Abstract: The enrolment and the attendance in public primary schools in Nigeria keep going down every year and the statistics of out-of-school children growing. This led to the introduction of School Feeding Programme (SFP) in all the states of the federation. It is believed that SFP can improve enrolment, attendance as well as completion rate of primary education, if well utilised. However, these can only be achieved through proper implementation of SFP. Hence, this study examines the quality of implementation of SFP in Osun and Oyo states of Nigeria. The study adopted triangulation design of mixed methods. A multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 90 primary school teachers, 75 parents and the State Coordinator of SFP from each state. Three self-designed research instruments were used for data collection namely; Perception of Parents about Quality SFP (0.75); Perception of teachers about SFP (0.71) and State Coordinator of SFP Interview guide. Five research questions were answered. Data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics and thematic analysis. Results show that in Osun State, there is equal access to school meal among all primary classes I to IV pupils while Oyo State feeds primary I to III and some schools are not receiving meal at all. Both states are still struggling with quality and quantity of food for pupils, though report from Osun State shows better quality. There are fair community inputs in SFP in Osun State while this was found low in Oyo State. Qualitative data showed...
that overall success of the programme is at an average level in Osun State while it is low in Oyo State. It was recommended that Oyo state government should endeavour to improve the quality of implementation of SFP by adopting some of the strategies used in Osun States so as to attract learners and produce the expected results.
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### 1.0 Introduction of the Study

School feeding is the provision of food and or snacks to children while in school not only to attract them to school but to ease the effect of poverty on the learning of the children. It is a programme that is now common in many African countries such as Somalia, Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Nigeria among other developing countries. One of the major rationales behind the school feeding programme (SFP) is to meet nutritional need of school children in public schools as majority of them do not have access to adequate diet in their various homes as a result of poverty level. According to the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP, 2017), school feeding programme is an incentive for vulnerable families to invest on children’s education and to encourage poor households to send their children to school and helps to retain the children in school. It is therefore a reasonable assumption that School Feeding Programme (SFP) could encourage enrolment, attendance and enhance pupil’s academic achievement (Falode & Mustapha, 2022b; Yani et al., 2022). But this assumption can only be a reality if the programme is well implemented across all schools.

There are different types of SFP being in operation in different countries. In Ethiopia for instance, it is operated in different components such as Children-In-Local-Development-Based Food for Education (CHILD-FFE), Food for Education programme (FFE) (Keba, 2011). In Ghana, it is operating under Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), and simply known as Ghana School Feeding Programme (GSFP) (Uduku 2011). In Nigeria, SFP is otherwise known as Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF). Majority of the countries operating school feeding programme have the backing of international agencies and NGOs (through MoU) such as The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), World Food Programme (WFP), Partnership for Child Development (PCD) and so on which have been backing Ghana, Somalia, Ethiopia and many other African countries.

According to the HGSF Resource Framework (2018), Nigeria is recently being supported by Imperial College’s Special Intervention Programme called Partnership for Child Development (PCD) to ensure quality
implementation of the feeding programme. Therefore, there have been several supports for the programme ranging from financial, technical, Manpower and resources. This is expected to ensure quality implementation of the programme. SFP can be divided into two main types namely: in-school feeding and take-home rations. In-school feeding is when pupils are fed in school whereas take-home rations involve giving food to families when their children attend school (Hung, 2014). In-school feeding is further divided into two, namely: programme that provides meals and programme that provides snacks or biscuits. Different countries also has different targets of school children to be fed. Some countries feed all primary school pupils, some feed lower primary classes only, while some accommodates both primary and pre-primary pupils (James et al., 2022; Falode & Mustapha, 2022a).

In Nigeria, school feeding programme is yet limited to primary school pupils alone and it is focusing more on lower primary. Although SFP or HGSF in Nigeria is initiated by Federal Government but it is being maintained and sustained by efforts of Federal and State Governments as well as international partners. The level of success of this programme may therefore differ from one state to another because its implementation depends partly on the efforts of such state (Egounleti, 2022; Hassan et al., 2022). The numbers of schools cover, the number/level of classes cater for, the quality and quantity of provision (food and or snacks) also depend on how a particular state manages its resources and the extent to which the state has made extra commitment toward the success of the programme.

School Feeding Programme was initiated and first launched in Nigeria at Laminga primary school, Keffi, Nassarawa State, by the then President Olusegun Obasanjo on 27th September, 2005 (Ime, 2016). The programme targeted about 2.5 million pupils and kicked off with 12 states. The states are: Nasarawa, Niger, Yobe, Enugu, Imo, Kano, Kogi, Ogun, Bauchi, Edo, Osun states and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. It was later extended to many other states in the country, including Oyo, Ebonyi and Zamfara states. The launching was partly in response to some demands of national policies. For example, Universal Basic Education Act 2004, Section 25:To provide pupils with a free lunch by all states primary schools; To improve nutritional status of school children; Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development: To develop suitable standards and cost-effective meal plans for schools in different communities in collaboration with the Federal Ministry of Health, among others (Nnamdi, 2014).

The vision of the SFP is to run a sustainable school feeding programme that will establish a safety net for the poor and eradicate malnutrition in school age children while stimulating the national economy; while the mission statement is, provision of a free meal a day to pupils in public primary schools in Nigeria by working
constructively with stakeholders to ensure a sustainable implementation of the programme (NHGSFP, 2017). The programme, according to National Home Grown School Feeding Programme (NHGSFP, 2017) has four cardinal objectives (popularly known as one programme, four benefits):

a) **Encourage:** the programme aims to improve the enrolment of primary school children in Nigeria and reduce the current drop-out rates from primary school which is estimated at 30%.

b) **Improve:** The programme aims to address the poor nutrition and health status of many children who have been affected as a result of poverty, this has affected the learning outcomes of the children.

c) **Stimulate:** Linking the programme to local agricultural production has direct economic benefits and can potentially benefit the entire community as well as the children. The programme aims to stimulate local agricultural production and boost the income of farmers by creating a viable and ready market via the school feeding programme.

d) **To create, improve family and state:** the programme aims to create jobs along the value chain and provides a multiplier effect for economic growth and development.

The implementation of SFP varies across the states in Nigeria because of the involvement of state government in it. The strategy of implementation is capable to make or mar the programme depending on quality and quantity of food served, monitoring and supervision of the programme as well as additional support to whatever the Federal Government is able to provide. Studies have been carried out on SFP across the nation but seems not much has been done in the area of comparing the implementation of SFP across states so as to identify the strength and weakness in the implementation and to recommend solutions that are implementable.

According to Encyclopaedia Britannica, Oyo State was created in the year 1976 out of the then Western State and it included the present Osun and Oyo states. This state was divided into two in 1991. The two states are homogeneous in social and cultural beliefs and norms. The occupants of the two states are Yoruba people who have a lot in common. The present Oyo State seems better off in terms of economic power because it houses the capital city - Ibadan, of the old Oyo State. Therefore, more industries and organisations are more in Oyo State compare to Osun State. For instance, The Guardian Newspaper on 16 April, 2021, reported that while Osun State generated IGR amount to N19.67 billion in the year 2020, Oyo State generated N38.04 billion in the same year.

Osun State is one of the pilot states for SFP and till date, the state is still running the programme irrespective of changes in government. SFP in State of Osun is fondly referred to as O-Meals. At policy level, there is commitment from many ministries that are key to the success of O-Meals which these include ministries such
as Health, Agriculture, Environment and Sanitation as well as Commerce. Donor support has been well expressed through the Sahara Group PLC and CHI Pharmaceuticals. However the programme is mostly funded by Osun State Government. According to the recent report by the State on the key success, it claims to have served over 252,793 public primary school pupils since inception and that the programme had recorded more success among all the piloting states.

Through the Federal Government Intervention in 2016, school feeding commenced in Oyo and few other states in addition to existing ones (NHGSFP, 2017). Since then the programme has been in progress but it seems that not all the public primary schools are benefiting. The rationale behind this study is to see how these states can benefit in the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of SFP; how each state can adopt better strategies for improvement, are however the primary focus of this study. Oyo and Osun states are two states in the same geographical location in the country. They also share similar characteristics in terms of education and man-power. If there exist differences in the implementation of SFP and level of success recorded, such differences is worthy of proper investigation. The SFP was established on goals-oriented framework and a broad context of making local nutritious food available for school children through members of the local community, thereby enhancing quality education, providing jobs and encouraging small holder farmers. The programme is growing gradually from traditional SFP to home grown school feeding (HGSF). According to the Resource Framework on SFP, the main innovative difference between HGSF and local SFP is the prioritization of small holder farmers in a way that maximizes sustainable benefits on prices, opportunities for commercialization, market linkages and access to productive assets for small holders.

2.0 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model

The CIPP Model of evaluation was proposed by an American educator, Daniel L. Stufflebeam in 1983. The Model can be used for both summative and formative evaluation of a programme. The most important thing about this model is that it provides the holistic view of every element by evaluating the context, input, process and product from each and every angle. This model assists decision makers to answer four basic questions; what should we do, how should we do it, are we doing it as planned and did the programme work? With the help of this model, evaluation can be done systematically, fulfilling the general needs of evaluation. The important element which makes this model different from other models is that it focuses on the context for the evaluation of teaching learning and development process (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).
Context evaluation helps to assess the needs and opportunities within a defined context or environment (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The objectives of context evaluation are to define, identify and address the needs of the target population, identify the problems and assess if the goals are responsive to the desired needs or not. The different types of methods for the evaluation of context include surveys, document reviews, data analysis and interviews (Sancer et al., 2013). Some questions that context deals with are as follows: Are the aims of a programme suitable or not? Are the objectives generated from aims? Is the programme fulfilling social needs? And so on. The purpose of input evaluation is to provide information for determining the resources used to meeting the goals of a programme (Khawaja, 2001). The resources include time resources, human resources, physical resources, infrastructure, means for evaluating the quality of a programme. In application of this model of evaluation, four questions generally come to mind: what should we do, how should we do it, are we doing it as planned and is it working as expected?

Process evaluation on the other hand focuses on the running of the programme including teaching and learning processes. Implementation is a phase in which the inputs are used in effective manner to achieve the desired aims, objectives, goals of the product (Mustapha, 2022). The evaluator assesses the processes to understand how a given programme is working and which processes are responsible for better working and maintaining the quality of education. In this phase, implementation decisions are taken (Patil & Kalekar, 2014). Processes of a programme include systematic approaches, teaching learning activities, parents-teachers collaboration, formative and summative evaluation of pupils (Print, 1993). Process deals with the following questions among others: What are different channels through which a given programme is being executed? Who are involved and what is their level of participation? Is there effective two way communication between administration, teachers and other stakeholders?

Product evaluation includes the outcomes of the school. The focus of the product is not on the students achievement of grades but the skills, attitudes, knowledge, learning and abilities they attain which the student is going to use in life for the benefit of the society. The aim of the school is to make the students productive so that they can stand on their feet in society (Scriven, 1994). Some important questions with respect to Product of evaluation include: To what extent is the programme meeting the need of students and society? What is the perception of stakeholders to success of a given programme? And so on. The CIPP model was considered important to this study in that it enable the investigators to examine the objectives of SFP, the resources used in the implementation; how the implementation was carried out and the achievement of the goals of the programme.
2.2 Objectives of the Study
The main objective of this study is to evaluate and compare the implementation of school feeding programme in two states in South West part of Nigeria. Specifically, the study determines:

1) the perception of parents towards quality School Feeding Programme (SFP) as a solution to major problem of basic education
2) the perception of teachers towards quality of SFP implemented in the schools across the two states
3) And compare the quality and quantity of food supply by Osun and Oyo states to the pupils
4) how often do inspectors/monitoring team inspect/supervise the SFP and
5) if there is equal access to school meal to the pupils in the two states.

2.3 Research Questions
The study shall attempt the following research questions:

1) What is the perception of parents towards quality School Feeding Programme (SFP) as a solution to major problem of basic education?
2) What is the perception of teachers towards quality of SFP implemented in the schools?
3) What is the quality and quantity of food supply by Osun and Oyo states to the pupils?
4) How often do inspectors/monitoring team inspect/supervise the SFP?
5) Is there equal access to school meal to the pupils in the two states?

3.0 Materials and Methods
The population of this study is the entire primary school parents, teachers as well as the State Coordinator of SFP in Oyo and Osun states. A multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted for the study. Disproportionate stratified random sampling was adopted to select three LGAs in Oyo and Osun states (One in each senatorial district). Purposive sampling technique was used to select five Government-owned primary schools that are involved in the programme. Six teachers were further selected from each selected schools, making a total of 30 teachers per local government and 180 teachers across the two states. Five Parents who have pupils in the selected schools were also sampled, making a total of 150 parents from the two states. The State Coordinator of SFP in each state was also interviewed.

Three types of data collection instruments were utilized, two are self-designed questionnaires tagged ‘Perception of Parents about Quality of SFP (0.75); Perception of teachers about SFP (0.71) and State Coordinator of SFP Interview guide. The teachers and parents questionnaires have two sections each; sections
A and B. Section A measures demographic information, Section B is a 4-point Likert scale containing items for measuring the perception. The third instrument which is a Key Informant Interview Guide, was used to solicit responses from the State Coordinators of the programme. Quantitative data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics. To minimize errors, the data were coded into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0, vetted before the analysis was done. Statistics employed were frequency count, percentages, cross tabulation and charts for better interpretation of results. Thematic analysis was employed to analysis the qualitative data collected.

4.0 Results of the Study

Demographic information of the teachers involved in the study

![Fig.1 Gender Distribution of the Teachers in Osun and Oyo State](image)

Figure 1 gives statistical details of the primary school teachers sampled in Osun and Oyo state. Out of 90 teachers from Osun state, 12.2% are male while 87.8% are female teachers. Oyo State on the other hand, has 15.6% of the teachers to be male while 84.4% are female.
Figure 2 above shows the distribution of the teachers based on the class taught. It shows that in Osun state, out of the 90 teachers, 28.9%, 21.1%, 26.7%, 17.8%, 3.3% and 2.2% teach Primary I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. In Oyo State, 30%, 22.2%, 22.2%, 16.7%, 4.4% and 4.4% teach primary I, II, III, IV, V and VI respectively. This implies that teachers were sampled across all the six classes in the selected schools. The statistics of parents involved in the study is being presented in Figure 3 below.
Figure 3 reveals the distribution of pupils’ parents in the two states. Out of the 75 in Osun State, male parents are 28% and female parents are 72% while in Oyo State, male parents, 22.7% and female parents are 77.3%. This also shows that both male and female parents anticipated in the study.

4.1 Answering of Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the perception of parents towards quality School Feeding Programme (SFP) as a solution to major problem of basic education?

Table 1: Perception of Parents towards Quality SFP as a Solution to Hunger: The Major Problem of Basic Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hunger stops pupils from going to school regularly</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When a child eat a balanced diet food at school, that can affect his/her performance in school.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At least one regular good food at school can stop pupils’ health being at risk</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A good school meal can attract children to school regularly</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A regular served school meal will increase school enrolment, completion and better performance</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Average 2.93
Table 1 displays perception of parents in both Osun and Oyo states towards SFP being a solution to hunger as a major problem of basic education. The parents agreed that hunger stops pupils from going to school regularly (Mean = 2.57); that when children eat balanced diet at school, that can affect his/her performance in school (Mean = 3.21); that at least one regular good food at school can stop pupils’ health being at risk (Mean = 3.17); that good school meal can attract children to school regularly (Mean = 3.08) and that a regular served school meal will increase school enrolment, completion and better performance (Mean = 2.61). The weighted average for the table is 2.93, which can be translated to agreed. This indicates that the perception of parents towards quality School Feeding Programme (SFP) as a solution to major problem of basic education is positive.

**Research Question 2:** What is the perception of teachers towards quality of SFP implemented in the schools?

Table 2: Perception of teacher towards SFP as a solution to problem of basic education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hunger is the most challenging problem school pupils have as far as</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attendance, health and good performance are concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The one meal giving in the school in a day is solving this problem</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The school feeding programme (SFP) is capable of providing one</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality square meal for the pupils per school day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SFP in my state is adequately meeting the above need</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The quality of food serving in the SFP is affecting the achievement</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the objectives of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above shows the perception of teachers in Osun and Oyo states towards quality of SFP implemented in the states as a solution to problem of basic education. The teachers agreed that hunger is the most challenging
problem school pupils have as far as attendance, health and good performance are concern (Mean = 3.23) that the one meal giving in the school in a day is solving this problem (Mean = 3.31), that The school feeding programme (SFP) is capable of providing one quality square meal for the pupils per school day (Mean = 3.38). But the teachers disagreed that SFP in their state is adequately meeting the above need (Mean = 2.41) and that the quality of food serving in the SFP is affecting the achievement of the objectives of the programme (Mean = 3.08). The weighted average of the Table is 3.08 which indicates that the teachers have positive perception about the efficacy of SFP to solve huger problem facing basic education but their perception about the quality implementation of the programme in the states is negative.

**Research Question 3:** What is the quality and quantity of food supply by Osun and Oyo states to the pupils?

**Table 3: Comparative Analysis of Quality and Quantity of Food Supply by the States to the Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There has never been an occasion that food did not go round to all the pupils</td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At times pupils take food home due to surplus</td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At all times pupils eat to their satisfaction</td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supplements such as fruit, local juice are usually part of the meal</td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The meal served to the pupils are balance diets</td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Averages</strong></td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals the comparison of the quantity and quality of food supplied to the schools for the pupils in the two states under consideration. Osun State has never had an occasion that food did not go round to all the
pupils (Mean = 2.82) while in Oyo State, such claim cannot be made (mean = 1.89); The teachers disagreed that at times pupils take food home due to surplus in Osun State (Mean = 1.86) and same is in Oyo State (mean = 1.68); Teachers disagreed that at all times pupils eat to their satisfaction (Mean = 2.04) and the same happened in Oyo State (Mean = 2.30); Osun State do have supplements such as fruit, local juice are usually part of the meal (Mean = 2.94) while this was not the case in Oyo State (Mean = 2.28); The teachers from Osun State agreed that the meal served to the pupils are balance diets (Mean = 3.41) and same is the case in Oyo State (Mean = 3.40). The weighted average for Osun State is 2.61 which indicates that the teachers have positive perception about the quality of SFP implemented in Osun State while teachers in Oyo State (Mean = 2.31) had negative perception about this. Hence, the study inferred that Osun State provides more quantity and quality food for the pupils compare to Oyo State.

**Research Question 4: How often do inspectors/monitoring team inspect/supervise the SFP?**

Answers to the above research question were gotten from the interview conducted for the coordinators of SFP in Osun and Oyo states. During the interview, the major provider and the partnerships in SFP in the state was asked. The coordinator of the programme in Osun State identified Federal Government of Nigeria as the major provider of the programme. The Coordinator however listed the following as the major partners: (i) Osun State government, (ii) Food Basket (Under each Local Government Authority), (iii) Partnership for Child Development (PCD), (iv) School Based Management Committee- SBMC and PTA and (v) New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD). The Oyo State Coordinator also identified FGN as the major provider. The only partnership mentioned was Partnership for Child Development (PCD). On the issue of supervision and monitoring, the coordinators were asked who and how frequent is the programme being supervised and monitored. Osun State Coordinator submitted thus

> Many people were put in charge of monitoring and supervising SFP in our state. This include the the parents, community members, School Based Management Committee (SBMC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and Government Team on Supervision and Monitoring. At least, a team will be in a school, in a week. But officially, the Government Team moves around every month.

The case was not the same in Oyo State as the Coordinator has this to say:

> Sometime the parents and the teachers do inspect the food to be given to the pupils. We also have the Government Monitoring and Supervision Team who do go round the schools to ensure that the food is served. The Government Team do go round every month.
With these submissions, it can be inferred that Government Officials do supervise and monitor SFP in the two states every month. But Osun State have more sets of people to monitor the programme, ranging from parents, community members and school governing bodies.

**Research Question 5:** Is there equal access to school meal to the pupils in the two states?

The interview with the State Coordinator reveals that Osun State have pupils accessing the SFP than Oyo State. The Osun State Coordinator said:

> Yes. By the grace of God all the primary schools in Osun State is receiving a meal on every school day. I want to say a very big thank you to Osun State Government; The State takes care of Primary IV pupils while Federal Government feeds the lower primary classes (Primary I to III). In fact, it’s not just the state alone, community members, PTA and other agencies are also making their inputs.

The Oyo State Coordinator, in the other hand, said:

> No. Currently, some schools do not have vendors, especially schools in rural areas. We are trusting that this present regime of state government will assist as we work towards recruiting vendors for the unreached schools.

To this end, this study inferred that Osun State pupils have more access to SFP in terms of number of schools and classroom covered that what obtained in Oyo State.

**5.0 Discussion of Findings**

The first finding of this study is that the perception of parents towards quality School Feeding Programme (SFP) as a solution to major problem of basic education is positive. This might be as a result of the fact that hunger and poverty have been identified as the major challenge facing Nigerian populace. As pointed out by Baba (2012) childhood hunger and malnutrition are some of the major factors responsible for poor education performance and poor health among primary school pupils. Ohanyelu (2022) also revealed that students whose parents acquired better education and higher income levels would positively support their children’s education. For instance, a child from poor socio-economic background who has nothing to eat in the morning may either not go to school or would lack concentration if he or she eventually get to school. Baba (2012) further points out that malnutrition are equally bad as it could cause underweight or obesity among the pupils. Ismail (2010) also highlighted hunger associated with poverty as one of the major obstacles confronting Nigeria education despite her rich resources. Many of the teachers involved in this study across the two states shared their experience of many occasions when the pupils will come to school with empty stomach. The teachers shared that many teachers used to feed many pupils most times from their limited resources. The public school being
the only option for the children of parents with less or no financial capacity. Many of these parents find it difficult to provide three meals a day for the children. This might be the reason the parent agreed that if SFP can be well and religiously implemented in the school, it will enhance, enrolment, attendance and consequently, the learning outcomes of the pupils.

The second finding of the study is that the teachers have positive perception about the efficacy of SFP to solve huger problem facing basic education but their perception about the quality implementation of the programme in the states is negative. Because of the experience of the teachers in public schools about the level of poverty glaring on the appearances of the pupils, in conjunction with proportion of the pupils who used to come to school with empty stomach; the positive perception that SFP will do a lot to solve such problem is based. This supports the finding of a survey by Taylor and Ogbugu (2016) on effect of school feeding programme on elementary school pupils in Osun State that the programme (SFP) in the state has increased enrolment and improved performance. In the other hand, the implementation of the programme by some vendors as well as those who employed the vendor has been seriously affected. The expertise of the vendors in one hand and the intention to maximise profit in the other, has been affecting the quality and quantity of the programme. This is found more pronounced in Oyo than in Osun State because Osun State involved many stakeholders in the supervision and monitoring which comes up more frequently than what obtained in Oyo State. Besides this, lack of accurate data of school children with limited financial capacity on the part of the government might have been affecting the quality and quantity of SFP in the states. This corroborates the submission of Taylor and Ogbugu (2016) who identified insufficient food as a problem facing SFP in Osun State.

The third finding of this study is that Osun State provides more quantity and quality food for the pupils than what obtained in Oyo State. The reason for this is not farfetched because it can be attributed to the involvement of many stakeholders in the programme. Osun State has functional School Based Management Committee (SBMC) that subsidizes food items for the pupils. The community as well as parents were also seen as partners in the programme. The level of success achieved by the programme in Osun State could be as the result of democratic leadership portrayed by the leadership. As opined by Tsegaye (2022), democratic leadership is “the performance of three functions: distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group's decision-making process. In Osun State, local juice such as zobo, kunu and fruits were provided along the meal but Oyo State has not fully embrace this approach. The support of the community cannot be over emphasised. As noted by Ismail (2010), schools that depend on the community to organize and implement SFPs offer certain advantages among which are increasing the contact and communication between parents, teachers, government officials and others as well as giving parents the opportunity to become more aware of what goes on at schools. What is obtainable in Osun State is in line with
findings of Afridi (2011) who found that parents support via construction of kitchen, paying the cooks, offering facilities like, spoons, plates, offering materials like firewood, they take part in kitchen cleaning activities and volunteering to serve the children. Afridi (2011) further gathered that the parents encourage their children to eat at school noting that the parents discussed the nutritional value of SFP with the school management occasionally.

The fourth finding of this study is that Government Officials do supervise and monitor SFP in the two states every month. But Osun State has more sets of people to monitor the programme, ranging from parents, community members and school governing bodies. The programme was inaugurated with supervision and monitoring unit. However, as discussed earlier, Osun State involves other stakeholders such as parents, community, SBMC, PTA and State Government monitoring team. Osun State has sub-channel through which they accommodate primary IV pupils. These channels include Food Basket, School Business Management Committee and PTA. The SFP leader emphasized the mission statement in Osun, “feed the child, feed the nation” and this has been one of their motivating factors that keep the programme ahead of many other states. Partnership for Child Development (PCD) which is Imperial College’s intervention through the Federal Government was also mentioned to have made input in both states. The coordinator of the programme in Osun identified their specific input in term of human resources training and technical supports alongside with NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa Development) while other state agencies, local government, special committees and PTA help in subsidizing the food items. Some of these agencies and committees are also involved in monitoring the programme. However, in Oyo State, the key people that monitor the programme are Government agencies - The 8 Zonal Inspectors and the 33 Local Inspectors who, according to the desk officer (Oyo HGSFP) submit reports on monthly basis.

The final finding of the study is that Osun State pupils have more access to SFP in terms of number of schools and classroom covered that what obtained in Oyo State. This can be attributed to the contribution of the State Government. In Osun State, the State Coordinator of SFP made it known that the state government is single-handedly feeding Primary IV classes in addition to the Federal Government efforts on Primary I to III. Besides, Osun State claimed that schools in the rural areas are well taking care off. These two points are not happening in Oyo State as at the time of this study.

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study

The parents and the teachers of primary education in Osun and Oyo states affirmed the power of School Feeding Programme as a solution to one of the major challenges facing the achievement of the goals of this
level of education. The programme has enhanced the enrolment, attendance and consequently, the learning outcomes in this level of education. But this has not been in completely achieved as there is still a huge number of out-of-school children in Nigeria in general and south western states of the country in particular. As a result, the implementation of SFP in the states was fingered as what could have brought about partly achievement of the its goals. This prompted the investigation of the implementation of SFP is two south western states of Nigeria - Osun and Oyo States. These two states are homogeneous is socio-cultural status as the two were together as a single state in recent past, though Oyo State seems more buoyant economically. This Study discovered that Osun State put more efforts and resources to the implementation of SFP than Oyo State. Osun State involve other partners, has chain of supervision and monitoring processes, in support of Federal Government efforts, make provision for additional class to be fed. It will not be a surprise if proportion of out-of-school children in Osun State is drastically low compared with that of Oyo State.

Based on the findings of this study, and for better achievement of the goals of primary education in the nearest future, the following recommendations are proffered: Oyo State should adopt partnership approach in the implementation of SFP across the State. Just like Osun State, Oyo State should consider partnering with School Based Management Committee (SBMC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA), community, parents, NGOs, Local Government Authority as well as Local Councils. All these partners should also be involved in the monitoring and supervision of the programme. Since Federal Government can only afford to fed lower primary classes (Primary I to III), The two State should try to support by feeding the upper primary classes. This could be achieved by investing in community food production. Based on the comment made by some of the teachers on late coming, the food should be served as a breakfast on the basis of ‘first come, first serve’ to discourage lateness. Federal and state governments should include pre-primary children in the feeding programme since that level of education has been officially recognized in the policy of education.
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