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ABSTRACT
The study was carried out to determine the extent of community participation in the provision of social services for the development of Community Secondary Schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas of Rivers State. A descriptive survey design was employed in the study. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 105 participants which included principals, vice principals and executive members of Parent Teacher Association. The instrument for data collection was a 21 item titled, “Community Participation in the Development of Secondary Schools Scale” structured on a four point rating scale. This was used to gather information on the extent of community participation in the provision of social service for the development of secondary schools in Eleme and Tai local government areas. The instrument was validated by three experts and distributed to 30 respondents to obtain reliability coefficient, using Cronbach Alpha, a reliability coefficient of 0.90 was obtained. A total of one hundred and five (105) copies of the instrument were sent for data collection with the help of research assistants while 97 copies were received for data analysis. The research questions were answered using mean while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 alpha level of significance using z-test. The results of the study showed that community participation in development of secondary schools in Eleme was high in the area of security in the form of vigilante, low in provision of health, welfare and basic amenities. The study recommended that communities should be encouraged to raise fund to support provision of sport facilities and basic facilities in school.
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INTRODUCTION
Apart from teaching and learning and other academic activities organized by the school for students and members of staff, other activities such social services are also very important for the development of students and the school environment. These social services according to the US Department of Education (2017), refers to the assistance rendered to schools for addressing a number of nonacademic issues that can negatively affect their participation and outcomes in school. Communities can deliver social services to schools or refer students and families to outside agencies for assistance. Social services can include health care services; welfare services; provision of basic amenities; provision of security; etc rendered to address material needs such as transportation, shelter, or clothing. Social services such as sports, health and welfare contribute greatly to the social and wellbeing of the students. As a result of this, social amenities such as sporting and health facilities are required in the schools.

Education in the Nigerian society is funded by government. For example, the payment of staff salaries, provision of instructional materials, facilities and infrastructure lie as responsibility of government. However, due to inadequacy in government provision of facilities, it is observed that some schools lack some of these basic facilities. But these schools are located in communities and as such some level of
participation is needed by communities in provision of social services for the development of secondary schools.

**Research Questions**

1. In what ways do communities participate in the provision of health services for the development of community secondary schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas?
2. To what extent do communities participate in the provision of welfare for the development of community secondary schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 alpha level of significance:

1. There is no significance difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai regarding ways communities participate in the provision of health services for the development of community secondary schools.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai regarding the extent communities participate in the provision of welfare service for the development of community secondary schools.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

A descriptive survey design was employed in the study. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 105 participants which included principals, vice principals and executive members of Parent Teacher Association. The instrument for data collection was a 21 item titled, “Community Participation in the Development of Secondary Schools Scale” structured on a four point rating scale. This was used to gather information on the extent of community participation in the provision of social service for the development of secondary schools in Eleme and Tai local government areas. The instrument was validated by three experts and distributed to 30 respondents to obtain reliability coefficient, using Cronbach Alpha, a reliability coefficient of 0.90 was obtained. A total of one hundred and five (105) copies of the instrument were sent for data collection with the help of research assistants while 97 copies were received for data analysis. The research questions were answered using mean while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 alpha level of significance using z-test.

**RESULTS**

**Research Question 1**

*In what ways do communities participate in the provision of health services for the development of community secondary schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas?*

**Table 1: Mean response on ways communities participate in health service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Eleme (N = 34)</th>
<th>Tai (N = 63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organizing health talk</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provision of first aid materials</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building of a sick bay for school</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equipping the sick bay with drugs</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employ a health worker for sick bay</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purchase health awareness materials for schools</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey
Table 1 shows the result of responses regarding ways communities participate in providing health service for school development in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas (LGAs). As shown, grand mean values of 1.54 and 1.59 respectively for Eleme and Tai indicate that respondents disagreed that communities participate in health service for school development in the study area.

Research Question 2: To what extent do communities participate in the provision of welfare for the development of community secondary schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas?

Table 2: Mean response on extent of participation in welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Eleme (N = 34)</th>
<th>Tai (N = 63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provision of accommodation for teachers</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provision of school bus</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Awarding scholarships to students</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provision of financial assistance for extra moral classes</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Awarding prizes for deserving teachers</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>RMK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey (LE = Low Extent; RMK = Remark)

Table 2: shows the result of responses regarding the extent communities participate in providing welfare service for school development in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas (LGAs). As shown, grand mean values of 1.61 and 1.70 respectively for Eleme and Tai indicate that communities participate in provision of welfare service for school development to a low extent in the study area.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significance difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai regarding ways communities participate in the provision of health services for the development of community secondary schools in Eleme Local Government Area.

Table 3: z-test: difference in mean response on provision of health service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Z_cal</th>
<th>Z_cri</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleme</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.5969</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.28677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 3 shows that the calculated value of Z (Z_cal = 0.93) is less than critical value of Z (Z_cri = 1.96). Based on this, the null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that there is no significant difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai LGAs regarding the ways communities participate in provision of health services for the development of secondary schools.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai regarding the extent communities participate in the provision of welfare service for the development of community secondary schools.
Table 4: Z-test: difference in mean response on provision of welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Z_{cal}</th>
<th>Z_{crit}</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleme</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.2606</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.2561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 4 shows that the calculated value of Z ($Z_{cal} = 1.52$) is less than critical value of Z ($Z_{crit} = 1.96$). Based on this, the null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that there is no significant difference in the mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai LGAs regarding the extent communities participate in provision of welfare services for the development of secondary schools.

**Summary of Findings**

Based on the findings from the study, the following summary is deduced:

1. Communities in Eleme and Tai do not participate in provision of health services for school development in their secondary schools.
2. The extent communities provide welfare service for school development is low in secondary schools in Eleme and Tai.

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

Research question one sought to determine how communities participate in the provision of health services for the development of secondary schools in Eleme LGA. The result obtained revealed that the respondents disagreed that communities participated in organizing health talks; provision of first aid materials; building of sick bay; equipping of sick bay with drugs; employment of a health worker for the sick bay; provision of health awareness materials for the development of secondary schools in the study area. The z-test for significance showed that there was no significant difference in mean response of respondents from Eleme and Tai regarding ways communities participated in the provision of social service in the study area. This result negates the findings of Daba (2010) who carried a study to explore community participation in education in Horro Guduru Wollaga Zone of Oromia National Regional Sate, Ethiopia and found that communities participated in humanitarian service to the administration of schools.

Research question two sought to determine the extent communities participate in the provision of welfare for the development of secondary schools in Eleme and Tai LGAs. The result obtained revealed that community participation in provision of welfare service in the study area was low. This could have resulted from the fact that communities may view funding of public schools to be solely the responsibility of the government. Based on this, any form of financial commitment related to school may not be seen as a responsibility that communities should be involved. The z-test of significance showed that the respondents had similar views regarding the extent communities participated in the provision of funds for the development of schools in the study area. This means that provision of welfare service in schools is very low in all the communities in Eleme and Tai LGAs. This result negates the findings of Ejeh, Okenjom and Cizi-Woko (2016) carried out their study to find out the extent communities participated in the funding of secondary school in Abakaliki Education Zone of Ebonyi State and found that community participation in funding construction of classrooms, toilets, furniture, and employment of teachers for subjects lacking teachers was high.

**Summary**

The study deals with the extent of community participation in the provision of social services for the development of secondary schools in Eleme and Tai Local Government Areas of Rivers State. The result of the study revealed that community participation in provision of health service to secondary schools was low. Secondly, community participation in the provision of welfare service and basic amenities were low. However, participation in the provision of security was high in the form of vigilante.
CONCLUSION
Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that community participation in the development of secondary schools in Eleme and Tai is low in the provision of health service, basic amenities and welfare. Participation by community is however high in provision of security of schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the findings of this study, it is therefore recommended that:
1. The communities should be encouraged to raise money to provide some basic amenities and sport equipment, hire and pay laborers to clean up school during holidays.
2. PTA should endeavor to raise funds building of libraries as this will help in the academic development of the students.
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