

School – Community Financing as Determinant of the Development of Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools in Ohaji LGA, Imo State

¹Israel C. Oparaji, PhD, ²Joy Itoya, PhD, ³Emmanuel C. Asiegbu, PhD, ⁴Rosita N. Ogbo, PhD & ⁵Innocent C. Igbokwe, PhD.
^{1,3,4&5}Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
²Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma

Abstract

In this study, the researcher investigated the influence of school-community financing on the development of infrastructure in public secondary schools in Ohaji, Imo State. Four research questions and four hypotheses were adopted to guide the study. The population of the study consisted of 12 public secondary schools in the study area. Due to the size of the population, all the schools were constituted as the sample size of the study. The instrument that was used to collect data from the respondents was a 16 – item questionnaire, titled, “Influence of School Community Financing on the Development of Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools in Ohaji Questionnaire, (ISCFDIPSSOQ).” The instrument was divided into four sections and all yielded a cumulative correctional value of 0.86 which was considered high enough for the instrument to be reliable. The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot-testing and analysis using Cronbach alpha. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses, at 0.05 level of significance. The correlation coefficients were classified according to the forms they exhibited. In testing the null-hypotheses, when p-value was equal or greater than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), it was accepted but it was otherwise, the null-hypothesis was rejected. One of the findings of the study was that public secondary school are always in need of infrastructure. It was therefore recommended that host communities of public secondary schools should assist government in the development of infrastructure in the study area and in the country at large.

Key words: School community, community financing, public secondary school

Introduction

Community financing has to do with community participation in the development of infrastructure in secondary school. It could be defined as the involvement of a school host community in the financing of the school. Achoka (2007) explained it as the financial support of a community to the school cited in their domain. Taking redundantly, it is the collaboration of a school and its host community expressed in financing terms.

Community participation in school financing is beyond the intervention of the Parent-Teacher – Association in times of need. It defines the collective attention of every adult male and female in generating money for a school to bridge the gap between what the school has and what it does not have (Edumark, 2012). It is community financial contribution to enlarge the scope of the school and bridge infrastructural gap or deficit.

Balter (2009) sees education as a veritable instrument for human life development with a view to optimizing their potentials. This according to UNESCO (2005) involves both the state and the private sector. In other words, it is public private partnership driven. The last decades in many developing countries have witnessed an increased public investment in education. This is because the growth of individual in every society is synonymous with the growth of the state and inadvertently, the growth of the community (Nores, 2010).

A community consists of different strata of people. There are the men folk, the women, the business class, farmers, the professionals, the petty traders and even the artisans. All these group at different times make their presence known in communal projects among which is the school. This they do though financial support (Swedener, Kabiru and Njenga, 2000). Principal in school community financing is the Parent – Teacher – Association. This body consists of the parents of the students in the school. They constitute an integral part of the school host community but do not represent the whole school community (Edumark, 2012).

The P.T.A. contributes to the infrastructural development of a school. Infrastructure in a school can be defined as the physical structures like buildings, wood works, the road network and other material objects that are used to facilitate teaching and learning in a school. Otieno (2007) opined that the participation of the public in school financing is part of the reform initiatives in the education sector. The Parent – Teacher – Association build classroom blocks hostel blocks and sometimes provide sports facilities to schools in their area (Swedener, Kahiru and Njenga, 2000).

In addition to the various sections of the community's financial support to the school, notable rich individuals within the community also assist the school financially. Some of them buy school buses for the school while some build hostel blocks and the school names the hostels after them (Edumark, 2012). The Old Boys Association or Alumni Association cannot be left out of the subject of school community financing. In most public secondary schools in various communities, they have given vent to the development of infrastructure. Uwadie (2012) stated that have erected school assembly hall structures and supplied book and non-book materials for school libraries.

Public secondary schools are schools established and administered by the government. It is important to point out that a community can build a school and hand it over to government. In that case, the government takes over ownership of school and administers it completed. Such a secondary school is also a public school (Olamuyan, 2012). Missions can also build schools but due to government policy, such schools are taking over by the Ministry of Education, such schools are equally regarded as public secondary schools. In other words, public secondary schools are the opposite of private secondary schools.

The need for community participation in financing the infrastructure development of a school cannot be under-estimated. Firstly, government cannot finance all the sectors of the economy alone. Education is a large sector that helps to mould other sectors and a lot is involved in the running of the sector. Apart from post primary education, there are the primary education sub-sector and the tertiary education sub-sector. The monetary investment profile huge, as such, the private sector is always needed to assist and one way they can help is through community financing.

Most of the public secondary schools are located in the various communities. The host communities therefore know the peculiar problems affecting the schools. They are therefore in the position to know how to assist the schools overcome their challenges. This as a matter necessity accounts for community participation in school financing (Edumark, 2010).

As indicated earlier, the growth of a school is akin to the growth of a community. This is because most of the students who are being trained by the school are from the community. The community therefore has connection with the school. This emotional attachment elicits financial assistance from the community, to the school, to the extent of building physical structures and even finance other relevant projects (Ajayi, 2010).

The growth of a school is marked by the rapid development of infrastructure. This it has a huge economic advantage for the host community. In most of the school host communities, small scale business units are set up to cater for the needs of both staff and students. These business activities enhance the economic development of the community and

in some cases the community infrastructure is also developed. The realization of this potential benefit makes a community to participate in financing schools that are located in their domain (Ikeoha, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

School – community financing is aimed at enhancing infrastructural development of a school. It is the participation of the members of a community in developing the physical structures in the schools located in their areas.

It is a financial obligation and it comes from human sections of the communities. The old and the young are involved in it including male and female that have attained financial responsibilities.

However, in most cases, there are schools in the study area that suffer for inadequate classroom spaces and office accommodation for teachers. This infrastructural deficit definitely affects teaching and learning activities. Besides, there seem to be the dearth of empirical research on the relationship between community school financing and school infrastructural development in the study area. It is on account of this, that this study examined the influence of community school financing on the development of infrastructure in public secondary schools in Ohaji, Imo state.

Purpose of the Study

The study ascertained the connection between school community financing and infrastructural development in a school. Specifically, the purpose of the study was to;

1. Investigate the influence of school community financing on the development of classroom structures in the school.
2. Examine the influence of school – community financing on the development of hostel structure in the school.
3. Investigate the influence of school – community financing on the development of office accommodation for staff in the school.
4. Ascertain the influence of school-community financing on the provision of sports facilities in the school.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study;

1. What is the influence of school-community financing on the development of classroom structures in a school?
2. How does school-community financing improve the development of hostel structures in a school?
3. How does school-community financing enhance the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school?
4. How does school – community financing improve the provision of sports facilities in a school?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were adopted to aid the study;

1. There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of classroom structures in a school.
2. There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of hostel accommodation in a school.
3. There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school.

4. There is no significant relationship between school – community financing and the provision of sports facilities in a school.

Method

In this study, the researcher investigated the influence of school–community financing on the development of infrastructure in public secondary schools in Ohaji, Imo State. Four research questions and four hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study consisted of 420 teachers in public secondary schools in Ohaji LGA. The instrument that was used to collect data from the respondents was a 16 – item questionnaire titled: Influence of School – Community Financing on the Development of Infrastructure of Public Secondary Schools in Ohaji Questionnaire, (ISCFDIPSSOQ).”

The instrument was divided into four sections. Section A dealt with the provision of classrooms. Section B was concerned with the development of hostel accommodation. Section C was about office accommodation for teachers and Section D treated the provision of sports facilities. The instrument is structured on a four point rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA) = 4 points, Agree (A) = 3 points, Disagree (D) = 2 points and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 point. The instrument was validated by three experts, two from the Department of Educational Management and Policy while one was from the Department of Educational Foundations, all in the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot-testing and analysis by Cronbach alpha yielded a correlation value of 0.86 which was considered high enough for the study. Mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions and determine the homogeneity of the respondents’ views while Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. In testing the null-hypotheses, when p-value is greater than 0.05, the hypotheses was accepted, but where p-value is less than 0.05 alpha level, it was rejected.

Research Question 1

What is the influence of school-community financing on the development of classroom structures in a school?

Table 1: Respondents’ mean ratings and standard deviation on influence of school-community financing on development of classroom structures N = 411

S/N	Questionnaire item	\bar{X}	SD	Remarks
1	School – community financing means community participation in financing a school.	3.88	0.71	Strongly Agree
2	It helps to provide classrooms needed by staff and students for lessons.	3.02	0.59	Agree
3	The classroom would be spacious enough to take all the students and teachers during lessons.	3.04	0.82	Agree
4	Classrooms are needed because most schools do not have sufficient classrooms for staff and students.	2.84	0.89	Agree
Grand Mean		3.20		Agree

Data in table 1 shows that the grand mean score is 3.20. This indicates that respondents agree that school-community financing enhances the development of classroom structures in a school. Item by item analysis reveals that item 1 is rated strongly agree with mean score of 3.88 while the remaining three items (items 2, 3 and 4) are rated agree. The

standard deviation ranging from 0.59 to 0.89 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Research Question 2

How does school-community financing improve the development of hostel structures in a school?

Table 2: Respondents' mean ratings and standard deviation on influence of school-community financing on development of hostel structures N = 411

S/N	Questionnaire item	\bar{X}	SD	Remarks
5	Hostels are important in schools	2.80	0.51	Agreed
6	They are the places where students live within the school compound.	3.62	0.83	Strongly Agree
7	Living in the hostels makes students to be more committed to their studies.	3.04	0.77	Agree
8	School – community financing helps in the provision of hostel accommodation for students	2.86	0.68	Agreed
Grand Mean		3.08		Agree

Data in table 2 shows that the grand mean score is 3.08 indicating that respondents agree that school-community financing improve the development of hostel structures in a school. Item by item analysis reveals that item 6 is rated strongly agree with mean score of 3.62 while the remaining three items (items 5, 7 and 8) are rated agree. The standard deviation ranging from 0.51 to 0.83 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Research Question 3

How does school-community financing enhance the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school?

Table 3: Respondents' mean ratings and standard deviation on influence of school-community financing on development of office accommodation N = 411

S/N	Questionnaire item	\bar{X}	SD	Remark
9	Office spaces or accommodation are important in the school.	2.72	0.54	Agree
10	Teachers need them to do their work well in the school.	3.84	0.76	Strongly Agree
11	Some non-teaching staff also need offices to do their work.	3.64	0.82	Strongly Agree
12	School – community financing helps to provide office accommodation in school	3.56	0.87	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		3.44		Agree

Data in table 3 reveals that the grand mean score of 3.44 shows that the respondents agree that school-community financing enhance the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school. Item by item analysis shows that the respondents strongly agree on items 10, 11 and 12 with mean scores ranged between 3.56 and 3.84 while they agree on item

9 with mean score of 2.72. The standard deviation ranging from 0.54 to 0.87 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Research Question 4

How does school – community financing improve the provision of sports facilities in a school?

Table 4: Respondents’ mean ratings and standard deviation on influence of school-community financing on provision of sports facilities N = 411

S/N	Questionnaire item	\bar{X}	SD	Remark
13	Sports facilities are important in the school	2.88	0.58	Agree
14	Students used them for use during sports activities	3.03	0.67	Agree
15	Sports activities help to develop students physically	3.62	0.72	Strongly Agree
16	School – community financing help to provide sports facilities in school	3.74	0.79	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		3.32		Agree

Data in table 4 shows that the grand mean score of 3.32 which indicates that respondents agree that school-community financing improve the provision of sports facilities in a school. Item by item analysis shows that respondents strongly agree on items 15 and 16 with mean scores ranged between 3.62 and 3.74 while they agree on the remaining two items (items 13 and 14) with mean scores between 2.88 and 3.03. The standard deviation ranging from 0.58 to 0.79 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of classroom structures in a school.

Table 5: Correlation coefficient of the relationship between school-community financing and the development of classroom structures

		Development of classroom structures
School-community financing	Pearson Correlation(<i>r</i>)	.911
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014
	N	411

Data in table 5 shows that *r* is .911 with a *p*-value of .014 which is less than 0.05 alpha level ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of classroom structures in a school.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of hostel accommodation in a school.

Table 6: Correlation coefficient of the relationship between school-community financing and the development of hostel accommodation

		Development accommodation	of hostel
School-community financing	Pearson		.792
	Correlation(<i>r</i>)		
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N		411

Table 6 shows that *r* is .792 with a *p*-value of .001 which is less than 0.05 alpha level ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of hostel accommodation in a school.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school.

Table 7: Correlation coefficient of the relationship between school-community financing and the development of office accommodation

		Development accommodation	of office
School-community financing	Pearson Correlation(<i>r</i>)		.813
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	411	

Table 6 shows that *r* is .813 with a *p*-value of .000 which is less than 0.05 alpha level ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of office accommodation for teachers in a school.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant relationship between school – community financing and the provision of sports facilities in a school.

Table 8: Correlation coefficient of the relationship between school – community financing and the provision of sports facilities

		Provision facilities	of sports
School-community financing	Pearson		.891
	Correlation(<i>r</i>)		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	
	N	411	

Data in table 8 shows that *r* is .891 with a *p*-value of .023 which is less than 0.05 alpha level ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between school – community financing and the provision of sports facilities in a school.

Discussion

The finding of the study as seen in Table 1 is that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the development of classroom structure in the school. By definition, school-community financing is the participation of a school host community in funding the operation of a school. Through different agencies like the Parent-Teacher-Association, classroom structures have been constructed in public secondary schools, especially in the study area. This has enhanced the availability of spacious learning classrooms for the ever increasing enrolment rate in public secondary schools. It has also facilitated the process of teaching and learning.

Another finding of the study as indicated in Table 2 shows that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the provision of hostel in the school. The hostel is the place where students, both male and female live within the school for learning. In most public secondary schools, hostels are always inadequate forcing more number of students than required to occupy or live in one room. The host communities of these schools therefore periodically intervene to erect hostel structures in the school. That has help to bring many students to live in the school and concentrate on their studies.

One other finding of the study as revealed in Table 3 is that there is a significant relationship between school community financing and the development of office accommodation for teachers in public secondary schools. It is important to state that most secondary schools have deficit of office spaces for the teaching staff. Teaching staff are the teachers in the school that are in charge of pedagogy. They are the teachers of the various subjects and such people need offices where they can sit, think and prepare to do their work well.

In most cases, offices are not enough and do not go round for all teachers. School – community financing has helped in such cases to bridge this infrastructural gap. As hinted earlier, the idea of school-community financing is not limited to the help from the host community alone. The definition extends to the assistance of Alumni Associations, Parent-Teacher-Association, Non-Governmental Organizations, good spirited individuals and even development partners. Any of these groups from time to time construct office accommodation in schools and this has helped to provide offices for teachers.

Another finding of the study as shown in Table 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between school-community financing and the provision of sports facilities in the school. Sports is a very integral part of education. It consists of the psychomotor training that forms part of the development of the total child.

These sports facilities are in most cases in short supply. School-community financing has aided their provision in schools. In most cases, sports enthusiasts have rallied round to assist schools by providing sports facilities for schools. Parent-Teacher-Associations has also assisted public secondary schools in that regard. At some other times, the school itself has reached out to development partners to help with the provision of sports facilities in the school.

Conclusion

Generally, financing education cannot be left for government alone. Due to the multi-ferrous sectors and sub-sectors that constitute the political and social-economic structures of government, it could be difficult or near impossible for government to give equal attention to everything that the citizens desire. It is therefore necessary that the host communities of public secondary schools and other stake-holders in education to assist government in financing the operation of schools.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that;

1. School host communities should help government in funding education in the state.
2. The alumni associations of public secondary schools should also be involved in financing their alma-mater by embarking on various and meaningful projects that can facilitate teaching and learning in the schools.
3. Non-governmental organization could equally be helpful by assisting the government in providing certain facilities that can improve learning in schools.
4. Finally, good spirited individuals and development partners should contribute to school financing through donation of books and non-book materials that are relevant and needed for learning.

References

- Achoka, I. (2007). Food insecurity in public boarding secondary schools in Western Kenya: A threat to development and peaceful existence. Paper presented at the 6th ATWS conference.
- Ajayi, A.O. (2010). Provision of physical facilities in secondary schools. Edumark publications limited, Ikeja Lagos.
- Baller, D.P. (2009). Importance of education O.P. Paper (online) <http://www.oppapers.com/essays/importance-education/72816>.
- Edumark, (2012). Edumark publications limited, Lagos.
- Ikeoha, G.E. (2013). The role of P.T.A. in school building: Edumark publications limited, Lagos.
- Nores, M. (2010). The economics of early childhood in D.J. Brewer, and Mc Ewan, P.J. ed (2010). *Economics of Education*. Amsterdam: Elsever.
- Olamyan, D.A., & Olenarakinde, T. (2008). Human capital theory: Implications for educational development: *European Journal of Scientific Research*. Retrieved November 8, 2010 from <http://www.eurojournals.com/eisr24201.pdf>.
- Olaniya, D.A. (2012). Development of school infrastructure: Issues and perspectives. *West African Journal of Educational Management*. University of Ibadan; Ibadan University, Press.
- Otieno, O. (2007). The initiatives of school empowerment. Nairobi, Kenya.
- Swedener, B., Kabiru, M., & Njenga, A. (2000). Does the village still raise the child? A collaborative study of changing child-rearing and early education in Kenya: State University of New York Press.
- UNESCO, (2003). Gender and education for all: The leap to equality. ETA global Monitoring Report 2003/2004 Parris, UNESCO.
- Uwadie, (2012). West African Examinations Council. Chief examiners' report, WAEC National office, Yaba, Lagos.