

Cost Sharing for The Development of Sustainable Public Secondary Education in Bayelsa State

KOLUBOWEI, WOYENGIKURO

Department of Educational Management
Faculty of Education
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
Kolus1964@yahoo.com,

ADIELE, EDWARD E. (Prof.)

Department of Educational Management
Faculty of Education
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
Eddy.adiele@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study investigated cost sharing for the development of sustainable public secondary schools in Bayelsa State. Two research questions and two hypotheses were formulated and the design of the study was a descriptive survey. The population of the study was 196 principals in the public secondary schools in Bayelsa State. Through a stratified random sampling technique, the sample of the study was 98 which was 50% of the entire population. Among the sample, 56 principals were from urban schools and 42 were from rural schools, which were 57% and 43% of the sample. The instrument for the study was a questionnaire tagged “Cost Sharing and Sustainable Education Development Questionnaire (CSSEDQ)”. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.92 determined through split half reliability method. mean score and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions while z-test was used to test the null hypotheses. It was find out that cost sharing makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education and concluded that cost-sharing plans must thus be part of broader policy packages that address all of the factors that drive up the cost of education and limit the government's budgetary capacity to finance it. Therefore, it was recommended that government should adopt cost sharing as it makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education so as to removes the burden of finance on the government.

Keywords: Cost Sharing, Development, Sustainable, Public Secondary.

INTRODUCTION

Education in developing nations, which is one of the poverty reduction programmes, is recognized to be a major component in improving the lives of socially disadvantaged communities. The motor of economic progress is human capital. There were also beneficial impacts of school education and literacy on poverty reduction and other social and human development elements, such as child

mortality and life expectancy. Knowledge is a crucial element in economic growth (Anietie & Zipamoh, 2017). In addition to the direct advantages of education, some indirect advantages of education been developed, include meeting basic needs, such as better use of healthcare services, shelters, hygiene, and impacts on women's behavior on decisions concerning fertility, family welfare and health (Boardman et al., 2006). These benefits have resulted, among other things, in recognition of education as a vital contributor to sustained economic growth through creating more skilled workers (Comhar, 2007).

The adoption of an educational cost-sharing policy has shown a significant share of the financial burden for schooling to communities and parents. Many parents and communities, with increasing levels of poverty, have been unable to fulfil cost sharing obligations (Archibald & Feldman, 2011). Cost sharing has been introduced in the education sector throughout the world since economic liberalization was introduced in the 1980s as a transfer in the burden of service expenses from government to parents and students (DCI, Department of Foreign Affairs, 2003). Cost sharing in education has the cost burden transferring partly from the state to the relatives of the student to finance higher education (Penrose, 1998). The introduction to cost sharing in the education sector was driven by massive growth in education spending world-wide due to increased education costs due to inflation, need for more sophisticated equipment such as computers, laboratory equipment, household materials and projects, and increasing demand for education because it had not been enough (Wambugu, 2012).

The objective of free basic education was to guarantee that disadvantaged children could attend school. For this reason, education in the Millennium Development Goals was given priority (MDGs). Each kid will get basic training by 2015 as promised by the MDGs. Due to their deprivation; the world's most disadvantaged children have yet to benefit from this promise as we reach the post-MDG period. Karemesi in Dorling (2014) noted that expenditures such as exam fees, wage supplements, textbooks, educational supplies such as school clothes, food, transport and sports are important. While enrolment in higher education has increased in many African nations, state support for secondary education has decreased in several of them (World Bank, 2008). Since the 1960s, the World Bank, which offers financial and technical assistance to disadvantaged nations, has recognized the importance of education investment and has been giving it (World Bank 2008). Nevertheless, the schools in some state have been reported to collect some fees from the students. Some of this fees are tagged different names like the handwork fees, exams fees, lesson fees etc. this trends seems to be different from school to school. This has raised questions whether the current basic education can be sustainable or not. To be sustainable, it implies meeting quality education needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs (Anietie & Zipamoh, 2017). Education for sustainable development (ESD) fosters the development of the information, skills, understanding, attitudes, and behaviours necessary to build a society that protects and conserves the environment, promotes social equality, and encourages economic stability (Boliver, 2011). Environmental education, which aimed to enhance people's knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and behaviours to care for their environment, influenced the development of ESD. ESD's goal is to empower individuals to make decisions and take activities that improve our quality of life while also protecting the environment.

ESD covers a wide range of topics, including poverty alleviation, citizenship, peace, ethics, responsibility in local and global settings, democracy and governance, justice, human rights, gender equality, corporate responsibility, natural resource management, and biological diversity, among others. Certain qualities are widely regarded as essential for the successful implementation of ESD,

showing the equal significance of both the learning process and the educational results (derived from UNESCO Nairobi Cluster, 2006, 'UN Decade of Sustainable Development'). ESD should include the following:

- Be embedded in the curriculum in an interdisciplinary and holistic manner, allowing for a whole-institution approach to policy making.
- Share the values and principles that underpin sustainable development.
- Promote critical thinking, problem solving and action, all of which develop confidence in addressing the challenges to sustainable development.
- Employ a variety of educational methods, such as literature, art, drama and debate to illustrate the processes.
- Allow learners to participate in decision-making on the design and content of educational programmes.
- Address local as well as global issues, and avoid jargon-ridden language and terms.
- Look to the future, ensuring that the content has a long-term perspective and uses medium and long-term planning.

The secondary education is a veritable tool for the projection and outright achievement of the goals of education for sustainable development (Kiveu & Mayo, 2009). By development, it implies that development is a process that creates growth, progress, positive change or the addition of physical, economic, environmental, social and demographic components. The purpose of development is to ensure a sustained rise in the quality of life of the populace, and the creation or expansion of local regional income and employment opportunities, without damaging the resources of the environment (Callender, 2013). Development is visible and useful, not necessarily immediately, and includes an aspect of quality change and the creation of conditions for a continuation of that change (Society for International Development, 2020, & World Bank, 2011). To this end, the sustainable education is better achieved when the education provided for today does not affect the provision of quality education for tomorrow (Nevin, 2008). The major problem to running education is the cost of funding the system. In Bayelsa, public secondary education is largely on the government for funding. In states like Akwa Ibom State, the government funds education and also summative examination like the external exams, majorly West African Senior School certificate examination (WASSCE) and National Examination Council (NECO). Hence each qualified student has the opportunity to write the exams paid for by the state government. Though questions of sustainability has been raised as regards the need for the system to continue without interruption; sustainability.

Based on the current economic realities in Nigeria, coupled with the declined in price of crude oil and other non-oil sectors still struggles to stand, hence causing huge financial burden on the government (Anietie & Zipamoh, 2017). This has made the concept of cost sharing quite a considerable one in the current times (UNICEF, 2004). This implies that parents would have to put aside money to partly fund their wards education if the government must continue to share education amongst its secondary school students. In this endeavour, Bayelsa receives minimal help from the federal government. This may become an impediment to continuous funding of free education in Bayelsa as there is more sectors and controversial issues competing for resources of the state government. For instance, the issue of security has become pressing in almost all then state of the federation, and finances has been greatly or largely redirected to cushion the effect of insecurity on the economic good of the state. Hence, in this study, there is need to consider how cost sharing affect sustainable education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The government has to finance the entire cost of secondary education in the state and 80% of the cost of primary education. This stretches the N23bn (\$64m) that the state is budgeting for education this year. That is just over 10% of its statutory allocation from central government. In the middle of Kaiama, the Ijaw National Academy is expanding fast, with new teaching blocks and dormitories under construction.

This supports the fact that education is very instrumental for the total transformation of individuals and revives the need for environmental consciousness and economic property. The current economic realities and swindling prices of crude oil which has affected federal allocation to the state has raised question on the pressure on the purse of government. Funding schools and other sectors has led the government to rationalize its resources to the best places that yields returns (Callender, 2013). Since provision of free and basic education is entirely on government. The assurance of quality has been an issue of concern and hence this has shown that there is need to take drastic and coordinated action towards the redressing issues of poor educational quality delivery. This is because if the government continues to provide free secondary education, couple with the observable trend of population explosion, there is high tendency that this process may not be sustainable to continue to provide free and basic education. Other spill over problems may include issue of maintaining standards with very small finances that are rolled to funding exclusively the education system. In fact, several governments tenors in federal level has made politically driven promises to move free education to another level by even providing feeding to the primary school level. The big question has been whether the government would be able to ensure that this is however sustained at a higher level of quality delivery. Hence, evidence from other states has showed that, in the midst of free education, there has been issue relating to government inability to pay minimum wage and untimely and irregular payment of salary. This is perceived to be spill off from the pressure of not sharing cost with the users of the education. To contain this, the government has made effort to ensure that they reduce the number of teachers to ensure prompt payment and to also ensure that they pay wages that they can pay. But this has over the years shown to be counterproductive, while the education system suffers more severely. It based on this note that this current research intended to investigate explore cost sharing for the development of sustainable public secondary education in Bayelsa State.

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on Cost Benefit Analyses by Julien Dupuit in Anietie and Zipamoh (2017). Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is the principal analytical framework used to evaluate public expenditure decisions. CBA (cost-benefit analysis) is a strategy for comparing the entire expenses of a program/project against its benefits using a single parameter (most commonly monetary units). This enables the net cost or benefit associated with the program to be calculated. It is most commonly used as a strategy at the outset of a program or project, when many alternatives or courses of action are being evaluated and compared, as a means of selecting the optimal approach. It may, however, be used to assess a program's overall impact in quantifiable and monetized terms. The overall expenses of a program or activity are added up and compared against the total benefits. The method implies that a monetary value can be assigned to all program's by looking at costs and benefits, including physical and intangible returns to individuals and organizations other than those directly touched. As a result, one of the primary benefits of cost-benefit analysis is that it forces individuals to think about the different elements that should impact strategic decisions clearly and methodically. This theory is

related to this current study because government who funds education should weigh the cost with the possible economic benefit over time. This can be done by comparing total funding by government and cost sharing and if the benefit of cost sharing outweighs the complete funding by government, then the government should share the funding with the parents or the community of the school. This can be achieved when government and parents of student agreed which aspect of the schooling they can fund, owing to their capacity as determined by available resources.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To find out the relevance of cost sharing for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.
2. To ascertain the critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.

Research Questions

1. What is the relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State?
2. What are the critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.
2. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.

METHODOLOGY

The design of the study is a descriptive survey design and the population of the study is all the 196 secondary schools in Bayelsa State. The sample of the study constitutes 98 principals which is 50% of the entire population, determined through a stratified random sampling technique. The location distribution of the sample constitutes 56 principal in urban areas and 42 in the rural areas representing 57% and 43% or respectively. The study used a questionnaire instrument captioned “Cost Sharing and Sustainable Education Development Questionnaire (CSSEDQ). The instrument is made of 10 items that are designed to elicit information on cost sharing and sustainable education development. The questionnaire was face and content validated. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.92 determined through the split half method. To analyse the data, the mean core and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions while z-test was used to test the null hypotheses.

Answers to Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State?

Table 1: Mean scores and rank order of the urban and rural principal on the relevance of cost sharing on school management for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.

S/n	Item	\bar{x}_1 (56)	Sd ₁	\bar{x}_1 (42)	Sd ₂	Mean Set	Decision
1.	Cost sharing makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education.	3.41	.73	3.43	.62	3.42	Agree
2.	Cost sharing removes the burden of finance on the government.	3.22	.67	3.14	.64	3.18	Agree
3.	Cost sharing brings a sense of commitment by the parents and the students.	3.21	.67	2.79	.86	3.00	Agree
4.	Cost sharing will lead to more community engagement.	3.21	.67	3.19	.69	3.20	Agree
5.	Cost sharing can bring more ideas to the table hence ensuring sustainable development.	3.14	.64	3.43	.62	3.29	Agree
Total		3.24	0.67	3.20	0.68	3.22	

Criterion mean = 2.50

On table one, the following were accepted to be the relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State. It was accepted that cost sharing makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education, cost sharing removes the burden of finance on the government, cost sharing brings a sense of commitment by the parents and the students, cost sharing will lead to more community engagement, and that cost sharing can bring more ideas to the table hence ensuring sustainable development. This is because all the items were accepted as they exceed the mean criterion of 2.50.

Research Question 2: What are the critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State?

Table 2: Mean scores and rank order of the urban and rural principal on the critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.

S/n	Item	\bar{x}_1	Sd ₁	\bar{x}_1	Sd ₂	Mean Set	Decision
1.	Cost sharing involves commitment of both government and the community to determine their roles and engagement.	3.43	.62	3.43	.62	3.43	Agree
2.	Cost sharing looks involves the budgetary allocation.	3.41	.73	3.41	.73	3.41	Agree
3.	Cost sharing involves cost benefit analyses to determine the benefit of investing in secondary education for sustainable development.	3.22	.67	3.22	.67	3.22	Agree
4.	Cost sharing involves the engagement of stakeholders to consider the financial implication for ensuring sustainable secondary education.	3.21	.67	3.14	.64	3.18	Agree

5.	Cost sharing involves partnership among the educational financiers regarding the aspect of funding that can be managed by each party for sustainable secondary education.	2.79	.86	2.79	.86	2.79	Agree
Total		3.21	0.71	3.20	0.70	3.20	

Criterion mean = 2.50

Table two shows that the items are above the criterion mean of 2.50, this is evident as the respondents all accepts that cost sharing involves commitment of both government and the community to determine their roles and engagement, cost sharing looks involves the budgetary allocation, cost sharing involves cost benefit analyses to determine the benefit of investing in secondary education for sustainable development, cost sharing involves the engagement of stakeholders to consider the financial implication for ensuring sustainable secondary education, and cost sharing involves partnership among the educational financiers regarding the aspect of funding that can be managed by each party for sustainable secondary education.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypotheses one: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on the strategies for funding secondary education in Rivers State Nigeria.

Table 3: Mean score, standard deviation and z-test of the difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on the strategies for funding secondary education in Rivers State

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Z-cal.</i>	<i>Z-crit.</i>	<i>Decision</i>
<i>Urban</i>	56	96	3.24	0.67	0.13	1.96	Accept
<i>Rural</i>	42		3.20	0.68			

Nigeria.

Table shows the null hypotheses stating that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on the relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State. The z-calculated of 0.13 is less than the z-critical of 1.96 and therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypotheses two: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State.

Table 4: Mean score, standard deviation and z-test of the difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State .

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Z-cal.</i>	<i>Z-crit.</i>	<i>Decision</i>
<i>Urban</i>	56	96	3.24	0.67	0.29	1.96	Accept
<i>Rural</i>	42		3.20	0.68			

Based on the details on the table, the table shows the null hypotheses which stated that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural principals on critical areas of cost sharing on resource provision for development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State. The z-calculated is 0.29 which is less than the z-critical of 1.96 at 0.05 significant level and with the degree of freedom standing at 164, hence the null hypotheses is rejected.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study revealed that the relevance of cost sharing for the development of sustainable secondary education in Bayelsa State are that cost sharing makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education, cost sharing removes the burden of finance on the government, cost sharing brings a sense of commitment by the parents and the students, cost sharing will lead to more community engagement, and that cost sharing can bring more ideas to the table hence ensuring sustainable development. This finding is in line with Ministerie van (2004) & Penrose (1998).

Furthermore, the study also revealed that cost sharing involves commitment of both government and the community to determine their roles and engagement, cost sharing looks involves the budgetary allocation (Nevin, 2008). Cost sharing involves cost benefit analyses to determine the benefit of investing in secondary education for sustainable development, cost sharing involves the engagement of stakeholders to consider the financial implication for ensuring sustainable secondary education, and cost sharing involves partnership among the educational financiers regarding the aspect of funding that can be managed by each party for sustainable secondary education (Wambugu, 2012).

CONCLUSION

Cost-sharing plans must thus be part of broader policy packages that address all of the factors that drive up the cost of education and limit the government's budgetary capacity to finance it. In the absence of broader reforms, implementing cost recovery schemes makes little sense. They can do significant harm: the reduction in enrolments and/or enrolment ratios in many countries indicate the existence of such harm, despite the fact that there are other factors at play.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Government should adopt cost sharing as it makes more resources available for schools hence leading to sustainable education so as to removes the burden of finance on the government.
2. Government at all level should adopt cost sharing as it brings a sense of commitment by the parents and the students and lead to more community engagement, and that cost sharing can bring more ideas to the table hence ensuring sustainable development.
3. Both government and the community should be committed to cost sharing as to determine their roles and engagement, which involves budgetary allocation, cost sharing involves cost benefit analyses to determine the benefit of investing in secondary education for sustainable development.
4. The government should be involved stakeholders to consider the financial implication for ensuring sustainable secondary education and partner among the educational financiers regarding the aspect of funding that can be managed by each party for sustainable secondary education.

REFERENCES

- Anietie, R & Zipamoh, M. (2017). Cost reduction strategies for efficient resource utilization in secondary schools in Rivers State. *African Journal of Education Research and Development*. 9(1),230-237
- Archibald, R. & Feldman, D. (2011). *Why does college cost so much?*, Oxford University Press.
- Boardman, A., Greenberg, D., Vining, A., & Weimer, D. (2006). *Cost benefit analysis: Concepts and practice*. (3rd. ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Boliver, V. (2011). Expansion, differentiation, and the persistence of social class Inequalities in British Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 61(3), 229-242.
- Callender, C. (2013). Part-Time undergraduate student funding and financial support'. in browne and beyond: Modernizing English higher education, Institute of Education Press pages 130-158.
- Comhar, S.D.C. (2007). *Recommendations on the Review of the National Sustainable Development Strategy*, Dublin.
- Comhar, S.D.C. (2007). *Recommendations on the Review of the National Sustainable Development Strategy*, Dublin.
- DCI, Department of Foreign Affairs. (2003). *Describing, understanding, challenging...the story of human development in today's world*, Development Cooperation Ireland
- Department of Education and Science (DES) (2004) *A Brief Description of the Irish Education System*, Government of Ireland.
- Dorling, D. (2014). Tuition fees: a bonanza for the 1%, The Guardian, September 30th, <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/sep/30/tuition-fees-bonanza-for-one-percentdanny-dorling>
- ECO-UNESCO (2007). <http://www.ecounesco.ie>.
- ECO-UNESCO (2007). *Research Project on Education for Sustainable Development in Ireland*, commissioned by Comhar SDC, Dublin.
- Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development (2006) *Strategy for Education and Training for Sustainable Development and Implementation Plan 2006-2014*, Finland.
- Heller, D. (2011). *The states and public he policy: Affordability, access, and accountability*, (2nd Ed.), John Hopkins.
- Kiveu, N, Mayo, J. (2009). The impact of cost-sharing on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Ndivisi division of Bungoma district Kenya. *Educational Research and Review*, 4(5), 272–284.
- Ministerie van L.N.V. (2004). *Learning for Sustainable Development: From the Margins to the Mainstream*, The Netherlands.
- Nevin, E. (2008). Education and sustainable development', Policy and Practice. *A Development Education Review*, 6, 49-62.
- Penrose, P. (1998). *Cost sharing in education—public finance, school and household perspectives*. Education Research Paper No. 27. <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/12878/1/er980027.pdf>
- The Sustainable Development Education Panel (2003). *Learning to Last: The Government's Sustainable Development Education Draft Strategy for England*.
- UNECE (n.d.). Good Practices' in Education for Sustainable Development in the UNECE Region. <http://www.unece.org/env/esd/inf.meeting.docs/Bureau/Good%20practices.tem pl.pdf>
- UNECE, (2005). *Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development*. <http://www.unece.org/env/documents/2005/cep/ac.13/cep.ac.13.2005.3.rev.1>
- UNESCO (2006) *International Implementation Scheme for the Decade in Brief*. http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=23280&URL_DO=DO_TOPI.
- UNICEF. (2004). *Comprehensive education sector analysis report*. Nairobi. UNICEF Country Office.

- United Nations (1992). *Agenda 21, Rio de Janeiro*, available:
<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/index.htm>.
- United Nations. (2002). *Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, Johannesburg.
[http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/636/93/PDF/N0263693.pdf? Open Element](http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/636/93/PDF/N0263693.pdf?OpenElement).
- Wambugu, J.W. (2012). *The impact of the policy of cost sharing: A case study of selected Kenyan secondary schools*. (Unpublished Masters Dissertation). University of South Africa.
- World Bank (2011) Kenya: Country at Glance (2011 edition). World Bank.
- World Bank. (2008). *Expanding opportunities and building competencies for young People: new agenda for secondary education*. World Bank.