Household Education Expenditure of Families at Primary Education Level[1]

Berru ULUSOY[2], Hüseyin YOLCU[3]

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to present the amount of families' primary education level household education expenditure and to find out whether this amount of expenditure differs according to variables related to school and socio-economic status factors. Research data was collected from 6 public and 2 private primary education schools in Kastamonu in the 2011-2012 academic year. 789 families participated in this research. Research data was gathered from "Families' Primary Education Level Household Education Expenditure Detection Survey" developed by the researchers. Data analysis, descriptive statistics, Kruskal Wallis H test, Mann Whitney U test, t test, and ANOVA were used in this research. In the research it was observed that the primary education level household education expenditure of families in the 2011-2012 academic year is 11,971.34 TL (Turkish Lira) total for one student. This amount is approximately 1,920.15 TL for the families whose children are in public schools and 10,051.19 TL for the families whose children are in private schools. The primary education level household education expenditure of families differs according to school related factors of school type (public/private), education type (full time/ part time) and transportation type (walking/service/car). The primary education level household education expenditure of families differs according to some of the socio-economic status related factors such as with whom the child lives, the education level of the parents, the vocational status of the parents, the family income level, the number of family members, and the class level of the student, but it doesn't differ according to the number of students in primary education.

Key Words: Household education expenditure, Primary education, Direct education expenditures, Indirect education expenditures

DOI Number: http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2013.311a

[1] This study was produced from some of the data of Berru ULUSOY's Master's Thesis carried out in Kastamonu University Social Sciences Institute under Hüseyin YOLCU's consultancy.

[2] Teacher - Kastamonu Directorate of National Education - kayaberru@hotmail.com

[3] Assist. Prof. Dr. - Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department - hyolcu@kastamonu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

It is now widely accepted that education is important for both the person him/herself and for the society he/she lives in. People gain favor from education with opportunities such as a good occupation, high income level, social status, and transfer in higher education level. From a social perspective, education makes contributions to the development of human rights and democracy, decreases crime rates, increases environmental protection, and aids the productivity of the economy by creating a high-quality work force.

Certainly, discussing education in the way it was explained above means omitting its social aspects and discussing it in a pragmatic way. From a socialist point of view, education is a right that enables a person to develop him/herself freely, makes it possible for him/her to use freedom in every area, and it should be provided to everybody equally, free of charge and in the same quality. From a pragmatic approach, contrary to this approach, education is not at all different from other goods and services that are purchased and sold in the market. It should be pointed out at this point that the second approach represents the dominant opinion in capitalist systems. Accordingly, in this approach education should be produced where it is beneficial according to a cost-benefit measure (Ünal, 2004). The meaning of this in economic language is that those who pay the price can only benefit from education levels that are different from the ones the state has made compulsory. Compulsory education is what the state makes its citizens have. The time of this education is determined according to the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that the state wants its citizens to have. Desired knowledge, attitudes, and skills are given to children through education processes that are directed to cognitive kinetic objectives. While the state wants school-age children to go to compulsory school, it guarantees that it will provide equal education service for everyone everywhere (Başaran, 1982; Okçabol, 2012).

It has been pointed out in international conventions and declarations that the right of education should be provided without charge by the government for at least compulsory education, in other words, for the primary education level. For example, it was declared in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, accepted in the United Nations General Assembly on 10th December 1948, that every people have the right to education; it should be compulsory in the primary education level and provided by governments. Likewise, education is one of the basic rights of a child, and primary education is compulsory and free of charge for all the children, as stated in the United Nations' Declaration of Rights of Children on 20th December 1959. In practical terms, however, the time of compulsory education differs, and while it is limited to primary education in some countries, it may contain secondary education in other countries. For example, compulsory education in the USA is 10 years on an average, although it might change from one state to another. While the time of compulsory education in Australia, New Zealand, England, and France is 10 years, it is 9 years in Denmark and Belgium (Aydınonat, 2012). According to the 42nd article of the 1982 Constitution, primary education is compulsory and free of charge in public schools in Turkey. Until the law no 4306 was enacted in 1997, primary education consisted of independent five-year primary school and three-year secondary school. The first one was compulsory for all the school age children, but the latter was put to children or their parents. With this law, primary and secondary schools were united, and eight-year compulsory education was enacted with elementary schools[4]. The first reason for providing free and

[4] Duration of compulsory education in Turkey was increased to 12 years from 8 years by the law number 6287, enacted upon publication in Official Journal no: 28261 on 11th April 2012. The application of this law was started in the 2012-2013 academic

compulsory primary education underlies the social contract that organizes person-state (public-authority) relations. The fact that a person needs a social order where he/she can freely and completely develop his/her personality brings with it the obligation to obey the rules set by social order. This obligation exists as long as the person can develop completely and freely. Equalization of the social contract will be the basic criteria when organizing the content of compulsory education. The education, which will give freedom to children and young learners to develop their personalities completely and educate them firstly for themselves, is legitimately compulsory. Only with the prerequisite of providing it free of charge can the state force children or parents and take measures against them for taking primary education (Altunya, 2003). Another reason for the state to undertake the primary education duty itself is that as well as it wants its citizens to be healthy, to provide their own livelihood, to contribute to country's development, and to obey the rules of common life, the state also sees education as necessary for its own existence. The state has to instill in its citizens common values and a political culture that sustains the society they live in to ensure continuity of its own existence (Başaran, 1982; Altunya, 1999). The fact that it is pointed out both in international declarations and contracts and in countries' own regulations that primary education is compulsory and should be provided by states for free means that families do not need to make any expenditure at this education level from their household budgets, theoretically. However, current practices and experiences show that the real situation is otherwise (Yolcu, 2007). For example, although there is an emphasis on free education in the constitution of Greece, the expenditures made by families from their household budgets to education constitutes 1.5% of the gross national product. In South Korea one third of education costs are paid for by households (European Commission Report [ECR], 2005). Tilak (2002) indicates that there is nothing called free education in India. Expenditures made by families from their household budgets to education equal to 2% of the gross national product (Alfonso, 2002). In Bolivia 20% of education expenditures made in 2005 were paid for by families (www.unicef.org). In Turkey the ratio of household expenditures to total education expenditures in 2002 was 32.9%, and the ratio of these expenditures to gross national product was 1.9% (Turkish Statistics Institute [TSI], 2006; Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2010). Moreover, families' household education expenditures in the primary education period, which is said to be free and compulsory in article 42 of the constitution, constituted 30.1% of total education expenditures in 2002 (TSI, 2006).

The families' expenditures from their household budgets to benefit from education services are defined as special costs of education (Ünal, 1996). Special education costs of households consist of direct, indirect, and opportunity costs. Direct costs contain household expenditures like a child's school payment, book, stationery, uniform, school bag, and transportation. Direct expenditures made by families change between 50,000 and 224,000 Riel (Bray, 1999). Indirect expenses contain expenditures made for food, shelter, and clothing. In Belgium, for example, 15% of expenditures that families made for education constitute indirect expenses. Cession cost means a person's choice of going to an education institution instead of working in an occupation where he/she can get paid. In that case, the cession cost of going to an educational institution is the income that can be received by working (Karakütük, 2007). However, there are difficulties in measuring cession costs in practical

year. Because of the fact that the data of this research was collected before this law, the changes made related to compulsory education weren't taken into consideration.

terms. The reason for this is that when a student chooses an economically active life instead of education it is not certain that he/she can find a job in the labor market (Türköz, 2002). The cost of education to households equals the total expenditures made for these three types of costs.

In literature, there are various classifications related to the factors effecting families' household education expenditure. Tilak (1988) divided the factors effecting household education expenditures into two groups. The first one contains the general features of the household and the second contains the factors related to the school. Among general features of the family are social features (class, region, and ethnicity), economical features (household income, vocational level), demographic factors (size of the households) and education (education level of family members). The factors related to school are the features of the residential of the school, the availability of free lunch, uniforms, course books and stationery, etc. at schools, the employment status of teachers at school, the type of school (public, private, or semi-private school supported by public), developmental features of the child, and village development factor. Arthaud (2008) classified the factors effecting household education expenditures into three groups. The first one contains the features of the family. There are characteristic features like parents' age, gender, level of education, and occupation among these features. The second one contains the factors related to family. In this group are type of family, size of family, family income, total expenses, and number of school children. The third one contains the features of the region where the family lives.

It can be said that the research on financing education in Turkey mostly focuses on a macro level analysis of public education expenditures. Because of this, a very limited number of studies that are directly subject to household education expenditures were encountered (Yükseköğretim Kurulu [YÖK], 1998; Akça, 2002; Keskin & Demirci, 2003; Tansel & Bircan, 2006; TSI, 2006, Kahveci, 2009; Köktaş, 2009; Küçüker & Aslan, 2010; Türk Eğitim Derneği [TED], 2010; Sakallı, 2010; Yolcu, 2011). As a result, being one of the rare studies in this area in the related literature, this research is thought to be important. On the other hand, it is important to note that this research is the first study to present families' household education expenditures at the primary education level in Kastamonu, a midsize Anatolian city. Besides, the findings and results of this research are expected to shed light on new studies in this area in the future.

The aim of this research is to present the amount of families' primary education level household education expenditure and to find out whether this amount of expenditure differs according to variables related to school and socio-economic status factors. This research attempted to answer the questions below.

1. What is the amount of household education expenditures made by families at the primary education level? How is this amount divided according to direct and indirect cost types? How do the household education expenditures made by families at the primary education level differ according to their choices of registering their children in public or private schools?
2. How do the household education expenditures made by families at the primary education level differ according to factors related to school (type of school, education type, and access to school)?
3. How do the household education expenditures made by families at the primary education level differ according to socio-economic factors (the person that the child lives with, parents' education status, parents' employment status, monthly

income, number of family members, number of primary education-age children, and grade level)?

METHOD

Research Model

The research that aimed to present the amount of families' primary education level household education expenditure and to find out whether this amount of expenditure differs according to variables related to school and socio-economic status factors is a survey model.

Population and Study Group

The population of the research consists of families of students attending public and private primary education schools in Kastamonu. There are 24 primary education schools in total, including 22 public and two private ones in Kastamonu. 10,000 students attend public and 456 students attend private primary education schools. Accordingly, families of 10,456 students constitute the population of this research (Kastamonu Directorate of National Education, 2012). A workgroup of eight primary education schools was formed in the research. Six out of these eight primary education schools in the workgroup are public, and two of them are private primary education schools. Two of the public primary education schools are lower SEL, two of them are medium SEL, and two of them are from upper socio-economical regions. On the other hand, because of the fact that there are only two private primary education schools in Kastamonu, these schools were directly included in the research. Interviews have been made with the authorities from the Kastamonu Directorate of National Education and the directors of related schools in defining the SEL of the schools in the workgroup. The visits have been made by researchers to find out whether the schools included in the workgroup really represent the SEL of the areas they are situated in. The schools to be included in the workgroup of the research were decided as a result of all these efforts. The info about the schools in the workgroup was given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Features of the schools in the workgroup*

Name of Primary Education School	*Public*	*Private*	*SEL*	*Number of Students*
Ali Fuat Darende	✓	-	High	944
Şerife Bacı	✓	-	High	667
Candaroğulları	✓	-	Medium	1,040
Merkez Primary	✓		Medium	1,069
İsfendiyarbey	✓	-	Low	395
23 Ağustos Primary	✓	-	Low	405
Aral Fen Primary	-	✓	High	355
Bahçeşehir Primary	-	✓	High	101
TOTAL	6	2	-	4,976

A data collecting tool of the research was applied in one of the classes neutrally determined from 1-8 grade level in each of the schools in the workgroup. 779 out of 800 (97.4%) of the surveys were applied in public schools, and 88 out of 150 (58.7%) of the surveys applied in private schools returned. As a result, 779 families in public primary education schools and 88 families in private primary education schools were reached. However, 72 of the 779 surveys returned from public primary education schools and 6 of the 88 surveys returned from private primary education schools were excluded from the evaluation because of the fact that they hadn't been filled out appropriately. In this case, the

number of the surveys included in the evaluation of public primary education schools is 707 (90.8%), and the number of the surveys included in the evaluation of private primary education schools is 82 (93.1%).

743 (94.2%) of the families who participated in the research indicated that their children live with the parents, and except for them, 29 (3.7%) of them live with their mothers, 5 (0.6%) of them live with their fathers, and 12 (1.5%) of them live with other family members. While 16 (2%) of mothers' level of education is limited to literacy, 379 (48%) of them are primary education level, 175 (22.2%) of them are high school level, and 219 (%27.8) of them are university graduates. 7 (0.9%) of fathers are literate, 236 (29.9%) of them are primary education level, 223 (%28.3) of them are high school level, and 323 (40.9%) of them are university graduates. When it comes to occupation status, 76 (9.6%) of mothers are workers, 149 (18.9%) of them are civil servants, 30 (3.8%) of them are self-employed, 5 (1.6%) of them are retired, and 529 (67.1%) of them are housewives. Occupation statuses of fathers are as follows; 220 (27.9%) of fathers are workers, 298 (37.8%) of them are civil servants, 224 (28.4%) of them are self-employed, 32 (4.1%) of them are retired, and 15 (1.8%) of them are unemployed. While 174'ü (18.3%) of families have 750 TL or lower income per month, 235 (26.5%) of them have an income between 751 and 1,500 TL, 189 (22.8%) of them have an income between 1,501 and 2,500 TL, and 269 (32.4%) of them have 2,501 TL or higher monthly income. On the other hand, 257 (32.6%) of the families send their children to school by school bus, 456 (68.8%) of them on foot, and 76 (9.6%) of them by their own car. 446 (56.5%) of the families who participated in the research indicated that they send their children to full-time schools, and 343 (43.5%) of the families said that they send their children to part-time schools. The Number of households in 15 (1.9%) of the families who participated in the research is 2, in 105 (13.3%) of them the number of households is 3, in 363 (46%) of them the number of households is 4, in 195 (24.7%) of them the number of households is 5, and in 111 (14.1%) of them the number of households is 6 or more.

470 of the families (52%) have a child in primary education, 325 (41.2%) of them have 2 children, and 54 (6.8%) of them have 3 primary education children. 79 (10%) of the families declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 1st grade, 71 (9%) of them declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 2nd grade, 81 (10.3%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 3rd grade, 69 (8.7%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 4th grade, 86 (10.9%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 5th grade, 47 (6%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 6th grade, 41 (5.2%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 7th grade, 15 (1.9%) declared that the grade level of their primary education children is 8th grade, and 300 (38%) of them declared that they have more than one child in different grade levels.

Data Collection Tool

Research data was gathered from "Families' Primary Education Level Household Education Expenditure Detection Survey" developed by the researchers. Similar research in related literature was used in developing this data collection tool (Akça, 2002; Tilak, 2002; TSI, 2006; Arthaud, 2008; Kahveci, 2009; Sakallı, 2010; Yolcu, 2011). The data collection tool had initially been prepared as a draft, and then it was submitted to the opinions and advice of 14 experts. Necessary changes were made according to the feedback given by experts. Thus the content validity of the tool was ensured. To find out whether there is a problem in reading and understanding the items in the survey, the tool was applied to 10 families

among the workgroup schools. After this pre-application it was seen that there aren't any difficulties in reading and understanding the items of the tool. Research data was collected between 15th May and 15th June.

The data collection tool consists of two parts. In the first part there are independent variables of the research (type of school, education type of the school, accessibility of the school, person that the child lives with, parents' education status, parents' employment status, monthly income, number of family members, number of primary education-age children, and grade level). In the second part of the survey there are questions to find out the families' primary education level household education expenditure, which is the dependent variable of the research. The expense items of families' primary education level household education expenditures are listed under 23 subtitles. Families were required to write in the boxes the average amounts they paid for each expense item in the 2011-2012 academic year in TL.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of data related to the first sub-problem of the research. In the analysis of the second and third sub-problems of the research, a t test and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) from parametric tests and a Kruskal Wallis H Test from non-parametric tests were used. Considering related assumptions and variables, an unrelated t test was used for variables of school type and education type of school. For the variable of accessibility of school among the factor related to school and variables of the person that the child lives with, parents' education status, parents' employment status, monthly income, number of family members, number of primary education-age children, and grade level, a Kruskal Wallis H test was used. A Mann Whitney U test was checked to find out between which groups the differentiation is significant. ANOVA was used for variable of monthly income. To find out between which groups the significant differentiation is, a Post Hoc Tukey test was used.

FINDINGS

Findings related to the amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families and the whether this amount of expenditure differs according to variables related to school and socio-economic status factors are listed below.

Findings Related to the Amount of Primary Education Level Household Education Expenditure of Families and Distribution of This Amount According to Expense Items

Table 2 shows the amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families and the distribution of this amount according to direct and indirect expense items.

Table 2. *The amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families and the distribution of this amount according to expense items*

School Type	*N*	*Direct Costs (1) TL*	*(1)/(3) % TL*	*Indirect Costs (2) TL*	*(2)/(3) %*	*Total Expenditure (3) TL*
Public	707	1,359.45	70.8	560.7	29.2	1,920.15
Private	82	8,792.94	87.5	1,258.25	12.5	10,051.19
Grand Total	789	10,152.39	15.2	1,818.95	84.8	11,971.34

According to Table 2, the total amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families per student in the 2011-2012 academic year is 11,971.34 TL. Families made 10,152.39 TL (84.8%) of total expenditure as direct expenses and 1,818.95 TL (15.2%) of this amount as indirect expenses. In terms of public and private school difference, the families who send their children to public schools paid approximately 1,920.15 TL for one student as their primary education level household education expenditure. The primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to private schools is approximately 10,051.19 TL for one student. 1,359.45 TL (70.8%) of the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to public schools was a direct expense and 560,7 TL (29.2%) of it was an indirect expense. 8,792.94 TL (87.5%) of the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to private schools was a direct expense and 1,258.25 TL (12.5%) of it was an indirect expense.

Findings about Primary Education Level Household Education Expenditure of Families According to Factors Related to School

In this section, findings about whether the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs according to type of school (public/private), education type (part time/ full time), and accessibility of the schools are listed below.

School Type

Table 3 shows findings about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to type of school.

Table 3. *t test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to type of school*

Type of School	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
1 - Public	707	1901.30	2076.975	787	26.658	.000
2 - Private	82	10051.20	5396.898			

p<.01

It can be seen that the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to type of school ($t_{(787)}$=13.559; p<.01). According to the results of analysis, the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to private schools ($X_{\text{Private School}}$=10051.20) is higher than the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to public schools ($X_{\text{Public school}}$= 10051.20).

Education Type of School

Table 4 shows findings about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education type of school.

Table 4. *t test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education type of school*

Education Type of School	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Part Time	446	412.37	3038.994	787	0.480	.015
Full Time	343	372.41	3346.406			

p<.05

It can be seen that the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to education type of school ($t_{(787)}$= 0.480, P < .05). The primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to full time schools ($X_{Full\ time}$=412.37) is higher than the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to part time schools ($X_{Part\ time}$=372.41).

Type of Transportation to School

Table 5 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to type of transportation to school.

Table 5. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to type of transportation to school*

Transportation Type	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann-Whitney U)*
1 - School Bus	257	522.06	2	130.319	.000	1-2*
2 - On Foot	456	319.73				1-3*
3 - Car	76	416.97				2-3*
						2-3*

*p<.01

When the analysis results in Table 5 are analyzed, it can be seen that the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to type of transportation to school ($X^2_{(2)}$=130.319, p<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. According to this, (U=29153.500, p<.01) the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to school by school bus ($X_{School\ bus}$=522.06) is significantly higher than the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to school on foot ($X_{on\ foot}$=319.73), (U=6555.000, p<.01), the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to school by school bus ($X_{School\ bus}$=522.06) is significantly higher than the primary education level household education expenditure of families who drive their children to school by their own car (X_{Car}=416.97), (U= 12447.000, p<.01), and the primary education level household education expenditure of families who drive their children to school by their own car (X_{Car}=416.97) is higher than the primary education level household education expenditure of families who send their children to school on foot ($X_{on\ foot}$=319.73).

Findings about Primary Education Level Household Education Expenditure of Families According to Socio-Economic Factors

Findings about whether the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs according to the variables of person that the child lives with,

parents' education status, parents' employment status, monthly income, number of family members, number of primary education-age children, and grade level are listed below.

Person That Child Lives With

Table 6 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to person that the child lives with.

Table 6. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to person that child lives with*

Person That Child Lives With	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann Whitney U)*
1 - With Parents	743	400.55	3	8.381	.039	1-2*
2 - With Mother	29	304.90				
3 - With Father	5	228.60				
4 - Others	12	338.33				

*p<.05

When the analysis results in Table 6 are analyzed, it can be seen that the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to person that child lives with ($X^2_{(3)}$=8.381, p<.05). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. According to this test (U=8160.00; p<.05) the household education expenditure of families of children who live with both parents ($X_{Parents}$= 400.55) is significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families of children who live with only mother (X_{Mother}=304.90).

Education Level of Mother

Table 7 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education level of mother.

Table 7. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education level of mother*

Education Level of Mother	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann Whitney U)*
1 - Literate	16	238.69	3	131.267	.000	1-3*
2 - Primary education	379	309.40				2-4*
3 - High School	175	441.84				3-2*
4 - University	219	517.13				3-4*
						4-1*

* p<.01

According to analysis results in Table 7 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and the education level of mothers ($X^2_{(3)}$= 131.267, p<.05). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. Considering the Mann Whitney U test results

(U=697.500, P< .01), the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=441.84) are significantly higher than the families whose mothers are only literate ($X_{Literate}$=238.69), (U=19739.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is university ($X_{University}$=517.13) is higher than the expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is primary education ($X_{Primary\ education}$=309.40), (U=21830.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=441.84) is significantly higher than the families whose mothers' education level is primary education ($X_{Primary\ education}$=309.40), (U=15324,500, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is university ($X_{University}$=517.13) is higher than the expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=441.84), (U=605.500, p<.01), and the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' education level is university ($X_{University}$=517.13) is significantly higher than the families whose mothers are only literate ($X_{Literate}$=238.69).

Education Level of Father

Table 8 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education level of father.

Table 8. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to education level of father*

Education Level of Father	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann Whitney U)*
1- Literate	7	271.43	3	114.175	.000	1-4*
2- Primary education	236	281.15				2-3*
3- High School	223	385.81				2-4*
4- University	323	487.20				3-4*

* p<.01

According to the analysis results in Table 8 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and the education level of fathers ($X^2_{(3)}$=114.175, p<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. Considering the Mann Whitney U test results (U=514.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=385.81) is significantly higher than the families whose fathers are only literate ($X_{Literate}$=271.43), (U=19096.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=385.81) is higher than the expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is primary education ($X_{Primary\ education}$=281.15), (U=18456.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is university ($X_{University}$=487.20) are significantly higher than the families whose fathers' education level is primary education ($X_{Primary\ education}$=281.15), (U=26507.500, p<.01), and the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is university ($X_{University}$=487.20) is significantly higher than the expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is high school ($X_{High\ school}$=385.81).

Mothers' Employment Status

Table 9 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to mothers' employment status.

Table 9. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to mothers' employment status*

Mothers' Employment Status	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann-Whitney U)*
1 - Worker	76	385.86	4	60.165	.000	2-5*
2 - Civil Servant	149	521.54				
3 - Self Employed	30	402.12				
4 - Retired	5	500.70				
5 - Housewife	529	359.27				

*p<.01

According to the analysis results in Table 9 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and mothers' employment status ($X^2_{(4)}$=60.165, p<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. According to this analysis (U=22986.500, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' employment status is civil servant ($X_{\text{Civil servant}}$=521.54) is significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' are housewives ($X_{\text{Housewife}}$=359.27).

Fathers' Employment Status

Table 10 shows data about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to fathers' employment status.

Table 10. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to fathers' employment status*

Fathers' Employment Status	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann-Whitney U)*
1- Worker	220	354.24	4	48.713	.000	1-2*
2- Civil Servant	298	463.24				1-5*
3- Self Employed	224	364.81				2-3*
4- Retired	32	331.80				2-4*
5- Unemployed	15	222.77				2-5*
						3-5*

*p<.01

According to the analysis results in Table 10 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and fathers' employment status ($X^2_{(4)}$=48.713, p<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. According to this analysis (U=23474.500 p<.01), the household education expenditure of families whose fathers are civil servants ($X_{\text{Civil servant}}$=463.24) is significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers are workers(X_{Worker}=354.24); (U=1057.000, p<.01) household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are workers(X_{Worker}=354.24) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are unemployed

($X_{Unemployed}$=222.77); (U=23176.500, p<.01) household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are civil servant ($X_{Civil\ servant}$=463.24) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are self-employed ($\mathbf{X}_{Self\text{-}employed}$=364.81); (U=3246.500, p<.01) household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are civil servant ($X_{Civil\ servant}$=463.24) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are retired ($\mathbf{X}_{Retired}$=331.80); (U=925.500, p<.01) household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are civil servant ($X_{Civil\ servant}$=463.24) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are unemployed ($\mathbf{X}_{Unemployed}$=222.77); (U=1061.000, p<.01) and household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are self-employed ($\mathbf{X}_{Self\text{-}employed}$=364.81) are higher than the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are unemployed ($\mathbf{X}_{Unemployed}$=222.77).

Monthly Income

In Table 11 there is data about primary education level household education expenditure of families according to families' monthly income.

Table 11. *ANOVA test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to families' monthly income*

The Level of Monthly Income		*Sum of Squares*	*sd*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p**	*Significant Difference (Post-Hoc Tukey)*
1- 750 TL and lower	Between	1.726	3	5.754	52.775	.000	1-3*
2-751-1,500 TL	Groups						1-4*
3-1,501-2,500 TL	Within	8.559	785	1.090			2-3*
4-2,501 and higher TL	Groups						2-4*
	Total	10.029	788				3-4*

* p<.01

As it is seen on Table 11 primary education level household education expenditure of families differ significantly according to families' monthly income ($F_{(3\text{-}785)}$=52.775; p<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists Post-Hoc Tukey test was used. According to this, household education expenditure of families whose monthly income is 2,501 TL and higher ($X_{2501\ TL\ and\ higher}$=2748.31) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families of other income groups. Household education expenditure of families whose monthly income is between 1,500 and 2,500 TL ($X_{1501\text{-}2500\ TL}$=2645.78) are significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose monthly income is 750 TL or lower ($X_{750\ TL\ and\ lower}$=1244.92) and the families whose monthly income is between 750 and 1,500 TL ($X_{751\text{-}1500\ TL}$=1417.19).

Number of Family Members

In Table 12 shows findings about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to number of family members.

Table 12. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to number of family members*

Number of Family Members	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann-Whitney U)*

1 - Two people	15	324.73	4	22.370	.000	2-5*
2 - Three people	105	438.47				3-5*
3 - Four people	363	396.88				4-5*
4 - Five people	195	420.61				
5 - Six people and above	111	312.24				

According to analysis results in Table 12 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and number of family members ($X^2_{(4)}$=22.370, P<.01). In order to find out between which groups the difference exists, a Mann Whitney U test was used. Considering the test results (U=4107.000, p<.01), it can be seen that the household education expenditure of families with three members ($X_{\text{Three people}}$=438.47) is higher than that of families with six or more members ($X_{\text{Six people and above}}$=312.24); (U=15741.500, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families with four members ($X_{\text{Four people}}$=396.88) is higher than that of families with six or more members ($X_{\text{Six people and above}}$=312.24); (U=7829.000, p<.01), the household education expenditure of families with five members ($X_{\text{Five people}}$=420.61) is higher than that of families with six or more members ($X_{\text{Six people and above}}$=312.24).

Number of Primary Education-Age Children

Table 13 shows findings about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to number of primary education-age children.

Table 13. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to number of primary education-age children*

Number of Primary education-Age Children	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*
1- One Person	410	387.84	2	2.930	.231
2- Two Persons	325	409.64			
3- Three Persons	54	361.24			

According to Table 13 there is not a significant relation between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and the number of primary education-age children ($X^2_{(2)}$=2.930. p>.01). However, the highest amount of education expenditure in terms of number of primary education children has been made by families with two primary education age children ($X_{\text{Two persons}}$=409.64), and the lowest expenditure has been made by families with three primary education age children ($X_{\text{Three persons}}$=361.24).

Grade Level

Table 14 shows findings about the primary education level household education expenditure of families according to grade level.

Table 14. *Kruskal Wallis H test results of primary education level household education expenditure of families according to grade level*

Grade Level	*N*	*Mean Rank*	*df*	X^2	*p*	*Significant Difference (Mann-Whitney U)*

1- 1st Grade	79	371.24	8	17.797	.023	2-3*
2- 2nd Grade	71	319.12				2-8*
3- 3rd Grade	81	422.88				2-9*
4- 4th Grade	69	413.26				5-9*
5- 5th Grade	86	378.25				
6- 6th Grade	47	345.81				
7- 7th Grade	41	401.28				
8- 8th Grade	15	488.87				
9- More than one grade	300	414.44				

* p<.05

According to Table 14 there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and primary education grade level ($X^2_{(8)}$=17.797, p<.05). According to the Mann Whitney U test, (U=2135.000, p<.05) the household education expenditure of families whose children are in primary education 3rd grade ($X_{3rd\ grade}$=422.88) is higher than expenditure of families whose children are in primary education 2nd grade ($X_{2nd\ grade}$=319.12), and (U=292.000, p<.05) the household education expenditure of families whose children are in primary education 8th grade ($X_{8th\ grade}$=488.87) is significantly higher than the expenditure made by families whose children are in primary education 2nd grade ($X_{2nd\ grade}$=319,12).

RESULT, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

The aim of this research is to present the amount of families' primary education level household education expenditure and to find out whether this amount of expenditure differs according to variables related to school and socio-economic status factors. A data collection tool was applied to 789 families in the Kastamonu city centre during the 2011-2012 academic year. According to research results, the average amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families is 11,971.34 TL in the 2011-2012 academic year. This amount of expenditure is approximately 1,920.15 TL for families who send their children to public schools and approximately 10,051.19 TL for families who send their children to private schools. The amount of household expenditure of families in the primary education level differs significantly according to type of school (private/public), education type, and accessibility of the school variables, which are among the factors related to school. Among socio-economic factors, the variables of person that the child lives with, parents' education status, parents' employment status, monthly income, number of family members and grade level are the factors according to which the amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly. On the other hand, the number of primary education-age children has no significant effect on the amount of primary education level household education expenditure of families.

Public schools are the ones that are founded, directed, and funded by the state. Private schools are founded and directed by legal persons or organizations and funded by the people who benefit from the education provided or by their families. Therefore, families' household education expenditure is expected to differ according to whether the school is public or private. At this point, considering the findings of the research, the primary education level household education expenditure of families is approximately 11,971.34 TL in the 2011-2012 academic year. In this research, the amount of household expenditure made by families for primary education education is significant because it indicates the extent of commoditization of education in Kastamonu, a medium-sized city of Anatolia. Besides, it can

be seen that the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to whether they send their children to public or private schools. Accordingly, while the families who send their children to public schools paid 1,920.15 TL on average for one student, the families who send their children to private schools paid 10,051.19 TL on average for one student. In other words, the amount of household education expenditure at the primary education level made by families who send their children to private schools is approximately 5.3 times more than that of families who send their children to public schools. This finding corresponds with Bray (1996) and Tilak's (2002) research findings. According to this, families who sent their children to public schools paid 32 baht, and families who sent their children to private schools paid 326 baht in Thailand in 1987 (Bray, 1996). In India the amount of education expenditure made by households differs according to whether the school that the children attend is public, semi-private and supported by the government, or private. Families who send their children to public schools pay 322 Rs yearly for one student. This amount increases by 20% in semi-private schools supported by the government, and it is three times higher in private schools (Tilak, 2002). Although the families who send their children to public schools make less education expenditure, the actual fact to be discussed here is the reason why some families send their children to private schools knowing that they would make more expenditure on education. There is a quite short and simple answer for this, which is the importance that these families attach to their children's education. This is in line with the recent trend of associating the information and quality education with the market families' expectations about idea that a private school would contribute to their children's human capital more than a public school, which directs them to such a choice. This situation leads to favorable outcomes of education for the rich part of the society, although it should actually be provided to every segment of society equally and with the same quality. When we look at the distribution of primary education expenditure of families as direct and indirect costs, 7,921.2 of this cost is direct and 4,031.30 of it is indirect. It is pointed out in general observation report no 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) that the indirect costs, which are relatively more expensive than the direct costs, impede the right to free education and jeopardize the realization of this right, and efforts should be made to eliminate these costs (Özsoy, 2004, 79).

Whether the primary education's type of education is full time education or part time education that contains morning and afternoon sessions affects the expenditure made by families. The meaning of the term type of education here is related to whether the school provides part time education as morning and afternoon sessions or full time education from morning to afternoon. Part time education is widely used in Turkey to overcome the problems of the lack of capacity in primary and secondary education. In areas with a heavy demand, it is used as one of the methods of increasing the capacity without using extra funds (building). Part-time education was provided in 8,437 schools in Turkey in the 2011-2012 academic year. 6,953 of these schools are primary education schools and 1,484 of them are high schools (MoNE, 2012). When the subject is discussed in the context of Kastamonu, where the research was carried out, it can be seen that 237 primary education schools out of 241 provide full time and 4 out of them provide part-time education (Kastamonu İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, 2012). In the research it was observed that the primary education level household education expenditures made by families who send their children to full time schools is higher than that of families who send their children to part-time schools. The reason for this is the fact that the parents who both are working generally tend to send their children to full time schools; these children can't go home for lunch and they sustain these

needs from school. On the other hand, the fact that there are social and cultural events with a charge during lunch break for these children increases the primary education level household education expenditure of families. According to ECR (2005) the expenditures made in school canteens increases the household education expenditure of families by 10%.

There is a significant difference between primary education level household education expenditure of families and whether the families send their children to school by school bus, on foot, or drive them to school. This difference is between the families who send their children to school by school bus and those who send their children on foot, it is between the families who send their children to school by school bus and those who drive their children to school, and it is also between families who drive their children to school and those who send their children on foot. Therefore, the families who make the most education expenditure at the primary education level according to transportation to school criteria are the ones who send their children to school by school bus, and the families who make the least expenditure are the ones who send their children to school on foot. The reason for this can be explained by the effect of distance between home and school on the education expenditure of families. If the distance between home and school is too much to walk, the spending on means of transportation can increase the amount of household education expenditure of families. For example, according to research carried out in Indonesia in 1992, households pay 1,957 Rupiah at the primary education level, 18,047 Rupiah at the secondary school level, and 42,390 Rupiah at the high school level. In Mongolia the expenditure that the families made for transportation was 11.9 Tughrik in 1992. In Cambodia the primary education level expenditure that the families made for transportation was 11,400 Riel in 1993 (Bray, 1996). According to Bray (1999, 21), 3.7% of household education expenditure was made for transportation in Indonesia. Less than 50% of families who send their children to schools in Cambodia make expenditure on transportation. The reason for this is the wide usage of bicycles for transportation in Cambodia (Bray, 1999). Theoretically, the surroundings that the school gets its students from change according to the variables of distance between home and school, population density of the area, and the size of the school. For the distance of the school, the transportation time rather than the distance between home and school is taken in to account. For example, the distance of the area that the school gets its students from is 3.5km in Costa Rika, 2km in Iran, and 2miles in Ireland for primary education. However, the length of transportation to school for a primary education student is accepted as 45 minutes at most in all the countries. This depends on the area, transportation time, and the vehicles (ECR, 2005).

The school bus fees in Turkey are defined by the governorships. For example, it is 140 TL in Istanbul for the closest distance. It is 108 TL in Ankara, 95 TL in İzmir, and 90 TL in Bursa. There are 180,000 school buses in Turkey, and the fees in metropolitan cities go up to 325 TL from 140 TL, which is for the closest distance of 0-3 km. For primary education and kindergarten there is 35 TL of additional fee for guidance. In Kastamonu, according to tariff of fares set by municipal committee, the fares for distances between 3 to 15 km change between 85 TL and 100 TL for a full day 4 round services, and they change between 60 TL and 75 TL for a part time 2 round service (www.haber3.com). According to the data of Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği (TOBB, 2012), the numerical size of school bus services in Turkey is estimated as a minimum of 2,500,000,000 TL. However, when the families who send their children to private schools are excluded, this situation might increase the household education expenditure of families who want to send their children to the farther public school that is thought to have a higher quality education rather than to the nearer

public schools according to address-based population registration system. In other words, school bus transportation increases the inequality of opportunity in education.

In the research it can be observed that the household education expenditure of families at the primary education level differs according to the person with whom the child lives. This difference is between the children who live with both parents and the children whose parents are separated but live with their mothers. The fact that the child lives with both parents increases the families' household education expenditure on primary education level. Omori (2010) indicates that the children with one parent or those who live with unmarried couples are disadvantaged. Therefore, the household education expenditure made by these families is low. The reason for this is the education level of these families and the households being low-income and not the marital status of the couples. When the expenditure on books and education is analyzed, it can be seen that the households of married couples have a higher percentage in spending for these expenses when compared to the families with unmarried couples or only mothers. These differences are basically due to the socio-economic and demographic features of the households (Omori, 2010). According to Baum and Paye (2005), 49% of the children who are under 18 and live with mothers do not continue their high school education, while this rate is 19% among the children whose parents are married and live together. This means that the possibility of going up in the levels of education is high for children who live with both parents, but the household education expenditure of these families is higher.

The education statuses of parents are closely related to their decisions about investing in their children's education. Parents with higher education levels are expected to invest more in education than the others. The reason for this is the fact that the highly educated parents consider the education expenditure as an investment in their children's human capital. For example, the average education length of families whose household education expenditure is the most is 11.2 years and the average length of those whose household education expenditure is the least is 4.6 years in Peru, which proves this idea (Alfonso, 2002). The studies in the related literature point out that the education level of father rather than that of mother is decisive in household education expenditure (Knight & Shi, 1996; Tilak, 2002; Tomul, 2008; Köktaş, 2009; Eğitim Reformu Girişimi, 2009; Huy, 2012). Knight and Shi (1996) indicated that the educational acquisitions of parents are the most important factor affecting a child's education. However, the educational acquisitions of fathers are more decisive than of mothers. Tilak's (2002) research observed that there is not a significant relation between the family member with the highest level of education and the expenditure made per one student, but there is a significant relation between the education level of father as the leader of the household and the expenditure made per one student. To clarify, according to father's education level there is an increase or decrease in the amount of education expenditure. According to Huy (2012), families whose leader's education level is secondary school or high school make 2.2 times more education expenditure than the families whose leader didn't graduate from any education level. Families whose leaders graduated from upper secondary school are the ones that make the most expenditure on their children's education. Shi's (2006) research in China doesn't confirm this data. The reason for this is the single child policy applied in China. Therefore, families are more eager to make expenditure on their children's education. There is a significant relation between the household education expenditure of families at the primary education level and the education level of mother. The higher the education level of mother is, the higher the household education expenditure of families in primary education level is.

According to research, families whose mothers' education level is high school or university make more expenditure on education than families whose mothers' education level is only literate or primary education. This finding corresponds to Gignoux and Ferreira's (2010) research findings. The researchers put forward with their related research that the mothers being educated has a positive effect on the registration rates of children, and this increases the household education expenditure.

In the research it can be observed that there is a significant relation between the household education expenditure of families at the primary education level and the education level of father. In other words, the higher the education level of fathers goes up, the higher the household education expenditure of families in primary education level becomes. According to research, the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is high school is higher than the families whose fathers' education level is primary education, and the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' education level is university is significantly higher than that of families whose fathers' education level is high school or primary education. In Gignoux and Ferreira's (2010) research it was pointed out that the education level of father is more decisive in girl's attendance at school, but it has no effect on boy's attendance to school. Tomul (2008) found out that an increase in father's education level is decisive on the education expenditure made for the child. It is more decisive on the education expenditure made for girls. Köktaş's (2009) research corresponds to the research findings above.

According to research, the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to mothers' employment status. According to this, the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' employment status is civil servant is significantly higher than the household education expenditure of families whose mothers' are workers and housewives. Similarly, the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs significantly according to fathers' employment status. The household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are civil servants differs significantly from the household education expenditure of families whose fathers' are workers, self-employed, or unemployed. This means that parent's employment status has an important effect on household education expenditure. For example, the household education expenditure of families who are specialists, engineers, etc. is relatively higher than the household education expenditure of families dealing with agriculture (Arthaud, 2008). If the parents' job is a low paid one, they will not be eager to invest on education. However, if both parent's and at least the mother's or father's job is a well-paid one, they will be willing to invest in education (ECR, 2005). According to Bernal (2005) in Spain, families who send their children to public schools make less expenditure on education when compared to families from the working class. Families who send their children to private schools are families of high-status jobs. They make more expenditure on education. In China, fathers who work in white collar jobs pay $20 more for the education of their primary education children than the fathers who work in blue collar works. There is a slight difference between the expenditures made by mothers' work in white collar jobs and blue collar jobs (Shi 2006). Again in China, Qian and Smithy's (2008) research showed that fathers who work in professional jobs make more expenditure on their children's education. Fathers who work in white collar jobs make 1.65 times more expenditure on the education of their children than the fathers who work in blue collar jobs.

Income elasticity of education decisions is accepted as a parameter in market and macro economy, and therefore defining the limits of household expenditure of families with

high income level is an important factor. The expected result here is the rise in demand for education as long as the families' income levels go up. Parents' making income by working has an important effect on families' prosperity. The funds that the rich families allocate for their children's education will undoubtedly be more than that of poor families. Otherwise, one or both of the parents' having no income because of unemployment will reduce the education expenditure down to the minimum that the family would make (ECR, 2005). Research findings confirm the information mentioned above. According to this there is a significant difference between the primary education level household education expenditure of families and the families' monthly income level. In other words, as long as the families' monthly income levels goes up, their expenditure on education goes up too. Accordingly, the most expenditure on education is made by families whose monthly income is 2,501 TL or higher, and the least expenditure on education is made by families whose monthly income is 750 TL or lower. These findings correspond to the related literature (Acemoğlu & Pischke, 2001; Maitra 2003; Quian & Smityh, 2008; Kahveci, 2009; Köktaş, 2009; TSI, 2011; Huy, 2012). For example, an increase of 10% in the income of families in England leads to an increase in college registrations by a rate of between 1% to 1.4% (Acemoğlu & Pischke, 2001). In Bangladesh, in a study by which personal and household features upon education demand are analyzed, it was pointed out that a rise in household income brings about a rise in education expenditure (Maitra, 2003). In China, the income level is important in decisions of families who send their children either to the schools in the country or to the schools overseas (Qian & Smithy, 2008). Tomul's (2008) research in Turkey showed that the effect of income on child's being a student is high up to middle income level, but it tends to go down after that level. Kahveci (2009) observed in his research that as long as the families' monthly income levels go up, their expenditure on education goes up too. Köktaş (2009) found in his related study in 2003 that most expenditure on education was made by families in İstanbul. 80% of the families participating in the research in Istanbul were of middle or higher income levels. In other words, families of higher income level make more expenditure on education. Hereof Turkish Statistical Institution's research confirms the positive relation between family income and education expenditure. According to the research mentioned above, it can be observed that families whose monthly income is approximately 907 TL reserve 0.9% of their household income to education, and the families with approximately 3,066 TL reserve 3.4% of their income to education. As long as families' income increases, their expenditure on education increases as well in Vietnam. According to related research, while the families of the lowest income level make 5,618,000 VND of education expenditure, the families of the highest income level make 64,654,000 VND of education expenditure (Huy, 2012).

This finding, which presents a positive relation between family income and primary education level household education expenditure of families, contradicts Tilak's (2002) research findings. Tilak (2002) presented that contrary to the expectations there is a negative relation between family income and education expenditure of families. In that research, while families of lower income level reserve 6.9% of their income for their children's education, this rate goes down through higher income levels. Families of higher income level reserve 0.63% of their income for their children's education.

There is a significant relation between number of family members and the primary education level household education expenditure of families. According to this, families with three members make more primary education level household education expenditure than families with six or more members, families with four members make more primary education level household education expenditure than families with six or more members,

and families with five members make more primary education level household education expenditure than families with six or more members. The reason for this can be explained with difference of consumption expenditure according to the number of family members. From a perspective of human capital theory there is a positive relation between increase in number of family members and education expenditure. As the number of the family members' increases, the amount reserved for education goes up, too. However, it is observed that some of the studies in related literature have findings to the contrary. According to these findings, as the number of the family members' increases, the amount reserved for education goes down (Houston, 1995). According to Tomul's (2008) research in Turkey, while the excessiveness of the number of the family members reduces the education expenditure, the scarcity in the number of family members increases the education expenditure. The fact that the families have 4 people in rural areas and 3 or less people in urban areas makes a marginal effect on education expenditure.

No significant relation is observed between the number of primary education children in the families and the primary education level household education expenditure of families. It is not an expected finding. The reason for this can be explained by the income level of the families. However, it is understood that the most education expenditure is made by families with 2 primary education level children, and the least education expenditure is made by families with 3 primary education level children.

A significant relation is observed between the grade level of primary education children in the families and the primary education level household education expenditure of families. According to this finding, the primary education level household education expenditure of families whose children are third graders is higher than the families whose children are second graders; the expenditure of families whose children are eight graders is significantly higher than the families whose children are second graders. The excessiveness of the expenditure at the 8th grade level is especially significant here. The reason for this is the fact that in Turkey secondary school placement is made through exam results after primary education. Therefore, private lessons, private classroom training, and courses and studies for Secondary School Entrance or Placement Test increase the primary education level household education expenditure of families. This finding corresponds with the research of Bray (2007), Kahveci (2009) and Sakallı (2010). Bray (2007) observed the private education expenditures which increase the education expenditure of families according to grade levels on 8,420 student families in Malaysia in 1990. According to this, 59% of families whose children are 3rd graders, 53% of families whose children are 5th graders, and 31% of families whose children are 6th graders provide private lessons to their children. According to Kahveci's (2009) research results, the primary education level household education expenditure of families differs according to the grade level of the primary education children in the families. In the research mentioned above, when the expenditure made by families is analyzed according to grade level, it can be seen that families in the work group made 2,291.2 YTL expenditure for 150 students in 6th grade, they made 2,077.8 YTL expenditure for 177 students in 7th grade, and they made 3,808.8 YTL expenditure for 165 students in 8th grade.

The suggestions below can be made according to research findings and results.

1. This research includes the household education expenditure of families in Kastamonu. Therefore, in the future a more global research that includes pre-school, primary education, secondary school, and high school levels can be made.

2. This research was made by relating the amount of families' primary education level household education expenditure with variables related to school and socio-economic status factors. Therefore, families' household education expenditure can be presented by including perceptions about cultural and personal factors, institutional factors, and the variables related to economic factors.

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D. & Pischke, J. S. (2001). Changes in the wage structure, family income, and children's education. *European Economic Review*, 45 (4-6), 890-904.

Akça, Ş. (2002). Ailelerin ilköğretim kademesine yaptıkları eğitim harcamaları (Ankara İli Örneği). [Families' primary education level education expenditure (Example of Ankara)]. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Alfonso, M. (2002). Private spending on primary and secondary education in Peru". Second Draft. Presented at the *46th Annual Meeting of Comparative and International Education Society*, March 9, 2002. Orlando, USA.

Altunya, N. (1999). Eğitim hakkı [Right to education]. *75. yılda eğitim*. İstanbul: Türk Tarih Vakfı Yayınları. ss. 77-89.

Altunya, N. (2003). *Anayasa hukuku açısından Türkiye'de eğitim öğretim hakkı [Education right in Turkey from constitutional law].* İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Arthaud, K. (2008). Household expenditure for children's education. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.* School of Applied Statistics National Institute of Development Administration.

Aydınonat, N. E. (2012). Gelişmiş ülkelerde kademeli eğitim var mı? [Is there gradual education in developed countries?]. *Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı Değerlendirme Notu No: 201213.*

Başaran, İ. E. (1982). *Temel eğitim ve yönetimi [Basic education and administration].* Ankara: A.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Yayını No: 112.

Baum, S. & Payea, K. (2005). The benefits of higher education for individuals and society. www.collegeboard.com İndirme Tarihi: 10.05.2011.

Bernal, J. L. (2005). Parental choice, social class and market forces: The Consequences of privatization of public services in education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20 (6), 779-792.

Bray, M. (1995). *Counting the full cost parental and community financing of education in the East*. A collaborative Report by the World Bank and the United Nations Children's Fund.

Bray, M. (1996). *Counting the full cost parental and community financing of education in East Asia*. Washington: The World Bank.

Bray, M. (1999). *The private costs of public schooling: household and community financing of primary education in Cambodia.* Paris: UNESCO.

Bray, M. (2007). *The shadow education system: Private tutoring and its implications for planners* (Second edition). UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Eğitim Reform Girişimi (ERG) (2009). *Eğitimde eşitlik politika analizi ve öneriler [Equality in education, policy analysis and suggestions].* İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayını.

European Commission Report (ECR) (2005). Private household spending on education and training final project report. http://cie.ed.asu.edu http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc274_en.pdf Accessed September 15, 2010.

Ferrerira, F. H. G. & Gignoux, J. (2010). *Inequality of opportunity in education: Example of Turkey*. Welfare and Social Policy Analytic Report No: 4. Ankara: Republic Turkey State Planning Organization and World Bank,

Houston, J. E. (1995). *Thesaurus of eric descriptions*. Phoneix: AZ: Dry & Press.

Huy, V. Q. (2012). Determinants of educational expenditure in Vietnam. *International Journal of Applied Economics*, *9* (1), 59-72.

Kahveci, S. S. (2009). Ortaöğretim kurumlarına geçiş sisteminde uygulanan sınavların ailelere maliyetinin ailelerin toplam eğitim harcamaları içindeki payı [The share of cost of exams applied in secondary education placement system in total education expenditure of families]. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Karakütük, K. (2007). Eğitimin ekonomik temelleri [Economic base of education]. *Eğitim bilimlerine giriş*. (Edt: V. Sönmez). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık. ss. 151-185.

Kastamonu İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü (2012). *Örgün eğitim istatistikleri [Formal education statistics].* Kastamonu: Kastamonu İl Müdürlüğü İstatistik Şube Müdürlüğü.

Keskin, N. E. & Demirci, A. A. (2003). *Eğitimde çürüyüş* [*Corruption in education*]. Ankara: KİGEM Özelleştirme Değerlendirmeleri.

Knight, J. & Shi, L. (1996). Educational attainment and the rural-urban divide in China. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 58, 83-117.

Köktaş, A. M. (2009). Türkiye'de hanehalkı eğitim harcamaların analizi [Analysis of household education expenditure in Turkey]. *Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.* Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Küçüker, E. & Aslan, G. (2010). Ailelerin çocuklarının özel okullara gönderme nedenleri [The reasons for families to send their children to private schools]. XIV World Congress of Comparative Education Societies. June 14-18 2010. Istanbul, Turkey.

Li, D. & Tsang, C.M., (2002). Household education decisions and implications for gender inequality in education in rural China. *The Annual National Conference of the Association for Asian Studies*, April 4-7, 2002. Washington, USA.

Maitra, P. (2003). Schooling and educational attainment: evidence from Bangladesh. *Education Economics*, *11* (2), 129–153.

Martins, H. J. (2006). Household cash expenditure by living standards measure group. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumers Sciences*, 34, 1-9.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2010). *Ministry of National Education Formal Education Statistics*. Ankara: Strategy Development Department.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2012). *Ministry of National Education Statistics: Formal Education*. Ankara: Strategy Development Department Publication.

Okçabol, R. (2012). Gericileşmenin ve piyasalaşmanın şifreleri 635,651,652,653,666, 4+4+4 ve… [Codes of being reactionary and marketization 635,651,652,653,666, 4+4+4 and …]. *Eğitim Bilim ve Toplum Dergisi,* 10 (39), 28-41.

Omori, M. (2010). Households expenditures on children 2007-08. *Monthly Labor Review* (September). p. 2-16.

Özsoy, S. (2004). Eğitim hakki: Kendi dilini bulamamış bir söylem[Education right: A discourse that could not find itself] . *Eğitim Bilim ve Toplum Dergisi*, *2* (6), 58-84.

Qian, X. & Smyth, R. (2008). Educational expenditure in urban China: Income effects, family characteristics and the demand for domestic and overseas education. *Asian Business and Economics Research Unit Discussion Paper 60.*

Sakallı, F. (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğrenci velilerinin eğitim harcamaları [Education expenditure of primary education students']. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Shi, Y. (2006). The private direct costs of primary education in urban China. *Education and poverty in an international context.* (Eds: R. Bangura, T. D. Jules, C. J. Calcagno & Y. Zha.). New York: Columbia University. pp. 51-64

Tansel, A. & Bircan, F. (2006). Demand for Education in Turkey: A tobit analysis of private tutoring expenditures. *Economics of Education Review*, 25, 303-313.

Tilak, J., B. G. (1988). Education and its relation to economic growth, poverty and income distribution. *Discussion Papers Washington: World Bank Discussion Papers*.

Tilak, J., B. G. (2002). Determinants of household expenditure on education in rural Indiana. Research Working Paper Series No: 88. New Delhi: The Department of National Council of Applied Economic

Tomul, E. (2008). The effect of family's socio-economic features on participation in education. *Education Researches Journal*, 30, 153-168.

Türk Eğitim Derneği (TED) (2010). *Ortaögretime ve yükseköğretime geçis sistemi* [Secondary and higher education placement system]. Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği Yayını.

Turkish Statistics Institution (TSI) (2011). *Household expenditure consumption 2011.* http://www.tuik.gov.tr. İndirme Tarihi: 19.05.2011

Turkish Statistics Institution (TSI) (2006). Turkey education expenditure research 2002. Ankara: Turkish Statistics Institution Press.

Türkiye Odalar & Borsalar Birliği (TOBB) (2012). Türkiye eğitim meclisi sektör raporu [Turkey education assembly sector report]. Rapor No: 2012/160. Ankara: TOBB.

Türköz, M. (2002). Türkiye'de ortaöğretim yatırımları ve verimliliği [The Investment and Productivity od Secondary Education in Turkey]. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Ünal, L. I. (1996). *Eğitim ve yetiştirme ekonomisi [Education and edification economy].* Ankara: Epar Yayınevi.

Ünal, L. I. (2003). Meclisteki partilerin eğitim politikaları ve hedefleri üzerine görüşler [Opinions about education policies and objectives of parties in parliament]. *Eğitim Bilim ve Toplum Dergisi*, *1* (1), 41-50.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization-UNESCO (2012*). Household education spending: An analytical and comparative perspective for 15 African countries*. Published by UNESCO Office in Dakar.

Web: http://www.haber3.com/kastamonuda-ogrenci-servislerine-10-tl-zam-yapildi-1019629h.htm İndirme Tarihi: 19.05.2011.

Web: http://www.unicef.org/bolivia/resumen_gasto_hogares_educacion_ENG.pdf İndirme Tarihi: 19.05.2011

Yolcu, H. (2007). Türkiye'de ilköğretim finansmanın değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of primary education finance in Turkey]. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yolcu, H. (2011). Hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarını etkileyen etmenler: Kuramsal bir çalışma [Factors effecting household education expenditure: A theoretical study]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *5* (3), 12-35.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) (1998). Üniversite öğrencileri aile gelirleri, eğitim harcamaları, mali yardım ve iş beklentileri araştırması [Research on family income of university

students, education expenditure, economic support and job expectations] Taken from www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/ailegel.html. İndirme Tarihi: 19.05.2011.

Ailelerin İlköğretim Düzeyinde Yapmış Oldukları Hanehalkı Eğitim Harcamaları[1]

Berru ULUSOY[2], Hüseyin YOLCU[3]

Giriş

İlköğretimin gerek uluslararası bildirge ve sözleşmelerde, gerekse ülkelerin kendi yasal metinlerde zorunlu olduğu ve devlet tarafından parasız olarak sunulması gerektiği belirtilmiştir. Bu durumda, en azından teoride, ailelerin diğer öğretim düzeyleri ile karşılaştırıldığında hanehalkı bütçelerinden ilköğretim düzeyine daha az eğitim harcaması yapması beklenir. Buna karşın, var olan uygulamalar ve deneyimler bunun tam tersi yönünde olduğunu göstermektedir. Örneğin Yunanistan Anayasasında ücretsiz eğitim vurgusu yapılmasına karşın, ailelerin hanehalkı bütçelerinden eğitime yaptıkları harcamalar Gayri Safi Yurt İçi Hasıla'nın [GSYİH] % 1,5'ini oluşturmaktadır. Güney Kore'de eğitim harcamalarının üçte biri hanehalkı tarafından sağlanmaktadır (European Commission Report [ECR], 2005). Peruda'da ailelerin hanehalkı bütçelerinden eğitime yapmış oldukları harcamalar GSYİH'nin yaklaşık % 2'sine karşılık gelmektedir (Alfonso, 2002). Bolivya'da 2005 yılında yapılan eğitim harcamasının % 20'si aileler tarafından yapılmıştır (www.unicef.org). Türkiye'de 2002 yılındaki hanehalkı harcamalarının toplam eğitim harcamalarına oranı % 32,9 olup bu harcamaların GSYİH'ye oranı % 1,9'dur (TÜİK, 2006; MEB, 2010). Dahası Anayasanın 42. maddesinde "parasız ve zorunlu" olduğu dile getirilen ilköğretim düzeyinde, ailelerin yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları 2002 yılındaki ilköğretime yapılan eğitim harcamalarının % 30,1'ini oluşturmaktadır (TÜİK, 2006).

Ailelerin hanehalkı bütçelerinden eğitim hizmetinden yararlanabilmek için yaptıkları harcamalar, eğitimin özel maliyeti olarak nitelendirilmektedir (Ünal, 1996). Hanehalkının özel eğitim maliyetleri dolaysız, dolaylı ve fırsat maliyetlerinden oluşmaktadır. Dolaysız maliyet; hanehalkının bir çocuğun okul ücreti, kitap, kırtasiye, forma, okul çantası ve ulaşım gibi harcamalarını kapsamaktadır. Örneğin Kamboçya'da ailelerin yapmış oldukları doğrudan harcamalar 50.000 ile 224.000 Riel arasında değişmektedir (Bray, 1999). Dolaylı parasal maliyet; beslenme, barınma ve giyinme gibi konularda yapılan harcamaları içermektedir. Örneğin, Belçika'da 2001 yılında ailelerin eğitime yaptığı harcamaların % 15'i dolaylı harcamalardan oluşmaktadır. Vazgeçme maliyeti ise, bireyin bir ekonomik etkinlikte bulunarak gelir elde edebileceği bir işte çalışması yerine, bir eğitim kurumuna devam ederek, gelir elde etmekten vazgeçmesidir. Bu durumda bir eğitim kurumuna devam etmenin vazgeçme maliyeti, bir işte çalışarak elde edilebilecek gelir olmaktadır (Karakütük, 2007). Bununla birlikte, pratikte, vazgeçme maliyetini ölçmede güçlükler bulunmaktadır. Bunun nedeni bir öğrencinin, öğrenimine devam etmek yerine ekonomik bakımdan aktif yaşamı seçmesi durumunda, işgücü piyasasında iş bulma olasılığının kesin olmamasıdır (Türköz, 2002). Eğitimin hanehalkına maliyeti ise bu üç maliyet türüne yönelik yapmış olduğu harcamaların toplamına eşittir.

Türkiye'de eğitim finansmanına ilişkin yapılan araştırmaların daha çok kamu eğitim harcamalarının makro düzeyde çözümlenmesi üzerinde yoğunlaştığı söylenebilir. Bu nedenle, doğrudan doğruya hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarını konu alan sınırlı sayıda araştırmaya rastlanılmıştır (Yükseköğretim Kurulu, 1998; Akça, 2002; Keskin & Demirci,

[1] [1] Bu çalışma Berru ULUSOY'un Kastamonu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'nde Hüseyin YOLCU'nun danışmanlığında yürüttüğü yüksek lisans tezinin verilerinin bir kısmından üretilmiştir.

[2] Öğretmen - Kastamonu İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü - kayaberru@hotmail.com

[3] Yrd. Doç. Dr. - Kastamonu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü - hyolcu@kastamonu.edu.tr

2003; Tansel & Bircan, 2006; TÜİK, 2006, Kahveci, 2009; Köktaş, 2009; Küçüker & Aslan, 2010; Türk Eğitim Derneği [TED], 2010; Sakallı, 2010, Yolcu, 2011). Dolayısıyla, araştırma ilgili alanyazında bu yönde yapılmış sınırlı çalışmalardan biri olması bakımından önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırmanın amacı ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarının miktarı ve bu harcamaların okulla ilgili etkenler ile sosyo-ekonomik etkenlere göre farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını ortaya koymaktır. Araştırmada aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmıştır:

1. Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış olduğu henehalkı eğitim harcamasının miktarı nedir? Bu harcama miktarı doğrudan ve dolaylı eğitim harcama türlerine göre nasıl dağılım göstermektedir? Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları çocuklarını kamu ya da özel okullara gönderme durumlarına göre nasıl farklılaşmaktadır?
2. Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları okulla ilgili etkenlere (okulun türü, okulun öğretim biçimi ve okula ulaşım türü) göre nasıl farklılık göstermektedir?
3. Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları sosyo-ekonomik etkenlere (çocuğun kiminle yaşadığı, anne-baba eğitim durumu, anne-baba meslek durumu, aylık gelir, ailedeki birey sayısı, ilköğretime devam eden çocuk sayısı ve devam edilen sınıf düzeyi) göre nasıl farklılık göstermektedir?

Yöntem

Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarının miktarı ile bu harcamaların okulla ilgili etkenler ile sosyo-ekonomik etkenlere göre farklılaşıp farklaşmadığını ortaya koymaya yönelik bu çalışma tarama modelinde, betimsel bir araştırmadır. Bu araştırmanın evrenini Kastamonu il merkezinde bulunan kamu ve özel ilköğretim okullarında öğrenim gören öğrencilerin aileleri oluşturmaktadır. Kastamonu il merkezinde 22 kamu, 2 de özel ilköğretim okulu olmak üzere toplam 24 ilköğretim okulu bulunmaktadır. Kamu ilköğretim okullarında 10.000 öğrenci, özel ilköğretim okullarında ise 400 öğrenci öğrenim görmektedir. Buna göre 10.400 öğrenci ailesi bu çalışmanın evrenini oluşturmaktadır (Kastamonu İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, 2012). Araştırmada sekiz ilköğretim okulundan oluşan bir çalışma grubu oluşturulmuştur. Çalışma gurubunda bulunan bu okullardan altısı kamu ilköğretim okulu, ikisi de özel ilköğretim okuludur.

Araştırmanın verileri, araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen "Ailelerin İlköğretim Düzeyinde Yapmış Oldukları Hanehalkı Eğitim Harcamalarını Belirleme Anketi" yoluyla elde edilmiştir. Veri toplama aracı iki kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Birinci kısımda araştırmanın bağımsız değişkenlerine (okulun türü, okulun öğretim biçimi, okula ulaşım, çocuğun kiminle yaşadığı, anne-baba eğitim düzeyi, anne-baba meslek durumu, aylık gelir ve ailedeki kişi sayısı, ilköğretime devam eden çocuk sayısı ve devam edilen öğretim düzeyi) yönelik sorulara yer verilmiştir. İkinci kısımda ise araştırmanın bağımlı değişkeni olan ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarını belirlemeye yönelik sorular bulunmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamalarına ilişkin harcama kalemleri 23 alt başlık olarak listelenmiştir. Ailelerin bu harcama kalemlerinin karşılarındaki kutucuklara, 2011-2012 öğretim yılı içinde her bir harcama kalemi için yaptıkları miktarı ortalama olarak TL (Türk Lirası) cinsinden yazmaları istenmiştir.

Araştırmanın veri toplama aracı 15 Mayıs-15 Haziran 2012 tarihleri arasında 850 aileye uygulanmıştır. Bunların 869'u geri dönmüştür. Geri dönen anketlerin 789 geçerli sayılmıştır. Böylece araştırma 789 aileden elde edilen veriler üzerinden yürütülmüştür.

Araştırmanın birinci alt problemine ilişkin verilerin çözümlemesinde betimsel istatistiklerden; ikinci ve üçüncü alt problemine ilişkin verilerin çözümlenmesinde ise parametrik testlerden t testi ve Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi (ANOVA), nonparametrik testlerden Kruskal Wallis H testinden yararlanılmıştır. Anlamlı farklılaşmanın hangi gruplar arasında olduğunu ortaya koymak amacıyla da Post Hoc Tukey testine başvurulmuştur.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, 2011-2012 öğretim yılında ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde bir öğrenci için yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcaması ortalama 11.971,34 TL'dir. Bu harcama miktarı çocuklarını kamu okullarına gönderen aileler için ortalama 1.920,15 TL, özel okula gönderen aileler için ise ortalama 10.051,19 TL'dir. Okulla ilgili değişkenlerden okulun türü, okulun öğretim biçimi, okula ulaşım türüne göre ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları anlamlı biçimde farklılaşmaktadır. Sosyo-ekonomik değişkenlerden çocuğun kiminle yaşadığı, anne-babanın eğitim düzeyi, anne-babanın meslek durumu, ailenin gelir düzeyi, ailede yaşayan birey sayısı, devam edilen sınıf düzeyine göre, ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları anlamlı biçimde farklılaşmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, ilköğretime devam eden öğrenci sayısı ile ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları arasında anlamlı bir farklılaşma bulunmamaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Hanehalkı, Hanehalkı eğitim harcaması, İlköğretim, Doğrudan eğitim harcaması, Dolaylı eğitim harcaması

Atıf için / Please cite as:
Ulusoy, B. & Yolcu, H. (2013). Household education expenditure of families at primary education level [Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 3* (1), 1–27. http://ebad-jesr.com/