expectations of this group differ from the expectations of teachers, insofar as they idealize future outcomes for their children, such as they expected their children to go to college or even that their children could study hard at school (Ji & Koblinsky, 2009, p. 697). However, despite the study concluding that the involvement of parents is beneficial, few are actually involved in school activities, due to the socioeconomic situation and the difficulty of communication, which is not far from Brazilian cases.

Teachers, as representatives of the school, need to know the expectations of families for alignments to take place. In this way, managers, together with the school community, will be able to define priorities, develop plans and draw up more effective action plans for the school. By not aligning these expectations well, the efforts of the school as a whole may be, in part, frustrated and will not reach the expectations of families and the educational system. In this sense, Diambo and Branco (2019) provide relevant data on the perception of teachers and families about the family-school relationship at a public institution in Angola. Teachers interviewed report that the school often makes decisions without consulting parents and guardians and that this negatively affects families.

Continuing with the analyses, the presence of Gap 1 again stands out because, as shown, the faculty had higher expectations compared to the responses of the families. If the school team does not know what parents and guardians want from the institution, some efforts may even displease these families, as it became clear that they do not care so much about the variables that teachers believed to be the most important, proving the perception gap. In this sense, in order for a perceived quality service to be delivered, both teachers and managers need to focus their efforts and be attentive to the wishes of families, since we understand the school as a democratically managed public space.

Among the few investigations on the subject involving the term expectation, an Australian survey on the expectations of first-year students: results of a student survey across the university noted a certain approximation with the proposed study (Crispy et al., 2009). The authors point out that it is necessary to consider that there is a significant difference between the expectations of students and the experience that institutions are prepared to offer. That is, the expectations of one group are not always correlated to the other, and this happens, basically, because of two factors, one is the fact that expectations from the students’ side (which involves families, for example) they are generally unrealistic, and the other cause is associated with the information provided by the institution about its culture or simply because the institution is unaware of the students’ expectations.

Thus, it is necessary to consider that both teachers and other professionals are prone to make erroneous assumptions about the needs of students, since the understanding is based on their own expectations, not those of the student (Pithers & Holland, 2006). In this sense, it is observed that of the nine significant variables, there is only one similarity in terms of the degree of demand for teaching and a certain discrepancy in the evaluations carried out between family members and the teaching staff, the Figure 1 clarifies these results.
It is noticed that, despite the agreement regarding the expectation regarding the degree of demand of teaching for the two groups, there is a difference in the results, where the four variables best evaluated by the faculty were not the same as those of the group of family members. This fact confirms the existing gap between the population of this study.

4.2 Multiple Linear Regression

4.2.1 Regressions for analysis of the dependente variable: expectations regarding teaching and school

To identify the factors that impact the general expectation of families about the education they expect students to receive at school, as well as about the school in general, multiple linear regressions were performed between the 23 independent variables and the dependent variables “general expectation about the teaching of the school” and “general expectation about the school”. The results are shown in Tables 2 and 3.
Table 2
Model obtained from multiple linear regression

REGRESSION: General expectation about the TEACHING at the school model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R squared</th>
<th>R squared adjusted</th>
<th>Standart error of estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.495c</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.6514</td>
<td>2.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Predictors: (Constant), Good physical structure, Freedom of thought and expression, Degree of teaching demand
d. Dependent Variable: General expectation about the EDUCATION at the school

Source: Research Data (2022).
Estimation method: Stepwise Validity tests:
ANOVA: significant
Test of Randomness: Supports the hypothesis of randomness
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Adherence Test: Supports hypothesis of adherence to normal distribution; Homoscedasticity Test: Supports the hypothesis of homoscedasticity

Table 3
Estimated coefficients of the dependent variable expectations regarding education for families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
<th>Non-standard coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95,0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Inferior limit</td>
<td>Upper limit</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>0,280</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good physical structure</td>
<td>0,228</td>
<td>0,056</td>
<td>0,285</td>
<td>0,118</td>
<td>0,337</td>
<td>0,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of thought and expression</td>
<td>0,178</td>
<td>0,059</td>
<td>0,203</td>
<td>0,061</td>
<td>0,295</td>
<td>0,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of teaching requirement</td>
<td>0,111</td>
<td>0,045</td>
<td>0,166</td>
<td>0,022</td>
<td>0,199</td>
<td>0,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: General expectation about the EDUCATION at the school

Source: Research Data (2022).
The data in Table 2 point to the results achieved with the families regarding school teaching. It can be noticed that the model obtained has an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.233, which means that 23.3% of the variation of the dependent variable (expectations regarding the teaching at the school) is explained by the presented regression model.

In Table 3, they point out that the variables that positively influenced the evaluation made by the family regarding their expectations regarding teaching were three: good physical structure, freedom of thought and expression and the degree of demand of teaching.

Tables 4 and 5 reveal the results achieved with the families regarding the school. They show that the model has an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.256, which means that 25.6% of the variation in the dependent variable (expectations regarding school) is explained by the presented regression model.
Table 4
Model obtained in multiple linear regression

**REGRESSION**: General expectation about the SCHOOL Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R squared</th>
<th>R squared adjusted</th>
<th>Standard error of estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,517&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0,267</td>
<td>0,256</td>
<td>0,6317</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Predictors: (Constant), Good physical structure, Degree of teaching demand, Access to student information
d. Dependent Variable: General expectation about the SCHOOL

Source: Research Data (2022).
Estimation method: Stepwise Validity tests:
- ANOVA: significant
- Test of Randomness: Supports the hypothesis of randomness
- Kolmogorov-Smirnov Adherence Test: Supports the hypothesis of adherence to normal distribution
- Homoscedasticity Test: Supports the hypothesis of homoscedasticity

### Table 5

Estimated coefficients of the dependent variable expectations regarding school for families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Non-standard coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferior limit</td>
<td>Upper limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>0,237</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good physical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,230</td>
<td>0,055</td>
<td>0,292</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of teaching demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,141</td>
<td>0,045</td>
<td>0,214</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>0,002</td>
<td>0,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-standard coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized coefficients</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</td>
<td>Collinearity statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferior limit</td>
<td>Upper limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to student information</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,109</td>
<td>0,048</td>
<td>0,160</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>0,024</td>
<td>0,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2022).
Tables 4 and 5 reveal the results achieved with the families regarding the school. They show that the model has an adjusted R² of 0.256, which means that 25.6% of the variation in the dependent variable (expectations regarding school) is explained by the presented regression model.
According to table 5, it was found that the variables “good physical structure”, “degree of teaching demand” and “access to student information”, are significant for the combination with the dependent variable (expectations regarding the school).

After identifying the significant variables in the families’ perception for the study of the dependent variables (expectations regarding the school and expectations regarding the teaching at the school), it was observed that the two general expectations resulted in three significant variables, however, two were repeat: good physical structure and demanding level of teaching, thus showing that families expect their pupils to study in schools that have a good physical structure, but also yearn for quality teaching that is also demanding.

In the other significant variables, “access to student information” and “freedom of thought and expression”, family members express their desire to obtain information about their children through online tools, which in public education in the municipality surveyed is not yet available. In addition, parents demonstrate the desire that their children have the right to a voice and turn, through a democratic education, where everyone can express themselves.

The data in the last tables show the importance of the school institution knowing what they are, accepting and responding to the expectations of the families. Such an attitude will be able to avoid future dissatisfactions, will contribute to the improvement of criteria in decision-making at the school, focusing resources and efforts on increasing satisfaction with the services provided.

5 CONCLUSION

The objective of this study was to identify whether families and teachers (taken here as representatives of the school) converge in terms of expectations related to teaching provided in public institutions of Elementary Education, that is, to identify Gap 1, between what the body teacher thinks that families expect from the school and the teaching developed there.

Of the nine significant variables that showed difference in thinking between the two groups surveyed, five were better rated by faculty than by family members, with four variables that the family rated with higher averages, including general expectations regarding school and teaching provided. This result confirms the existence of a gap between the families of freshmen students and teachers regarding their expectations. The difference found in the thinking between families and teachers shows that teachers do not have exact information on the most important points of view for the students’ families, pointing to an urgency for the school to align its expectations with those of the public served.

In the regressions carried out related to the expectations of the families regarding teaching and the school, they were basically similar between what they aspire to from the school and applied teaching. The results indicate that families expect the school to have a good physical structure, a higher level of learning demand, that their children have freedom of expression and thought, and also want to have access to information about their children through online means. Thus, the results indicate that these four aspects were pointed out as the focus of importance by the families, and the school should consider them when planning actions that align the school’s objectives with what is expected by users of the public educational system. Only then will the school have, in fact, democratic management, considering the effective participation of the entire school community.

The present study shows that the marketing theme can also be used in public elementary education institutions, collecting data and bringing analyzes that can be used to improve the quality of services offered by the public education system.

With regard to limitations, the lack of a theoretical framework is highlighted, especially similar research that investigates public schools, so that there are greater comparisons and arguments that converge or diverge from the findings obtained. As said, academic works on the subject, mainly in the public sphere, are still rare. Also, it should be pointed out as a limitation that this study only included schools in an administrative region of a municipal education network. For future investigations, it is important to replicate the same research in other administrative regions and in other education systems and, with that,
compare the expectations of the students’ families and the expectations that the school has about the families’ desires. In addition, there may be other expectations of families that were not covered in this research, which would be important to investigate.
REFERENCES


