

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMME
(NSNP) FOR HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS
IN MALAMULELE, LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

by

HLONGWANE TSAKANE FAITH



MINI-DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT

in

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

in the

FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT AND LAW

(Turfloop Graduate School of Leadership)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

SUPERVISOR: Mr M.B. Njoko

2022

DEDICATION

In memory of my late husband, Risimati Ronald Hlongwane, and my late mother-in-law, Solani Grace Hlongwane, who continued to love, care for, and support me throughout my studies but passed on before I could finish my degree.

DECLARATION

I declare that THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMME (NSNP) FOR HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN MALAMULELE, LIMPOPO PROVINCE is my own work, that all sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged with complete references, and that this work has not previously been submitted for any other degree at any other institution.

HLONGWANE FT

05 DECEMBER 2022

HLONGWANE FT, Mrs

DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank the following individuals for their contributions to this dissertation:

- The Lord, God Almighty, who created an opportunity for me to study and enabled me to complete in the midst of obstacles on the way.
- My late husband, Risimati Ronald Hlongwane, for his support and care of our children while I was away
- My three children, Lefa Ezekiel Keith, Risuna, and Risima, who encouraged me to continue my studies even when it was difficult, in order to inspire them.
- My late parents, Gezani Wilson and Elizabeth Mafemani, who made sure I attained a better education than they could.
- Solani Grace Hlongwane, my late mother-in-law, who always believed in me and encouraged me to pursue my education.
- A special thanks to Mr M.B Njoko, my supervisor, for his excellent guidance and supervision throughout.
- Mr Baloyi Eddie, my former Circuit Manager at Malamulele South Circuit, for encouraging me to continue my studies and assisting me with my dissertation title.
- My colleagues at Bungeni Primary School and former colleagues at Maledza Primary School.
- Vhembe East District Department of Education.
- Limpopo Department of Education.
- All participants in this study, namely the school principals of the three chosen schools, the district coordinator, the circuit coordinator, the school principals, the school coordinators, the food handlers, and the learners' parents at the chosen schools.

ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to determine whether the National School Nutrition Programme contributes to food security in recipient households, in addition to providing one meal per school day to students. The researcher was interested in whether the programme had a long-term effect on households rather than simply meeting a short-term need. The researcher chose the interpretivist paradigm for the study, since it was likely that participants would have different perspectives on the same programme, and it is these perspectives which the researcher sought to uncover. This study made use of qualitative research methods. The schools selected are all Quintile 2 schools situated in rural villages in the far north of Limpopo. Many of the learners at the schools come from child-headed or grandparent-headed families; some because their parents work in cities far from home, and others because they rely on social grants for income. The study's findings indicate that the programme has an impact in terms of ensuring daily meals at schools for students, which is a short-term need, and goes some way to meeting household food security needs, but is insufficient to have any significant effect, being neither regular nor sustainable. In light of this finding, the researcher has made nine recommendations that may contribute to the provision of sustainable household food security for households in Limpopo Province by the National School Nutrition Programme, based on its existing policy, principles and goals.

ACRONYMS

NSNP	: National School Nutrition Programme
NGO	: Non-Governmental Organisation
RDP	: Reconstruction and Development Programme
DBE	: Department of Basic Education
WHO	: World Health Organisation
PSNP	: Primary School Nutrition Programme
DoH	: Department of Health
RDA	: Recommended Daily Allowance
DPME	: Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
RSA	: Republic of South Africa
NSLP	: National School Lunch Programme
SFPS	: Sustainable Food Production in Schools
GPoA	: Government Programme of Action
VFH	: Voluntary Food Handlers
JAM	: Joint Aid Management
ECD	: Early Childhood Development
STATSSA	: Statistics South Africa
SGB	: School Governing Body

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACRONYMS	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Background to the study	1
1.3. Problem statement	2
1.4. Motivation for the study	3
1.5. Purpose of the study	4
1.5.1. Significance of the study	4
1.5.2. Aim of the study	5
1.5.3. Research objectives	5
1.6. Research questions	5
1.7. Definition of key concepts	5
1.8. Outline of the dissertation	7
1.9. Synthesis of the chapter	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	9

2.1. Introduction.....	9
2.2. Background on school feeding programmes.....	9
2.3. Implementation of the NSNP.....	11
2.4. The contribution of the NSNP to household food security	13
2.5. The participation and collaboration of stakeholders.....	16
2.6. The National School Nutrition Programme’s sustainability	19
2.7. The impact of the National School Nutrition Programme	20
2.8. Management of the NSNP	22
2.9. Monitoring and evaluation of the NSNP	24
2.10. Lessons from other studies.....	25
2.11. Conclusion	28
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	29
3.1. Research paradigm	29
3.2. Research design and methods.....	29
3.3. Target population	30
3.4. Research sampling.....	31
3.5. Data collection methods	32
3.6. Primary data	32
3.6.1. Interviews.....	32
3.6.2. Semi-structured interviews.....	32

3.6.3.Focus groups.....	33
3.6.4.Direct observation.....	33
3.6.4.1.Non-participant observation.....	34
3.7 Validity and reliability.....	35
3.8. Data analysis.....	35
3.8.1.Description.....	35
3.8.2.Interpretation.....	36
3.8.3.Critical thinking.....	36
3.9. Limitations and delimitations	36
3.10. Ethical considerations	37
3.10.1. Permission.....	37
3.10.1.1.Informed consent.....	37
3.10.1.2.Voluntary participation.....	38
3.10.2. Anonymity and confidentiality	38
3.10.3. No harm to the participants.....	38
3.10.4 Record keeping	39
3.11. Conclusion	39
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	40
4.1. Introduction.....	40
4.2. Demographic information of participants	40

4.3. Findings and discussion.....	42
4.3.1. Objectives of the programme.....	42
4.3.2. Implementation of the programme and roles of implementers.....	43
4.3.2.1.Roles of district and circuit NSNP officials.....	44
4.3.2.2.Roles of principals and school NSNP coordinators.....	44
4.3.3.Interventions towards household food security.....	44
4.3.3.1.Training,Monitoring and Support.....	44
4.3.4.Effectiveness of the programme.....	46
4.3.5.Sustainability of interventions towards household food security.....	47
4.3.5.1.Areas of improvement for sustainability according to participants	47
4.3.5.1.1.Training.....	48
4.3.5.1.2.Funding,Supply of food and Menu.....	48
4.3.5.2.Other area of improvement.....	49
4.4.Limitations of the findings.....	50
4.5. Findings on observation.....	50
4.5.1.School 'A' Food garden.....	51
4.5.2.School 'B' Food garden.....	53
4.6. Synthesis of Chapter 4.....	55

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	56
5.1. Introduction.....	56
5.2. Limitations of the study	56
5.3. Conclusions	56
5.4. Recommendations.....	57
REFERENCES.....	59
Annexure 1: Consent form.....	64
Annexure 2: TREC approval letter.....	66
Annexure 3: Permission letter.....	67
Annexure 4: Interview guide for parents.....	68
Annexure 5: Interview guide for circuit and district NSNP officials.....	70
Annexure 6: Interview guide for principles and district NSNP coordinators...72	
Annexure 7: Interview guide for food handlers.....	75

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. Introduction

In South Africa, school nutrition is a crucial social protection tool. Every school day across the nation, nine million children in more than 20 000 schools receive a meal from one of the government or NGO feeding programmes that operate across the country. The National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP), a government programme, has the potential to improve local livelihoods, access to schooling, learning results, and household food security (Devereux, Hochfeld, Karriem, Mensah, Morahanye, Msimango, Mukubonda, Naicker, Nkomo, Sanders and Sanousi., 2018:32). The potential of the NSNP to have an impact beyond its clearly defined goals is its most important feature; apart from providing food, the programme aims to give learners, teachers and parents the knowledge and skills necessary to cultivate their own food. The aim of the programme is to improve students' capabilities by providing a healthy lunch at school and to contribute to long-term home food security.

This chapter discusses the problem statement, the motivation for and purpose of the study, the research questions, and definitions of relevant concepts. It also provides an outline of the whole dissertation.

1.2. Background to the study

According to Gibson (2012:5), food security is a state in which everyone has access to enough food to eat every day, not only on a particular day. The availability of food to eat and the ability to maintain that availability continuously are thus the two key components of food security.

Before the dawn of democracy, one of the reasons some children could not attend school was hunger, as a result of a lack of sufficient food in their homes. When democracy dawned in 1994, programmes such as the Primary School Feeding Scheme were introduced to replace the previous feeding scheme of the old regime. It provided for a few primary schools, according to the Limpopo Provincial Report (2010/2011), and formed part of the Reconstruction and Development Programme

(RDP). In 2004 the Primary School Feeding Scheme was extended and renamed the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP).

The researcher's aim in this study was to determine whether the NSNP is being implemented in accordance with its objectives. According to previous studies (Gresse, Nomvete and Walter, 2017; Motoane, 2011) the NSNP has been able to provide one nutritious meal per day to learners, which contributes towards the improved health of learners, their concentration in class, their school enrolment and continued school attendance. Previous studies have mainly evaluated the implementation of the NSNP as far as quality and preparation of meals is concerned, focusing on nutritional content, impact of the programme and implementation challenges.

Previous studies include "Situational analysis: Implementation of NSNP in low socio-economic primary schools in Nelson Mandela Bay" by Gresse, *et al.* (2017), "Challenges in implementing NSNP at Khomela Primary School," by Netshipise (2015), and "Impact of NSNP in Tsimanyane Circuit, Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province" by Motoane (2011) except for an international study by Huang, Kim, & Barnidge, (2016) titled "Seasonal difference in national school lunch programme participation and its impact on household food security", which is unrelated to the NSNP. Previous studies comparable to this one have not evaluated the impact of feeding schemes specifically on household food security. This is the reason why the researcher deemed it necessary to engage in this particular study.

1.3. Problem statement

The NSNP aims to provide daily nutritious meals to improve learning capacity, assist with the establishment of food gardens in schools, and promote healthy lifestyles through nutritional education (DBE and DPME, 2014). Various sources, including the DBE website, NSNP Annual Reports and NSNP officials, present various objectives within the NSNP's overarching goal of boosting sustainable food production. According to Devereux *et al.* (2018:16), these goals include: obtaining fresh produce to supplement NSNP feeding; selling produce to raise money for schools; using produce as a teaching and learning resource; teaching students, teachers, and parents how to grow their own food for household food security; and improving the environment.

The researcher initiated this research with the assumption (based on observation) that the nutrition that is provided at schools that benefit from the NSNP is not sufficient for most of the learners. The implication is that even though learners are served meals at school through the NSNP, they may not be sufficient to supplement what they get or do not get at home nor sustain them. Increasing its relevance, appropriateness and efficacy are among the policy, management, implementation and future research recommendations that the programme has established for itself (Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme. Full Report, 2016:174). This indicates that additional investigation is absolutely necessary.

One of the NSNP's goals is to promote the widespread adoption of household and school food gardens, and to inculcate related skills amongst communities. However, there appears to be a vacuum in the promotion of sustainable food production efforts in schools. This means that there is a need for research about how the programme is implemented.

1.4. Motivation for the study

The National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) is mandated by the Constitution in Chapter 2 of the Bill of Rights, Section 28, sub-section 1, which states that "every child has the right to adequate nutrition, shelter, basic health care services, and social services". This study is pertinent, since obtaining wholesome food is a component of food security. As mentioned in point 1.3 above, the 2016 NSNP Report recommends the further development of policy, management and implementation, along with further research into the programme and its effects.

The NSNP faced numerous difficulties during its initial implementation stage, which drew the attention of researchers. Its problems, many of which have not been resolved, gave rise to this study, which examines specifically the effects of the programme on community food security. The researcher was interested in finding out how the programme is implemented in terms of its stated objectives.

1.5. Purpose of the study

1.5.1. Significance of the study

This study is significant because its findings will help decision-makers determine whether the National School Nutrition Programme's goal of supporting sustainable food production in schools is being achieved through its implementation. The availability of food and people's access to it, including pricing, are measured by the concept of "food security". The three main factors that determine whether a person has food security are availability, access and utilisation (Suresh *et al.*, 2009). The communities where recipient schools are located would benefit if household food security were indeed attained through the programme.

According to Hubbard (1995:2), it is beneficial to concentrate on family security since the household serves as the primary earning and decision-making entity for those who are at highest risk of malnutrition, i.e. infants and young children, pregnant women, and nursing mothers). Hubbard states that that food security is a useful concept because in rural areas access by poor households to an adequate supply of staple food may be particularly critical (1995:4). This observation supports the need for a study such as the current study. Hubbard's study focused on schools in rural Malamulele, and is therefore relevant to the current research, which is situated in the same area.

The research is also significant in that it fills gaps that exist in previous studies on the NSNP, specifically in terms of household food security. The results of this study will help schools determine whether they are applying NSNP correctly, and, if they adopt the recommendations made, could help them boost the programme's success. It is desirable that the programme not only contributes to the feeding of learners at schools but fulfils its overarching goal of enhancing food production in schools and homes, which lead to food security.

1.5.2. Aim of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) for household food security in selected Malamulele public schools, Limpopo Province.

1.5.3. Research objectives

Objectives are clear and explicit statements of the aim in conducting the research, including the question that is to be investigated (Terre-Blanch et al., 2006:24).

The objectives of this study are:

- to assess how the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) is being implemented at selected Malamulele schools;
- to identify the NSNP interventions that enhance sustainable household food security in the selected schools;
- to determine how the NSNP affects the availability of food in households in selected public schools.

1.6. Research questions

- How has implementation of the National of School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) been effective?
- What are the NSNP's interventions towards enhancing sustainable household food security?
- How does the NSNP impacts on the availability of food in households?

1.7. Definition of key concepts

1.7.1. National School Nutrition Programme

The South African Government's National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP), part of the Reconstruction and Development Programme, was launched in 1994. The primary goal of the NSNP is to improve the physical and mental well-being of the most disadvantaged students. Its objectives include fostering better learning through feeding, enhancing nutrition instruction in schools to encourage healthy lifestyles,

fostering sustainable food production, and creating partnerships to advance the programme.

1.7.2. Food security

Food security, according to Gibson (2012:7), is a condition that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. This is one of the most well-known and frequently used definitions of food security. According to Gibson (2012:27), food security is predicated on and underpinned by the notion of nutrition, whether good or bad; hence the following key concept – nutrition.

1.7.3. Nutrition

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines nutrition as food consumption that is considered in respect to dietary requirements. The foundation of good health is excellent nutrition, which is an appropriate, well-balanced diet combined with frequent physical exercise. Reduced immunity, greater vulnerability to disease, hampered physical and mental growth, and decreased productivity can all result from poor nutrition. The foundation of health and development is nutrition, which can be thought of as a continuum, with over-nutrition at one end and under-nutrition at the other (Gibson, 2012:103).

1.7.4.Sustainable

The term "sustainable" has several meanings. In Adelson et al. (2008:139), Lèlè (1991) makes a distinction between ecological and social sustainability. Others classify the third category of sustainability as "economic". There is debate over whether sustainability should be "strong", which calls for the preservation of a minimum amount of natural capital, or "weak", which allows for the substitution of different forms of capital (such as natural, manufactured, intellectual and social), as

long as the overall result enables future generations to maintain a minimal standard of living.

1.7.5. Household

A household, according to McGregor (2016:5), consists of one or more occupants of a housing unit or dwelling. Homes, hospitals, universities, apartments, convents, orphanages, boarding schools, hotels, and army barracks are not typically considered households. In addition, the term "household" does not apply to homeless people, who may temporarily seek refuge in shelters or live on the streets (UN, 2004). Household often refers to the physical building, the people (McGregor, 2016:24).

1.8. Outline of the dissertation

The study comprises five chapters as follows:

1.8.1. Chapter 1: Introduction and background

This chapter has described the background of the study, its particular area of focus, and the research aim, objectives and questions. It has also discussed the significance of the study and the given definitions of relevant concepts.

1.8.2. Chapter 2: Literature review

Other research, both internationally and locally, is presented in this chapter. The researcher discusses findings derived from academic books, journals and papers, along with the South African legislative framework on the subject.

1.8.3. Chapter 3: Research methodology and design

The chapter discusses the research design and methodology selected for this study, detailing the overall approach taken and the methods employed to gather and analyse the data.

1.8.4. Chapter 4: Data presentation, analysis and discussion

This chapter presents the study's findings and analyses and discusses them in order to reach a conclusion.

1.8.5. Chapter 5: Summary, conclusion and recommendations

The final chapter summarises the findings, draws conclusions and makes recommendations based on the findings.

1.9. Synthesis of the chapter

In essence, this chapter has answered questions that might arise when one considers undertaking research on the topic, such as "Why this study, and not another?" This hypothetical question was answered through a presentation of the problem statement, the motivation for and purpose of the study, the relevant concepts, and what may be expected of the whole study.

The following chapter discusses the topic on the basis of what other researchers have found with regard to the South African NSNP and school feeding in general. Reference is made to how school feeding is conducted in other countries and in various provinces of South Africa. Various forms of literature such as dissertations, articles, papers and legislation as described in government gazettes form part of the literature review.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The chapter covers the body of research on school feeding schemes and household food security. One of the primary goals of the NSNP is to enhance food security, a goal which, from observation, seems the least fulfilled and yet, according to the researcher, is the most important, in light of the crisis of poverty affecting so many South African rural households. The chapter examines issues beyond the NSPS's initial challenges of implementation, which mainly revolved around providing a meal for learners at schools. Since the programme has been in place for some time now, many logistical challenges have been resolved but the core issues to be considered remain.

In order to gain greater insight into the topic of school nutrition programmes, this chapter compares and contrasts many studies on the National School Nutrition Programme in South Africa, which provide a picture of the status quo. Similar programmes that operate in other countries are also reviewed.

2.2. Background on school feeding programmes

According to Kallaway (1996), in "Implementation evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme 2016", although large-scale state-sponsored feeding dates back to the early 1940s, when free milk was provided to roughly one million white, coloured, and some African school children, benefits were withdrawn in the 1950s and school feeding fell to charitable organisations. In 1994, school feeding was once more seen as a governmental duty, and the Primary School Nutrition Programme (PSNP), which was run by the Department of Health (DoH) until 2003, was established. In 2004, it was transferred to the Department of Education.

Prior to being expanded to Quintile 1 and 2 secondary schools in April 2009, the nutrition programme was intended primarily for primary schools; hence the name Primary School Nutrition Programme (PSNP). Some of the criteria for participation were age of the needy children, number of the dependents in the household,

employment status, family food support, and total income of the family. According to these criteria, the objective of ensuring food security remains important.

The Primary School Nutrition Programme (PSNP) was initially intended to be a temporary solution that would be phased out once programmes under the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) took over. The PSNP's objectives included enhancing educational outcomes by providing early-morning snacks that would satisfy 25% of the recommended daily allowance (RDA) of energy requirements, enhancing health via micronutrient supplementation, parasite control, and the dissemination of nutritional information (Health Safety Trust, 1996:2).

Thus, the NSNP had its roots in the Primary School Nutrition Programme (PSNP), which aimed simply to ensure that hunger did not interfere with studying. The initiative targeted all students in South Africa's Quintile 1–3 public schools, constituting 60% of all schools, and the poorest. Its intended recipients were therefore learners from underprivileged socioeconomic situations (DBE and DPME, 2014).

In contrast to the PSNP, the NSNP focuses on much broader goals than simply fulfilling immediate hunger needs for improving educational attainment. It seeks to improve the educational experience of the most vulnerable primary school students by encouraging regular attendance, easing temporary hunger, enhancing focus, promoting overall health improvement and enhancing the practice of food gardening (DBE and DPME, 2014). The instillation of long-term healthy eating habits and the knowledge of food gardening are the most far-reaching objectives of the programme and are the goals against which the success of the programme must ultimately be evaluated. It is only when these goals are attained that the programme can be considered to have had lasting impact.

The majority of schools in South Africa lack functional food gardens, according to the NSNP log frame's key assumptions. The main reasons offered for this are a lack of water and human resources (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report 2016:151). The log frame lists its intended outcomes as: Land, water, seeds and tools are available for gardening in the community; community members are willing to be appointed as garden managers; training is appropriate and pitched at the correct level for garden managers; funds are sufficient, and schools are able to access seedlings

and other inputs in close proximity (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:150).

However, it appears that the attainment of these outcomes has not been evaluated, as the DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016) does not include them in its final evaluation. The researcher believes that this study will establish whether or not these goals have in fact been attained, and if so, to what extent. With regard to whether or not the process theory holds true, and the programme is being implemented as planned, individual schools are likely to differ, since previous studies and reports have found that while some schools have flourishing food gardens, many have none at all.

2.3. Implementation of the NSNP

Implementing the NSNP necessitates adherence to numerous laws, including those outlined in the Republic of South Africa's Constitution. Every child has the right to basic nutrition, shelter, basic health care and social services, as stated in the Republic of South Africa's Constitution, Section 28 (Sub-section 1c). Since the NSNP is a national programme, it is essential that its implementation adheres to the Constitution, which is the nation's highest legislation.

For implementation of any programme to be effective, implementers should have a clear idea of the purpose and objectives of the programme. The major goal of the NSNP is to raise the nutritional and health status of the most underprivileged primary and secondary school students. Its primary goals include supporting sustainable food production efforts in schools, boosting nutrition teaching in schools to encourage healthy lifestyles, enhancing the programme through partnerships, and enhancing learning through the provision of school meals (DBE and DPME, 2014).

So far, government has managed to ensure improvements in health and nutritional status for poor learners through the provision of much-needed nutritious food in schools, which contributes to the enhancement of learning. The researcher is not convinced, however, that it has succeeded in promoting sustainable food production; hence this study.

Furthermore, in the Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016:11), the first question asked in the Terms of Reference is: “Is the programme implemented as planned?” This is an important question to ask when one seeks to uncover whether any programme or project is effective, and is especially relevant in this study, since its focus is on the NSNP’s implementation. Bundy *et al.* (2009), in the NSNP Report (2016) suggest six indicators to evaluate the design and implementation of programmes. Two that are pertinent to this study are (i) whether or not the programme has appropriate objectives, or what issues the programme will address; and (ii) whether an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system is in place and operating. The last applies at both the level of the Department of Education and the level of the school.

Shaw, in Khuzwayo (2016:18), argues that in order to guarantee the efficiency of any programme, suitable monitoring and evaluation policies should be in place during implementation. It appears to the researcher that in this area, NSNP is lacking, as little monitoring and evaluations seems to take place in schools. This observation is supported by Motoane (2011) in his study, “The impact of NSNP in Tsimanyane Circuit, Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province”, where he states that there is little monitoring and support of the programme in participating schools. Motoane (2011:49) recommends that the Department of Basic Education regularly visits schools to gain a sense of the challenges they face. Motoane (2011) also recommends that an intervention plan be devised to deal with the programme’s challenges.

In order to determine if the programme is being carried out as intended, the DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016:11) examines the second chain of outcomes, which is related to school food gardens. According to their findings, very little financing is available for food gardens from the NSNP Conditional Grant; therefore, assistance from partners such as the Department of Agriculture and non-profit organisations is crucial. The schools have land and water for food plots. Partners could help by supplying resources and inputs such as infrastructure, machinery and seeds.

The sustainable management of food gardens requires a garden manager, who may be hired from the local community. The garden is planted and maintained with the help of the learners. Although food from the garden may be used to supplement school

meals or given to children in need, the main goal is to spur enthusiasm, increase awareness, and improve gardening skills (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:167). The researcher is of the opinion that school food gardens would function effectively if financing, land and water (along with infrastructure such as hosepipes and watering cans) were made available to schools. Other aspects such as the appointment of suitable garden managers who can motivate and involve learners are also critical.

Devereux *et al.* (2018:36) argue in their study that numerous implementation-related components of the NSNP need to be improved, including (amongst others) incorporating parents and local communities in planning and maintaining school food gardens. Their suggestion emphasises the importance of involving the relevant stakeholders in implementation of the NSNP for its success. If this is done properly, challenges such as lack of garden managers would not be experienced, as parents and the local community would assist, giving meaningful input.

2.4. The contribution of the NSNP to household food security

Everyone has the right to sufficient food and water, according to the South African Constitution, Chapter 2, Bill of Rights, Section 27 (Sub-section 1b). In simple terms, this means that everyone has the right to food security, and food security exists when nutritious food is available, accessible and affordable for all people at all times. Nutrition programmes such as the NSNP are meant to assist with alleviating hunger, whether in developed or developing countries, by providing nutritious fruits and vegetables. In schools specifically, they are meant to contribute to effective learning.

In the United States, one of the most crucial food aid programmes to guarantee children's food security and healthy development is the National School Lunch Programme (NSLP), which is similar to the NSNP. Results from the journal article "Seasonal differences in national school lunch programme participation and its impacts on household food security" (Huang, Kim and Barnidge, 2016:235) suggest that the NSLP plays a significant role in promoting food security among low-income households with children. Important policy implications derive from these results, since the NSLP protects low-income households from low food security.

The researcher believes that the South African school nutrition programme should promote food security not only among learners at schools but in learners' households. Many South African families are poverty-stricken, especially in rural villages, including those in Limpopo Province where the schools in this study are based. The 2016 study by Huang *et al.* (2016) shows that food security is a global issue that needs to be viewed in a serious light, with efforts made to ensure the implementation of all policies that pertain to the matter. This includes the NSNP.

According to Tomlinsin (2016:35), food sovereignty implies that protecting the right to food also entails ensuring that people have access to the resources necessary to produce food, such as land, fisheries, seeds and other resources. This claim emphasises the need for gardens for growing food to support household food security and to maintain food security generally, whether the gardens are located at schools or in learners' backyards. The NSNP Evaluation Report (2016) indicates that land is available for food production, but it remains to be determined whether enough seeds and water are available at schools and in households to ensure food security.

Mawela and van den Berg (2018:33) claim that the NSNP's advantages extend beyond the school, since principals in their study reported that food parcels were given to needy students on Fridays, as part of the programme's contribution to the community. However, the researcher is of the view that this kind of contribution, on its own, breeds dependency on the part of those who are given these food parcels, and that such efforts have little lasting impact. A better idea might be to hand out food parcels only as a supplement to those who are already being assisted with food gardens, in terms of receiving tools. The handing out of tools, along with the necessary instructions, would go further to enhancing food security and independence than the handing out of food parcels alone. Basic tools and gardening skills would enable people to help themselves and impart something valuable and permanent that recipients could use for the rest of their lives.

Although this was not the main focus of their research, Mawela and van den Berg (2018:34) suggest that school vegetable gardens could be used for teaching science, environmental studies and nutrition. They also recommend further research in the area of school nutrition. The current study aims to answer some of the questions that they may be referring to, since it focuses on school gardens and whether they meet the

objectives that they are intended to meet. The researcher agrees that school gardens can meet some of objectives listed by Mawela and van den Berg (2018:34) but is of the view that the objectives should not be limited to enhancing theoretical knowledge. A practical outcome of school feeding schemes, and indeed their main objective, should be to impart gardening skills for the sustainability of food production beyond the schools.

Another worrying aspect of the NSNP is that its targets for sustainable food production are described by several sources, including the DBE website, annual reports, and NSNP officials (Devereaux *et al.*, 2018:16). These include getting fresh produce to augment NSNP meals, teaching students, teachers and parents how to cultivate their own food for household security and making the school environment more beautiful. Thus, the sustainable food production in schools (SFPS) pillar has a set of unclear goals, in addition to restrictions imposed by lack of funds. According to the researcher, this lack of clarity is to blame for most schools in the nation ignoring the most crucial SFSP objective – that of providing teachers, parents and students with the knowledge and skills necessary to grow their own food. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that the DBE does not provide adequate funding for school gardens.

Thus, sustainable food production in schools appears to be a neglected pillar of the NSNP. School food gardens have the potential to improve student learning, home food security and local job creation, as Devereaux *et al.* (2018:17) note. The researcher concurs with this observation. It is clear that to fulfil only one part of a programme would hamper its full potential, as appears to be the case with the NSNP. Unless schools are able or given a chance to exploit all possible ways of implementing the programme, its effectiveness might never be realised.

The National Workshop on School Feeding in South Africa (2018:7) provided the basis for the third theory of change on poverty reduction. It states that improvements in children's food security in the short term and their access to and performance in education in the medium-term amount to an investment in human capital that can stop the intergenerational transmission of poverty and reduce household and national poverty rates in the long run. This theory of change correlates with the main objective that the NSNP should strive to fulfil, which is to invest in household food security for future generations.

2.5. The participation and collaboration of stakeholders

Because the South African NSNP is a national policy, it was necessary for the researcher to examine international studies on national food security such as that by Saint Ville, Hickey and Phillip (2017). Their study, titled, “The case of Saint Lucia: How do stakeholder relationships influence Caribbean national food security policies?” found that stakeholders in a Saint Lucia food security programme had little success in identifying shared objectives, in terms of collaboration. A gap between policy and practice was one of the things that concerned most participants in their study. The study concluded that the creation of public policies requires a multi-stakeholder approach (Saint Ville, Hickey and Phillip, 2017:59). The results demonstrate that engagement and cooperation by pertinent stakeholders, such as learners' parents, is necessary for the successful implementation of any community-level food security programme. This is especially true for national initiatives such as the NSNP (2017:62). It is clear that collaboration and broad participation is necessary for the success of programmes rooted in the community, so that participants do not lose focus and begin working toward different goals.

The positive impact of the United States National School Lunch Programme (NSLP) reveals the importance of these kind of programmes in ensuring food security; hence the researcher’s interest in investigating the implementation of the NSNP towards household food security as one of its objectives (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:235). Significant policy changes can be made on the basis of finding in studies such as the current study to enhance household food security and child well-being (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:242).

In “The 2007/2008 Financial Year Report for Sustainable Food Production in Schools, the Cabinet Decision (23 January 2003) and Government Programme of Action (GPoA)”, the Department of Education was mandated to implement and manage the NSNP and lead the mobilisation of civil society and social sector departments in setting up school vegetable gardens as a food security initiative. This is in accordance with the sustainable food production in schools (SFPS) sub-programme of the NSNP, the goal of which is to encourage and support the establishment and maintenance of food production initiatives in schools. These include vegetable and herb gardens, fruit orchards, poultry, small livestock and fish rearing. The realisation of this objective

obviously needs the participation of stakeholders such as teachers, learners, school governing bodies and learners' parents, in order to extend the initiative to learners' homes to ensure household food security.

Olubayo, Amisi-Aluvi and Namusonge (2015:1433) emphasise the idea of broad collaboration by suggesting that community involvement in the form of parent associations improves problem-solving and the sustainability of school feeding programmes.

According to Motoane's (2011:52) recommendations, there is little involvement of parents in the programme so far, which needs to change so that the programme impacts positively on learners. This recommendation, amongst others, simply implies that participation and collaboration by stakeholders is not taking place as it should. This should be carefully looked at and rectified for implementation to be successful. Community participation is one of the core principles of development and needs to be adhered to in the implementation of the NSNP, just as in any other developmental programme.

Rendall-Mkosi, Wenhold, and Sibanda (2013:47) state that community involvement is limited to parents serving on school governing bodies (SGBs) who are attracted by the prospect of receiving a stipend as volunteer food handlers in the DBE Implementation Evaluation Report (VFHs). Beyond them, the programme barely engages with the community, and there is hardly any "systematic communication with the community" (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report 2016:45). The DBE acknowledges this fact in its 2016 report, and it is incumbent upon them to rectify a weakness they acknowledge. It is also a compelling factor that the researcher believes need to be researched further, since time has passed since the report was written and there may be new developments.

In terms of the training of stakeholders already participating in the programme such as the voluntary food handlers (VFH), according to the DBE (Year) report, the percentage of people involved in the programme who have been trained was only 3,2%, which is really inadequate in view of the fact that they are handling food. Voluntary food handlers are mainly parents of learners who, if given an opportunity to acquire skills,

would be able to use them for gardening in their own homes, which would ensure food security.

Participation rates among students in food gardening activities are generally low. The primary issues here appear to be a lack of staff to manage the school grounds and a shortage of water (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report 2016:153). This, according to the researcher, cannot be the case for all schools and needs to be studied further since the issue of gardening has always been there in one form or the other, even as part of curriculum.

Again, the report found that principals and NSNP co-ordinators (educators) had far higher participation than community stakeholders, which is regarded as a sign of ownership (DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP the Report, 2016:102). Effective participation by pertinent stakeholders results in ownership and protection of any programme or project, but it doesn't appear that this is the case with the NSNP.

The many parties involved in the programme seem to be aware of their duties and obligations and are largely carrying them out, especially at the national level. At lower levels, there are no regulations governing the distribution of personnel and resources, and institutional systems differ greatly between provinces (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:140). It is clear that implementation in terms of involving stakeholders is ineffective because there are no rules at lower levels and a variety of arrangements.

One of the recommendations in the DBE study is that the NSNP's food production component be revitalized, and that the food gardening component at the school level be led by committed employees. Garden managers with suitable experience should be hired, paid a stipend, and provided with training in the same way as VFHs are (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:176). If this was the case in all schools which are implementing NSNP, the researcher believes that if there are garden managers who are teachers and tend to be complaining about time spent in the garden, their problem would be resolved and the skills that need to be transferred to the learners and their parents would be transferred with ease.

Partnerships are vital for the NSNP, according to Devereux et al. when discussing the role of NGOs and the private sector, both to augment the delivery of the programme and to pilot innovative ideas (Devereux *et al.* 2018:30). These are other very important stakeholders that can assist in effective implementation of NSNP, according to the researcher, especially in terms of funding and other resources. They should clearly be involved if government is serious about achieving all the objectives set for the programme and not some of them.

For instance, the Joint Aid Management (JAM), which has operations in several nations, including South Africa, provides small farmers with the tools they need to manage and administer backyard and community gardens as part of its agricultural development program. Every ECD centre supported by JAM is also urged to cultivate a food garden to further complement the children's dietary requirements and serve as an "outside physical classroom to help them learn" (Devereux *et al.* 2018:31). Partnerships and collaborations like this are what is needed to achieve the most important objective of sustainable food production in schools through school gardens and go far beyond ensuring household food security.

2.6. The National School Nutrition Programme's sustainability

The goals have not changed since the 2016 NSNP Report, with one of the four key goals still being to support sustainable food production activities in schools. A versatile notion, food security is typically utilized at three aggregate levels: national, regional, and household or individual. According to Suresh, the FAO's 1996 definition of food security was adopted in the 1996 Food Summit: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient food that matches their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life" (Suresh 2009:8).

Home gardens are essential for the sustainability of household food security, according to a study by Megbowon et al. (2014) on the assessment of food security among households in the Eastern Cape Province. The researcher also agrees since it is the easiest and less expensive way which has been practised since ancient times, including sustenance farming to ensure food security.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, studies have also been done about NSNP here in South Africa (Limpopo), they mainly investigate its impact or challenges, like 'The challenges in implementing NSNP at Khomela Primary School by Netshipise T.R. (2015). The study primarily focuses on some of the goals and practical aspects of implementing the National School Nutrition Programme and the need to enhance such.

The NSNP has an objective aimed at boosting sustainable food production, according to the DBE Report on NSNP implementation. The focus is on using food production as a learning tool rather than as a means of maintaining the NSNP. According to Bundy et al. in the NSNP Report, it is impractical and potentially exploitative to expect food production in schools to maintain a nutrition program. This is in keeping with international guidelines that the aim of school food gardens should be primarily instructional (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:47). The researcher agrees with Bundy et al, in a sense that the educational skills that the learners will get from school food gardens, as well as their parents will promote sustainable food production as far as their homes, thereby promoting household food security as well,

2.7. The impact of the National School Nutrition Programme

A number of policy objectives, research studies, programmes and initiatives, have a commonality of the importance of nutrition programmes, either for an individual or household benefit. Findings also indicate that government role in ensuring food security is also key. Food security has also remained a global phenomenon and critical need for human survival, especially for current generation and generations to come.

In their study "Situational Analysis: Implementation of NSNP in Low Socio-Economic Primary Schools in Nelson Mandela Bay" Gresse, Nomvete, and Walter (2017:63) discovered that some students did not take part in NSNP while other schools did not adhere to the recommended menu. The most important matter though, is participation by the most vulnerable learners who are from poor families and who need the meals most.

The government, or more specifically the Department of Basic Education, has also made progress in ensuring that schools follow the recommended menu, and that food

is consistently provided to schools. What is key though, one may argue, is whether NSNP is able to have impact on its beneficiaries after implementation, and whether that impact is positive or negative. Positive impact will be realised if only implementation is done accordingly. The number of school food gardens in South Africa has decreased recently, according to Rendall-Mkosi et al. in the DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP Report (2016:47), however the reasons why are not given. This is surely reason for concern, and it is one area that this study seeks to deal with as this is an indicator that impact is declining as well.

Because the theory of change and results of school feeding programs in general, and the NSNP in particular, are not obvious, Devereux et al. argue that a more fundamental problem is a lack of clarity surrounding what hypothesised impacts should be studied (Devereux *et al.* 2018:14). Therefore, the researcher thinks that this claim needs to be further investigated.

The NSNP is likely to have an impact if;1) the change theory (i.e., links from inputs, activities, and outputs to outcomes and impact) is plausible;2) important assumptions outlined in the log frame hold true; and 3) the process theory holds true, and the programme is implemented as planned (DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP Report 2016:147). It is, therefore, imperative to first outline some of these inputs/activities, as well as outcomes, in order to evaluate if there is impact.

The NSNP's Theory of Change is built on four outcome chains that lead to the program's objective, which is to improve access to education and learning ability (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:25). Establishing school food gardens, educating school communities about food gardening, teaching students gardening skills, and fostering an interest in food gardening are the second result that this project is interested in. The researcher will need to determine whether school gardens have been built, whether food gardening awareness has been raised in school communities, whether students are receiving gardening instruction, and whether an interest in food gardening has been sparked.

Students should be involved in planting and maintaining the garden to increase awareness, teach gardening skills, and spark an interest in food gardening. This will also improve their understanding of food production. Some students may even start

their own food gardens at home. According to DBE Evaluation Report, the main goal is to stimulate interest, create awareness, and transmit gardening skills, even though food from the gardens may be utilized to supplement school meals or distributed to underprivileged students in the schools (DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report, 2016:26). The researcher believes that this is the most practical, easiest and interesting way of imparting the knowledge without doing it formally in the classroom, and, therefore, plausible. This outcomes chain's key presumption is that there is land and water accessible for establishing a food garden and that there is a mechanism to protect it from stray animals and theft (DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP Report, 2016:27).

Overall, one cannot overlook the impact that NSNP was able to achieve so far, despite the fact that there is room for improvement, the main one being that learners are mostly receiving NSNP meals regularly according to Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP (DPME, 2017:1). NSNP also complies with the following national imperatives: first, to reduce poverty (STATSSA, 2013 and 2015); second, to protect children's rights, including the right to basic nutrition and education (Leatt et al. 2015); third, to achieve universal access to education (DBE and MIET Africa, 2010); fourth, to improve learner concentration (meals provide nutrients that aid concentration and serve as an incentive for students to attend regularly and stay in school); fifth, to achieve universal access to education (DBE, 2014: 58).

Children at the schools receiving NSNP received higher marks than those at control schools in both the first and last terms. In terms of educational results, students at schools receiving nutrition interventions do better than those who do not receive such interventions. According to Graham *et al.* (2015:10) in Devereux *et al.*, (2018:15) there is some evidence that school feeding interventions can improve children's nutritional status by lowering the prevalence of wasted and underweight children, which are signs of short-term malnutrition (as was the case when evaluating school feeding in the Western Cape), stunting, and even protection against overweight and obesity.

2.8. Management of the NSNP

In addition to other earlier studies that shared the same perspective on the NSNP, Mbusi in Mawela and van den Berg (2018:31) claim that despite the fact that school

nutrition programs provide a number of benefits, in the context of South Africa, the service has faced management difficulties. He also suggests that the NSNP needs to be managed urgently, particularly in regard to encouraging sustainable food production in schools and effective cooperation with non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and other stakeholders. The researcher absolutely agrees that management of NSNP leaves much to be desired in some areas and for any project or activity to be successful needs effective management and accountability by those responsible.

In their analysis of the literature, Mawela and van den Berg (2018:31) discovered a sizable knowledge and competence gap in the management of nutrition programs. Many school principals and nutrition coordinators are overwhelmed by the lack of a clear strategy for managing nutrition programs. Teachers believe that overseeing a school nutrition programme places a significant burden on their teaching and learning time and jeopardizes their academic performance. Principals, who already have a full job, are similarly affected. This paints a picture that shows that NSNP is viewed as an extra burden to stakeholders who have been given the responsibility to manage it and with this kind of a negative view; they are likely not to do the tasks assigned to them in a diligent manner.

According to Mawela and van den Berg's (2018:32) results, principals and nutrition coordinators were generally aware of their responsibilities with regard to the NSNP. Principals of schools mostly discussed the program's general management, which included the management of coordinators and food handlers. Additionally, they hinted in their answers to the interview that they had identified some of the jobs not included in the NSNP policy but had been unable to complete them all because of time restraints or their workload. This emphasises the fact that management of NSNP in schools might not be happening in a manner that was envisaged when the programme was initiated or as effective as it should be, and initiators should find a better way to manage NSNP in order to achieve the set objectives.

One of the principals at Mawela and van den Berg (2018:33) acknowledged that having a vegetable garden at the school was not always simple as it added additional management responsibility to the effort. This was considered as a further difficulty. Six of the eight schools where they conducted the research had active vegetable gardens, whereas one had an inactive one. They add that despite having vegetable gardens,

schools frequently struggled to produce enough vegetables due to a lack of available land or water, despite having these gardens.

In light of the aforementioned difficulty, they also advise that nutrition coordinators adopt a developmental training programme on time and resource management to help them balance managing food handlers and teaching. Naturally, this would only be somewhat helpful, but since this was mentioned as one of the difficulties, it does not imply that the additional workload would be decreased. The researcher suggests that nutrition coordinators be recruited to assist administrators and teachers and relieve them of the responsibility of daily coordination of the nutrition programme (Mawela and van den Berg, 2018:34). If done, it will increase commitment to and attention on executing the NSNP as it should be.

2.9. Monitoring and evaluation of the NSNP

According to Drake et al in DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP Report (2016:127) report, the literature review highlighted accountability and quality assurance systems as a critical component supporting the successful implementation of school nutrition programs, despite the fact that many programs had this mechanism categorized as "poor". Again, the NSNP calls for extensive monitoring and reporting at all levels. The researcher wants to know whether monitoring and assessment are being done at all levels, how extensive they are, and how effective they are. As of now, the investigation has shown that problems with monitoring that district officials have described span different implementation models, including a lack of staff, a high staff turnover rate, and restricted access to cars.

Interviewees' opinions on the effectiveness of the monitoring and reporting systems varied according to the department's evaluation, which also identified other challenges such as the national reporting system's heavy reliance on compliance and the lack of standardization of the indicators and report templates used in different provinces and at different levels (DBE Implementation Evaluation of NSNP Report, 2016:130). With this kind of variety in monitoring and reporting system at different levels, especially concerning indicators, key objectives to be achieved are bound to be missed. This is

why, according to the researcher, such an important objective which this study is dealing with, about sustainable food production is overlooked.

Compliance and low-quality reporting have always been long-standing challenges with regard to implementation of policy in different government departments which hinders efficiency of very important programmes. According to the DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016:140) report all provinces except Gauteng have the capacity to verify district and school reports. A programme that is implemented without the necessary capacity is always bound to fail and monitoring and evaluation, as a crucial part of implementation, that is not effective cannot yield positive results because that is where you realise what is working and what is not working, in order to come up with strategies for improvement.

Devereux *et al.* (2018:34) state that a more robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system is required for school feeding in South Africa in order to provide an evidence foundation and produce recommendations for better programming decision-making. Clearly, monitoring and evaluation for NSNP in South Africa, including other programmes, leaves a lot to be desired based on the above statement as well as other studies mentioned here, and government needs to do something about it.

2.10. Lessons from other studies

It is these gaps that are realised after research is conducted that intrigue further studies. This study also seeks to find out if there are gaps in other areas otherwise not identified by previous studies done by other researchers concerning the National School Nutrition Programme.

Another takeaway from Khuzwayo's (2016) article is that internal monitoring and assessment, which has been lacking since the school feeding program's beginning, is one of the key challenges it faces. The researcher concurs with Khuzwayo since improper monitoring and evaluation make it difficult to implement most developmental programs. Most programmes with great objectives and strategies end up not being implemented properly, if at all implemented, just like many policies here in South Africa.

One of Khuzwayo's (2018:81) recommendations is that the school governing body (SGB) should be provided with the knowledge and skills necessary to supervise the execution of the national school nutrition programme in accordance with Regulation R198 of 1999. This is one area that the researcher is going to look at to find out if SGB's, as well as other stakeholders at school level are knowledgeable and skilled enough to implement NSNP accordingly.

According to Afula and Odula (2018:13784), in their study titled "Considerations for the Shift in Roles of National and County Governance towards the Realization of Food Security in Kenya," government should increase accountability by clearly delineating roles and ensure adequate participation, especially from the population segments that are food insecure. The researcher also fully agrees with this finding in their study because without clear allocation and understanding of responsibilities to those concerned, implementation of any task cannot be effective.

However, the researcher disagrees with Afula and Odula (2018) when they suggest that governments have been faced with a challenge of proliferation of organisations in the past years have resulted in multiple, alternative institutional frameworks that have weakened the state, resulting in ensuing power struggle which makes it difficult for governments to enact legislation or design policies that guarantee the right to food. It is difficult to believe that government can be weakened by other organisations, instead of being strengthened, hence the researcher believes that they are there to supplement government and in turn government should just ensure that all its policies are implemented to the core.

The fact that in the abstract and results of their study, 'Situational Analysis: Implementation of the National School Nutrition Programme in Low Socio-Economic Primary Schools in Nelson Mandela Bay', Gresse *et al* (2017:59-63) indicate that 1 out of 8 primary schools had a vegetable garden providing for meals calls for concern for the researcher.

According to the DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016:95), learning from the school food garden need be didactic. Students can gain the knowledge and gardening skills they need to start their own gardens at home or spark an interest in agriculture through hands-on learning. However, the learner survey

found that the likelihood of this happening is low, which is, 22, 2% of the students that responded to the survey who worked in the school food garden. Concerning, 9, 4% of those who did so did so as punishment, meaning they would link gardening with punishment rather than something they would like and gain from. Only 70% of those who did so did so as part of a lesson. The lesson that the researcher learns here, is that as far as school gardens are concerned, people who are responsible, or rather stakeholders, have different views and objectives regarding the use of gardens. This has to be changed, so that all involved focus on the same objective, i.e. to transfer skills and develop interest in gardening if household food security is to be achieved.

Of the various studies and reports done, the most common challenges and recommendations given have to do with monitoring, for example, the recommended that monitoring at school level should be improved, according to the DBE Implementation Evaluation of the NSNP Report (2016:11).

In addition to the various prior studies mentioned in this study, Devereux *et al.* (2018) state in their study that there have been very few evaluations of school feeding in South Africa. One of the many explanations for this is that school feeding is frequently viewed as a logistical exercise: the benefits of feeding poor children at school are obvious; there is no need to quantify impacts; instead, it is sufficient to check that the programme is being carried out effectively and efficiently.

For this long-running program, there are no baseline survey data available, and it is nearly impossible to establish a control group when almost all participants are poor. The researcher does not agree with the views of Devereux *et al.* above about reasons for having few evaluations on the NSNP. In fact, there is more reason to quantify impacts of the programme than the most obvious benefits since the programme has more than one objective. All the objectives for NSNP need to be quantified for the programme to be completely effective.

The final conclusion from Devereux *et al.* (2018)'s working paper is that, despite the NSNP's substantial scope and cost, its objectives and priority outcomes are nebulous and that there has been insufficient research on the program's effects. This indicates that the NSNP's goals and the difference it is making are unclear beyond merely providing meals to students. They continue by saying that while promoting sustainable

food production through school food gardens and possible local procurement is a key goal of the NSNP, neither the budget nor the policy-making procedures have paid much attention to this component. The researcher totally agrees with Devereux *et al* (2018) with regard to the importance of the objective and the fact that it might not be receiving as much attention as it should, hence the engagement in this particular study by the researcher.

What planning and organizing is required to make it work better, particularly in provinces with decentralized systems of procurement for school feeding; what is the contribution of NSNP to local economic development; how much do schools use foodstuffs purchased from local communities; what happens to the food produced in school food gardens are questions that Devereux *et al.*, (2018:33) also pose in the implications for further research and policy. These are highly essential questions to address since they further examine the success of NSNP implementation, particularly in terms of enhancing household food security, which is the primary focus of this study.

2.11. Conclusion

This preceding chapter was basically highlighting what this study is all about and the areas that it will be concentrating on, which are of much significance concerning NSNP according to the researcher, also considering other relevant previous studies by various researchers. The following chapter will deal with the technical aspects of the research, such as research methods, data collection, and analysis, as well as the ethical aspects of the research, such as considerations and limitations, which are critical to having a credible outcome at the end.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

According to Abutabenjeh and Jaradat (2018:24), each research methodology has advantages and disadvantages, and some approaches are more suited for studying particular concepts than others. This chapter describes the population being studied, the sampling process, the research paradigm, the research design, and the data collection method. The validity and dependability of the research tool are discussed. There is also discussion of the research's ethical issues.

3.1. Research paradigm

A research paradigm may be seen as a "camp" to which a researcher is committed in terms of assumptions, propositions, reasoning, and research methodology, according to Bakkabulindi (2015:21). Study paradigms are crucial because they affect the researcher's choices regarding the research topics to concentrate on and the methods to use. The researcher used an interpretivist paradigm in this investigation.

The interpretivist paradigm, according to Hammersley (2013:26), is based on the idea that methods used to understand knowledge in the human and social sciences cannot be the same as those used in the physical sciences because humans interpret their environment and then act in accordance with that interpretation while the rest of the world does not. In place of a measurement-based truth, this paradigm adopts a relativist ontology in which a same phenomenon may have different interpretations. Instead, then attempting to generalize the basis of understanding for the entire population, researchers typically get a deeper understanding of the event and its complexity in its own context, according to Creswell (2007). The researcher chose the interpretivist paradigm because participants may have different perspectives on the same program, which is what the study seeks to discover, rather than being subjective or having assumptions.

3.2. Research design and methods

According to Kumar (2014:122), a research design is the road map that you decide to follow during your research journey in order to find answers to your research questions as validly, objectively, accurately, and economically as possible. This research

employed the exploratory research design. As stipulated by Stevens and Wrenn (2013:87) exploratory research design is most useful when the researcher wants to discover ideas and insights. It is appropriate for this study given that the design seeks to assist the researcher to attain more information concerning the phenomenon studied.

This study utilized qualitative research methods. The researcher's choice of methodology is also emphasized by Maree(ed.) in Creswell *et al* (2016:83), when he says that using a qualitative methodology provides researchers with the tools (e.g. Interviews, observation, documents) to study complex phenomena within their contexts. According to Elliott, Fischer, and Rennie (1999:215-229), qualitative research allows the researcher to gather information and gain insight into the actions being investigated.

According to Van Zyl (2014:213), qualitative research is social or behavioural science research that employs exploratory techniques such as interviews, surveys, case schools studies, and other relatively personal techniques to investigate the processes that underpin human behaviour. This research method is appropriate for this study because it allows the researcher to collect detailed information while also providing a comprehensive view of stakeholders' perceptions of the NSNP's theory of change.

3.3. Target population

According to Neuman (2006:224), population is the abstract concept of a large group of many cases from which the researcher draws a sample and from which results from a sample are generalized. This study's population includes schools from Malamulele area, under Collins Chabane Municipality, in Vhembe District of Limpopo Province, which is primarily rural. Collins Chabane Municipality has a population of 347 974, according to the 2020/2021 Review IDP (2007-2017 rates), with Malamulele having a relatively larger population than the rest. For the review period mentioned, poverty rate was high, at 72% and unemployment at 20,4% (2020:136). There are 30 schools in Malamulele South circuit and they all benefit from the programme, hence the need for NSNP, as also indicated by the statistics outlined above.

3.4. Research sampling

According to Kumar (2014:229), sampling is the process of selecting a few (a sample) from a larger group to estimate or predict the prevalence of an unknown piece of information, situation, or outcome pertaining to the larger group. A sample is a subset of the population that is of interest to you. According to Neale (2009:130), a credible cohort is chosen without bias and reflects the people in the interest group. Purposive sampling was used in this study. Purposive sampling, according to Bryman *et al* (2011:186), aims to sample cases/participants in a strategic manner so that those sampled are relevant to the research questions. The researcher selected two NSNP officials from Vhembe East District Department of Education (one manager and one coordinator), one Malamulele South Circuit NSNP official, three principals of the selected schools within Malamulele area three school NSNP coordinators, foodhandlers (three per school from two schools and four from one school) and four parents with children from the three schools within Malamulele area, in the Limpopo Province.

The researcher selected these participants purposefully based on the fact that firstly, the officials and principals are directly involved in the programme as implementers and they also have influence in decision making, as well as the knowledge and experience needed for this study. The foodhandlers are also directly involved in storage and preparation of food, whereas parents can observe the impact of the implementation through their children. Those excluded in the study are learners in the selected school, since they may not have the necessary information that will be able to answer to the objectives of this study, especially with regard to implementation of NSNP towards food security.

The schools selected are all situated at the rural villages of far north Limpopo Province and are all quintile 2 schools. Many of the students at the schools come from child-headed or grandparent-headed families, some because their parents work in cities far from home, and others because they rely on social grants for income.

3.5. Data collection methods

According to Kumar (2014:170), most data collection methods can be used in studies classified as qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. The distinction is primarily determined by the constraints placed on the philosophy underpinning the inquiry, the freedom and flexibility in the structure and approach to data collection, and the depth and freedom granted to you as a researcher in probing to obtain answers to your research questions. The researcher used the following data collection methods for this study:

3.6. Primary data

3.6.1. Interviews

An interview is a conversation with someone during which you attempt to elicit information from them. The data could be facts, opinions, or attitudes, or any combination of the three (Thomas, 2017: 202). According to Bless et al (2006:183), an interview is a data collection technique based on a series of questions about the research topic that research participants must answer. Sofaer (2002:329-336) contends that a strategic informant interview will yield insufficient practical and constructive material if the interviewer does not have adequate contextual information to understand at which point a response necessitates extended querying, or acceptable experience to establish either the genuineness of the respondent or the degree to which there is understanding relevant to the question.

3.6.2. Semi-structured interviews

The researcher will use an interview guide to conduct semi-structured interviews to obtain information from the district NSNP manager and coordinator, circuit NSNP official, principals and school NSNP coordinators. Semi-structured interviews are appropriate when there is a particular interest in complexity or process, or when the issue is contentious or personal (De Vos, Strydom, Fouche & Delpont, 2011:352). The semi-structured interview allows the researcher to ask follow-up questions to obtain additional information as well as clarification. Furthermore, it allows the researcher to probe for more specific responses while also assisting the researcher in repeating a

question when the response indicated that the respondent misunderstood the questions (Ramadhani, 2014:19).

This study utilized objective information. To avoid generalization, objective information is information that is understood from multiple perspectives and presents all sides of an argument. The researcher used semi-structured interview to collect data from the Vhembe East district NSNP official, Malamulele South circuit NSNP official, principals and NSNP coordinators from Maledza Primary School, Manavela primary School and Thambisa Secondary School at their different workplaces rather than as a group, where there could be subjectivity and they could be reluctant to be honest in the presence of the other officials.

3.6.3. Focus groups

A focus group is a group of people who are moderated by a member of a research team and possibly observed, openly or secretly, by other members of the research team (Van Zyl, 2014:215). Van Zyl (2014:216) also claims that focus groups assist researchers in bringing diverse viewpoints together in ways that individual interviews do not, as well as understanding how group members arrive at their conclusions. The researcher used focus group interviews in a natural setting to interview four parents per school with children at Maledza Primary School, Manavele Primary School, and Thambisa Secondary School, under Malamulele South Circuit, Vhembe East in the Limpopo Province for this study. The type of focus group used was the interview, the reason being to get different views about the programme from parents of learners of the same school, as well as from different school. The interviews were done for about two hours, at the respective schools, after school hours, for convenience and to avoid any disturbances. Interviews were also recorded as backup for notes taken, as well as to refer back in case some information was missed.

Focus group discussions were also held for three food handlers per school, since they are already grouped and were done at their respective schools, as it is an environment that they are already used to and would feel comfortable discussing their experiences. Because the focus group discussions were done at the schools they work without food handlers from other schools, there was neither subjectivity nor influence.

3.6.4. Direct Observation

Observation is a descriptive technique in which activities in the participants' usual and regular environment are observed, highlighting (Thomas, Nelson and Silverman, 2005:19). The systematic process of recording the behavioural patterns of participants, objects, and occurrences without necessarily questioning or communicating with them is known as observation. Observation is a commonplace activity in which we use our senses (seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, and tasting) as well as our intuition to gather information.

Direct observation in this study was carried out by the researcher at the three selected schools, namely, Maledza Primary School, Manavela Primary School and Thambisa Secondary School. Furthermore, Babbie and Mouton (1998:294) agree that the benefit of observation is that it can take place anywhere. There are two types of observation: participant observation and non-participant observation. The researcher used the non-participant method exclusively.

3.6.4.1. Non-participant observation

Non-participant observation occurs when you, as a researcher, remain a passive observer, watching and listening to the group's activities and drawing conclusions from this (Kumar, 2014:174). However, Bless, Smith and Kagee (2006:114) state that, even though it may appear to be a simple task, it is necessary for the application of observation to be monitored using a methodical structure and adhering to controlled procedures to ensure feasible and measurable data. Given that the NSNP encourages the development of school food gardens, it will be interesting to see if this goal is met.

The researcher found it best to use this method of data collection for triangulation purposes after having had the interviews as she was observing gardens and not people. Observations were done on the three schools selected, i.e. Manavele Primary School, Maledza Primary School and Thambisa Secondary School, to find out if they have gardens, how big are the gardens (compared to the school size), the type of vegetation in the gardens, how learners benefit from the gardens and if the gardens are taken care of. Pictures of the gardens in the selected schools were taken as evidence.

3.7. Validity and reliability

Two factors define precision: reliability and validity. To compute reliability, several measurements on the same subjects are used. The researcher defined validity as the extent to which a particular measurement provides data that is related to commonly accepted definitions of a specific concept. This means that validity is achieved when the measurement does what it is supposed to do. Auriacombe (2006: 643) asserts that measurement is an important aspect of scientific research methodology.

Reliability is concerned with issues of strength and dependability. According to Babbie and Mouton (2005:125), reliability is the likelihood that a given measurement procedure will yield the same description of a given phenomenon when repeated. The researcher in this study believes that by conducting one-on-one interviews with participants who are directly involved in the program, as well as asking relevant questions about the research objectives in focus groups, reliable and valid data will be gathered.

3.8. Data analysis

Data analysis is a stage in project work where you begin to step back from the field and focus on making sense of what you've discovered (De Vos *et al.*, 2011: 333). It could be done by condensing the codes and then representing the information in the form of a discussion. The researcher used content analysis to analyse qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews as well as views and experiences from focus groups. (Kumar, 2011:354) defines qualitative content analysis as a strategy for identifying communicative characteristics of language by focusing on the content, underlying themes, and meaning of text. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:367) define qualitative data analysis as a systematic process of data coding, categorizing, and interpretation.

The researcher thought it was appropriate to use this type of data analysis because the interviewees had different perspectives on the research topic, which needed to be analysed based on their responses. The qualitative approach examines both primary and secondary documents in depth. Data was examined by categorizing individual

responses into themes. According to Wolhuter (2015: 158), there are three types of interpretation of analysed data: description, interpretation, and critical analysis.

3.8.1. Description

This is the simplest and most straightforward method of explaining and decoding data. It entails a systematic approach to data description. As an example, suppose the researcher is researching the legal frameworks that govern health care in South Africa. The study would conduct a thorough examination of these Acts to determine their significance and significance.

3.8.2. Interpretation

The researcher does more than just report the data at a higher level; the researcher actively interprets the information. For example, in research on South Africa's health system, the South African system may be interpreted over time based on the country's history, economy, and political system.

3.8.3. Critical thinking

Critical analysis involves the researcher probing and questioning the evaluated data as well as the existing body of information and knowledge. The study's findings were extrapolated and linked to the study's context, while the statistical analysis regarding significant relationships among key variables was made credible. These findings were then corroborated by key literature in the field while being linked to relevant study objectives and research questions for consideration by the Department of Education.

3.9. Limitations and delimitations

Limitations, according to Simon (2011:174), are potential flaws in the study that are beyond the researcher's control, whereas delimitations are characteristics that limit the scope and define the boundaries of the study. The limitation of this study would be that some school principals and NSNP officials might not be willing to divulge information that shows ineffectiveness in implementing the programme. As a result, they will not receive an accurate picture of what is going on in terms of their roles in the NSNP implementation. As a delimitation, the researcher first assured them that

the study is not about witch-hunting, but just trying to investigate if schools are managing to implement NSNP correctly and that findings of the study may assist where there are challenges.

The study's limitations were that no pilot study was done due to time constraints and the researcher was unable to observe the implementation on a daily or continuous basis, so data from some schools may be suspect. The researcher mainly focused on data gathered when doing real observation, since observation is also another data collection method to be used, to alleviate incredibility of data.

3.10. Ethical considerations

According to Thomas, *et al.* (2017:37), ethics are principles of conduct that govern what is right and wrong. When applied to research, ethical principles include some decisions and dilemmas that balance one right action against another right action, considering the potentially conflicting interests of the parties involved.

Obtaining ethical or institutional clearance is a critical step in starting your project (Thomas, *et al.*, 2017:40). The researcher applied for ethical clearance through TREC and submitted the institution's ethical letter to the Limpopo Department of Education's Vhembe East District, Malamulele South Circuit, and schools involved for permission to conduct research.

Obtaining ethical or institutional clearance is a critical step in starting your project (Thomas, *et al.*, 2017: 40). The researcher applied for ethical clearance through TREC and submitted the institution's ethical letter to the Limpopo Department of Education's Vhembe East District, Malamulele Circuit, and schools involved for permission to conduct research.

The researcher considered the following ethical principles:

3.10.1. Permission

3.10.1.1. Informed consent

Informed consent implies that subjects are made sufficiently aware of the type of information you seek from them, why the information is being sought, what purpose it will serve, how they are expected to participate in the study, and whether it will directly or indirectly affect them (Kumar, 2011:285). The researcher informed the participants about the nature and purpose of the study, the expected benefits of the study, the ethics procedures in place, and the availability of voluntary consent.

3.10.1.2. Voluntary participation

Social research is frequently, but not always, an intrusion into people's lives. A fundamental principle of medical research ethics is that experimental participation must be voluntary. The same standard holds true for social research (Babbie, 2014:64). The researcher ensured the voluntary participation of learners, NSNP officials at the district and circuit levels, school principals and coordinators, food handlers, and learners' parents in this study because it required their time and would inconvenience them in some way.

3.10.2. Anonymity and confidentiality

According to Thomas, *et al.*, (2017:46), you should always treat any information given to you as confidential, taking care not to violate or jeopardize that confidentiality. Maintaining the anonymity of your participants is an important part of this, both in your everyday dealings and conversations with others, as well as in your data storage and reporting. The researcher used codes to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, as well as making a commitment to protect participants' confidentiality and anonymity.

3.10.3. No harm to the participants

Human research should never endanger the people being studied, whether they volunteer or not. Because subjects can be psychologically harmed during a social research study, the researcher must look for and guard against the most subtle dangers (Babbie, 2014: 65). When developing questions and administering questionnaires, the researcher ensured that the participants, particularly the learners, were not harmed in any way.

3.10.4 Record keeping

The researcher used transcripts and a recorder to gather data, therefore, these records will be kept safely by the researcher for the sake of participants who chose anonymity, as well as for future reference,

3.11. Conclusion

The research design and data collection methods were discussed in this chapter. It thoroughly justified the choice of research paradigm, research design, data collection methods, and research sampling. It also discussed data analysis, ethical considerations, and the study's limitations.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study's findings, and data was collected using an interview guide, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups to obtain different perspectives from respondents. Content analysis was used to analyse data in order to search for the communicative characteristics of language through focusing on the content, underlying themes and meaning of text.

4.2. Demographic information of participants

Code	Age	Gender	Designation	Educational Qualifications	Work Experience
P01	45	Male	Secondary School Principal	Teaching Diploma ACE(Management)	5 years
P02	56	Female	Primary School Principal	Teaching Diploma ACE(Management)	9 years
P03	52	Male	Primary School Principal	Teaching Diploma ACE(Management)	10 months
P04	52	F	Secondary School Coordinator	Teaching Diploma	15 years
P05	49	F	Primary School Coordinator	Teaching Diploma	6 years
P06	39	M	Primary School Coordinator	Honours Degree (Teaching)	3 years

P07	53	M	District Coordinator	Post-graduate Diploma in Public Management	4 years
P08	42	F	Circuit Coordinator	Logistics Degree	17 years
P09	58	F	Food handler	Illiterate	6 months
P010	50	F	Food handler	Grade 9	6 months
P011	55	F	Food handler	Primary Education	6 months
P012	38	F	Food handler	Grade 10	6 months
P013	54	F	Food handler	Primary Education	6 months
P014	51	F	Food handler	Grade 10	6 months
P015	48	F	Food handler	Illiterate	6 months
P016	39	F	Food handler	Primary Education	6 months
P017	47	F	Food handler	Grade10	6 months
P018	40	F	Food handler	Grade 9	6 months
P019	47	F	Parent	Primary Education	N/A
P020	45	F	Parent	Grade 8	N/A
P021	37	F	Parent	Grade 9	N/A
P022	47	F	Parent	Grade 12	N/A
P023	50	M	Parent	Grade 12	N/A
P024	55	F	Parent	Illiterate	N/A
P025	35	F	Parent	Grade 11	N/A
P026	29	F	Parent	Grade 12	N/A
P027	32	F	Parent	Grade 10	N/A
P028	62	F	Parent	Illiterate	N/A
P029	40	F	Parent	Grade 12	N/A
P030	60	F	Parent	Illiterate	N/A

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS: 30

Of the 30 participants in this programme, only five participants were male and all food handlers were females, which makes sense for the researcher, since women are mostly the ones who do cooking at homes and know more about cooking .In terms of age, there were more participants within the age range 40-50years.Most of these

women have either little formal education or none, which does not have much impact on the performance of their roles, especially the food handlers.

The district official, circuit official, school principals to school coordinators had different professional qualifications but not something related to the feeding programme. The programme only needs to be implemented and monitored in accordance with the goals that have been established. However, the following themes, namely the roles of implementers and the program's impact, are critical.

P07 does not have qualifications related to food and nutrition, but the respondent's qualification of public management assisted in dealing with the different stakeholders. The food handlers who were interviewed had no qualifications above primary and secondary level, but this does not seem to be much of a hindrance though, since they are all mothers who handle food in their own homes on a daily basis, during family or community functions, and if well-trained they easily handle food for many learners at school.

4.3. Findings and discussions

4.3.1. Objectives of the programme

The NSNP objectives, as outlined in the NSNP Report (2016:4), contribute to improved learning in schools, strengthens nutrition education in schools to promote healthy eating, promotes sustainable food production initiatives in schools, and develops partnerships to strengthen the program. P07 stated that the three main goals of NSNP are meal preparation, nutrition education, and food initiatives.

Whilst P07 seemed to be clear about the main objectives of the programme, the other role players are aware of just one or two of the objectives. The principals, for instance, are clear about the provision of a single meal to learners on a daily basis and ensuring that they take the necessary follow-up steps in a case there is no supply or delivery of food at schools.

What most schools are mainly concerned about as far as NSNP is concerned is ensuring that learners get their daily meals, since it influences the learner attendance, as well as their conduct, according to what the participants indicated. On the flip side of ensuring that the program's main objectives are met, the opposite frequently occurs,

with sometimes fruitless expenditure occurring in some schools (in the words of the NSNP district coordinator, especially township schools because most of the learners do not eat the meals offered at school because they come from families that can afford it and believe that the NSNP meals are a little inferior to what they have at home).

P07 stated that *"most schools, especially secondary schools, focus more on producing good results in terms of learner performance rather than ensuring that NSNP objectives are realized, specifically with regard to food gardens, though lack of water is sometimes the reason why some schools do not have food gardens."*

The researcher has also gathered from the NSNP district coordinator that, for the same objective of food initiatives, *"different initiatives by different stakeholders like the Limpopo Department of Agriculture, the University of Venda, Vhembe FET and Madzivadila FET are undertaken, for example, the Jala- Peo Initiative, where learners are given seedlings and garden tools to start food gardens at their homes, which were also monitored."*

The above-mentioned *"initiative also extends into a symposium, where the learners display their produce to serve as motivation that it is simple to start a food garden and can be done, in the words of the district coordinator. He also continued to say that "schools are also encouraged to breed animals like chicken and pigs, where food waste or food not consumed is fed to the pigs. Learners and schools would benefit by sale of the animals to the local market."*

Whilst P08, just like P07 understands the objectives of the programme, the food handlers are only aware of the objective of provision of a meal per day to learners as means to alleviate poverty, and the same applies with all the parents interviewed. *"Some of the learners come to school without a lunch box nor pocket money"*, said P09, according to her observation when interacting with learners on a daily basis at school.

4.3.2. Implementation of the programme and roles of implementers

Shaw explains in Khuzwayo (2016:18) that proper monitoring and evaluation policies should be in place during the implementation of any programme to ensure the program's effectiveness. The researcher agrees with Khuzwayo, particularly when it

comes to our country, South Africa, where our mostly brilliant policies are not being implemented properly (Khuzwayo, 2016:18).

4.3.2.1. Roles of the district and circuit NSNP officials

The NSNP is a multi-stakeholder programme with stakeholders at four levels: national, provincial, district, and school, with the following roles: training, supporting, and monitoring, service provider management and payment, assuring compliance and reporting according to the NSNP Report (2016:99).

4.3.2.2. Roles of principals and school NSNP coordinators

Principals and school coordinators are responsible in implementing the programme by managing and payment of service providers, monitoring, ensuring compliance as well as reporting. All the principals did understand their main role which, as correctly phrased by P03, *“to oversee and monitor correct implementation of NSNP as per policy”*. According to P07, his role is *“to monitor and give support to 18 circuit coordinators under his supervision and sometimes some of the schools”*. He believes that *“the coordinators at school and circuit levels are aware of the objectives of NSNP and know their roles, as they always attend workshops and monthly operational meetings”*.

All of the food handlers who took part in this study appeared to understand their roles, though nearly all of them were dissatisfied with some of the ways the programme was implemented. As a result, the researcher agrees with the statement that the ability to meet roles and responsibilities is dependent on having enough staff, having supporting resources in place, and having staff that is adequately skilled and capacitated.

According to Drake *et al.* (2016:98) in the NSNP Report, decentralized procurement and logistics require adequate capacity to ensure that implementers, managers, and other role players can adequately execute their roles and responsibilities. Due to the decentralized nature of the NSNP, role players only need to be adequately capacitated for the programme to be effective.

4.3.3. Interventions towards household food security

4.3.3.1. Training, monitoring and support

According to Khuzwayo (2016:18), one of the major challenges facing the school feeding programme is a lack of internal monitoring and evaluation, which has existed since the program's inception. One of Khuzwayo's (2018:81) recommendations in her study is that the school governing body (SGB) be provided with knowledge and skills in the national school nutrition programme in accordance with Regulation R198 of 1999, in order to monitor its implementation at the school level. The status quo at the moment, is that internal monitoring of implementation at schools is done by the school NSNP coordinators, with the school principals being overseers.

The training and support given to principals and school coordinators seem to be more or less the same, with principals attending one or two workshops per year and school coordinators attending more or less once per quarter. Two out of three principals believe the training is not sufficient, whilst all believe that they get the necessary support from the circuit coordinator. All three-school coordinator believe it is enough, since they get more information and support during school visits by the circuit coordinators.

Training of food handlers is firstly done at the beginning of their contracts, where they observe from the outgoing food handlers how the work is done for two weeks before their contract term ends. Circuit workshops are attended by mostly one or two food handlers per school, who are supposed to report back to or train their fellow food handlers. Some food handlers thought because of this the training is not enough, instead all food handlers should be trained at the same time, and the researcher agrees because second-hand information may not be as accurate as it is supposed to be.

P07 indicated that he has “*received various kinds of training, from financial (budgeting, specifically), Nutrition education, monitoring and stakeholder engagement, some of which were conducted by the Limpopo Department of Agriculture, Thulamela Municipality and the University of Venda. As far as monitoring and support is concerned, circuit coordinators’ monitoring plan involves monitoring each school on a*

quarterly basis, whereas district plan entails having quarterly review meetings to check if targets are met and giving support in case there are challenges". Evaluation, according to the P07," is done by the national department annually, where one district is chosen per year and is evaluated."

According to the researcher training, monitoring and evaluation of circuit coordinators, principals and food handlers is continuous but not effective, and there is a lack in the content. The other challenge is with regard to monitoring in some schools, hence P09, who works at a secondary school, said "*when educators do not monitor the serving of meals in the classrooms, older learners tend to serve themselves more share of the food or sometimes take all the remaining food in the serving containers and run away with it while some of the learners are still waiting for their share in the queue."*

4.3.4. Effectiveness of the programme

In the DBE report, Drake *et al.* (2016:127) state that the literature review identified accountability and quality assurance mechanisms as a key factor underpinning effective implementation of school nutrition programs, albeit a mechanism identified as "weak" in many programs and the researcher couldn't agree more.

As far as effectiveness of the NSNP in general, there is a common view amongst participants interviewed. There is the same view, from all participants, i.e. from P01 to P030, that the most obvious impact of the programme is improvement of learner school attendance and health of learners. P07, in his own words, indicated that '*whenever there are no meals to feed the learners on the first day of school reopening, there is an outcry from schools and the communities*'.

The other impact, as indicated by P07, is that of food initiatives, especially in instances and areas where learners are encouraged to start food gardens with the help of partnerships with the Limpopo departments of Education and Agriculture, as well as Vhembe and Madzivandila FET colleges, as mentioned earlier on the sub-topic about the objectives of the NSNP programme. This impact, although sounds like a good one, according to the researcher, seems to be selective and minimal, since none of the schools, including the coordinators at Malamulele South circuit mentioned anything concerning these initiatives, particularly the Jala-Peoo Initiative.

“The community business also benefit from the programme, as explained by P07, in the form of local service providers are appointed to supply food ,especially fruit and vegetables to schools ,which leads to funds circulating within the districts.”

PO7 also explained that *“there is impact with regard to instilling knowledge on food handling to food handlers at schools, whom he believes are appointed to those position without this kind of knowledge, as well as the knowledge about the objectives of the programme shared during stakeholder meetings, so that they can be protective of the programme.”*As far as the researcher is concerned, data collected from food handlers , who also represent parents as well as learners’ parents themselves ,there was no clear indication that they are aware of the knowledge that they are gaining from the programme.

Lastly, as indicated by principals, NSNP school coordinators and foodhandlers, *“the programme has been effective in some instances in contributing towards food security by offering foodstuff to learners at the end of the school terms, if there are any leftovers”*, but according to the researcher, this is not currently sustainable.

4.3.5. Sustainability of interventions towards household food security

According to Suresh (2009), food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 1996) .The researcher believes that sustainability is key for any programme to succeed, therefore, even if the findings would be that indeed the NSNP ensures household food security, the most important question to ask would be, ‘is it sustainable?’

4.3.5.1 Areas of improvement for sustainability according to participants

In their study, Devereux *et al.* (2018:36) suggest that many aspects of NSNP implementation need to be improved, such as (among others) involving parents and local communities in planning and school food gardens. Devereux *et al* (2018) suggestion above, together with the data collected from the participants in this research, form the basis for this sub-heading.

Although P01 to P08 think that NSNP is a very good programme with benefits, they also believe that there could be improvement on the following:

4.3.5.1.1. Training

Two out three school principals believe that training for school implementers of the NSNP is not enough and workshops should be regular. Although all the school NSNP coordinators said that training offered to themselves as well as foodhandlers was enough, the food handlers themselves do not believe it is enough. P07 thinks that the training offered to him as a district officer is sufficient, but he believes "*it would be ideal if training was offered formally in a form of a diploma or degree*". The researcher turns to agree with the district coordinator to some extent, with the view that the formal training could start from a certificate.

In the NSNP Implementation Evaluation, Olubayo, Amisi-Aluvi, and Namusonge (2015:1433) argue that community participation in the form of parent associations improves problem-solving and the sustainability of school feeding programs. As far as this research is concerned, the parents of learners at the selected schools do not take part in the programme nor did they receive any form of training.

In some of the communities, according to the district official, "*training on nutrition education was done and the researcher believes that participation by parents was minimal,*" since the impact thereof is not evident. Matoane's (2011:52) recommendations on his study also indicates that there is little involvement of parents in the programme so far and this must change so that the programme impacts positively on the learner. This confirms sentiments by some food handlers, as well as the district coordinator, that training is generally not enough.

4.3.5.1.2. Funding, supply of food and menu

The NSNP is supported by a Conditional Grant to PED, which is allocated in accordance with DoRA. The Grant, as the name implies, is subject to rules such as the submission of approved business plans and minimum feeding requirements as outlined in National Treasury (2015), which include;

-Provision of nutritious meals to all students in quintiles 1-3 primary and secondary schools, as well as identified special schools, on all school days;

-Compliance with recommended food specifications and an approved menu consisting of meals containing a starch, protein, and fresh vegetable/fruit (NSNP Report, 2016:5).

One of the participants interviewed, P01, indicated that *“it would be better for schools to be allocated a budget as well as the latitude to purchase food supplies for their learners”*. A participant at the same school as P01, that is P04 agreed with P01 by indicating that *“money should be allocated to schools to buy extra food in case there is a need.”* P07 also agreed with this idea by saying that *“schools should be given an opportunity to purchase food by themselves, and that a few schools are already being piloted in this area of the programme”*.

P03 and P05 had a concern with the supply of food to school with regard to suppliers not delivering food in time and delivering low quality fruit and vegetables and suggesting that *“there should be thorough monitoring of delivery of food supply by service providers.”* P07 agreed, indicating that *“some service providers supply low quality food items so that they remain with more profit.”*

As far as the menu is concerned, almost all participants in this research are of the same view that there should be some amendments on the menu, except for one principal and one school coordinator who did not mention anything about improvement of the menu. These changes include schools choosing their own menu, supplementing porridge with bread on some days, provision of juice, replacing soya mince and milk because most learners do not like the soya mince, as well as learners being given soft porridge in the morning, for example, two meals per day instead of one, since for some learners, it's their only meal for the day. All food handlers agree that soya beans, for example, should be replaced since many learners do not like nor eat it and its one of the foodstuffs that is usually leftover at the end of the term.

4.3.5.2 Other area of improvement

P05 suggested that *“food parcels must be offered to all vulnerable learners at school on a regular basis and not only when there are leftovers”* with one parent being of the view that *“fruit be offered to learners twice per week, since some parents cannot afford to buy fruit but only basic food.”* This suggestion by P05 speaks to the issue of ensuring that there is household food security.

4.4. Limitations of the findings

The first limitation that the researcher faced was securing appointments with the district coordinator, as well as the circuit coordinator, due to both having tight work schedules, which led to appointments with them being delayed. When the appointments were finally secured, the researcher feels the venues were not as comfortable for both the researcher and the participants, though they all did justice in terms of responding to the interview questions. The interview with the district coordinator was done outside the community library, located near a busy and noisy main road, whereas the circuit coordinator was done at a parking site outside a mall. Although the participants were comfortable and relaxed, the researcher believes that had the interviews been held at their workplaces there would be more focus since there would be less distractions.

The other main limitation in the findings of the study had to do with language barrier, where most participants (both the educated and the illiterate ones), were not familiar or clear about the meaning of food security, hence the researcher had to rephrase the question without losing the real meaning of the term, since they thought it referred to food being safe and secure. Failure to explain accurately would mean the main question in this study, of finding out if the programme contributes towards household food security is not answered.

4.5. Findings on observation

The main focus of using the observation as means of collecting data was to check if there are functional food gardens at the schools selected, but the researcher was also able to observe safekeeping of the food supply. Out of the three schools observed, namely, Maledza Primary School, Manavela Primary School and Thambisa Secondary School, one had a functional garden, the second school had a garden which was barely there due to shortage of water and the third school did not have a food garden.

4.5.1. SCHOOL 'A' FOOD GARDEN



Figure 1: Back garden (spinach)



Figure 2: Middle garden (tomatoes)



Figure 3: Front garden

According to Rendall-Mkosi et al. in the DBE NSNP Report, the number of school food gardens in South Africa has decreased in recent years, but the reasons for this are not stated (2016:47). Again, in terms of key assumptions in the NSNP log frame, the majority of schools lack functional food gardens, with the main reasons cited being a lack of human resources and a lack of water (Rendal-Mkosi et al2016:151). Food Garden A's condition above confirms Rendall-Mkosi et al' s statement as well as one of the reasons for existence of less functional food gardens being lack of water and human resources to maintain the gardens, though the researcher believes there could be other ways of taking care of them. The researcher has also found out, through this research, that there are less functional gardens, i.e., one out of three and the main reason was shortage of water.

4.5.2.SCHOOL 'B' FOOD GARDEN



Figure 4: Tomatoes



Figure 5: Onions and spinach



Figure 6: Irrigation lines

Data collected on observation was quite interesting, or rather surprising for the researcher. The actual evidence on the ground was different from what P07 indicated, as highlighted in 4.3.1, that most secondary schools are concerned about learner performance than ensuring that NSNP objectives are realised, whereas the only school from the selected schools that had a functional food garden was a secondary school. This means, according to the researcher, that this notion should not be generalised but suffice to indicate that though most secondary schools are mainly focused on attainment of good results, there are some schools that also ensure that all objectives, including the one on food initiative is realised in the form of food gardens, therefore, it depends on individual schools.

4.6. Synthesis of Chapter 4

This chapter highlighted the data that the researcher collected from participants when they were responding to interview questions in trying to answer the main research questions and interpretation of their responses. This analysis, together with the limitations thereof, leads to the next chapter, which will be the consolidation of the data in the form of summary, recommendations and conclusion.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This final chapter concludes the study by outlining the overall limitations that the researcher encountered, which had no effect on the study's findings. It also includes the conclusions reached based on the findings, as well as recommendations for improving NSNP implementation for long-term improvement of household food security.

5.2. Limitations of the study

There were few limitations to this study. The first limitation was that two of the schools originally chosen to participate in the study were not available at the time of data collection, forcing the researcher to look for two replacement schools. The second limitation had to do with getting the focus group in one place at the same time, instead the researcher had to interview more than three groups of two or three, and also as individuals.

Though it was somehow an advantage to interview others alone, since there would not be influence, it equally time-consuming, since it took more time than expected in terms of number of days used, which also delayed consolidation and interpretation of data. The other issue that seem like a limitation to study, according to the researcher, is that she did not get an opportunity to find out the difference in impact for township schools with rural schools, since all schools were from villages and Malamulele South circuit, Vhembe District in Limpopo Province, is only comprised of rural schools.

5.3. Conclusions

Implementation of National of School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) according to all the data collected by the researcher has been effective as far as ensuring a meal daily to school learners at a level of 90%, with the remaining 10% being some school reopening days and last days of the school terms. Because there is sometimes complaints from parents and learners, when food is not available, as indicated by some of the participants, it is clear that the programme is indeed filling a huge gap in terms of nutritional needs of learners.

Although the interventions by the Department of Education, through NSNP to ensure that learners get a meal on every school day are evident, the researcher's conclusion, through this study is that if all the schools participating in the programme had food gardens, the impact of the programme would be increased.

Though noted already, that government through Department of Education is already doing something to meet the nutritional needs of learners at schools, it seems not to be sufficient for some learners, especially if there are learners who come to school without a meal. This is an indication that meeting nutritional needs of learners goes deeper and needs to be looked at further.

Since this study was looking at implementation of NSNP towards household food security, which can also be explained as sustainability of the programme, with regard to provision of food or meals to learners, one can draw a conclusion that more still needs to be done, in ensuring that all schools participating in the programme have functional school food gardens, and that these gardens translate into food gardens at different learners' households. If all stakeholders who are part of the NSNP, from school, circuit, district, provincial and national levels, can work towards the same objectives of the programme as highlighted in this study, this can be achieved since potential has already been demonstrated through some of the sites observed on this study.

5.4. Recommendations

- Escalation of impartation of nutrition education for promotion of healthy lifestyles to all schools participating in NSNP together with their communities. What the researcher has gathered from the interview with the district official is that nutrition education was only imparted to those community members who were able to attend stakeholder or community meetings and a few schools who participated in the Jala-Peo food initiative as well as the symposium thereof.
- Thorough education of National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) implementers, including food handlers, NSNP coordinators, and school principals, on the food initiative's goal of ensuring household food security. Though the implementers mentioned here are aware that leftover foodstuff

should be given to learners, there is inconsistency in when and how they are given to the learners, which leads us to the next recommendation.

- Clear guidelines on which learners should be offered leftover foodstuff, how and when, because some learners might not need them as their families can afford, as alluded by the district director.
- Food initiative projects, like the Jala-Peol being extended to all circuits in the district as all schools which participated in the project are not participating in these projects as it seems to be a promising and sustainable idea.
- Strict and constant monitoring of serving of meals to learners during mealtime(break) by educators to ensure that all learners, especially vulnerable learners, receive their meals and equal share thereof, as well as eliminate bullying by older learners.
- Changes to NSNP policy to require mandatory food gardens for all schools participating in the National School Nutrition Programme, as well as the department of education (with the assistance of partnerships if necessary) ensuring water supply to participating schools. Provision of breakfast in the form of soft porridge, which would be cheaper than other types of cereal since mealie-meal is already provided to school. This would be the solution for learners who come to school with empty stomachs from home and in cases where the meal offered at school is their only meal.
- Increment of funding for NSNP so that there is also provision for food parcels for all vulnerable learners.
- Strict adherence to identification of all vulnerable learners and ensuring that they are provided with food parcels on a monthly basis, instead of quarterly and only if there are leftovers because there won't be sustainability.
- Further study or investigation into finding out if the need for meals for learners is lower in some schools, so that funds meant for, rather provision of meals in those schools is reduced in order to divert those funds to the most-needy schools.

REFERENCES

Abutabenjeh, S. & Jaradat, R. 2018. Clarification of research design, research methods and research methodology: A guide for public administration researchers and practitioners. *Teaching Public Administration*, 36(3), pp 237-258.

Adelson, G., Engell, J., Van Anglen, K.P. and Ranalli, B. eds., 2008. *Environment: an interdisciplinary anthology*. Yale University Press.

Auriacombe, C.J., 2006. Understanding and planning measurement. *Journal of Public Administration*, 41(3), pp.631-645.

Babbie, E., Mouton, J. 1998. *The Practice of Social Research*. Goodwood, Cape Town, Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Babbie, E., Mouton, J. 2005. *The Price of Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Babbie, E. 2014. *The Basics of Social Research* .6th edition. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Bakkabulindi, F. 2015. *Educational Research. An African approach*. Oxford University Press, Southern Africa. Edited by Okeke, C., van Wyk, M.

Bless, C., Smith, C.H., and Kagee, A. 2006. *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods. An African Perspective*, 4th ed. Cape Town, Juta & Co.

Bryman A & Bell E. 2011. *Research Methodology: Business and Management Context*. South Africa: Oxford.

Bundy, D., Burbano, C., Grosh, M., Gelli, A., Jukes, M. & Drake, L., (2009), *Rethinking school feeding*. Washington, DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank.

Cooperative Governance Traditional Affairs.2020.*Municipal IDPs*. Collins Chabane Municipality.Available at: <https://www.cogta.gov.za/index.php/docs/limpopo/>

Cresswell,JW,Ebersohn,L,Eloff,I,Ferreira,R,Ivankova,NV,Jansen,JD,Nieuwenhuis,J, Pietersen,J & Plano Clark,VL.2016.*First steps in research*.2nd edition., edited by K Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

DBE.2016. Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme Report. *Report*. Pretoria: JET Education Services.

Department of Education. 2011. Report on the implementation of the NSNP. *Report*. Limpopo. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Devereux, S., Hochfeld, T., Karriem, A., Mensah, C., Morahanye, M., Msimango, T., Mukubonda, A., Naicker, S., Nkomo, G., Sanders, D. and Sanousi, M., 2018. *Food Security SA Working Paper Series No.004*.DST-NRF Centre of Excellence in Food Security, South Africa.

De Vos, AS, Strydom, H, Fouche, CB & Delport, CSL. 2011. *Research at GrassRoots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Profession*. 4th edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

DPME. 2014. *Impact and implementation evaluation of government coordination systems: Final Report: Policy Summary, Executive Summary and Short Report (Evaluation Report)*. Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

Drake, L., Woolnough, A., Burbano, C., & Bundy, D., (eds.), 2016, *Global school feeding sourcebook: Lessons from 14 countries*. London: Imperial College Press.

Elliott, R., Fischer, C.T., Rennie, D.L.1999. *Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields*. British Journal of Clinical Psychology. Vol. 38.

Gibson, M. 2012. *The Feeding of Nations: Redefining food security for the 21st century*. United States of America: CRC Press.

Graham, L., Hochfeld, T., Stuart, L. and Van Gent, M. 2015. *Evaluation study of the National School Nutrition Programme and the Tiger Brands Foundation In-School Breakfast Feeding Programme in the Lady Frere and Qumbu Districts of the Eastern Cape*. Johannesburg: Centre for Social Development in Africa, University of Johannesburg, the Tiger Brands Foundation, the National Department of Basic Education (DBE) and the Eastern Cape Department of Education.

Gresse A, Nomvete A & Walter C. 2017. *Situational Analysis: Implementation of the National School Nutrition Programme in Low Socio-Economic Primary Schools in Nelson Mandela Bay* (2):59-68.

Hammersley, M. 2013. *What is Qualitative Research?* London and New York: Bloomsbury

Health Systems Trust, 1996. Nutrition actions that work well. Durban. No.20 p2.

Huang, J, Kim, Y & Barnidge E. 2016. Health & Social Work. *Seasonal Difference in National School Lunch Programme Participation and Its Impacts on Household Food Security* 41(4):235-243.

Hubbard, M. 1995. *Improving Food Security: A guide for rural development managers*. London: ITDG Publishing.

Kallaway, P., 1996. Policy Challenges for Education in the New South Africa: The case for school feeding in the context of Social and Economic Reconstruction. *Transformation*, (31).

Khuzwayo, HP. 2016. *Food for thought: A closer look at Ipolokeng Primary School's nutrition programme*. MA (Education) University of KwaZulu-Natal, KwaZulu-Natal.

Kumar, R. 2014. *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners*. 4th Edition. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Leatt, A., Rosa, S., & Hall, K., 2005, Towards a means to live: Targeting poverty alleviation to realise children's rights. In: Leatt, A., & Rosa, S., (eds.), *Towards a means to live: Targeting poverty alleviation to make children's rights real*. Cape Town: Children's Institute, University of Cape Town.S

Lèlè, S.M. 1991. "Sustainable Development: A critical Review", *World Development*

Mawela & van den Berg 2020. *Management of school nutrition programmes to improve environmental justice in schools: a South African case study*, *South African Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 33(2), pp.30-35.

Megbowon, E.T. and Mushunje, A., 2018. Assessment of food security among households in Eastern Cape Province, South Africa: Evidence from general household survey, 2014. *International Journal of Social Economics*.

Motoane. 2011. *Impact of National School Nutrition Programme in Tsimanyane Circuit, Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province*. MA (Law and Management). University of Limpopo, Polokwane.

Netshipise, T., R. 2015. *Challenges in implementing NSNP at Khomola Primary School, Vhembe District, Limpopo Province*. MA (Law and Management). University of Limpopo, Polokwane.

Neuman, W., L. 2006. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Olubayo, M. A., AmisiAluvi, P., & Namusonge, G., 2015 Factors affecting implementation of school feeding programme in public primary schools in Kenya: A survey of Emuhaya Sub-County, Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 4(8), pp. 1431-1436.

Ramadhani, J. 2014. *An assessment of the effects of school feeding programmes on school enrolment, attendance and academic performance in primary school in Singida District, Tanzania*. Dodoma: Open University of Tanzania.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Rendall-Mkosi, R., Wenhold, F., & Sibanda, N. B. 2013, *Case study of the National School Nutrition Programme in South Africa*. Pretoria: School of Health Systems and Public Health, University of Pretoria.

Saint Ville, A., S., Hickey, G., M. and Phillip, L., E. 2017. *Food Policy. How do stakeholder interactions influence national food security policy in the Caribbean? The case of Saint Lucia*, pp. 68:53-64.

Simon, M. 2011. *Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations*. Dissertation and Scholarly Research: Recipe for success. Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success, LLC.

South Africa. 2008. *The Financial Report for Sustainable Food Production in Schools. Report*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Stevens, L & Wrenn, C. 2013. Exploratory (qualitative) research. *Concise encyclopedia of church and religious organization marketing*, 53.

Suresh, C. 2009. *Food Security, Poverty, and Nutrition Policy Analysis, Statistical Methods and Applications*. 1st edition. New Washington D.C: USA.

Terre-Blanch, M., Durrheim, K. and Painter. 2006. *Research in practice: applied methods for the social science*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Thomas, J., R., Nelson, J., K. and Silverman, S., J. 2005. *Research Methods in Physical Activity*. USA Human Kinetics.

Tomlinson, M., 2007, *School feeding in east and southern Africa: Improving food sovereignty or photo opportunity?* EQUINET Discussion Paper Number 46, EQUINET.

United Nations, 2004. United Nations Demographic Yearbook Review: National Reporting of Household Characteristics, Living Arrangements and Homeless Households. *Report*. Paris, France.

Van Zyl, L., E. 2014. *Research methodology for the economic and management sciences*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Wafula, E.N. and Odula, O., 2018. Considerations for the shift in roles of national and county governance towards the realization of food security in Kenya. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*, 18(3), pp.13776-13791.

Wolhuter, C.C., 2015. Quisnam sum ego? Crises of identity in comparative education and the call for comparison of comparative studies. In *Comparative sciences: Interdisciplinary approaches*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

ANNEXURE 1: CONSENT FORM

Participant's Number

Interview Date.....

Project / Research Title: **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMME (NSNP) FOR HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY**

Description of the Project This research is about finding out from those who are part of the implementation of NSNP if it contributes to household food security of the beneficiaries.

- I confirm that my participation in this research is voluntary and anonymous
- I understand that I will not receive any payments for participating in this research interview
- I understand that most interviews will find the discussion interesting and thought provoking I have the right to decline to answer any question or to end the interview.
- I confirm that the research interview will last approximately 20 -30 minutes

- I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports using information obtained from this interview and that my confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure.
- I have read and understood the explanation provided to me
- I have been given a copy of the consent form
- I wish to review the notes, transcripts or other data collected during the research interview
- I agree that the researchers may publish documents that contain quotations by me.

By signing this form, I agree to the terms indicated above

Participant's Signature

Researcher's signature

.....

.....

Date

Date

.....

.....

ANNEXURE 2: TREC APPROVAL LETTER



85. TF
Hlongwane.pdf

ANNEXURE 3: PERMISSION LETTER



Hlongwane TF
(1).pdf

ANNEXURE 4: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS

RESPONDENT: FOCUS GROUP (PARENTS)

INTRODUCTION

A. Hello, I am Tsakane Faith Hlongwane, a Master of Development in Planning & Management student at University of Limpopo. Thank you for granting me the permission to interview you.

B. Firstly, I would like to ask you some questions about your background and your relationship with the school.

C. The information you provide will assist me in understanding NSNP and its implementation at the school your children are attending, and with your permission, I shall record the interview for analysis later.

D. This interview will take about 10-15 minutes and is conducted anonymously. Are you available to participate at this time?

Transition (As individual parents, have all your children attended at this school?)

INTERVIEW QUESTION

1. May you please tell me what is your age or age group?

2. What is your highest educational level?
3. Are you currently employed and if so what is your occupation?
4. If not employed, what is your source of income?
5. How many children do you have and how many attend at this school?
6. How many people live in your household?
7. How many of these people have an income?
8. What are the things that you buy or use your household income for?
9. Does the food that you buy monthly last for the whole month?
10. Do your children have a meal every morning before going to school and what do they have?
11. Do your children take part in the school nutrition programme?
12. If the answer is 'no', what is the reason?
13. What do you know or understand about NSNP?
14. Do you think it is helpful to your children or to you as parents or families?
15. If the answer is "yes", what are the benefits?
16. Is there anyone amongst yourselves who is a member of SGB?
17. If so, what is your role in the NSNP, if any?
18. What do you think could change about the programme, if any?

(Transition) It is an honour to me for you to have shared information about your work. I will now briefly share with you that I have recorded during this interview

CONCLUSION

- A. I hope you would not mind if I contacted you in case I need further clarity on some of the issues I interviewed on.
- B. Thank you for your participation.

ANNEXURE 5: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT NSNP OFFICIALS

RESPONDENT: CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT NSNP OFFICIALS

INTRODUCTION

A. Hello, I am Tsakane Faith Hlongwane, a Master of Development in Planning & Management student at University of Limpopo. Thank you for granting me the permission to interview you.

B. Firstly, I would like to ask you some questions about your background, education and experience.

C. The information you provide will assist me in understanding the implementation of NSNP and your role in the position you are in, and with your permission, I shall record the interview for analysis later.

D. This interview will take about 10-15 minutes and is conducted anonymously. Are you available to participate at this time?

Transition (Would you kindly tell me how long you have been employed on this position and how has it been?)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. May I ask you what is your age?
2. What is your highest educational qualification?
3. What is your current position in the department of education?
4. For how long have you worked in this position?
5. What is your understanding about NSNP?
6. What is your specific role in NSNP?
7. What training with regard to NSNP did you receive?
8. Do you believe it was adequate?
9. How do you monitor and give support to the schools?
10. What is your perception about the implementation of the programme, i.e. do you think is it successful or not?
11. Do you think the objectives of NSNP at schools are being realised?
12. What about the objective of ensuring household food security?
13. Do you believe the NSNP coordinators at circuit and school level know the objectives of NSNP and their roles?
14. What are your interventions to ensure that household food security is achieved through the NSNSP at schools?
15. Do you have a monitoring and evaluation plan for schools/circuit under your supervision?
16. Do you think the programme is helpful and if so, how is it helpful?
17. What would you change about the programme?

(Transition) It is an honour to me for you to have shared information about your work. I will now briefly share with you that I have recorded during this interview

CONCLUSION

- A. I hope you would not mind if I contacted you in case I need further clarity on some of the issues I interviewed you on.
- B. Thank you for your participation.

ANNEXURE 6: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND NSNP COORDINATOR

RESPONDENT: PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL NSNP COORDINATOR

INTRODUCTION

A. Hello, I am Faith Hlongwane, a Master of Development in Planning & Management student at University of Limpopo. Thank you for granting me the permission to interview you.

B. Firstly, I would like to ask you some questions about your background, education and experience.

C. The information you provide will assist me in understanding you better and the position you are in, and with your permission, I shall record the interview for analysis later.

D. This interview will take about 10-15 minutes and is conducted anonymously. Are you available to participate at this time?

Transition (Would you kindly tell me how long you have been working at this institution and how has it been?)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. May I please ask you what is your age?
2. What is your highest education qualification?
3. What is your position in the school?
4. For how long have you been in this position?
5. What is your specific role or involvement in NSNP?
6. What kind of training did you receive concerning NSNP, if any?
7. Do you believe that the training was sufficient?
8. What kind of support do you get from the circuit and district office?
9. What kind of support do you give to the school concerning implementation of the programme?
10. How does the programme benefit/impact the learners?
11. Have you noted any difference in the performance of learners who partake in the programme, if so, what is that difference?
12. Does the programme have any impact in learner conduct in class or absenteeism?
13. What is your observation with regard to the physical outlook of learners who partake in the programme?
14. Are there any benefits to the school or the community?
15. Do you have a school garden? If so, who is responsible for the garden?
16. What kind of vegetation do you have in your garden?
17. Do you think it is important to have school food gardens as part of NSNP?

18. What is the role of the learners in the garden?
19. Who designs the NSNP menu?
20. How many times per week are the learners provided with meals?
21. What role do you play in ensuring household food security in your school?
22. What is your perception about the implementation of the programme?
23. Is there anything that you think could be done to improve the programme?

(Transition) It is an honour to me for you to have shared information about your work. I will now briefly share with you that I have recorded during this interview

CONCLUSION

- A. I hope you would not mind if I contacted you in case I need further clarity on some of the issues I interviewed on.
- B. Thank you for your participation.

ANNEXURE 7: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FOOD HAND LANDERS

RESPONDENT: FOOD HANDLERS

INTRODUCTION

A. Hello, I am Faith Hlongwane, a Master of Development in Planning & Management student at University of Limpopo. Thank you for granting me the permission to interview you.

B. Firstly, I would like to ask you some questions about your background and your experience in food handling.

C. The information you provide will assist me in understanding you better and the position you are in.

D. This interview will take about 10-15 minutes and is conducted anonymously. Are you available to participate at this time?

Transition (Would you kindly tell me how long you have been a food handler and how has it been?)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. May you please tell me what your age/age group is?

2. What is your highest educational level?

3. Do you have any other source of income besides your current work as a food handler?
4. What are your main duties as food handlers?
5. Did you receive training on foodhandling and for how long?
6. Do you think the training was enough?
7. Do you understand the purpose of NSNP?
8. Do you think that the food that you cook for learners is enough?
9. Is the food kept safely?
10. Do you sometimes experience food shortage or theft?
11. If your answer to the previous question is 'yes', what was the reason?
12. What is done to resolve the shortage or theft of food so that learners get their daily meals?
13. Are you, as food handlers allowed to have the meals or food given to the learners and under which circumstances, if so?
14. According to your own observation when serving the meals, do a lot of learners partake in the programme?
15. Do you sometimes have leftover food and what happens to it?
16. What do you think could be done better as far as food handling is concerned?

(Transition) It is an honour to me for you to have shared information about your work. I will now briefly share with you that I have recorded during this interview.

CONCLUSION

A. I hope you would not mind if I contacted you in case I need further clarity on some of the issues I interviewed on.

B. Thank you for your participation.

TRANSLATION

INTERVIEW GUIDE/ INTHAVHIYU NA VATSWARI.

FOCUS GROUP/ VATSWARI

MANGHENELO

INTERVIEW GUIDE/NHLOKOHLISO/INTHAVHIYU

RESPONDENT: FOCUS GROUP (VATSWARI)

MANGHENELO

A. Xewani, ndzi Tsakane Faith Hlongwane, mudyondzi wa Vufambisi bya Nhluvukiso eka ku Kunguhata no Fambisa(MDEV) eYunivhesiti ya Nwalungu. Ndzi khensa loko mi ndzi nyikile mpfumelelo wa ku mi nhloko hlisa/vutisa swivutiso.

B. Xo sungula,ndzi ta tsakela ku mi vutisa swivutiso swinwana hi vundzeni ni vuxaka bya nwina na xikolo

C. Mahungu hinkwawo lawa mi nga ta wa nyika ma ta ndzi pfuna ku twisisa mphakelo wa rixaka wa swakudya exikolweni ni vuhumelerisi bya wona exikolweni lexi vana va nwina va ngenaka eka xona.

D. Nhloko hliso lowu wu ta teka nkarhi wo sukela ka khume ku fikela ka khume-ntlhanu wa timinete, na swona wu ta va nhloko hlisano na xikala-vito. Xana mi ta swi kota ku ngenelela eka nkarhi lowu?

Ku cinca maendlelo(Tani hi vatswari va vana hi ku hambana ka nwina,xana vana va nwina hinkwavo va ngenile eka xikolo lexi?)

SWIVUTISO.

1. Xana u na malembe ya ngani hi vukhale?
2. Xana hiswa dyondzo u fike kwihi ke?
3. Xana wa tirha, na swona u tirha ntirho wanjhani?
4. Loko u nga tirhi, xana u ti hanyisa hiyini ke?

5. Xana u na vana vangani, naswona i va ngani va dyondzaka laha xikolweni lexi?
6. Xana u tshama ni vanhu va ngani ekaya?
7. Xana i vanhu vangani vatirhaku ekaya?
8. Xana u yi tirhisa njhani mali ya wena ya muholo ekaya?
9. Xana swakudya leswi u swi xaveka swaheta nhweti ke?
10. Xana vana va wena va swikuma swakudya swo fihlula ke na swona u va nyika yini?
11. Xana vana va wena vadya swakudya leswi phakiwaka exikolweni ke?
12. Loko hlamuli kuri "hayi" xana hikokwalaho ka yini ke?
13. Xana u tiva yini kumbe u twisisa yini hi NSNP?
14. Xana u vona swiri ni nkoka eka vana va wena tani hi mutswari kumbe ndyangu ke?
15. Loko nhlamulo kuri "hayi" xana hikwalaho ka yini ke?
16. Xana kuna wunwani exikarhi ka nwina a nga xirho xa SGB ke?
17. Xana u xirho muni eka SGB?
18. Xana u vona i ngari ku nga cinca yini hi nongonoko wa mphakelo wa swakudya xikolweni?

(Ku cinca maendlelo) Ndzi ti twa ndzi xiximekile loko u kotile ku ndzi avela mahungu mayelana ni ntirho wa nwina. Sweswi ndzi ta ku avela leswi ndzi nga swi kandziyisa eka nhlokohliso lowu.

MAHETELELO

- A. Ndza tshemba leswaku a mi nga vileli loko ndzi tlhela ndzi burisana na nwina ku ya emahlweni loko ndzi tshuka ndzi tsakela ku basisia eka swinwana leswi hi nga burisana hi swona.
- B. Ndzi khensa ku nghenelela ka nwina

MANGHENELO

INTERVIEW GUIDE/NHLOKOHLLISO/INTHAVHIYU

RESPONDENT: FOOD HANDLERS/ VAPHAKERI VA SWAKUDYA

MANGHENELO

- A. Xewani, ndzi Tsakane Faith Hlongwane, mudyondzi wa Vufambisi bya Nhluvukiso eka ku Kunguhata no Fambisa(MDEV) eYunivhesiti ya Nwalungu. Ndzi khensa loko mi ndzi nyikile mpfumelelo wa ku mi nhloko hlisa/vutisa swivutiso.
- B. Xo sungula, ndzi ta tsakela ku mi vutisa swivutiso swinwana hi vundzeni ni ntokoto kumbe vutivi lebyi mi ngana byona eka ku phakela swakudya.
- C. Vuxokoxoko lebyi u ngata ndzi nyika byona, byita ndzi pfuna kuri ndi ku tiva no twisisa xiyimo xa nwina tani hi muphakeri wa swakudya.
- D. Nhloko hliso lowu wu ta teka nkarhi wo sukela ka khume ku fikela ka khume-ntlhanu wa timinete, na swona wu ta va nhloko hlisano na xikala-vito. Xana mi ta swi kota ku nghenelela eka nkarhi lowu?

Ku cinca maendlelo (U nga ndzi byela hiku komisa kuri xana I nkarhi wo tani hikwini u ri muphakeri wa swakudya ke na swona a swiri njhani?)

SWIVUTISO

- 1. Xana u na malembe ya ngani hi vukhale?
- 2. Xana hiswa dyondzo u fike kwihi ke?
- 3. Xana u na xihlovo xinwana xamali etlhelo ka ntirho wa wena tani hi muphakeri wa swakudya?
- 4. Xana hi yihi mintirho ya wena leyikulu tani hi muphakeri wa swakudya?
- 5. Xana u kume ndzetelo tani hi muphakeri wa swakudya na swona ku
- 6. Xana u heleketa leswaku ndzetelo lowu wu ringanerile?
- 7. Xana wa xi twisisa xikongomelo xa NSNP?
- 8. Xana u ehleketa leswaku swakudya leswi u swi swekelaka vadyondzi swi ringanerile?
- 9. Xana swakudya swi hlayisiwa swi hlayisekile?

10. Xana minkarhi yin'wana u kuma ku pfumaleka ka swakudya kumbe ku yiva?
11. Loko nhlamulo ya wena eka xivutiso lexi hundzeke yi ri 'ina', hi xihhi xivangelo xa kona?
12. Xana ku endliwa yini ku lulamisa ku pfumaleka kumbe ku yiva swakudya leswi vadyondzi va kuma swakudya swa vona swa siku na siku?
13. Xana wena, tani hi vafambisi va swakudya u pfumeleriwile ku dya swakudya kumbe swakudya swi nyikiwa swichudeni naswona ehansi ka swiyimo swihi, loko swi ri tano?
14. Hi ku ya hi leswi u swi xiyeke loko u phamela swakudya, xana swichudeni swo tala swi hlanganyela eka nongonoko?
15. Xana minkarhi yin'wana u ni swakudya leswi saleke naswona ku humelela yini hi swona?
16. Xana u ehleketa leswaku i yini lexi nga endliwaka ku antswa loko swi ta eka ku khoma swakudya?

(Ku cinca maendlelo) Ndzi ti twa ndzi xiximekile loko u kotile ku ndzi avela mahungu mayelana ni ntirho wa nwina. Sweswi ndzi ta ku avela leswi ndzi nga swi kandziyisa eka nhlokohliso lowu.

MAHETELELO

- A. Ndza tshemba leswaku a mi nga vileli loko ndzi tlhela ndzi burisana na nwina ku ya emahlweni loko ndzi tshuka ndzi tsakela ku basisia eka swinwana leswi hi nga burisana hi swona.
- B. Ndzi khensa ku nghenelela ka nwina