ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

# Extent to Which Heads of Schools Involve the Community in Decision-Making Regarding Infrastructure Development in Public Secondary Schools in Hai District

Josephat G. Omahe[1]; Dr. Peter Siamoo[2]; Dr. Emmanuel Kileo[3]

[2]Supervisors

[2,3]Mwenge Catholic University

[1,2,3]Department of Educational Psychology and Curriculum Studies Faculty of Education Mwenge Catholic University, Moshi, Tanzania

Publication Date: 2026/11/13

**Abstract: The study examined the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District, Tanzania. Resource Mobilization Theory guided the study. The study employed a convergent research design under a mixed-methods research approach. The target population comprised 35 public secondary schools, 35 Heads of Schools, 726 teachers, 17 Wards, 17 Ward Executive Officers, and 1 District Secondary Education Officer, making a total population of 831. A sample of 11 public secondary schools was selected using simple random, 11 Heads of Schools and 5 Ward Executive Officers were selected using criterion purposive, and 1 District Secondary Education Officer, making a total of 276, was selected using total population sampling. Quantitative data were collected using questionnaires, while qualitative data were collected through interview guides and document analysis guide. The validity of the research instruments was established through three expert reviews in Educational Planning and Administration from Mwenge Catholic University (MWECAU). A pilot study was conducted in one public secondary school that was not included in the main study. Reliability of the teachers' questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a coefficient of .89, while the trustworthiness of qualitative data was enhanced through triangulation. Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, and means with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27, whereas qualitative data were analyzed thematically. Ethical considerations were observed through obtaining research clearance and institutional permission, securing informed consent, maintaining confidentiality and anonymity, and acknowledging all sources appropriately. The study found that to a moderate extent heads of schools involve community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure development. The study concludes that heads of schools involve community members in infrastructure development decision-making to a moderate extent, but greater emphasis is required on structured, inclusive, transparent, and systematic community participation throughout the infrastructure development process. The study recommend that heads of schools strengthen structured community participation in infrastructure development by involving community members in needs assessment, priority setting, planning, work scheduling, resource mobilization, implementation, monitoring, and maintenance decisions.**

***Keywords:*** *Community Involvement, Decision-Making, Infrastructure Development, Resource Mobilization.*

**How to Cite:** Josephat G. Omahe; Dr. Peter Siamoo; Dr. Emmanuel Kileo (2026) Extent to Which Heads of Schools Involve the Community in Decision-Making Regarding Infrastructure Development in Public Secondary Schools in Hai District. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(11), 180-192. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

## I. INTRODUCTION

Community involvement in school governance has become a central principle of educational decentralization and participatory leadership worldwide. Modern education systems recognize that schools perform better when stakeholders such as parents, school boards, local government authorities, community leaders, and development partners participate in making important decisions, including those concerning infrastructure development (UNESCO, 2024). Community participation enables schools to mobilize financial, material, and human resources while strengthening

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

accountability, transparency, and ownership of development projects (UNESCO, 2024). Infrastructure development, including classrooms, labouratories, libraries, teachers' houses, sanitation facilities, and ICT infrastructure, directly influences students' learning outcomes and teachers' working conditions. Consequently, the extent to which heads of schools involve communities in decision-making has become an important indicator of school leadership and good governance. According to UNESCO (2024), education systems that institutionalize stakeholder participation create more responsive and sustainable schools because local communities become partners in planning, implementing, and monitoring development projects. Likewise, the World Bank (2020) argues that community participation strengthens school accountability and improves service delivery through shared responsibility between governments and citizens. Despite these policy commitments, meaningful participation remains uneven across countries because school leaders differ in how they engage stakeholders during decision-making processes.

Globally, countries have strengthened school governance by promoting community participation in infrastructure development. In Australia, school councils are legally mandated to participate in planning, budgeting, and monitoring school development projects. Research by Gurr and Drysdale (2023) indicates that schools practicing collaborative leadership successfully mobilize community resources, improve infrastructure maintenance, and strengthen accountability between schools and local communities. Similarly, in the United States, School-Based Management (SBM) reforms encourage principals, parents, teachers, and local school boards to make decisions about school improvement projects jointly. According to the World Bank (2020), participatory governance increases transparency in resource utilization while improving school infrastructure through local ownership and stakeholder collabouration. Schools with active community engagement generally experience better facility maintenance and higher public confidence than schools where decisions remain centralized. These international experiences demonstrate that school leadership increasingly depends on the ability of school heads to involve stakeholders throughout infrastructure planning, implementation, and evaluation rather than merely consulting them after decisions have already been made.

In Africa, decentralization reforms have similarly emphasized community participation as an important strategy for improving educational infrastructure. In Ghana, School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parent–Teacher Associations (PTAs) participate in identifying infrastructure priorities, mobilizing community resources, and supervising construction projects. Studies have reported that schools with active stakeholder participation experience improved accountability and better completion rates of school infrastructure projects. Likewise, in South Africa, School Governing Bodies (SGBs), established under the South African Schools Act, participate directly in school planning and infrastructure management. Research has shown that principals who practice participatory leadership strengthen community ownership of school projects and improve transparency in resource management. These African experiences suggest that although decentralization policies provide opportunities for community participation, the actual extent of involvement depends largely on leadership practices adopted by school heads and the capacity of local communities to participate effectively.

In Tanzania, the development of adequate and sustainable infrastructure is essential for improving the quality of teaching and learning in public secondary schools. Government initiatives such as BRN, SEDP, EP4R, and SEQUIP have invested substantially in classrooms, labouratories, dormitories, sanitation facilities, administration blocks, and teachers' houses, while emphasizing community participation in identifying needs, prioritizing projects, mobilizing resources, monitoring implementation, and ensuring accountability. The PPRA Guidelines for Carrying Out Works under Force Account further recognize heads of schools as key actors in coordinating school committees, parents, local authorities, and other stakeholders in infrastructure development (PPRA, 2020). However, policy provisions do not necessarily translate into meaningful community participation. Evidence indicates that community involvement in school development activities remains inconsistent, with some communities participating only occasionally or not at all (Mosha & Katabaro, 2022; Ministry of Education, 2021–2024). Similarly, the CAG Annual Audit Report identified weaknesses in the implementation of school construction projects, including cases involving inadequate community involvement, raising concerns about the effectiveness of existing participatory mechanisms (URT, 2024).

The study selected Hai District due to its comparatively higher number of prolonged incomplete secondary school infrastructure projects within Kilimanjaro Region (URT, 2022). Hai District accounts for the largest share of incomplete projects among the councils in the region, including labouratories, classrooms, and staff houses that have remained unfinished for an extended period. The distribution of long-delayed incomplete infrastructure projects in secondary schools across the seven councils of Kilimanjaro Region is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Long-Delayed Incomplete Projects in Kilimanjaro Region (Secondary Schools Only)

| No. | Council | Labouratory Rooms | Classrooms | Staff Houses | Dormitories | Hostels | Toilet Pits | Administration Blocks | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Siha DC | 13 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 36 |
| 2 | Same DC | 14 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 22 |

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Rombo DC | 6 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 33 |
| 4 | Moshi DC | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 5 | Moshi MC | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| 6 | Mwanga DC | 21 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 7 | Hai DC | 46 | 3 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 78 |
| | Total | 108 | 19 | 58 | 4 | 7 | 24 | 4 | 224 |

Source: RAS Kilimanjaro, (2026)

The concern is particularly relevant in Hai District Council, which records the highest number of long-delayed incomplete secondary-school infrastructure projects in Kilimanjaro Region. Data from RAS Kilimanjaro (2026) show that Hai District has 78 incomplete projects out of 224 reported across the region, representing approximately 34.8% of the total. These include 46 labouratories, 24 classrooms, 3 staff houses, 2 dormitories, 3 hostels, and 1 administration block, making Hai the council with the largest infrastructure completion gap in the region. Due particular, limited empirical evidence in Hai district exists on whether heads of school provide meaningful opportunities for community members to participate in determining infrastructure needs and priorities, rather than merely involving them during project implementation. Therefore, the persistence of infrastructure gaps alongside policy expectations for stakeholder participation creates a clear empirical need to investigate the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District (PPRA, 2020; URT, 2024; RAS Kilimanjaro, 2026).

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Inadequate community participation in decision-making in sustainable infrastructure development in public secondary schools is a persistent problem that hinders parents, school committees, local leaders, and other community members from contributing to the identification of infrastructure needs, prioritization of projects, allocation of available resources, monitoring of implementation, and accountability. Hai District accounts for approximately 34.8% of the 2024 long-delayed incomplete secondary-school infrastructure projects reported across Kilimanjaro Region (RAS Kilimanjaro, 2026). If the problem remains unresolved, infrastructure decisions may continue to be dominated by school or administrative authorities, potentially resulting in projects that are poorly aligned with community priorities, limited local ownership, weak monitoring, reduced willingness to contribute resources, prolonged project delays, and continued inadequacies in the learning environment.

The studies by Ngonge (2024), Stewart, Phillipo, and Pesha (2023), and Anania (2025) have examined challenges affecting community involvement in secondary-school construction projects and the influence of policy and political processes on community participation in school development in Tanzania. However, these studies have limited attention to heads of school involving community members specifically in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools. This knowledge gap justifies the need for the present study, which seeks to examine the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District, Tanzania.

### ➢ *Research Question*

The study was guided by the following research question

To what extent do heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District?

### ➢ *Significance of the Study*

The findings of the study are expected to provide empirical evidence on the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District. The results inform education policy and school leadership practices and guide stakeholders, including heads of schools, education officers, school committees, parents, and local leaders, in strengthening participatory decision-making, transparency, accountability, and community ownership in school infrastructure development. The findings are expected to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on educational leadership and community participation by providing context-specific evidence on community involvement in infrastructure-related decision-making in public secondary schools. Theoretically, the study contributes to the understanding and application of Resource Mobilization Theory by demonstrating how heads of schools can facilitate community involvement in identifying, accessing, coordinating, and utilizing locally available resources through collective decision-making.

### ➢ *Theoretical Framework*

This study was guided by the Resource Mobilisation Theory, developed by McCarthy and Zald (1977). Resource Mobilisation Theory is based on the principle that achieving collective goals depends on the ability of individuals, groups, and institutions to identify, acquire, organise, coordinate, and effectively utilise available resources (McCarthy and Zald 1977). The theory emphasises key aspects, including resource availability and mobilisation, resource acquisition and access, organisation and coordination, strategic utilisation of resources, leadership capacity, and networks and relationships (McCarthy and Zald 1977).Therefore, the

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

theory is relevant to this study as it explains how the leadership practices of heads of schools can promote community participation, encourage shared decision-making, strengthen stakeholder collabouration, and enhance community involvement in infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District, Tanzania.

The theory offers several strengths that directly support this study. First, it emphasizes the importance of leadership, organization, coordination, and strategic action in mobilizing resources for collective objectives. This is relevant because heads of schools occupy a central position in creating opportunities for community members to participate in infrastructure-related decision-making. Through meetings, consultations, school committees, communication, and collabourative planning, heads of schools can facilitate the identification of community resources and integrate them into school infrastructure priorities. Second, the theory recognizes that resources are not limited to financial contributions but can include human, material, informational, and organizational resources. Third, RMT provides a useful basis for understanding variations in community involvement across schools because differences in leadership capacity, organizational arrangements, communication, and resource networks may influence the extent to which communities participate in infrastructure decision-making (McCarthy & Zald, 1977).

Despite its strengths, Resource Mobilization Theory has some weaknesses that may limit its ability to fully explain community involvement in infrastructure decision-making. One limitation is that the theory tends to emphasize the availability, organization, and strategic use of resources, while giving comparatively less attention to non-material factors such as trust, social relationships, cultural values, motivation, and community attitudes that can influence participation (Edwards, 2004). In addition, the theory may give insufficient attention to inequalities in power and socioeconomic status within communities. For example, poverty may limit some parents' ability to contribute financially or materially, while unequal power relations may prevent certain community members from having an effective voice in infrastructure decisions even when they are formally invited to participate.

The theory has implications for the present study by suggesting that effective community involvement in infrastructure decision-making depends partly on the capacity of heads of schools to identify, organize, coordinate, and utilize resources available within the school community. In this study, RMT guides attention to how heads of schools create opportunities for community members to participate in identifying infrastructure needs, prioritizing projects, discussing resource requirements, and determining appropriate approaches to infrastructure development. The theory therefore provides a framework for examining whether heads of schools use effective communication, consultation, coordination, and stakeholder engagement to transform community resources and knowledge into collective decisions concerning infrastructure development.

## III. REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES

An empirical literature review refers systematic literature review, analyses previous empirical studies in order to provide an answer to specific research topic Rather than drawing information from theories, belief, empirical research relies on observations and measurements to arrive at conclusions. To address specific research inquiries in involves making a list of people, behaviors or events that are being researched.

- *The Extent to Which Heads of Schools Involve the Community in Decision-Making Regarding Infrastructure Development in Secondary Schools*

The involvement of the community in decision-making on infrastructure development is an important responsibility of heads of public secondary schools. Such involvement promotes cooperation, accountability, and support for school projects. Examining the extent of this involvement helps determine how school infrastructure is effectively developed.

Farley-Ripple (2024) conducted a study on the use of research in schools: Principals' capacity and contributions" to examine how school principals' leadership practices influence decision-making processes in public schools in the United States. The study adopted a quantitative survey research design and utilized national-level data collected from a sample of more than 4,000 educators drawn from 134 public schools. Participants were selected through systematic and stratified sampling procedures to ensure representation across school contexts. Data were collected using structured questionnaires focusing on decision-making roles, evidence use, stakeholder involvement, and leadership capacity, and were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The study found that while principals play a dominant role in shaping school decisions, the involvement of other stakeholders, including parents and community members, was inconsistent and generally limited, particularly in major organizational and strategic decisions such as resource allocation. Although the study provides valuable understandings into leadership-driven decision-making in schools, it gives limited attention to community participation in infrastructure-related decisions. Therefore, the current study fills this gap by examining the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in secondary schools.

Tellen, Besong, and Emmanuel (2025) conducted a study on the role of community involvement in enhancing infrastructural support and its impact on the quality of public primary school pupils' education in rural areas in Cameroon. The study adopted a convergent design under the mixed-methods approach to examine how community members contribute to school infrastructure and how this influences educational quality. The study involved a sample of 138 respondents, including head of schools, teachers, and community leaders, selected through a combination of purposive, stratified snowball, convenience, and simple random sampling techniques to ensure representation across schools and communities. Data were collected using questionnaires and interview guides, and analysed through

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

descriptive and inferential statistics for quantitative data and thematic analysis for qualitative data. The study found that while communities participated in providing infrastructure support, such as classrooms and sanitation facilities, the overall level of community contribution was limited, and inadequate infrastructure negatively affected educational quality. Although the study provided treasured understandings into the link between community support and educational outcomes, it paid limited attention to examining the extent to which heads of schools actively involve community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure development. Therefore, the current study fills this gap by investigating the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in secondary schools.

Lakan (2025) conducted a study on community participation and its impact on sustainable educational infrastructure development in rural areas of Nigeria. The study adopted a survey design under a quantitative research approach to examine how community engagement influences the sustainability of school infrastructure projects in rural contexts. A total of 349 respondents, comprising community leaders, school heads, parents, and government officials, were selected using a multistage sampling technique to ensure diverse stakeholder representation across selected rural communities. Data were collected using a structured approach and analyzed using descriptive statistics to answer the research question. The findings revealed that community involvement in planning, construction, and maintenance of school infrastructure significantly influenced the sustainability of such projects, with communities contributing labour, land, and local materials, leading to higher maintenance and utilization of facilities. However, although the study highlighted the positive role of community participation in infrastructure development and sustainability, its reliance solely on quantitative methods may have limited in-depth understanding of stakeholders' experiences, perceptions, and the strategies employed by school heads to engage communities in decision-making. Therefore, the current study addresses this gap by adopting a mixed methods approach to collect qualitative and quantitative data to collect both qualitative and quantitative data.

Ngwama (2024) conducted a study on the effects of community participation on school infrastructure development in rural Uganda. The study adopted a desk-based analytical design to examine how community involvement influences infrastructure development in rural schools. The study reviewed secondary data from published research, policy reports, and case studies on community participation and school infrastructure development. Data were analyzed using document and thematic analysis to identify patterns, impacts, and challenges of community engagement in school infrastructure projects. The study found that community participation promotes ownership, relevance, and sustainability of school infrastructure, and can reduce project costs while accelerating construction outcomes. However, the study revealed that participation levels were inconsistent, and limited technical capacity among community members sometimes constrained the quality and effectiveness of infrastructure development. Although the study provided useful understandings into the role of communities in supporting school infrastructure, it paid limited attention to assessing how heads of schools involve community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure projects, leaving a gap in understanding leadership-driven participatory processes. Therefore, the current study addresses this gap by examining The extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in secondary schools.

Ndunguru (2024) conducted a study on community participation in improving school infrastructure in selected public secondary schools in Songea District Council, Tanzania. The study adopted a descriptive survey design under a mixed-methods approach to examine how communities are involved in infrastructure development. The study involved a sample of heads of public secondary schools, teachers, parents, community leaders, and education officers, selected through purposive sampling for key informants and simple random sampling for parents and teachers. Data were collected using questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis, and were analyzed through descriptive statistics for quantitative data and thematic analysis for qualitative data. The study found that although community members participated in infrtstructure development through meetings, provision of labour, and financial contributions, their involvement in decision-making processes such as planning, prioritization, and budgeting was limited. Although the study provided general understandings relevant to the current study, it fell short of explicitly assessing the extent to which heads of public secondary schools actively involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development. Therefore, the current study fills this gap by investigating the extent to which heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in secondary schools.

- *Demonstration of Research Gap*

Several empirical studies have examined community involvement in school infrastructure development, revealing methodological, knowledge, and contextual gaps that justify the present study. Methodological gap. Previous studies have employed different methodological approaches, but several have relied predominantly on single-method designs that provide limited opportunity to obtain complementary evidence on how heads of schools involve communities in infrastructure-related decision-making. For example, Farley-Ripple (2024), Lakan (2025), and Ngwama (2024). This study fills this gap by adopting a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative evidence to examine the extent to which heads of public secondary schools involve community members in decisions concerning infrastructure development.

Knowledge gap. Existing studies provide evidence that community participation contributes to the development, sustainability, ownership, and maintenance of school infrastructure, but there is insufficient knowledge about the extent to which heads of schools actually involve

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

communities in decision-making processes concerning infrastructure development. For instance, Ndunguru (2024) reported that community members participated through meetings, labour, and financial contributions, but their involvement in key decisions related to planning, prioritization, and budgeting remained limited. Farley-Ripple (2024) also showed that principals played a dominant role in school decision-making and that stakeholder involvement was inconsistent, particularly in major organizational and resource-allocation decisions. This study fills this knowledge gap by specifically examining the extent to which heads of public secondary schools involve the community at different stages of infrastructure-related decision-making.

Contextual gap. Although evidence on community participation in school infrastructure development is available from the United States, Cameroon, Nigeria, Uganda, and Tanzania, the findings are drawn from different educational, administrative, socioeconomic, and institutional contexts and therefore cannot automatically be generalized to public secondary schools in the specific study context. Farley-Ripple (2024), Tellen, Besong, and Emmanuel (2025), and Ngwama (2024) examined rural schools in Uganda. Therefore, there remains a contextual gap concerning empirical evidence on the extent to which heads of public secondary schools involve communities in infrastructure-related decision-making within the context of the present study. This current study fills this gap by generating context-specific empirical evidence on community involvement in infrastructure decision-making among public secondary schools in the selected study area.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a convergent research design under a mixed-methods research approach, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data concurrently to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the research Problem (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The target population comprised 35 public secondary schools, 35 Heads of Schools, 726 teachers, 17 Ward Executive Officers, 1 District Secondary Education Officer to make a total population of 831. The sample consisted of 11 public secondary schools, 11 Heads of Schools, 248 teachers, 5 Ward Executive Officers, and 1 District Secondary Education Officer, for a total of 276 respondents. Public secondary schools were selected through simple random sampling, Heads of Schools, Chairpersons of School Boards, and Ward Executive Officers through criterion purposive sampling, while the District Secondary Education Officer was selected through total population sampling. Teachers were selected using proportionate stratified random sampling based on gender, with the sample size determined using the Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table. Quantitative data were collected using questionnaires, while qualitative data were collected through interview guides and document analysis guide. The validity of the research instruments was established through three expert reviews from the field of Educational Planning and Administration from Mwenge Catholic University (MWECAU). A pilot study was conducted in one public secondary school that was not included in the main study and involved 1 Head of School, 30 teachers, and 1 Ward Executive Officer, making a total of 32 participants. Reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient which yielded a coefficient of .89 for teacher, while the trustworthiness of qualitative data was enhanced through strategies of peer debriefing and data triangulation to enhance credibility and dependability. Quantitative data were analysed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, and means with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27, whereas qualitative data were analyzed thematically through the stages of organizing and preparing the data, reading the data to obtain a general understanding, coding meaningful segments, developing themes, presenting the themes narratively, and interpreting the findings in relation to the research questions and existing literature (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). Finally, quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated during interpretation to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem. Ethical considerations were observed through obtaining research clearance and institutional permission, securing informed consent, ensuring voluntary participation, maintaining confidentiality and anonymity, protecting participants' information, and acknowledging all sources appropriately to uphold academic integrity and avoid plagiarism.

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study examined the extent do heads of schools involve the community in decision-making regarding infrastructure development in public secondary schools in Hai District. Data were collected through a questionnaire administered to teachers, an interview guide administered to the head of the school, District education Officer and ward Executive Officer, and a document analysis guide. A five-point Likert scale was used for data analysis, ranging from Very low Extent (VLE) to Very High Extent (VHE). The rate of Percentage described as < 20 = extremely minority, 20 -29 = Very Low Majority, 30 -39 = Low Minority, 40 – 49 = minority, 50 – 59 = Moderate, 60 – 69 = Majority, 70 -79 = High Majority, 80 – 89 = Very High Majority, 90 – 99 = Extremely Majority, 100 = Overwhelming Majority (Taherdoost, 2022). To measure the extent, the results were analyzed using the mean score criteria developed by Chyung and Hutchinson (2023), where the mean score range is: 1.00–1.99 Very Low Extent, 2.00 –2.99 Low Extent, 3.00 –3.99 Moderate 4.00– 4.49 High Extent, and 4.50 –5.00 Very High Extent. Table 1 presents the summary of the findings from the teacher's questionnaire.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

Table 2 Response of Teachers on the Extent to Which Heads of Schools Involve the Community in Decision-Making Regarding Infrastructure Development in Secondary Schools (n=236)

| S/N | Statement | VLE | | LE | | M | | HE | | VHE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | Mean |
| i | The head of school involves community members when mobilizing financial contributions for infrastructure development | 7 | 3 | 15 | 6.4 | 46 | 19.5 | 79 | 33.5 | 89 | 37.7 | 3.97 |
| ii | The head of school consults the community members before deciding how locally mobilized funds are used | 10 | 4.2 | 17 | 7.2 | 47 | 19.9 | 89 | 37.7 | 73 | 30.9 | 3.84 |
| iii | The head of school encourages community members to contribute building materials for school infrastructure projects | 13 | 5.5 | 16 | 6.8 | 40 | 16.9 | 76 | 32.2 | 91 | 38.1 | 3.92 |
| iv | The head of school mobilizes community members to provide voluntary labour for infrastructure development projects | 12 | 5.1 | 33 | 14 | 33 | 14 | 87 | 36.9 | 71 | 30.1 | 3.73 |
| v | Community members participate in decisions regarding show volunteer labour is organized | 17 | 7.2 | 33 | 14 | 69 | 29.2 | 75 | 31.8 | 42 | 17.8 | 3.39 |
| vi | Community representatives are involved in planning meetings concerning infrastructure development | 10 | 4.2 | 21 | 8.9 | 53 | 22.5 | 85 | 36 | 67 | 28.4 | 3.75 |
| vii | Community suggestions are considered before final decisions are made on infrastructure projects | 7 | 3 | 20 | 8.5 | 53 | 22.5 | 90 | 38.1 | 66 | 28 | 3.80 |
| viii | The head of school promotes community ownership of completed infrastructure projects | 12 | 5.1 | 16 | 6.8 | 45 | 19.1 | 94 | 39.8 | 67 | 28.4 | 4.61 |
| ix | Community members participate in decisions regarding maintenance of school infrastructure | 16 | 6.8 | 33 | 14 | 51 | 21.6 | 83 | 35.2 | 53 | 22.5 | 3.53 |
| x | Community involvement in decision-making contributes to the timely completion of infrastructure projects | 17 | 7.2 | 34 | 14.4 | 67 | 28.4 | 70 | 29.7 | 48 | 20.3 | 3.42 |
| | **Grand Mean** | | | | | | | | | | | **3.796** |

Source: Field Data (2026)

[Keys: 1= Very low Extent (VLE), 2= Low extent (LE), 3= moderate (M), 4= High Extent (HE), 5= Very High Extent (VHE), F= Frequencies, %= Percentage.

Data in Table 1 on the extent to which heads of schools involve the community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure development indicate that a majority of teachers (71.2%) rated at a large extent and a very large extent that heads of schools involve community members when mobilizing financial contributions for infrastructure development, while extremely minority of teachers (19.5%) rated the practice at a moderate extent and extremely minority of teachers (9.4%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.97 indicates that heads of schools involve community members in mobilizing financial contributions for infrastructure development to a moderate extent. This implies that financial resource mobilization is one of the areas in which community participation is relatively well established. During the face to face of interview of Head of School '9' shared that:

When the school needs financial resources for infrastructure development, I involve community members by explaining the identified needs and discussing the proposed development activities with parents and other community representatives. I hold meetings where the required contributions are discussed, agree on how community members can support the project, and communicate the progress of the activities. Where contributions are made, we keep records and provide feedback to the community on how the resources have been used. This helps community members understand the importance of their contributions and encourages them to participate in supporting school infrastructure development (HM 9, Interview, 21st July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the District Education Officer Explained:*

At the district level, I encourage heads of schools to involve the community when mobilizing resources for infrastructure development. I review proposed projects and advise schools on appropriate procedures for engaging parents, community leaders, and other stakeholders. Where necessary, I participate in meetings involving the school and

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

community, provide guidance on resource mobilization, and monitor the implementation of infrastructure projects. I also encourage schools to maintain transparency by communicating the purpose of contributions and reporting on how the resources have been utilized (DSEO, Interview, 23rd July, 2026).

- *The Ward Executive Officer from Ward 3 Further Commented:*

The ward office works with schools and community members when there is a need to mobilize resources for infrastructure development. I may participate in community meetings, explain the importance of the proposed school project, encourage parents and other residents to contribute according to their capacity, and help coordinate community participation. I also work with school leaders and community representatives to monitor the progress of development activities and encourage transparency in the use of contributions so that community members can remain confident in supporting school projects (WEO E, Interview, 20th August, 2026)

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and Ward Executive Officer indicate that involving community members in mobilizing financial contributions is recognized as an important component of participatory decision-making and infrastructure development, with specific activities undertaken at different administrative levels. The Head of School emphasized that community involvement involves explaining school infrastructure needs, organizing meetings with parents and community representatives, discussing required contributions, agreeing on possible forms of support, maintaining records of contributions, communicating project progress, and providing feedback on the use of resources. Similarly, the DSEO noted that district-level support involves reviewing proposed infrastructure projects, advising heads of schools on appropriate community-engagement procedures, participating in meetings where necessary, providing guidance on resource mobilization, monitoring project implementation, and encouraging transparency and accountability in the use of community contributions.

The Ward Executive Officer further emphasized that community participation involves attending community meetings, explaining the importance of school infrastructure projects, encouraging parents and residents to contribute according to their capacity, coordinating community participation, monitoring development activities, and promoting transparency in the utilization of mobilized resources. The findings imply that heads of schools generally involve community members in mobilizing financial contributions for infrastructure development through community meetings, consultation, communication of development priorities, resource mobilization, monitoring, and feedback mechanisms. These findings are consistent with Lakan (2025), who found that community participation in school infrastructure development involved communities in planning, construction, and maintenance, with members contributing labour, land, and locally available materials. The findings suggest that heads of schools create opportunities for community members to contribute resources and participate in processes associated with infrastructure development, thereby strengthening community ownership and support for school projects.

Data on Table 1 indicate that majority of teachers (68.6%) rated as large extent and a very large extent that heads of schools consult the community before deciding how locally mobilized funds are used. In contrast, extremely minority of teachers (19.9%) rated the practice at a moderate extent, while extremely minority of teachers (11.4%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.84 indicates that heads of schools consult community members before determining how locally mobilized funds are used to a moderate extent. This demonstrates that community participation extends beyond resource mobilization to some aspects of financial decision-making. During the face-to-face interview, the Head of School '8' explained:

Before deciding how locally mobilized funds will be used, I normally consult community members through parents' meetings, school-community meetings, and discussions with local leaders. We explain the amount of money available, the infrastructure needs of the school, and the proposed priorities, and then give community members an opportunity to express their views on how the funds should be allocated. Their suggestions are considered together with the school's priorities and the relevant financial procedures. I also communicate the agreed decision to the community and provide updates on the progress of the project so that members understand how their contributions are being used (HM 8, Interview, 8th July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the District Education Officer Explained:*

Usually, I encourage heads of schools to consult community members before deciding how locally mobilized funds are used, particularly where the funds are intended for infrastructure development. I review school development plans and financial reports, provide guidance on appropriate priorities, and encourage heads to discuss proposed expenditures with parents, school committees, and local leaders. Where necessary, I follow up to ensure that the funds are used for the intended purpose and that the process is transparent and consistent with the established financial procedures (DSEO, Interview, 23rd July, 2026).

- *The Ward Executive Officer Further Commented:*

At ward level, I support schools by participating in meetings where infrastructure priorities and the use of community contributions are discussed. I encourage school leaders to explain to community members how much has been mobilized, what the funds are intended for, and why a particular project has been given priority. Community members are given an opportunity to provide suggestions, raise concerns, and agree on priorities with the school leadership and local authorities. I also follow up the implementation of projects to ensure that community contributions are used for the agreed purposes (WEO B, Interview, 2nd August, 2026)

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and WEO indicate that consultation with community members is

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

an important mechanism for determining how locally mobilized funds are utilized for infrastructure development. The Head of School emphasized that consultation involves organizing parents' and school-community meetings, explaining available funds and infrastructure priorities, receiving community views, considering their suggestions alongside school development priorities and financial procedures, and communicating decisions and implementation progress. Similarly, the DSEO indicated that consultation is supported through reviewing school development plans and financial reports, guiding heads on appropriate expenditure priorities, encouraging discussions with parents, school committees, and local leaders, and following up the use of funds to promote transparency and accountability. The WEO further emphasized participation through ward and community meetings, communication of the amount mobilized and intended expenditure, discussion of infrastructure priorities, receiving community concerns and suggestions, and monitoring implementation to ensure that funds are used for agreed purposes. The findings imply that heads of schools generally consult community members before determining how locally mobilized funds are used through meetings, communication of financial information, discussion of infrastructure priorities, consideration of community suggestions, and monitoring and feedback mechanisms. The findings also correspond with Ndunguru (2024), who established that communities in public secondary schools in Tanzania participate in infrastructure development through meetings and financial contributions, although their involvement in planning and budgeting remains limited. This suggest the need for heads of schools to strengthen participatory decision-making by ensuring that community members are actively involved not only in contributing resources but also in planning, prioritising, budgeting, and monitoring infrastructure development projects.

Data on Table 1 regard to community contribution of building materials, indicate that high majority of the teachers (70.3%) rated at a large extent and a very large extent that heads of schools encourage community members to contribute building materials for school infrastructure projects. Meanwhile, extremely minority of the teachers (16.9%) rated the practice at a moderate extent, whereas the extremely minority of the teachers (12.3%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.92 indicates that heads of schools encourage community members to contribute building materials to a moderate extent. This suggests that community participation in infrastructure development is not restricted to financial contributions but also involves the mobilization of locally available physical resources. During the face-to-face interview, the Head of School '1' explained:

I encourage community members to contribute building materials when the school is implementing infrastructure projects, but the response is not always consistent. Some community members are able to provide materials such as sand, stones, bricks, timber, or cement, while others prefer to contribute money or labour because they do not have the required materials. The school usually explains the materials needed and discusses with community members how they can support the project according to their ability. However, the amount of material contributed depends on the economic situation of households and the availability of materials within the community. Therefore, although I encourage material contributions, we cannot expect all community members to contribute in the same way (HOS 1, Interview, 1st July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the District Education Officer Explained:*

Schools are encouraged to involve communities in providing locally available building materials, particularly where infrastructure projects require community support. However, the level of contribution differs from one school and community to another. Some communities have access to materials such as sand, stones, and bricks, whereas others face difficulties because of limited household income, distance from sources of materials, or competing community needs. I therefore advise heads of schools to mobilize communities according to their capacity and to avoid putting excessive pressure on households. The district also follows up infrastructure projects to assess whether the expected community contribution has been realized and whether other sources of support are required (DSEO, Interview, 23rd July, 2026).

- *The Ward Executive Officer Further Commented:*

At ward level, I encourage community members to support school infrastructure projects by contributing locally available building materials, labour, or other resources. However, not every household can provide building materials because their economic circumstances are different. In some cases, community members contribute stones, sand, bricks, or timber, while others support the project through labour or small financial contributions. The availability of materials also differs between villages, and sometimes people are willing to contribute but cannot provide the quantity requested. I work with school leaders and local community leaders to identify what the community can realistically provide and encourage participation according to people's capacity (WEO A, Interview, 07th July, 2026).

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and WEO indicate that although heads of schools encourage community members to contribute building materials for infrastructure projects, the actual level and consistency of such contributions are influenced by several contextual factors. The Head of School emphasized that community members may provide materials such as sand, stones, bricks, timber, and cement, but their capacity to contribute differs according to household economic circumstances and the availability of materials. Similarly, the DSEO noted that material contributions vary across schools and communities because of differences in household income, accessibility to construction materials, distance from sources of materials, and competing community needs. The WEO further indicated that some community members contribute building materials, while others participate through labour or financial contributions, depending on their capacity and the resources available within their localities. The findings imply that heads of schools encourage community participation in

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

infrastructure development through the mobilization of building materials; however, such participation is not uniform across all community members or school projects. The finding aligns with Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) (McCarthy & Zald, 1977), which emphasis on the identification, organization, coordination, and utilization of diverse resources to achieve collective goals. This suggest that heads of schools need to strengthen community engagement through inclusive communication, collective decision-making, transparent resource mobilisation, and equitable opportunities for participation to ensure that all community members contribute according to their abilities towards sustainable school infrastructure development.

Data on table 1 show that majority of the teachers (67.0%) rated at a large extent and a very large extent that heads of schools mobilize community members to provide voluntary labour for infrastructure development projects. A further extremely minority of the teachers (14.0%) rated the practice at a moderate extent, while the extremely minority of the teachers (19.1%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.73 indicates that heads of schools mobilize community members to provide voluntary labour to a moderate extent. This indicates that community participation includes direct physical involvement in infrastructure development activities. During the face-to-face interview, the Head of School '3'explained:

I normally encourage community members to provide voluntary labour when implementing school infrastructure projects, especially during activities such as collecting sand and stones, making bricks, clearing construction sites, digging foundations, and transporting materials. However, participation is not always consistent because many community members have farming, business, and household responsibilities that limit the time they can dedicate to school projects. Some members are willing to contribute labour but can only participate during specific periods. Therefore, I mobilize community members according to their availability and the requirements of the project, while also allowing those who cannot provide physical labour to contribute through other forms of support (HOS 3, Interview, 13th July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the District Education Officer Explained:*

Heads of schools are encouraged to mobilize community members to provide voluntary labour for infrastructure projects because this can reduce construction costs and increase community ownership of school facilities. However, the level of participation differs between communities. Some members participate actively in activities such as site preparation, brick making, transportation of materials, and other construction-related work, while others are unable to participate because of their economic activities, age, health, or other family responsibilities. I advise schools to organize voluntary labour in a way that considers the capacity and availability of community members and to combine labour contributions with other forms of community support (DSEO, Interview, 23rd July, 2026).

- *The Ward Executive Officer D Further Commented:*

I assist schools and local leaders in mobilizing community members to participate in infrastructure development through voluntary labour. Community members may be involved in activities such as preparing construction sites, making bricks, collecting sand and stones, transporting materials, and supporting other activities that do not require specialized technical skills. However, attendance is sometimes lower than expected because people have agricultural activities, businesses, and household responsibilities. In some cases, community members are willing to support the school but prefer to contribute money or materials rather than physical labour. I encourage participation according to people's ability and availability rather than expecting everyone to provide the same type of contribution (WEO D, Interview, 6th August, 2026).

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and WEO indicate that voluntary labour is an important form of community participation in school infrastructure development, but its implementation is influenced by the availability, capacity, and competing responsibilities of community members. The Head of School emphasized that community members are mobilized to participate in activities such as site preparation, brick making, collection and transportation of construction materials, and foundation-related activities, although participation varies because of farming, business, and household responsibilities. Similarly, the DSEO noted that voluntary labour can reduce construction costs and strengthen community ownership, but participation differs across communities because of differences in economic activities, age, health, and family responsibilities. The WEO further indicated that local authorities support schools in mobilizing voluntary labour, while recognizing that some community members may prefer to contribute through financial resources or building materials rather than physical labour. The findings imply that heads of schools generally mobilize community members to participate directly in infrastructure development through voluntary labour, including site preparation, brick making, material collection, transportation, and other construction-related activities. However, the qualitative evidence suggests that participation is not uniform because community members differ in their economic activities, availability, physical capacity, and preferred forms of contribution.

During document analysis of community meeting report and school meeting report, the reviewed records from School revealed varying levels of evidence regarding community involvement in infrastructure development. School meeting minutes involving staff and community members were observed, providing evidence that community members were engaged in meetings where school development matters could be discussed. However, the school had no financial records or implementation logs showing the amount and type of resources mobilized from the community. Furthermore, although two school infrastructure committee reports were observed, the records indicated that only a few community members were involved in the committees. The attendance registers showed that 20 community members had participated in the recorded

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

meetings, suggesting that community engagement existed but was not extensive across the wider community. The findings suggest that heads of schools have established some mechanisms for involving community members in infrastructure development, particularly through community meetings and school infrastructure committees. However, the evidence of participation was stronger in relation to consultation, meetings, and committee involvement than in relation to documented financial and resource contributions. The findings support the principles of Resource Mobilization Theory (McCarthy & Zald, 1977), which emphasize the importance of identifying, organizing, coordinating, and utilizing available resources to achieve collective goals. The finding suggests that although community involvement in infrastructure development is evident in the studied schools, there is a need for heads of schools to strengthen systematic documentation, broaden community representation, and improve transparency in recording financial, material, and other forms of community contributions.

Data on Table 1 on participation in decisions about the organization of voluntary labour, the findings reveal a comparatively lower level of community involvement indicate that minority of the teachers (49.6%) rated as a large extent and a very large extent that community members participate in decisions regarding how volunteer labour is organized, whereas very low majority of the teachers (29.2%) rated the practice at a moderate extent. In addition, very low majority of the teachers (21.2%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.39 indicates that community members participate in decisions regarding the organization of voluntary labour at a moderate extent. This implies that participation is important because it shows a distinction between mobilizing communities to provide labour and involving them in deciding how that labour should be organized. During the face-to-face interview, the Head of School '7' explained:

When mobilizing community members to provide voluntary labour, I normally explain the activities that need to be done and encourage community members to participate according to their availability and ability. However, community members are not always directly involved in deciding how the labour should be organized. In most cases, the school identifies the activities, determines when the work is needed, and then informs or mobilizes community members to participate. Sometimes community members provide suggestions about the appropriate time or how the work can be shared, but their involvement in making these decisions is not always consistent (HM 7, Interview, 17th July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the DSEO Explained:*

Schools are encouraged to involve community members in infrastructure activities, including voluntary labour, but participation in deciding how that labour is organized is not always strong. In many cases, the school leadership identifies the required activities, determines the work schedule, and mobilizes community members to participate. Community members may give their views on the timing and distribution of tasks, particularly when the activities affect their daily responsibilities, but the extent to which they participate in organizing the labour varies from one school to another (DSEO, Interview 23rd July, 2026).

- *The WEO Further Commented:*

At the ward level, I support schools and local leaders in mobilizing community members for voluntary labour, especially during construction activities. Community members are usually informed about the activities and the time when their participation is required. Some community members suggest suitable days or how the work can be shared among households, but most of the organization is normally coordinated by the school and local leaders. Therefore, although the community participates in providing labour, their involvement in deciding how the labour is organized may be limited (WEO C, Interview, 03rd August, 2026).

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and WEO indicate that community participation in voluntary labour extends beyond simple mobilization, but involvement in decisions concerning the organization of such labour remains relatively limited and inconsistent. The Head of School emphasized that community members are informed about the required activities and encouraged to participate according to their availability and capacity, while decisions concerning the activities, work schedules, and allocation of tasks are largely coordinated by the school. Similarly, the DSEO noted that schools mobilize community members to participate in infrastructure activities, although community involvement in determining work schedules and task distribution varies across schools. The WEO further indicated that community members may provide suggestions concerning suitable working days and the sharing of tasks, but the organization of voluntary labour is generally coordinated by school leaders and local leaders. The findings imply that heads of schools could strengthen participation by involving community members earlier in planning discussions and allowing them greater opportunities to determine suitable working schedules, task allocation, and other arrangements for organizing voluntary labour. The finding aligns most directly with Ngonge (2024), who found that although community members were recognized as important stakeholders, their involvement in decision-making was often limited to passive roles, with substantial decision-making authority remaining with school boards and heads of schools. It recommended collabourative measures to strengthen meaningful community participation.

Data on Table 1 regarding on participation in infrastructure planning meetings indicate that, the majority of the teachers (64.4%) rated at a large extent and a very large extent that community representatives are involved in planning meetings concerning infrastructure development. Meanwhile, very low majority of the teachers (22.5%) rated the practice at a moderate extent, while only the extremely minority of the teachers (13.1%) rated it at a very low extent and low extent. The mean score of 3.75 indicates that community representatives are involved in infrastructure planning meetings to a moderate extent. This implies that heads of schools provide community representatives with opportunities to participate in discussions concerning

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

infrastructure development. During the face-to-face interview, the Head of School '5' explained:

I involve community representatives in meetings when planning infrastructure development projects. During these meetings, I explain the infrastructure needs of the school, discuss the proposed projects, consider the resources available, and seek views from parents, community leaders, and other representatives. Community representatives are given an opportunity to suggest priorities, identify challenges, and comment on how the proposed activities can be implemented. However, the level of participation may differ depending on the nature of the project and the availability of the representatives (HM 5, Interview, 15th July, 2026).

- *Similarly, the DSEO Explained:*

I encourage heads of schools to involve community representatives in planning meetings for infrastructure development because the community is an important stakeholder in school development. During such meetings, representatives can discuss the infrastructure needs, priorities, available resources, and possible ways of supporting implementation. We also advise schools to consider the views raised by community representatives when preparing their plans, although the extent of their involvement may vary from one school to another depending on the nature of the project and the stakeholders involved (DSEO, Interview, 23rd July, 2026)

- *The WEO Further Commented:*

Community representatives are normally involved when schools hold meetings to discuss infrastructure development. I assist in bringing together local leaders and community representatives so that they can understand the needs of the school and provide their views on the proposed projects. In these meetings, representatives may discuss which infrastructure needs should receive attention, how the community can support the projects, and the challenges that may affect implementation. Their participation helps the school and local leaders to understand community priorities and organize support for the planned activities (WEO E, Interview, 20th August, 2026).

The responses from the Head of School, DSEO, and WEO indicate that community representatives are provided with opportunities to participate in meetings concerning infrastructure planning at school and local government levels. The Head of School emphasized that planning meetings provide opportunities to explain school infrastructure needs, discuss proposed projects, consider available resources, and obtain views from parents, community leaders, and other representatives. Similarly, the DSEO noted that schools are encouraged to involve community representatives in discussions concerning infrastructure needs, priorities, available resources, and possible approaches to implementation. The WEO further explained that local leaders assist schools in bringing community representatives together to discuss proposed infrastructure projects, identify community priorities, and determine possible forms of community support. This implies that infrastructure planning meetings serve not only as mechanisms for communicating school development plans but also as platforms through which community perspectives can be incorporated into infrastructure planning and resource mobilization. The finding aligns with Ndunguru (2024) who found that communities participated through meetings and resource contributions, but their involvement in specific decision-making processes such as planning, prioritization, and budgeting was limited.

Generally, the quantitative findings found that heads of schools involve community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure development to a moderate extent (Grand Mean = 3.796), with teachers reporting positive responses on community involvement in mobilizing financial contributions, consulting community members on the use of locally mobilized funds, encouraging contributions of building materials, mobilizing voluntary labour, involving community representatives in infrastructure planning meetings, considering community suggestions, promoting community ownership of completed infrastructure, and involving community members in maintenance decisions. This quantitative finding is supported by qualitative evidence from Heads of Schools, the District Education Officer, and Ward Executive Officers, which indicated that community involvement involves conducting parents' and school-community meetings, explaining infrastructure needs and priorities, consulting community members on the use of funds, mobilizing financial resources and building materials, organizing voluntary labour, involving community representatives in planning meetings, communicating project progress, and providing feedback on resource utilization. However, the qualitative evidence also revealed contextual challenges, including differences in household economic capacity, limited availability of construction materials, competing farming, business and household responsibilities, differences in physical capacity and availability of community members, and limited community involvement in determining work schedules and task allocation. Document analysis further showed that although school meeting minutes and infrastructure committee reports provided evidence of community engagement, participation was not extensive across the wider community, with only a few community members represented in infrastructure committees. The reviewed records also lacked adequate financial records and implementation logs documenting the amount and type of community resources mobilized, indicating weaknesses in systematic documentation, representation, transparency, and accountability. Overall, the integrated findings indicate that heads of schools involve community members in infrastructure development decision-making to a moderate extent in the studied public secondary schools in Hai District.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the study concludes that, to a moderate extent, heads of schools involve community members in decision-making regarding infrastructure development through conducting parents' and school-community meetings, consulting community members on infrastructure needs and priorities, involving community representatives in planning meetings, mobilizing financial

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26nov044

contributions and building materials, organizing voluntary labour, considering community suggestions, communicating project progress, promoting community ownership, and involving community members in infrastructure maintenance decisions. However, community involvement is limited by factors such as differences in household economic capacity, business and household responsibilities, limited availability of construction materials, inadequate involvement in determining work schedules and task allocation, limited representation of the wider community in infrastructure committees, and inadequate documentation of financial contributions and implementation act.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the conclusion, it is recommended that heads of schools strengthen structured community participation in infrastructure development by involving community members in needs assessment, priority setting, planning, work scheduling, resource mobilization, implementation, monitoring, and maintenance decisions. Local government education authorities should provide regular training and technical support to heads of schools and infrastructure committees on participatory planning, financial management, community mobilization, project monitoring, and infrastructure maintenance.

## REFERENCES


[1.] Anania, A. M. (2025). The influence of policy and political discourses on community participation in school development in Tanzania. *Cogent Education, 12*(1). https:// doi. org/ 10.1080/ 2331186X.2025.2530902

[2.] Chyung, S. Y., & Hutchinson, D. (2023). Evidence-based survey interpretation using Likert-type scales. *Performance Improvement, 62*(2), 18–25.

[3.] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

[4.] Edwards, B., & McCarthy, J. D. (2004). Resources and social movement mobilization. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 116–152). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999103.ch6

[5.] Farley-Ripple, E. N. (2024). The use of research in schools: Principals' capacity and contributions. *Education Sciences, 14*(6), 561. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060561

[6.] Goode, H., Drysdale, L., & Gurr, D. (2023). What we know about successful school leadership from Australian cases and an open systems model of school leadership. *Education Sciences, 13*(11), 1142. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111142

[7.] Lakan, M. J. (2025). Community participation and its impact on sustainable educational infrastructure development in rural areas of Niger State. *Journal of Research in Adult and Continuing Education, 4*(1), 55–65.

[8.] McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(6), 1212–1241. https://doi.org/10.1086/226464

[9.] Ndunguru, A. (2024). *Community participation in improving school infrastructure in the selected public secondary schools in Songea District Council, Tanzania*

[10.] Ngonge, R. G. (2024). Assessing the participation of local community members in schools managerial activities and decisions making: A case of community secondary schools in Coast and Kagera Regions, Tanzania. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences, 22*(12), 137–147. https://doi.org/10.9734/arjass/2024/v22i12603

[11.] Ngwama, C. (2024). Effects of community participation on school infrastructure development in rural Uganda. *African Journal of Education and Practice, 10*(2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.2520

[12.] Public Procurement Regulatory Authority. (2020). *Guideline for carrying out works under force account* (PPRA: GL/05/2020/FA).

[13.] Stewart, J. H., Phillipo, F., & Pesha, J. (2023). Challenges facing community participation in construction projects of ward secondary schools in Kibaha Town Council, Tanzania. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences, 21*(4), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.9734/ arjass/2023/v21i4489

[14.] Taherdoost, H. (2022). Designing a questionnaire for a research paper: A comprehensive guide to design and develop an effective questionnaire. *Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 11*(1), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2022.11.1.3087

[15.] Tellen, D. N., Besong, B. J., & Emmanuel, N. (2025). The role of community involvement in enhancing infrastructural support and its impact on the quality of public primary school pupils' education in rural areas in the South West Region of Cameroon. *GPH-International Journal of Educational Research, 8*(3), 119–136. https://doi.org/10.5281 /zenodo. 15103335

[16.] UNESCO. (2024). *Leadership in education: Lead for learning*. Global Education Monitoring Report. UNESCO.

[17.] URT. (2024). *Basic education statistics in Tanzania (BEST) 2024*. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology

[18.] World Bank. (2020). *Project information document: Voice and accountability Community empowerment for improved local service delivery in Zambia*. World Bank.