

An innovation in educational financing

The Edusave scheme in Singapore

JASON TAN & S. GOPINATHAN

This article illustrates the case of a government continuing to invest heavily in education against the backdrop of cutbacks in government expenditure on education in a number of countries. Since recent studies indicate a tendency for the proportion of the costs for schooling that are borne by families to be increasing, the role of the state in expanding financial resources provides an interesting perspective on the financing of education. The focus of this article is a recent innovation in educational financing in Singapore. Under the Edusave scheme, which first started in 1993, the Singapore government has established an Education Endowment Fund. The money in this fund comes from government budgetary surpluses. It is used for several purposes: (a) to provide individual students with annual grants for educational expenditure; (b) to provide individual schools with annual per capita grants; (c) to provide individual students with scholarships based on academic merit; and (d) to provide bursaries on the basis of academic merit and financial need.

Since its inception, the scheme has undergone several changes in its scope. The article describes these changes and analyses the reasons behind them. It argues that the changes have been precipitated not only by public demands but also by the need to meet several major competing policy objectives.

It may be plausibly argued that much of the current focus in research on educational finance is driven by the reality of economic difficulties in both the less developed and in developed industrialised countries. In many countries in sub-Saharan Africa and in Latin America, World Bank-imposed structural adjustment policies have resulted in declines in growth in per capita educational expenditure. Increasingly, these countries are being urged to allow a greater role for the private sector in education and to offer more choice as a means of improving quality (Bray, 1996a), to name two policy prescriptions. In the industrialised countries, lack of economic competitiveness is often attributed to failures in education policy and practice (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). However, the inability, due to lack of financial resources, to fund better provision has led to policy prescriptions along much the same lines. These include greater involvement of the corporate sector, the establishment of community-funded schools, the promotion of choice through vouchers and the search for greater efficiency

in the use of resources devoted to education (Bray, 1996b, 1997; Cummings & Riddell, 1994). The most recent example of business involvement is the Educational Action Zone initiative in the United Kingdom in which businesses have been invited to serve as partners in the funding of schools.

Such a research focus misses out on innovations and patterns of educational expenditure in a group of countries in East Asia that have experienced rapid economic growth in the last three decades and have accumulated budgetary surpluses. In these countries – notably Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore – policy-makers have placed much emphasis on the enhancement of human capital through education; indeed, investment in education is often seen as one of the reasons for rapid economic growth, a view that is strengthened by reports of poor literacy and numeracy skills in industrialised countries. The present position, as these countries move out of export-led industrialisation into service- and knowledge-based industries, is to invest in labour upgrading via education and training, rapid development of R & D activity and expansion of post-secondary education. In general, then, investment in education by the state for economic development purposes is a major characteristic in several East Asian countries (Ihm, 1995; Morriss & Gopinathan, 1997; Young, 1995).

In this article we examine an innovation in educational finance in Singapore. Singapore's economic transformation has been a 'rags to riches' story. In the fifties and sixties Singapore was an underdeveloped entrepot economy with high levels of unemployment and little going for it except a good geographical location and a deep water port. Today it has a standard of living second only to Japan in Asia, high per capita income, a high savings rate and a large fiscal surplus (Gopinathan, 1995).

The success of its export-led industrialisation was facilitated by educational expansion and diversification beginning in the sixties. Policy-makers emphasised early on the need for science and mathematics education, competence in English and vocational and technical education.

As Singapore moves along its fourth decade of political independence, it continues to have a strong belief in the need for further investment in education (Morriss & Gopinathan, 1997). At the same time, economic growth and maturation and social transformation now pose new challenges in education. One principal feature of the education system is the attempt to institutionalise meritocracy, the advancement of students within the system on the basis of merit. This is a major challenge for Singapore education since Singapore is ethnically diverse and inherited a tradition of separate language schools with differences in achievement and opportunity between ethnic groups. Related to this is the emergence of social stratification which cuts across ethnic groups. The policy response has been to try and find solutions that will aid the needy without creating a dependency culture. Another concern centres around the effects of an overly centralised system with a heavy emphasis on content coverage and assessment. Meanwhile, employers' complaints about the lack of critical and problem-solving skills among school-leavers have increased. The government has sought to address these last two concerns by specific curricular changes such as the Thinking Skills, Learning Nation initia-

tive, which will see a greater emphasis on fostering creative and critical thinking with a corresponding de-emphasis on content mastery. There is also an experimentation with greater school autonomy by introducing independent schools and autonomous schools (Tan, 1998).

The Edusave scheme, described below, addresses some of the challenges noted above. Introduced in 1993, it is one of a series of moves by the government to better resource the education sector. Since the inception of the scheme, the government has made several changes in its administration and scope in a bid to strike a balance between the various objectives of the scheme. The article describes the evolution of the scheme. It also provides details on the usage of Edusave funds by schools and students. It provides evidence of a government bucking the growing international trend of cutbacks in government educational expenditure.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE EDUSAVE SCHEME, 1990-1997

Right from the initial mooted of the idea of the Edusave scheme in December 1990, the scheme has evolved through various stages in an attempt to meet several major and, at times, competing objectives. In his speech outlining the new scheme, Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong stated that a major goal of the scheme would be to equalise opportunities for all Singaporeans regardless of their family background. Goh proposed that each child between the ages of six and 16 be provided with an Edusave account into which the government would make annual contributions. The money in these accounts was to be used for educational purposes.

Goh viewed education as the main means of socio-economic mobility and wanted to ensure that "all children, rich or poor, are brought to the same starting line, properly equipped to run" (Goh, 1990, p.25). In addition, he wanted to "temper our meritocratic, free market system with compassion and more equal opportunities" (ibid., p.25). To those individuals who raised objections that funds should be awarded only to those who needed them (Fernandez, 1990; Zuraidah, 1990), Goh pointed out that because it was not desirable to divide students into "haves and have-nots", no student would be allowed to opt out of the scheme. However, those parents who insisted on giving up their children's share could donate the money to the school (Zuraidah, Goh & George, 1991; see also *Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 256).

As Goh saw it, another way in which the Edusave scheme would equalise opportunities would be through enabling students in non-independent secondary schools to use part of the money in their Edusave accounts to pay for enrichment activities. Well-planned school-based enrichment activities were seen as one way of equalising opportunities while at the same time providing for a more holistic education. Goh pointed out that independent secondary schools,¹ with their extra financial resources, were better placed than non-independent secondary schools to offer a wider range of extra-curricular activities and programmes. However, the Edusave scheme would enable all students to have the necessary funds to pay for such activities and programmes.

Another benefit of the Edusave scheme would be the introduction of an element of choice. Students could now choose how to spend their Edusave funds. This would prompt schools to come up with "interesting programmes which will appeal to the students" (Goh, 1990, p.24). Edusave funding to programmes conducted within not-for-profit schools would make it easier for the government to monitor the quality of the programmes being offered (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 281). Also, since students could use part of the funds to pay for their miscellaneous fees, this meant that they could "shop around" for the best schools to attend (Edusave Fund, 1991).

The third key feature of the scheme was that it could be viewed as a state 'dividend' for individual citizens as a reward for their individual contributions to national economic growth. This money was to be used as an investment in their children's education. However, Goh cautioned that parents had to continue paying part of their children's school and miscellaneous fees (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 256). They should not "leave everything to the State" (Goh, 1990, p.25).

The Edusave scheme was consistent with concurrent government moves to delegate greater operating autonomy and flexibility to schools in such matters as finance. At the same time, the government showed its traditional antipathy to the idea of a 'welfare state' (see for instance, Goh, 1993; Goh, 1996; Lee, 1996) by stressing that the Edusave scheme was not meant to be a welfare scheme (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 256). The promotion of choice and competition among schools as benefits of the scheme were also resonant with the increasing use of the language of the marketplace in Singapore education (Tan, 1998).

The emphasis on equalising of opportunities through the scheme came amid growing concern, both within and outside of the government, that social cohesion might be weakened as a result of growing income inequalities. The independent schools scheme and other schemes such as the Gifted Education Programme had been criticised as being elitist (J. Tan, 1996). The need to mollify public opinion took on added urgency in the wake of the 1991 general elections, in which the ruling People's Action Party suffered a decline in its share of electoral votes as well as the loss of a few parliamentary seats. The loss of votes was officially attributed, among other things, to voter dissatisfaction with the rising costs of public services (Hussin, 1992; Singh, 1992).

Since the early 1990s, the government has taken deliberate measures to deflect some of the controversy over the perceived rise in the cost of living and increase in income inequalities. For instance, several 'asset enhancement schemes', such as the sale of the corporatised Singapore Telecoms and the upgrading of public flats, have been initiated to return part of the government's annual budgetary surpluses to the public (Chua, 1996; Kwok, 1995). The Edusave scheme can thus be viewed as one such asset-enhancement scheme.

At the same time, however, the need to equalise opportunities through the Edusave scheme was in tension with the need to reward individual ability and effort in keeping with the official stress on meritocracy. In 1992, the government announced further details

of the Edusave scheme. First, in addition to the annual cash award for each student, all non-independent secondary schools would receive annual per capita grants. Each school would establish an Edusave Grants Management Committee to decide on the allocation of its annual grants. These grants could be used for the purchasing of resources and equipment, the conducting of enrichment programmes, and the hiring of administrative support services. This would enable non-independent schools to be "equipped more like independent schools" (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 59, January 6, 1992, Col. 19). The awarding of these grants could be seen as part of further government attempts to deflect criticisms that the independent schools were elitist.

Secondly, three kinds of annual scholarships were announced as well. The first, the Edusave Entrance Scholarships for Independent Schools (EESIS), would be awarded to the top 25 percent of students who qualified for admission to independent schools each year. These scholarships, tenable for the entire four years of students' secondary education, were to be used to cover the difference between the school fees in a particular independent school and the minimum sum of \$12 that was charged in non-independent secondary schools. The second, known as the Edusave (Independent Schools) Yearly Awards (E(IS)YA), would be awarded to the top 5 percent of each of the four levels from secondary 1 to 4 in independent schools. These scholarships would be for students not already in receipt of the EESIS awards and would be awarded on the basis of school examination results each year. They were to be used for the same purpose as the EESIS awards (Ministry of Education, 1996a). These scholarships for independent schools could be seen as part of a government response to public criticism about the high fees charged by independent schools. The scholarships would also serve to assure the public that students would not be denied access to independent schools because of their inability to afford the fees.

The Edusave Scholarships for Secondary Schools (ESSS) formed the third category of scholarships. These were to be awarded to the top 10 percent of students in each level in non-independent secondary schools on the basis of annual examination results. The top 5 percent would be awarded \$500 while the next 5 percent would be awarded \$300.

An interesting feature of these three scholarships is that, on the one hand, there was an explicit emphasis on the rewarding of individual merit and effort as measured by examination results; the government argued that the provision of scholarships on the basis of academic merit was consistent with its stress on meritocracy. However, the fact remained that these scholarships, as well as those for non-independent schools, would be awarded without regard to students' actual need for financial assistance. Hence, there was tension between the need to reward merit while at the same time distributing the awards to those who needed them most.

The administrative details of the scheme were also announced in 1992. First, the minister for finance was to be responsible for the administration of the Education Endowment Fund, into which all capital funds for the Edusave scheme would be deposited. The government also said that it hoped to have a total of \$5 billion in this fund. In addition, an Edusave Pupils Fund, out of which money would be deposited into stu-

dents' individual Edusave accounts, would be administered by the Central Provident Fund Board. Students could use the money in their Edusave accounts to pay for miscellaneous fees and enrichment programmes conducted in schools, as well as their polytechnic and university tuition fees (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p.6). Upon reaching the age of 21, any remaining money in an individual's Edusave account could be transferred to his or her ordinary Central Provident Fund account (Republic of Singapore, 1992).

Each student received an annual contribution of \$50 in his or her Edusave account in 1993, the first year of the scheme. This sum has increased steadily to \$100 in 1994, \$110 in 1995, \$130 in 1996, and \$160 in 1997. However, the annual per capita Edusave grants awarded to non-independent secondary schools have remained steady at \$90.

In the four years since the scheme has been implemented, its scope of coverage has been steadily widening. It has been pointed out that the Edusave scheme was initially restricted to non-independent secondary schools and to students enrolled in primary and secondary schools. In reply to a question from a member of parliament in 1992 as to whether the scheme could be extended to primary schools (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 262), the education minister replied that he wished to see how the scheme worked in secondary schools before extending it any further to primary schools (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 282). By early 1995, the Ministry of Education announced that primary schools would be awarded Edusave grants from 1996 onwards. The per capita grant was fixed at \$50. The scheme will be further extended to pre-university institutions, institutes of technical education, and independent secondary schools in 1997. The per capita grants in these cases will be \$120, \$100 and \$90 respectively (Leong, 1996).

During several parliamentary sessions from 1991 to 1996, various members of parliament had requested that the scheme be extended to disabled children in special schools. They argued that it was unfair to exclude them from the scheme (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 57, March 14, 1991, Cols. 557-558; 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 274; 62, March 10, 1994, Col. 842; 64, March 16, 1995, Col. 475; 65, March 20, 1996, Cols. 1738, 1740-1742, 1748, 1754). However, the response from the Ministry of Education was unfavourable. The reply has always been that per capita grants for children in schools for the disabled were several times those for primary school students. These children were thus already receiving special government treatment (*Parliamentary Debates Singapore*, 57, March 14, 1991, Col. 564; 60, September 14, 1992, Col. 284; 62, March 11, 1994, Cols. 896-897; 64, March 16, 1995, Col. 504). However, there was a change of heart on the part of the government in 1996. The ministry announced that it had decided to respond positively to appeals from members of parliament, parents of disabled children, the National Council of Social Service and voluntary welfare organisations. From 1996, students in special schools for the disabled each received an annual contribution of \$130. Special schools would receive annual per capita grants of \$50 each (Leong, 1996).

In another recent extension of the scheme, the government has announced that primary 5 and 6 students will also be awarded annual Edusave scholarships based on their examination performance. The top 5 percent in each level in each school will be awarded

\$300 each, while the next 5 percent will receive \$250 each. Furthermore, 10 percent of students in each level of primary schools, secondary schools, pre-university institutions and technical institutes will be awarded Good Progress Awards each year on the basis of improvements in their school examination grades (S. Tan, 1996).

Further evidence of the seriousness with which the problems of social stratification and social cohesion were viewed by the government was provided in August 1995. The prime minister announced that Edusave Merit Bursaries would be introduced from 1996 onwards to reward students who came from lower-middle and low-income families and who had performed well academically. Goh took pains to stress that Singapore was a meritocratic society and that many able but poor families had experienced upward social mobility over the last three decades. However, he expressed concern that Singapore society might become more stratified by ability as the better educated in society passed on their advantageous position to their children (Goh, 1995).

An interesting development in the case of these new bursaries was the combination of merit and financial need as a basis for awarding funds. Not only would students have to rank among the top 25 percent in their respective cohort in a particular school, they would also need to have a gross monthly family income below \$3,000. Furthermore, they should not be in receipt of any other scholarships. A strong message was being sent that those who performed well in school and were from less well-to-do homes would be rewarded for their effort. In addition, education was to be the key means of upward socio-economic mobility.

These bursaries were initially restricted to primary and secondary school students but were later extended in 1996 to include students in pre-university institutions and technical institutes (see Table 1, at the end of this article, for more details). Yet another interesting development was the allocation of responsibility for administering the Edusave Merit Bursaries to grassroots organisations in each electoral constituency. These organisations, called Community Development Councils, were established by the government in 1997 in a bid to develop social cohesion (Goh, 1997). However, the Ministry of Education would still be responsible for identifying students who qualified for these bursaries.

USAGE OF EDUSAVE FUNDS BY STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS, 1993-1997

Students' Edusave accounts

Table 2 (see end of article) provides the details of withdrawals made by students in primary schools and secondary schools over the four financial years from 1993/94 to 1996/97. Several observations may be made. First, the student participation rate, as measured by the number of accounts with withdrawals as a percentage of the total number of student accounts, is much larger for secondary school students than for primary school students. Secondly, participation rates have increased over the four years, especially in the case of secondary school students. However, the participation rates may still be considered as low for both groups of students. Thirdly, the amount of money withdrawn from

accounts has increased rapidly over the four years in the case of both primary students and secondary students. Next, the proportion of funds withdrawn for enrichment programmes has increased for both groups of students. Lastly, schools' participation in the scheme has improved vastly since the inception of the scheme.

Edusave grants

Tables 3 and 4 (see end of article) provide data on the usage of Edusave grants in primary schools and secondary schools from 1993/94 to 1996/97. The main trend over this period is the increase in the proportion of grants used for enrichment programmes and administrative support services and the corresponding decrease in the proportion allocated to teaching resources and equipment. Some principals were initially, and are still, unsure about what enrichment programmes would be suitable for their students and how to go about conducting them (Mathi & Leong, 1995). Now that the Singapore Teachers' Union is working together with the Ministry of Education to compile a list of agencies and individuals who are able and willing to conduct enrichment programmes in schools, school principals have a wider choice of programmes available.

Another trend that can be discerned in secondary schools is that a greater percentage of schools are using more of their Edusave grants. For instance, the percentage of schools using less than half their grants has declined from over 50 percent in 1993/94 to 14.2 percent in 1995/96. However, about 90 percent of primary schools used less than half their Edusave grants in 1995/96, the first year in which primary schools were allocated these grants. Further data need to be collected from schools to gain a clearer understanding of how schools utilise their Edusave grants. Also, research needs to be done on why some principals do not make full use of their grants. Even in those cases where the grants are being used, there are no data on how decisions on fund allocation are made and on whether these grants are being used efficiently and effectively.

CONCLUSION

The Edusave scheme was first proposed by the Singaporean prime minister in 1990. It represented a bold innovation in educational financing. The government established an Education Endowment Fund to provide capital funds for the scheme. When the scheme first began in 1993, there were three main means of fund allocation. First, each child between the ages of six and 16 was provided with an Edusave account into which the government made annual deposits. The money in these accounts was to be used to pay for miscellaneous fees in schools, tuition fees in universities and polytechnics, and enrichment programmes in schools. Secondly, each non-independent secondary school received annual per capita grants for such purposes as the purchasing of resources and equipment, the conducting of enrichment programmes and the hiring of administrative support services. Thirdly, several annual scholarships were awarded to top-scoring students in secondary schools.

In the past three years, the scope of the Edusave scheme has been gradually widened to include a larger number of students and educational institutions. This is in part

due to demands from the public and members of parliament; perhaps there was also a realisation that there were enough funds to expand the scope of the scheme. At the same time, the government has had to balance various competing objectives of the scheme. On the one hand, it has stated that the Edusave scheme should reward academic merit and hard work. On the other hand, there is also the need to allocate funds on the basis of financial need. This latter move is an attempt to allay public criticism that government policies are elitist and is also an explicit recognition of the political fallout that may result from increasing social stratification. However, it is not clear to what extent the Edusave scheme will effectively contribute to an equalising of education opportunities and a lessening of the disparities in academic outcomes between students from different home backgrounds.

Data on the usage of funds in individual students' Edusave accounts indicate that a substantial percentage of students are still not making full use of their funds. Similarly, some secondary schools and the vast majority of primary schools are still using less than half their annual Edusave grants. Further research needs to be done on how decisions on fund allocation are made and the effectiveness and efficiency of fund allocation.

The Edusave scheme represents an interesting case of a government that continues to invest heavily in education and that has devised an innovative means of funding to encourage effort and achievement, aid poorer families, and provide for parental and student choice. This article has shown that the administration and implementation of the scheme, even when resources have been ample, have by no means been problem-free. Such an observation is unsurprising in view of the competing social and economic objectives that the scheme is trying to attain.

Jason Tan and S. Gopinathan are associated with the School of Education, National Institute of Education, Singapore.

NOTES

1. The idea of having independent secondary schools was first raised by Goh Chok Tong in 1985. The scheme was aimed at promoting creativity and innovation in school management by giving the principals of selected secondary schools greater operating autonomy. Three prestigious secondary schools opted to become independent in 1988. These schools enjoy greater autonomy in such matters as school fees, staff recruitment, management structure, and curriculum. There are now eight independent schools, all of which are well-established and prestigious, out of a total of 149 secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- Bray, M. (1996a) *Privatisation of secondary education: Issues and policy implications*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Bray, M. (1996b) *Decentralization of education: Community financing*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Bray, M. (1997) 'Recognising the burden on households: Family and community financing of primary education in East Asia', *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 11, pp.163-178.

- Chua, B.H. (1996) 'Culturalisation of economy and politics in Singapore', in R. Robison (ed.) *Pathways to Asia: The politics of engagement*, pp.87-107. St Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Cummings, W.K. & Riddell, A. (1994) 'Alternative policies for the finance, control, and delivery of basic education', *International Journal of Educational Research*, 21, pp.751-776.
- 'Edusave Fund can be used to pay part of school fees' (1991), *The Straits Times*, August 12, p.17.
- Fernandez, W. (1990) 'Edusave scheme welcomed, but many feel it should only help the needy', *The Straits Times*, December 19, p.1.
- Goh, C.T. (1990) 'Edusave – a dividend to our citizens, an investment in our future', *Speeches*, 14(6), pp.22-25.
- Goh, C.T. (1993) 'Preserving the sense of personal responsibility', *Speeches*, 17(5), pp.8-13.
- Goh, C.T. (1995) 'The Edusave Merit Bursaries Scheme', *Speeches*, 19(4), pp.13-16.
- Goh, C.T. (1996) 'Making Singapore the best home', *Speeches*, 20(2), pp.1-3.
- Goh, C.T. (1997) 'Community development councils: Building a cohesive and compassionate community', *Speeches*, 21(2), pp.8-12.
- Gopinathan, S. (1995) 'Singapore', in P. Morris & A. Sweeting (eds), *Education and development in East Asia*, pp.79-103. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Hussin, M. (1992) 'Domestic politics', in T.Y. Lee (ed.), *Singapore: The year in review 1991*, pp. 69-106. Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Ihm, C.S. (1995) 'Korea', in P. Morris & A. Sweeting (eds), *Education and development in East Asia*, pp.125-148. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Kwok, K. W. (1995) 'Singapore: Consolidating the new political economy', in D. Singh & W.T. Leong (eds) *Southeast Asian affairs 1995*, pp.291-308. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Lee, K.Y. (1996) 'Will Singapore be another slow-growing developed nation?' *Speeches*, 20(2), pp.7-23.
- Leong, C.C. (1996). 'Edusave extended to JC and ITE students', *The Straits Times*, March 22, p.1.
- Mathi, B. & Leong, C.C. (1995) 'More Edusave funds put to use', *The Straits Times*, April 9, p.23.
- Ministry of Education, Singapore (1994) *Education Endowment Scheme first annual report for the period 1 January 1993 to 31 March 1994*. Singapore.
- Ministry of Education, Singapore (1995) *Education Endowment Scheme annual report for financial year 1994/95*. Singapore.
- Ministry of Education, Singapore (1996a) *Edusave Merit Bursaries (EMB) and Edusave (Independent Schools) Yearly Awards (E(IS)YA)* (Ministry of Education Notification (GS/12/96). Singapore.
- Ministry of Education, Singapore (1996b) *Education Endowment Scheme annual report for financial year 1995/96*. Singapore.
- Ministry of Education, Singapore (1997) *Education Endowment Scheme annual report for financial year 1996/97*. Singapore.
- Morriss, S.B. & Gopinathan, S. (1997) 'Trends in educational funding in Singapore', *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 11, pp.297-320.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Parliamentary Debates Singapore: Official Report*, 57, March 14, 1991; 59, January 6, 1992; 60, September 14, 1992; 62, March 10, 1994, March 11, 1994; 64, March 16, 1995; 65, March 20, 1996.
- Republic of Singapore (1992) *The Education Endowment Scheme Act 1992* (No. 33 of 1992). Singapore: Government of Singapore.
- Singh, B. (1992) *Whither PAP's dominance? An analysis of Singapore's 1991 general elections*. Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications.

- Tan, E.T.J. (1996) *Independent schools and autonomous schools in Singapore: A study of two school privatization initiatives aimed at promoting school innovation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Tan, J. (1998) 'The marketisation of education in Singapore: Policies and implications', *International Review of Education*, 44, pp.47-63.
- Tan, S. (1996) 'Awards too for weak pupils who improve', *The Straits Times*, December 27, p.3.
- Young, Y.R. (1995) 'Taiwan', in P. Morris & A. Sweeting (eds), *Education and development in East Asia*, pp.105-124. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Zuraidah, I. (1990) 'Use it strictly for education, say teachers', *The Straits Times*, December 18, p.23.
- Zuraidah, I., Goh, S. & George, C. (1991). 'Ministry plans to start Edusave next January', *The Straits Times*, January 27, p.20.

Table 1: Summary of the Edusave scheme

Student Edusave accounts

- Annual government contribution of \$160 per student between the ages of six and 16.
- May be used for paying second-tier miscellaneous fees, for additional miscellaneous fees in autonomous secondary schools, and for enrichment programmes in schools.

Edusave grants to schools

- Annual government per capita grants to schools
 - \$50 for primary schools
 - \$50 for special schools
 - \$90 for secondary schools
 - \$100 for institutes of technical education
 - \$120 for pre-university institutions, ie junior colleges and centralised institutes.
- Money may be used for such purposes as buying teaching resources and equipment and conducting of enrichment programmes.

Edusave scholarships

- Independent secondary schools
 - Edusave Entrance Scholarships for Independent Schools for the top 5 percent of students who qualify for admission to independent schools each year. Awards tenable for entire four years of secondary education. The value of each scholarship is equal to annual school fees (subject to a maximum of \$2,400) less \$144 (the minimum fees charged in non-independent secondary schools).
 - Edusave (Independent Schools) Yearly Awards for the top 5 percent of students in each level in each school each year based on school examination results. The value of these awards is identical to that for the Edusave Entrance Scholarships.
- Non-independent secondary schools
 - Edusave Scholarships for Secondary Schools for the top 10 percent in each level in each school each year based on school examination results. The value of each scholarship is \$500 for those in the top 5 percent and \$300 for those in the next 5 percent.

- Primary Schools

Primary 5 and 6 students in the top 10 percent in each school each year based on school examination results. The top 5 percent receive \$300 and the next 5 percent receive \$250.

Edusave Merit Bursaries

- For students in primary schools, secondary schools, junior colleges, and centralised institutes.
- Administered by the People's Association, which coordinates grassroots organisations in each electoral constituency.
- Students must be ranked in the top 25 percent of their respective cohorts in their schools each year based on school examination results. They must have a gross monthly family income below \$3,000. They must not be in receipt of any other scholarships.
- \$150 for students in primary 1 to primary 3.
- \$200 for students in primary 4 to primary 6.
- \$250 for students in secondary schools.
- \$300 for students in junior colleges and centralised institutes.

Good Progress Awards

- Students will be nominated by their principals and teachers on the basis of their having made significant progress in their school examination grades. Ten percent of students in each level of primary schools, secondary schools, pre-university institutions, and technical institutes will receive these awards. The money will be administered by individual Community Development Councils.

Table 2. Analysis of withdrawals made by primary school students, secondary school students and students in junior colleges and centralised institutes from their Edusave accounts from 1993/94 to 1996/97

| | Primary | | | Secondary | | | J/C/I | | | Total | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 1993/94 | 1994/95 | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1993/94 | 1994/95 | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1993/94 | 1994/95 | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | | |
| Student participation rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total no. of accounts | 222,476 | 231,900 | 238,900 | 248,300 | 134,204 | 140,700 | 162,600 | 165,800 | 14,200 | 16,600 | 356,680 | 372,600 | 415,700 | 430,700 |
| Total no. of accounts with withdrawals | 29,043 | 33,300 | 57,600 | 74,700 | 33,489 | 61,100 | 80,500 | 92,400 | 600 | 1,610 | 62,532 | 94,400 | 138,700 | 168,710 |
| Participation rate (%) | 13.0 | 14.4 | 24.1 | 30.1 | 25.0 | 43.4 | 49.5 | 55.7 | 4.2 | 9.7 | 17.5 | 25.3 | 33.4 | 39.2 |
| Amount withdrawn (\$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd tier miscellaneous fees | 389,619 | 380,200 | 436,700 | 456,600 | 269,049 | 393,400 | 500,100 | 661,700 | 10,100 | 34,800 | 658,668 | 773,600 | 946,900 | 1,153,100 |
| Enrichment programmes | 108,163 | 563,000 | 2,342,300 | 5,043,000 | 632,237 | 2,328,800 | 3,722,000 | 8,142,000 | 6,400 | 26,500 | 740,400 | 2,891,800 | 6,070,700 | 13,211,500 |
| Total amount withdrawn | 497,782 | 943,200 | 2,779,000 | 5,499,600 | 901,286 | 2,722,200 | 4,222,100 | 8,803,700 | 16,500 | 61,300 | 1,399,068 | 3,665,400 | 7,017,600 | 14,364,600 |
| Total contributions | 62,845,800 | 25,509,000 | 31,057,000 | 39,728,000 | 15,477,000 | 18,752,200 | 23,117,800 | - | - | - | 53,591,400 | 40,986,000 | 49,809,200 | - |
| Utilisation rate(%) | - | 3.7 | 8.9 | 13.8 | - | 17.6 | 22.5 | 38.1 | - | - | 2.6 | 8.9 | 14.1 | 22.8 |
| School participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of schools with withdrawals from student accounts | 73 | 189 | 193 | 195 | 99 | 150 | 146 | 147 | 18 | 18 | 172 | 339 | 357 | 360 |
| Total no. of schools | 193 | 198 | 197 | 196 | 151 | 151 | 149 | 147 | 18 | 18 | 344 | 349 | 364 | 361 |
| Participation rate of schools | 37.8 | 95.4 | 98.0 | 99.5 | 65.6 | 99.3 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 97.1 | 98.1 | 99.7 |

Notes: Students in junior colleges and centralised institutes do not receive any Edusave contributions. The amount withdrawn represents the accumulated balance from their secondary school contributions.
Sources: Ministry of Education, 1994, pp.8, 10; Ministry of Education, 1995, pp.6, 7; Ministry of Education, 1996b, pp. 7, 8; Ministry of Education, 1997, pp. 7, 8.

Table 3. Usage of Edusave grants in primary schools and non-independent secondary schools from 1993/94 to 1996/97

| Categories of expenditure | 1993/94 | | 1994/95 | | 1995/96 | | 1996/97 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| | Secondary \$m | % | Secondary \$m | % | Primary \$m | Secondary \$m | Primary \$m | Secondary \$m | | | | |
| Resources & equipment | 4.55 | 45.8 | 3.23 | 29.0 | 0.12 | 28.6 | 3.55 | 26.3 | 2.4 | 26.1 | 3.1 | 20.6 |
| Enrichment programmes | 4.51 | 45.4 | 6.62 | 59.4 | 0.30 | 71.4 | 9.96 | 73.7 | 6.87 | 3.9 | 11.8 | 79.4 |
| Administrative support services | 0.28 | 2.8 | 0.64 | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Miscellaneous items | 0.59 | 6.0 | 0.65 | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 9.93 | 100.0 | 11.14 | 100.0 | 0.42 | 100.0 | 13.51 | 100.0 | 9.2 | 100.0 | 14.9 | 100.0 |

Note: Primary schools began receiving Edusave grants in 1995/96.

Sources: Ministry of Education, 1994, p. 16; Ministry of Education, 1995, p. 13; Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 10; Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 10.

Table 4. Percentage of Edusave grants spent by primary and non-independent secondary schools from 1993/94 to 1996/97

| Percentage of Grant Spent | 1993/94 | | 1994/95 | | 1995/96 | | 1996/97 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| | Secondary No. | % | Secondary No. | % | Primary No. | Secondary No. | Primary % | Secondary % | | | | |
| Up to 25% | 21 | 15.9 | 6 | 4.2 | 177 | 89.8 | 5 | 3.5 | 18 | 9.1 | 2 | 1.4 |
| 26% to 50% | 49 | 37.1 | 25 | 17.5 | 15 | 7.6 | 15 | 10.6 | 36 | 18.3 | 10 | 7.2 |
| 51% to 75% | 35 | 26.5 | 46 | 32.2 | 3 | 1.5 | 33 | 23.4 | 61 | 31.0 | 28 | 20.1 |
| 76% to 100% | 27 | 20.5 | 43 | 30.1 | 1 | 0.5 | 44 | 31.2 | 55 | 27.9 | 39 | 28.1 |
| More than 100% | - | - | 23 | 16.1 | 1 | 0.5 | 44 | 31.2 | 26 | 13.2 | 60 | 43.2 |
| Total | 132 | 100.0 | 143 | 100.0 | 197 | 100.0 | 141 | 100.0 | 197 | 100.0 | 139 | 100.0 |

Note: 1. Primary schools began receiving Edusave grants in 1995/96. 2. Percentages above 100% represent the utilisation of funds that were unused in previous years.

Sources: Ministry of Education, 1994, p. 16; Ministry of Education, 1995, p. 13; Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 10; Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 10.