

Parents' Voluntary Contributions to Primary Schools Which Are Not Directly Monetary

Hüseyin YOLCU*

Suggested Citation:

Yolcu, H. (2013). Parents' Voluntary Contributions to Primary Schools Which Are Not Directly Monetary. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 227-246.

Abstract

Problem statement: A significant decrease has been recently observed in the resources for education allocated from Turkey's public budget, despite the increasing number of teachers and students. It is possible to better observe this trend at the primary education stage, which is compulsory and free at public schools through law no 42 under the Constitution. Allocating fewer resources from the public budget for primary education has led to parents' contributing more to primary education financing. Moreover, parents' contributions to these schools are not limited to monetary contributions. Through various projects and regulations, parents are expected to contribute voluntarily and in an indirectly monetary way, such as helping with office work, working in measurement-assessment services, participating in school trips, etc.

Purpose of the study: This study aims to present the type of parents' voluntary, but not directly monetary, contributions to schools according to school administrators' views, and assess whether these contributions differ in sub dimensions of the scale and in other variables.

Method: The research is a survey model, and 443 public schools located in five central districts (Altındağ, Mamak, Keçiören, Yenimahalle, and Çankaya) within the borders of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality constitute the population of the research. The data in the study were obtained by using a scale of 26 items. This scale measures parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions to schools in three dimensions. Descriptive analyses, *t* test, and one-way variance analysis were used in data analysis.

* Assist. Prof. Dr. University of Kastamonu, Faculty of Education, Department of Education Sciences, Kastamonu/TURKEY e-mail:hyolcu@kastamonu.edu.tr

Results: The school administrators' opinions on parents' voluntary and indirectly monetary contribution to schools did not differ meaningfully in regards to age, gender, seniority level, position, or educational background in any of the dimensions in the scale. Furthermore, observed results differed in the SEL of the schools, such as where they are located and the number of students.

Discussion and conclusion: According to the findings of the research, parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions to school management, educational and social-cultural activities increase as the SEL of the area where the school is located changes from the lowest to the highest. Furthermore, while parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions to school management and instructional activities do not change meaningfully in relation to the student population, they differ meaningfully regarding their contributions to social-cultural activities in parallel to the student population.

Keywords: neo-liberal policies, primary education, volunteering, voluntary contribution

The Turkish economy experienced an economic crisis in the late 1970s because of high inflation, deficits in the balance of payments, lack of foreign currency, and overdue debts. Due to this, neo-liberal policies were put into practice which stipulated the diminishing of the state, liberalized the economy, and therefore led to an open economy by the IMF and the WB (Sezen, 1999). As a result of these policies, whereas a significant decrease has been observed in social expenditures since the 1980s, an increase has occurred in interest payments which seem to support the capital indirectly. Through this process, which is occurring as a solution to the process of depreciation of the capital, finding solutions to the capital crisis by eliminating the decrease in profitability with means of high yielding domestic debt was tried. When viewed within the context of public expenditure, an attempt at compensating for the cost of crisis was made by reducing the expenditure on service areas, the social sides of which were dominant so as to be defined as social expenses (Temelli, 2003). Education comprises one of the major areas of expenditure among social expenses. Neo-liberals predicate their stand on this issue upon the fact that public resources have become insufficient for the rapidly increasing demand on education: the system does not work efficiently, foreign debt has increased, and the previous age when everything was expected from the state has already ended (Eğitim Sen, 1998). The influence of these claims on the practices has appeared as a decrease in the amount of public resources allocated to education, as it may be estimated.

In parallel to the decrease in resources allocated for education from the public budget, a process has commenced that transfers the service of education from the public to local authorities, non-governmental organizations, families, and even to the personal responsibility of citizens. Therefore, large numbers of people have become

involved in the repair, maintenance, and equipment of all schools, to a certain extent. Its meaning in view of education is to eliminate the dependence on public resources for the service of education and to put social finance into effect instead, which is one of the private financial resources. Behram, Deolalikar & Soon (2002) stated that there are several ways in practice to apply social finance in education. Firstly, while the society allocates an area of land for school, constructs school buildings, and supplies equipment, the state employs educational personnel and pays their salaries. Secondly, whereas some parents and schools supply monetary contributions directly for for constructing, equipping, maintaining, and repairing school buildings, some are encouraged to supply voluntary contributions which are not directly monetary, such as providing tools and materials for the construction, equipment, maintenance, and repair of school buildings, and supplying teachers and students with food. Thirdly, parents—especially those living in rural areas—are expected to participate in some indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions such as the construction, maintenance, and repair of school buildings as a labor force, along with planting and harvesting the crops to be used in cooking at schools.

An attempt to increase **the public's participation in educational finance in Turkey** has been made since the early 1980s under different names and through comprehensive education campaigns and projects. The contribution of the public was 1,7% in 1982, 4,9% in 1985, 1,8% in 1990, 3% in 1995, %2,4 in 2000, and %4,1 in 2011 within the budget of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). In parallel to the **increase in the public's rate of participation in educational finance, the rate of investments** within the budget of MoNE has decreased significantly. For example, the rate of 15% in 1997 changed to 5,85 % in 2005. Moreover, 18% of 159,951 **classrooms constructed between 2003 and 2011 were constructed by citizens' contributions** (Writer, 2007; MNE, 2012). When the law no 42 under the Constitutional Law stipulating primary education to be compulsory and free at public schools is considered, it becomes possible to more clearly observe the situation articulated above. According to the research by the writer (2007), the expenditure rate on primary education in 1974-2003 decreased at the rate of 6,2 % within the MNE expenditure. The same is true for the investment expenditure on primary education. Despite the continuous increase in the student population in the stated period, a continuous decrease was observed, whereas an increase was supposed to occur at the **same rate. Özkan's (2008) research found that school repair and maintenance work is what school administrators expect the most contribution for, other than monetary aids and student affairs complying with the explanations above. Allocating fewer resources for primary education from public resources has led to parents' significant level of contribution to primary education in view of the educational finance. The studies conducted in the related literature show that parents contribute to the educational finance via giving money directly for course materials or making compulsory monetary contributions, besides management expenses such as repair, maintenance, and cleaning (Kavak, Ekinci & Gökçe, 1997; Öztürk, 2002; Akça, 2002; Süzüük, 2002; Sambal, 2005; Writer, 2007; Yamaç, 2010; Özdemir, 2011).**

Voluntary contributions to public schools in Turkey are not a new incident. It is known that parents have participated for a long time in activities to provide income, besides their voluntary supports such as buying course materials and books, donating, etc. For example, 42 primary schools and 12 secondary schools were constructed by citizens in 1973. Moreover, mukhtars, citizens, and other organizations have also contributed to primary schools by providing televisions, radios, cupboards, libraries, and books (Bircan, 1979). However, the difference of the practice of volunteerism is that it relies upon creating an organic bond among schools, parents, and a majority of the community in an increasing rate. This bond is fulfilled through WB and EU controlled projects and regulations that aim to make structural reforms in the whole education system. The first is Curriculum Laboratory Schools (CLS), put into practice as suggested by the Project of Supporting National Education, a WB Project. CLS are pilot study schools where education programs and new education, instruction, and administration approaches are experimented before generalizing, and where technological advances are reflected. The second may be exemplified through regulations on CLSs, Permanent Staff, Educational Regions, Total Quality Management, School-Parent Associations, School-Parent-Student Agreement, address based registry system, and Social Activities of Primary Educations and High Schools. They aim at supplying financial resources from the close neighborhood by adopting an administration approach of sharing and a collaborative school culture (Şahin, 2009). Thus, parents' voluntary monetary contributions to educational finance become prominent. Parents' voluntary contributions to schools to increase their children's academic successes are not restricted to only directly monetary contributions. Parents are encouraged to sacrifice more for their children by including them in all activities and work groups in the School Development Management Committee, as prescribed by the approach of TQM. Among these activities are the following: helping students as private tutors, helping with the office work, working in measurement-assessment services, and participating in school trips. Hence, schools' current problems are intended to be solved via solidarity among the related parts of the community.

In the literature, volunteerism is described as the spontaneous emergence of privatization. Volunteerism, as a frequently encountered method of privatization in practice, includes gathering people to work on a public kind of service without paying them (Köksal, 1993; Murphy, 1996; Murphy, Gilmer, Weise & Page, 1998). The rate of volunteerism practices in public services and programs was 1,1% in the USA in 1998 (The Florida School Boards Association & Florida Tax Watch). In the UK, it has become a sector for the last 30 years. The contribution of this sector to education is approximately £40 billion, and half of the population is estimated to work in voluntary activities (Bussell & Forbes, 2002). Volunteerism is given a significantly wide area of application in the Turkish education system.

The studies conducted in Turkey focus on revealing parents' monetary contributions to the educational finance (Kavak, et. al.,1999; Öztürk, 2002; Akça, 2002; Süzük, 2002; Sarıbal, 2005; Writer 2007; Yamaç, 2010; Özdemir, 2011). Nonetheless, parents' indirectly monetary yet voluntary contributions to schools should be revealed, too. The research completes the dimensions left incomplete by others in the

literature. Therefore, the research is expected to contribute to the literature within this direction. Moreover, as this issue has not been researched before, it will allow for shedding a light on future studies.

The purpose of this research is to reveal parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions to primary schools. Answers to the following were sought:

1. What are the school administrators' opinions on parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions regarding each item in the scale "Assessing parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions to primary schools"?
2. Do school administrators' opinions on parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions differ in the sub-dimensions of "school management", "instructional activities", and "social-cultural activities"?
3. Do school administrators' opinions on parents' non-monetary but voluntary contributions differ in regards to their age, seniority level, duty, educational background, SEL of the area where the school they work at is located, and student population?

Method

Since this research described the existing occasion as it is, a survey model approach was adopted.

Sample

The research population is comprised of 443 public schools located in five central districts of Ankara (Altındağ, Mamak, Keçiören, Yenimahalle and Çankaya) within the borders of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality. Thus, rather than gathering samples, the entire population was preferred. The data gathering tool was applied to 330 schools (74,4%) of those in the research; therefore, the research population became a sample.

Of 330 school administrators participating in the research, 2,7 % were 21-30 years old; 30,6% were 31-40, 42,4% were 41-50, and 24,2% were 51 years old and over. 16,7% of them were female, while 83,3% were male administrators. When the distribution ratio of their duties are viewed, 30% were school principals, 10,9% were head assistant principals, and 58,8% were assistant principals. Of all the participants, 12,1% had associate degrees, 72,7% had undergraduate degrees, and 15,2% had graduate degrees. Moreover, 53,6% were classroom teachers and 46,4% were branch teachers. 10,3% had 1-10 years of experience, 37,3% had 11-20 years of experience, 30,9% had 21-30 years of experience, and 21,5% had 31 years of experience or more. The SEL in 32,4% of the schools was low, while it was medium in 61,2% and high in 6,4% of the schools. 12% of these schools had 500 students or less, the population in 35,8% of them was 501-1000, the population in 27% of the schools was 1001-1500, the population in 18,2% of the schools was 1501-1200, and 7% of the schools was 2001 or more students.

Development and Implementation of the Data Collection Tool

Firstly, the related literature was searched while developing the data gathering tool. Moreover, interviews were held with the school administrators and teachers. Through these interviews, the intention was to gather information on parents' voluntary contributions to schools which are not directly monetary. 45 items in total were created regarding parents' voluntary contributions which are not directly monetary. The scale designed as a draft was presented to 15 field experts for opinions and suggestions. Under the direction of the specialists' opinions and suggestions, the number of items was reduced to 35. The scale was prepared as a 5-point Likert scale: (1) never, (2) slightly, (3) moderate, (4) much, (5) absolutely.

In order to determine the validity and the reliability of the scale, factor analysis and reliability analysis were carried out. Kaiser–Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficients and Barlett's tests were examined prior to the factor analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2004; Balcı, 1995). The value from the KMO test was 0,94, and the value from the Barlett's Test was $\chi^2 = 6,073$ $p < 0,000$. The values from both tests were found to be significant. The principal components factor analysis was then applied so as to determine the factor structure of the scale.

In this analysis, done by 6-factor and Varimax rotation method, factor loads were examined. The items whose factor load values were under .30, the items which were found to be in more than one factor, and the items in which the difference between the factor loads were less than .10 were omitted from the scale. By using a Screen Plot graph, the scale was determined to be formed in a 3-factor structure (Büyüköztürk, 2004). Following the analysis, the scale was composed of 26 items and 3 factors covering these items. 9 items that were incompatible with the criteria were omitted from the scale.

When designating the sub-dimensions of the scale— (1) School Management, (2) Instructional Activities, and (3) Social–Cultural Activities— similar studies in the related field were examined and utilized (Kebece 2006; Polat, 2007; Özkan, 2008; Şahin, 2009). 9 of the remaining 26 items of the scale were taken under the sub-dimension of "school management"; 8 of them were taken under the sub-dimension of "instructional activities"; and 8 of them were taken under the sub-dimension of "Social–Cultural Activities".

The reliability results obtained after carrying out the structural validity of the scale are as follows: The "school management subscale" consists of 9 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 19), the factor load of these items range from .61 and .74, and the total correlations range from .50 and .72. The total variance which the school management explains is 51%, and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient is .86. 8 items in total (9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 26) are included in the "instructional activities" subscale. Factor loads of these items range from .61 and .75, whereas their total correlations range from .62 and .82. The total variance explained by the instructional activities subscale is 53%, and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient is .87. There are 9 items (10, 12, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25) in the "socio-cultural activities subscale". The factor load values of the mentioned subscale range from .61 and .75, and item total

load values range from .41 and .59. The total variance which the socio-cultural activities subscale explains is 53%, and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient is .90.

Data Analyses

Besides descriptive statistics such as arithmetic average, standard deviation, percentage, and frequency, a *t* test, one-way variance analysis was used first in analyzing the data. Whether parametric test hypotheses were implemented was checked via homogeneity of variances test. As a result of the one-way ANOVA test, **Tamhane's T2 test was applied to find the reason for the difference if the variances were not equal; if the variances were equal, a Tukey HSD test was used, one of the multiple comparative tests. In all meaningfulness tests, alpha value $\alpha=.05$ was considered the meaningfulness level.**

Findings

The distribution of school administrators' opinions on parents' voluntary contributions to schools which are not directly monetary, according to each item, are given in Table 1.

Table 1.

The Distribution of School Administrators' Opinions on Parents' Voluntary Contributions to Schools Which are Not Directly Monetary, According to Each Item in the Scale

Order No	Item	N	M	SD
1.	Providing materials for the physical maintenance and repair of school	330	1,42	0,77
2.	Helping in transporting the materials provided for the physical maintenance and repair of school	330	1,42	0,72
3.	Doing physical maintenance and school repair work such as plumbing, electricity, and painting	330	1,46	0,76
24.	Helping on Teachers' Day by cooking pastries (cakes, cookies, etc.)	330	2,72	1,02
25.	Working on special occasions such as charity sales, tea parties, graduation parties, etc.	330	2,85	1,12
26.	Working at student clubs	330	2,90	1,15

Table 1 shows the items in which school administrators participated at the highest level regarding parents' voluntary contributions to schools, excluding directly monetary contributions: "Working at school clubs ($M=2,90$)", "Working on special occasions such as charity sales, etc. ($M=2,85$)", and "Helping on Teachers' Day by cooking pastries ($M=2,74$)". The qualitative correspondents of school administrators' opinions on these three items are at the "moderately" level.

The items with the lowest average points are as follows, with the average score ($M=1,42$): "Providing materials for the school's physical maintenance and repair such as surrounding walls, plumbing, etc.", and "Helping in transporting the materials provided for the physical maintenance and repair of the school such as surrounding walls, etc.". These items are followed, respectively, by "Doing physical maintenance and school repair work such as plumbing, electricity, and painting ($M=1,46$)". The qualitative correspondent of school administrators' opinions on three items are at "never" level.

The data on school administrators' agreement levels on parents' voluntary contributions to schools which are not directly monetary, according to dimensions, are given in Table 2.

Table 2.

The Distribution of School Administrators' Opinions on Parents' Voluntary Contributions to Schools Which are not Directly Monetary, According to the Dimensions in the Scale

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
School management	330	1,82	0,61
Instructional activities	330	1,66	0,60
Social – cultural activities	330	2,39	0,72

Table 2 shows the dimension in which, according to school administrators, parents' indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions to schools are at the highest level: "social-cultural activities ($M=2,39$)". The qualitative correspondent of school administrators' opinions on this dimension is "moderately". It is followed, respectively, by "school management ($M=1,82$)" and "instructional activities ($M=1,66$)". While the qualitative correspondent of school administrators' opinions on the former is "slightly", it is "never" for the next dimension.

According to the results of the t-test and one-way variance analysis, school administrators' opinions on parents' contribution to schools did not differ in relation to their age, gender, seniority level, position, or educational background in any of the dimensions. Furthermore, observed results differed in the SEL and population of schools.

The results of One-way ANOVA regarding the school administrators' opinions on parents' voluntary contributions to the school which are not directly monetary are given in Table 3, according to the SEL of the neighborhood.

Table 3.

The Results of One-way ANOVA Regarding the School Administrators' Opinions on Parents' Voluntary Contributions to the School Which Are Not Directly Monetary, According to the SEL

Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
School Management	Among groups	7,403	2	3,70	10,17	.000
	Within groups	119,00	327	.36		
	Total	126,41	329			
Instructional activities	Among groups	7,58	2	3,79	10,83	.000
	Within groups	113,70	325	.350		
	Total	121,29	327			
Socio-cultural activities	Among groups	741,44	2	370,72	7,402	.001
	Within groups	16378,36	327	50,08		
	Total	17119,806	329			

Table 3 shows that the school administrators' opinions on parents' voluntary contributions which are not directly monetary differed meaningfully in the SEL of the neighborhood in the dimensions of "school management" [$F_{(2-327)} = 10.17, p < .05$], "instructional activities" [$F_{(2-325)} = 10.83, p < .05$], and "social-cultural activities" [$F_{(2-327)} = 10.83, p < .05$]. The school administrators' opinions on parents' indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions to schools differed meaningfully in the SEL of the neighborhood.

The school administrators' opinions differed meaningfully in the SEL of the neighborhood in the dimension of "school management" [$F_{(2-327)} = 10.17, p < .05$]. A Tamhane test was applied to detect from which groups the difference among groups resulted from. Considering these results, when the parents from schools at high ($M = 2,16$) and medium ($M = 1,89$) SEL are compared with those at low SEL ($M = 134,09$), it is understood that they contribute voluntarily, but not directly financially, more than others in the school management dimension.

The school administrators' opinions on parents' indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions to schools differed meaningfully in the SEL in the dimension of "instructional activities" [$F_{(2-325)} = 10.83, p < .05$]. As a result of the Tamhane test, which was applied to find out the resource of this difference, it was detected that parents from schools located at high ($M=2,10$) and medium ($M=1,71$) SEL provided more voluntary contributions that are indirectly monetary than those at low ($M=1,49$) SEL in the dimension of instructional activities.

The school administrators' opinions differed meaningfully in the SEL in the dimension of "social-cultural activities" [$F_{(2-327)} = 10.83, p < .05$]. A Tukey HSD test was applied to detect from which groups the difference among groups resulted from. Consequently, it was detected that parents from schools located at high ($M=28,52$) and medium ($M=24,35$) SEL provided more voluntary contributions that are indirectly monetary than those at low ($M=22,36$) SEL in the dimension of social-cultural activities.

The results of One-way Variance Analysis regarding the school administrators' opinions on parents' indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions are given in Table 4.

Table 4.

The Results of One-Way ANOVA Regarding the School Administrators' Opinions on Parents' Non-monetary Voluntary Contributions to the Primary Schools, according to the Schools' Population

Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Social-cultural activities	Among groups	709,51	3	236,50	4,69	.003
	Within groups	16410,294	326	50,33		
	Total	17119,806	329			

Table 4 shows that the school administrators' opinions on parents' non-monetary voluntary contributions to the primary schools according to the school population differ significantly in the "social-cultural activities" sub-dimension of the scale [$F_{(3-326)}=4.69, p < .05$], whereas for the other sub-dimensions of the scale, the school administrators' opinions do not differ significantly.

A Tukey HSD test was applied to detect from which groups the difference among groups resulted from. According to this test, parents from schools with 1501-2000 students ($M=26,08$) provided more voluntary contributions that not directly monetary than those from schools with 1001-1500 students ($M=23,23$) and 0-500 ($M=21,27$) in the dimension of social-cultural activities.

Discussion and Conclusion

Of all voluntary but indirectly monetary contributions, those with the highest average points depending on the school administrators' views are "working at student clubs", "working for school charity sales, etc.", and "cooking pastries for Teachers' Day". Parents' making more voluntary contributions that are not directly monetary to the item "working at student clubs" may be explained with the "Regulations of MoNE on the Institutions of Primary and Secondary Education" (MoNE, 2008). The activities within the direction of the related regulation may be conducted within the scope of student clubs and community service by benefiting from the opportunities in and out of school. Voluntary parents can help and guide students' participation in social activities, together with classroom/branch teachers. Parents' increased voluntary contributions to items other than this may result from their being voluntary contributions provided for a long period of time.

The items with the lowest average points are the following: "providing materials for the physical maintenance and repair of school such as surrounding walls, etc. ", "helping in transporting the materials provided for physical maintenance and repair of the school such as surrounding walls, etc.", "doing physical maintenance and repair works of the school such as plumbing, electricity, and painting", and "helping in repairing tools and materials at school". The reasons for parents' voluntary and indirectly monetary contributions to the items at the lowest level is that supplying and transporting them to school would result in some certain level of expenses and require a certain amount of time to be spent besides the necessity of professional knowledge and expertise to deal with these issues. When this finding is handled along with of Writer's (2007) and Özkan's (2008) findings, it appears to be far from meeting school administrators' expectations on this issue.

According to school administrators, the dimension with the highest average score is the dimension of "social-cultural activities". Its reason may be explained by parents being more inclined to contribute voluntarily but not directly monetarily to social-cultural activities. It may be seen in parents' efforts in preparing their children for ceremonies such as the Republic Day and April 23rd National Sovereignty and Children's Day. Especially at schools with low SEL, providing directly monetary contributions to school causes trouble, and in cases when the teacher appears to be unskillful in this issue, (s)he supplies contributions from parents in teaching folk dances to children. Similarly, Kebeci (2006) suggested that 68,4% of parents contributed to social-cultural activities, and 30,7% of them express that they did not demand this support. According to school administrators, the dimension with the lowest average score is the dimension of "instructional activities". This may result from the fact that the activities included in this dimension require pedagogical formation, experience, and communicative and persuasive skills.

The school administrators' opinions differ meaningfully in the dimensions of school management, instructional activities, and social-cultural activities, and the SEL of the area. This mentioned difference is between the schools at medium SEL and lower SEL, and also between the school at higher SEL and lower SEL in the

school management dimension in the scale. Parents from schools at medium SEL make more voluntary but not directly monetary contributions to the school management than those at lower and higher SEL. This fact may result from parents' expectations from education and the importance they place on their students' education. Şahin (1999) observed parents making voluntary but not directly monetary contributions by dealing with repair works and painting schools, depending on their professions. Kebeci (2006) suggested that 53% cooperate with the school administration to keep schools clean and hygienic, 20% provide support, which is not enough, and 26,4% do not contribute at all. Bray (1999) states that in rural Cambodia, parents are expected to contribute as a work force, besides supplying necessary materials for school maintenance and repair. Therefore, it was viewed that while some parents work at school construction, some contribute by supplying construction materials or equipment. Families in the Kampong Cham state in the rural areas contribute by giving rice. It was observed that some contribute to schools voluntarily but not directly financially by supplying construction materials such as sand, cement, and bricks; some provide equipment for schools in the same state. Some families even repair fences and mow the grass, as well. Despite variations depending on the country, in Nepal, Bangladesh, Uganda, Sri Lanka and Kenya, families make voluntary contributions to schools which are not directly monetary, such as maintaining and repairing school buildings, cleaning, and supplying construction, cleaning materials, and cereals (Boyle, Brock, Mace and Sibbons, 2002).

The difference among groups in the instructional activities dimension in the scale is between schools at higher and lower SEL, and also between those at medium and lower SEL. Thus, parents from schools at higher SEL make more voluntary but not directly monetary contributions to instructional activities than those at lower and medium SEL. This may result from parents' expectations that their children receive a more qualified education by providing voluntary but not directly monetary contributions to instructional activities at schools. This finding complies with those of Şahin's (1999).

The findings on the management expenditure and instructional activities comply with the findings of other studies in the literature on parents' monetary contributions to schools. These direct expenditures are the financial contributions parents must make under different names. These include painting, cupboards, boards, photocopy and stationery costs, fees for school-parents associations, resource books, registration costs, computers, cinema and theatre costs, and costs regarding school management, educational, and social-cultural activities. (Kavak, et al., 1997; Öztürk, 2002; Akça, 2002; Süzük, 2002; Sarıbal, 2005; Writer, 2007; Yamaç, 2010; Özdemir, 2011). A research by the Turkish Statistical Institute (2006) shows parents' contributions to primary schools constituted 13% of the household expenditure on education.

Writer's (2007) and Özdemir's (2011) studies the increase of parents' directly monetary contributions to primary schools depending on the SEL. For example, Özdemir (2011) stated that when schools' budgets are compared, schools' budgets with the highest SEL are four times as big as those with the lowest SEL, and twice as

big as those with medium SEL. Thus, schools with the highest SEL supply more financial resources. It is also confirmed with the fact that schools with the highest SEL search less for out of budget resources than those with medium and lowest SEL **in the writer's (2007) related study**. All these factors force parents to choose whether to contribute to educational expenses and whether to receive more qualified education. Thus, contributing to educational expenses cause injustice to the detriment of students in poor families, rather than the wealthy (Polat, 2007). Therefore, contributing to educational expenses preclude poor people from benefiting from education equally or in similar qualities.

In the social-cultural activities dimension, parents from schools at higher SEL make more non-monetary but voluntary contributions to social-cultural activities than those at medium and lower SEL. There may be several causes for these results. Firstly, activities involving indirectly monetary but voluntary contribution are included more often at schools with the highest SEL, and parents show interest in them. Şahin (1999) suggested that parents generally contribute by watching the national ceremonies and celebrations at school, participating in activities such as tea parties, charity sales, etc. Furthermore, it was observed that parents' interest in schools increases as the schools' SEL increase. Secondly, this may result from the efforts of encouraging parents to sacrifice more for their children by including them in all activities and work groups within the SDMC, as prescribed by the TOM approach. For instance, an SDMC representative's duty is to take a role in and organize activities to develop the collaboration of schools with its neighborhood and parents, to contribute to improve the school's physical resources, and to organize school publicity activities. The third may be the students' success. Parents who participate in and support the school activities are significant for students' success. Parents' roles may differ, ranging from direct participation in educational, social, and cultural activities at school to being the audience. Parents, herein, are expected to be in contact with school administration and take roles in school activities in parallel to their strength (Gümüşeli, 2004). Kebeci (2006) expressed that whereas 2/3 of the families support social and cultural activities at school, 1/3 do not support them at all.

The school administrators' opinions differ meaningfully in the social-cultural activities dimension depending on the school population regarding parents' voluntary and indirectly monetary contributions to schools. Thus, parents from schools with 2001 students make more not directly monetary but voluntary contributions to social-cultural activities than those with 0-500 students; parents from schools with 501-1000 students contribute more than those with 0-500 students; parents from schools with 1501-2000 students contribute more than those with 0-500 students; parents from schools with 1501-2000 students contribute more than those with 501-1000 students; parents from schools with 1501-2000 students contribute more than those with 1001-1500 students; and parents from schools with 1501-2000 students contribute more than those with 1001-1500 students. This may result from the differentiation in parents' profiles in parallel to the increase in student population.

Parents' not directly monetary but voluntary contributions to schools could be said to increase as SEL increases. Whereas this leads to parents at the highest SEL to exploit schools according to their expectations, it also results in discrimination against students from lowest SEL. This serves to reproduce social inequalities as well as differentiation in educational acquisitions.

Several suggestions may be made regarding future research based upon the findings and results of this research. Firstly, research presenting the monetary values of parents' voluntary contributions to schools that are not directly monetary should be conducted. Secondly, the methods and techniques school administrators and teachers employ to provide parents' indirectly monetary but voluntary contributions should be identified, and the difficulties experienced at this stage should be revealed. Thirdly, a research study dealing critically with parents' roles in school life should be made.

References

- Akça, Ş. (2002). *Ailelerin İlköğretim Kademesine Yaptıkları Eğitim Harcamaları* (Ankara İli Örneği)[The Educational expences of the families on primary education]. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Balcı, A. (1995). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma* [Research in Social Sceinces]. 72 TDFO Bilgisayar, Ankara Yayın. L.T.D.
- Behrman, R. J., Deolalikar, B. A., & Soon, L. (2002). *Conceptual issues in the role of education decentralization in promoting efecttive schooling in Asian developing countries*. Asian Development Bank: ERD Working Paper Series No. 22.
- Bircan, İ. (1979). *Planlı dönemde temel eğitim ve ekonomik göstergeler* [Basic education and economic indicators in planned period]. Unpublished master thesis by non-career. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı.
- Boyle, S., Brock, A., Mace, J., & Sibbons, M. (2002). *Reaching the poor 'costs' of sending children to school a six country comparative study*. Published by Department for International Development.
- Bray, M. (1999). *Household and community financing of primary education in Combodia*. Published by International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Bussell, H. & Forbes, D. (2002). *Understanding the volunteer market: The what, where, who and why of volunteering*. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 7 (3), 244-257.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* [The date analysis handbook for social sceinces]. PEGEM Yayıncılık, .Ankara.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2004). *Ailenin katılım ve desteğinin öğrenci başarısına etkisi* [The Effect of Parents Involvement and Support to Student Achievement]. Özel Okullar Birliği Bülteni, 2 (6), 14-17.

- Eğitim Sen (1998). *Demokratik eğitim kurultayı* (2-6 Şubat 1998) [Democratic education conference (2-6 February 1998)] Ankara: Eğitim Sen Yayınları.
- Kavak, Y., Ekinci, E. & Gökçe, F. (1997). *İlköğretimde kaynak arayışları* [The fund researching in primary education]. Ankara: Şafak Matbaacılık.
- Kebece, S. (2006). *Okul- Aile Birliğinin Okul Performansı Üzerindeki Etkisi* [The Role of Parent Teacher Association on School Performance]. Unpublished master thesis. Marmar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Köksal, T. (1993). *Belediye hizmetlerinin özelleştirilmesi: yöntemler ve uygulamalar* [The privatization of municipality service: Methods and applications]. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Yayınları.
- Ministry of National Education (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı) (2008). *İlköğretim ve orta öğretim kurumları sosyal etkinlikler yönetmeliği* [Primary and secondary education institutions social activities regulations]. Resmi Gazete. Sayı: 25699 (Mükerrer). 13.1.2005. Ek ve Değişiklikler: 2.3.2008/26804.
- Ministry of National Education (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı) (2012). *Milli eğitim istatistikleri: örgün eğitim* [National education statistic: Formal education] Ankara: Strateji Dairesi Başkanlığı Yayını.
- Murphy, J. (1996). *Why privatization signals a sea change in schooling. Education Leadership*. 54 (2), 60-62.
- Murphy, J., Gilmer, W. S., Weise, R. & Page, A. (1998). *Patways to privatization in education. London: Ablex Publishing Corporation.*
- Özdemir, N. (2011). *İlköğretim finansmanında bir araç: okul aile birliği bütçe analizi* (Ankara ili örneği) [A Tool for Primary Education Financing: Analysis of Parent Teacher Association's Budget (Example of Ankara)]. Unpublished master thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Özkan, O. (2008). *İlköğretim Okullarının Yönetimde Velilerin Katkısı: Zonguldak İli Örneği*. [Parents' helps in management of primary school: Zonguldak Province Case]. Unpublished master thesis, Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Zonguldak.
- Öztürk, S. (2002). *İlköğretim okullarının finansman kaynakları* (Ankara ili polatlı ilçesi örneği) [Financial sources of primary schools (The case of Ankara city Polatlı provience). Unpublished master thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Polat S. (2007). *Eğitim Politikalarının Sosyal Adalet Açısından Sonuçları Konusunda Yönetici ve Öğretmen Görüşleri* [Educational policies social justice in terms of results about view of administrator and teachers]. Unpublished doctorate thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

- Sarıbal A. Y. (2005). *İlköğretim okullarının finansman ihtiyaçlarını karşılama düzeyleri (Van ili örneği)* [The level of meeting the financial needs of primary schools, Van Province Case]. Unpublished master thesis, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Van.
- Sezen, S. (1999). *Devletçilikten Özelleştirmeye Türkiye'de Planlama*. [The planning in Turkey from statism to privatization] Ankara: TODAİE Yayın NO:293.
- Süzük, İ. (2002). *İlköğretim okul harcamalarında genel bütçe dışındaki kaynakların yerine ilişkin okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri (Ankara ili örneği)* [Opinions of the teachers and directors on expenditure of primary schools is out of general budget (Ankara case study)]. Unpublished master thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Şahin, İ. (2009). *İlköğretim Müfredat Laboratuvar Okullarının Okul Geliştirme Süreci Açısından İncelenmesi* [A Study of Curriculum Laboratory Schools in Terms of School Improvement]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- The Florida School Boards Association and Florida Tax Watch (1998). *Research Report: A Study of Non Instructional Services: A Study of Non-Instructional Services: Contracting for Services/Competition Options Available to Florida's Public Schools*
- Temelli, S. (2003). Türkiye'de sosyal harcamaların gelişimi [Development of Social Expenditure in Turkey]. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi*, 1 (4),34-45.
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (Turkey Statistic Institution) (2006). *Türkiye eğitim harcamaları araştırması 2002* [Turkey education expenditures researcher]. Ankara: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası
- Yamaç, U. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarının finansman kaynakları* [Financial resources of primary schools]. Unpublished master thesis, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Writer (2007).

Ailelerin İlköğretim Okullarına Doğrudan Parasal Olmayan Gönüllü Katkıları

Atıf:

Yolcu, H. (2013). Parents' Voluntary Contributions to Primary Schools Which Are Not Directly Monetary. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 227-246.

(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Türkiye'de son yıllarda, kamu bütçesinden eğitime ayrılan kaynak miktarındaki azalmaya paralel olarak, eğitim hizmetinin sunumunun kamudan yerel birimlere, sivil toplum örgütlerine, aileler ve hatta bireylerin kendi sorumluluklarına indirildiği bir süreç başlatılmıştır. Böylelikle toplumun geniş bir kesiminin okulların bakım, onarım ve donanımına kadar belli etkinler içinde yer almalarının önü açılmıştır. Bunun eğitim finansmanı açısından anlamı, eğitim hizmetinin sunumunda kamu kaynaklarına duyulan bağımlılığı ortadan kaldırmak ve bunun yerine özel finansman kaynaklarından biri olan toplum finansmanını uygulamaya koymaktır. Behram, Deolalikar & Soon (2002), toplum finansmanının uygulamaya yansımalarının birkaç biçimde olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bunlardan ilki toplumun okulların arsasını tahsis etmesi, binasını yaptırması ve donanımını üstlenmesi gibi sermaye giderlerini karşılarken, devletin ise, yalnızca, eğitim görevlilerini ataması ve onların maaşlarını ödemesidir. İkincisi ailelerin ve toplumun bir kısmının okul binasının yapımı, donatımı ile bakım ve onarımı için doğrudan parasal katkı sağlarken, bir kısmının da okul binasının yapımı, donatımı, bakım ve onarımı için malzeme temin etme, öğretmen ve öğrencilere yiyecek sağlama gibi gönüllü katkılar sunmaya teşvik edilmesidir. Üçüncüsü ise, ailelerin okul binasının yapımı, bakım ve onarımında işgücü olarak yer almalarının yanı sıra okulda yemek yapımında kullanılacak mahsullerin ekim ve hasadında çalışma gibi parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarda bulunmasıdır.

Türkiye'de halkın eğitim finansmanına katılımında 1980'li yılların başından günümüze kadar geçen sürede kayda değer bir artış gözlenmektedir. Halkın eğitim finansmanı katılım oranındaki artışa paralel olarak, MEB bütçesi içerisindeki yatırım harcamalarının oranı kayda değer biçimde azalmıştır. Örneğin 1997'de % 15 olan bu oran 2005'te % 5,85'e kadar düşmüştür. Bu söylenenler biraz daha somutlaştırılmak istenilirse, 2003-2011 yılları arasında yapılan 159.951 dersliğin % 18'i halk katkılarıyla yapılmıştır (Yazar, 2007; MEB, 2012). Bunu, Anayasanın 42. maddesinde zorunlu ve devlet okullarında parasız olduğu dile getirilen ilköğretim düzeyinde daha somut olarak görmek mümkündür. İlköğretime kamu kaynaklarından daha az kaynak ayrılması beraberinde, bu öğretim düzeyinde, ailelerin belirgin biçimde eğitimin finansmanına katılmalarına yol açmıştır. İlgili alanyazında yapılan araştırmalar, ailelerin ilköğretim okullarının bakım ve onarım temizlik gibi işletme maliyetlerinin

yanı sıra ders araç ve gereçleri için doğrudan para verme ya da zorunlu bağış yapma gibi yollarla bu okulların finansmanına katıldıklarını göstermektedir (Kavak, Ekinci & Gökçe, 1997; Öztürk, 2002; Akça, 2002; Süzük, 2002; Sarıbal, 2005; Yazar, 2007; Yamaç, 2010; Özdemir, 2011). Ailelerin bu okullara katkıları doğrudan parasal katkılarla sınırlı değildir. Bunun yanı sıra, ailelerin çeşitli projeler ve yasal düzenlemelerle, okulların büro hizmetlerine yardımcı olması, ölçme ve değerlendirme hizmetlerinde çalışması ve okulda yapılacak gezilere eşlik etmesi vb. doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarda bulunmaları da beklenmektedir. Böylelikle, okulların var olan sorunlarının toplumun ilgili kesimleri arasında gönüllülüğe dayalı bir dayanışma örneği sergilenerek çözümlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. İlgili alanyazında gönüllük, özelleştirmenin kendiliğinden ortaya çıkış biçimi olarak nitelendirilmektedir. Amerika'da kamu hizmet ve programlarındaki gönüllülük uygulamalarının oranı 1998'de yılında % 1,1'dir (The Florida School Boards Association & Florida Tax Watch). Dahası, gönüllülük uygulamaları Birleşik Krallık'ta ise, son 30 yıldan buyana, bir sektör konumuna gelmiştir. Bu sektörün ekonomiye katkısı yaklaşık 40 milyar £ olup ülke nüfusunun yarısının gönüllü etkinliklerde görev aldığı tahmin edilmektedir (Bussell & Forbes, 2002).

Türkiye'de son yıllarda ilköğretimin finansmanına ilişkin yapılan araştırmaların, ailelerin ilköğretim okullarına yapmış oldukları parasal katkılar üzerinde yoğunlaştıkları gözlenmektedir (Kavak at al., 1997; Öztürk, 2002; Akça, 2002; Süzük, 2002; Sarıbal, 2005; Yazar, 2007; Yamaç, 2010; Özdemir, 2011). Oysa ailelerin okullara yaptığı doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarının da ortaya konulması gerekmektedir. Bu nedenle araştırma ilgili alanyazında yapılan diğer araştırmaların eksik bıraktığı bir boyutu tamamlar niteliktedir. Dolayısıyla, araştırmanın ilgili alanyazına bu yönde bir katkı yapması beklenmektedir. Ayrıca araştırmanın konuyla ilgili yapılan ilk araştırma olması nedeniyle, bundan sonraki yapılan araştırmalara da ışık tutacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Okul yöneticilerinin görüşlerine göre, ailelerin okullara hangi tür doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarda buldukları ve bu katkıların ölçeğin alt boyutları ve çeşitli değişkenler bakımından farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını ortaya koymaktır.

Yöntem

Araştırma tarama modelinde olup çalışma evreni Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi sınırları içerisindeki beş büyük merkez ilçede (Altındağ, Mamak, Keçiören, Yenimahalle ve Çankaya) bulunan 443 kamu ilköğretim okulundan oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın verileri, ailelerin ilköğretim okullarına doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarını üç boyutta ölçen ve 26 maddeden oluşan bir ölçek kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler, t testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları

Ailelerin doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarına ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri, ölçeğin hiçbir boyutunda; yaş, cinsiyet, kıdem, görev, mezuniyet durumu

bakımından anlamlı bir farklılık göstermemektedir. Bunun dışında okulların içinde bulunduğu çevrenin SED'i (Sosyo-Ekonomik Düzey) ve okulların öğrenci sayısına göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği gözlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın Sonuç ve Önerileri

Araştırmada alt SED'den üst SED'de doğru gittikçe ailelerin okullara yapmış oldukları doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkılarının artmış olduğu gözlenmiştir. Bu durum üst SED'de bulunan ailelerin kendi beklentileri doğrultusunda, bir anlamda, okulları dönüştürmenin/sömürgeleştirmenin yolunu açarken, alt SED'den gelen ailelerin çocuklarının ise ayrımcılığa uğramasına neden olmaktadır. Bütün bunlar, eğitim yoluyla elde edilen kazanımlardaki farklılaşmayı beraberinde getirmenin yanı sıra toplumsal eşitsizliklerin de yeniden üretilmesine yol açmaktadır.

Araştırmada elde edilen bulgu ve sonuçlara dayalı olarak ileride yapılacak olan araştırmalara ilişkin birkaç öneride bulunulabilir. Bunlardan ilki, ailelerin okullara yapmış oldukları doğrudan parasal olmayan gönüllü katkıların parasal değerini ortaya koyan bir araştırma yapılması gerektiğidir. İkincisi, okul yöneticilerinin, öğretmenlerin ailelerin doğrudan parasal olmayan katkılarını sağlamada başvurdukları yöntem ve stratejiler ile bu süreçte karşı karşıya kaldıkları güçlüklerin ortaya konulmasıdır. Üçüncüsü de ailelerin okul yaşamındaki yerini sorgulayan bir çalışmanın yapılmasıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Neo-liberal politikalar, ilköğretim, gönüllülük, gönüllü katkı

