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**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of the study was to assess the challenges of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County. Specifically, the study examined the impact of accessibility on the smooth running of the school feeding programme; the effects of sustainability on the school feeding programme; and to establish the management challenges to SFP arising from increased enrollment of pupils in the beneficiary schools in Kajiado County. The study employed a descriptive survey design to explore the challenges facing school feeding programme in Kajiado County. Sampling was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, purposive sampling method was used in selection of the sample schools, while in the second stage the same technique was used in selection of the respondents / informants. All the head teachers (or deputies) and SFP managers from the 49 schools under SFP programme from Isinya Division were interviewed while five schools were purposively selected for the focus group discussions. Seven schools were excluded from the final sample tally due to inaccessibility and hostility. Survey data was conducted from 42 primary schools from within Isinya Division. The respondents were head teachers, SFP managers, education officers, as well as SFP programme managers from WFP.

The study found that the current state of infrastructure within and outside the beneficiary schools has hindered the extent to which the beneficiaries are able to access the benefits of the SFP. The other findings showed that ranking top on hinderance to accessibility is: lack of tarmacked roads; inaccessibility to clean drinking water sources; and lack of permanent dwelling structures within the schools. Secondly, the findings showed that the schools reliance on external support (donors and the government) is extremely high. This is in comparison to the support that the schools and the communities ought to be providing to come up with long lasting solutions geared towards sustainability of the SFPs. In all the schools visited, it was evident that the donors and the government contribute most of the resources required in running the SFPs, with very little being drawn from the local communities (mainly the parents). Finally, the findings showed that increased enrollment as a result of the introduction of free primary education and the SFP had significantly constrained the capacity of schools to adequately manage the meals programmes. In conclusion, the study shows that the challenges facing the implementation of SFPs are diverse. The deficiencies from state actors in terms of policy formulation and implementation emerged that the major sources of challenges facing the implementation of the community. Of great importance also is the role played by the communities in ensuring that the programmes are running on day to day basis. The study recommends the need for the government to address food security needs for pastoralist communities; the need to revamp the policy framework detailing the management of SFP; and the need to improve on the physical infrastructure so that the target beneficiary schools can be accessed with ease.
CHAPTER ONE
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

Schultz (1988) asserts that investing in education is very crucial for any country’s long term economic development. Private and social returns to educational investments have proved to be high particularly in primary education. However, malnutrition and resultant poor health keep pupils from attaining their full potential especially in a developing country such as Kenya. According to United Nations (UN) Millennium goals, (2005), hunger is both a cause and an effect of poverty as it holds back economic growth and limits progress in reducing poverty. The effect of malnutrition on children can be even more life-threatening and permanent. Malnourished children are subject to wasting, stunting and reduced cognitive function. World Food Programme (WFP) Report (2006) acknowledges that to support learning and human capital development, it is necessary to tackle the problems of hunger.

In 2000, the United Nations member states met in Dakar, Senegal and committed themselves to the eradication of hunger and the attainment of universal primary education. School feeding programmes (SFPs) were identified as one of the main interventions chosen to address these challenges. School feeding falls squarely within the ambit of the UN declaration, and specifically three of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), namely MDG 1 (to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger), MDG 2 (to achieve universal primary education) and MDG 3 (to promote gender equality and empower women). Furthermore, the greater focus on educational objectives arising from the UN commitments has seen the number of SFPs (funded by governments, donors and NGOs, mainly from Africa) increase greatly in the past five to ten years (Tomlinson, 2007).

The WFP Report (2006) continues to state that according to Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) statistics, 44% of the population of Kenya is undernourished and 23% of the population falls below the international poverty line of US$1 per day consumption. The Government of Kenya (GOK) 2000 and the United Nations Children Education Fund (UNICEF) Report (1998) indicates that Kenya is currently performing poorly in both income
and nutritional support. Indicators include law income due to low levels of education, poor nutritional status, poor health status and poor housing.

The government in its effort to address hunger and to enhance learning in schools especially for the nutritionally vulnerable children from low income communities in the ASALS and unplanned settlements initiated the School Feeding Programms jointly with WFP in 1980. According to KANU Manifesto of 1969, the founding father of the Kenyan nation, the late president Mzee Jomo Kenyatta noted in his speech while outlining the Kenya African National Union (KANU) election manifesto that, the school meals programme which was in place in some schools in selected areas will be expanded to cover other parts of the country. KANU believed that only a healthy child could utilize fully the opportunities provided by schools to develop intellectually.

According to the School Feeding Programme Training handbook (2006) the objectives of the School Feeding Programme are to: improve the primary schools enrolment, enhance the attendance rates and reduce the dropout rates due to hunger; reduce the disparities in enrolment, attendance rates and gender; improve the children capacity to concentrate and assimilate information by relieving short term hunger; contribute to improvement of nutrition intake and general health of the children from low income families; and to enhance the participation rates and increase enrolment of children in the disadvantaged districts and urban unplanned settlements in Kenya.

Providing food in schools has been shown not only to boost access and encourage regular attendance but also to enhance general learning and performance for children from particularly poor households (WFP, 2005). SFPs also help to expand the reach of a number of other important activities including de-worming campaigns and HIV/AIDS education. This helps to provide lifelong and the only opportunity some children will ever have for lifting themselves out of situations of extreme hopelessness and poverty (Coins for Kids Program, 2004). WFPs school feeding program works towards achieving Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) including the goals of reducing hunger by half and achieving
gender parity in education by 2015 (WFP, 2005). This study focuses on the challenges facing the implementation of school feeding programme in Kenya.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Primary school enrolment in Kajiado County has lagged behind for several decades. According to Achoka, et al. (2007) only one out of three children in Kajiado County attends primary school and a large majority of those in school also drop-out before completion. One of the most often cited reasons for this state of affairs are hunger. Interventions such as the SFP in Kajiado’s arid and semi-arid areas are therefore necessary to enable children benefit from free primary education, and also boost retention and primary school completion rates. The School Feeding Programs therefore has the potential to increase access to primary education, reduce dropout rates, and improve academic achievement of pupils. However, lack of clear cut policies, sustainability, accessibility and increased enrollments and the school feeding modalities of the programs, could lead to major constraints that limit the success of the school feeding programs (Machocho, 2011).

The major objectives of the school feeding program (SFP) are to increase enrolment, improve learning performance and level of participation and concentration in the schools (MOE, 2002). Studies show that SFP has an impact on enrolment, nutritional status and academic achievement of school children. Despite this, the enrolment rate of school age children in the nomadic communities and ASALs is still very low compared to other settled communities in Kenya. Amolo (2004) identified a number of challenges of SFP at the national level. These include: lack of clear policy on school nutrition programs in the country for all schools; the sustainability of these programs is of great concern because they largely depend on donor funding; accessibility of the schools for delivery of the food to the intended beneficiaries, as most of them is based in remote parts of the country with poor infrastructural network remaining a great challenge. Studies documenting challenges in implementing SFPs in ASALs regions in Kenya are not systematically documented. It is due to this that the research project sought to find out the challenges facing the school feeding program in Kajiado County.
1.3. Research Objectives

1.3.1. General Objectives
The general objective of the study was to assess the challenges of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives
The study sought to achieve the following specific objectives:

a) To find out how accessibility affects the smooth running of the school feeding programme
b) To assess the sustainability of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County
c) To establish the management challenges to SFP arising from increased enrollment of pupils in the beneficiary schools.

1.4. Research Questions
The study sought to answer the following research questions:

a) How does accessibility affect the smooth running of the school feeding programme?
b) What is the level of sustainability of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County?
c) What are the management challenges to SFP arising from increased enrollment of pupils in the beneficiary schools?

1.5. Justification of the Study
Findings of the study may be significant to the government, development partners, and public primary school managers, school feeding programme committee members and the community in the following ways. First, to the government, the study may provide data on the challenges of school feeding programmes, and its implications on access and retention. Such data could be used to improve programme implementation thereby meeting the intended goals more cost effectively especially in the arid and semi-arid regions.

Secondly, the study may serve as a reference point for development partners notably World Food Programme in informing how they formulate guidelines for rolling out SFPs in arid and
semi-arid regions of Kenya. Findings of the study could be used to advise these organizations and others interested in school feeding programme on future policy directions to improve operational efficiency.

Thirdly, to primary school managers and the school feeding programme committees, the study may be useful in that findings could be used as an appraisal of the strategies they employ in management of the programme. By making relevant recommendations, the study could enable school managers and school feeding programme committee members to take the necessary measures to improve operational efficiency of the programmes on the ground. The overall benefit of an improved school feeding programme is to the community, who may gain from the benefits accruing from investing in human capital. Community members may also learn from the study findings the importance of the role they play in promoting sustainability of school feeding programmes.

Finally, the findings of the study shall be of great importance to future academicians and researchers, especially on matters touching on education for ASAL and nomadic/pastoralist communities. The study will help in filling-in the gaps in the literature regarding understanding of the SFP challenges as well as the current trends.

1.6. Scope and Limitation
The study was undertaken within Kajiado County. The schools are spread out across the county. However, the study was limited to schools in Isinya Division that are involved in the SFP. The selection of the Divisions is informed by its proximity in reach and the fact that it has high agglomeration of the SFP supported primary schools. Given this limitation, the findings of the study cannot be generalizable to other counties whose social structures, physical layouts, and histories are notably different.
1.7. Definition of Terms

**Nomadic:** This is a way of life of a group of people who tend to move from place to place frequently looking for pasture and water for their animals.

**Retention:** The ability of pupils being able to remain and progress in school until they complete their primary education cycle.

**School Feeding Program:** Refers to meals provided in schools for the benefit of the poor and needy children in a partnership project co-sponsored by World Food Programme and Government of Kenya to provide food to targeted schools.

**Home-Grown School Feeding:** This is a school feeding programme that offers food produced and purchased within a country. WFP’s HGSF particular focus is to produce and purchase food for the school feeding programme from local small-scale farmers. From WFP’s perspective, an HGSF programme aims to both increase children’s well-being and promote local agricultural production and development by providing an ongoing market for small scale farmers.

**School Feeding Approaches:** These are the different approaches or arrangements used in school feeding programmes. Basically, there are two school feeding modalities: in-school meals, where food is cooked, distributed and consumed in the school; take-home rations, whereby pupils are given rations of raw food to take home; or a combination of these two types.
2.1 Review of Empirical Literature

2.1.1. Education in Kenya

In pre-colonial times, localized, relevant indigenous knowledge was very important in the organization and transmission of knowledge. But when formal education was introduced during the British colonial era, ideological conflicts arose because this was a western-style education provided mainly by the missionaries with the cooperation of the colonial government (Bunyi, 1999; Ntarangwi, 2003; Strayer, 1973). In 1963, the country gained independence and a commission was set up to make changes in the formal educational system. The focus of the commission was to build a national identity and to unify the different ethnicities through subjects in school such as history and civics, and civic education for the masses. The education system the post-colonial government inherited from the outgoing colonial regime was stratified along racial lines.

Separate schools were provided for pupils of European, Asian, Arab and African origin; and furthermore, an altogether disproportionate share of public resources had been devoted to the schools reserved for the more privileged groups. During the ten years before Independence, more capital was invested in European and Asian education, representing 3% of the population, than in the education of the African 97% (Republic of Kenya, 1964). In 1963, only about 840,000 African children were attending primary school; less than 35% of the estimated age group (Sheffield, 1971). Between 1964 and 1985, the 7-4-2-3 education structure modeled after the British education system was adopted. The system was designed to provide seven years of primary education, four years of lower secondary education, two years of upper secondary education, and three years of university (Buchmann, 1999). The country was in dire and immediate need for skilled workers to hold positions previously held by the British. Hence, the government set out to quickly expand educational opportunities to its citizens, many of whom had been previously been denied educational and economic opportunities (Ntarangwi, 2003).
According to Ominde (1964), the chairman of the first educational commission in the independent Kenya, “during colonial era, there was no such thing as a nation” only several nations living side by side in the same territory. Education, like society, was stratified along racial lines, there existed an ‘African education’, a ‘European Education’, and an ‘Asian Education’; three separate systems divided by rigid boundaries (Ominde 1964). This stratification was based on the colonialist’s assertion that the mental development of the average African adult was equivalent to that of the average 7-8 year old European boy (Gachathi, 1976). African education’ therefore tended to be a hybrid, precariously hovering between a European model with a European subject matter, and an education deemed suitable to the place in colonial life considered ‘appropriate’ to the African population (Ominde 1964). Thus, independence brought with it sweeping reforms in the educational system. With the creation of a single nation came the emergence of a single educational system, no longer stratified along racial lines. Ominde Commission was formed to introduce changes that would reflect the nation's sovereignty. The commission focused on identity and unity, which were critical issues at the time. Changes in the subject content of history and geography were made to reflect national cohesion. The principle preoccupation for Ominde’s report was introducing an education system that promoted national unity and inculcated in the learners the desire to serve their nation (Simiyu, 2001; Wanjohi, 2011).

At Kenya’s independence (1963) the enrolment at primary schools was only 891,553 pupils in 6,058 schools. According to Statistical Booklet (2005) from the Ministry of Education the level of enrolment had increased to 5,917,162 in 1999 and to 7,494,763 in 2004 with the most significant increase being recorded between 2002 and 2003 due to introduction of free primary education. This growth in the enrolments and schools is attributed to the population growth and government initiative towards the provision of universal primary education (UPE) by 2015. As at end of 2013, there are over 10 Million children enrolled for primary education in Kenya (MoE, 2014).

In the mid-80s, the government introduced the cost sharing policy, where the parents were expected to provide their children with uniforms, textbooks, stationery and also to take responsibility for the construction and maintenance of classrooms and provision of other
physical facilities. However, the policy of cost sharing in education was introduced after the sessional paper No.1 of 1986 on economic management for renewed growth on education and manpower training for the next decade and beyond. This Sessional paper introduced far reaching measures aimed at reducing the cost education to the government but ended up denying the children from poor families’ access to education. This policy made access to education more difficult for the poor and the vulnerable members of the society. In this scenario only a handful of children from the ASAL districts and informal urban settlements had access to primary education. UNESCO, (1999) noted that even when children are enrolled in schools, their attendance is irregular due to economic problems which includes ill health and nutritional deficiencies as most pupils hardly take any meal before going to school.

The Kenya education system consists of an 8-4-4 system. Basic education is defined as eight years of primary and four years of secondary schooling. Policy goals in education are to attain Universal Primary Education (UPE) and basic Education for all (EFA) by the year 2015 (Republic of Kenya, 2003). Early childhood development (ECD) consists of early childhood care for children up to three years old and pre-school education for three to five year old children. Children enter primary education at six years of age leading to a Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) after eight years (Republic of Kenya, 2003).

The policy of the Kenya Government in pursuing Universal Primary Education (UPE) has to be seen within development in the wider international context. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948, declared that ‘everyone has a right to education.’ The World Conference on Education for All (EFA) held in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, convened jointly by UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank sparked a new impetus in basic education especially with its so-called expanded vision and renewed commitment. It was noted that to ‘serve the basic needs of all, requires more than a recommitment to basic education as now exists. There was need therefore for an expanded vision that surpasses resource levels, institutional structures, curricula and conventional delivery systems while building on the best practices’ (Mutahi, 2004). The expanded visions encompassed facilitating access and
promoting equity, focusing on learning, broadening the means and scope of basic education, enhancing the environment for learning and strengthening partnerships.

Mutahi (2004) also noted that after introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) policy in 2003, Gross Enrolment Rates (GER) rose to 104 which placed unprecedented demands on MoEST. This situation called for innovative and flexible education delivery approaches. He proposed for the provision of education within the goals of Education for All (EFA) and the implementation of stipulations in the Children Act 2001 to influence the different strategies employed in order to address education as a basic human right. Mutahi (2004) further identified the factors that contribute to low transition rates as being the inadequate capacity in secondary schools, reduced household capacity to cost-share at secondary school level, poverty, socio-cultural attitudes and the increase in the number of orphans resulting from HIV/AIDS pandemic.

MoEST, in collaboration with other key players, has put in place several measures to enhance transition from primary to secondary school. These include elimination of school levies and other barriers to increase access to primary school education, providing bursary for needy secondary school children and establishing a policy that prohibits grade repetition. Others include establishing a policy on expansion of the existing secondary schools to a minimum of three streams per school, working closely with stakeholders in the education sector to provide other options to public secondary schools and creating child friendly and gender responsive environment in schools. However, in spite of these interventions, over 50 percent of primary school leavers are still excluded. There is, therefore, the need to have a corresponding post primary education infrastructure to sustain the gains made by FPE (African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect – ANPPCAN, 2004).

According to Sifuna (2004) primary education is expected to provide knowledge, which is essential for individuals, household, community and national development and a foundation for further formal education and training. The national development plans and economic survey reports underpins a general consensus that primary education yields higher social returns. Another principle, which underscores the widening of access to basic education, is
the provision in the declaration of human rights, which considers education as a basic right, for which every government has the responsibility to guarantee each citizen. Provision of primary education, therefore, should not be seen as exercising an act of charity. Sifuna noted that the attainment of universal primary education (UPE) has been the long-term objective in the primary school sub-sector since independence. Within the context of the long-term objective of primary education, the National Development Plan (1997 - 2001) aimed at raising completion rates to 70 percent for both girls and boys. Issues of relevance and financing of primary education were addressed in the plan. Accordingly, the Government was committed to increasing expenditure in primary education from 57 to 67 percent in the ministry’s recurrent expenditure during the Plan period.

Sifuna (2004) further noted that although the demand for secondary school far outstrips the facilities available, there are no efforts by the Ministry of Education to address the impending transition problem paused by free primary education. It is projected that with the estimated 6 percent annual growth in the number of candidates by the year 2015, the number of candidates will be over one million per year. The situation will be compounded by the surge of free primary education candidates (enrolled in 2003) estimated to be 907,849 given the attrition rate of 5 percent. This is certainly an enormous problem that calls for a corresponding enthusiasm from the MoEST. Kidenda (2004) noted that during the design of the current education structure, it was anticipated that the existing secondary schools would not absorb the primary school graduates and options had been proposed.

2.1.2. Basic Education in Arid and Semi-Arid Regions

Kenya like most of the countries in the sub-Saharan Africa experiences a number of natural hazards, the most common being weather related, including floods, droughts, landslides, lightning/thunderstorms, wild fires, and strong winds (Achoka and Maiyo, 2011). Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) constitute 84 percent of the total land mass in Kenya, or 24 million hectares (GoK, 2007). The extent of aridity, coupled with demographic structures, shape the economic mainstay of these lands. Drought has affected the communities economically and the affected people cannot afford to provide food for their families but to depend on the government and other donors for food aid. In many households in the drought stricken areas,
hunger has been a barrier to school participation (Dheressa, 2008). A hunger-stricken child is not only unable to enroll in school at the right age but also cannot attend school properly even if enrolled. Besides, such children are also likely to quit school because they have to deal with their immediate subsistence needs before they get ready for schooling. Thus, low school enrolment, low class attendance, involvement in class activities and low retention of pupils in school is a recurring problems in child education among households living in ASALs (Ahmed, 2004). Due to these reasons the level of education attainment has also been low in many developing countries mainly characterized by poverty (Adelman, Gilligan and Lehrer, 2008).

Inequality of access to education has made some regions in Kenya to lag behind academically. Though the government has tried to bridge the inequality, lack of funds has limited her efforts. Some non-governmental organizations are trying to bridge this discrepancy by supplying resources to schools. It aims at improving the quality of education in the arid and semi-arid areas as part of promoting integrated rural development (Lukwo, 2005).

Nkinyangi (1980) noted the ideology of development as seeing "underdevelopment of pastoral people as a result of psychological deficits". Government effort to assist pastoral people in Kenya tend to centre around prescribing educational training whether of formal or non-formal kind instead of making intervention of a more direct economic nature. Schemes like livestock development projects either do not go far enough or are circumvented by more privileged groups or individuals, pastoral people continue to exist at the periphery of the market economy and generally lack the monetary resources to avail themselves and their children of such good and services as education. In a society where educational credentials are the basis for social mobility and individual advancement, low education participation rates in any community are a matter of serious political ramifications (Wambua, 2008).

The ASAL, home to roughly 30 percent of the Kenyan population, has suffered through the crippling social effects of recently intensifying droughts and food shortages. The prolonged droughts have resulted into constant conflict among the communities in the region fighting
for the control of the dwindling resources. Emphasis has however been put on communities which live in areas prone to drought in which food is scarce, this daily meal provision relieves much of the burden of childrearing. According to field studies, the “magnet effect” of the meal programmes has greatly increased school attendance rates especially among school going children. Rural schools that provide meals show higher attendance rates and lower initial dropout rates than schools that do not (Espejo, 2009). With the improved school enrolment the relationship between education and development and the power of education as a panacea for individual and societal problems, it was soon perceived that the low education participation rate in pastoral areas was a serious political question which needed immediate attention (Wahome, 2005). The government initiatives in this regard started with the waiver of tuition fees in primary schools in the arid and semi-arid areas. When this did not elicit much response in terms of increased enrolment, the government recommended boarding primary schools and School Feeding Programme. Great concern was shown on low enrollment through various development plans including the most recent (2002-2008) [Ministry of Education, 2010].

With school feeding program implemented for many years in Kenya, Finan (2010) found that between 2002 and 2007, the net primary school enrolment increased from 77 percent to 92 percent while enrollment in the ASAL increased from 17 percent to 29 percent. An evidence that, ASAL continue to lag behind their counterparts in the urban areas; in terms of education expansion and accessibility.

According to Galal (2005), children who receive meals are generally healthier, more receptive, energetic, and easier to teach. Following WFP recommendations, some ASAL school districts have begun providing fortified morning biscuits to get a jumpstart on the cognitive and nutritional benefits of feeding (Finan, 2010; Galal, 2005). Though significant gains have been achieved throughout the country in terms of educational expansion and accessibility, rural Kenyans continue to lag far behind their urban counterparts. Between the years 2002 and 2007, although Kenya’s net primary school enrollment increased from 77 percent to 92 percent, enrollment in the ASAL increased from 17 percent to 29 percent (Finan, 2010).
2.2. Interventions towards Basic Education in Kenya

2.2.1. Concept of School Feeding Programme in Kenya

School feeding is defined by the WFP (2013) as the provision of food to school children. There are as many types of programmes as there are countries, but they can be classified into two main groups based on their modalities: (1) in-school feeding, where children are fed in school; and (2) take-home rations, where families are given food if their children attend school. In-school feeding can, in turn, be divided into two common categories: (1) programmes that provide meals; and (2) programmes that provide high-energy biscuits or snacks (WFP, 2013). In some countries, in-school meals are combined with take-home rations for particularly vulnerable students, including girls and children affected by HIV, to generate greater impacts on school enrolment and retention rates and reduce gender or social gaps. Additionally, school feeding programmes may cover pre-primary-, primary- and secondary-school children in many countries.

The National School Feeding Council launched a SFP in 1966. The aim of the council was to provide a supplementary mid-day meal to the school children. The programme was started after a survey was carried out on nutritional status of children by the Ministry of Education sponsored by the World Health Organization in 1964 (Kimani, 1985). Introduction of the school milk programme in 1979 increased enrolment in schools. The GoK and WFP launched a five year SFP plan in 1980 under project 2502 which was continued as project 2502/EXP1 for a further 3 years in 1982. The objective of the project was to increase enrolment and attendance rates for pre-primary and primary school children. Recently the government of Kenya launched a Home-Grown School Feeding Programme, aimed at feeding some 550,000 schoolchildren previously fed by WFP, starting in the first term of 2009 (Ministry of Education, 2010). An initial US$6 million was allocated by the government for the 2008/09 fiscal year for the program. A targeting exercise identified 28 marginal agricultural districts with access to markets for the new program. The cash is transferred directly to schools for local purchase of cereals, pulses, and oil.
The idea of having school feeding programme was to give children the opportunity to be provided with a meal at school with the expectation that they would attend school regularly thus improve concentration as well as performance of many children in schools. The reason for advocating for education in an area was to remove an individual out of poverty syndrome according to World Food Programme (WFP, 2009). Each year, World Food Programme provides millions of school children with food in the world as an incentive to lure children to school and maintain their attendance. The programme targets areas where enrolment ratios are lowest and which can have greatest effect towards improving education standards of the children (WFP, 1999). In 2001, WFP launched a global campaign to expand access to education for millions of children in the world. By then, there were 66 million school children attending school hungry in the world (World Food Program, 2001). According to Ahmed (2004), school meals increased pupils’ participation in school. Ahmed found that school feeding increased pupils’ enrolment, reduced dropout rate, increased attendance and improved performance in participating schools as compared to their counterparts where no feeding programs were available.

Health and nutrition have significant impact on overall educational achievements of school going children particularly those in developing countries. Ensuring that children are well fed, healthy and able to learn are essential to the effectiveness of education systems (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The current country programme confirmed that provision of lunches at school provides a strong incentive to make parents take children to school and much can be achieved through strengthening of the partnership and supporting the government’s efforts in achieving education effort (WFP, 2004). The Interim Evaluation Summary Report 1 of Project Kenya 2502/EXP1, indicated that enrolment had increased in the schools with SFP by 50% (in pre-primary) and 22% in the primary schools (Mugiri, 1995). According to the MOEST (2002), the objectives of the SFP are: to increase enrolment; to prevent dropout rates and stabilize attendance in primary schools; to improve attention span, learning capacity of students and ultimately improve exam performance by relieving short term hunger; to improve health of pupils by providing a significant contribution to their nutrient intakes by providing SFP; to reduce disparities in enrolment and attendance rates among different regions; and to increase level of participation and concentration in schools (MOEST, 2002).
According to WFP (2013), school feeding contributes to having healthy and well-educated children but its impact depends on whether quality education is available. School feeding supports families in securing education for their children, especially girls who are often differentially excluded from education. This promotes human capital development in the long run and helps break intergenerational cycles of poverty and hunger. School feeding contributes to a child’s readiness to learn and ability to participate in his or her own educational process, and the benefits are particularly strong for girls. However, school feeding can only help if the other major elements that are prerequisites for learning – such as teachers, textbooks, curriculum and an environment conducive to learning – are also in place. Additionally, care should be taken to avoid using teachers or education staff to prepare food, since this merely taxes the system that school feeding programmes aim to enhance (WFP, 2013).

2.2.2. World Food Programme Supported Feeding Programme

Food for education (FFE) programs, including meals served in school and take-home rations conditional on school attendance, is a common tool used to attract children to school and to reduce short-term hunger to help students concentrate and learn. FFE programs generally take two forms: in-school meals and take-home rations. The major objectives of both modalities are the same: to improve education outcomes and increase food consumption, and possibly nutritional status, of children. However, differences between these two modalities suggest that they may not be equally effective or may affect different aspects of education and nutrition. Among the differences between the programs are the likely timing of food consumption during the school day; who controls and distributes the food; the ability of recipient households to divert the food to other family members; and the quality of food stemming from differences in storage, sanitation, and preparation practices. The composition of the food provided is also often different. Take-home rations are more likely to be single, nonperishable food items, such as cereals or oil. Moreover, in the FFE modality, individual programs can be implemented very differently to achieve specific desired results.
In-School Feeding Programs

In-school feeding programs provide food to children while they are attending school. This food can take the form of breakfast, snack(s), and/or lunch. School meals vary in the quantity of food provided and in their nutritional content, and so their expected impacts also vary. In some cases, the food may be fortified, for example, with vitamin A or iron. School meals are often prepared on site, requiring kitchen facilities, cooking staff, eating and serving utensils, and a space at the school for consuming the meal, making these programs relatively costly to operate. Schools serving meals must set aside time to serve the food, which could disrupt learning, if time for meals would not otherwise be provided. Some programs also offer other health, nutrition, or education programs jointly with in-school feeding. These programs have included deworming, improving school quality and infrastructure, and providing health education. Unlike in the United States, for example, where school meals are targeted to selected students through exclusive breakfast before school or a targeted subsidy of lunch already available for sale, in developing countries it is often infeasible or undesirable to target individual students for school meals. As a result, all students in program schools receive the food, substantially raising costs. By providing food at school during the school day, in-school feeding has two advantages over take-home rations. First, it provides an incentive for school attendance directly to the child, rather than through the parents, as with take-home rations. Second, well-timed school meals alleviate short-term hunger, possibly improving students’ ability to concentrate and learn (Caldes and Ahmed 2004). Although it is also possible that take-home rations can achieve this goal, this outcome is not explicit in the take-home rations design.

Take-Home Rations

Take-home rations are food rations given to the household conditional on a child’s enrollment in school and a minimum level of attendance. Usually the ration is given monthly. A common requirement, though often weakly enforced, is that children attend at least 80–85 percent of school days to maintain eligibility for the program. Because the transfer is directed to the household and not the child, the welfare gains may be more dispersed. The household can redirect the food ration to whomever it desires or sell it for other goods or cash. In this sense, the ration is comparable to an income transfer. Take-home ration programs place less
emphasis on alleviating short-term hunger for children at school, focusing instead on improving food security at the household level (Pollitt, 1995). It is often much less costly than in-school feeding and does not take time away from learning. In practice, take-home ration programs are often cheaper to operate, because they are more easily targeted, for example, toward poor households. Although it is often infeasible in developing countries to restrict in-school meals to specific children, either for logistical or political reasons, take-home rations are routinely provided to a select set of children. For example, the WFP sometimes targets take-home rations exclusively to girls, who often lag behind boys in school attendance. In some cases, these take-home rations are provided as a top-up transfer to girls: an additional incentive in areas where all primary-school children receive in-school meals (WFP 2005).

2.2.3. Homegrown School Feeding Program (HGSFP)

Historically, the involvement of large foreign players has greatly limited the Kenyan government’s role in the direction and stewardship of these programs. Heavy reliance on foreign aid and management has subjected the programs to fluctuating, and often conditional, international support. In an effort to transition toward a more sustainable and nationally integrated alternative, the Kenyan government introduced the Homegrown School Feeding Program (HGSFP) in 2009. Though financial strains and infrastructural challenges have called into question Kenya’s ability to successfully fund and operate its own school feeding program, the country’s renewed commitment to education, agriculture, and rural development shows great promise (Espejo, 2009).

Beginning in 2009, the Kenyan government transferred over 500,000 primary school children from WFP programs (mostly from Semi-Arid districts) to HGSFP, and promised to add 50,000 students each year until reaching full coverage (Finan 2010). Prior to this transfer, 71 percent of associated program costs were provided by WFP, 15 percent were borne by local communities, and only 14 percent came from the Kenyan government (Galloway 2009). To guarantee the success of this program, the Kenyan government allocated $5.3 million (along with an additional $2 million from the Japanese government counterpart fund) in 2009 to subsidize the costs of expansion (USDA, 2009). Even so, with combined annual costs of the
previous program estimated at around $20 million a year (Galloway 2009), the Kenyan Ministry of Finance was required to commit itself to even greater investment if the government intends to replace WFP as the main benefactor of school meals in Kenya.

Rather than continuing to rely on WFP agents to procure foodstuffs and distribute meals, this program transfers cash stipends directly into the bank accounts of participating schools to be applied to the program (Finan 2010). The government makes these cash payments twice a year at the beginning of each three-month term, with aid amounts determined by net student enrollment. The government-subsidized program sets funding levels at nine cents per student meal, approximately half of what WFP sponsored programs spend per meal (USDA, 2009). To avoid additional overhead costs associated with management and distribution expenses, the government of Kenya has transferred the logistics of implementation to local School Management Committees (made up of parents, teachers, and community members) who are placed in charge of purchasing food from local farmers, cooperatives, and traders.

2.3. Challenges to Implementing School Feeding Programmes

2.3.1. Geographical Targeting of Benefiting Schools

Geography is the most frequent explicit criterion for targeting school feeding programs. Programs may be offered in some schools or districts and not in others. A poverty and food security map, whether crude or sophisticated, informs decisions about the locations where school feeding programs operate. Sometimes, in addition to the geographic location, school characteristics that correlate with poverty are used. For example, preference might be given to schools with multi-grade classrooms where these tend to serve the poorest; conversely, private schools might be excluded because they are perceived to be a preserve for the richest. Where school feeding programs are relatively small, geographic targeting can be powerful and can result in most of the benefits going to the poor. A program that serves 10 percent of schools and is placed only in the poorest districts would have few errors of inclusion. But as coverage increases and grows towards universal, school feeding programs will include higher proportions of non-poor children (Bundy et al., 2009).
In addition, urban areas are sometimes overlooked when poverty and food insecurity are assessed geographically because the lowest level of geographical targeting is often the district level. This can result in rural areas being identified as generally worse off, even though increased urbanization and the rapid growth of slum areas in cities have led to urban areas with large populations living in extreme poverty. Once target areas have been identified, the next stage in the process involves school-level targeting. In this process, selecting some schools and not others in a particular area might attract pupils from neighbouring schools, which are not receiving food, to those that are targeted under the program (Bundy, et al; 2009). This criterion at times leads to scenario where schools that were initially benefiting from the regular school feeding programme no longer benefit at some point in future. In Kenya, schools offering feeding programmes are bound to experience increased enrolment, especially considering the government FPE policy requirement that head teachers do not deny any child a chance to enroll in school. To avoid this, all schools in a homogeneous administrative or catchment area should be targeted. This study seeks to interrogate the current policies governing the administration of school feeding programme in Kajiado County with the view of establishing the extent to which they hinder the smooth implementation of the programme.

2.3.2. School Feeding Approaches
There are real differences between the benefits of in-school feeding (meals) and take-home rations. The choice of school feeding approach, therefore, depends on program objectives. Similarly, there are significant differences in the appropriateness of the different approaches to local capacity and contexts. For in-school meals, the timing and composition of school meals depends on such local factors as the length of the school day, the nutritional status of children, local eating habits, availability of commodities (for example, in the case of in-kind donations), ease of preparation, shelf life of different commodities, and costs, as well as the availability of trained cooks, cooking facilities, and clean water (Bundy, et al; 2009). Cooking food in school involves the complications and costs of providing labour, fuel, and cooking and eating facilities. These complications are reduced by the fact that they draw parental and community involvement into the program and may include food that is available locally, which is a key element of quality and sustainability.
2.3.3. Financial Burden of Running the SFP

Over the past years the government of Kenya has started allocating resources to the program through in-kind transfers of food that is locally produced. Management responsibilities are also being gradually transferred to the parents through the school management committees (SMCs). The government receives external assistance for purchasing and providing the food for the program, while the government itself is responsible for food distribution from the warehouses to the assisted schools. The full cost of running the school feeding program in Kenya, including community contributions, was estimated at US$28 per child per year (WFP, 2013). A range of contributions are also made by parents and other community members in each assisted school. The school management committee generally manages the program and agrees on fees that will be charged to each child in the school to support school feeding. If parents cannot afford to pay in cash, they provide in-kind contributions or services. The school levies charged for each child in Kenya are in the range of 100 to 300 Kenya shillings (US$1.38 to US$4.17) per child per year for rural and urban schools, respectively.

Generally, the costs of school feeding programmes will depend on several different factors, including the choice of the feeding approach, the composition and size of the rations, whether the food is purchased locally or is imported, and the number of beneficiaries and school feeding days per year. Logistics, security, and climatic conditions have an impact on program expenditures. The geographical context will also affect the overall cost; programmes in landlocked countries will generally face greater operational costs than countries implementing the same type of program but have access to seaports, depending on the provenance of the food. Estimating the full cost of in-school meal programmes is not always straightforward because providing cooked meals in schools generally includes a range of school-level costs that are normally not included within overall program expenditures. The World Food Programme estimated that the costs (standardized over 200 days and 700-kcal) of providing a child with food at school were on average US$34 per child per year in 2001 (World Food Programme, 2005) and US$20 per child per year in 2006 (Gelli, et al; 2009).
Another study, which estimated WFP project expenditures (that is, the costs of the program to WFP), found that in 19 countries providing on-site meals, the average cost of the program, standardized using the parameters outlined above, was US$ 20.40 per child per year (Gelli, et al; 2009). Regional variations in the costs were mostly due to the choice of school feeding basket choices. Assuming that WFP-estimated costs account for a 60 percent share of total implementation cost would imply that the full costs for on-site meals would be approximately US$ 34 per child per year. These studies show that school feeding programmes are expensive to sustain, especially when considering other competing needs. The choice of program objectives will to a large degree dictate the food modality (biscuits, cooked meals, or take-home rations) and associated implementation costs. Fortified biscuits can provide substantial nutritional inputs at a fraction of the cost of school meals, making them an appealing option for service delivery in food-insecure contexts. Both costs and effects should be considered carefully when designing the appropriate school-based intervention (Ahmed, 2004).

In low-income countries there are often major challenges associated with the implementation of school feeding programs. Central concerns are the potential costs of the program and how to implement the program without burdening the already fragile education system. Many countries, especially countries affected by crises, have traditionally addressed these concerns by relying on external support for resources and often the implementation of their programs. A majority of such programs rely on community participation for daily implementation activities, while the overall management of the supply chain is often undertaken by an external partner. Such programs are often peripheral to the education sector management processes and the national budget, and are particularly vulnerable to external factors and may not persist beyond external support (Ahmed, 2004).

2.3.4. Stakeholders’ Involvement in Running the SFP
It is important to find the right balance between programs that count on community participation and ownership (which is a very positive factor in sustainability) and programs that seek to be largely funded by communities. There is a tendency to consider community-sustained programs as an option in reducing dependence on external assistance, but this
places significant expectations on communities which they may not be able to fulfill. Indeed, there is anecdotal evidence from many low-income countries that communities introduce fees or in-kind contributions to support such programs, and by so doing erect barriers to education, particularly for girls and the poor citizenry. Additionally, this type of program by definition can only be sustained in food-secure and generally better-off areas in a country and cannot serve the populations that are most needy. Similarly, this model is particularly susceptible to shocks (for example, rising food prices or drought) and may have problems regarding the type, quality, and regularity of meals provided. In Kenya, communities are expected to provide firewood, employ a cook, provide kitchen utensils, cooking water and monitor the utilization of the project’s funds, as part of their contribution (MOEST, 2009).

2.4. Theoretical Framework
The study was guided by the human needs theory of Abraham Maslow (1943). According to this theory, there are certain minimum requirements that are essential to decent standards of living. These are known as physiological needs. They include food, shelter, health and clothing. They are primary needs and have to be catered for before other needs such as security and shelter, sense of belonging and affection, love, esteem and finally self-actualization are pursued. Maslow proposed that man’s drive towards certain direction can be arranged in a hierarchical order according to his needs as Figure 2.1 below.

The first level of physiological needs is the needs that everyone needs on a daily basis for survival and includes basic needs like food, shelter and clothing. The second level is that of security of the self and of the physiological needs. The third level is of social need, which is a need to belong to a certain group or association. This includes friendship, love and belonging. The fourth level is that of self-esteem, which a sense of self-respect and self-motivation is. It also includes how one may relate to other people. The last level is of self-actualization, whereby man strives towards a viable experience and personal growth.
Maslow says that a human being go through a hierarchy of needs starting with physical needs for example food to much higher needs for example emotions. For a child to achieve this, care givers for example teachers or parents should ensure that they provide nutritious foods to the child in order to have a healthy growth. Safety and security needs are referred to as freedom from fear and anxiety and also protection from emotional harm. Children should be provided with safety and security so as to do well in school and even at home. Failure to provide security creates discontentment. The social needs include love and belonging where children should be acceptable and provided with friendship. The self-esteem needs are the prestige needs whereby one feels he/she wants to be recognized. This makes children feel proud of themselves. The utmost need is the self-actualization, which is the motive to

become all that a person is able to be. This requires self-drive to achieve the goal one desires. According to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, it demonstrates that when needs are met or fulfilled, pupils are generally happy and contented. The atmosphere in the school is good and learning goes on smoothly. The reverse is true in that when the needs are not met or fulfilled there is discontentment. This model highlights the importance of food provision and security. From a broader view of development, it means that countries must also struggle to provide basic needs for use by their population. For a developing country like Kenya, it means that poverty must be prevented by making basic needs like food, clothing and shelter available to all citizens. Since man cannot survive without food, the government should make an effort to reduce food insecurity, especially amongst vulnerable groups like children. Where food aid is available for instance in schools through school feeding programmes, it will encourage good health, high motivation, participation, attention in class and will obviously reduce hunger. It should be properly monitored to ensure it assists the children (King, 1966).
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Site

Figure 3.1: Research Site

The study was undertaken within Kajiado County. The schools are spread out across the county. However, the study covered schools involved in SFP, limited to schools in Isinya Division of the county. The selection of the Isinya Divisions was informed by its proximity in reach and the fact that it has high agglomeration of the SFP supported primary schools.
3.2. Research Design
The study employed a descriptive survey design to explore the challenges facing school feeding programme in Kajiado County. Descriptive survey designs are used in survey studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret data for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2004).

3.3. Study Population
The study population of the study was the head teachers, deputy head teachers the teachers in charge of SFPS, the parents and even the pupils in all the primary schools involved in SFP in Isinya Division of Kajiado County. According to the August 2013 Food Security Assessment report for Kajiado County, Isinya Division has 49 schools under the SFP programme (see Annex 7.5.). Table 3.1 below indicates the breakdown of the target population.

Table 3.1: Distribution of the Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 per school</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 per school</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP teacher I/C</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 per school</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Sample Technique and Sample Size
Sampling was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, purposive sampling method was used in selection of the sample schools, while in the second stage the same technique was used in selection of the respondents / informants, as well as the schools where focus group discussions were conducted. According to Kothari (2003), purposive sampling is appropriate when selecting study subjects that meet a certain pre-determined criterion. In this case, the pre-determined criterion was “persons with direct involvement in day-to-day running of the SFPs at the school level” as well as the beneficiaries. As a result, a census of all the head teachers (or deputies) and SFP managers from the 49 schools under SFP programme from
Isinya Division were interviewed while five schools were purposively selected for the focus group discussions.

**Table 3.2: The Sampling Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Purposive Selection</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 H/teacher OR the Deputy H/Teacher OR the SFP teacher in charge, whoever is available</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP teacher I/C</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5. Data Collection Methods**

**3.5.1. Survey**

The study applied the sample survey technique in which questionnaires were used as the main data collection instrument. Upon approval, the researcher recruited and inducted three research assistants to aid in data collection. These were graduates in social sciences and with past experience in research. The research assistants were oriented on the purpose of the study, the objectives, structure of the tools, and the approaches to be applied in sampling as well as the actual data collection. The surveys were carried out in 49 primary schools across Isinya Division in the month of October 2014.

**3.5.2. Focus Group Discussions**

FGD is a qualitative method of data collection in which 6-12 people who have similar experiences and concerns or from similar social and cultural backgrounds are brought together to discuss a specific issue (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005). Typically, in an FGD participants are purposively sampled and brought together in a setting where they comfortably engage in dynamic discussion for at least one to two hours (Krueger and Casey, 2000). The discussion is often guided by a moderator/facilitator who introduces the topics for discussion, moderates and assists the participants in the discussion through probes and/or takes notes of the discussions in great detail. The facilitator plays an important role not only in encouraging interaction and guiding discussion but also in obtaining good and accurate information from the participants.
In the present study, focus group discussions were conducted in five purposively selected primary schools as described above. In each school, an FGD was constituted comprising of 5 male parents and 5 female parents. The pupils FGDs were similarly constituted to comprise of 5 boys and 5 girls. The discussions took between 45 minutes and one hour.

3.5.3. Key Informant Interviews

Key informants are defined as those individuals with special expertise in the issues under investigation and community life (Schensul et al. 1999). For this study, key informants were identified based on their leadership role in the school feeding programme. These interviews were typically unstructured, conversational meetings and were intended to promote familiarization with principal issues and actors and local frames of reference (Spradley, 1979). The issues and concerns raised informed interview guides to be used in interviewing. Key informants provided important contextual information helpful for establishing sample parameters for later interviews. Interviews were held with the divisional education officers at kajiado as well as the WFP programme officers seconded to oversee the programmes in Kajiado County.

3.6. Data Processing and Analysis

After the fieldwork, before analysis, all the questionnaires were adequately checked for completeness. Quantitative information was coded and entered into a spreadsheet and analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The data was checked to ensure that the output is free from outliers and the effect of missing responses is at minimum. The survey data was initially summarized using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation (SD). It was presented using graphs, charts and contingency tables. Qualitative analysis was used to establish the outstanding challenges reported to have the greatest impact on SFP in the County. This technique was applied in analysis of field notes and open-ended responses.
3.7. Ethical Considerations
Ethical considerations like ensuring confidentiality of responses were assured before the data collection commences. This was necessary because it encouraged the respondents to be honest. No respondent was forced to take part in this study. The authority to visit the schools was sought from the respective authorizing agencies. A research permit was also obtained from the National Commission for Science and technology.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of the study was to assess the challenges of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County. Specifically, the study examined the impact of accessibility on the smooth running of the school feeding programme; the effects of sustainability on the school feeding programme; and to establish the management challenges to SFP arising from increased enrollment of pupils in the beneficiary schools in Kajiado County. Survey data was conducted from 49 primary schools from within Isinya Division. The respondents were head teachers, SFP managers, education officers, as well as SFP programme managers from WFP. The study achieved as response rate of 85.7% since only 42 of 49 targeted schools could be reached for interviews. Heavy rains hindered accessibility in 5 schools while in 2 of the schools, the headteachers were non-receptive since the students and the teachers were preparing for end of year examinations. The sample of 42 schools was therefore considered representative for the next stage of analysis. The findings have been systematically and thematically presented in line with the study objectives.

4.2. General Profile of the Sample
4.2.1. Profile of the Sample Respondents
At the school level, interviews were being conducted with the head teacher, the deputy head teacher or the SFP teacher-in-charge; depending on who of the three was readily available at the time when the interview was designated. The findings of Table 4.1 indicate the profile of the sample in terms of gender, the category, and whether or not they had been previously inducted in management of SFP for schools. The results indicate that about two thirds of the sampled respondents (66.7%) were head teachers of the respective sampled schools. The findings also indicate that a majority of the respondents (81%) were male with the female respondents accounting for 19% of the sample. Finally, the results indicate that over 95% of the sampled respondents had been previously trained in the management of SFP for schools. The results are in line with the study’s design where the target was to draw as much diverse a
sample as possible as well as to reach out to persons well versed with matters of the SFP at the school level.

Table 4.1: General Profile of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of the respondent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of the respondent</td>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFP Teacher in-charge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you ever trained in the management of the SFP?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2014)

4.2.2. Profile of the Sampled Schools

The findings of Table 4.2 presents a distribution of responses on various attributes relating to the 42 schools where the sample surveys were conducted. The findings indicate that a majority of the schools had a total pupil population of less than 300 pupils (64.3%), with the mean population of the sample being 182 pupils (STD Deviation = 15.32). This would be attributable to the sparse distribution of the households as well as the semi-arid conditions experienced in Isinya Division. Further assessment was done into the estimated number of pupils covered under the SFP programme out of the total population of pupils. This proportion was calculated as a percentage of the total school population. The findings indicate that half of the sampled schools have over three quarters of their population (75% of the pupils) under the SFP; with an additional 38.1% of the schools reporting that between half and three-quarters of the school populace are under the SFP. Cumulatively, this shows that there was huge participation into the SFP across a majority of the sampled schools. In
regard to the duration the schools had been under SFP, the results show that over 95% of the schools sampled had been under SFP for a period exceeding 5 years. Finally, the results show that all the sampled schools relied on the government and non-governmental organizations for support in running the SFPs. Also, all the schools reported that they run a combination of both the Home Grown School Meals programme (HGSMP, by the Government of Kenya) and the Expanded School Meals Programme (ESMP, by the World Food Programme, WFP).

Table 4.2: General Profile of the Sampled Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall School Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 300 pupils</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 301 - 500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 500 pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Pupils Covered Under SFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26% - 50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 75%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration Under SFP in Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main sponsor of the SFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donors / NGOs/ Well Wishers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of SFP Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HGSMP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESMP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both HGSMP and ESMP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HGSMP = Home Grown School Meals programme (by GoK); ESMP = Expanded School Meals Programme (by WFP)
Source: Field Data (2014)
4.3. Challenges Facing School Feeding Programme in Kajiado County

4.3.1. Accessibility of the Beneficiary Schools
The first objective of the study sought to find out the impact of accessibility on the running of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County.

Current State of Physical Infrastructure to Support SFP Implementation
The findings of Table 4.3 indicate the split of responses regarding the state of physical infrastructure at or within reach of the sampled schools. The findings indicate that all the sampled schools had permanent and lockable storage facilities where they would store the food stuffs as well as various materials and accessories used in preparation and serving of food to the pupils. However, few schools were found to have access to clean drinking water sources as well as permanent dwelling structures. Of high deficiency was lack tarmacked roads leading to the schools as well as lack of electricity. Only four of the 42 sampled schools were found to be situated near tarmacked access road. During the focus group discussions with the pupils and the parents, it emerged that this becomes as big challenge especially during the rainy seasons since the roads become impassable hence locking out the schools from access. According to some of the informants, the children have gone without meals during such incidences since the suppliers are not able to reach the schools. Lack of permanent dwelling structures implies that the pupils usually learn and handle food in dusty and non-hygienic environments. Being a semi-arid area, Isinya has a challenge on availability of clean water for drinking.

Table 4.3: State of Infrastructure to Support SFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following are available at or within reach of your school?</th>
<th>Number of responses (based on multiple responses)</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water sources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmacked Roads</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murram Carpeted Roads</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent dwelling structures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and Lockable storage facilities</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2014)
In the order of importance, the respondents were requested to rank each of the above aspects in regard to smooth implementation of the SFP at their school (Rank 1 for most important and Rank 6 for least important. Table 4.4 indicates that aggregated computed ranks for each attribute using the Spearman’s Rank formulae. The findings indicate that the top three ranked aspects were: lack of tarmacked roads; inaccessibility to clean drinking water sources; and lack of permanent dwelling structures within the schools. According to one of the Divisional education officer interviewed, logistics of food supply is a big challenge in the entire Kajiado County. For instance, he reported that schools in Kajiado County receive their food commodities irregularly due to secondary transportation problems from the National Cereals produce Board (NCPB) depots or the district headquarters to schools. This constraint is caused by inadequate allocation of funds by the Ministry of Education for this exercise and limited financial inputs from the Parents and Teachers Associations of the beneficiary schools.

Table 4.4: Ranking of Infrastructure Attributes with Highest Impact on SFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank 1</td>
<td>Tarmacked Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 2</td>
<td>Clean drinking water sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 3</td>
<td>Permanent dwelling structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 4</td>
<td>Murram Carpeted Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 5</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 6</td>
<td>Permanent and Lockable storage facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2014)

Another challenge that hinders accessibility of some of the schools under SFP was reported to be insecurity. Relative security is a prerequisite for all activities in emergencies to ensure access to the targeted areas, mobility of children and teachers to and from school, transport of food commodities to the target areas and, importantly, delivery of food to its intended beneficiaries. During the focus group discussions, the parents reported that sometimes there are instances of insecurity that inhibit food suppliers from making deliveries to the beneficiary schools. The respondents further indicated that the recurrent water shortage was
a challenge to the implementation of SFP in the County. Two respondents indicated that due to poverty, some parents are unable to give money for the cooks which make the implementation of the programme to be a challenge. The respondents indicated that the other challenge was the delay in the delivery of the food by the suppliers. The findings from the respondents also indicated that the preparation of the food also require others inputs such as fuel such as firewood and charcoal which are not readily available sometimes.

4.3.2. Sustainability Measures in Place for SFP
The second objective of the study sought to assess the effects of sustainability on the school feeding programme in Kajiado County.

Adequacy of Budgetary Allocations
First, the respondents were requested to state their opinion regarding perceived adequacy of funds allocated to SFP. The findings below indicate that a large majority of the sampled respondents (95.8%) were of the view that the allocated funds are inadequate.

Figure 4.1: Adequacy of Funds Allocated to SFP
Further probing was done to establish how the inadequacy of finances had affected the running of the feeding programme at the respective schools. All the schools visited were found to run the SFP under the in-school meals approach. This is where the meals are prepared and served at schools; as opposed to the rations approach where the children take food rations home. According to a majority of the respondents, the biggest challenge to school feeding programmes is the rising cost of food commodities, as elaborated by most of the head teachers. This dynamism in costs of food stuffs affects the sustenance of the budgetary allocations provided to the schools.

**Alternative Source of Finances for SFPs**

To further assess the sustainability measures put in place by the SFP supported, two major questions were posed to the head teachers, their deputies and SFP teachers-in-charge as shown in Table 4.5. The first question touched on whether or not the schools had initiated any income generating activities at the schools to supplement what the donors or the government provided. The second question bordered on whether or not the schools had alternative sources of financing to supplement what the donors or the government provided. First, the results of Table 4.5 indicate that none of the sampled schools had initiated alternative income generating activities at the school to supplement what the donors/ GoK was providing. Secondly, a large majority of the schools (85.7%) had no alternative sources of financing to supplement what the donors/ GoK provides. Six of the sampled schools reported that they have alternative sources of funding in addition to what the donors and the government provide. The alternate financiers are mainly churches and religious organizations that sponsor the schools.
Table 4.5: Availability of Alternative Sources of Funding and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Posed</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you initiated any income generating activities at the school to supplement what the donors/ GoK provide?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Posed</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have alternative sources of financing to supplement what the donors/ GoK provide?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Contribution from Communities and Local Stakeholders

The respondents were largely satisfied with the level of involvement of the stakeholders in the management of the SFPs. Table 4.6 shows the various types of contributions made by communities towards support of the SFPs in the target schools. The results show that the communities participate by way of: providing labour in cooking (95%); participating in construction of food stores (76.2%); provision of firewood and water (71.4%); ensuring cleanliness is maintained in the kitchens (64.2%); providing sufurias and other related utensils / accessories (61.9%); and maintaining security of school stores (59.5%). This indicates that the level of involvement of community members in the implementation of school feeding programme was very adequate. This implies that the community members are actively involved in the school feeding programme, which is an indicator for their ownership to the underlying approaches.

Table 4.6: Contributions of Community Members towards Feeding Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Role of Stakeholders …</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides labour in cooking</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in construction of food stores</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of firewood and water</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring cleanliness is maintained in the kitchen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of sufurias for cooking</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain security of school stores</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, the head teachers reported that they involved parents in the management of the school feeding programme by asking them to supply their children with a clean metallic bowl for meals, providing salaries for cooks and the cooking utensils and also in the provision of water. Some parents are also included in the school feeding programme committee. On challenges, the head teachers reported that parents sometimes failed to provide water and funds to pay the cooks. The other respondents were asked to name the contributions made by the community towards the school feeding programme

4.3.3. The Impact of Increased Pupils’ Enrollment
The third objective of the study sought to establish the effects of increased enrollment on the school feeding programme in Kajiado County. All the respondents were in agreement that the SFPs have resulted to increased enrollment. Besides, the respondents reported that the introduction of free primary education also resulted in increase in enrollment figures. When asked to give reasons for their responses, the head teachers for their responses, the head teachers from the sampled schools stated that school feeding had motivated the majority of parents to enroll their children. “Parents enroll because they know that their children will have meals while at school instead of staying home hungry,” “there is negative attitude of parents and the community at large towards the education of their children.” The SFP teachers-in-charge also had similar opinions. “As teachers, we used to appeal to the parents to enroll their children but since the introduction of school feeding programme, parents enroll their children without being persuaded by the school authority,” said one teacher. During the focus group discussions with the parents as well as the pupils, School feeding was mentioned as a reason for increase in enrolment. Most of the parents interviewed disclosed that due to poverty levels in communities, they were encouraged to enroll their children where pupils were fed with food. Both the Education Officers and World Food Programme Officers in the interviews also disclosed that there was an increase in the school enrolment especially in selected schools. The officers were of the view that with that kind of enrolment, Kajiado County would hence be able to achieve the Education for All (EFA) goals.
According to the respondents, the increased enrollment from both the free primary education and the SFP has led to a strain in the school resources, including the SFP itself. According to one of the head teacher, “previously, we would comfortably cater for all the pupils within the budget provided. However, increased enrollments from FPE and SFP have led to a strain on the existing resources. We have since introduced food rationing to ensure the little we have is available to all”.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction
This chapter provides a summary of the research findings, conclusion as well as recommendations based on the findings of the research.

5.2. Summary of Findings
The purpose of the study was to assess the challenges of the school feeding programme in Kajiado County. Specifically, the study examined the impact of accessibility on the smooth running of the school feeding programme; the effects of sustainability on the school feeding programme; and to establish the management challenges to SFP arising from increased enrollment of pupils in the beneficiary schools in Kajiado County. Survey data was collected from 42 primary schools from within Isinya Division. The respondents were head teachers, SFP managers, education officers, as well as SFP programme managers from WFP. The study employed a descriptive survey design to explore the challenges facing school feeding programme in Kajiado County.

First, the findings showed that the current state of infrastructure within and outside the beneficiary schools has hindered the extent to which the beneficiaries are able to access the benefits of the SFP. According to the findings, ranking top on hinderance to accessibility is: lack of tarmacked roads; inaccessibility to clean drinking water sources; and lack of permanent dwelling structures within the schools. Poor roads network becomes as big challenge especially during the rainy seasons since the roads become impassable hence locking out the schools from access. According to some of the informants, children have gone without meals during such incidences since the suppliers are not able to reach the schools. Lack of permanent dwelling structures implies that the pupils usually learn and handle food in dusty and non-hygienic environments. Being a semi-arid area, Isinya has a challenge on availability of clean water for drinking. Insecurity also featured has a major challenge towards access for schools under the SFP.
Secondly, the findings showed that the schools reliance on external support (donors and the government) is extremely high. This is in comparison to the support that the schools and the communities ought to be providing to come up with long lasting solutions geared towards sustainability of the SFPs. In all the schools visited, it was evident that the donors and the government contribute over 80% of the resources required in running the SFPs, with 20% being drawn from the local communities (mainly the parents). Rising cost of food commodities was cited by most of the head teachers as the biggest threat towards making the meals programme sustainable. The findings showed that none of the sampled schools had initiated income generating activities geared towards directly supporting the meals programmes. This is founded on the attitudes and perceptions from the school stakeholders (teachers, parents, communities) that SFP is a government-supported venture and therefore they should not strain to have is running. Only six of the forty two visited schools had alternative sources of financing to supplement what they receive from the donors and the government is offering. These are mainly those sponsored by religious institutions, which also demonstrates the role of faith-based organizations in ensuring sustainability of the meal programmes.

Finally, the findings showed that increased enrollment as a result of the introduction of free primary education and the SFP had significantly constrained the capacity of schools to adequately manage the meals programmes. According to the respondents, previously they would be able to cater for all the pupils under the programmes within the financial and non-financial resources available. However, with increased enrollment, the schools have been compelled to result to adverse measures such as rationing of food served to pupils as well as increasing demands on the supportive materials that the communities (parents) ought to provide. For instance, in some of the schools, typical contributions requested include firewood, water, cash for cooks’ salaries, and salt.

5.3. Discussion of Findings
It was realized from the findings above that school management, funding, personnel and attitudes of students influenced implementation of school feeding programs in Isinya Division. Food incentives offered to students, such as school meals, or food incentives
offered to families, such as take-home rations (especially for girls, orphans, and vulnerable children) compensate parents and guardians for direct educational costs and opportunity costs accrued from the loss of child labour when children go to school. Implementation of school feeding programs is associated with increased enrolment, particularly for girls.

Other factors such as water scarcity and inadequate infrastructure continue to impede full realization of the central goals of the school meals program. Certain financially strapped schools require families to contribute money, labor, water, and firewood to receive the daily meal allowance, compromising the full effect of the meal incentive. Rural schools, widely without firewood to fuel kitchen stoves, clean water, and money to pay cooks, find it difficult to provide daily meal services without burdening parents for missing inputs. Additionally, schools are not always equipped with suitable bathrooms and kitchens to ensure that food is prepared in a hygienic and safe environment. This is evident by the fact that most of the sampled schools had no permanent dwelling structures. These factors undermine the quality and effectiveness of the feeding program.

To avoid additional overhead costs associated with management and distribution expenses, the government of Kenya has transferred the logistics of implementation to local School Management Committees (made up of parents, teachers, and community members) who are placed in charge of purchasing food from local farmers, cooperatives, and traders. However, poor accessibility hinders the suppliers from making their deliveries especially during the rainy seasons and in far flung schools. Based on the findings from the study, it was observed that: community participation and involvement was strong at every school visited. Each household is asked to contribute to the [School Feeding Program], and typical contributions include firewood, water, cash for cooks’ salaries, and salt. Wherever households cannot contribute the school management committees (SMCs) makes alternative arrangements with the families.

According to field studies, the “magnet effect” of the meal programs has greatly increased school attendance rates especially among young children. The schools that provide meals show higher attendance rates and lower initial dropout rates than schools that do not. The
immediate financial and nutritional benefits provided by schooling attract parents struggling to support their children on low-yielding subsistence farming or Maasai pastoralists. On average, participating families save between four and nine percent of their annual income by taking advantage of school meals and avoiding added food expenditures. However, the findings have shown the observed growth in enrollment rates had led to additional strain on the available facilities.

5.4. Conclusions
School feeding programs are one type of intervention used by policy makers and non-governmental organizations as a social safety net in developing nations to aid in several policy areas. These programs are believed to be effective because of the ability of the interventions to target a specific population that is vulnerable – school-aged children. There are various modalities in which these interventions are utilized to attain impactful outcomes on students and their families. This study looked at various challenges to implementation of the SFPs in Kajiado County. The study has shown that the challenges facing the implementation of SFPs are diverse. Regarding accessibility, the deficiencies from state actors in terms of policy formulation and implementation emerged that the major sources of challenges facing the implementation of the community. Of great importance also is the role played by the communities in ensuring that the programmes are running on day to day basis. Sustainability of the meals programmes (as currently implemented) seems uncertain largely due to inadequate financial allocations; failure by schools to kick-start income generating projects target SFP support; lack of alternate sourcing of funding; and the ever increasing numbers of pupils enrolling year after year against stagnated budgetary allocations.

Other confounding factors exist that also hinder smooth running of the SFP. Education development in Isinya Division and the Kajiado County in general is faced by a number of challenges. These include: poverty, long distances from schools, cultural factors such as moranism (a cultural rite of passage of the Maasai culture), nomadism (movement from one place to another in search of pasture and water), early marriages, low level awareness of the value of education in the community and sparse population. Other minor challenges include: ignorance, poor staffing of schools, drought, diseases, truancy and child labour. This has
brought some complications in the implementation and management of the School Feeding Programme, due to the erratic enrollment.

5.5. Recommendations

5.5.1. Areas for Further Improvement
Based on the findings above, the study makes the following recommendations: there is need for the Government of Kenya (GoK) to increase its inland transport, storage and handling charges (ITSH) financial allocations so as to facilitate effective transportation of food from the National Cereals Produce Board (NCPB) depots at Kajiado town to schools; there is need to address the question of sustainability of the SFP programme when donor assistance ceases by urging the GoK to begin adopting some recommendations in "The Social Dimensions of Development in Kenya (1996)", a policy document which recommends provision of school lunches and health services to children in primary schools with emphasis on community participation; the need to recognize that school feeding models embrace multi-sectoral coordination since school feeding starts from production to utilization, hence the need to involve as many stakeholders as possible.

In addition, enhanced food security at the household level would imply increase in capacity by the parents (communities) to continue supporting the SFP. Therefore, the government ought to put in place measures to enhance this since once the parents attain household food security they will be willing to contribute food to sustain the SFP. Adequate sensitization and involvement of all stakeholders at all levels is important for ownership of the Programme. Therefore, all parents, key stakeholders/ministries need to be involved at all levels. There exists an untapped potential in local donor support. This includes in attending to matters such as: provision of non-food items; development of infrastructure; sensitize the communities on the importance of education; and to provide technical assistance. Infrastructure should be improved especially in the remote areas. This will ease communication in these areas thus improving the, implementation and management of the SFP. On the other hand, parents involvement needs to be embraced in the implementation and management of the programme. This initiates ownership of the programme thus developing a concern of its
implementation and management. Security is also another handle in the management of the programme.

5.5.2. Areas for Further Research
This study was delimited to only one division of Kajiado County. It is therefore important that a similar study be replicated for the rest of the County. In addition an in-depth study should be done to explore the role of the local civil society organizations in complementing the government and WFP efforts in running the SFP. It will also be important that a study is undertaken to establish the level of community participation on the School Feeding Programme initiatives as well as its implication on future sustainability of the SFP.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Questionnaire Letter of Introduction
Beatrice W. Munuhe
University of Nairobi
Institute of Anthropology, Gender and African Studies
P.O. Box 30197 – 00100
Nairobi

March 16, 2014

Dear Respondent,

REF: INTRODUCTION AS A RESEARCH STUDENT
I am a postgraduate student at University of Nairobi pursuing a Masters of Arts Degree in Development Studies. As part of partial fulfillment I am conducting a project paper on: “CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMME IN KENYA: A CASE OF KAJIADO COUNTY”. For this reason I would appreciate if you would kindly spare a few minutes of your time to respond to a few questions I am going to pose to the best of your knowledge as they apply to yourself or your school. The information in this questionnaire will be treated with confidentiality and in no instance will your name be mentioned in this research. In addition, the information will not be used for any other purpose other than for this research. Your assistance in facilitating the same will be highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.
Yours Faithfully

__________________________
BETTY MUNUHE
Supervisor
(MA Student)
Appendix II: Interview Guide for Head Teachers/ SFP Teachers
This interview session is designed to help the researcher find out the challenges experienced in the School Feeding Programme in Kajiado County. Your school has been purposive selected for being a beneficiary school under the programme. The information you give will be used for the purpose of the study only. Therefore, do not write your name.

Date of interview __________/ __________/ 2014

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Name of the School ________________________________________
2) Designation: a) Headteacher □  b) D/Headteacher □  c) SFP Teacher □
3) Sub-County in which the school belongs _________________________
4) Gender of the respondents a) Male □  b) Female □
5) Estimated Number of pupils in the school a) Boys___________ b) Girls __________
6) How many pupils are you covering in the current year under SFP? _______________
7) Total number of teachers in the school _____________________
8) For how long have you been receiving food aid under the school feeding programme (SFP)? Since ____________ (Month) _________ Year
9) Who are your main sponsors for the SFP? _____________________________
10) There are two type of school meals programmes namely Home Grown School Meals programme (HGSMP) supported by government of Kenya (GOK) and the Expanded School Meals Programme (ESMP) supported by World Food Programme(WFP). Which of the two are applicable to your school?
   a. HGSMP □
   b. ESMP □
   c. Both HGSMP and ESMP □
11) Were you ever trained in the management of the SFP?
   a. Yes □
   b. No □
   If NO, what suggestion would make about it?
   ____________________________________________
SECTION B: INFORMATION ON SUSTAINABILITY

12) Do you consider the finances allocated for SFP at your school adequate to cover the needy pupils’ population?
   a) Yes  □   b) No  □

13) If NO, how has this affected the running of the feeding programme at the school?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Have you initiated any income generating activities at the school to supplement what the donors/ GoK provide?
   a) Yes  □   b) No  □

14) Do you have alternative sources of financing to supplement what the donors/ GoK provide?
   a) Yes  □   b) No  □

   Briefly specify:
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

Suggest how the following stakeholders would support the programme if the donors withdraw?

Government
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
SECTION C: INFORMATION ON ACCESSIBILITY

15) Which of the following are available at or within reach of your school? (Tick all that apply)
   a. Clean drinking water sources
   b. Electricity
   c. Tarmacked Roads
   d. Murram Carpeted Roads
   e. Permanent dwelling structures
   f. Permanent and Lockable storage facilities

16) In the order of importance, how would you rank each of the above facilities in regard to smooth implementation of the SFP at your school? (Rank 1 for most important and Rank 6 for least important)
   a. Clean drinking water sources
      Rank ________
   b. Electricity
      Rank ________
   c. Tarmacked Roads
      Rank ________
   d. Murram Carpeted Roads
      Rank ________
   e. Permanent dwelling structures
      Rank ________
   f. Permanent and Lockable storage facilities
      Rank ________
17) What specific challenges are you experiencing currently in implementing SFP that you would attribute to the current state of physical infrastructure around your school?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

SECTION D: INFORMATION ON INCREASED ENROLLMENT
18) Have you recorded significant increase in the number of pupils enrolling at the school since introduction of the SFP?
   a. Yes □
   b. No □
   Briefly explain _______________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

If YES, has this impacted on the implementation of the SFP at this school?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

19) What recommendations would you wish to raise regarding overcoming challenges experienced in implementing the SFP in arid and semi-arid regions in Kenya?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSES
Appendix II: Focus Group Discussion Guide for Parents / Pupils

Date ________________________  School ________________________________

Location ___________________  Number of participants:  Male _________  Female _______

Parents  □  Pupils  □

1) What are the financial challenges facing the school feeding programme in your school?

2) What are some of the measures taken to address these challenges?

3) What are the physical challenges facing the school feeding programme in your school?

4) What are some of the measures taken to address these challenges?

5) What do you think is the way forward towards effective running of the school feeding programme for your school?
**Appendix iv: Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost (KSHS.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Permit</td>
<td>3 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing Literature (Books, Journal Articles, Internet Access)</td>
<td>20 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs: Research Assistants (3 x 14 days x Kshs. 1000)</td>
<td>42 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>7 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Research Instruments</td>
<td>15 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies: (Stationery, Photocopy Paper and Pens)</td>
<td>18 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing, Printing and Binding of Study Reports</td>
<td>15 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>120 500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix v: List of Sampled Schools in Isinya Division

1. Royal atar academy- pri  
2. St james academy-pri  
3. Wema junior academy-pri  
4. Mocedet sch  
5. Sargull educational centre pri  
6. Merry edge springs academy pri  
7. Lynkers academy  
8. Springfield prep sch pri  
9. Success academy-pri  
10. Sunnyside academy  
11. Wamukoy academy- pri  
12. The magutu school  
13. New horozon preparatory pri  
14. St louis academy  
15. Neema education center pry  
16. Saropa bells academy-pri  
17. Christiane preparatory sch  
18. Efa academy pri  
19. Kitengela shalom academy  
20. Precious treasure academy- pri sch  
21. Pe-elis education center pri  
22. Ida star academy pri  
23. St linas academy- pri  
24. St phillip junior academy pri sch  
25. Joyland prep sch  
26. Our lady queen of mercy  
27. Muthenya junior academy-pri  
28. Kauti academy-pri
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>St benard pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Shining stars academy pri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Kitengela ebenezer academy pri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Naisula springs sch pri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Isiait pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Oloosiyamalil pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ilmolelian pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Ilbissil pri special unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Ilparrua pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Inkuseron pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Singoi pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Malilima pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Oltepesi pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Saina pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Nalepo pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Ole nkotila pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Enkasurai pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Kikayaya pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Emurkeya pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Ilkiremisho pri sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Iltareto pri sch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>