

ECONOMIC  
RESEARCH  
FORUM



منتدى  
البحوث  
الاقتصادية

2008

# working paper series

PRIVATE SUPPLEMENTARY  
TUTORING IN TURKEY RECENT  
EVIDENCE ON ITS VARIOUS ASPECTS

Aysit Tansel and Fatma Bircan

Working Paper No. 451

Private Supplementary Tutoring in Turkey  
Recent Evidence on Its Various Aspects

**Aysit Tansel and Fatma Bircan**

Working Paper 451

October 2008

This paper is prepared at the kind request of Professor Dr. Mark Bray, Director UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP). We are grateful to him for his encouragement. We also thank Emmanuel Souzo of the IIEP for providing helpful comments on the manuscript. Any errors are our own.

Aysit Tansel , Department of Economics, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey and  
Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) Bonn, Germany  
Email: [atansel@metu.edu.tr](mailto:atansel@metu.edu.tr)  
Fatma Bircan, Department of Economics, Karaelmas University, Zonguldak, Turkey  
Email: [bircanf@gmail.com](mailto:bircanf@gmail.com)

## Abstract

This paper first describes the educational system in Turkey and the two national examinations for advancing to upper levels of schooling, which spur demand for private tutoring called “dersane” in Turkish. Second, the evolution of Private Tutoring Centers (PTCs) is described and compared with high schools in the country. Third, geographical distribution of the PTCs, general high schools and the proportion of high-school-age-population are compared over the provinces to touch on special equity issues. Other topics addressed include gender and PTCs students, disruption of mainstream education, determinants of the demand for PTCs services, cost of PTCs and evidence on the effectiveness of PTCs.

## ملخص

تصف هذه الورقة أولاً النظام التعليمي في تركيا، وكذا الاختبارين الذين يجريان على مستوى الدولة للانتقال إلى مراحل متقدمة من التعليم. تلك الامتحانات التي تؤدي إلى زيادة الطلب على الدروس الخصوصية المعروفة باسم "درسان" في اللغة التركية. ثانياً، تشرح الورقة تطور مراكز الدروس الخصوصية وتقارنها بمدارس التعليم الثانوي في تركيا. ثالثاً، تتعرض الورقة إلى التوزيع الجغرافي لمراكز الدروس الخصوصية والمدارس الثانوية العامة ومقارنة تناسب أعمار الطلبة في المدارس الثانوية على مستوى الأقاليم لمعرفة المسائل المتعلقة بعدالة التوزيع الجغرافي كما تتعرض أيضاً لعدة موضوعات مثل نوع الطلبة وطلبة مراكز الدروس الخصوصية واختلال التعليم السائد ومحددات الطلب على مراكز الدروس الخصوصية وأسعار تلك المراكز والأدلة على مدى كفاءتها.

## **1. Introduction**

Private supplementary tutoring has been wide-spread in the East Asian countries for some time. In recent decades it has grown substantially in other regions of the world including Western developed countries and more recently in the East European countries.

Recently, there is an upsurge of studies on the supplementary private tutoring. Stevenson and Baker (1992) was one of the first studies to investigate this topic in Japan. It was followed more recently by Bray (1999) who drew the attention of the international community to supplemental private tutoring with works such as Bray (2003), Bray and Kwok (2003), Silova and Bray (2006). Bray (1999) also coined the word “shadow education” for the supplementary private tutoring since it develops parallel to the mainstream education but with different characteristics. Bray (2006) provides a review of the recent studies in this area.

Private tutoring is a large-scale industry especially in countries where there are national examinations to select students who will advance to the upper educational levels. The system of private tutoring has developed in Turkey as a result of such national examinations. In 2006 there were almost four thousand registered private tutoring centers catering for one million students and employing fifty thousand teachers. Tansel and Bircan (2005; 2006) are two of the most important studies devoted to private tutoring in Turkey. Gök (2006), Akgün (2005) and Güvercin (2005) are other studies that indicate the recent attention in Turkey regarding this topic. Recently, several governmental and non-governmental organizations prepared extensive reports on the university entrance examination system and the private tutoring centers in Turkey. These reports include Turkish Educational Association (TED) (2005), Higher Education Board (YÖK) (2007) and Trade Union of Educators (Egitim-Sen) (2007). All of these reports will be reviewed and referred to in this study.

These reports address the interrelated problems of the university entrance examination system and the accompanying system of private tutoring which is considered a key factor in securing a place at a university program and the orientation of the secondary education students for general versus “special” high schools.

This study will examine various aspects of supplemental private tutoring in Turkey by drawing largely on the recent evidence. The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 will review the educational system in Turkey and the two national examination systems that are mainly responsible for the development of the private tutoring system. Section 2.1.A addresses the transition from basic education to high schools which creates demand for the services of PTCs. This section also reviews the March 2007 government intervention in the examination system at this level. Section 2.1.B addresses the transition from high schools to universities which creates a second wave of demand for services of the PTCs. Section 2.2 addresses the reasons for the high demand for university education in Turkey and therefore the demand for services of the PTCs. Section 3 reviews the forms of private tutoring in Turkey. Recent developments in the in the private tutoring centers and the secondary schools are also examined and compared in this section. Gender of the attendants of the PTCs, determinants of the demand for services of PTCs and disruption of mainstream classes are all addressed in this section. Provincial distribution of private tutoring centers, general high schools and the high school age population are considered in section 4. This section sheds light on the spatial equity issues in the distribution of PTCs and high schools. Section 5 will review evidence on effectiveness of PTCs and their cost. Finally, section 6 will provide concluding remarks.

## **2. Education System in Turkey**

Education system in Turkey consists of basic, secondary and tertiary education. Until 1997 the five-year primary schooling was the only compulsory level. In 1997 it was combined with three years of middle schooling. The combined 8 years became compulsory and were called basic

education. This is followed by 3-4 years of secondary education consisting of general and vocational high schools. In 2005-2006 secondary education schools were extended to 4 years of training. Universities take 2-6 years depending on the program of study. Although state is the major provider, there are a number of private providers at the three levels of education. In view of the excess demand for tertiary level education, the government has been increasing the number of universities. In 1992, some 25 public universities were established. In 2006, an extra 15 new universities were established. Currently there are 93 universities, 25 of which are private (YÖK, 2007). A recent law of April 2007 stipulated the establishment of 17 additional new universities.

## **2.1 Two National Examinations in Turkey**

### *2.1.1 Transition to Secondary Education*

There are two national examinations in Turkey which determine who will advance to the upper levels of schooling. The first examination is called Secondary School Examination or OKS in short. It is administered by the Ministry of Education. It is taken by the graduates of basic education who hope to be placed at one of the special and prestigious high schools. Such high schools are believed to provide better quality education and their graduates are believed to have a higher chance of success at the university entrance examination. Some of these schools provide a year of English courses before the start of the regular classes which may be administered in English. These schools include Anatolian high schools (general and vocational), Science high schools, Super high schools and private high schools. There are about 700 such high schools. Students who cannot attend these high schools have the option of attending general high schools or vocational high schools. There is no restriction on attendance in the latter schools. Therefore OKS is relevant only for students who would like to attend “special” high schools. Students who would like to attend other high schools are not required to take this examination.

For this reason parents spend on private tutoring for their children in preparation for the OKS examination, in order to place them into special high schools. Special high schools are believed to increase their children’s chances of placement at a university program.

Indeed, responses to the Question 13 in Table 6 show that 67 percent of the senior high school graduates, 67 percent of the university graduates and 74 percent of the teachers and administrators agree that the quality of high school is an important determinant of success in the university entrance examination. Responses to Question 14 in the same table show that 50 percent of the parents indicated that while choosing a high school for their child they considered past performance of the high school at the university entrance examination.

In an attempt to reduce the role of private tutoring centers, the Ministry of National Education announced a new model of transition from basic to secondary education in March 2007 (Ministry of National Education, 2007). OKS will be gradually abolished and students will be placed at the “special” high schools according to their examination scores at the end of the sixth, seventh and eighth grades. These examinations will cover the school curricula in those years. A placement score for entry into the special high schools will be determined for each student. The three examinations will contribute 70 percent and the basic education GPA will contribute 25 percent and finally the general attitude of the student evaluated by his/her teachers will contribute five percent towards the final placement score of student. The system will be fully implemented in the 2008-2009 academic year. The process of preparation for OKS normally starts at the sixth year of basic education and continues throughout the seventh and eighth grades with student efforts intensifying during the eighth year. However, with the recent change in the selection system of students for special high schools most PTCs have already started advertising preparatory classes for the fourth and fifth years of basic education. Şahin (2007) reported that most educators agreed that the new system will force students to attend PTCs at earlier years than before. Recently, there is also the news of generalizing the new examination system for all the graduates of basic

education even for determining the placement at the state general high schools to which admission is currently not restricted. (Cumhuriyet, 2007).

### *2.1. 2 Transition to Universities*

The second national examination is called Student Selection Examination or ÖSS in short and determines advancement to universities. It is administered by an independent organization called Student Selection and Placement Center (OSYM). Unlike OKS which is relevant only for admission to “special” high schools, ÖSS must be taken by all students who want to be placed at a public or private university program. Not all of the 93 universities scattered around the country are considered of the same quality in terms of the job market prospects of their graduates and the salaries they command. Most of these “prestigious” universities provide instruction in English. Competition for placement at these “prestigious” universities is fierce.

Table 6 provides the selective results of a survey including high school seniors, high school graduates, university students, parents, teachers and administrators. According to Question 1, approximately 60 percent of the high school seniors stated that there is nothing in their life now more important than the university entrance examination. Further, 70 percent of the high school seniors, 68 percent of the high school graduates and 83 percent of the university graduates stated they are currently attending PTCs, while 84 percent of the parents stated that children and 92 percent of the teachers and administrators stated that their students are currently attending PTCs.

Question 5 in Table 6 inquires about the most important reason for attending PTCs. In response to this query, 58 percent of high school senior students, 77 percent of high school graduates, 57 percent of university students and 72 percent of the teachers and administrators believed that school education is not adequate for success in university entrance examination.

Question 12 in the same table asks about the attitude of school teachers and administrators towards PTCs. In their responses 47 percent of high school seniors, 43 percent of high school graduates and 50 percent of university students stated that their teachers and administrators absolutely want them to attend the PTCs.

In 2006, some 1, 678, 383 applicants took the university entrance examination. Of those applicants 43 percent were fresh high school graduates, 41 percent were repeat-takers who were not placed in a university program in earlier years, 13 percent were repeat-takers who were already enrolled at a university program and 3 percent were already graduates of a university. Thus, 57 percent were repeat-takers and 48 percent of them were placed at a program, while 43 percent were fresh high school graduates taking the examination for the first time and 44 percent of them were placed at a university program. Overall only 22 percent of the applicants could be placed at a university program (Student Selection and Placement Center, 2007).

As indicated above, in the 2006 ÖSS examination 41 percent of the applicants were repeat-takers. The rather high percent of repeat-takers implies that most high school graduates spend a year or more in preparation for the examination. There is evidence that they mostly attend private tutoring centers during this period. Question 11 in Table 6 provides the hours of education per week received at the PTCs by various groups. This information indicates that 51 percent of the high school seniors attend PTCs for 10-20 hours per week while 84 percent of the high school graduates attend PTCs for 15-20 or more hours per week. This indicates that high school graduates attend PTCs for more hours per week than the other groups. This group is mostly the group of repeat-takers. This concurs with the views of PTCs providers that PTCs is a better alternative for the young than spending idle time at cafes.

### **2.2. Why is There a High Demand for University Education in Turkey?**

There is a very high demand for university education in Turkey. This may be due to a number of factors. The foremost factor is the very high private monetary returns to university education in

Turkey. Tansel, (1994, 2001 and 2005) show that over the years, monetary returns to a year of university education is higher than that at other levels of education by a large margin. Further, the probability of finding a job out of unemployment is higher for the university graduates than for the unemployed at other levels of education (Tansel and Taşçı, 2007). University education confers on men the advantage of serving their military service as an officer rather than as a private soldier. Finally, as it is in other countries university graduates enjoy a prestigious position within the Turkish society. These advantages make university education very desirable for the young and their parents. For this reason parents are willing to make great sacrifices in order to invest in private tutoring for their children. As stated in the previous section, parents first spend on the PT of their children in order to place them into special high schools which are believed to increase their chances of placement at a university program. Next, parents spend on private tutoring of their children for placement at a university program.

### **3. Recent Developments in the Private Tutoring Centers in Turkey**

#### ***3.1. Forms of Private Tutoring in Turkey***

As is the case in other countries, private tutoring is delivered in three different forms in Turkey. These different forms are reviewed in detail in Tansel and Bircan (2006). Below we give a brief account of the common private tutoring forms in Turkey. One kind is one-to-one individualized teaching by the tutor on the requested subjects at a cost agreed upon by the parties involved. Accomplished students of the prestigious universities as well as retired or currently active teachers are known to provide this service which is tailored to the needs of the student in terms of quality and content. This is the most expensive form of private tutoring. The suppliers of this service often guarantee success of their students and therefore charge high prices.

The second form of private tutoring takes place at the premises of the mainstream schools, taught by the mainstream teachers for pay outside of the formal class hours. These courses are organized by the school boards with the permission of the Ministry of National Education upon demand for them. Teacher participation is voluntary. This form of private tutoring is prevalent at the elementary school level rather than at the high school level. It is organized for the students who may need extra help with their regular class-work and for the students preparing for the national entrance examination to the “special” high schools such as science high schools, Anadolu high schools and private high schools. Students participate upon the suggestion of their parents who also pay the amount determined by the Ministry of National Education for the courses. Currently, this pay ranges between 1-2 USD per hour depending on the school location. Teachers are paid 80 percent of the income generated. For a class in a particular subject to be provided there must be at least ten students and the class size is limited to 20 students. In order to evaluate student performance two examinations are given each term, the results of which are reviewed by the school board so as to reflect on the teacher performance with the board’s suggestions for their improvement or replacement.

The third type of private tutoring in Turkey is provided by the private tutoring centers (PTCs) which are school-like organizations operating for profit. Professional teachers teach in a class room setting. These centers are called “Dersane” in Turkish. This is the most prevalent form of private tutoring with such centers being located all over the country. Although they provide supplementary courses to the mainstream school subjects of the elementary and secondary schools, their main activity centers on examination oriented courses. Those examination oriented courses are for the national examination for entry to the “special” high schools (OKS examination) and for the national examination for entry to the universities (ÖSS examination). Together with their express courses on the subject matter covered in the national examination, they also teach techniques on how to prepare for these examinations as well as provide counseling and guidance services for the students on the choice of study fields at the universities, a choice of universities and future career selection.

PTCs also provide courses in order to prepare the participants for the language proficiency examinations for public servants (KPDS) and for the recently instituted examinations (KPSS) selecting candidates for various stages of the public service positions. During the academic year 2005-2006 there were a total of 1, 071, 827 PTCs students: 37 percent of them were students of basic education, 20 percent were high schools students, 43 percent were preparing for the university-ÖSS examination and 0.63 percent were preparing for KPSS examination. At each level approximately 52 percent of the students were boys while 48 percent were girls. However, of those preparing for the KPSS examination 42 percent were men and 58 percent were women. This indicates that more women than men are interested in seeking a public sector job.

PTCs started being organized in the early 1960s with the purpose of preparing students for the university entrance examination. They were legally recognized in 1965 and a law passed governing their operation. They operate with a license from the Ministry of National Education and under its surveillance. They must satisfy certain criteria in order to be granted the license. They are then legally established, tax-paying businesses. After their establishment, the PTCs are subject to inspection by inspectors from the Ministry of Education just like the regular basic education schools or the high schools of the Ministry of Education.

In the early 1970s there were public discussions about the equity implication of the university entrance examination and the PTCs. Such discussions were intensified in the early 1980s during the military intervention. In 1980 the government banned all PTCs. However, a year later, before the ban become effective, it was lifted mainly as a result of the lobbying activities of the Association of the Private Tutoring Centers called ÖZDEBİR. This association of PTCs was established in 1985 with headquarters in Ankara. Currently, it has about 500 members operating a total of 800 PTCs (together with branches) all over the country. The two other smaller and less well-known associations were established recently – GÜVENDER and TÖDER. GÜVENDER was established in 1991 and its members operate about 360 PTCs (together with branches) all over the country. TÖDER was established in 2003 and its members operate about 700 PTCs (together with branches) all over the country. Memberships in these associations are voluntary. According to the Ministry of National Education sources, in 2006 there were about four thousand PTCs with over a million students (see Table 1). ÖZDEBİR officials claimed that there are at least an additional four thousand PTCs operating unofficially without a license from the Ministry of National Education as part of Turkey's underground economy. They not only avoid paying taxes but also avoid inspection by the Ministry of National Education inspectors. These three associations administer on the same day– in May – a national practice ÖSS examination for their students. According to the law governing the PTCs, each PTC has to provide services free of charge to five percent of their total students from low income families. Özdebir officials stated that in practice it often exceeds the officially required five percent for their members.

Most private centers give an initial placement examination for their applicants. Those who rank very high are allowed to register for free. If later on, these students achieve a high-score in the university entrance examination ÖSS , their names and photographs are used in the advertisements of the PTC at which they were a student.

### ***3.2. Recent Trends in Private Tutoring Centers***

Table 1 gives the recent developments in the number of PTCs and related statistics. During the 1975-76 academic year there were 157 PTCs throughout the country which increased to about four thousand in 2006 which is a very substantial increase in a period of 30 years (see Table 1). During the same period, the number of participating students increased from about 46 thousand to over one million. The number of teachers employed at the PTCs reached almost to 50 thousand in 2006. This indicates that today the PTCs are a significant outlet in employing people with “teacher” training. On average, over the past years the PTCs employed 9-12 teachers per PTC with the exception of 1980-81. Over the years the average number of students per PTC ranged



around 250-290 with the exception of 1980-81. Therefore, the PTCs in Turkey can be considered of medium size. They are not very large enterprises such as those in Hong-Kong with students in the thousands (Bray and Kwock, 2003). Table 1 also shows the number of students per teacher in PTCs which ranged between 22-33.

Table 2 shows the recent trends and developments in the secondary schools (high schools) in Turkey. The table pertains to all kinds of general high schools including “special” high schools as well as vocational and technical high schools. The total number of secondary schools increased from about two thousand in 1976 to about eight thousand in 2007 with the total number of students reaching about 3.4 million and teachers employed reaching to about 188 thousand. The number of students per secondary school ranges between 348-487. The average number of teachers per secondary school ranged between 10-29. The number of students per teacher ranged between 16-37 which is lower than in the PTCs. However, this particular statistic for the secondary schools is misleading. It is well-known that the number of students per teacher in vocational technical high schools is rather low (Tansel, 2002b) as compared to that in the general high schools which are more popular and therefore more crowded. For more on this point see the last paragraph of this section.

Until 1997, the graduates of both the general and the vocational high schools were allowed to participate in the national university entrance examination equal terms. With the changes in the university entrance system, since 1997 vocational high school graduates were allowed to enter two-year university programs in their fields of study while in the vocational high school. If they wanted to enter into a four-year program or follow a different study area however they were allowed to sit in the university entrance examination but with a penalty in the determination of their final university entrance score.

Although some vocational high school students and graduates attend PTCs to prepare for the national university entrance examination, the pertinent group to compare to PTCs may be the general high schools including the “special” ones. For this reason the last two rows in Table 2 provide the number of general high schools including “special” ones and the relevant statistics. The last row shows that in 2005-2006, while there were 3986 PTCs, the number of general high schools was 3460. The number of PTCs students was about a million while the general high schools had about twice as many students –about two million. The number of PTC teachers was about 50 thousand while the number of teachers in general high schools was almost twice as many at 103 thousand. The PTCs had about half the number of students per PTC (269) compared with the number of students per general high school (581). The number of teachers per PTC was about 12 against 28 in a general high school. The number of students per teacher was about the same in the PTCs and general high schools. However, these are all averages and it is well known that some of the general high schools especially those at the large metropolitan centers are rather crowded in terms of the number of students per teacher.

### ***3.3. Private Tutoring Center Students and Gender***

In developing countries, girls lag behind boys in education. Turkey is no exception. In spite of the fact that returns to women’s education is higher or at least as large as those of men in Turkey, parents invest more to educate their sons than their daughters (Tansel, 2002a) mainly because boys are considered to be the main providers for their parents in the old-age. Education of boys is favored over that of girls especially when a household’s resources are limited. Tansel (2002a) reports that income poses a greater hindrance for the formal education of girls than boys. The same may hold true in the case of private tutoring.

There is very little evidence on the gender differences of students attending PTCs in the literature. Assaad and El-Badawy (2004) addressed gender issues in PT in Egypt. Kim and Lee (2002) found that there were more private tutoring expenditures for female students in Korea who may

be taking expensive courses in music and arts. Tansel and Bircan (2005) found that the probability of receiving PT is lower among females in Turkey.

Table 3 shows the proportion of male and female students at the PTCs versus secondary education graduates during the period 2000-2001 to 2005-2006. The proportion of male students is higher than that of female students both among the PTCs and the secondary school graduates. The proportion of male students at the PTCs declined from about 55 percent in 2000-2001 to about 53 percent in 2005-2006 while the proportion of female students increased from about 45 percent to about 48 percent during the same period. Similarly, the proportion of male secondary education graduates declined from about 57 to 55 percent and that of females increased from 43 to 45 percent.

In the academic year 2005-2006, the gender gap among the PTC students was about 5 percent and that among the secondary education graduates was about 9 percent. These results indicate that the gender gap between the PTCs students is less than the gender gap between the secondary school graduates. In this sense there is more gender equality among PTCs students than among students of secondary education. This may be a paradox since parents have to pay for PTCs while secondary education is mostly provided by the government free of charge. For this reason one would expect more gender equality among secondary school graduates than among the students of PTCs.

### ***3.4. Private Tutoring Centers and Disruption of Mainstream Education***

It is felt from public discussions that attending PTCs and the process of preparation for the two national examinations disrupt the formal schooling attendance. It is well known that this happens especially during the second semester for the basic school while seniors are preparing for the OKS and while the high school seniors are preparing for the ÖSS . These examinations take place in mid June. The students preparing for these examinations concentrate on attending the PTCs and on their own preparations at home rather than attending mainstream classes. For this reason most students hand in false medical reports of sickness which enable them to be absent from their mainstream classes. Receiving a false medical report of sickness has become a widely accepted and an expensive process. Question 8 in Table 6 investigates this process: 55 percent of high school seniors, 49 percent of high school graduates and 44 percent of university students said that they will receive a false medical report of sickness for their non-attendance to the school and 36 percent of the parents and 57 percent of the teachers and administrators said that their children and their students respectively will receive medical reports for non-attendance. An average of 20 to 26 percent of the respondents in various categories said that they will use the legally allowed non-attendance days while about 19-34 percent of the respondents stated that they will continue mainstream schools as usual.

Recently, the president of the Independent Educators Union (2007) argued that false medical reports of sickness undermine the “psychological and ethical development” of the children, and that being involved in this process parents teach their children how to cheat the establishment. This is an aspect that has been overlooked up till now.

The subject matters in the high school senior year thought are not explicitly covered in the university entrance examination. For this reason students feel free not to attend mainstream classes during that year especially during the second semester. This also leads to their arrival at the universities without working knowledge of certain topics covered in the high school senior year. This has led the Ministry of Education to devise ways to increase the importance of mainstream schooling over PTCs. For instance, over the years, the high school GPA (Grade Point Average) has been essential in contributing points towards university entrance along with the result of the ÖSS examination. It was also announced in 2005, and started being implemented in 2006, that the subject matters of a high school senior year will be covered in the ÖSS . However

this has not prevented non-attendance. In the recent June 2007 ÖSS examination the Ministry of Education allowed one week of non-attendance for the high school senior students.

As mentioned earlier in section 2.1.A the national examination for placement into special high schools (OKS examination) was recently re-organized to increase the role of high schools in the placement, thus reducing the role of PTCs. Similarly, many educators, non-governmental organizations and also the authors of this paper suggest, reorganizing the ÖSS in a similar way to increase the role of high school performance in the university placement and thus reducing the role of PTCs. Suggestions are also made to administer examinations at the high school level covering the subject matter of the high school curriculum and using the result of these examinations at the university placement with a certain weight. This is expected to increase the importance attached to high school classes and respect for the high school teachers and prestige of the high school education level.

### ***3.5. Determinants of Receiving Private Tutoring***

Tansel and Bircan (2006) examined factors that determined the household expenditures on private tutoring in Turkey. Their findings emphasized the importance of household income and parental education levels as the most important determinants of private tutoring expenditures with a larger effect of the mother's education than that of the father's. In order to emphasize the importance of income this study further reported that among the households in the lowest income quartile about 6 percent had private tutoring expenditures however, in the highest income quartile four times as much, about 25 percent of the households, had private tutoring expenditures. Further, 54 percent of the households in the lowest income quartile spent 1-10 percent of their total monthly expenditures on private tutoring. In contrast, in the highest income quartile 71 percent of the households spent 1-10 percent of their monthly expenditures and 27 percent of the households spent 10-30 percent of their total monthly expenditures on private tutoring.

Tansel and Bircan (2005) examined the factors that contributed to the probability of receiving private tutoring. They found that the most important factor was the high school graduation ranking of the student. Those individuals with high school graduation ranking above satisfactory were more likely to receive private tutoring compared to individuals who have just passed. Graduation with high honors, honors and satisfactory rankings contributed 26, 17 and 9 percent respectively to the probability of receiving private tutoring. Thus, it appears that the motivation and ability of the individuals determine the probability of receiving private tutoring. This indicates that the demand for private tutoring by students of high performance students is higher, which may be partly because their demands are not met at the mainstream schools.

The second most important factor determining the probability of whether or not an individual received private tutoring was the household's income. Individuals from households with higher levels of income were more likely to receive private tutoring. The third most important factor determining whether an individual received private tutoring or not is the education level of his/her parents. Here a mother's education was found to contribute more to the probability of receiving private tutoring than that of the father's. Tansel (2002-a) also found that the parental education level was the following important factor determining the educational attainment of children in Turkey after household income. In conclusion, students with high academic ability, high household income and highly educated parents receive more private tutoring.

## **4. Geographic Distribution of Private Tutoring Centers**

This section considers the geographic distribution of the PTCs in Turkey. Table 4 provides the numbers of PTCs and general high schools in each of the 81 provinces of Turkey during the academic year 2005-2006. They are listed from the provinces with the highest number of PTCs to the lowest. Istanbul has the highest number of PTCs with 630 and also the highest number of general high schools with 544. The second highest number of PTCs (541) and general high

schools (216) is Ankara. The last column in Table 4 gives the ratio of the number of PTCs to that of general high schools. The numbers larger than one in this column indicate that the number of PTCs in a province is larger than that of general high schools while the numbers smaller than one indicate the opposite. The highest concentration of PTCs is in Ankara where the number of PTCs is 2.5 times that of general high schools. Bursa (1.6), Antalya (1.5), Adana (1.4), Balikesir (1.4), Mersin (1.3), Mugla (1.3) and Bolu (1.3) are the other provinces with high concentration of PTCs. The provinces with low concentration of PTCs are Tunceli (0.2), Ardahan (0.3), Bilecik (0.4), Agri (0.4) Erzincan (0.4) and Aksaray (0.4) PTCs where the number of PTCs is substantially less than that of the general high schools. This may be due to low demand for PTCs in those provinces.

Table 5 shows the percentage shares for each of the 81 provinces, of the PTC and the general high schools in total for Turkey. The provinces are listed according to their share of PTCs in Turkey's total from the highest to the lowest. The third column gives the percent of the high school age population (aged 14-16) in a province in the total high school age population of Turkey. For example, Istanbul houses about 16 percent of the total PTCs in Turkey and 15 percent of the general high schools of Turkey while 14 percent of the high-school age population of Turkey lives in Istanbul. Ankara houses about 14 percent of the PTCs and about 6 percent of general high schools while about 5 percent of the high school age population of Turkey lives in Ankara. Thus Ankara is singled out as the province with 15 percent of the total PTCs serving only 5 percent of the high school age population. In a way this table gives an idea about the opportunities available to the high school age population in the provinces. Therefore, this table provides information about the spatial equality in the distribution of PTCs and high schools. This table should not be interpreted as providing the full picture about the formal secondary education opportunities available in a province since this table gives only the information with respect to general high schools, while there are also vocational and technical high schools at the secondary education level in each of the provinces catering to the high school age population.

Table 5 shows that for most of the provinces the percent of PTCs and general high schools and high school age population are about the same such as in Izmir, Adana, Hatay, Kocaeli etc. For instance, Hatay, Kocaeli and Kayseri house about two percent of the PTCs and general high schools and two percent of the high school age population live in these provinces. Similarly, in the province such as Amasya, Nigde, Bolu, Artvin, Yalova and Kırıkkale the percent of the PTCs, the general high schools and high school age population are about the same. In some of the provinces the percent of the general high schools is larger or equal to that of the high school age population while the percent of PTCs is smaller. For instance in Tunceli, the percent of general high schools is 0.4 which higher than the percent of high school age population which is 0.1 but the percent of PTCs is only 0.1 which is equal to the percent of the high school age population. Similarly, Kastamonu, Nevsehir, Kirsehir, Karaman, Duzce, Kars, Cankiri, Sinop, Erzincan, Hakkari, Siirt, Bilecik, Gümüşhane, Kilis, Bayburt, Ardahan and some other provinces have the same or a larger percent of general high schools as the percent of the high school age population but a smaller percent of PTCs.

Some of the provinces have a larger percent of high school age population but a smaller share of general high schools and PTCs. Some of these provinces are Konya, Diyarbakir, K. Maras, Ş. Urfa, Ordu, Tokat, Yozgat, Erzurum, Afyon, Van, Aksaray, Mus, Bitlis and Çankırı. However, the differences are small.

In general we observe a more equal provincial distribution of general high schools compared to the provincial distribution of PTCs. The mean number of general high schools is 46 and the mean number of PTCs is 49. The standard deviation of the general high schools is 39 while the standard deviation of the PTCs is 42. Thus, although the mean number of PTCs is larger than that of the general high schools, their standard deviation is also larger indicating a more unequal distribution.

In general, in those provinces where the percent of PTCs smaller than that of the high school age population the difference is not very large. In those provinces the demand for PTCs may be small at the prices they charge and the PTCs may not be profitable to operate.

### **5. Effectiveness of Private Tutoring Centers**

There is little research examining the effect of private tutoring on academic achievement. The evidence on this issue has been mixed. Some of this evidence is reviewed by Bray (2006). Limited evidence indicates that students who received tutoring have better outcomes in terms of various measures of academic achievement which included better reading performance, less grade repetition and better academic performance while some studies found no correlation between private tutoring and achievement.

The President of ÖZDEBİR stated that “There is demand for our services, because we are effective in helping students achieve their desired goals.” The demand for their services could indeed be taken as the evidence of the effectiveness of PTCs. Tansel and Bircan (2005) examined a random sample of students taking part in the university entrance examination (ÖSS). They found that attending PTCs during the last year in high school increased significantly the probability of getting placed in a university program. Further, attending PTCs increased the test scores significantly in most of the subjects in the university entrance examination among the applicants to the university entrance examination in 2002.

Table 6 gives further information about the effectiveness of PTCs from the point of view of high school senior students, high school graduates who are PTC students, university students and other groups. In this table, Question 3 asks the respondents to compare the quality of education at the PTCs and at the mainstream schools: The responses show that 44 percent of high school senior students, 65 percent of high school seniors, 65 percent of high school graduates and 34 percent of the university students indicate that the quality of education is better at the PTCs. Interestingly, 42 percent of the teachers and administrators also indicate that the quality of education is better at the PTCs. Further, among each of these groups a substantial percent stated that PTCs teach only examination techniques. It is true that PTCs concentrate on preparing for the national examinations and multiple choice question answering techniques in the shortest possible time. For this reason development of students in the subjects that are not covered in examinations such as sports, arts, music and foreign languages are hindered during the valuable high school years. The lack of foreign language skills is especially noticeable for high school graduates. This point needs to get the attention of the Ministry of National Education. The anecdotal evidence shows the inefficiency in foreign language teaching. Even the students from “special” high schools (most of which teach in a foreign language, mostly in English) spend an intensive year of instruction in English if they are admitted to a university teaching in English. This is an indication of inefficient efforts in teaching foreign languages in Turkey.

Question 4, in Table 6 asks about the possibility of success at the university entrance examination without attending PTCs. A larger percentage of the respondents believed that it is difficult or not possible. In particular among the parents, teachers and administrators asked the question, the percentage of those who believed that passing the university entrance examination without attending PTCs is difficult or not possible were rather very high – 68 and 63 percents respectively.

Question 10 in Table 6 asks about the satisfaction levels of the various groups with the PTCs they are attending. The responses indicate that 54 percent of the high school seniors, 67 percent of the high school graduates and 43 percent of the university students are satisfied with the PTCs they are attending and 56 percent of the parents are satisfied with the PTCs their children are attending.

Responses to Question 6 in Table 6 indicate that 52 percent of high school seniors, 67 percent of high school graduates and 78 percent of the teachers and administrators believe that PTCs will contribute a lot to the success at the university entrance examination.

Both PTCs and general high schools provide counseling and guidance services for the students in terms of selecting study fields at the universities and future careers. Question 7 asks participants to compare the quality of counseling and guidance services at PTCs and at mainstream schools. A high proportion of high school graduates, university students, parents, teachers and administrators believed that these services were better at PTC or similar in both places.

Finally, some educators claimed that PTCs are replacing the high schools also as a place where students socialize. Question 9 in Table 6 asks respondents whether they like the PTCs or the schools. While the percentages of students who liked PTCs or schools were about the same, the majority of them stated that they like both places.

### ***5.1. Cost of Private Tutoring Centers***

There is no accurate information on the cost of PTCs. The estimated costs of PTCs vary substantially according to the institutions that provide them. Question 15 in Table 6 asks about the annual payment to the PTCs. Up to 38 percent of high school seniors, 60 percent of high school graduates, 34 percent of university student and 44 percent of the parents claimed paying 1000-2000 YTL (800-1600 USD) per year. Most of the respondents claimed paying 500-3000 YTL (400-2400 USD). However, according to the anecdotal evidence some PTCs in the mega cities of Istanbul and Ankara charge as high as 3 000-4 000 USD per year per student.

According to the estimates of TED (2005), a student who participated at the ÖSS

examination in 2004 spent 1,646 USD per year on PTCs. Since, 1,786,963 students participated in the ÖSS -examination in 2004, TED computed the total PTC cost as 2.9 billion USD which amounted to 0.96 percent of Turkey's GNP in 2004. However, this computation is challenged by ÖZDEBİR (2007) since not all of the participants of the ÖSS examination attended PTCs. ÖZDEBİR alternatively provided the following estimate. During the academic year 2005-2006, some 800 thousand students attended the PTCs, and ten percent of the students attended free of charge as stipulated by the government. This gives the total number attending with pay as 720 thousand. Applying a differential rate of 1,034 USD for those preparing for ÖSS examination and 551 USD for those preparing for OKS examination ÖZDEBİR reaches an estimate of 618 million USD as the gross income of PTCs, which amounted to 0.16 percent of Turkey's GNP. This could be considered as the lower bound of the total expenditures on PTCs in Turkey. In contrast, the national government expenditure on education was 3.0 percent of Turkey's GNP in 2006. The per capita GNP of Turkey in the same year was 5,477 USD.

## **6. Conclusion**

This paper reviews the recent evidence on various aspects of supplementary private tutoring in Turkey. Supplementary private tutoring has a history in Turkey going back to mid 1960s. Over the years the number of private tutoring centers increased significantly. According to the 2006 official statistics there were about four thousand PTCs with over one million students and about fifty thousand teachers spread across Turkey. According to the unofficial sources, there is an additional four thousand unregistered PTCs operating as part of the country's underground economy.

There is a high demand for private tutoring because students prepare for two national selection examinations; one for placement into special high schools (OKS) and the other for placement into university programs (ÖSS). Those who receive private tutoring will be able to go to better schools and prestigious universities and finally succeed in the labor market with higher paying jobs – and may reach influential positions in the government. The patterns of private tutoring described for

Egypt by Bray (2006) and World Bank (2002) and several other countries cited in the literature (Bray, 2006) are very much relevant to Turkey.

Students attending PTCs learn techniques of answering multiple-choice questions in a short period of time rather than develop abilities to analyze and interpret. Attending PTCs become more important for senior high school students than attending mainstream classes since university entrance examination (ÖSS) only partially covers topics thought in mainstream classes. For this reason, attending PTCs disrupts mainstream classes. Since the PTCs are examination oriented, the development of students in subjects that are not covered in the national examinations such as sports, arts, music and foreign languages are hindered during the valuable high school years. The lack of foreign language skills is especially noticeable for high school graduates. The authorities of the Ministry of National Education must pay attention to the lack of foreign language skills of students graduating from both the basic education schools and the high schools.

This paper also reviews the considerations with regards to the determinants attending PTCs, effectiveness of PTCs, costs of PTCs and geographic distribution of PTCs in Turkey with a view towards spatial equity.

The governments and educators have been much concerned about the equity implications of the PTCs. It has been argued that private tutoring contributes to social stratification and inequalities in the society. Available evidence suggests that receiving private tutoring is highly dependent on household income and parental education levels. Parents with high incomes can afford better quality and greater quantities of tutoring while poor parents cannot afford the same. In the end, those who can pay for private tutoring have an advantage over those who cannot in getting higher incomes and prestigious positions in the labor market eventually. However, Özdebir officials argued that those who could afford to buy the services of private teachers for their children and PTCs provide services for middle income and low income families at affordable prices. In this way, contribute to equal opportunity. For this reason PTCs create and contribute to social and educational inequalities. The government must consider providing scholarships to students from poor families who would like to attend private tutoring centers.

Shortly before the ÖSS examination in mid June 2007, various youth groups organized meetings in Istanbul protesting against the ÖSS examination. Further, in order to appeal to the young voters in the upcoming national parliamentary elections, the major parties all promised to abolish the ÖSS examination if they come to power. These two pieces of news give an idea about the extent of national obsession with the national university entrance examinations.

Since March 2007, OKS examination system has been redesigned by the Ministry of Education to increase the importance of mainstream education. It is the common opinion that the present ÖSS examination system must be redesigned to increase the dependence of the ÖSS subjects on the high school curriculum. Further, new annual examinations should be introduced at the high schools just like in the basic education level in the new OKS examination system. This will be a move towards better (but not complete) provision of equitable opportunities for university education. At the present time the authors believe that Ministry of National Education must expend resources to improve the quality of high school education all over the country. Providing students with quality education in high schools which is also relevant to the national selection examination topics will be a step towards providing equal opportunities.

## References

- Akgün, M. (2005). "Özel Dersanelere Ayrılan Ekonomik Kaynakların İncelenmesi." (An Investigation of the Economic Resources Devoted to Private Tutoring Centers). Paper presented at the Educational Sciences Congress, 28-30 September, 2005, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Assaad, R. and A. El-Badawy (2004). "Private and Group Tutoring in Egypt: Where is the Gender Inequality?" Paper presented at the workshop on Gender Work and Family in the Middle East and North Africa, University of Minnesota.
- Bray, M. (1999). "The Shadow Education System: Private Tutoring and Its Implications for Planners." *Fundamentals of Educational Planning* No. 61. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Bray, M. (2003). "Adverse Effects of Private Supplementary Tutoring: Dimensions, Implications, and Government Responses." Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Bray, M. (2006). "Private Supplementary Tutoring: Comparative Perspectives on Patterns and Implications." *Compare*, 36 (4), 515 – 530.
- Bray, M. & Kwok, P. (2003). "Demand for Private Supplementary Tutoring: Conceptual Considerations, and Socio-economic Patterns in Hong Kong." *Economics of Education Review*, 22 (6), 611–620.
- Cumhuriyet Newspaper. (2007). "Genel Liselerde Sınav Dönemi." (Examinations Period in the General High Schools). April 2, 2007.
- Gök, Fatma (2006). "Üniversiteye Girişte Umut Pazarı: Özel Dershaneler." (Expectations Market in the Entrance to Universities: Private Tutoring Centers). *Eğitim, Bilim, Society*, 8: 102-109.
- GÜVENDER (2007). "Güven Dershane Sahipleri Derneği." (Association of the Owners of Güven Private Tutoring Centers), <http://www.guvender.org.tr/> (Accessed in May 2007).
- Güvercin, G. (2005). "Özel Dersanelerde ve MEB'e Bağlı Okullarda Öğretmenlik Yapan Öğretmenlerin, Öğretmenlik Mesleği ile İlgili Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması, Özel Dersanelerde Öğrenim Gören Lise-3 Öğrencilerinin Dersaneye İlişkin Görüşleri." (A Comparison of the Views of Private Tutoring Center teachers and Ministry of National Education Teachers on Teaching Profession, Views of High School Senior Students Who Are Attending Private Tutoring Centers on Private Tutoring Centers). Paper Presented at the Educational Sciences Congress, 28-30 September, 2005, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Higher Education Board of Turkey (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu) (YÖK) (2007). <http://www.yok.gov.tr/> (Accessed in May 2007).
- Higher Education Board of Turkey (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu) (YÖK) (2007). "Türkiye'nin Yüksek Öğretim Stratejisi." (Higher Education Strategy for Turkey) Ankara, Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu.



- Independent Educators Union (Bağımsız Eğitimciler Sendikası) (2007). “Çocuklarımızı Sahtekarlığa Alıştırıyoruz.” (We Allow Our Children to Cheat). Press Release, May 24, 2007 Ankara.
- Ministry of National Education (2006). “Education Statistics of Turkey, 2005-2006.” Ankara: Ministry of National Education Strategy Development Presidency.
- Ministry of National Education (2007). “National Education Statistics, Formal Education, 2006-2007.” Ankara: The Ministry of Education, the Presidency of Strategy Development.
- Ministry of National Education (2007). “Ortaöğretime Geçiş Modeli.” (A Model of Transition to the Secondary Education). <http://www.meb.gov.tr/>
- ÖZDEBİR (Özel Dershaneler Birliği) (Association of Private Tutoring Centers) (2007). <http://www.ozdebir.org.tr/> (Accessed in May 2007).
- Silova, I. and M. Bray (eds.) “*Education in the Hidden Market Place: Monitoring of Private Tutoring.*” New York: Open Society Institute.
- State Institute of Statistics (SIS) (1991). “Statistical Indicators 1923-1990.” Ankara: State Institute of Statistics. Publication No: 1472.
- State Institute of Statistics (SIS) (1997). “Statistical Yearbook of Turkey, 1996.” Ankara: State Institute of Statistics. Publication No: 1985.
- State Institute of Statistics (SIS) (2003). “2000 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics of Population.” Books for the Provinces. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics.
- Stevenson, D. L. & D. P. Baker (1992). “Shadow Education and Allocation in Formal Schooling: Transition to University in Japan.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 97 (6), 1639–1657.
- Student Selection and Placement Center (Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi) (ÖSYM), <http://www.osym.gov.tr> (Accessed in May 2007).
- Şahin, Zeynep (2007). “Eğitimciler Yeni Siytemin Öğrencileri Dersaneye Zorlayacağını Vurguladılar.” (Educators Emphasized That the New System Will Force the Students to Private Tutoring). *Cumhuriyet Newspaper*, 20 March, 2007.
- Tansel, A. (1994). “Wage Employment, Earnings and Returns to Schooling for Men and Women in Turkey.” *Economics of Education Review*, 13 (4), 305–320.
- Tansel, A. (2001). “Self-employment, Wage Employment and Returns to Schooling by Gender in Turkey.” In *Labor and Human Capital in the Middle East: Studies of Markets and Household Behavior* (pp. 337–367) eds. by Djavad Salehi-Isfahani. Reading: Ithaca Press.
- Tansel, A. (2002a). “Determinants of Schooling Attainment for Boys and Girls in Turkey: Individual, Household and Community Factors.” *Economics of Education Review*, 21, 455–470.
- Tansel, A. (2002b). “General versus Vocational High Schools and Labor Market Outcomes in Turkey.” in *Human Capital: Population Economics in the Middle East*, ed. by İsmail Sirageldin, Cairo: Economic Research Forum and American University of Cairo Press.

- Tansel, A. (2005). "Public–Private Employment Choice, Wage Differentials and Gender in Turkey." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 53 (1), 453–477.
- Tansel and Bircan (2005). "Effect of Private Tutoring on University Entrance Examination Performance in Turkey." Economic Research Forum WP No. 0407, Cairo, Egypt and IZA Discussion Paper No. 1609, Bonn, Germany.
- Tansel, A. & Bircan, F. (2006). "Demand for Education in Turkey: A Tobit Analysis of Private Tutoring Expenditures." *Economics of Education Review*, 25 (4), 303–313.
- Tansel, A. and H. Mehmet Taşçı (2007). "Explaining Unemployment Duration for Men and Women in a Developing Country: The Case of Turkey." Mimeo. Ankara: Department of Economics, Middle East Technical University.
- TÖDER (2007). "Tüm Özel Öğretim Kurumları Derneği."(Association of All Private Educational Establishments) <http://www.toder.org/> (Accessed in May 2007)
- Trade Union of Educators (Eğitim-Sen) (Eğitimciler Sendikası) (2007). <http://www.egitimsen.org.tr/> (Accessed in May 2007)
- Turkish Educational Association (Türk Eğitim Derneği) (TED) (2005). "Türkiye’de Üniversite’ye Giriş Sistemi Araştırması ve Çözüm Önerileri." (Study on the University Placement System in Turkey and Suggestions for Solution), Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği.
- World Bank (2002). "Arab Republic of Egypt: Education Sector Review—Progress and Priorities for the Future." Washington DC: The World Bank.

**Table 1: Recent Trends in Private Tutoring Centers, Students and Teachers, 1975-2007, Turkey.**

Years	Number of Private Tutoring Centers	Number of Private Tutoring Center Students	Number of Private Tutoring Center Teachers	Number of Students per Private Tutoring Center	Number of Teachers per Private Tutoring Center	Number of Students per Teacher in Private Tutoring Centers
1975 – 1976	157	45 582	1.384	290	8.8	32.9
1980 – 1981	174	101 703	3 826	585	21.9	26.6
1990 – 1991	762	188 407	8 723	247	11.5	21.6
1995 - 1996	1292	334.270	10 941	259	8.4	30.5
2000 - 2001	1 920	556 282	17 300	290	9.0	32.15
2001 - 2002	2 122	608 716	19 881	286	9.3	30.60
2002 - 2003	2 568	668 673	23 730	260	9.2	28.17
2003 - 2004	2 984	784 565	30 537	262	10.2	25.69
2004 - 2005	3 570	925 299	41 031	259	11.4	22.55
2005 – 2006	3 986	1 071 827	47 621	269	11.9	22.5

**Source:** 1975-1996: Ozdebir  
2000-2006: Ministry of National Education (2006; 2007)

**Table 2: Recent Trends in Secondary Schools, Students and Teachers, 1975-2007, Turkey.**

Years	Number of Secondary Schools <sup>a</sup>	Number of Secondary School		Number of Secondary School Teachers	Number of Students per Secondary School	Number of Teachers per Secondary School	Number of Students per Teacher in Secondary Schools
		Graduates	Students				
1975 – 1976	2 110	176 998	773 436	21 079	367	10.0	36.7
1980 – 1981	3 031	210 370	1 054 937	75 303	348	24.8	14.0
1990 – 1991	3 743	343 548	1 426 632	112 775	381	30.1	12.7
1995 – 1996	4 987	551 124	2 162 865	145 241	434	29.1	14.9
1999 – 2000	6 000	536 124	2 316 350	143 379	386	24.9	16.2
2000 – 2001	6 291	532 952	2 362 653	139 969	376	22.3	16.9
2001 – 2002	6 367	507 363	2 579 819	144 884	405	22.8	17.8
2002 – 2003	6 212	530 259	3 023 602	137 956	487	22.2	21.9
2003 – 2004	6 408	683 350	3 014 392	147 776	470	23.1	20.4
2004 – 2005	6 816	590 834	3 039 449	167 614	446	24.6	18.1
2005 – 2006	7 435	645 328	3 258 254	185 317	438	24.9	17.6
2006 – 2007	7 934	-	3 386 717	187 665	427	23.7	18.1
2005 – 2006 <sup>b</sup>	3 406	410 109	2 075 617	102 581	609	30.1	20.2
2006 – 2007 <sup>b</sup>	3 690	-	2 142 218	103 389	581	28.0	20.7

**Notes : a:** The number of secondary schools, students and teacher provided in this table include all kinds of general and vocational high schools.

**b:** These statistics refer only to the general high schools for the period 2005-2007.

**Sources :** 1975-1976, 1980-1981: SIS (1991), Table IV-3, Table IV-4.  
1990-1991: SIS (1997), Table 109.  
1999-2007: Ministry of National Education (2007), Table 1.6.

**Table 3: Number of Students in Private Tutoring Centers and Number of Secondary Education Graduates by Gender, 2000-2006, Turkey**

Years	Number of Students in Private Tutoring Centers			Number of Secondary Education Graduates		
	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)
2000-01	556 282	308 157 (55.4)	248 125 (44.6)	532 952	302 530 (56.8)	230 422 (43.2)
2001-02	608 716	331 330 (54.4)	277 386 (45.6)	507 363	280 252 (55.2)	227 111 (44.8)
2002-03	668 673	361 503 (54.1)	301 170 (45.9)	530 259	292 670 (55.2)	237 589 (44.8)
2003-04	784 565	420 979 (53.7)	363 586 (46.3)	683 350	376 730 (55.1)	306 620 (44.9)
2004-05	925 299	491 408 (53.1)	433 891 (46.9)	590 834	321 847 (54.5)	268 987 (45.5)
2005-06	1 071 827	562 916 (52.5)	508 911 (47.5)	645 328	352 384 (54.6)	292 944 (45.4)

**Source:** Ministry of National Education (2006; 2007).

**Table 4: Distribution of Private Tutoring Centers and General High Schools by Provinces, 2005-2006, Turkey**

Provinces	Number of private tutoring centers	Number of high schools.	a/b	Provinces	Number of private tutoring centers	Number of high schools.	a/b	Provinces	Number of private tutoring centers	Number of high schools.	a/b
	(a)	(b)			(a)	(b)			(a)	(b)	
İstanbul	630	544	1.2	Osmaniye	35	33	1.1	Aksaray	13	33	0.4
Ankara	541	216	2.5	Ordu	35	37	1.0	Kastamonu	13	27	0.5
İzmir	195	183	1.1	Adıyaman	34	33	1.0	Neveşehir	13	27	0.5
Adana	159	112	1.4	Çorum	32	31	1.0	Kırşehir	12	20	0.6
Bursa	141	88	1.6	Sivas	32	42	0.8	Şırnak	12	14	0.9
Antalya	127	85	1.5	Çanakkale	30	35	0.9	Karaman	12	24	0.5
Mersin	121	92	1.3	Erzurum	29	51	0.6	Bingöl	12	16	0.8
Konya	95	110	0.9	Isparta	29	43	0.7	Artvin	11	12	0.9
Balıkesir	84	61	1.4	Mardin	28	25	1.1	Düzce	11	16	0.7
Hatay	79	67	1.2	Kütahya	27	35	0.8	Muş	11	14	0.8
Kocaeli	78	70	1.1	Tokat	27	34	0.8	Bitlis	10	14	0.7
Kayseri	70	73	1.0	Elazığ	27	34	0.8	Yalova	9	9	1.0
Manisa	69	65	1.1	Yozgat	25	35	0.7	Kars	9	19	0.5
Samsun	67	58	1.2	Kırklareli	24	27	0.9	Çankırı	9	12	0.8
Diyarbakır	59	54	1.1	Afyon	23	42	0.6	Sinop	9	19	0.5
Denizli	54	49	1.1	Edirne	23	27	0.9	Erzincan	9	24	0.4
Trabzon	53	53	1.0	Kırıkkale	22	21	1.0	Hakkari	9	14	0.6
Gaziantep	53	62	0.9	Giresun	21	27	0.8	Ağrı	8	19	0.4
Sakarya	52	45	1.2	Burdur	20	23	0.9	Bartın	7	8	0.9
Muğla	51	38	1.3	Rize	20	28	0.7	Siirt	7	15	0.5
Aydın	49	50	1.0	Uşak	20	20	1.0	Iğdır	6	9	0.7
K.Maraş	49	48	1.0	Van	20	39	0.5	Bilecik	6	15	0.4
Malatya	45	65	0.7	Amasya	19	18	1.1	Gümüşhane	5	11	0.5
Eskişehir	44	50	0.9	Karabük	18	18	1.0	Kilis	3	6	0.5
Ş.Urfa	44	45	1.0	Batman	18	20	0.9	Bayburt	3	6	0.5
Tekirdağ	41	34	1.2	Niğde	15	22	0.7	Tunceli	3	14	0.2
Zonguldak	35	37	1.0	Bolu	14	11	1.3	Ardahan	2	8	0.3
								Turkey	3986	3690	

Notes:

\*: The provinces are ordered by the number of private tutoring centers they have from highest to lowest.

a: Number of private tutoring centers in a province at the end of the academic year 2005-2006.

b: Number of general high schools in a province at the beginning of the academic year 2006-2007.

Sources:

a and b: Ministry of National Education (2006; 2007).

c: State Institute of Statistics (2003).

**Table 5: Distribution of Private Tutoring Centers, General High Schools and High School Age Population by Provinces, 2005-2006, Turkey**

Provinces	% Private Tutoring <sup>a</sup>	% High School <sup>b</sup>	% Pop. <sup>c</sup>	Provinces	% Private Tutoring <sup>a</sup>	% High School <sup>b</sup>	% Pop. <sup>c</sup>	Provinces	% Private Tutoring <sup>a</sup>	% High School <sup>b</sup>	% Pop. <sup>c</sup>
İstanbul	15.8	14.7	13.5	Osmaniye	0.9	0.9	0.8	Aksaray	0.3	0.9	0.7
Ankara	13.6	5.9	5.3	Ordu	0.9	1.0	1.4	Kastamonu	0.3	0.7	0.5
İzmir	4.9	5.0	4.3	Adıyaman	0.9	0.9	1.2	Nevşehir	0.3	0.7	0.5
Adana	4.0	3.0	3.0	Çorum	0.8	0.8	0.9	Kırşehir	0.3	0.5	0.4
Bursa	3.5	2.4	2.8	Sivas	0.8	1.1	1.2	Şırnak	0.3	0.4	0.5
Antalya	3.2	2.3	2.1	Çanakkale	0.8	0.9	0.5	Karaman	0.3	0.7	0.4
Mersin	3.2	2.5	2.6	Erzurum	0.7	1.4	1.6	Bingöl	0.3	0.4	0.5
Konya	2.4	3.0	3.4	Isparta	0.7	1.7	0.7	Artvin	0.3	0.3	0.3
Balıkesir	2.1	1.7	1.3	Mardin	0.7	0.7	1.2	Düzce	0.3	0.4	0.4
Hatay	2.0	1.8	2.1	Kütahya	0.7	1.0	0.9	Muş	0.3	0.4	0.9
Kocaeli	2.0	1.9	1.7	Tokat	0.7	0.9	1.3	Bitlis	0.3	0.4	0.7
Kayseri	1.8	2.0	1.7	Elazığ	0.7	0.9	0.9	Yalova	0.2	0.2	0.2
Manisa	1.7	1.8	1.8	Yozgat	0.6	1.0	1.2	Kars	0.2	0.5	0.5
Samsun	1.7	1.6	1.8	Kırklareli	0.6	0.7	0.4	Çankırı	0.2	0.3	0.4
Diyarbakır	1.5	1.5	2.4	Afyon	0.6	1.1	1.2	Sinop	0.2	0.5	0.4
Denizli	1.4	1.3	1.1	Edirne	0.6	0.7	0.5	Erzincan	0.2	0.7	0.5
Trabzon	1.3	1.4	1.5	Kırıkkale	0.6	0.6	0.6	Hakkari	0.2	0.4	0.4
Gaziantep	1.3	1.7	2.2	Giresun	0.5	0.7	0.8	Ağrı	0.2	0.5	1.0
Sakarya	1.3	1.2	1.0	Burdur	0.5	0.6	0.3	Bartın	0.2	0.2	0.3
Muğla	1.3	1.0	0.8	Rize	0.5	0.8	0.5	Siirt	0.2	0.4	0.4
Aydın	1.2	1.4	1.4	Uşak	0.5	0.5	0.4	Iğdır	0.2	0.2	0.3
K.Maraş	1.2	1.3	1.7	Van	0.5	1.1	1.5	Bilecik	0.2	0.4	0.2
Malatya	1.1	1.8	1.4	Amasya	0.5	0.5	0.5	Gümüşhane	0.1	0.3	0.3
Eskişehir	1.1	1.4	0.9	Karabük	0.5	0.5	0.3	Kilis	0.1	0.2	0.2
Ş.Urfa	1.1	1.2	2.7	Batman	0.5	0.5	0.8	Bayburt	0.1	0.2	0.2
Tekirdağ	1.0	0.9	0.8	Niğde	0.4	0.6	0.5	Tunceli	0.1	0.4	0.1
Zonguldak	0.9	1.0	1.0	Bolu	0.4	0.3	0.3	Ardahan	0.05	0.2	0.2
								Turkey	100	100	100

Notes:

\*: The provinces are ordered by the number of private tutoring centers they have from highest to lowest.

a: Percent of the number of private tutoring centers in a province in the total number of private tutoring centers in Turkey at the end of the academic year 2005-2006.

b: Percent of the number of general high schools in a province in the total number of general high schools in Turkey at the beginning of the academic year 2006-2007.

c: Percent of the high school age population (14-16) in a province in the total high school age population of Turkey in 2000 general census of population.

Sources:

a and b: Ministry of National Education (2006; 2007).

c: State Institute of Statistics (2003).

**Table 6: Selected Results of a Survey on Private Tutoring Centers (PTC) Conducted by TED, Turkey, 2005.**

	High School Senior Students %	High School Graduates <sup>a</sup> %	University Students <sup>b</sup> %	Parents <sup>c</sup>	Teachers and Administrators <sup>d</sup> %
Number Interviewed	1078	1073	1064	1103	486
1. Is There Anything in Your Life Now More Important Than The University Entrance Examination?					
a. Yes	24	21	-	-	-
b. No	60	66	-	-	-
2. Are You Currently Attending PTCs?					
a. Yes	70	68	83	84	92
b. No	25	23	16	14	6
3. Where is the Quality of Education Better in?					
a. PTC	44	65	34	-	42
b. Schools	6	3	10	-	5
c. PTC Teach Only Examination Techniques	17	20	32	-	31
4. Possibility of Success at University Entrance without PTC?					
a. Possible	44	35	49	21	36
b. Difficult or Not Possible	58	64	50	68	63
5. The Most Important Reason for Attending PTCs					
a. School Education is not Adequate for Success in University Entrance Examination	58	77	57	-	72
6. How Much Do You Believe that PTC will Contribute to Your Success at the University Entrance Examination?					
a. Will Contribute a Lot	52	67	-	-	78
b. Will not Contribute Much	16	14	-	-	15
c. Will not Contribute	3	3	-	-	2
7. Where are the Quality of Counseling and Guidance Services Better at?					
a. PTC	38	52	35	32	45
b. Schools	8	4	12	12	7
c. Both Places	36	30	27	49	44
8. How Does Preparing for the University Examination Affect your Second Semester School Attendance?					
a. Will receive Medical Report	55	49	44	36	57
b. Will Use Allowed Non-Attendance Days	24	21	25	26	8
c. Will Continue School	19	29	29	34	32
9. Do You Like Schools or PTC?					
a. PTC	23	29	-	-	-
b. Schools	20	22	-	-	-
c. Both Places	30	37	-	-	-
10. Are You Satisfied with the PTC You are Attending?					
a. Yes	54	67	43	56	-
b. Partly	18	28	36	27	-
c. I regret	5	4	11	2	-



11. How Many Hours of Education per Week Do You Get at PTCs?					
a. 0 - 10 Hours	13	6	16		
b. 10 - 15 Hours	36	6.9	29		
c. 15- 20 Hours	15	51	28		
d. 20+ Hours	8	33	15		
12. What is The Attitude of your School Teacher and Administrators Towards PTCs?					
a. Do not Think Necessary	12	17	10	-	-
b. Absolutely Want Me to Go	47	43	50	-	-
c. No Comment	40	40	39	-	-
13. Is the Quality of High School Important Determinant of Success at University Entrance Examination?					
a. Yes	67	67	67	-	74
b. Partly	26	26	26	-	25
c. No	7	6	7	-	1
14. While Choosing a High School for your Child Did you Consider Past Performance of the High School at the University Entrance Exam?					
a. Yes	-	-	-	50	-
b. No	-	-	-	49	-
15. How Much will you Pay to the PTCs this year?					
Less than 500 YTL	5	2	9	4	-
500-1000 YTL	12	17	28	17	-
1000-2000 YTL	38	60	34	44	-
2000-3000 YTL	10	14	8	14	-
3000-4000 YTL	3	1	4	7	-
Over 4000 YTL	5	2	3	1	-
No Reply	28	4	15	13	

**Notes:** a: High school graduate and attending Private Tutoring Centers.

b: University Preparatory School or first year university students. The questions addressed to this group refer to their experiences prior to their success at the university entrance examination.

c: The questions addressed to this group refer to their experiences with regards to their children.

d: Teachers and administrators of secondary schools and Private Tutoring Centers. The questions addressed to this group refer to their experiences with regards their students.

**Source:** Turkish Educational Association (TED) (2005). Various Tables.

### **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

**PTC** : Private Tutoring Center (Dersane).

**YÖK**: Higher Education Board of Turkey (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu)

**OKS**: Examination for Selection and Placement of Students for Secondary Education Schools. (Orta Öğretim Kurumları Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Sınavı).

**ÖSS**: Student Selection Examination (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı).

**ÖSYM**: Student Selection and Placement Center (Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi).

**ÖZDEBİR**: Association of Private tutoring Centers (Özel Dersaneler Birliği).

**GÜVENDER**: Association of The Owners of Güven Private Tutoring Centers (Güven Dersane Sahipleri Derneği).

**TÖDER**: Association of the all Private Educational Establishments (Tüm Özel Öğretim Kurumları Derneği).

**TED**: Turkish Educational Association (Türk Eğitim Derneği).

**KPDS**: Language Proficiency Examination for Public Servants (Kamu Personeli Dil Sınavı).

**KPSS**: Examination for Selection of Public Servants (Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı).