

## **Influence of Uniform and Transportation Fees on Students' Participation in Public Secondary Schools in Kaduna South Local Government Area of Kaduna State**

**YAKUBU, Iliya, Ph.D**

Education Foundations

Federal College of Education, Zaria

**&**

**Cordelia Adanma Goldface Irokalibe**

Education Foundations

Federal College of Education, Zaria

### **Abstract**

*The study assessed the influence of uniform and transport fees on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. The study was carried out with the four objectives, which were translated into four research questions and four null hypotheses. The study was conducted using survey research design. The target population of the study was made up of 53 principals, 820 teachers and 2,375 students from Kaduna South Local Government, Kaduna State. A sample size of 5 principals, 82 teachers and 238 students were sampled, making the total of 325 respondents, used in the study. The instrument named "Private Cost of Education and Student Participation Questionnaire (PCESPQ)" was used for data collection in the study. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha statistic and a reliability coefficient of 0.79 was obtained. The data gathered in the study was computerized into database using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0. The descriptive statistics of frequency, mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Findings of the study among others established that uniform fees influenced students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government, Kaduna State. Recommendations made include that, Kaduna State Government should ensure that students undertaking secondary education in public secondary schools should not be charged any fees, whether they are learning in boarding or day schools.*

**Keywords:** Uniform Fees, Transportation Fees, Students' participation, Public Secondary Schools.

### **Introduction**

The private cost of education has crucial role in determining the access to education. The rising level of private cost of education has raised the equity issues in a very serious manner. The private cost of education (paid by individuals) varies according to the location of the school, level and field of study. The cost per student at primary school is half of the cost of secondary students. Meanwhile, cost per student at boarding school was five times higher than those at the day secondary school. Private cost of education is an economic

burden to the household and could be measured by a ratio to household income (Levin, 1995; Tsang, 1995). Thus, basic understanding for 'school financing' is very important.

It is imperative to distinguish between the terms, 'expenditure' on education and 'costs' of education which are often anonymously used. That part of expenditure which has some relationship with the production process and the output only can be referred to as costs; and that part which has no such relationship with the production process and output is merely expenditure. In this sense expenditure is a broader concept than costs; but the vice-versa is also true, in the sense that while costs can include imputed items like opportunity costs, generally expenditure does not include such items. Expenditure could be expressed only in monetary terms, while costs could be expressed in monetary as well in real or physical terms. In this sense, the concept of costs used in economics is quite different from that used in accountants. For example, the concept of shadow prices never figures in the works of accountants. To the accountant, costs mean the expenditures only - the costs of goods and services actually utilised during a particular period in the educational process (Veeraraghavan & Jandhyala, 2003). To the economists, costs include the imputed value of goods and services, depreciation etcetera.

School uniform is a set of standardised clothes worn primarily for an educational institution. They are common in primary and secondary schools. When used they form basis of schools dress code. Hanna in Kingori (2015) in writing about school uniform cost said that the office of fair trade in United Kingdom wrote to all head teachers asking them to review the arrangements to make for school uniform. She said school choose single supplier or retailer where parents buy school uniform making them unable to buy uniform from cheaper shops. Hanna in Kingori (2015) also asserted that in order to address issue of poverty and barrier given to parent and the learners, then the cost of uniform and school meals must be kept down.

World Bank (2004) has urged that although several countries in sub-Saharan Africa have eliminated school fees, significant costs remain including cost of providing uniform for a child, students are less likely to be sent away from school for failure to wear school uniform but still students feel stigmatised by failure to wear uniform and may be reprimanded by teachers. In Uganda and Ethiopia, parent who could not afford to buy uniform and textbook retained their children home thus affecting participation (Stasavage, 2005; World Bank, 2004). Some families are forced to withdraw their children from school due to lack of school uniform. This has mainly, affected people from poor backgrounds (World Bank, 2004). Uniform makes all students to be equal, those without feel inferior and discriminated from others. This affects their participation in school and some opt to drop out (GoK, 2010).

Getting children to school requires large expenditures by the public sector on school bus operations and infrastructure. But school transportation costs are not exclusively public. Nearly 87% of students in Kaduna State use private vehicles to reach school (McDonald et al., 2011). These families bear financial costs in terms of vehicle operation and time. Beyond the direct costs borne by public and private actors, school travel also imposes costs on society through externalities like vehicle emissions and congestion. These costs are justified by the enormous benefits to individuals and society of ensuring access to education for all children. More so, students in rural schools may transport longer distances because of the dispersed nature of population settlement, which increases costs. In addition, some student

transportation costs are mandated by the school location and cannot be voluntarily reduced. However, busing is required for all homeless students and students with documented special needs. While national data on special needs busing is scarce, a 2002 study in Kaduna State estimates that special needs busing costs account for 28 % of total student transportation expenditures (Chambers et al., 2002).

This study is therefore geared toward exploring the influence of private cost of Education on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Many costs have been left in the hands of parents including Parent Teachers Association (PTA) levies, cost of school uniform, and cost of transportation to school. Government financing of education does not consider these costs though the parents and or the student incur them in the process of acquiring education. These costs are private and they are not reflected in the Ministry of Education provided fees guidelines which are expected to be followed by all secondary schools' management and therefore referred to as private costs. Even as the government moved to introduce subsidized secondary education, households were expected to meet most of these secondary education cost. It appears that some students and their parents or guardians experience difficulties in cushioning these costs of education and as such a good number of students have had to drop out of school due to these. It therefore becomes important to ascertain the influence of private cost of Education on student's participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The study was set to:

1. determine the influence of uniform fees on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State; and
2. determine the influence of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What influence does the cost of school uniform have on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government, Kaduna State?
2. Do transport fees influence students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State?

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were postulated for this study:

- H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the influence of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.
- H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the influence of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

**Methodology**

The study was conducted using survey research design. The target population of the study was made up of 53 principals, 820 teachers and 2,375 students from Kaduna South Local Government, Kaduna State. Using research advisor (2006), a sample size of 5 principals, 82 teachers and 238 students were sampled, making the total of 325 respondents, used in the study. The instrument named “Private Cost of Education and Student Participation Questionnaire (PCESPQ)” was used for data collection in the study. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha statistic and a reliability coefficient of 0.79 was obtained. The data gathered in the study was computerized into database using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0. The descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

**Response to Research Questions**

**Research Question 1:** What influence does the cost of school uniform have on students’ participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State?

Questionnaire was used to gather the opinions of principals, teachers and students in respect to research question one. The summary of analysis made on this research question is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Influence of the Cost of School Uniform on Students’ Participation in Public Secondary Schools in Kaduna South Local Government Area of Kaduna State

SN	Item	Respondents	Mean	SD
1.	The cost of school uniform hinders students’ participation in education.	Principals	3.292	1.095
		Teachers	3.378	1.026
		Students	2.840	1.150
2.	Students drop out of school to help in household work due to lack of money to purchase school uniform.	Principals	1.302	0.447
		Teachers	3.195	1.126
		Students	2.970	1.148
3.	School uniform is unnecessary expense to the students.	Principals	3.200	2.049
		Teachers	1.801	1.059
		Students	3.063	1.197
4.	The cost of school uniform in Kaduna State are sufficiently funded by non-governmental organisations.	Principals	2.209	0.894
		Teachers	2.689	0.983
		Students	3.176	1.068
5.	Parents buy uniform from a shop of their choice.	Principals	2.214	1.095
		Teachers	3.561	1.043
		Students	2.697	1.309
6.	School uniforms influence attendance of student in education.	Principals	2.431	0.891
		Teachers	3.426	1.018
		Students	2.718	1.318

7.	Uniforms are provided in school at a subsidised price.	Principals	1.200	0.447
		Teachers	2.902	1.243
		Students	2.424	1.256
8.	Without uniform students would still participate in education effectively.	Principals	3.610	1.303
		Teachers	3.024	1.216
		Students	3.548	1.227
9.	School uniform are overcharged making it unaffordable to some parents.	Principals	2.477	1.341
		Teachers	3.292	1.094
		Students	3.277	0.980
10.	School provides uniform at the prevailing market price.	Principals	1.811	1.303
		Teachers	3.341	1.091
		Students	3.243	0.971
			<b>2.81</b>	<b>1.11</b>

Table 1 showed that the cost of school uniform had no influence on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. The table presents the average response mean of 2.81 which is less than the rating mean of 3.0. The implication of this is that, without uniform, students would still participate in education effectively. This item on the table attracted the highest response mean of 3.610 for principals, 3.024 for the teachers and 3.548 for students with detail showing that 1 principal agreed, 1 stayed undecided against 2 that disagreed and 1 principal that strongly disagreed with this item. Likewise, 1 teacher strongly agreed, 41 agreed, against 16 that stayed undecided while 7 disagreed and 17 strongly disagreed. Also, 90 students strongly agreed, 35 agreed, while 2 stayed undecided and 54 disagreed, against 57 that strongly disagreed.

**Research Question 2:** What is the influence of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State?

Questionnaire was used to gather the opinions of principals, teachers and students in respect to research question two. The summary of analysis made on this research question is presented in table 2.

**Table 2:** Influence of Transport Fees on Student Participation in Public Secondary Schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State

SN	Item	Respondents	Mean	SD
1.	Students miss school due to lack of money to transport to school.	Principals	2.600	1.516
		Teachers	3.207	1.141
		Students	3.163	1.122
2.	Adequate means of transportation are provided in school to influence student participation.	Principals	3.000	1.414
		Teachers	3.317	1.226
		Students	3.483	0.970
3.	The cost of school transportation	Principals	3.205	1.095

	hinders students participation in education.	Teachers	3.158	1.138
		Students	2.916	1.250
4.	Students drop out of school due to lack of money to pay for bus maintenance fee.	Principals	3.625	1.643
		Teachers	3.743	1.322
		Students	3.895	1.151
5.	Kaduna State Government provided transportation for students which influenced their participation in education.	Principals	3.441	1.140
		Teachers	3.243	1.281
		Students	3.025	1.147
6.	Transport fees charged on students sometimes become an increased burden to parents already struggling to keep their children in schools.	Principals	3.600	0.547
		Teachers	3.414	0.928
		Students	3.731	1.250
7.	Most students drop out of school because they cannot trek several kilometres to and fro school.	Principals	4.006	0.894
		Teachers	4.231	0.103
		Students	3.953	1.068
8.	Students drop out of school for lack of payment of development fund.	Principals	3.255	1.095
		Teachers	3.341	1.008
		Students	3.273	1.045
9.	Transport fees is a major obstacle to students in participating in education.	Principals	2.810	0.894
		Teachers	3.451	0.931
		Students	3.113	1.086
10.	Most students in urban area of Kaduna South Local Government drop out of school due lack of money meant for transportation.	Principals	2.011	1.095
		Teachers	3.512	1.080
		Students	3.193	1.061
			<b>3.33</b>	<b>1.09</b>

Table 2 showed that transport fees influenced students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. The table presents the average response mean of 3.33 which is higher than the rating mean of 3.0. The implication of this is that, most students drop out of school because they cannot trek several kilometres to and fro school. This item on the table recorded the highest response mean of 4.006 for principals, 4.231 for the teachers and 3.953 for students with detail showing that all the 2 principals strongly agreed, 1 agreed, while 1 disagreed and 1 principal that strongly disagreed with this item. Likewise, 15 teachers strongly agreed, 38 agreed, against 25 that stayed undecided while 1 disagreed and 1 strongly disagreed. Also, 30 students strongly agreed, 98 agreed, while 60 disagreed and 50 strongly disagreed.

### Null Hypotheses Testing

The result of the hypotheses tested in this study using analysis of variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance.

**Null Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the impact of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

The opinions of principals, teachers and students were gathered and analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The summary of the hypothesis tested is presented in table 3:

**Table 3:** Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics on the influence of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government Area of Kaduna State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	4.862	2	2.431	1.844	2.61	.250
Within Groups	309.726	323	1.318			
Total	314.588	325				

Table 3 shows that the critical value (2.61) is higher than f-ratio value (1.844), while the probability level (.250) is higher than 0.05 level of significance at 323 degrees of freedom. This means that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the impact of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the influence of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area Kaduna State is retained.

**Null Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the influence of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government Area of Kaduna State.

The opinions of principals, teachers and students were gathered and analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The summary of the hypothesis tested is presented in table 4:

**Table 4:** Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics on the influence of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government Area of Kaduna State

Status	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	10.757	2	5.378	3.061	2.61	.003
Within Groups	412.962	323	1.757			
Total	423.718	325				

Table 4 shows that the critical value (2.61) is less than f-ratio value (3.061), while the probability level (.003) is less than 0.05 level of significance at 323 degrees of freedom. This means that there is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the impact of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the

influence of transport fees on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State is rejected.

### **Summary of Major Findings**

In view of the hypotheses tested in the study, the following findings were discovered:

- 1- The cost of school uniform influenced students' participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area Kaduna State.
- 2- Transport fees influence student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The first findings of the study established that the cost of school uniform had no impact on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. The implication of this is that, without uniform, students would still participate in education effectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis three which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the impact of uniform fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State was retained. This finding contradicts the finding of Kingori (2015) which revealed that school uniform contributes to students dropping out of school. Kingori also indicate that school uniform have influence on students participation in education in public secondary school.

Lastly, the study revealed that transportation fees had impact on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State. The implication of the finding is that, most students drop out of school because they cannot trek several kilometres to and fro school. Therefore, the null hypothesis four which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the impact of transport fees on student participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State was rejected. This finding corresponds with the finding of Mutegi (2015) which established that a child is less likely to enrol in a secondary school if the household expenditure on transportation is higher than the government expenditure. Thus, government education subsidies on transportation may be promoting enrolments and participation in secondary schools.

### **Conclusion**

Conclusion was made that school uniform have no influence on students' participation. Therefore, without uniform, students would still participate in education effectively. Lastly, most students drop out of school because they cannot trek several kilometres to and fro school. This denied them adequate participation in public secondary schools in Kaduna South Local Government area of Kaduna State.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations were made in the study:

- 1- Non-governmental organisations should partner with parent to subsidise the school uniform cost, doing this will enhance students participation in education.
- 2- More secondary schools should be built in the rural areas of Kaduna South Local Government, Kaduna State to reduce student trekking several kilometres before getting to school.

## References

- Chambers, J. G., Parrish, T. B., & Lam, I. (2002). *What are we spending on transportation services for students with disabilities, 1999–2000?* Palo Alto, CA.: Center for Special Education Finance.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2009). *National policy on education*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Education.
- Government of Kenya (2010). *Government Appropriator Bill 2010*. Nairobi, Kenya: Government Printers.
- Hallak, J. (2009). *The analysis of educational costs and expenditures*. Paris: UNESCO, IIEP.
- Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) (2007). Making public secondary school education affordable. *IPAR Policy View Issue, 3 Nairobi*. Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
- Jandhyala, J. B. G., & Varghese, N. V. (2003). Resources for education in India. *Occasional Paper No. 2* (New Delhi, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration) mimeo.
- Kingori, J. N. (2015). *Influence of hidden costs in education on students' participation in public secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub County, Kenya*. Unpublished research report for the award of master degree in educational planning in the school of education department of educational administration and planning, Nairobi University, Kenya.
- Levin, H. (1995). School Finance. In Carnoy, M. (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Economics of Education (IEE)*, pp 412-419. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonald, N. C., Brown, A. L., Marchetti, L. M., & Pedroso, M. S. (2011). U.S. school travel 2009: An assessment of trends. *Am. J. Prev. Med. 41*: 146–151.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2005). *Education for All in Kenya: National Handbook for 2000 and Beyond*. Nairobi: MOEST.
- Mutegi, R. G. (2005). *Factors affecting demand for secondary education in Central Division, Tharaka District*. Unpublished Masters Research Project, University of Nairobi.
- Mutegi, R. G. (2015). *Influence of unit cost of education on students enrolment rates in public secondary schools in Tharaka South Sub-county, Kenya*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Tsang, M. (1995). Private and Public Cost of Education in Developing Nations. In Carnoy, M. (Ed). *International Encyclopedia of Education (IEE)*. 2nd Eds, pp. 393-398. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations, Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2012). *World Conference on Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Veeraraghavan, J., & Jandhyala, B. G. T. (2003) Collection of statistics on costs of education, in particular private costs of education. *Paper presented in the Seminar on Experimental application of sampling methods to obtain statistics on education and to control their quality* (New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research & Training) mimeo.

World Bank (2004). *Education Sector Strategy update. Achieving Education for All Broadening our perspective, maximizing our effectiveness*. Washington D. C: World Bank.