
Motivations that promote the professional development of the Educational Inspection: an analysis from the Learning Ecologies

Motivaciones que impulsan el desarrollo profesional de la Inspección Educativa: un análisis desde las Ecologías de Aprendizaje

推动教育督察专业发展的动机: 学习生态学的分析

Мотивы, определяющие профессиональное развитие инспекторов образования: анализ с точки зрения экологии обучения

Andrea Carme Doural García

CEIP Anxo da Garda (A Coruña)
andrea.doural@edu.xunta.gal
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9071-790X>

Iris Estévez Blanco

University of Santiago de Compostela
iris.estevez.blanco@usc.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2821-5663>

Mercedes González Sanmamed

University of A Coruña
mercedes.gonzalez.sanmamed@udc.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3410-6810>

Dates · Fechas

Received: 2023-05-10
Accepted: 2023-09-30
Published: 2023-12-31

How to Cite this Paper · Cómo citar este trabajo

Doural, A. C., Estévez, I., & González, M. (2023). Motivations that promote the professional development of the Educational Inspection: an analysis from the Learning Ecologies. *Publicaciones*, 53(3), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.30827/publicaciones.v53i3.29487>

Abstract

This paper deals with the analysis of one of the key components of the Learning Ecologies of education inspectors: motivation. The general objective is aimed at identifying and understanding the reasons behind their involvement in improving their performance and boosting their professional development. To this end, a quantitative study has been implemented through the application of a questionnaire in the Galician autonomous community. Data analysis was performed with the support of SPSS software. The results show that the study participants are involved in the processes of professional improvement and updating, essentially, for reasons of an intrinsic nature. The conclusions drawn have important implications for the design of training plans more adjusted to the needs and interests of this group.

Keywords: motivation, educational inspection, learning ecologies, professional learning, professional development.

Resumen

Este trabajo aborda el análisis de uno de los componentes clave de las Ecologías del Aprendizaje de los inspectores/as de educación: la motivación. El objetivo general se dirige a la identificación y comprensión de las razones que están detrás de su implicación en la mejora de su desempeño y el impulso a su desarrollo profesional. Con este fin se ha implementado un estudio de corte cuantitativo a través de la aplicación de un cuestionario en la comunidad autónoma gallega. El análisis de los datos se realizó con el apoyo del software SPSS. Los resultados muestran que los participantes del estudio se involucran en los procesos de mejora y actualización profesional, esencialmente, por razones de carácter intrínseco. Las conclusiones emanadas tienen importantes implicaciones para el diseño de planes de formación más ajustados a las necesidades e intereses de este colectivo.

Palabras clave: motivación, Inspección Educativa, Ecologías de Aprendizaje, aprendizaje profesional, desarrollo profesional.

概要

本研究致力于分析教育督察专业学习生态的关键组成部分之一：动机。总体目标旨在识别和理解他们参与提高绩效和促进专业发展背后的原因。为此，我们通过在加利西亚自治区进行问卷调查的方式进行了定量研究，在SPSS软件的支持下进行分析。结果表明，研究参与者参与专业改进和更新的过程，本质上是出于内在的原因。研究得出的结论对于设计更适合该群体的需求和兴趣的培训计划具有重要意义。

关键词：动机、教育检查、学习生态、专业学习、专业发展。

Аннотация

Данная работа посвящена анализу одного из ключевых компонентов «Экологии обучения» инспекторов образования - мотивации. Общая задача состоит в том, чтобы выявить и понять причины их участия в повышении эффективности своей работы и профессиональном развитии. Для этого было проведено количественное исследование с использованием анкетирования в автономном сообществе Галисия. Анализ данных проводился с помощью программы SPSS. Полученные результаты свидетельствуют о том, что участники исследования вовлечены в процессы профессионального

совершенствования и обновления в основном по внутренним причинам. Сделанные выводы имеют важное значение для разработки учебных планов, в большей степени отвечающих потребностям и интересам этой группы.

Ключевые слова: мотивация, образовательная инспекция, экологии обучения, профессиональное обучение, профессиональное развитие, повышение квалификации.

Introduction

Education inspectors are essential to the functioning of the education system, and they do key work in supervising and improving the quality of its structures and processes. This means that it is important to understand their reasons for engaging in improving their occupational performance and in the processes of professional development.

Hence this paper presents a study about Galician education inspectors' motivations behind the performance of their duties. We examine the elements making up this motivation, such as professional improvement, keeping up to date, innovation, professional identity, and perceptions about the importance of the work.

One of the reasons for this study was the gap in the available research literature specifically about educational inspection. Authors such as Castán (2018), Blanco (2018), and Tébar (2017) demonstrated the interest and urgent need for rigorous studies illuminating aspects inherent to inspectors' professional development in order to be able to design and implement training strategies, measures, and programs that are tailored to this profession's specifics and characteristics. To date, there is only a single study about inspectors' motivations, which is the qualitative study by Doural, González-Sanmamed et al. (2021), providing a somewhat brief, preliminary description of the motivation of this group when they join the inspectorate.

This scant body of work about education inspectors may be explained because it deals with a specific, not particularly large professional group. In addition, given that having worked as a teacher is a *sine qua non* for entry into the Inspectorate, the literature about teachers is commonly referred to, looking for findings that could be applied to inspectors. However, from the point of view of accuracy and thoroughness, this may produce poorly-applicable inferences, which are out of context, and lack a solid foundation. The attribution of explanations and inconsistent deduction of commonalities between the two closely-related profiles—in terms of the discipline they arise in (Science of Education)—which are clearly different in terms of functions, competencies, identity, and professional paths, may lead to disjointed, inconsistent decision-making. This is more evident if we consider the characteristics of today's context, and the interdisciplinary approach that demands a high level of expertise in performing duties that are ever more specific, technical, and circumscribed (Rodríguez et al., 2018).

Education Inspection in Galicia

Administrations perform educational inspections through civil servants belonging to the Education Inspectorate [*Cuerpo de Inspectores de Educación*] and those belonging to the now defunct Educational Administration Inspectorate created by the 1984 Public Worker Reform act [*Ley 30/1984, 2 August, de Medidas para la Reforma de la Función*

Pública, modified by Ley 23/1988, 28 July] who did not choose to join the current inspectorate when it was created (art. 152, LOMLOE).

The Education Inspectorate in Galicia supervise and evaluate all aspects of the education system in schools, services, activities, and programs—both public and private—in all levels of education. Its objective is to ensure that education legislation and rules are followed, to help improve the education system, and to ensure the rights and responsibilities of all those involved in the teaching-learning process, all with the aim of assuring teaching quality (art. 2.1. of Decree 99/2004, 21 May, regulating the organization and functioning of the Education Inspectorate and access to the Inspectorate in the Autonomous Community of Galicia).

In relation to that, it is worth emphasizing that education inspectors' training (the design and implementation of which is the responsibility of the Department of Culture, Education, and Universities) is a right and a responsibility of the inspectors (Decree 99/2004). This process is realized formally through an annual training plan from the Education Inspectorate which is specified in *Resolution 7, November 2022, from the Directorate General for Education Planning and Innovation, which establishes the general plan for Inspection for academic year 2022/23*. This document specifies that the aforementioned department organizes periodic training days, encourages internationalization of the Inspectorate, and considers the possibility of participation in other specific activities (including those aimed at teachers).

Education Inspectors' professional competencies

These competencies are the set of skills, knowledge, procedures, techniques, and attitudes needed to successfully, effectively perform a specific job and to be able to resolve problems creatively (Jornet et al., 2011).

If we focus on inspectors (Blanco, 2018), the contribution from Soler (2015) stands out, which lays out ten professional competencies for education inspectors in three categories (knowledge, skills, and attitudes). The explanatory framework for the relationship between these skills was enhanced by Piñel (2019), which is summarized below.

Knowledge means that inspectors need to have scientific knowledge related to the discipline of the field of education and pedagogy, without ignoring mastery of legislative and regulatory frameworks. *Skills* essentially cover teaching experience, digital competence, and competency in inspection (highlighted by the study from Doural, Estévez & Cubeiro, 2021) and assessment techniques, advisory capability (covered by the study from Doural, Estévez & González-Sanmamed, 2021), organization, planning, problem-solving, and decision-making. *Attitudes* include elements such as professional leadership, a sense of observation, emotional intelligence, the ability to work as part of a team, ethical engagement, flexibility, and adaptability.

Current professional development for Education Inspectors

The new models of knowledge production are based on four factors that characterize today's society: lifelong and life-wide learning, technology mediation, removal of obstacles and spatial-temporal distance, and individualized learning (Oliveira et al., 2015; Marimon et al., 2016). This has meant that in recent years there have been significant

changes in individuals' roles in their learning processes and in the elements involved in them (Coll, 2014).

This is the context from which Learning Ecologies (LEs) have emerged. This concept provides an analytical framework so that we can deeply and holistically interpret how we learn and what contexts and elements we use to educate ourselves (González-Sanmamed, Sangrà, Souto-Seijo & Estévez, 2018). One of the values of this emerging ecological paradigm is its potential to produce greater awareness in the individual about learning opportunities that arise. In other words, being aware of the elements and contexts that make up our LEs can be a very useful strategy for keeping ourselves up to date in a way that is self-directed, satisfactory, and effective (González-Sanmamed, Sangrà, Souto-Seijo & Santos, 2018; Rocosa et al., 2018).

To facilitate analysis and understanding of the construct of LEs, González-Sanmamed et al. (2019) identified their key components and grouped them in two categories, personal and experiential, in order to be able to make a conceptual approach to each of these ecological elements.

The *personal dimension* is made up of intersubjective elements that characterize the learner and their disposition towards learning. These intrinsic ecological components include *motivation* (Estévez et al., 2021), *conceptions*, and *expectations* about the learning, which are considered important factors when it comes to deciding to involve oneself in learning activities and contexts. The *experiential dimension* includes other elements that may also influence a person's learning throughout their life. These include *actions* (such as strategies deployed in formal, informal, non-formal, or self-taught settings), *resources* (key resources being technological tools in the performance of any modern educational/training process; González-Sanmamed et al., 2020), *interpersonal relationships* (interactions with other people or communities that contribute to, influence, and moderate an individual's learning process, as noted by Estévez et al., 2022), and *context* (which is thought of as any minimally structured social order). As authors such as González-Sanmamed et al. (2019) have noted, identifying and operationalizing each of the components only has an analytical purpose, as each is linked in a web of relationships with others, and they make little functional sense if considered separately.

Consideration of the motivational element as a fundamental component of LEs was not a novel proposal from the authors cited above. Barron (2006a) and Jackson (2013b) had mentioned it briefly in their work, arguing that an individual's ecology was strengthened and enriched, in part, through perseverance in a learning task.

It is worth emphasizing the importance of LEs in analyzing professional development, bearing in mind that it is a highly complex, multidimensional learning phenomenon. For Day (2005), professional development covers all the learning and training experiences (both formal and informal) that attempt to meet the particular needs of an individual, group, or institution. Its main aim is to improve professional knowledge and abilities so that people can do their jobs better. Making an inference to approach a definition of professional development for education inspectors as a group, we can say that it is a process aimed at modifying and enriching the conceptions, knowledge, abilities, and attitudes belonging to this professional profile. Adding this to the contributions from Soler (2015) and Piñel (2019), this process of learning and updating must be aimed at developing knowledge about the education system, legislative and organizational frameworks regulating the system, educational innovation, digital competence, skill in inspection techniques and assessment strategies, advisory capabilities, problem solving, decision making, professional leadership abilities, inter- and

intra-personal skills, working as part of a team, ethical engagement, and adaptability, among others.

This process of change is influenced by various factors, such as experience, motivation, collaboration with peers, organizational support, and participation in training activities.

However, we need to bear in mind that these factors which drive the process of professional development can also hinder it. The process of professional development is discontinuous (as opposed to linear) and there may be regression, changes of direction or insurmountable limitations (Huberman *et al.*, 2000). These elements may be directly linked to the profession (e.g., access to it or the systems for promotion), they may be more personal (e.g., age, health, personality, motivation, experience, and knowledge), contextual (e.g., family, friends), or social factors (e.g., political events, social developments, economic changes and legislative changes, or cultural changes) (Caballero & Bolívar, 2015).

Motivation as a key ecological element in inspectors' professional development

As indicated above, motivation has emerged as one of the key elements in the personal dimension of LEs. This idea is in line with the contributions from other previous studies (Barron, 2006; González-Sanmamed *et al.*, 2019; Jackson, 2013). The interest that drives an individual's improvement and learning is indispensable for shaping LEs. In any learning process, motivation plays a central role, both in terms of being able to activate and maintain the process, or in contrast, hinder it.

Despite the many, diverse conceptual approaches to the complex motivational process, they all agree that motivation covers a set of processes involved in the activation, direction, and persistence of a behavior (Beltrán, 1993; Good & Brophy, 1983). It is an internal process in a person which produces strong interest in a specific goal and putting actions in place to successfully achieve that goal.

Recent studies on motivation have focused on cognitive aspects in search of solutions for motivational problems that occur in various settings such as sport, the workplace, or in education. The fact that these approaches focus on specific areas (rather than trying to understand this human behavior more generally) has led to changes in the way motivation is conceived of and studied, producing various approaches (Reeve, 2008).

Motivational planning and activation, according to Pintrich (2000), involves setting goals (related to the reasons for involving oneself in the task), along with the activation of a set of self-referential beliefs, such as perceived self-efficacy (assessment of competency in relation to doing the task), personal interest in the task (related to the content of the activity, the domain, or content area), beliefs about the value of the task (ideas about its importance, usefulness, or relevance), and the affect (emotions) produced in an individual doing this activity.

Of the motivational paradigms explaining the various results in task resolution from a cognitive approach, one that stands out is expectancy-value models. This approach understands the individual as an active, rational, decision-making agent, which allows them to moderate their volition according to the different teaching-learning situations and processes (Pintrich & Shunk, 2006; Valle *et al.*, 2010). In addition, expectancy-val-

ue theory has become one of the most well-rooted motivational theories (together with achievement-goal theory and self-determination theory) that has been applied to the study of teacher motivation (Estévez et al., 2021; Rodríguez et al., 2009), leading to a slight increase in the number of studies about this professional group that is close to education inspectors (Han & Yin, 2016).

In addition, we can also differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Reeve, 1994). Intrinsic motivation is defined as doing an activity for its inherent satisfaction rather than any separate consequence. In other words, when a person is intrinsically motivated, they engage themselves in a task or action for the challenge involved. Participation in the task itself is its own reward, rather than potential external stimuli, pressure, or reward (Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Schunk et al., 2014). Intrinsic motivation is based on internal factors such as self-determination, curiosity, challenge, or effort (Reeve, 1994).

Extrinsic motivation is a construction that is applied whenever one does an activity in order to achieve a result that is separate or dissociated from the task itself (such as praise or rewards). In this case, what is more important is the image an individual projects, other people's opinions, and getting positive judgements (Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Schunk et al., 2014).

In light of the evidence summarized above, and given the issue associated fundamentally with a lack of knowledge in the current body of research, the aim of the present study was to analyze and understand the motivational element of education inspectors' LEs. From an ecological standpoint, the research questions to be answered with this study were: a) What are the reasons behind education inspectors' involvement in their professional development processes? And b) Are Galician inspectors motivated to continue professional training and to keep their professional knowledge up to date?

Methods

This study followed a qualitative methodological research framework. It used an exploratory, descriptive design via survey. In addition, it was a transversal study as the data was collected at a single point in time.

Participants

The population for the study comprised 71 inspectors working in the autonomous community of Galicia (Spain). This was a small, manageable group and the initial intention was to ask all of them to participate. In the end, the sample comprised 44 inspectors, representing 62% of the overall population.

Three-quarters (75%) of the sample were men, 25% were women. In terms of age (\bar{X} = 57.27; SD = 8.39), 2.3% of the sample were aged 31 to 40; 22.7% were between 41 and 50; 40.9% were between 51 and 60; and 34.1% were over 61 years of age.

The mean number of years of teaching experience was \bar{X} = 23.32 (SD = 10.56). 9.1% had between 6 and 11 years' experience; 22.7% had between 12 and 17 years'; 29.5% had between 18 and 23; 15.9% had between 24 and 29; and 22.7% had over 30 years' teaching experience. In this regard, it is worth noting that they performed their teaching functions in various areas (such as teacher-training, university teaching, or preparation for civil service exams, among others) in parallel with their work as inspectors.

The mean number of years' experience as inspectors was \bar{X} = 13.43; (SD = 9.96). 15.9% had between 0 and 5 years' experience; 40.9% had between 6 and 11 years'; 22.7% between 12 and 17 years'; 2.3% between 18 and 23; and 9.1% had more than 30 years' experience as inspectors.

Data collection instrument

In order to respond to the research questions, data was collected using a 10-item questionnaire, the creation and use of which is detailed below.

Instrument design began with the motivational theories discussed above, and took its references from the Teacher Motivation Scale [*Escala de Motivación Docente*] (Rodríguez et al., 2009), used in previous studies, such as Estévez et al. (2021), to evaluate teacher motivation. For our study, we altered the scale so that the items fit the specific reality of education inspectors, basically changing nomenclature.

The ten items in the scale were created in order to evaluate the inspectors' levels of motivation in relation to various statements about professional training and development. Specific questions were written to examine intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The responses were given on a Likert-type scale, with answers from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a lot).

Once the preliminary design of the instrument was finalized, it was reviewed by a panel of experts in order to verify its validity (Colmenero & Pegalajar, 2015). The panel for this review was made up of five experts with previous experience in design and application of questionnaires, as well as experience in continual training and LEs. Various items in the instrument were amended based on their suggestions. In addition, based on the recommendations from DeVellis (2017), a pilot study was run to ensure the instrument was suitable for and easily understood by the target audience.

In addition, in pursuit of rigorous strategies in the study linked to the instrument's psychometric properties, we performed an exploratory factor analysis of the scale using principal component extraction and the Varimax rotation method with Kaiser normalization. The results allowed the extraction of 2 factors (Rodríguez et al., 2009; Estévez et al., 2021). The value for Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy, of .6, together with Bartlett's sphericity test, with a significance of $p < .01$, provided statistical support for this factorization.

In the final analysis, we removed item 9 from the original questionnaire as it exhibited factor loadings that were very similar in both factors. The variance explained by the two factors extracted from the items that finally made up the scale reached 55.72% of the total. Table 1 shows the factor loadings for both factors.

Table 1

Factorial structure of the motivation scale

Motivation scale items	Factor loadings of items in factor 1	Factor loadings of items in factor 2
Item 1: Improve professionally.		.87
Item 2: Keep up to date.		.70

Motivation scale items	Factor loadings of items in factor 1	Factor loadings of items in factor 2
Item 3: Be ready to innovate in my professional performance.		.73
Item 4: Gain points for competitive exams.	.69	
Item 5: Achieve another six-year appointment.	.67	
Item 6: Be better than my colleagues.	.75	
Item 7: So that my colleagues think I am a good professional.	.79	
Item 8: So that schools think I am a good inspector.	.75	
Item 10: Feel more satisfied with my work.		.67
Variance explained (%)	31.12	24.60
Total variance (%)	55.7	

Lastly, reliability was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha. This gave excellent indices of internal reliability for the overall scale ($\alpha = .72$) and each of its dimensions. The first factor ($\alpha = .72$) included items 1, 2, 3, and 10, while the second factor ($\alpha = .78$) included items 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The first factor, called *Extrinsic Motivation*, had 4 items related to factors external to the individual: achieving an economic incentive, points towards competitive exams (to move to another area), and others' opinions about performance. In contrast, the second factor, *Intrinsic Motivation*, had 5 items representing ideas and objectives linked to satisfaction and pleasure of work, or about professional learning itself (for example, improving professionally).

Procedure

We distributed the questionnaire using the *Google Forms* survey platform, sending a link to participants by email. The application was available to participants to complete for three months. We chose this format because of its reach and low cost (Díaz de Rada, 2012). The study complied with the ethical research principles of the University of A Coruña Ethics Committee, outlined in the Helsinki Declaration, ensuring that participants' anonymity was protected and the confidentiality of the information collected.

Data analysis

Owing to the quantitative nature of the study, in order to codify and process the data, we statistically treated it with the support of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) data analysis software version 27.

First, we performed a descriptive analysis to examine the distribution of the data (including asymmetry and kurtosis), summary measures such as the means, and indicators of dispersion such as minimum and maximum values and standard deviations.

Following confirmation that the data followed a normal distribution, we assessed the instrument's psychometric properties. Once we had the results from the factorial analysis (in the Data Collection Instrument section), we moved on to producing the constructed variables identified with each of the two factors (*Intrinsic Motivation* and *Extrinsic Motivation*) from the observed variables (items). Finally, given that the study was exploratory and descriptive, we recalculated the variables for distribution, central tendency, and dispersion for the newly created variables in pursuit of the study objectives and in response to the research questions.

Results

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the constructed variables.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for the constructed variables

Constructed variables	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Asymmetry	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
Extrinsic motivation	1.00	4.80	2.22	.81	.67	1.38	= .72
Intrinsic motivation	3.25	5.0	4.30	.50	-.08	-1.11	= .78

In general, the inspectors exhibited fundamentally intrinsic motivation ($\bar{X} = 4.30$; $SD = .5$), with much lower extrinsic motivation ($\bar{X} = 2.22$; $DT = .81$). Looked at separately, the intrinsic motivation scores were high, while extrinsic motivation scores were moderately low. The closeness of the minimum and maximum values for intrinsic motivation were particularly noteworthy, with $Min = 3.25$ and $Max = 5.0$.

Extrinsic Motivation

As noted above, *Extrinsic Motivation* was made up of four items from the original set of questions. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for each item.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics for extrinsic reasons

Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Asymmetry	Kurtosis
4. Gain points for competitive exams.	1.00	5.00	1.32	.74	3.37	14.06
5. Achieve another six-year appointment.	1.00	5.00	1.55	.93	1.97	4.02
6. Be better than my colleagues.	1.00	5.00	2.09	1.18	.71	-.67

Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Asymmetry	Kurtosis
7. So that my colleagues think I am a good professional.	1.00	5.00	2.73	1.25	-.06	-.97
8. So that schools think I am a good inspector.	1.00	5.00	3.43	1.35	-.67	-.67

The inspectors' showed relatively little interest in "gaining points for competitive exams" (Item 4: $\bar{X} = 1.32$; $SD = .74$) or "achieving another six-year appointment" (Item 5: $\bar{X} = 1.55$; $DT = .93$). We believe that the inspectors' motivations in this regard are so small because with such long experience as teachers (Mean years' experience: $\bar{X} = 23.32$; $SD = 10.56$) and as inspectors (Mean years' experience: $\bar{X} = 13.43$; $DT = 9.96$), they may already have had the five possible appointments or have the necessary training (100 hours each). In addition, we do not believe that getting points for the competitive exams was vital to their motivation either, as given their seniority they would most likely have managed to get posts in their preferred locations.

The scores were slightly higher in the items "Be better than my colleagues" (Item 6: $\bar{X} = 2.09$; $SD = 1.18$) and "So that my colleagues think I am a good professional" (Item 7: $\bar{X} = 2.73$; $SD = 1.25$). The highest scoring item was "So that schools think I am a good inspector" (Item 8: $\bar{X} = 3.43$; $SD = 1.35$). These results show that the inspectors placed more importance on the image they projected in schools than in the inspectorate groups they were part of. It seems, therefore, that their concerns focused more on meeting expectations from school authorities, teachers, students, and families than on demonstrating their professional ability to their colleagues in the inspectorate.

Intrinsic motivation

The intrinsic dimension was made up of items 1, 2, 3, and 10. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for each of those observed variables.

Table 4

Descriptive statistics for intrinsic reasons

Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Asymmetry	Kurtosis
1.Improve professionally	3.00	5.00	4.32	.64	-.39	-.62
2.Keep up to date	4.00	5.00	4.59	.50	-.38	-1.94
3. Be ready to innovate in my professional performance.	2.00	5.00	4.00	.81	-.56	.06
10. Feel more satisfied with my work	3.00	5.00	4.30	.73	-.53	-.94

Overall, the mean scores for these items were much higher than the items making up the previous dimension (extrinsic motivation). All of the items in this case had scores of 4 or higher, which is a relatively high score. This shows that the drive for training

comes from essentially intrinsic motivations linked to the work itself. For example: *keep up to date* (Item 2: $\bar{X} = 4.59$; $SD = .50$), *improve professionally* (Item 1: $\bar{X} = 4.32$; $SD = .64$), *feel more satisfied with my work* (Item 10: $\bar{X} = 4.3$; $SD = .73$) and *be ready to innovate in my professional performance* (Item 3: $\bar{X} = 4.00$; $SD = .81$). The reasons that seem to have been more important in education inspectors' motivation were actions that directly impacted improvement in professional practice, such as updating competencies and honing their expertise.

Discussion

This section provides the interpretations and conclusions drawn from the results, bearing in mind the two main axes related to the research questions: a) the nature of the motives behind inspectors' involvement in their professional development, and b) the importance of continuing training and its links to development, professional identity, and professionalization.

Initially, we can conclude from our results that inspectors' motivations for continuing their training tended towards the intrinsic. In other words, it is linked to developing and perfecting their expertise and abilities, and indicates notable preoccupation about how they perform their jobs, aspects that are in line with other studies about motivation in teachers (Estévez, 2020; Estévez et al., 2021). More specifically, the driver for training is the desire to keep up to date, to improve professionally, to feel more satisfied with the job, and to be able to innovate at work.

Looking at the intrinsic dimension comparatively, although the mean score for the item associated with innovation was also high, it was the lowest mean. One possible explanatory hypothesis may lie in the fact that using resources, tools, and strategies that directly lead to innovation is less widespread in inspectors' work (compared to teachers, for example).

With regard to factors related to extrinsic motivation (those associated with professional image and competency as projected onto others, or external rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000)), the inspectors ascribed more importance to meeting the expectations of various agents in schools (teachers, administrations, etc.) than other inspectors' opinions. In addition, the motivations that were not closely related to the process of professional development and improvement were those linked to extrinsic rewards, incentives, or remuneration.

These results indicate that training programs for these inspectors should be tailored to their intrinsic needs and interests. They also suggest the possibility of involving schools in planning and delivery, ensuring effectiveness and satisfaction for all parties and agents in the process.

With regard to the second of the research questions, continual training is essential for professional development (Villagrà, 2012) and consolidation of teachers' identities (Nieto & Alfageme-González, 2017). The construction of a professional identity is also fundamental in the process of teacher professionalization (Serrano et al., 2013) and that of any other group. Professionalization involves social recognition of a professional activity and performance supported by specialist knowledge (Frades, 2007). Along these lines, education inspection has historically sought professionalization through a rigorous selection procedure, knowledge development, clear definition of functions, independent and impartial decision-making, training, and assessment of practice (Lo-

rente & Madonar, 2006). However, in the light of our results, it seems that the design of training plans and processes for continued updating for these inspectors is felt to be insufficient and often a poor fit to their motivational interests and outlooks. This makes it difficult for them to adapt to new educational challenges and to effectively perform their duties, which may end up leading to gradual loss of influence for the Education Inspectorate and reassignment of tasks to specialist external units (such as private companies) (Tébar, 2017). This would involve underutilizing the functions attributed to inspectors, a backward step away from professionalization, and an unnecessary transfer of educational responsibility to the private sector.

Based on the results, and trying to minimize or eliminate limitations of our study in future research, there is a need to design a competency map on which to base specific training programs (Blanco, 2018; Castán, 2018).

In addition, bearing in mind that education inspectors highly value the perception of schools about their work, our study might be complemented by adopting a new perspective. This new perspective may arise from examining the aspects that teachers feel indicates a good inspector. It would be interesting to differentiate between teachers' and administrators' opinions, looking at the different interaction produced between these agents and the inspectors. This would continue the previous work from Doural, Estévez and Cubeiro (2021) and Doural, Estévez and González-Sanmamed (2021), analyzing teachers' views about the functions, supervision, and advice of the Education Inspectorate, and the work by Doural, Rodríguez et al. (2021) on the views of school management. Such studies might provide valuable information for improving inspectors' performance and their relationships with schools.

In addition, future research might benefit from studying motivational positions based on the groups' different occupational phases (such as reasons for entering the profession), and may be able to propose a procedural characterization, similar to what Day et al. (2007) produced around teachers' work lives.

References

- Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecology perspective. *Human Development*, 49(4), 193-224. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000094368>
- Beltrán, J. (1993). *Procesos, estrategias y técnicas de aprendizaje*. Editorial Síntesis SA.
- Blanco, J. L. (2018). La competencia profesional del inspector de educación. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, (494), 68-72. <https://bit.ly/3IIItCOD>
- Caballero, K., & Bolívar, A. (2015). El profesorado universitario como docente: hacia una identidad profesional que integre docencia e investigación. *REDU: Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 13(1), 57-77. <https://cutt.ly/JroDvvg>
- Castán, J. (2018). La formación del Inspector de Educación del siglo XXI. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, (494), 73-79. <https://bit.ly/3BUK0g9>
- Coll, C. (2014). Los profesores, las TIC y la nueva ecología del aprendizaje. *Nova Escola en línea*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4806.3367>
- Colmenero, M. J., & Pegalajar, M. C. (2015). Cuestionario para futuros docentes de Educación Secundaria acerca de las percepciones sobre atención a la diversidad: construcción y validación del instrumento. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 29, 165-189. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.29.165-189>

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications
- Day, C. (2005). *Formar docentes. Cómo, cuándo y en qué condiciones aprende el profesorado*. Narcea.
- Day, C., Stobart, G., Sammons, P., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Smees, R., & Mujtaba, T. (2007). *Variations in teachers' work, lives and effectiveness*. Department for Education and Skills. <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/6405/1/rr743.pdf>
- Decreto 99/2004, de 21 de maio, polo que se regula a organización e o funcionamento da Inspección Educativa e o acceso ao corpo de inspectores de Educación na Comunidade Autónoma de Galicia. *Diario Oficial de Galicia*, 99, de 25 de maio de 2004. https://www.xunta.gal/dog/Publicados/2004/20040525/AnuncioE58A_es.html
- de Oliveira, J. M., Henriksen, D., Castañeda, L., Marimon, M., Barberà, E., Monereo, C., Coll, C., Mahiri, J., & Mishra, P. (2015). El panorama educativo de la era digital: prácticas comunicativas que (nos) impulsan hacia adelante. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, 12(2), 14-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v12i2.2440>
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale Development. Theory and Applications* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Díaz de Rada, V. (2012). Ventajas e inconvenientes de la encuesta por Internet. *Pappers: revista de sociología*, 97(1), 193-223 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers/v97n1.71>
- Doural, A. C., González-Sanmamed, M., & Santos-Caamaño, F. J. (2021). Percepciones de inspector de educación sobre sus tareas y responsabilidades profesionales. In M. A. Santos, M. M. Lorenzo, & A. Quiroga (Coords.), *La educación en Red. Realidades diversas, horizontes comunes: XVII Congreso Nacional y IX Iberoamericano de Pedagogía* (pp. 664-670).
- Doural, A. C., Estévez, I., & Cubeiro, N. (2021). Acciones de supervisión y control de la Inspección Educativa: opiniones del profesorado. In L. Ortiz, J. A. Torres, J. J. Carrión, S. Fernández, M. A. Peña, & E. Pérez (Coords.), *Organización educativa para todas las personas*. Universidad de Almería. Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory España. <https://bit.ly/3HFJK7R>
- Doural, A. C., Estévez, I., & González-Sanmamed, M. (2021). La labor de asesoramiento de la Inspección Educativa a los centros escolares. In L. Ortiz, J.A. Torres, J. J. Carrión, S. Fernández, M. A., & Peña, E. Pérez (Coords.), *Organización educativa para todas las personas*. Universidad de Almería. Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory España. <https://bit.ly/42sUUQr>
- Doural, A. C., Rodríguez, E. R., & Veiga, E. (2021). Las funciones de la Inspección Educativa desde la visión de la dirección escolar. In B. D. Silva, S. Leandro, A. Almeida, M. Barca, M. Peralbo & R. Alves. *Atas do XVI Congresso Internacional Galego-Português de Psicopedagogía*. Universidade do Minho (pp. 491-501). <https://bit.ly/44K-F5Xs>
- Elliot, E., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(1), 5-12. <https://cutt.ly/Grgzpye>
- Estévez, I. (2020). *Análisis del desarrollo profesional del docente universitario de ciencias de la salud a través de las ecologías de aprendizaje* [Tesis de doctorado]. Universidade da Coruña. <https://bit.ly/37X40xZ>

- Estévez, I., Souto-Seijo, A., González -Sanmamed, M., & Valle, A. (2021). Ecologías de aprendizaje y motivación del profesorado universitario de Ciencias de la Salud. *Educación XX1*, 24(2), 19-42. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.28660>
- Estévez, I., Souto-Seijo, A., & González-Sanmamed, M. (2022). Aprender de y con los demás: Análisis de las interacciones como oportunidades para el desarrollo profesional docente. *New Trends in Qualitative Research*, 12, e728. <https://doi.org/10.36367/ntqr.12.2022.e728>
- Frades, S. E. (2007). Reflexiones sobre las antinomias de la inspección educativa en España. Un problema sin resolver. *Revista Avances en Supervisión Educativa*, 6, 1-22. <https://avances.adide.org/index.php/ase/article/view/273/233>
- González-Sanmamed, M., Estévez, I., Souto-Seijo, A., & Muñoz-Carril, P. C. (2020). Ecologías digitales de aprendizaje y desarrollo profesional del docente universitario. *Revista Comunicar*, 28(62), 9-18. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C62-2020-01>
- González-Sanmamed, M., Muñoz-Carril, P., & Santos-Caamaño, F. (2019). Key components of learning ecologies: A Delphi assessment. *British Journal of Education Technology*, 50(4), 1639-1655. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12805>
- González-Sanmamed, M., Sangrà, A., Souto-Seijo, A., & Estévez, I. (2018). Ecologías de aprendizaje en la Era Digital: desafíos para la Educación Superior. *Publicaciones*, 48(1), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.30827/publicaciones.v48i1.7329>
- González-Sanmamed, M., Sangrà, A., Souto-Seijo, A., & Santos, F. (2018). *Learning ecologies oriented to the professional development of university teachers. Towards Personalized Guidance and Support for Learning Proceedings*. 10th European Distance and E-Learning Network Research Workshop.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. E. (1983). *Psicología educacional: un enfoque realista*. Interamericana.
- Han, J., & Yin, H. (2016). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. *Cogent Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1217819>
- Huberman, M., Thompson, C. L., & Weiland, S. (2000). Perspectivas de la carrera del profesor. In B. J. Biddle, T. L. Good, & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *La enseñanza y los profesores. La profesión de enseñar* (pp. 19-98). Paidós.
- Jackson, N. J. (2013). Learning Ecology Narratives. Lifewide Learning, Education and Personal Development E-book. <https://cutt.ly/9rsBTK6>
- Jornet, J., González, J., Suárez, J. M., & Perales, M. (2011). Diseños de procesos de evaluación de competencias: consideraciones acerca de los estándares en el dominio de las competencias. *Bordón* 63(1), 125-145. <https://bit.ly/3XTkIz>
- LeyOrgánica3/2020, de 29 de diciembre, por la que se modifica la LeyOrgánica2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 340, de 30 de diciembre de 2020. <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2020/12/29/3>
- Lorente, Á., & Madonar, M. (2006). La formación permanente de los inspectores de educación: retórica, realidad y futuro. *Avances en Supervisión Educativa*, (3). <https://avances.adide.org/index.php/ase/article/view/219>
- Marimon, M., Barberà, E., Coll, C., & Monereo, C. (2016). Nous models de construcció de coneixement. In M. Gisbert & J. González (Eds.), *Nous escenaris d'aprenentatge des d'una visió transformadora. New learning environments from a transformative perspective* (pp. 57-78). Wolters Kluwer.

- Nieto, J. M., & Alfageme-González, M. B. (2017). Enfoques, metodologías y actividades de formación docente. Profesorado. *Revista de Currículum y Formación de Profesorado*, 21(3), 63-81. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/567/56752489004.pdf>
- Orden del 13 de diciembre de 2004 por la que se desarrolla el Decreto 99/2004, del 21 de mayo, por el que se regula el funcionamiento de la Inspección Educativa y el acceso al cuerpo de inspectores de Educación na Comunidade Autónoma de Galicia. *Diario Oficial de Galicia*, 247, de 22 de decembro de 2004. https://www.xunta.gal/dog/Publicados/2004/20041222/Anuncio2448E_es.html
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451-502). Academic Press
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2006). *Motivación en contextos educativos. Teoría, investigación y aplicaciones* (2ª ed.). Pearson Educación.
- Piñel, S. (2019). Competencias profesionales de la inspección de educación (esbozo de necesidades formativas). *Supervisión* 21, 51, 1-31. <https://usie.es/supervision21/index.php/Sp21/article/view/360>
- Reeve, J. (1994). *Motivación y Emoción*. McGraw-Hill.
- Reeve, J. (2008). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (5ª ed.). Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Resolución de 7 de noviembre de 2022, de la Dirección General de Ordenación e Innovación Educativa, por la que se establece el Plan general de la Inspección Educativa para el curso 2022/23. *Diario Oficial de Galicia*, 220, de 18 de noviembre de 2022. https://www.xunta.gal/dog/Publicados/2004/20041222/Anuncio2448E_es.html
- Rocosa, B., Sangrà, A., & Cabrera, N. (2018). La organización escolar y el desarrollo de la competencia de Aprender a Aprender: un enfoque globalizador singular. *REXE, Revista de Estudios y Experiencias en Educación*, 2, 31-51. https://doi.org/10.21703/rexe.especial2_201831512
- Rodríguez, M., Álvarez, C., & Camacho, A. (2018). Claves para el diseño de un plan de formación permanente para la Inspección Educativa en España. *Avances en Supervisión Educativa*, 29, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.23824/ase.v0i29.608>
- Rodríguez, S., Núñez, J. C., Valle, A., Blas, R., & Rosario, P. (2009). Auto-eficacia docente, motivación del profesor y estrategias de enseñanza. *Escritos de Psicología*, 3(1), 1-7. <http://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/ep/v3n1/art01.pdf>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Santos Caamaño, F. (2019). Ecologías de aprendizaje en la formación de los futuros maestros [tese de doutoramento]. Universidade da Coruña. <https://ruc.udc.es/dspace/handle/2183/24360>
- Tébar, F. (2017). Mejorar la calidad de la Inspección Educativa. *Supervisión 21, revista de educación e inspección*, 44, 1-19. <https://usie.es/supervision21/index.php/Sp21/article/view/231>
- Schunk, D., Meece, J., & Pintrich, P. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th Edition). Pearson Higher Ed.
- Serrano, J. D., González, M. B. A., & Pastor, F. J. S. (2013). Identidad profesional de los docentes en formación de Ciencias sociales. *Enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales*, (12), 77-89. <https://raco.cat/index.php/EnsenanzaCS/article/view/271370>

- Soler, E. (2015). Decálogo de las Competencias Profesionales del Inspector de Educación. *REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 13(4), 149-160. <https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2015.13.4.009>
- Valle Arias, A., Sánchez Rodríguez, S. M., Núñez Pérez, J. C., González Cabanach, R., González-Pienda García, J. A., & Rosário, P. (2010). Motivación y aprendizaje autorregulado. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 44(1), 86-97.
- Villagrà, S. L. (2012). Desarrollo profesional del profesorado centrado en el uso de rutinas de diseño y prácticas colaborativas con TIC en Educación Primaria [Tesis Doctoral]. Universidad de Valladolid.