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Higher education benefits both the individual recipient and the state. It equips the individual with skills, knowledge, abilities and capabilities which are necessary for raising one's productivity and income levels. Higher education also benefits the state by contributing to the development of human resources and to the high rate of economic growth and standard of living that the society enjoys. Higher education further plays a role in eliminating poverty, reducing crime rate and ensuring national security. In the light of this, the government assumes responsibility for the provision of school services at the tertiary level and bears a greater contribution of the financing. But individuals also gain from tertiary education and probably, may be required to bear part of the cost of providing tertiary education.

Though all the stakeholders seem to agree on the principle that the cost of providing tertiary education in the country must be shared, they appear to have varying views regarding the approach. Due to the low level of income and sharp income disparity, many of the people feel that the policy might not favour them. The fear is expressed that this may lead to the creation of a class society with its attendant political and economic consequences.

All the stakeholders of tertiary education in the Central and Ashanti Regions were considered to be the population for the study. Precisely 60 tertiary students, 30 tax-payers and 20 employers from these two regions were randomly chosen as the
population sample for the study. Questionnaire and interview guide were the instruments used in the study. The data collected were analysed using percentages.

The key findings of the study include the observation that the majority of the stakeholders are in favour of the policy of cost-sharing but do not accept the notion that such a policy is favourable to all of them. The study further reveals that most stakeholders think that some students and parents may not be able to pay their quota of cost of higher education. As a result, the fear among the stakeholders is the Policy of Cost-Sharing may discourage poor potential students from pursuing tertiary education.

A number of possible alternative sources for mobilizing additional funding for the provision of tertiary education in the country have been recommended. These include:

a. The private sector teaming up with the tertiary institutions to establish research oriented departments so that the business organizations can sponsor the activities and programmes of such departments

b. The Universities and Polytechnics seeking arrangement with the private sector for meaningful work-study programmes or jobs for the students

c. The universities themselves engageing seriously in profit oriented or revenue yielding ventures as a way of diversifying their sources of revenue.

The study recommends further area of research to improve the government policy of cost-sharing as a means of mobilising funds for the financing of tertiary education. This can be done by replicating the study in any of the remaining eight regions in the country.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

This study examines stakeholders' perception of the government policy of cost-sharing as one of the ways of funding tertiary education in the country.

The issue of funding tertiary education in Ghana has in recent times become a matter of great concern to all stakeholders in the country.

Oduro (1999) observes that universities and polytechnics in Africa have long been identified as major national institutions with the skills, the equipment and mandate to generate new knowledge for the solution of local problems. In Ghana, as in other countries the indispensability of university education in the acquisition of critical skills and disciplines such as teaching, medicine, engineering, accounting, architecture and administration has been acknowledged. University education is the potent means necessary for enhancing socio-economic development. In this new millennium, there is no doubt that the role of tertiary institutions in research, teaching, evaluation, information transfer, human resource development and technology development are critical to the nation's quest for a middle level income status.

In recognition of the key role tertiary education plays in national development, successive governments have over the years been striving to ensure that equal opportunities in tertiary education are created for all capable citizens in the country. To this end the government has been investing heavily in the resources for the full delivery of tertiary education in the country. Apart from the newly established Private
universities, the polytechnics and all the five state owned and controlled universities are heavily dependent on government funding.

The practice of full government funding for tertiary education in general and university education in particular developed in the past because the resources that were available at that time were sufficient to cater for the promotion of tertiary education for the secondary school leavers. According to Oduro (1999) these were the times when university students were treated as “first born” babies and provided with almost everything including even pocket money just to ensure that the needed psychological and physiological comfort is obtained for smooth academic work. Some governments such as that of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah in the past created the impression that the state was capable of sustaining the provision of free university education in Ghana. In the immediate post-independence era, the need for skilled middle and high level manpower in both the buoyant economy and the urgent need for educated people to man the political structures vindicated the government policy of a fee-free education up to university. Specific measures, then politically expedient, such as free tuition at all levels of the educational ladder, a free supply of or highly subsidised textbook scheme and food subsidies at all levels of education could also be accommodated when the economy was healthy and the number of students enrolled in the institutions was relatively small.

Of late, the issue of funding tertiary education has been the source of great concern not only to the government but also to parents and students who are the direct beneficiaries. It has become so clear that financing tertiary education is very expensive and that funding tertiary education appears to be in serious crisis. It has become clear to almost every Ghanaian that members of the public cannot continue to
depend entirely on the government to provide all the resources needed to promote high quality tertiary education.

Whereas tertiary institutional administrators complain of high operational costs, parents and students grumble of increasing students’ maintenance costs on the various campuses. The government on her part has clearly stated her inability to continue to act as the sole financier and provider of tertiary education in the country due to the prevailing national economic problems. Consequently, the government has reduced her fund allocation drastically to the tertiary institutions even at the time when enrolment into both polytechnics and the universities has more than tripled since the early eighties. According to an official report issued in October 1986, the per capital expenditure on education had declined from $20 in 1972 to $10 in 1979 and to $1 in 1983. Again, Addae-Mensah (2001) observes that the average subvention per student per annum paid by government to the universities between 1991 and 2001 has fallen from $2360 to $800.

Government subvention still forms a very substantial proportion of the finance that is available for use by the universities and polytechnics. Recurrent expenditure in terms of academic and non-academic staff’s salaries, student maintenance facilities, general education expenditure as well as capital cost in terms of building lecture theatres, academic staff accommodation, providing furniture and other equipment costs are borne by the government. Nevertheless, the money allocated to the universities and other tertiary institutions is far less than what is needed to fully fund tertiary education in the country. Professor Ivan Addae-Mensah, the Vice-Chancellor of University of Ghana observed that the resources available for meaningful academic work had dwindled to such an extent that the universities would have to be closed
down if no additional funds were made available. He further explained that the present cost per head per annum that stood at less than $600 made the universities uncompetitive in relation to other universities in the world (Daily Graphic, Wednesday, 15 Sept. 1999). Dr. G.M. Afeti, the Principal of Ho Polytechnic, on his part revealed that whereas the government spent an average of about $900 on each student in the universities only $74 was spent on each polytechnic student during the same year. He, however, said that funding for the polytechnics which is supposed to provide the middle level manpower base of the country has been too low to facilitate the running of credible programmes for polytechnic students (Daily Graphic, Saturday, 25 September 1999).

Ibn Chambas, then Deputy Minister in charge of Tertiary Education, explained that the present scenario at the tertiary education level is the result of increasing population which had brought excessive pressure on the financial and technical resources of that sub-sector. He admitted openly that “the issue of funding tertiary education continues to be one of the major problems facing the sector” (Daily Graphic, Saturday, 25 September 1999).

The situation continues to deteriorate as the years roll by. While public demand for tertiary education continues to increase, funding from government continues to decline. Given the current economic situation of African tertiary institutions in general and Ghanaian universities and polytechnics in particular, the funding structure of tertiary institutions must be broadened to include contributions from all beneficiaries comprising students, parents, government, communities, professional bodies, religious bodies and so on.
Several options have come up for consideration. One option that has gained credence among most stakeholders is “cost sharing”. By this option, the cost of providing tertiary education is to be shared among the government, the individual students, parents and the private sector. In as much as this alternative has gained popularity, the questions that still linger in the minds of the majority of the stakeholders are: who should pay for the cost of tertiary education? Should the student and his parents be asked to pay the full cost? What constitutes cost of tertiary education or what difference exists between cost-sharing and cost-shifting?

In pursuance of the cost-sharing, the government in the late eighties withdrew the students’ maintenance allowances, bursaries feeding subsidies, textbook allowances and other academic expenses and replaced them with the students’ loan scheme. The government realised that students would not be able to raise enough money to pay for these items hence she brokered with the SSNIT to give loans payable on completion of school to students to cover items like students’ maintenance, feeding, textbook and academic expenses to enable them to successfully undertake their studies.

In the 1998/99 academic year, the government officially introduced the concept of cost-sharing with the charging of Academic user fee, residential user fee in addition to examination fee, admission fee, medical examination fee, contribution to health care and sports. Against this background, the government continues to provide and maintain the infrastructure and facilities and pays the personal emoluments of both teaching and non-teaching staff of polytechnics and universities.

Some people are of the view that a certain percentage of the cost should be borne by the students because higher education raises the economic productivity of
the students and therefore make them earn more. They are the ones who reap the major returns from government investment in tertiary education.

Parents on their part believe that they are already burdened with children’s maintenance and payment of taxes and hence the new arrangement is a shift of responsibility on the part of the government. As the university authorities and Ministry of Education are claiming that the increase in the user fees is part of measures to share cost of education, some students contend that the new increases amount to cost shifting (Daily Graphic, 22nd September, 1999). Adongo cautioned the government not to hide behind the excuse of not being able to fund tertiary education alone and shirk her responsibilities (Daily Graphic, 24th September, 1999). Benneh also decries the inadequate funding levels for Universities and Polytechnics and stresses the need to diversify sources of funding for tertiary education in order to enhance the success of the education reform programme. (Daily Graphic, 31st December, 1998).

Despite the above argument, the fact still remains that higher education has a cost which must be estimated and specified for all students and services. The cost must be made clear and charged while the issue of equity must be taken care of through extensive supportive systems such as loans, grants, bursaries, scholarships, and Trust Funds.

Statement of the Problem

The government has been the sole provider and financier of tertiary education in Ghana for quite a long time. With time, the burden has become too heavy for the government alone to bear. As resources available for the provision of tertiary education continue to be in short supply, enrolment keeps increasing. The
situational is even made worse by the current unjust world economic order and the unfavourable terms of trade. As a result of this, there has been the need for some form of cost-sharing and stakeholders seem to agree on the mechanism. The introduction of the residential user fees and academic user fees during the 1998/99 academic year was an attempt at cost-sharing as a way of mobilising financial support for tertiary education.

Interestingly, due to the low per capita income and the fact that a greater number of Ghanaians find themselves within the bracket of poverty, the policy generated a lot of tension on the various university campuses and in the country as a whole which led to the closure of universities in the country for some time. Since then, the various stakeholders, including students, are expressing varying views concerning the policy of cost-sharing.

One of the contentions is that now that the resources available for funding tertiary education continue to dwindle, would it not mean creating more other problems to the economy should the government decide to continue to provide the funding alone by shifting resources from other sectors of the economy such as health, security, agriculture and industry to education? Would such an action not impact negatively on other sectors of the economy and thereby result in creating tension and social and political upheavals?

Again, under the circumstance where the cost is shared and students are made to pay something for their education, the contention lies in the ability of the government to attract the good candidates to do the courses of their choice given the situation where a significant number of tertiary education students come from low-income families. As people get educated their ability to create wealth grows. The
skills and intellects of such people become sharpened to raise their productivity and income levels. With the rise of productivity of the individual, the total output of the economy rises. As any increase in the total output is a measure of economic growth, if many individuals are not able to acquire higher education or pursue a course of their choice due to their inability to pay for their education, it will be a great loss to both the individuals and the state. Definitely, the skills and intellects of such people would remain dormant and their potential output and income levels would be kept at the low profile. How would the government make the best out of such a situation knowing very well that highly qualified persons are motivated to work hard on their own without much supervision and therefore investment in higher education has the potency of accelerating economic growth. This is the dilemma in which the state finds itself. This study therefore seeks to gather and examine the views of the people of the government’s policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education in the country.

**Purpose of the Study**

The study seeks to examine the various perceptions held by stakeholders of tertiary education on government policy of cost-sharing as the policy for financing tertiary education in the country. Specifically, the study tries to:

a. seek the stakeholders’ perception on the current state of funding tertiary education in the country.

b. find out people’s reactions to the government policy of cost-sharing as the policy for financing tertiary education in the country.

c. find other alternative strategies for funding higher education in the country.
Research Questions

There are quite a number of questions to which the study seeks to find answers. Among the questions are:

1. How sound is the present state of funding tertiary education in the country?
2. How prepared or willing are people to assist the government to bear the burden involved in funding tertiary education in the country?
3. Do people view the government policy of cost sharing favourable to all stakeholders in tertiary education?
4. Do people consider the introduction of the policy of cost sharing timely?
5. Does the policy of cost-sharing address the issue of the ability to pay?
6. Can the government policy of cost-sharing discourage potential students from pursuing tertiary education in the country?
7. Are there other alternative sources of mobilising funding for tertiary education?

Delimitation of the Study

The study is confined to stakeholders in the Central and the Ashanti Regions of Ghana.

Limitation of the Study

Financing tertiary education in Ghana is one that is very topical in these days of economic stringency in the nation. Without adequate funding the attainment of quality and relevant tertiary education in Ghana is really difficult. Issues on the funding of tertiary education is therefore of great interest to the Ghanaian public. The
findings of the study when published in the Journal of Education Management dailies or other educational magazines will have great significance in several respects.

(1) The outcome of the study may provide the government with the reactions of the stakeholders of tertiary education concerning the policy of cost sharing. These reactions could help the government to take some interventional measures to make the policy more sustainable.

(2) The findings of the study may throw much more light on alternative strategies for financing higher education in the country. This may help provide solution to the problems of finance confronting the tertiary institutions

Limitation of the Study

This study seeks to find out the stakeholders' perceptions of the concept of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ghana. In the course of the study the researcher encountered two major problems.

First, it was the wish of the researcher to get information from employers based on the institution's policy of contributing to the financing of tertiary education in the country. In most cases, the institutions concerned did not have any laid down policy of such nature. The employers were therefore forced to give information based on their own personal convictions. This affected the objective nature of the outcome of the study to a great extent.

Secondly, it was also the desire of the researcher to extend the scope of the study to cover stakeholders in more than two regions in the country. Unfortunately, the researcher was constrained by lack of funds and time. By concentrating the study
on the stakeholders in the Central and Ashanti Regions makes it difficult to generalise the outcome of the study to cover the entire country.

Thirdly, it was the desire of the researcher to contact the Registrar General’s Department for the list of all registered companies and establishments in the Central and Ashanti Regions of Ghana. Nevertheless, due to some problems beyond his control he could not make it and was forced to rely only on the Telephone Directory. If he was able to contact the Registrar General’s Department, he could have had access to a good number of companies and establishments duly registered in the Central and Ashanti Regions to include in the sampling to enhance the level of representativeness of the sample.

Organisation of the Research

In this study, chapter one deals with the introduction, comprising the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation, limitations of the study, organisation of the study and preliminary definition of terms.

Chapter two covers the review of literature while the third chapter treats the methodology. Chapter four provides information on findings or results of the study while finally the fifth chapter deals with the discussion, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for future research.
**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are explained here to bring out their meanings as used in the text.

**Stakeholder.** The term as used in the text refers to a person or a group of persons who have direct or indirect involvement in educational provision such as students, tax-payers and employers.

**Educational cost.** Cost incurred in providing educational services.

**Educational clients.** The people and agencies that are direct and indirect beneficiaries of the educational services. E.g. students, parents.

**Educational managers.** The people and bodies who are charged with the provision of the educational services. For example, the Ministry of Education, the G.E.S., the Mission’s Educational Units, the Vice-Chancellors, the Headmasters and Mistresses.

**Tertiary institutions.** Institutions of higher learning where diploma and degree are awarded.

**Relevance.** The extent to which a body of knowledge, practices and products are in consonance with and respond to the needs, values and objectives of those who are producers and end-sellers.

**Quality.** The term refers to excellent performance or attainment in educational pursuit.

**Cost-sharing.** The situation whereby the cost of providing tertiary education is to be shared among the government, individual, students, parents and the private sector.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A lot of studies have been conducted on financing education generally and tertiary education in particular over the years. This section seeks to review some of the studies conducted on the study. The review of the literature will not only give the researcher a clearer mental picture of the problem but will help him to obtain the necessary information, and methods. The review is broken down into:

i. Financing Tertiary Education
ii. Cost components of education
iii. Cost-sharing in Tertiary Education
iv. Stakeholders in Tertiary Education
v. Other alternative sources for funding Tertiary Education
vi. The SSNIT students' loan scheme
vii. Tertiary Education Bursary Fund
viii. Residential and academic charges
ix. Determination of parental ability to pay for the education of their wards.

Financing Tertiary Education

Much has been written on tertiary education financing. Wattenbeger (1971) contends that the society should be responsible for the financing of education. He further explains that free public education is the basic element in the American tradition of democracy. According to him, the idea of free education is not to provide
education for some and not for others but for all persons even through the highest level. In his view the state must bear the full responsibility for financing higher education because it is essential for the attainment of the following objectives.

**Development of Human Resources.** The most important resource a nation has is its people. Thus, formal education or schooling has a great impact in developing skills, knowledge and competence, which could be useful for developmental processes.

**Economic Growth.** Education has a great potential in developing resources in technology and skills for productive activities. As people get educated, their ability to create wealth may well grow. Their skills will be sharpened leading to high marginal productivity and national income and hence overall economic growth.

**National Security.** As people get educated, their skills are sharpened and their abilities to create wealth grow exponentially. Therefore their individual lifetime earnings and that of the state become secured. According to Clinton, education is a crucial national security issue of our future and warns that politics must not enter into discussions on education.

**Elimination of Poverty.** As people’s ability to create wealth increases with the acquisition of education, poverty is eliminated. In this light, Wattenbarger observed that education is used to break the cycle of poverty and overcome the lack of motivation among the low income groups. He contends that “education is not a commodity which can be sold at the market prices to those who receive the benefits directly (P. 46). Wattenbarger in writing about the role of the society in financing higher education in America concludes by saying that “education at all levels is a social responsibility” (P. 153).
Bowen (1971) shares the viewpoint of Wattenbarger and tries to condemn the situation where proposals are made to increase tuition fees drastically and to finance students by putting them heavily into debt through the granting of loans. In his view, such practice of shifting cost of higher education to students especially at the time when there is a need to provide higher educational opportunity to millions of persons can not be the best. He further contends that this is the time the nation depends very much on the Universities and Polytechnics (colleges) “as the principal source of value, ideas and techniques needed to regenerate the American society” (P. 155)

According to Antwi (1992), in August 1951, Dr. Nkrumah’s regime introduced the Accelerated Development Plan for Education which was implemented in January 1952 to provide for the rapid development of education at all levels. Following a decision taken in 1959, a commission on university education under the chairmanship of K. Botsio, a minister of state, was appointed to advise on the future development of university education. The Education Act of October 1961 established the legal basis for compulsory education and the provision of educational facilities continued to be free throughout the system up to the tertiary level.

Oduro (1999) observes that since independence, the government has assumed responsibility for financing tertiary education in Ghana. He adds that the universities and other tertiary institutions were seen as state institutions and hence the government must provide funds for their upkeep and maintenance.

Friedman (1962), on the contrary, contends that parents should bear the full cost of their children education. He explains that the provision of educational services at all levels including the tertiary level should be borne entirely by parents and students who are the direct beneficiaries. In his view the full cost of providing
education services must not be borne by the state alone and therefore parents and
students who are the consumers of such services must be prepared to pay for them.

Spio-Garbra’s (1999) writing on “Let’s save our universities” calls on parents
to contribute towards the education of their wards since they stand to gain from the
knowledge their wards acquire from the universities (Daily Graphic, 15th September,
1999).

According to the Association of African Universities the World Bank Report
(1997) the state is the sole provider and financier of higher education to a far larger
degree in Africa than in other regions. African governments routinely underwrites
90% or more of university costs. This dependency generates frequent tension around
issues of university autonomy and State control. It also inhibits the growth of higher
education enrolments by linking it directly to availability of public financing. The
report says that some nations over-invest in higher education while others under-
invest. As a general rule, however, tertiary education investment in African
Universities and polytechnics should receive between 15% and 20% of the
government’s overall education budget. Overall government expenditures on
education should aim at representing between 5% and 7% of GDP.

Benneh observes that “although government’s recurrent budget on education
has increased from 24% in the early 1970’s to 36% in 1998 the education sector needs
more resources to expand and improve existing facilities to enhance the standard of
education in the country”. He further cautioned that government funding levels of
50% and 30% for universities and polytechnics respectively are inadequate and
stressed the need to diversify sources of funding for tertiary education in order to
The Concept of Cost-Sharing

According to the Association of African Universities World Bank Report (1997), financial contributions towards the cost of education by a significant portion of university students can also enhance educational quality and relevance. When students pay something for their education, they are likely to generate pressures for increased accountability on the part of academic staff to attend class, to come prepared and to be available for student consultations. The students will be concerned with the connection between what they learn and their future income-earning possibilities. They are also likely to be motivated to complete their studies in good time, thus improving the internal efficiency of the educational institutions.

Again, Cost-sharing will allow public resources to be focussed on the main mission of the university (i.e. teaching and research), while the resulting diversification of funding reduces the university’s vulnerability to fluctuations in government revenues. Sizer (1969) gives credence to such a move by advocating for a joint partnership between students and/or their parents and the state on the finance of education of their children.

Abeasi (1998) Director-General of Private Enterprises Foundation (P.F.P.) observes that financing tertiary education is very expensive and members of the public cannot continue to depend entirely on the government to provide all the resources needed for the promotion and maintenance of tertiary education in the country. He reiterates that cost-sharing in tertiary education is inevitable if society wants to promote quality education in the country. He further impressed on people to
see cost-sharing as a more constructive effort to promote quality education in the country. (Daily Graphic, Tuesday August 4th 1998).

Otabil (1998) notes that the public universities which were established to provide top-level manpower training for the development of the nation’s human and material resources have suffered serious setbacks in recent times. It has therefore become clear to almost every Ghanaian that tertiary education is in serious crisis and the government alone cannot solve the problem. He therefore advocates for the participation of the private sector and the church in the provision of tertiary education. (Daily Graphic, Tuesday August 4th 1998).

Amoako-Nuamah, the former Minister of Education, observes that “the issues of cost-sharing in our tertiary institutions has now become imperative” and called on communities and individuals to assist the country’s universities and polytechnics (Daily Graphic Saturday 28th February 1998).

Chambas, the then Deputy Minister of Education in charge of tertiary education, asserts that “the issue of funding tertiary education continues to be one of the major problem facing the sector” He further observes that just what stakeholders including religious bodies, district assemblies, non-governmental organisations, parents, the private sector etc. should contribute to reduce the huge pressure on the government is the crux of the matter. He attributes the present setbacks at the tertiary education level to the increasing population which has brought excessive pressure on the financial and technical resources of that sub-sector (Daily Graphic, Saturday, 25th September, 1999). Chambas further revealed that whereas there are 2.4 million students in basic schools, universities and polytechnics
now have enrolment of between 45,000 to 50,000 (Daily Graphic, 15th September, 1999).

Addae-Mensah, Vice-Chancellor of University of Ghana, has said that resources available for meaningful academic work had dwindled to such an extent that the Universities would have to be closed down if no additional funds were made available. According to him, what parents are being asked to pay is just between 2% to 3% of the direct teaching cost which does not take into account high electricity bills and other overhead costs. He explained that the present cost per head per annum which stood at less than $600 made the universities uncompetitive in relation to other universities in the world. He added that whilst the funding of the universities were dwindling, the intakes were increasing. He revealed that the issue of cost-sharing which started in 1969 has always been shelved by successive governments hence making university administration a difficult task. (Daily Graphic, Wednesday, September 15th 1999).

According to the communiqué issued at the end of its national congress held between September 2nd and 4th 1999 at the KNUST, University Teachers Association of Ghana (UTAG) supports the scheme of cost-sharing in principle since the government alone cannot bear the cost of education but suggests that the government must explore other sources of funding such as the imposition of educational tax on industry, petroleum, products, cigarette, alcoholic drinks. In the Communiqué whilst the association accepts that the primary beneficiaries should contribute to the cost of education, it believes that the current levels of contribution are too high in view of the present low wage and salary levels in the country. (Daily Graphic, Thursday, September 9th 1999).
Wereko-Brobbey observes that if students are to be made to take their share of the cost seriously, then it is imperative that means must be found to have access to the funds that they need to finance their education especially for students from very poor homes where parents cannot immediately fund the increasing levels of fees. He stresses that the way forward is that all stakeholders must agree and share the cost in an equitable and just manner in which there were no masters to order the slaves to do their bidding. (Daily Graphic, Thursday August 27th 1998, p7).

According to Rapporteur General’s Report on the National Education Forum held in November 1999, the participants had difficulty in evolving an approach to cost-sharing in tertiary education but all of them agreed on the principle of cost-sharing.

Akangbou (1987) observes that the burden of financing educational programmes amongst stakeholders may not be equal. According to him, the burden will depend on the philosophy guiding the provision of education in that nation concerned. He asserts that in a fee-free education nation, the public sector is expected to bear the largest share of educational expenditure whilst in a country where fees are paid by all, the private sector will be very active.

Tuah, Chairman of CVCP, observes that no credible academic programme can be run for 1999/2000 academic year without additional funding. (Daily Graphic, 5th Aug. 1999). According to Hesse “we are facing the twin problems, accommodation needs and the necessary burdens of financial dispensation, as well as the alternative objectives of a fee-free education, and of cost-sharing, especially as it affects our ability to equalise the opportunities” (Daily Graphic, 13th Aug. 1998).
Cost Components of Tertiary Education

Cohn (1979) groups cost into direct, indirect, social and private. He explains that the direct costs are borne by the state on one hand and the individual on the other. The indirect costs are the earnings foregone. The costs incurred by the state also constitute social cost while the cost incurred by the individual parent or student is private cost.

According to Stone (1992), costs included in a budget may be either recurrent or related to capital items of expenditure. She added that recurrent cost for consumption items include personnel costs, such as salaries and fringe benefits. The cost of utilities (heat, light and power), textbooks, maintenance and perhaps small items of equipment. The opportunity cost value of time a student spends in school is identified as the “average amount of money students of different ages could be expected to earn if they were gainfully employed instead of spending time on their studies” (Benson 1988:357). Another cost, which falls into this category, is that of voluntary labour performed by parents and other members of the community at a school.

Thomas (1971) distinguishes between private and social opportunity costs. Within the model, these may be internal and external. Private opportunity costs he identified as the foregone opportunities for individuals and their families in terms of the money spent by them on their education which is not available for alternative uses. The income was termed foregone because the individual is studying and not in the workforce and represents the value which may be attributed to the loss of leisure
time for the individual and family. Under Social cost, Thomas (1971) included all the private costs of the individual and the costs shared by the community.

Antwi (1992) observes that since 1961 tuition at all levels of the public educational systems has been free. The students pay minimal book-user fees every year, residential boarding fees, text-books and examinations fees while the Ministry of Education allocates funds for all other expenses. According to him educational expenditure is claiming a larger and growing share of current government expenditure. He observes a wide disparity in cost per head or student per year at different levels of education and says that the cost of education at tertiary level is inflated by the presence of large number of non-teaching staff whose salaries are borne by the government (P.82).

Adjei-Manu (1998) observes that following from the implementation of Structural Adjustment Programme, government decided to limit its expenditure on feeding, textbooks, drawing and technical instruments. Other academic expenses were kept on hold while government continues to pay for the tuition, lecture theatres and administrative infrastructure, medical and other expenses of students. (Daily Graphic, 12/8/98).

Wereko-Brobey (1998) writing on the topic “Breaking the Cost-Sharing” log-jam II sees the elements of the cost borne by students or parents or both under the cost-sharing as:

a. payment for the requisite academic registration
b. tuition and other related fees
c. Procurement of academic accessories such as books, stationery and other research tools.
d. Payments for meals and other basic social needs and transportation during term-time and home travel vacation time.

e. Payment for accommodation. (Daily Graphic, Thursday, August 27th 1998).

Concerning the introduction of residential and academic user-fees, Antwi (1992) observes that under the 1986 Educational Reform proposals, parents were made liable for book-user fees and for the total residential and feeding costs at secondary and university levels. The boarding and lodging subsidy was officially reckoned in 1986 at ₦6,100.00 for SSS students and ₦21000 for university students. Assuming parents spent roughly these amounts to maintain their children in these institutions, the removal of the subsidy would require parents to spend at least ₦12000 and ₦42,000 a year for each of their children attending SSS and universities. As at that time, one wondered whether the government intended to discourage the children of the majority of Ghanaians from going to university since most of them can not afford to pay the fees.

According to Oduro (1999) students spend an average of ₦120,000 per semester on Internal shuttling services provided by taxis on campus of U.C.C. alone while ₦100,000 is spent on photocopying. Besides, non-residential students who rent rooms in the surrounding villages of the universities pay between ₦400,000 and ₦700,000 as rent.

In the campaign to call for tuition fees at Legon, Prof. Addae-Mensah (2001) revealed that the real average direct cost per student per annum for Ghanaian students is about $3000. This comes to about ₦21 million. He added that the total direct cost estimated between $6000 and $8000 or ₦42 million and ₦56 million per student at current exchange rate.
According to Akangbou (1986) university students have enjoyed tuition free education for a decade and given the poor financial condition of the government as well as parents, the issue of payment of tuition fees in the university becomes rather touchy and delicate and hence suggests that undergraduate university education especially in Nigeria should continue to be tuition—free in view of the little amount to be collected from this source of finance and the possible political, economic and social implications of a re-introduction of tuition-fees. (P.18)

Stakeholders in tertiary education

University Rationalisation Study Vol. II Final Report (1988) looks at the stakeholders and the beneficiaries of tertiary education as students, parents and their future employers.

Akangbou (1987), views stakeholders of tertiary education as comprising the government (local, state and central) individuals, parents or relatives, voluntary agencies, communities and companies, and the foreign agencies. According to him all these could be grouped into three main sources of funding for education. These are the public sector, private sector and external agencies.

Chambas in explaining the impasse at the tertiary education level and the way forward referred to stakeholders to comprise religious bodies, district assemblies, non-governmental organisations, parents, the private sector etc. (Daily Graphic, Saturday September 25th 1999).

Other alternative sources for funding tertiary education

Akangbou (1987) observes that given the dominant role government plays in the financing of education and the dwindling government revenue in recent times,
coupled with increasing responsibilities by governments, there is the need for alternative sources of funds to be sought. He suggests the following among others as:

a. the private enterprises and establishments which employ the product of the school system could be identified. An educational “levy” or “tax” could be imposed on such industries, companies etc with a view to generating some funds for education.

b. Community participation could be enforced. Communities could be asked to donate land and build a certain number of classrooms in their locality.

c. There is the need for the introduction of a “higher educational tax” whereby the cost of higher education by programmes can be borne at the moment by the government after training.

Peacock and Culyer (1969) suggest the institution of loan schemes to students. They contend that such loans should be big enough to carry the students through their programmes and they should be made to repay the loans after schooling. In supporting this view, Wereko-Brobbey (1998) asserts that any loan scheme put in place must be substantial enough to allow students to cover the cost of their core needs and must be self-sustaining in the long term.

According to the University Rationalization Study Vol. 11 Final Report (1988) more scholarships schemes should be instituted so that students can pay for what kind of educational services they want. The big industrial establishments like Lever Brothers, Valco, and Breweries can institute some scholarship packages to help finance tertiary education. Retrieval training cost mechanism must be encouraged. The authority can work out the alumni fund well.
National Union of Ghana Students (NUGS) on her part proposed the establishment of an educational funds and the institution of an educational tax to finance tertiary education. (Daily Graphic, 24th September 1999).

Regarding the search for alternative sources for financing tertiary education, Bowen (1971) observes three basic patterns and calls them "Full cost pricing, free public education and a conglomerate model."

According to him

Under the free public education model, instruction would be provided without cost to students. The institutions would be financed mainly from public appropriations and private gifts. With full pricing, each student would be charged tuition to cover the cost of instruction in his particular programme. As for the conglomerate model, the cost is covered partly by tuition and partly by public appropriations and private gifts, loans and grants (p.164-165)

The SSNIT Students' Loan Scheme

According to Adjei-Manu, the SSNIT loan scheme was established by PNDC Law 276 on January 20th 1988. Since 1988, SSNIT has paid about c66,987.59 million as loans scheme, it is now a fact that it has come to stay perhaps until an alternative scheme of financing these aspects of tertiary education is found (Daily Graphic Wednesday 15th September 1999).

It was also reported that beneficiaries of the student loan scheme are owing the SSNIT over c72 billion and thereby threatening the sustainability of the scheme. The indebtedness is made up of c50 billion of disbursed loans and c22 billion overdue interests. The early projection was that, only university students would be covered,
but the scheme which was introduced in 1988/89 academic year was extended to all the 24 tertiary institutions (Daily Graphic, 8th Feb. 1999)

Wereko-Brobey observes that a meaningful students loan scheme must satisfy two principal objectives:

a. It must be sustaining enough to allow students to cover the cost of their core needs

b. It must be self-sustaining in the long term.

According to him, the first objective presumes that the poorest student who is admitted into our tertiary education should be able to pay all the elements of tertiary education to be borne by students. The second objective recognizes the need to diversify the source of funding as well as to establish an effective repayment scheme for students loan scheme (Daily Graphic 27th August 1998) P. 7

Antwi (1992) observes that following from the implementation of structural adjustment Programme government decided to limit its expenditure on tertiary education. As a result, expenditure on feeding, textbooks, drawings and technical instruments and other academic expenses were kept on hold while government continues to pay the tuition, administrative maintenance (halls of residence, lecture theatres and administrative expenses of students). Government then realised that students would not be able to raise enough money to pay for these items hence she brokered with the SSNIT to give loans payable on completion of school to students to successfully undertake their studies. He further contends that the Busia government must be credited for taking a bold step in introducing the student loan scheme for the under-graduates in an effort to cut down educational expenditure. According to him, this alienated students from the government. The National Redemption Council
headed by Col I.K. Acheampong abolished the student loan scheme launched by the Busia Regime.

Ameyaw-Ekumfi, the Minister of Education, observes that the students loan scheme as managed by SSNIT has not been as effective as it is desired. Consequently, he has called for the establishment of Student Loan Service Agency to be solely responsible for the disbursement of loan to students.

**Tertiary Education Bursary Fund**

Spio-Gabrah contends that a bursary programme started in 1991/92 academic years but was discontinued because students resorted to all kinds of dubious means to prevent others from availing themselves of the facility. He was of the opinion that if students had allowed the programme to continue, it would have been an enhanced programme such as the students loan scheme. He further disclosed that the government is prepared to increase the initial $3 billion fund set aside for the needy students. (Daily Graphic, 11th Sept. 1999).

AAU World Bank report (1997) observes that where a significant number of university students come from low-income families, some combination of grants and students loans must be needed to achieve equal access to higher education. It however decries the fact that the general experience with student loan programmes has not been good as they are plagued by high administrative costs, and low recovery rates all of which undermined the sustainability of the loan programme. According to Bowen (1971) “student financial aid should be basically in the form of grants rather than loans”. He is of the view that, grants should be capable of taking a student through whatever level of education one wishes to pursue without any frills. (P.166).
Residential and Academic Charges

Antwi observes that the introduction of residential charges at tertiary institutions became possible as a result of the implementation of the 1986 Educational Reform proposals. Under this reform proposal, boarding and lodging subsidies were removed. Again, parents were made liable for book-user fees and for the total residential and feeding costs at secondary and university levels.

According to Chambas, at the initial stage of the introduction of residential charges at tertiary institutions, the initial proposal was between $150,000.00 and $240,000.00 but was later reduced to the range of $90,000.00 and $150,000.00. In his view this change became possible as a result of the concerns expressed by stakeholders of tertiary education, Parliament, parents, students, corporate sponsors and the general public. Students of University of Ghana, University of Cape Coast, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology were to pay $150,000.00 each. Students of UDS and UCEW were also to pay $100,000.00 while students in Polytechnics will pay $90,000.00 and $110,000 depending on the type of facility in the institution. All these charges were meant for the 1998/99 academic year (Daily Graphic 12th August, 1998).

In another development Chambas explains that President Rawlings directed the Ministry of Education to review the new academic facility user-fees being charged in the various universities through the granting of the 30% rebate (Daily Graphic, 25th Sept. 1999).
Determination of Parental Ability to Pay for the Education of their Wards

Blaug (1970) asserts that two ways of determining parental ability to pay part or full cost of their children’s education are:

a. the use of previous year’s income of parents
b. the size of the family

In his view, the use of the previous year’s income of parents will give a broad overview of what the parents earn as income for engaging in economic activities. The use of previous year’s income is to enable analyst make projections about the future earnings of each household. When the families’ income levels are determined it will be easier to assess their readiness to pay part or the full cost of their children’s education. Again, the use of the size of the family can be a good indicator to determine the pattern and the depth of a family’s expenditure. Generally, a family that has a large membership will spend more on their children. Such families will need more financial resources to provide a qualitative life for their children. The larger the size of the family, the more difficult it is to provide a quality child service.

Lee Hansen and Weisbrod (1970) have propounded another index that can be used to determine parental ability to pay. This is what they called “parental net wealth”. This can be explained as the stock of wealth of the family. This will include fixed and circulative capital of the family. The worth of every family can easily be assessed by this index. The smaller the parental net wealth they contend, the more difficult it will be for such families to finance their children’s education. They thus suggest that government (state) financial assistance should be given directly to students.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The study examines stakeholders’ perception of the government policy of cost sharing in tertiary education. This section of the study describes the design, population, sample of the study, research instruments and procedure followed in the collection of data.

Research Design

The study used the survey method. The study involved collection of data on students of tertiary institutions, tax-payers and employers in the Central and Ashanti Regions of Ghana.

Population

The population of the study is all stakeholders of tertiary education in the Central and Ashanti Regions. This comprises students of tertiary institutions, tax-payers and employers in the two regions.

Sample

The sample of the study comprises 60 tertiary students, 30 tax-payers and 20 employers from the Central and Ashanti Regions. In all 110 stakeholders were selected to answer questionnaire or to be interviewed. These were selected because they were considered to possess the information needed for the study.
Sampling Procedure

Random sampling was used to obtain a part of the population from whom information of the entire population was inferred. The sampled population of 110 stakeholders from the Central and Ashanti Regions was grouped into tertiary students, tax-payers and employers. Percentages were given to such stratified groups according to their size and accessibility. The breakdown was as follows: tertiary students-55%, tax-payers-27% and employers – 18%.

A list of 40 businesses and establishments situated in the Central and Ashanti Regions was selected from Telephone Directory. Ticking at intervals of two names, the 20 businesses were selected to have their employers interviewed.

Again the tertiary students were grouped into University of Cape Coast (U.C.C.), Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), University College of Education – Kumasi (UCEW-K) Cape Coast Polytechnic and Kumasi Polytechnic and percentages were given to them. Precisely, U.C.C. and KNUST were given 25% each while Cape Coast Polytechnic, Kumasi Polytechnic and UCEW-K had 16% each. This was done based on the assumption that the number of students in these two universities are more than that of UCEW-K, Cape Coast Polytechnic and Kumasi Polytechnic.

Lastly, the tax-payers, which constituted 27% of the sample were also randomly selected from the two regions for the study.

The researcher decided to use this selection method with a view to ensuring representativeness.

All these categories of respondents (stakeholders) were covered because they were deemed to possess the information that the researcher would need for the report.
They were considered to have better understanding of the economic predicaments and implications of funding tertiary education in the country.

**Instrumentation**

The main instruments that were prepared and used for the study were questionnaire and interview guide. Two separate questionnaires were prepared and administered to the student and tax-payer respondents. Each set of the questionnaires had three main sections treating the background of the respondents, the perceptions of the state of tertiary education financing in Ghana and the alternative sources of financing tertiary education in the country.

The sets of questionnaire had 20 items for the tax-payers and 23 items for the students. The questionnaires were structured based on the “Likert Scale” as described by Oppenheim. Closed items had mainly two options “Yes” or “No” while the open-ended questions had space(s) for the respondents to provide their own answers. The employers were interviewed using an interview guide, comprising seven differently structured questions.

**Pretesting of Instruments**

Pretesting of the research instrument was carried out at the University College of Education of Winneba. Copies of the questionnaires were given to 30 students and 20 workers for completion and return. The researcher interacted with them personally to ascertain their reactions to the questionnaire with regard to any ambiguity, incoherence or incomprehension associated with the drafting of the questionnaire. This was hoped to help the researcher to come out with the final instrument that would be used in the study. For example, it was discovered during the pretesting
stage that section B of the Tax-payers' questionnaire was wrongly structured. This section was therefore put in a table for an easy picking.

**Data Collection Procedure**

After the research instruments had been prepared an introductory letter was obtained from the researcher's department. The required number of copies of both the questionnaire and introductory letters were made. The researcher then moved out to the campuses of Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, University College of Education Wenniba-Kumasi, Kumasi Polytechnic and Cape Coast Polytechnic one after the other to present the introductory letters to the offices for Students' Affairs. At any instance, such offices detailed an executive member of the SRC to conduct the researcher round halls of residence and lecture theatres to enable him administer the questionnaire. In most cases, the researcher left the questionnaire with the respondents and went for them the following day.

**Data Analysis Plan**

The data collected from the stakeholders were analysed.

Statistical analyses of data began with the tallying of the scores of the various items. Frequency and percentage distributions were the analytical tools used to answer the various research questions.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The study seeks to examine stakeholders' perception of the government policy of cost-sharing as one of the ways of funding tertiary education in the country.

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and discussion of data collected from three different types of stakeholders of tertiary education. These include students, tax-payers and employers selected from Ashanti and Central regions of Ghana. These three categories of respondents were selected for the study because they were assumed to know pretty well the socio-economic implications of educational financing in the country. The tax-payers and students were given questionnaires to respond to whilst interview guide was administered to the employers. In all, 90 copies of differently structured questionnaire were administered to sixty (60) students and thirty (30) tax-payers while an interview guide was administered to twenty (20) employers purposively selected from different organisations in Ashanti and Central regions of Ghana. The two research instruments were meant to solicit information on the respondents' perception of the government policy of cost-sharing as a way of mobilising funding for tertiary education in Ghana.

The information that was gathered was processed, converted into figures and symbols that could be quantified and analysed. In this way, the entries for the table that the researcher needed in order to draw conclusions were obtained. Frequency and Percentage distributions were used as analytical tools.
Gender Distribution of Students and its Relation to the Government Policy of Cost-Sharing

Table 1 examines the gender distribution of students and their attitude toward Cost-Sharing.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost-Sharing</td>
<td>Cost-Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22 (77.1%)</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>2 (5.7%)</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows that precisely 77.1% and 76% of the male and the female respondents respectively are in favour of the government policy of Cost-Sharing in tertiary institutions in the Ashanti and the Central Regions of Ghana. This means that both male and female students equally support the idea of Cost-Sharing.

Age Group of Students and Their Attitude Towards the Government policy of Cost-Sharing

Table 2 explains the age grouping of students and their attitude towards cost-sharing.
Table 2

**Age Group of student Respondents and Their Attitude Towards Cost-Sharing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>For Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Against Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger (30 yrs and below)</td>
<td>28 (84.8%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>33 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older (31 yrs and above)</td>
<td>23 (85.1%)</td>
<td>3 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows that 33 of the 60 students are 30 years and below. Assuming those students who are 30 years and below are considered to be young, then 33 of the 60 students are young. This is precisely 55% of the total student respondents of 60.

The table further reveals that 28 of the 33 students who are young are in favour of cost-sharing. This is about 85% of those who are young. Again 23 of the 27 students who are old also support the idea of cost-sharing. This is precisely 85.1% of those students who are 31 years and above. This gives an indication that the support for the idea of cost-sharing is the same among the young and the old students.

**Programmes Pursued by Students and Their Attitude Towards Cost-Sharing**

Table 3 shows the various types of programmes being pursued by students and how they view the government policy of cost-sharing.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>For Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Against Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>3(100%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil/M.ED/M.A</td>
<td>9(90%)</td>
<td>1(10%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>10(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>21(77.7%)</td>
<td>5(18.5%)</td>
<td>1(3.7%)</td>
<td>27(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/H.N.D</td>
<td>13(65%)</td>
<td>5(25%)</td>
<td>2(10%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that irrespective of the programme being pursued, majority of the students accept the government policy of cost-sharing. However, acceptance is greater among those students pursuing Ph.D (100%) and Masters degrees (90%) than those pursuing other programmes such as Degree (77.7%), Diploma or H.N.D (65%).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Students on Study Leave</th>
<th>Students not on Study Leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Cost-Sharing</td>
<td>12(66.7%)</td>
<td>15(35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Cost-Sharing</td>
<td>6(33.3%)</td>
<td>26(61.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18(100%)</td>
<td>42(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reveals that precisely 66.7% of the students on study leave with pay are in favour of Cost-Sharing. On the other hand, about 62% of the students who are not on study leave with pay are not in favour of cost-sharing. This gives an indication that those students on study leave with pay are more likely to afford to pay what they are asked to pay under cost-sharing. The finding makes it more acceptable the recommendation made by the University Rationalisation study Vol. II Final Report (1988) that "students should be made to engage in work-study as a means of helping to pay their way through school".

**Agencies that Award Study Leave with Pay to Students**

Table 5 looks at the various agencies which award study leave with pay to students.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Service</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Education Service</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5, shows that the Ghana Education Service is the leading agency that grants study leave with pay to students. As large as 66% of the respondents enjoy study leave with pay granted by Ghana Education Service. This shows that the Ghana Education Service which is the major body charged with the administration of Basic and Secondary education in the country also assumes responsibility in improving the calibre of its manpower studying in tertiary institutions.
Stakeholders' Perception of the Government Policy of Cost-Sharing in Tertiary Institutions

The perceptions held by the various stakeholders of the government policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ashanti and Central regions are captured in tables 6, 7, and 8. Table 6 deals with the perception of students, table 7 the perception held by tax-payers while table 8 covers the employers' perception of the Government Policy of Cost-Sharing in financing tertiary education in Ghana.


Table 6 examines the various perceptions held by students about the government policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ghana.

Table 6

Students' Perception of Cost-Sharing as Government Policy of Financing Tertiary Education in Ghana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing tertiary education in Ghana is expensive</td>
<td>59(98.3%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Tertiary Education in Ghana is a problem</td>
<td>55(91.7%)</td>
<td>2(3.3%)</td>
<td>3(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government alone can still solve the problem of financing tertiary education There is the need for some form of cost-sharing between the government on the one hand and parents or students on the other</td>
<td>5(8.3%)</td>
<td>5(8.3%)</td>
<td>50(83.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interpretation of this table will be done together with the findings of tables 7 and 8. This will be done not only to enhance easy comprehension and clear presentation of ideas but also to avoid verbosity and repetition of ideas.

**Tax-payers' Perception of the government Policy of cost sharing**

Table 7 captures the various forms of perceptions held by tax-payer about the government policy of cost sharing in tertiary education in Ghana.
Table 7

Tax-Payers’ Perception of Government Policy
of Cost Sharing in Tertiary Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing tertiary education is expensive</td>
<td>28(93.3%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>2(6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing tertiary education in Ghana is a problem</td>
<td>28(93.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>2(6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government alone can still solve the problem of financing tertiary education</td>
<td>4(13.3%)</td>
<td>3(10%)</td>
<td>23(76.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is the need for some form cost-sharing between the government on one hand and parents or students on the other.</td>
<td>23(76.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>7(23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government policy of cost-sharing is favourable to all parents and tax payers</td>
<td>5(16.6%)</td>
<td>2(6.6%)</td>
<td>23(76.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and tax-payers are already bearing part of the cost of tertiary education so there is no need for further sharing of cost between the government and parents or students.</td>
<td>10(33.3%)</td>
<td>5(16.6%)</td>
<td>13(43.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders can afford this quota of cost of tertiary education under the cost-sharing</td>
<td>6(19.9%)</td>
<td>1(3.3%)</td>
<td>23(76.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of cost-sharing is a shift of responsibility from the government to the individual tax-payer</td>
<td>17(56.6%)</td>
<td>3(10%)</td>
<td>10(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What parents or students are being asked to pay under the cost-sharing is just a significant part of the present cost per student per annum.</td>
<td>25(83.3%)</td>
<td>1(3.3%)</td>
<td>4(13.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of this table will be done together with tables 6 and 8 to enhance better comprehension and clarity of ideas.
Employers' Perception of the Government Policy of Cost Sharing in Tertiary Education

Table 8 shows the various forms of perceptions held by employers concerning the government policy of cost sharing.

Table 8
Employers' Perception of Cost-Sharing as Government Policy of Financing Tertiary Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Tertiary education in Ghana is a problem.</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
<td>0(%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy of cost-sharing is in the right direction.</td>
<td>13(65%)</td>
<td>7(35%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-sharing is the best option to be adopted by the government</td>
<td>10(50%)</td>
<td>10(50%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other possible options to be adopted.</td>
<td>12(60%)</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers' participation in financing tertiary education is satisfactory</td>
<td>12(60%)</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers should contribute more than they are doing now</td>
<td>17(85%)</td>
<td>3(15%)</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tables 6 and 7 show that 98.3% and 93.3% of student and tax-payer respondents respectively in Central and Ashanti Regions are of the view that financing tertiary education in the country is expensive. This agrees with the observation made by Wattenbarger (1971) that "the average citizen, in looking at the requests for funds, may conclude that higher education is becoming more expensive by leaps and bounds" (p. 148). The statement made by Abeasi (1998) agrees with this finding. He states that "financing tertiary education in Ghana is very expensive and that the public cannot continue to depend entirely on the government to provide the resources needed for the promotion and maintenance of tertiary education in the country" (Daily Graphic 4th August 1998). For instance, Addae-Mensah (2001) disclosed that the real average direct cost per student per annum for Ghanaian students is about $3000. At current cedi dollar exchange rate, it comes to about c21 million (Daily Graphic Oct. 22nd).

Financing Tertiary Education is a Problem

The study buttresses the general concern being expressed among the various stakeholders in education that financing tertiary education is a problem. As large as 91.7% of students and tax-payers who answered the questionnaire and 100% of employers who were interviewed confirm this assertion. This assertion is supported by Chambas's (1999) observation that the "issue of funding tertiary education continues to be one of the major problems facing the sector" (Daily Graphic, 25th September 1999). In line with this view, Bowen (1971) observes that "the present
system of financing higher education is admittedly complex" (P. 156). Hesse’s (1998) views reinforce this point when he observes that

We are facing the twin problems, accommodation needs and the necessary burdens of financial dispensation, as well as the alternative objectives of a fee-free education and of cost sharing, especially as it affects our ability to equalise the opportunities for both the rich and the poor. (Daily Graphic, 13th Aug. 1998).

But in addition to the view expressed by Hesse (1998) the government is faced with the issue of growing demand for places in tertiary intuitions in the country. Given the limited resources the government has to think of the need for infrastructural expansion and staffing.

In a similar contribution, Benneh (1998) agrees with this point when he notes that the government funding levels of 50% and 30% for universities and polytechnics respectively are inadequate and stresses the need to diversify sources of funding for tertiary education” (Daily Graphic, 31st Dec. 1998).

The Need for the Government Policy of Cost Sharing in Tertiary Education

Realising the expensive nature of tertiary education and the problem confronting the government in providing that level of education, the stakeholders in Ashanti and Central Regions as the study shows, massively support the governments idea of cost-sharing that government alone cannot continue to finance tertiary education and that there is the need for cost sharing between government and the
various stakeholders. Precisely 90% and 76.6% of students and tax-payer respondents respectively who answered questions state this while 65% of the employers interviewed consider the government policy of cost-sharing as being in the right direction. This perception is in line with the observation made by Abeasi (1998) that cost-sharing "is inevitable if society wants to promote quality education in the country and so people should see it as a more constructive effort to promote quality education in the country" (Daily Graphic, 4th August 1998). It also agrees with Otabil's (1998) proposition that tertiary education is in serious crisis and that the government alone cannot solve the problem. He therefore advocates for the private sector and church participation in the provision of tertiary education. (Daily Graphic, 4th August 1998). Bowen’s (1971) view is reinforce by this point when he observes that the provision of tertiary education should be a joint responsibility between students or their parents on the one hand and the society on the other hand. On the other hand, Adongo (1994) observes that "the government should not shirk her responsibilities by hiding behind the excuse that the government alone cannot fund tertiary education" (Daily Graphic, 24th Sept. 1999). For the policy to work, there is the need for all stakeholders to play their roles effectively and reliably.

The Policy of Cost-Sharing Not Favourable to Stakeholders in Tertiary Education

The study shows that despite the fact that majority of the students, tax-payers and employers in Ashanti and Central regions welcome the policy of cost sharing, they are of the opinion that government policy of cost-sharing is not favourable to all stakeholders. About 90% and 76% of the student and tax-payer respectively express the idea that in view of their inability to contribute to their part of the Cost-Sharing
some stakeholders do not favour government's idea of Cost-Sharing. The finding is similar to Akangbou's (1987) observation when he states that the "burden of financing educational programmes amongst the three groups of financiers may not be equal". The finding also vindicates Spio-Garbra's (1999) observation that "tax-payers are over-stretched and therefore students are to look elsewhere like district Assemblies, Non-governmental organizations and other sources for assistance". (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999). Once the policy has generally been accepted efforts must be made to institute some in-built mechanisms that may help those who may genuinely be unable to pay their part of the Cost-Sharing.

The Ability of One to Pay for His or Her Share

Under the Policy of Cost-Sharing

According to Tables 6 and 7, 55% and 76.6% of student and tax-payer respondents in the Ashanti and the Central Regions are of the opinion that not all stakeholders can afford the portion of the cost of tertiary education allotted to them. Presumably, this is due to the differences in the levels of income of the people and the number of dependants that one has. The problem that arises out of the ability to pay concept is the determination of who is able to pay for higher education in Ghana. Once the policy of cost-sharing is being pursued in the country without any regard to the ability to pay, the policy is likely not to favour a lot of people and may run into problems. It is for this reason that the government is always forced to absorb increments in user-fees almost every year whenever the educational authorities agitate for them. One would say that it would be in the interest of all stakeholders if certain mechanisms could be put in place to cater for the aspect of the ability to pay once and for all. It is to cater for some of these problems that Peacock and Culyer (1969), in
considering the problem of funding higher education in USA, propose that the state should make available subsidy and loans big enough to enable students to finance their education. Lee Hansen and Weisbrod (1970) writing about financing higher education in the USA, supports this viewpoint by saying that grants should be given directly to the students depending on their parent’s ability and the student himself to pay for higher education and that “the poorer the student, the larger the grant” (P. 116).


About 82% of the students who responded to the questionnaire in the Ashanti and the Central Regions do not consider time for the introduction of the government policy of cost sharing as being favourable to all students and parents. The timing factor is seen more as a problem when one considers the preparedness of the affected public to accept additional financial burden when they are most of the time struggling to have ends meet. This result underscores the general sentiment that characterized the forum organised by the Ministry of Education in 1999 to sample views for the alternative sources of funding higher education in Ghana. It was reported that “all contributors were of the view that the increases were uncalled for, untimely and above all premature as all stakeholders were not consulted before the increases were announced”. (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999). The finding agrees with the observation of the National Union of Ghana Students when its president, Adongo (1998), states that “the policy of cost-sharing is being unduly rushed without the government doing its homework” (Daily Graphic, 22nd Sept. 1998). In another contribution, Addae-
Mensah (1999) Vice-Chancellor of University of Ghana observed that the issue of cost sharing was started as far back as 1969 by Busia's regime but has always been shelved by successive governments (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999). This means that the timing, as one may note, can never be favourable. Therefore, for any major policy like this, there is always the need for more education to prepare the minds of the people and more consultations with the affected group by the government to make it work.

The Government Policy of Cost-Sharing May Discourage Children of Poor Families from Pursuing Tertiary Education

Of the student and tax-payer respondents, 78.3% and 83.3% respectively consider the government policy of cost sharing as something that may discourage children of poor families to pursue tertiary education. This finding agrees with the position of Lee Hansen and Weisbrod (1971) when they observe that high school graduates from low income families will continue to be less likely than others to attend college, less likely to go to high quality colleges, and less likely to remain in college until graduation"(p117).

This finding also supports the views of Wattenbarger (1971) that “education at all levels is a social responsibility” (P.153). It is hoped that something can be done to help the children from poor families in order to avoid what Akangbou (1986), describes as a “situation whereby the gap between the poor and the rich would be further increased with its attendant creation of a class-society coupled with its far reaching political and economic consequences”(P. 18).
The User-fees Increment and its Effects on the Halls of Residence and Facilities

The study reveals that as large as 80% of the student respondents in Ashanti and Central regions think that the user-fee increment has not led to any improvement in the halls of residence and facilities. Tuah (1999) on the contrary, has expressed the view that the increase in the user-fees has led to some improvement in the halls of residence and facilities (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999). Students’ views on several occasions in both the print and electronic media do not agree with the position of Tuah on such an issue.

What Stakeholders are Being Asked to Pay Under Cost-sharing Forms an Insignificant Part of the Total Cost per Student per Annum.

The study reveals that a good number of stakeholders in the Ashanti and Central Regions are divided on this issue. While 83.3% of the tax-payer respondents consider the quota they are being asked to pay under cost-sharing as insignificant part of the total cost per student per annum, student respondents on their part consider it to be significant. The students argue that apart from what they are officially paying under the cost-sharing, they pay other costs relating to students’ maintenance, feeding, books, photocopying, transport, clothing and other forgone earnings. For instance, Addae-Mensah, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana, has expressed the view that what parents are being asked to pay is just between 2% to 3% of the direct teaching cost which does not take into account high electricity bills and other overhead expenses (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999). According to the estimates from the National Council for Tertiary Education, what was supposed to be spent on a
student in the 1999/2000 academic year was as follows: Humanities; €3.2m Science €5.6m; Engineering student; €6.2m Pharmacy student; €7.0m and Medicine student, €9.5m. The truth of the matter is that such figures might have even doubled by the year 2001. For instance, Prof. Addae-Mensah (2001) said that the total direct cost is estimated between $6,000 and $8,000 or €42,000,000 and €56,000,000 per student at current exchange rate (Daily Graphic 22nd October, 2001)

In another development, one could take note of another type of cost which is not readily noticed. This has to do with foregone earnings. According to Wattenbarger (1971) this is “the money a young person would earn if he were working instead of going to school” (P.151). Since some students lose their earnings while in school, the earnings foregone constitute a part of their cost of schooling and Wattenbarger estimates this to be “almost six times the cost per student paid by public support” (P. 152). This means that some students bear extra cost apart from what they officially pay under the cost-sharing.

**Number of Dependents of Tax-payer Respondents and their Attitude towards Cost-Sharing**

Table 9 looks at the number of dependents of tax-payers and how they view the government policy of cost-sharing.
### Table 9
**Number of Dependents of Tax-Payers and their Attitude Towards Cost-Sharing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Dependents</th>
<th>For Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Against Cost-Sharing</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
<td>2 (14.2%)</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and above</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows that majority of the tax-payers have one or more dependents. That is 25 of the 30 tax-payers have one dependent or more. It further reveals that irrespective of whether one has a dependent or not, majority of the tax-payers accept the government policy of cost-sharing. However, acceptance is greater among those without any dependent (60%) than other tax-payers with 1-2 (50%), 3-4 (57.1%) and 5 and above (50%) dependents. The finding is in line with Spio-Garbra's (1999) observation, stated earlier, that "tax-payer are over-stretched and so students must look elsewhere for assistance" (Daily Graphic, 15th Sept. 1999).

---

**The Willingness of Tax-payers to Contribute More Towards Funding of Tertiary Education**

Table 10 shows the willingness or otherwise of tax-payers to contribute towards funding tertiary education.
Table 10

Willingness to Contribute More Towards Funding Tertiary Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that of 30 respondents as large 25 or 83.3% of them are not prepared to contribute any more than they are currently doing. This is in line with Wattenbarger’s (1971) observation that the “parental income is stretched to the breaking point” (P151). Spio-Garbra’s statement that “tax-payers are overstretched” agrees with this point.

Reasons for Which Tax-Payers are Unwilling to Contribute

More Towards Funding Tertiary Education

Table 11 examines the reasons for which the tax-payers are not willing to pay more than they are currently doing towards financing tertiary education
Table 11

Reasons for Tax-payers' Unwillingness to Contribute More Towards the Funding of Tertiary Education in Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsh economic conditions in the country</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of income to tax payers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax-payers are already burdened with other responsibilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only few tax-payers have the chance of sending their wards to tertiary institutions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 36% and 32% of the tax-payer respondents in the Ashanti and the Central Regions respectively blame their unwillingness to contribute more than they are doing now towards funding tertiary education on their low level of income and that they are overburdened with other responsibilities.

Suggestions for Alternative Sources of Funding Tertiary Education in Ghana by Student Respondents

Table 12 indicates a number of alternative sources of mobilising funds for the provision of tertiary education in the country suggested by student respondents.
In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to select as many of these suggested possible alternative sources of funding tertiary education as possible. Their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ loan scheme</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposition of Educational tax on industry</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Tertiary Education Bursary Fund</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More scholarship packages from the Private Enterprise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval of Training Cost</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Tuition fees</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment fund</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Trust Fund</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation in the form of donations and bursaries by the District Assemblies</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Councils</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using part of poverty alleviation fund</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Insurance Policy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Tax on University Graduates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from Alumni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship from Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses are displayed in table 12. The pertinent issues portrayed in the table are discussed below

**Payment of Tuition Fees**

Table 12 shows that only 28.3% of the student respondents in the Ashanti and Central Regions support the payment of tuition fees. This means that payment of tuition fees is not popular with students in these two regions. This point agrees with Wattenbarger's (1971) observation that our national commitment to education causes us to regard the opportunity for continued education as essential despite the recent and increasing tendency to make the so-called user of education pay for it through "tuition and matriculation fees" (P. 142). In contribution to this notion, Akangbou (1986) observes that the payment of tuition fees "is likely to further increase the gap between the rich and the poor and the creation of a class-society". The students on their part, according to Akangbou, would resent such a move and if peace is to reign given the small amount to be earned from it. "University Education should continue to be free" (P18), meaning "tuition-free".

The establishment of many private Universities in Ghana has brought a great challenge to the government policy of fee-free tertiary education. If the private universities are to conform to this tuition-free policy of the public universities there is no way they can survive. It is to cater for some of these problems that the officials of the state universities are advocating for the payment of tuition-fees and total cost recovery in recent times.
Students' Loan Scheme

Of the 60 student respondents who answered the questionnaire in the Ashanti and Central Regions, 50 or 83% of them suggest the Students Loan Scheme as still a welcoming alternative of funding tertiary education. This view agrees with Peacock and Culyer’s (1969) suggestion that the state should make available subsidy and loans big enough to enable the students to finance their education. Bowen’s (1971) statement seems to disagree with this finding when he advocates for more grants other than loans. According to him, a “heavy use of loans is an impediment to opportunity” (P.166). Akangbou (1987) observes that since individual money lenders charge very exorbitant interest rates, co-operative or community associations may introduce educational loan scheme from which children of members can benefit since their interest rates may be manageable (P.64). In 1988 the government of Ghana brokered with the SSNIT to administer the Students Loan Scheme which is the main body granting loans to students. Unfortunately, beneficiaries of such students’ Loan Scheme are owing the SSNIT over $72 billion as at 1999 and this is threatening the sustainability of the scheme. (Daily Graphic, 8th Feb. 1999).

Imposition of Educational Tax on Industry

About 50 or 83% of the student respondents suggest the imposition of educational tax on industry as an alternative source of funding tertiary education in Ghana. This is supported by Akangbou’s (1986) proposition that “the organised private sector must be made to contribute at least 10 percent of the funds required by the Universities” (P20). The National Union of Ghana Students on her part has advocated among others for the “institution of an educational tax to finance tertiary education in the country” (Daily Graphic, 24th Sept. 1999). The government’s bold
steps to institute an educational tax of $2^{1/2}$ of the $12^{1/2}$% of the VAT which is paid into the Ghana Educational Trust Fund seems to be in the same direction.

**Establishment of Tertiary Education Bursary Fund**

As large as 51 or 85% of the respondents suggest this. In certain cases, government may be interested in paying for her citizen’s education through the award of bursaries. These bursaries are usually of a fixed amount irrespective of the programme of study being undertaken. As an intervention measure to avert the crisis that followed the government announcement of the payment of user-fees, the government decided to set up three billion cedis (¢3 billion) for needy students. (Daily Graphic, 17th August 1999). According to Spio-Garbra (1999), a bursary programme was started in 1991/92 for needy students but was discontinued because students resorted to all kinds of dubious means to prevent others from availing themselves of the facility (Daily Graphic, 11th Sept. 1999). In recent times, this same programme was announced but could not materialise because of the problem of how to determine who a needy student is.

**Establishment of Endowment Fund**

About 95% of the student respondents support this idea. This confirms Akangbou’s (1987) observation that financing educational programme can be done “through donations and establishment of endowment funds” (P63). These donations according to him are made by governments, communities and individuals who are eager to contribute to the upliftment of education in their states or nation.
More Scholarship Packages from the Private Enterprises

Majority of the respondents (49 or 81.6%) suggest this. The recommendation by the University Rationalisation Report (1988) agrees by saying that more scholarship schemes should be instituted by the big industrial establishments like Lever Brothers, Valco and the Breweries. This can help students pay for what kind of educational service they want. The private sector or enterprises are some of the direct beneficiaries of graduates from the universities and Polytechnics. There is the need for the private sector to be well organised and motivated to contribute to the training of such graduates.

Retrieval of Training Cost

Precisely 66.6% of the respondents are of the view that retrieval of training cost mechanism must be put in place. The statement of Akangbou (1987) is in line with this notion when he observes that the "introduction of higher education tax whereby cost of higher education by programme can be borne at the moment by the government and the student pays back through a special tax scheme to the government after his training" (P.72).

Part of the Poverty Alleviation Fund to be Devoted to the Upliftment of Tertiary Education

About 50% of the respondents to the questionnaire suggest this. It is noted that quality education is a key to poverty alleviation. Blaug's (1970) statement supports this assertion when he observes that the "extension of education tends to raise the earnings of those who have benefited from it and so investment in education
accelerates economic growth” (p.61). Wattenbarger’s (1971) views agree with this point when he states that “it has become a national policy to use education to break the cycle of poverty and overcome the lack of motivation among low income groups” (P146).

Educational Insurance Policy

Precisely 66.6% of the respondents suggest the institution of Educational Insurance Policy as an alternative source for mobilising funding for tertiary education. Parents can enter into contractual agreement with Insurance Companies to procure such a policy for their wards’ education in the near future.

Educational Trust Fund

Table 12 shows also that 100% of the respondents favour this alternative. This observation agrees with National Union of Ghana Students’ proposal that there must be the establishment of an Educational Trust Fund and the institution of an Educational Tax to finance tertiary education (Daily Graphic, 24th Sept. 1999). In 2000, parliament passed a bill establishing the Ghana Educational Trust Fund into law with two and a half percent of the Value Added Tax (VAT) proceeds going into the fund. The Ghana Educational Trust Fund has since then been doing well and has also become the bastion for education financing at all levels in the country. Graduates from universities and polytechnics can be levied at least one percent on their salaries to be paid into the Ghana Educational Trust Fund to make it more sustaining.


**Educational Tax on University Graduates**

Precisely 58.3% of the respondents are of the view that educational tax should be levied on Polytechnic and University graduates. By this they mean a special mechanism must be put in place to enable all those who have benefited from tertiary education to contribute a minimum amount towards financing tertiary education as they start working. This point is supported by Oduro’s (1999) observation of a policy that makes it mandatory for every employed graduate who has benefited from tertiary education in the country to contribute a minimum of say one percent of his or her monthly salary to the Educational Trust Fund. Clearly, the implementation of this alternative would not be easy, but with intensified public forum and education devoid of political prejudices, the support of graduate workers could be won in this venture.

**Sponsorship from Banks and Companies**

Precisely 50% of the respondents propose that banks must be encouraged to grant sponsorship to needy but brilliant students. This could be seen as their modest social contribution to the society. This point is reinforced by the observation made by Otumfo Osei Tutu II, Asantehene, during the sword-cutting ceremony for the multi-million hostel belonging to the KNUST SRC to the effect that the contribution of the business sector has been lukewarm. He therefore calls on the banks and private enterprises to grant more scholarships and loans to students as it is done in the developed world.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Tertiary education equips its recipients with the needed skills, abilities and capabilities to create wealth. As the skills, abilities, capabilities and intellects of the people become sharpened, their productivity levels are raised. A rise in productivity levels leads, normally, to an increase in the levels of income. Once the productivity and income levels are raised, the total output of the economy also rises. It is for this reason that it becomes a great loss not only to the individual but also to the state as a whole if an individual capable of acquiring higher education is not able to do so due to his/her inability to pay for it.

In recent times, the burden of providing funding for tertiary education in the country has become more expensive for the government alone to bear. As resources available for the provision of tertiary education continue to dwindle, enrolment and operational cost on their part keep going up. As a result, various concerns have been expressed from several quarters to the effect that more additional funds need to be sought from other sources to help save our higher educational institutions from grinding to a halt. It was in response to such concerns that the government came out with the policy of cost-sharing between the government and stakeholders as an alternative source for providing funding for tertiary education.

The study sought to gather and examine the various perceptions of a section of the stakeholders of tertiary education about the government policy of cost sharing in tertiary education in Ghana, namely, students, tax-payers and employers.
By way of methodology, the survey approach was adopted. Students of tertiary institutions, tax-payers and employers in Ashanti and Central regions of Ghana were treated as the population of the study. In all, 30 tax-payers, 60 students and 20 employers were randomly and purposively selected to be the population sample for the study. While the 60 students and 30 tax-payers were given questionnaire to answer, the 20 employers who were purposively selected from the two regions were interviewed. The data collected from the stakeholders were analysed to ascertain the perceptions of the different stakeholders concerning the government policy of cost-sharing. The analytical tools used comprised tables and percentages.

Findings

This section of the report summarises briefly the key findings of the study. The study has revealed that majority of the students, tax-payers and employers in Ashanti and Central Region are of the view that financing tertiary education in Ghana is not only expensive, but it is also a problem. It is expensive in the sense that the total direct cost per student as disclosed by Prof. Addae-Mensah, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana was between $6000 and $8000 or $42 million and $56 million at the current exchange rate. This creates a problem when one thinks about the number of students involved.

It has been discovered that even though majority of the stakeholders in the two regions accept the policy of cost-sharing, they debunk the notion that government policy of cost sharing is favourable to all stakeholders. Some stakeholders are not in favour of cost-sharing on grounds of their inability to pay for the cost of their children's education. The students, tax-payers and employers in the Ashanti and Central Regions are of the view that the policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education
can discourage children of poor families from pursuing tertiary education. The study also reveals that the issue of payment of tuition fees is not popular among the stakeholders in Ashanti and Central regions. However, this issue is not yet a problem since students in public tertiary institutions do not currently pay tuition fees.

In the light of the above findings certain alternative sources of mobilising funding for the provision of tertiary education were suggested:

- some respondents consider an imposition of Educational Tax on industry in the Ashanti and Central regions.
- Some respondents suggest the introduction of Tertiary Education Bursary Fund to help the needy but brilliant students in the two regions under study.
- More Educational Endowment Funds must be established by both political and traditional authorities in the regions under study.
- Other respondents consider the establishment of more scholarship packages from the private enterprises operating in the Ashanti and Central Regions.
- Also, many of the respondents recommend the institution of Educational Insurance Policy by the government in the two regions.
- Moreover, Educational Fund-Raising Programmes could be organised in the Ashanti and Central regions with a view to soliciting more funds in support of tertiary education in the regions.
- there must be the imposition of Educational Tax on University Graduates who have secured employment.

Conclusions

This section of the study seeks to draw conclusions from the findings of the study by summarising briefly what has been presented so far and what are believed to
be the perceptions of the stakeholders in Ashanti and Central Regions of the
government policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ghana.

The study has revealed that the concern among the students, tax-payers and
employers in the Ashanti and Central Regions of Ghana is that financing tertiary
education in Ghana is not only expensive but it is also a problem. There is therefore
the need for all stakeholders in the two regions under study to help in the provision of
tertiary education in Ghana.

Even though majority of the tax-payers, students and employers in Ashanti
and Central Regions accept the policy of cost-sharing, they debunk the notion that
government policy of cost-sharing is favourable to all of them. The issue of
affordability of one's share of the cost under the policy is still unresolved.

It is to help to solicit for an additional funding for the tertiary institutions and
to address the issue of ability to pay one's part of the cost under the policy of Cost-
Sharing that the following alternative sources of mobilising funding were
recommended. Some form of an Educational Tax on industry can be imposed.
Tertiary Educational Bursary Fund meant to assist brilliant but needy students can be
established. More Educational Edowment Funds, Scholarship packages from the
Private Enterprises, Educational Insurance schemes for students and parents can also
help ease the burden of financing tertiary education on all stakeholders. All
stakeholders must show their commitment to the policy to make it work successfully.
Recommendations

The issues discussed are those that would guide the recommendations to be made as part of the concluding remarks.

First and foremost, the issue of cost-sharing in our tertiary institutions has now become imperative. There is therefore the need for communities, the private sector, the churches and all primary beneficiaries to contribute meaningfully towards the provision of tertiary education in the Ashanti and Central Regions of Ghana.

Secondly, the issue on the individual's ability to pay under the cost-sharing concept has the potential of determining the success or otherwise of the policy. To this end, there is the need for the determination of who is able or not able to pay for higher education in Ashanti and Central Regions of Ghana to save the policy from running into problems. Once the ability to pay issue is not settled, the fear that the policy of cost-sharing can discourage children from poor families from pursuing tertiary education may not be put to rest.

Thirdly, the universities and polytechnics could seek arrangements with the private sector for meaningful work-study programmes or jobs for the students. This would enhance their ability to pay for their quota of cost of providing tertiary education.

Fourthly, the Private Sector must team up with the tertiary institutions to establish research oriented departments so that the business organisations can sponsor the activities and programmes of such departments. These organisations could be motivated to contribute more towards financing tertiary education in Ashanti and
Central Regions. However, this could be done depending on the prevailing economic conditions and financial strength of the individual organisation concerned.

Fifthly, the tertiary institutions in the Ashanti and Central Regions of Ghana must be encouraged to review and redesign their courses of study and research with a view to making them more practical and relevant to commerce and industry. This will motivate the business organisations to sponsor most of the activities of the universities and polytechnics.

Sixthly, there is the need to establish fund-raising committees in these regions with the mandate and goal to solicit for funds into the Ghana Educational Trust Fund to make it more sustaining. These may involve activities like raffles, drama, concerts, charity walks, collecting various items and auctioning them and cash donations.

Seven, since more students depend on the SSNIT Loan Scheme for sponsorship, all efforts must be made to make the scheme more sustaining and effective.

Lastly, the issue of payment of tuition fees has remained and still remains delicate and touchy not only in the two regions but also in the country in general and so the government must approach the issue with great circumspection.

Suggestion for Future Research

The researcher would like to humbly advise and caution readers that the research was limited to the Ashanti and the Central Regions of Ghana. It will therefore be risky to generalise the outcome of the study to cover the entire country. The researcher would like to recommend to interesting researchers to replicate the study in any of the eight remaining regions.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION:

This questionnaire is meant to solicit information from students to help establish the perception of stakeholders (students) of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ghana.

INSTRUCTION

From your own independent and objective point of view, please, give appropriate answers to the following questions. Except otherwise directed, please, tick [ ] in the boxes or write answers in the spaces provided.

A. BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

1. Sex (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]

2. Age (as at last birthday)
   (a) 20 and below [ ]
   (b) 21-25 [ ]
   (c) 26-30 [ ]
   (d) 31-40 [ ]
   (e) 41-50 [ ]
   (f) 51 and above [ ]

3. Tick your present level of programme of study from the checklist below:
   (a) Level 600 [ ]
   (b) Level 500 [ ]
   (c) Level 400 [ ]
   (d) Level 300 [ ]
   (e) Level 200 [ ]
   (f) Level 100 [ ]

4. Please, kindly tick to indicate your programme:
   (a) Ph.D [ ]
   (b) M.Phil/M.Ed/M.A [ ]
5. Are you on "study leave with pay"
   (a) Yes [ ]  (b) [ ]

6. If "Yes" what agency has offered you the study leave with Pay?

7. If "No", select from the checklist below the form(s) of sponsorship to your education:
   (a) Self-financing [ ]
   (b) SSNIT Loan Scheme [ ]
   (c) Parental and relative support [ ]
   (d) Scholarship form .................................................................
   (e) Bursary from .................................................................

B. PERCEPTIONS OF THE STATE OF TERTIARY EDUCATION
FINANCING IN GHANA

Please, kindly express your view(s) about the financing of Tertiary Education in the Country by pick from the scale to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement and jot the number in the space to the right of the item.

Scale

1. - Strongly Agree
2. - Agree
3. - Neutral
4. - Disagree
5. - Strongly Disagree
8. The financing of tertiary education is very expensive

9. Financing tertiary education in Ghana is in serious crisis

10. Government alone can still solve the problem of financing tertiary education

11. Government alone cannot solve the problem associated with financing Tertiary Education and needs to be supported.

12. There is a need for some form of cost-sharing between the government on one hand and parents and/or students on the other

13. The government policy of cost-sharing is favourable to all parents and students in tertiary institutions

14. The timing of the introduction of the policy of cost-sharing is favourable to all parents and students

15. Parents and students are already bearing part of the cost of tertiary education, hence there is no need for official sharing of cost between the government and parents and/or students.

16. The concept of cost-sharing is a shift of responsibility from the government to the individual parent and/or student.

17. What parents and/or students are being asked to pay under the policy of cost-sharing is just insignificant part of the present cost per head per annum of a student pursuing tertiary education in the country.

18. All stakeholders (students) can afford the quota of the cost of Tertiary Education.

19. Cost-sharing discourages children of people especially those from poor families to pursue tertiary education.
20. The user-fees increment has led to some improvement in the halls of residence and facilities.

C. ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF FINANCING TERTIARY EDUCATION

21. Please, kindly tick "Yes" or "No" in the boxes provided the words that can be potential alternative sources of funding tertiary education.

i. A students' loan scheme Yes [ ] No [ ]

ii. Imposition of educational tax on Industry, petroleum products, cigarettes, alcoholic drinks Yes [ ] No [ ]

iii. Establishment of Tertiary Education Bursary Fund (TEBF)

Yes [ ] No [ ]

iv. More scholarship packages Yes [ ] No [ ]

v. Retrieval of Training cost mechanism Yes [ ] No [ ]

vi. Payment of tuition fees Yes [ ] No [ ]

vii. Endowment funds Yes [ ] No [ ]

viii. Education Trust Funds Yes [ ] No [ ]

ix. Engaging in revenue yielding projects by the Universities

Yes [ ] No [ ]

X. Community participation in the form of donations and bursaries by district Assemblies and traditional Councils Yes [ ] No [ ]

22. Is/are there any alternative source(s) which is/are not included in the list?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

23. If "Yes", kindly state it/them

(a) ...........................................

(b) ...........................................

(c) ...........................................

(d) ...........................................
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TAX-PAYER

INTRODUCTION

This questionnaire is meant to solicit information from tax-payers to help establish the perception of tax-payers of the government policy of cost-sharing in tertiary education in Ghana.

INSTRUCTION

From your own independent and objective point of view, please give appropriate answers to the following questions. Except otherwise directed, please, tick ( ) in the boxes or write answers in the spaces provided.

A BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

1. Gender
   (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]

2. Age (as at last birthday)
   (a) 20 and below [ ]
   (b) 21-25 [ ]
   (c) 26-30 [ ]
   (d) 31-40 [ ]
   (e) 41-50 [ ]
   (f) 51 and above [ ]

3. Marital status
   Single [ ]
   Married [ ]
   Divorced [ ]
   Widowed [ ]

4. Do you have any children and/or dependants?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. If "Yes" indicate the number of dependants
   1-2 [ ]
   3-4 [ ]
   5 and above [ ]
In which sector of the economy are you employed?

i. Private or informal sector
ii. Public or formal sector

8. Which of the following type of tax(es) do you pay quite often?

i. Income [ ]
ii. Property [ ]
iii. VAT [ ]

Any other (Please specify) .................................................................

B  PERCEPTIONS OF THE STATE OF TERTIARY EDUCATION

Please, kindly express your view(s) about financing of Tertiary Education in the country by picking from the scale to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement and write the number that corresponds to word(s) in the scale in the space to the right of the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The financing of tertiary education is very expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Financing tertiary education in Ghana is a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Government alone can still solve the problems associated with financing tertiary education in Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Government alone can’t still solve the problem associated with financing tertiary education and needs to be supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There is a need for some form of cost-sharing between the government on one hand and the tax-payer on the other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The government policy of cost-sharing is favourable to all tax-payers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The government policy of cost-sharing is favourable to tax-payers who are also parents

15. Tax-payers are already bearing part of the cost of tertiary education and therefore there is no need for official sharing of cost between the government and tax-payers

16. The government policy of cost-sharing is a shift of part of government responsibility to the taxpayer

17. The government policy of cost-sharing discourages children from poor families from pursuing tertiary education

C. ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF FINANCING TERTIARY EDUCATION IN GHANA

18. which of the following do you consider as possible alternative source(s) of funding tertiary education?

Student’s loan scheme [ ]
Tertiary Education Bursary Fund [ ]
Education Trust Funds [ ]
Any other (Please specify) .................................................................

19. Would you suggest that tax-payers should contribute more toward the provision of tertiary education than they are currently doing?

(a) Yes [ ] (b) [ ]

20. If "No", kindly give your reason(s)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

The bearer of this letter, Owusu-Ansah Collins is a graduate student of the University of Cape Coast. He is collecting data/information in your Organisation for the purpose of writing a thesis as a requirement of the programme.

I would be grateful if you could help him collect the data/information from your Organisation. Kindly give the necessary assistance that Owusu-Ansah Collins requires to collect the data.

Thank you.

A. L. Dare (Dr.)
Ag. Director

Distribution
Principal, Cape Coast Polytechnic
Manager/Personnel, Telecom Company Limited, Cape Coast
Manager/Personnel, Ameen Sangari Industries Ltd., Cape Coast
Manager/Personnel, Savoy Restaurant and Hotel, Cape Coast
Manager/Personnel, Mfantsiman Press, Cape Coast
Manager/Personnel, Methodist Book Depot, Cape Coast
Manager/Personnel, Sanaa Lodging Ltd., Cape Coast
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I would be grateful if you could help him collect the data/information from your Organisation. Kindly give the necessary assistance that Owusu-Ansah Collins requires to collect the data.

Thank you.

A. L. Dare (Dr.)
Ag. Director

Distribution
Manager/Personnel, Elmina Beach Resort, Elmina
Manager/Personnel, Coconut Groove, Elmina
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The bearer of this letter, Owusu-Ansah Collins is a graduate student at the University of Cape Coast. He is collecting data/information in your Organisation for the purpose of writing a thesis as a requirement of the programme.

I would be grateful if you could help him collect the data/information from your Organisation. Kindly give the necessary assistance that Owusu-Ansah Collins requires to collect the data.

Thank you.

A. L. Dare (Dr.)
Ag. Director

Distribution
Dean of Students' Affairs, UCEW, Kumasi Campus
Principal, Kumasi Polytechnic, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, A. Life Company Ltd, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, A. E. Saoud Ltd, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, Consar Ltd, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, KBL - Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, Abuakwa Formulation Plant - Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, Addai Cutlass Ltd, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, LLL Ltd, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, Association of Ghana Industries, Kumasi
Manager/Personnel, CFAO Ghana Ltd, Kumasi