Socio-Economic Factors in Demand for Higher Education: Sample of Gaziantep Province[1]

Dr. Filiz GÖLPEK
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences
Hasan Kalyoncu University, Gaziantep/Turkey

Nöfer Çiftçioğlu
Gaziantep/Turkey

Abstract

Higher education demand of individuals is generally determined by public finance policy, educational level of parents which is defined as socio-economic statue, profession, income, number of children in family, elimination systems, rate of return, employment ratio and contemporary population. Demand for higher education has been significantly increased by the fact that rapid developments in technology make being graduate and continuing education of adults almost obligatory. This, combining with the benefits which individuals seek to gain from higher education, increases the demand for higher education. In this study, socio-economic statue of the families in Gaziantep Province which was the least successful in the higher education entrance exam in 2013 is analyzed. In consequence of the study, it is observed that the individuals who have a higher socio-economic statue plan to receive higher education more than the individuals with lower socio-economic statue and the former is more successful in higher education entrance exams than the latter.

Key Words: Demand for higher education, socio-economic statue, higher education expenses, education economics.

1. Introduction

According to the literature, demand for higher education is also affected by direct and indirect costs of individuals, family income, increase in income which is ensured by higher education, yield of return, unemployment rate, gender and quantity of the related age group (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985: 112; Aslan, 1998: 212; Berger and Kostal, 2002: 101). However, in consequence of the performed studies, it is observed that these factors do not affect demand of a student for higher education in the same way. Accordingly, demand for higher education is positively affected by education and income level of family, income difference and unemployment rate while it is negatively affected by education fee and other expenses (Yang, 2001: 3).

Today, it is crucial to receive career education in various fields due to the fact that more and more students in primary and secondary education are reaching higher education level; lower levels of education is inadequate in meeting the needs of social and economic life which is extremely complex due to scientific and technical development; and due to the increase in standards of life. This necessity leads programs supporting career education to be opened and new higher education institutions to be established. However, free supply of it increases demand for higher education in many countries (Gölpek, 2011: 149).

Within this framework, main purpose of this study is to analyze the socio-economic condition of the families of the students in Gaziantep Province which was the least successful in Turkey having an elimination system in 2013. The study consists of four parts including introduction and conclusion. In the second part is the theoretical framework and literature review. In the third part, data pertaining to the secondary school final year students who prepare for higher education entrance examination and the data pertaining to the students who are registered at a higher education institution are compared.

[1] This study is derived from the postgraduate thesis named *The Impacts of Socio-Economic Factors on Higher Education Demand: Samples of Gaziantep Provinces.*

In the conclusion part, it is stated that the students with lower socio-economical statues also wish for studying at a university, however, the students with higher socio-economical statue are more successful at the higher education entrance exams thus they can benefit from higher education.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Examination

According to the literature, demand for higher education is affected by social and private expenditures, cost of opportunity, increase in income which is ensured by higher education, yield of return, educational and income level of family and schooling rate. Contemporary population which is defined as the quantity of the related age group also affects the demand for higher education (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985: 112; Duchesne and Nonneman 1998: 212; Berger and Kostal, 2002: 105).

Higher education expenses include social expenditures which are made in order to supply educational services and private expenditures which are made by the families of the students during the education period. These expenditures are made directly and indirectly (Fournier and Rasmussen, 1986: 179; Gölpek, 2012: 77).

Social expenditure is the act of covering higher education expenses from public funding. The fact that higher education services have the quality of semipublic good makes it obligatory to use public funding. Main items of social expenditures are: salaries of academic and administrative staff, establishing and maintaining the buildings and premises; and equipment spending. These expenditures are classified as fixed and current expenditures (Atkinson, 1983:12; Gölpek, 2013: 51).

Fixed expenditures include the expenditures on the durable items which are expected to provide benefits in the long term such as buildings and equipment. Current expenditures are the expenditures on the items which are consumed in one accounting period which is considered to be one year (Aslan, 2003: 190).

Public funding is mainly the main finance form of education in many countries and the rate of private expenditures is quite low; and particularly higher education service is offered by state on a large scale. For instance, Japan and the U.S.A. are the countries in which income rate from public funding is the lowest with the rates of 42% and 45% respectively. This rate is often higher than 80% in other countries (Table 1).

Table 1: Income Distribution of Higher Education Institutions in Certain Countries

Country	Public type	Public funding (%)	Education fees (%)	Other (%)
The U.S.A.	All higher education	44,80	22,40	32,80
Japan	All higher education	42,00	35,80	22,20
The G.B	Universities	55,00	13,70	31,30
Australia	All higher education	87,96	2,11	9,93
Finland	All higher education	85,00	-	15,00
France	All higher education	89,50	4,70	5,80
Germany	All higher education	68,50	-	31,50
The Netherlands	All higher education	80,00	12,00	8,00
Norway	All higher education	90,00	-	10,00
Spain	Universities	80,00	20,00	-

Reference: Gülşen, C. & Akpınar, M. (2011). *Yükseköğretim finansmanında alternative yaklaşımlar.* İstanbul: Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011), 1227-1233.

For example, in Germany, in which the rate of public funding is almost 69%, higher education expenditures increased about 50% in 200-2010 period (Statistical Office of The European, 2012).

Approximately 32% of income of total 164 higher education institutions in England in 2005-2011 period comprise of budget appropriations. Education fees which are collected from students constitute the second largest income item with 33% (OECD, 2012).

According to the prices of 2011 in France, higher education expenditures increased threefold in three decades; expenditure per student which was € 7.650 in 1980 became € 11.630 with an increase of 52% in 2011. In this period, rate of higher education expenditures in GDB (Gross Domestic Product) is almost 20% (Statistical Office of The European, 2012).

In Australia, budget appropriations constitute the most important income source of higher education institutions with almost 88%. Considering the loan (HECS-HELP) and grant (FEE-HELP) payments to students, direct public support which was about 43% has become 57% (public finance: 43%; HECS-HELP: 11,7% and FEE-HELP: 2,2%).

Adding the public funding from local administrations (2,2%), the rate of public funding in total income items of higher education institutions is 60%. Education fees are the second larger source of income with 25% (Statistical Office of The European, 2012).

Total income of 8 higher education institutions which serve in Denmark was DDK 18.907.629 and has become DDK 24.970.875 with a 32% increase. Public income in these incomes has become DDK 3.312.817 with a 50% increase while it was DDK 2.108.562 (Statistical Office of The European, 2012).

In 2000-2012 period, in Turkey, budget appropriation which was TL 1.046.544.700 has become TL 12.743.603.000 by increasing almost twelve-fold. Budget appropriation increases almost 42% in proportion to GDB (MEB, 2012). Private expenditures include transportation, food, accommodation, clothing, education fees, textbooks, stationary and other expenses made for other materials related to the education and students' pocket money (Cohn, 1979:62; Coombs and Hallak, 1994:100).

Another cost element which the families of the students registered at higher education bear is waived earnings (cost of opportunity). A certain amount of waived income is in question due to the fact that a higher education student prefers to receive education at school rather than work (Abbott and Leslie, 2004: 71; Psacharopoulos and Papakonstantinou, 2005: 103).

For instance, in the Philippines and in the rural areas of Bangladesh, children of poor families start to help with the domestic affairs or contribute the family income younger than the children of high income families due to the fact that the value of waived earning is quite high (Psacharopoulos and Papakonstantinou, 2005: 108). In a study performed in India, it is found that the earning which a university student waives in the first year is 35% of the average earning of someone who quits school and begins to work; and it is 80% in the third year. It is also observed that the opportunity cost of a secondary school student is 35% in the first year and almost 90% in the fourth year (Gölpek, 2012: 51).

Gaining is defined as the benefits which an individual receiving education obtains and are not redounded on society. These benefits manifest themselves in a way that they increase the earning capacity and efficiency of an individual through bringing individual in knowledge and various skills and ensure individual to benefit from more goods and services (Aslan, 2002).

Compared to other educational levels, higher gaining are involved in higher education. Main for this is the fact that expenses of higher education are met by public funding. This decreases the expenses of individuals and increases private gaining (Bray and Kwok, 2003: 613; Fethke, 2005: 11). According to the educational data of OECD, a graduate earns more income than a primary school graduate. To illustrate, the country in which the said income difference is the highest is the U.S.A. (USD 177 and 66, respectively), and the lowest is Belgium (USD 131 and 91, respectively). In Turkey, income of a graduate (USD 149), is approximately as twice as a primary school graduate (69 USD) (OECD, 2012).

In a similar study performed in the U.S.A, according to the current prices of 2010, weekly wages of individuals with difference in educational level and the relation between education level and unemployment rate are estimated (Table 2).

Table 2: Unemployment Rates and Prices According to Educational Level in the U.S.A. (%-USD)

Educational level	Unemployment rate (%)	Weekly wage (USD)
Doctoral degree	1,9	1.150
Master's degree	4,0	1.272
University	5,4	1.038
Associate's degree	7,0	767
High school	10,3	626
Secondary +primary school	14,9	444

Reference: Kalkınma Bakanlığı (2012). Dünya ekonomisinde son gelişmeler. Mart, 10.

Unemployment rates in secondary school graduates and doctoral students are 15% and 2%, respectively. This indicates that unemployment rate decreases as educational level increases and weekly wage income is directly related with educational level. Weekly wage income which a graduate earns (USD 1.038) is almost three times as much as weekly wage income of a primary school graduate (USD 444).

According to a study performed by Ş. Çalışkan in 2005 called *Return of Education in Turkey: Sample of Uşak Province,* income increases with educational level. A primary school graduate earns TL 381 monthly while a graduate earns TL 881 and approximately 131% income increase is accrued (Table 3).

Table 3: Average Income Based on Educational Level in Uşak in 2005 and Proportional Difference Among Educational Levels

Educational level	Average income (TL)		Increase in income based on primary school graduates (%)	Difference among educational levels (%)
	Male	Female		
Primary school	381.50	336.90	-	-
Secondary school	466.90	412.30	22,4	22,4
High school	555.00	490.10	45,5	23,1
Vocational high school	582.90	514.70	52,9	30,5*
VHS	641.00	566.00	68,0	22,5**
Graduate	881.00	777.92	131,0	84,5**
Postgraduate	1157.50	1022.07	203,4	72,4

Reference: Çalışkan, Ş. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin harcamalarının kent ekonomisine katkısı: Uşak Üniversitesi örneği. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(31), 170.

*Difference estimated based on secondary school graduates.

** Difference estimated based on high school students.

Returns are compared with private costs and expressed as individual's private rate of return. In general, it is concluded that social returns at primary and secondary school level and private returns at higher education level dominate (Woodhall, 1994: 20-23). Private rate of return varies based on development level of countries, educational level and gender (Cohn, 1979:33; Woodhall, 1994: 209).

According to education monitoring report, while this rate is higher in higher education level than secondary education level in all the regions of the low and medium income level countries, it is significantly low at secondary education level based on gender (Table 4). This rate is the almost the same for men and women in Turkey and it is about 19% and 6% at higher education and secondary education, respectively (OECD, 2012).

Table 4: Data on Rate of Private Return Based on Educational Level (%)

		Educational level		
		Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Higher (%)
Income level of countries	Countries at Low Income Level	25,8	19,9	26,0
	Countries at Medium Income Level	27,4	18,0	19,3
	Countries at High Income Level	25,6	12,2	12,4
Regions	Asia	20	15,8	18,2
	Europe /Middle East /Northern Africa (Countries which are not OECD member)	13,8	13,6	18,8
	Latin America and Caribbean	26,6	17	19,5
	OECD Countries	13,4	11,3	11,6
	Africa (Sub-Saharan)	37,6	24,6	27,8
Gender	Male	20,1	13,9	11,0
	Female	12,8	18,4	10,8

Reference: Statistical Office of The European (2012). *Higher education statistics.*

One of the important factors affecting demand for higher education is employment rates. Employability increases as educational level increases. The unemployment possibility of a graduate within the period in which he asks for employment is quite small compared to other educational levels. Employers, even when they think that educated employees do not have specific skills and qualifications, may pay higher salaries due to the fact that they are more success-oriented, self-confident, enthusiastic about problem solving, adaptable to changing conditions and they benefit from job experiences and in-service training more (Yang, 2001: 3; Yeşilbag, 2008: 45).

In OECD countries, almost 60% of men and 36% of women who are primary school graduates; 88% of men and 79% of women who are graduates and postgraduates in 25-64 age group are employed. On the other hand, unemployment rate in graduate and postgraduate is approximately 4% and 5% for men and women, respectively; in primary school graduate, it is about 17% and 14% for men and women, respectively. These data indicates that employability increases as educational level increases (OECD, 2012).

Another factor affecting demand for higher education is income and educational level of family. Poor families have difficulty in affording expenses which are required to graduate. However, rich families do not have difficulty in spending on education (Bowen, 2004: 8-9). While a rich student can plan to attend a higher education institution, a poor student does not consider it (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985:112; Sauer, 2004:1189). Educational level of family strongly affects the school success of children and leads them to benefit education opportunity. Such a consequence means that their children benefit higher education services more. Particularly, this possibility will increase more in the countries which practice higher education entrance examination (Aslan, 1998: 306; Mutluer, 2008: 13; Gölpek, 2011: 241).

Number of family members may have an influence on education of children. To illustrate, if the family income remains stable, number of family members will affect the economic condition of a family. In the case of having a large number of family members and low family income, education of a child will be affected negatively. In families with a lot of children, parents may not pay as much attention as the children from families having less family members. This may cause the children to experience an additional disadvantage. Furthermore, absence of a parent, particularly father, may cause family to be poorer. In this case, child will feel under pressure to contribute the family income. In conclusion, this will cause the child to quit school and look for a regular job (Aslan, 2003: 125).

Increase in contemporary higher education population also increases the demand for higher education. It will increase the demand for higher education that by 2020, 40% of global labor power will be composed of information labor and higher education will continue to play an active role in acquiring and improving the qualifications required by the said labor (Ekinci, 2009: 121). However, in developed countries, population 25 years and over who are out of contemporary higher education population and become aware of the fact that academic qualities and skills which are acquired during education are necessary for success show an increasing interest to higher education. This creates need for expanding higher education (Tanrıkulu, 2011: 9; Uğurlugelen, 2013: 83).

In EU-27 countries, the average age of graduates is 22,1. In countries such as Denmark (24,9), Finland (24,8), Austria (24,7) and Luxemburg (24,1), the average of age is higher than the average in EU-27 countries while the U.S.A. (21,9), Croatia (20,8), Macedonia (20,5) and Turkey (21,6) are below the average in EU-27 countries (Statistical Office of The European, 2012).

The rate of those who continue their higher education in 25-34 age group is gradually increasing in the OECD countries and group of twenty (G-20). According to the data of 2010, while number of graduates in 25-34 age group in the OECD countries is almost 66 million, it is nearly 64 million in G-20 countries. it is estimated that for G-20 countries including Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and South Africa, this number will increase by 40% by 2020 and will be more than the number of the graduates in the OECD countries. Considering the share of the graduates among countries in the projections to 2020, China is in the first place with nearly 29% and India is in the second place with 12%. It is believed that no significant increase will appear in Germany, France, Canada, Brazil and Spain due to the fact that population growth follows a stable course in these countries. This indicates that China and India, having the maximal population, will also have the highest number of graduates in the future and the number of graduates in developing countries will increase based on rapid population growth (OECD, 2012). Another factor increasing demand for higher education is schooling rate which is the share of educated population in total population.

In conjunction with the increase in higher education demand, schooling rate in higher education and the number of students registered at higher education increase. Schooling rate in higher education varies in the countries which are in different income groups in the period of 1985-2011. According to this, schooling rates in higher education increased in all countries in all income groups. This increase is very rapid in some countries and very slow in others. Particularly, schooling speed is very low in the countries in low income groups. As of 2011, schooling rate is 72%, 35%, 26%, 18%, and 7% in the countries in high, medium-high, medium, medium-low and low income groups, respectively (The World Bank, 2012).

3. Method

3.1. Method of the study

This study utilizes descriptive survey model. In this model, a situation is described as it is. In the study, socio-economic statues of the families of students who demand higher education are assessed. Data on two different cases are analyzed. The first of these is to determine socio-economic characteristics of the families whose children are 12th grade at secondary school and prepare for higher education entrance examinations (YGS). In the second case, socio-economic statues of the families whose children are registered at higher education are assessed. A questionnaire study has been conducted for both cases.

3.2. Population and sample

Population consists of the 12th grade students who are registered at secondary education institutions in Gaziantep in 2012-2013 and different faculties of Hasan Kalyoncu University.

It is aimed that secondary education institutions at which the study has been conducted reflect the average of the province. Total 4 education institution including 1 University, 1 Science High School[2], 1 Anatolian High School[3], 1 Common High School[4] are included in the sample.

In the sample, questionnaire forms have been analyzed which have been answered by total 351 students including 156 12th grade students who prepare for higher education and 195 university students

3.3. Data collection tool and practice

Data of the study have been obtained through a survey prepared by the researcher. Questionnaire is developed in the direction of literature review and expert opinion. Two separate questionnaire are conducted within the framework of the study:

- Questionnaire Form 1– For those who prepare for higher education examination
- Questionnaire Form 2 – For those who are registered at higher education

Questionnaire forms include 18 questions which aim at determining socio-economic characteristics of sample groups.

Questionnaire forms have been conducted under the supervision of the researcher herself by making explanations to the students who answered them. Total 370 questionnaire forms were answered, 351 of them were assessed. Data were first transferred to Excel then SPSS and analyzed.

3.4. Analysis of data

Analysis of data has been performed according to the answers given in 351 questionnaire forms. It is ascertained that mothers of the subjects who choose the "other" as an answer to the question which is asked with the purpose of assessing working conditions of parents are housewives. Private teaching institution expenses and private lesson expenses are calculated as "0" cost data owing to the fact that some students do not spend on them.

4. Data

In this part, data obtained from valid questionnaire forms which have been answered by the 12th grade students and the students registered at Hasan Kalyoncu University are approached. Details of the students pertaining to questionnaire forms which are considered to be convenient to perform data analysis are presented in Table 5.

[2] Science High School: Private and official state schools which give primarily science education as well as normal education and admit students by a central examination system.

[3] Anatolian High School: Private and official state schools which have immersion programmers besides Turkish lessons and admit students by a central examination system.

[4] Common High School: Official state schools which provide students with minimum general knowledge and prepare them for higher education.

Table 5: Number of the Students Who Answer The Questionnaire

Gender	Preparing for higher education	Higher education	Total
	12th Grade	Hasan Kalyoncu University	
Male	71	105	176
Female	85	90	175
Total	**156**	**195**	**351**

Table 6: Data on Plans of the Students about Receiving Education

Do you want to receive university education?	12th grade students	
	Frequency	%
Unanswered	11	0,6
Yes	152	97,4
No	3	1,9
Total	**156**	**100**

According to Table 6, almost 97% of the secondary school 12th grade students state that they plan to receive university education.

Table 7: Data on the Reasons of Students' Desire to Receive University Education

Why do you want to receive university education?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	0	0	4	2,1
Earn a high income	96	61,5	125	64,1
Be successful	31	19,9	34	17,4
Not to become unemployed	1	0,6	8	4,1
A favorable social position	14	9,0	12	6,2
Experience university life	7	4,5	8	4,1
Other	7	4,5	4	2,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 7, 62% and 64% of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, report that they want to receive university education in order to earn a high income. Considering these data together with the data in Table 6, it can be suggested that students want to receive higher education in order to earn a high income.

Table 8: Data on the Types of the Secondary Education Institutions from/at Which Students Graduate /are Registered

Type of school	Preparing for university		Registered at university	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	-	-	5	2,6
Common high school	105	67,3	63	32,3
Anatolian high school	19	12,2	81	41,5
Science high school	16	10,3	3	1,5
Private school	16	10,3	27	13,8
Vocational high school[5]	-	-	5	2,6
Religious vocational high school[6]	-	-	4	2,1
Other	-	-	7	3,6
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

[5]Vocational High School: Official state schools which are subject to Ministry of National Education and prepare students for higher education and profession teaching primarily vocational subjects as well as common curriculum.

[6] Religious-Vocational High School: Official state schools which are subject to Ministry of National Education and prepare students for higher education and profession teaching primarily religious subjects as well as common curriculum

As can be seen in Table 8, approximately 67% and 10% of the students who prepare for higher education entrance examination are registered at common high schools; and science and private high schools, respectively. Almost 42% and 2% of the students who are registered at higher education are the graduates of Anatolian high schools; and Science and Religious Vocational high schools, respectively. These data indicate that the students who study at Anatolian high schools which admit students by examination are more successful in higher education entrance examination.

Table 9: Data on Age of the Students

How old are you?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
17 years old	58	37,2	5	2,6
18 years old	84	53,8	24	12,3
19 years old	12	7,7	38	19,5
20 years old	1	0,6	68	34,9
Over 20	1	0,6	60	30,8
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

According to Table 9, 37%, 54% and 1% of the students who prepare for higher education are 17; 18 and over 20, respectively. 3%, 12% and 31% of the students who are registered at higher education are 17, 18 and over 20, respectively.

Table 10: Data on How Many Times the Students Have Taken the YGS (University Entrance Examination)

How many times have you taken the YGS?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	155	99,4	10	5,1
2.	1	0,6	74	37,9
3.	-	-	88	45,1
4.	-	-	18	9,2
5.	-	-	1	,5
6.	-	-	2	1,0
7.	--	-	1	0,5
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 10, almost 1005 of the students who prepare for the YGS state that they will take the exam for the first time; 38% and 45% of the students who are registered at higher education report that they have entered the university in the first time and third time, respectively. Considering these data together with the data in Table 8 and Table 9, it is concluded that most of those who take the YGS for the first time are 18 years old; in the case of failure, the tendency to take the examination again diminishes and disappears in time after the age of 20; and the students who are registered at Anatolian high schools which admit students buy examination are more successful.

Table 11: Data on the Possession of the Houses in Which the Students Live

Who owns the house in which you live?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	-	-	1	0,5
We own it	112	71,8	173	88,7
Tenement	37	23,7	15	7,7
Other	7	4,5	6	3,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 11, 72% and 89% of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, state that they live in houses which they own.

Table 12: Number of Family Members in Students' Families

How many people are there in your family?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
2-3	23	14,7	24	12,3
4-5	74	47,4	118	60,5
5-6	34	21,8	30	15,4
7-8	24	15,4	17	8,7
9-10	1	,6	6	3,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

According to Table 12, almost 47% and 61% of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, have 4-5 people in their families. These data show that number of the family members affect the utilization of education opportunities.

Table 13: Number of Employed People in Students' Families

How many people are employed in your family?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	1	0,6	4	2,1
1	95	60,9	91	46,7
2	47	30,1	76	39,0
3	7	4,5	19	9,7
4	2	1,3	3	1,5
5	4	2,6	2	1,0
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 13, 61% and 30% of the students who prepare for higher education have 1 and 2 employed people in their family, respectively; 47% and 30% of the students who are registered at higher education have 1 and 2 employed people in their family respectively.

Table 14: Data on Who Provide for the Family

Who provides for the family?	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Father	126	80,8	115	59,0
Mother	3	1,9	4	2,1
Father – mother	19	12,2	62	31,8
Sibling	2	1,3	5	2,6
Relatives and help form community	0	0	1	0,5
Other	6	3,8	8	4,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 14, almost 81% and 59% the families of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, rely on fathers for household maintenance; and 32% of families of the students rely on father- mother for it. Considering these data together with the data in Table 11, Table 12 and Table 13, it is inferred that the students whose families own the house in which they reside; whose family members and employed family members are small and large in number, respectively benefit from education opportunities more.

Table 15: Data on the Profession of the Students' Parents

	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education			Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
Profession of father	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Profession of mother**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	0	0	3	1,5	Unanswered	2	1.2	2	1,0
Worker	15	9,6	7	3,6	Worker	8	5,1	5	2,6
Officer	30	19,2	62	31,8	Officer	9	5,8	46	23,6
Freelancer (Doctor, lawyer, accountant, tradesman etc.)	54	34,6	78	40,0	Freelancer (Doctor, lawyer, accountant, tradesman etc.)	6	3,8	7	3,6
Retired	27	17,2	21	10,8	Retired	2	1,3	16	8,2
Unemployed	4	2,6	2	1,0	Housewife	53	34,0	59	30,3
Other	26	16,7	22	11,3	Other	76	48,7	60	30,8
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**	**Total**	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 15, almost 35% and 40% of the fathers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are freelancers. Almost 34% and 30% of the mothers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are housewives. According to these data, while the fathers of the students from both groups have a profession which requires being a graduate, most of the mothers are housewives.

Table 16: Data on the Monthly Income of the Students' Families

	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
Income level (₺)	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	2	1,3	4	2,1
Less than 750	11	7,1	9	4,6
Between 750-1.000	21	13,5	2	1,0
Between 1.001-1.500	37	23,7	20	10,3
Between 1.501-2.000	18	11,5	10	5,1
Between 2.001-3.000	39	25,0	40	20,5
Between 3.001-4.000	8	5,1	32	16,4
Between 4.001-5.000	10	6,4	28	14,4
More than 5.000	10	6,4	50	25,6
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 16, almost 7% and 6% of the families of the students who prepare for higher education earn less than ₺ 750 and more than ₺ 5.000. Monthly income of most of these students (25%) is between ₺ 2.001-3.000. Almost 5% of the families of the students who are registered at higher education earn less than ₺ 750. Monthly income of most of these students (26%) is more than ₺ 5.000. These data indicate that the students who are registered at higher education are from high income groups.

Table 17: Data on Educational Level of the Parents of the Students

	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education			Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
Educational level of father	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Educational level of mother**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	0	0	0	0	Unanswered	0	0	5	2,6
Not graduated	6	3,8	3	1,5	Not graduated	17	10,9	17	8,7
Primary school	55	35,3	28	14,4	Primary school	71	45,5	38	19,5
Secondary school	21	13,5	14	7,2	Secondary school	30	19,2	27	13,8
High school	42	26,9	16	23,6	High school	21	13,5	56	28,7
Associate degree	3	1,9	46	9,7	Associate degree	4	2,6	5	2,6
Bachelor's degree	16	10,3	19	32,3	Bachelor's degree	10	6,4	38	19,5
Master's degree	8	5,1	63	9,2	Master's degree	3	1,9	3	1,5
Doctorate	5	3,2	18	2,1	Doctorate	0	0	6	3,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**	**Total**	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As can be seen in Table 17, almost 35% and 32% of the fathers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are primary school graduates. Nearly 46% and 29% of the mothers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are primary school graduates. These data suggest that parents of the students who are registered at higher education have high educational levels.

Table 18: Data on Who Provides for Education Expenses

	Preparing for higher Education		Registered at higher education	
Who provides for?	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	1	0,6	1	0,5
Father- mother	146	93,6	166	85,1
Grants	2	1,3	15	7,7
Education loan	0	0	4	2,1
Other	7	4,5	9	4,6
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As seen in Table 18, approximately 94% and 85% of the students' education expenses who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are provided by parents.

Table 19: Data on How The Students Have Prepared for YGS

How do/have you prepare/prepared for YGS?	**Preparing for higher education**		**Registered at higher education**	
	Frequency	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	2	1,3	4	2,1
Private teaching institution	89	57,1	106	54,4
School courses	10	6,4	2	1,0
Private lessons	6	3,8	8	4,1
Private teaching institution and private lesson	8	5,1	55	28,2
Unprepared	21	13,5	16	8,2
Other	20	12,8	4	2,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As seen in Table 19, most of the students who prepare for higher education and also most of the students who are registered at higher education have prepared for the examination by attending private teaching institutions (nearly 57% and 54%, respectively) and private teaching institutions-private lessons (nearly 28%).

These data show that preparation methods depend on family income, the students from high income groups are more successful in entrance examinations because they can take private lessons and attend private teaching institutions.

Table 20: Monthly Expenditures of The Students' Families on Private Teaching Institutions (₺)

	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
Monthly (₺)	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**
Unanswered	54	34,6	28	14,4
Less than 750	5	3,2	21	10,8
Between 750-1.000	2	1,3	10	5,1
Between 1.001-1.500	13	8,3	48	24,6
Between 1.501-2.000	16	10,3	26	13,3
Between 2.001-3.000	43	27,6	39	20,0
Between 3.001-4.000	11	7,1	5	2,6
Between 4.001-5.000	6	3,8	10	5,1
More than 5.000	6	3,8	8	4,1
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As seen in Table 20, most of the families of the students (almost 28%) and a small percentage (almost 4%) who prepare for higher education entrance examination have spent ₺ 2.001-3.000 and more than ₺ 5.000, respectively. Most of the families of the students (almost 25%) and a small percentage (almost 3%) who are registered at higher education have spent on private teaching institutions ₺ 1.001-1.500 and ₺ 5.000 monthly, respectively.

Table 21: Monthly Expenditures of The Students' Families on Private Lessons (₺)

Monthly (₺)	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	142	91,0	138	70,8
Less than 750	5	3,2	13	6,7
Between 750-1.000	3	1,9	2	1,0
Between 1.001-1.500	3	1,9	14	7,2
Between 1.501-2.000	0	0	2	1,0
Between 2.001-3.000	1	0,6	11	5,6
Between 3.001-4.000	0	0	3	1,5
Between 4.001-5.000	0	0	5	2,6
More than 5.000	2	1,3	7	3,6
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As seen in Table 21, 90% of the students who prepare for higher education entrance examination leave this question unanswered; 3% and 1% of the remaining 10% have spent on private lessons less than ₺ 750 and more than ₺ 5.000, respectively. 71% of the students who are registered at higher education leave this question unanswered; 7% and 7% and 4% of the remaining 29% have spent on private lessons less than 750; between ₺ 2.000-3.000; more than ₺ 5.000, respectively.

Table 22: Monthly Expenditures of the Students' Families on Private Teaching Institutions and Private Lessons (₺)

Monthly (₺)	Preparing for higher education		Registered at higher education	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unanswered	103	66,0	119	61,0
Less than 750	4	2,6	12	6,2
Between 750-1.000	0	0	4	2,1
Between 1.001-1.500	3	1,9	12	6,2
Between 1.501-2.000	8	5,1	9	4,6
Between 2.001-3.000	21	13,5	12	6,2
Between 3.001-4.000	9	5,8	4	2,1
Between 4.001-5.000	3	1,9	8	4,1
More than 5.000	5	3,2	15	7,7
Total	**156**	**100**	**195**	**100**

As seen in Table 22, 66% of the students who prepare for higher education entrance examination leave this question unanswered; almost 14% of the remaining 44% have spent on private lessons between ₺ 2.001-3.000. Approximately 61% of the students who are registered at higher education leave this question unanswered; almost 8% of the remaining 39% have spent on private lessons more than ₺ 5.000. Those who are defined as unanswered can be considered as the ones who do not receive private lesson. These data indicate that the students who prepare by means of private lessons and private teaching institutions are more successful in higher education entrance examination. Considering these data together with the data in Table 20 and Table 21, it can be inferred that the success of the students depends on the amount of their spending.

5. Conclusion

In this study, it is observed that almost 97% of the 12th grade students plan to receive university education. Nearly 62% of these students and 64% of the students who are registered at higher education state that they want to receive university education in order to earn high income.

Type of the school which the students who prepare for higher education entrance examinations attend affects the success in YGS. In the study, it is observed that 42% of the students who are registered at higher education are Anatolian high school graduates which admits students by examination and the graduates of these schools are more successful. However, it is also observed that most of those who take the YGS for the first time are 18 years old and in the case of failure, the tendency to take the examination again diminishes and disappears in time after the age of 20.

In the study, it is seen that 72% of the students who prepare for higher education live in the houses which they own and almost 47% of the aforesaid students have 4-5 people in their families.

The number of employed people in family is 1 and 2 in almost 61% and 30% of the students' families, respectively. It is observed that 89% of the students who are registered at higher education live in the houses which they own and almost 61% of the aforesaid students have 4-5 people in their families. The number of employed people in family is 1 and 2 in almost 47% and 30% of the students' families, respectively. In addition, almost 81% and 59% the families of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, rely on fathers for household maintenance; and 32% of families of the students rely on father- mother for it. Therefore, the students whose families own the house in which they reside; whose family members are small but employed family members are large in number benefit from education opportunities more.

Almost 35% and 40% of the fathers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are freelancers. Almost 34% and 30% of the mothers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are housewives. According to these data, while the fathers of the students from both groups have a profession which requires being a graduate, most of the mothers are housewives.

Monthly income of most of the students (25%) who prepare for higher education is between ₺ 2.001-3.000. Monthly income of most of the students (26%) who are registered at higher education is more than ₺ 5.000. Almost 35% and 32% of the fathers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are primary school graduates. Nearly 46% and 29% of the mothers of the students who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are primary school graduates. According to these data, the students who are registered at higher education are from high income groups and their parents have a high educational level. Approximately 94% and 85% of the students' education expenses who prepare for higher education and who are registered at higher education, respectively, are provided by parents. In other words, it can be suggested that the students who are registered at higher education have a high socio-economic statue.

Most of the students who prepare for higher education and also most of the students who are registered at higher education have prepared for the examination by attending private teaching institutions (nearly 57% and 54%, respectively) and private teaching institutions-private lessons (nearly 28%). Most of the families of the students (almost 28%) and a small percentage (almost 4%) who prepare for higher education entrance examination have spent ₺ 2.001-3.000 and more than ₺ 5.000, respectively, on private teaching institutions. Most of the families of the students (almost 25%) and a small percentage (almost 3%) who are registered at higher education have spent on private teaching institutions ₺ 1.001-1.500 and ₺ 5.000 monthly, respectively.

Nearly 3% and 1% of the students who prepare for higher education entrance examinations have spent on private lessons less than ₺ 750 and more than ₺ 5.000, respectively. Almost 7% and 7% and 4% of the students who are registered at higher education have spent on private lessons less than ₺ 750; between ₺ 2.000-3.000; more than ₺ 5.000, respectively. Almost 14% of the students who prepare for the higher education entrance examination have spent between ₺ 2.001-3.000 on private lesson. Nearly 8% of the students who are registered at higher education have spent more than ₺ 5.000 on private lesson. These data show that preparation methods depend on family income, the students from high income groups are more successful in entrance examinations because they can take private lessons and attend private teaching institutions.

In conclusion, in the study it is observed that educational level of parents affect the demand for higher education, as the income and educational level of parents rises, the chance of their children to benefit higher education increases and on the contrary, the number of the students who are from low income groups and attend a university decreases. Thus, the families with high socio-economic statue demand and benefit from higher education more than the families with low socio-economic statue due to the fact that the former can bear more preparation expenses and indirect costs.

References

Abbot, A., & Leslie, D. (2004). Recent trends in higher education applications and acceptances. *Education Economics, April,* 12(1), 67-86.

Aslan, M.H. (2003). Türkiye'de yükseköğretimin finansmanının ekonomi politiği. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, 29, 189-220.

Aslan, M.H. (2002). Eğitimin finansmanının ekonomi politiği ve yükseköğretimde adil ve etkin finansman politikaları. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, 28, 225-246.

Aslan, M.H. (1998). *Hizmet ekonomisi*. Bursa: Alfa Yayınları

Atkinson, G.B. (1983). *The economics of education*. London: Hadder and Stoughton.

Berger, M.C. & Kostal, T. (2002). Financial resources, regulation and enrollment in US public higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 21(2), 101-110.

Bowen, W.G. (2004). The quest for equity: Class (Socio-economic status) in American higher education. *The Thomas Jefferson Foundation Distinguished Lecture Series University of Virgina, April, ABD*.

Bray, M. & Kwok, P. (2003). Demand for private suplemantary tutoring: Conceptual considerations and sosyo-economic patterns in Hong Kong. *Economics of Education Review* 22, 611-620.

Çalışkan, Ş. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin harcamalarının kent ekonomisine katkısı: Uşak Üniversitesi örneği. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(31), 169-179.

Cohn, E. (1979). *The economics of education.* Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing**.**

Coombs, P & Hallak, J. (1994). *Bir sistem olarak eğitim. (Trans.* Yüksel, K. & Berrin, B.). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Duchesne, I. & Nonneman, W. (1998). The demand for higher education in Belgium. *Economics of Education Review*, 17(2), 211-218.

Ekinci, C.E. (2009). Türkiye'de yükseköğretimde öğrenci harcama ve maliyetleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 34(154), 119-133.

Fethke, H. (2005). Strategic determination of higher education subsidies and tuitions. *Economic of Education Review,* 24,1-9.

Fournier, G.M & Rasmussen, D.W. (1986). Salaries in public education: The impact of geographic cost of living differentials. *Public Finance Quarterly,* 14(2), 179-181.

Gölpek, F. (2011). Türkiye'de adalet ilkesi bakımından yükseköğretimde finansman politikası: kim faydalanıyor? kim ödüyor? *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* , 11(3), 149-176.

Gölpek, F. (2012). Eğitim getirileri ve etkinlik sorunu. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi,* 25(3-4), 77-95.

Gölpek, F. (2012). The price of higher education and individual demand**.** *EMAJ Emerging Markets Journal,* 2(1). 51-60.

Gölpek, F. (2013). Türkiye'de dört yıllık üniversite eğitiminin sonunda kim kazanır? *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*,

Gülşen, C. & Akpınar, M. (2011). Yükseköğretim finansmanında alternative yaklaşımlar. İstanbul: Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011), 2(X), 1227-1233.

Kalkınma Bakanlığı (2012). *Dünya ekonomisindeki son gelişmeler*. Ankara

MEB. (2012). *Milli eğitim istatistikleri-örgün eğitim* (www.meb.gov.tr.)

Mutluer, M. (2008). *Türkiye'de yükseköğretimin başlıca sorunları ve sorunlara çözüm önerileri.* Ankara: Ümit Ofset.

OECD. (2012). *Education at a glance*. http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/oecd-eag-2012-en.pdf.

Psacharopoulos, G & Woodhall, M. (1985). *Education for development: An analysis of ınvestment choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Psacharopoulos, G. & Papakonstantinou, G. (2005). The real university cost in a –free higher education country. *Economics of Education Review*, 24, 103-108.

Sauer, R. (2004). Educational financing and lifetime earning. *Review of Economic Studies*, 71, 1189-1216.

Statistical Office of the European. (2012). *Higher education statistics*. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Tertiary_education_statistics.

Tanrıkulu, D. (2011). Türkiye'de 2025 yılında yükseköğretim talebi karşılanabilecek mi? *Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı Dergisi* (SETA), 34, 1-43.

The World Bank (2013). *Higher education in Latin America*. http://www.worldbank.org/

Uğurlugelen, K. (2013). *Yükseköğretime giriş sistemleri ve maliyetleri: Gaziantep ve Diyarbakır illeri örnekleri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Gaziantep.

Woodhall, M. (1994). *Eğitim ekonomisi: Toplu bir bakış*. (Trans: Yüksel, K. & Berrin, B.). Ankara: PEGEM Yayınları No.14.

Yang, Y. (2001). Estimating the deman for higher education in the united states, 1965-1995. *School of Social Science &Interdisciplinary Studies,* Spring Courses.

Yeşilbağ, Y. (2008). *Eğitim ve ekonomi*. Ankara: Matsa Basımevi.