

Food Insecurity and Coping Strategies among Rural Households in Niger State, Nigeria

Mustapha Mukhtar

Department of Economics

Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University Lapai, Nigeria

Correspondence Email: mustaphamukhtar@gmail.com

Abstract

The study aimed to assess food insecurity and coping strategies adopted by rural households in Niger State, Nigeria. The research adopts a sample size of 104 rural household heads from three Local Government Areas drawn from three agricultural zones of the State. Food insecurity index was used to determine the food insecurity status of the rural households, while universal coping strategy index was used to determine the different strategies adopted by the rural households faced with problem of food insecurity. Food insecurity index result revealed that 48% of the rural household heads in Niger State, Nigeria were food insecure, while 52% were food secure with a per capita household consumption of 2,243 kcal and per capita requirement of 2,474 kcal, indicating that the State was facing food insecurity issues. Rural households in Niger State, Nigeria adopted seven coping strategies in order to cope with food shortage, which included eating less preferred food, reducing food consumption portion, children eating first, purchasing food on credit or borrowing food, leasing of assets, relying on help from relatives and friends and skipping meals. The study recommend that government should put forward policies in agriculture and employment aimed at reducing or eliminating poverty, which will subsequently increase the level of food secure households in Niger, Nigeria.

Keywords: Per Capita, Coping Strategy, Poverty, Food Shortage, Kcals

JEL Classification: H31

1. Introduction

The state of food insecurity in the world indicated that over 688 million individuals were in dire need of food by end of 2016 from 150 countries identified with severe food insecurity issues (Food and Organization [FAO], 2017). An estimated 48% of these individuals were located in the African continent. Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) accounted for the highest percentage of people with food insecurity problem with 92%, while Northern Africa accounted for only 8% of the share of hungry people in the region. Asian continent accounted for second largest continent with people suffering from serious food insecurity with about 45%, while less than 1% each were accounted by North America and Europe of

the world population suffering from chronic malnutrition as indicated in appendix 4 (FAO, 2017).

Food insecurity according to FAO (2015), is a situation in which people lack nutritious food intake necessary for vitality and supplements for full-scale starvation. Food insecurity can be chronic or transitory, which is highly dependent on duration of the hunger or the span. Chronic food insecurity, sometimes referred to as perpetual hunger, resulted into starvation vulnerability (Ingawa, 2002; Godfray et al., 2010). Chronic hunger has a direct relationship with the level of poverty among the society, especially among rural communities located in developing countries of the World that were seriously affected by conflicts and food insecurity challenges (Blattman & Miguel, 2010).

Some identified causes of food insecurity include unpredictable rise in global food price, shift in global food harvests to biofuel among the major food exporting countries, persistent government neglect of the area of agriculture particularly in infrastructural facilities and lack of investment in most of the developing countries, continuous conflict in some part of the world and the approaching danger of climate changes and its antagonistic impact on food production (FAO, 2012). This issue has long been observed and hence the introduction of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) with the ultimate aim of halving or reducing the number of under-nutrition individuals in the world by the end of 2015 (FAO, 2012).

As of now only 63 nations have met the MDGs target by the end of 2015. Regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean gained hugely in meeting the target, however only humble advance in Sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia was achieved mostly due to calamities and conflicts, which keep on trapping people into hunger (FAO, IFAD & WFP, 2014)

Nigeria has an estimated 25.5% of its total population (170 million) classified as having serious food insecurity according to FAO (2016); World Bank (2015). Abubakar (1997) observed that one of the typical indicators of food insecurity in Nigeria was poverty. According to Brock (2013) over 62% of the Nigerian population was trapped in extreme poverty and 80% were located in rural areas. Agriculture serves as a main source of employment among the rural households, which is characterized by low productivity due to traditional mode of farming and low government interventions in the area of agriculture (Omanukwue, 2005).

With an estimated 180 million population in the country, nearly accounting for 47% of West African population, food insecurity issues will continue to be a predicament in the country. With population increase, the demand for food in the society also increases, but then the ability to produce food of nutritious quality also diminishes due to weight from the growing population in form of climate changes and other vices (FAO, 2015).

Currently the level of poverty in Niger, Nigeria has taken a different level, especially with current recession that the country found itself. More and more households are finding it difficult to feed their households. Inflation and high level of unemployment is also impacting negatively on the food security status of households. Children and women are at the receiving end. This high level of food insecurity status necessitated this study. Therefore, the objective of this study was to determine the status of food insecurity among

rural households in Niger State, Nigeria and to identify the coping strategies adopted by rural households classified as food insecure.

Previous studies on food insecurity in Niger State, Nigeria were focused only on determining the effect of food insecurity, without determining the status of food insecurity among households. Therefore this study further determined the level of food insecurity among the rural households, since poverty was always considered to be high in such locations. The study also disaggregated the level of food insecurity among the regions of the state. In most cases, once a household is faced with food insecurity, then a coping strategy needs to be employed to manage the situation. Therefore the study also adopted the reduced CSI index to identify the strategies employed by households that were classified food insecure in the study area.

2. Literature Review

Theoretically, one of the best theories that explain food insecurity situation faced by households is Malthus theory of population (1776-1834). The theory highlighted the possible perils associated with overpopulation in a society. According to him, unless measures were put in place human population will soon exceed food production, thereby resulting in starvation and hunger. The theory has its assumptions based on irrational behaviour of human being in the process of reproduction (Weeks).

Empirically, there are various studies carried out on food security/insecurity and coping strategies adaptation in Nigeria. Most recent ones include the work of Olayiwola, Tashikalma and Giroh (2017); Obayelu, Vaughan & Afolabi (2016); Agada and Igboke (2014). Others include Idrisa, Gwary and Shehu (2008); Olayemi (2012). The most prominent tools used in measuring food insecurity of household include; Household income and expenditure (HIES), Dietary diversity score, Food insecurity index (FSI) and Coping strategy index (CSI).

Olayiwola *et al.* (2017) investigated food security and coping strategies among households in Oluyole, Oyo, Nigeria. The study used the descriptive analysis, CSI and food security index (FSI). Its result revealed that 42.3% of the household were food insecure and the most frequently coping strategies adopted by the household included selling of livestock, reducing money and purchasing on credit and sometimes skipping meals. Also, Quaye (2008) studied food security and coping strategies in Ghana and related problems. The study employed the CSI and dietary diversity score. Frequent coping strategies adopted by households included migration, depending on assistance from family and friends, selling of assets and livestock to feed, consumption reduction, eating less preferred meals and eating less meals. Similarly, Ehebhamen *et al.* (2017) investigated food security and coping strategies adaptation in Edo, Nigeria and the study use the CSI and FSI. Result indicated that 52.3% of the households were food insecure and that coping strategies adopted included eating less preferred food, reducing meals, purchasing and borrowing food on credit, depending on family and friends.

However, Agada and Igboke (2014) investigated food security and coping strategies among three ethnic groups in North central region of Nigeria and employed the FSI and CSI. Results of the study revealed that household considered food insecure relied on limiting

food portion and eating less preferred food to cope with food insecure situation. Shariff and Linkhor (2008) studied food insecurity and coping strategies in poor rural households in Malaysia. The study used the descriptive analysis and CSI. The results indicated that coping strategies adopted by food secure households included selling assets, while food insecure households employed the use of borrowing money to purchase food and reducing expenditure on children in the household. Finally, Ivanda, Igboke and Olatunji (2015) researched on food security situation among Tiv farming households of Benue, Nigeria. They used the FSI and CSI. The results showed that 57.1% of the household were food secure, while coping strategies used by the households including mixed cropping, early harvesting and using high yield agricultural inputs.

The above literature shows that there is no information concerning food security situation in Niger State, Nigeria and the current coping strategies used among rural households in the State. Thus, there is need to carry out the study in order to bridge the existing gap in knowledge.

3. Methodology

3.1 Data and Sample

The study used primary data, and well structured questionnaire to gather information among 104 household heads as sample. A stratified sampling technique was adopted and three local government areas were drawn from the three agricultural zones, one each from each zone, depending on population of households in each local government area, a household sample was drawn to make a total of 104 households. The reason for this method is to identify the extent of food insecurity among the three agricultural zones. Descriptive statistics, food insecurity index and coping strategy index were used to determine household food insecurity level as well as the coping strategies adopted by rural households in Niger State, Nigeria.

3.2 Food Insecurity Index

Given the model of multidimensional poverty index developed by Foster-Greer Thorbecke, Christiansen and Boisvert (2000) which revealed an indicator that incorporate three chronological dimension cumulatively, which also considered vulnerability and uncertainty of being food secure. The index identified the different dimensions of n of food secure, with a threshold y_j identifying where a household i th is deprive from achieving certain dimension j , inline with X_{ij} (value of dimension j for household i th) which is less than the threshold or equal to the threshold.

$$Fis_i = \sum a_j P_j \left(\frac{X_{ij}}{y_j} \right) \dots\dots\dots 1$$

Where a_j indicates the vital importance attached to future, in such way vulnerability can be discounted to current situation of shortage in food, while present time of food insecurity and vulnerability in term of food might have the same impacts.

At aggregative level, the index is given as follows:

$$Fis_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum a_j P_j \left(\frac{X_{ij}}{y_j} \right) \dots\dots\dots 2$$

Where X_{ij} measure the daily per capita food intake converted into calorie per household, y_i measures the per capita food intake requirement as recommended by FAO (2,470 kcal).

Household consumption is converted into grams and each food item calorie is multiplied with the grams to obtain kcals in line with common food item consumed in Nigeria provided by Oguntona and Akinyele (1995) in appendix 3 and adopted by various scholars like Babatunde et al. (2007). Household’s composition (infants, under 18 years and adults) was average using Kuwornu et al. (2013) in appendix 1 and Stefan and Pramila table of adult equivalent conversion table in appendix 2. The index is further simplifies as below:

$$\Pi = \frac{\beta_i}{\xi} \dots\dots\dots 3$$

Where Π is the food security index ranging between one and zero. A food secure household will achieve (1) and above value, while a food insecure household will fall below (1), β_i represents per capita daily food intake consume in household ith, while ξ is the per capita daily food intake requirement for the household.

3.3 Household Coping Strategy Index

One of the quickest and easiest ways to determine food insecurity situation in a location is through coping strategy index (Food and Nutrition technical Assistance [Fanta], 2003). Coping strategy index (CSI) measures household inability to meet up or access enough food for dietary requirement. Under normal circumstance a household hardly wait for food to get exhausted before adopting measures or adjusting consumption, especially when the problem is imminent (Christiaensen & Boisvert, 2000). According to Maxwell and Caldwell (2008) CSI is defined as dietary intake behavior pattern adjustment adopted by household faced with serious food insecurity situation by counting the frequency of occurring of the behavior with its severity. According to Fanta (2006) CSI measures the number of frequency and severity of behavior employed by households during food shortage.

Coping strategy is classified into two main types, modest food adjustment and sometime reversible over time, which include eating less preferred food and reducing the amount of food portion and a more severe behavior and difficult to reverse overtime including sales of productive assets (Watts, 1993). Corbett (1988); Devereux (1993) observed that the more food insecurity deteriorated, the likelihood of using coping strategies that are considered extremely severe and less reversible, which subsequently result in permanent food insecure position.

The index adopts direct questions developed to measure household frequent eating pattern, thereby relating it to the coping behavior answers to determine food security scale in the household or location. The CSI has three main basic points namely answer to the common question should be based on the correct list of coping behavior in a particular location, frequency of adaptation and identified as the severity of each coping behavior (Fanta, 2006).

4. Results

4.1 Household Heads Socio-economic Profile

Socio-economics profiling of the household heads is presented in Table 4.1 below. Results from Table 4.1 indicate that the average household head is 47 years, while classification of age brackets indicates that 43% of the household head age is 41 years – 50 years which

represents the highest age classification, about 14% are within the age brackets of 31 years – 40 years, 13% are within 21 years – 30 years of age, while only 3% are within 18 years – 20 years of age. In term of gender, Table 4.1 shows that 97% are male-headed household's heads and only 3% are female-headed household heads. Marital status also from Table 4.1 shows that 97% are married; about 2% are widowed, while only 1% are divorced. Average household size from Table 4.1 shows that, there is a minimum of 13 individuals from each household. In term of classification, Table 4.1 shows that 46% of the household head have a family size of 11 – 20 individuals; about 41% have family size of 1 – 10 individuals, while 15% have a family size of 21 – above.

In terms of farming activities of the study area, Table 4.1 shows that there is an average of 19 years farming experience among the rural household, an estimated 24% are within 1 - 10 farming experience, 63% are within 11 – 20 years farming experience while 13% have 21 – Above years farming experience. Household average farm size is estimated at 2 ha, farmsize classification from Table 4.1 shows that 88% have 1 – 5 ha of farm size, while 12% have 6 – 10 ha of farm size.

On land ownership structure, Table 4.1 indicates that 94% acquired their land through family by way of inheritance, 3% acquired their land through outright purchase while 3% also acquired their land by means of renting. An estimated 75% of the rural household farmers indicated that they have not established any contact with extension service agents, about 19% establish a contact of one in a month, while 6% had established contact of two times a month with extension service agents.

In terms of economic profiling of household heads, Table 4.1 shows that the average income among household heads is ₦43, 000. In terms of income classification, about 81% of the rural household heads were within N10, 000 – N100, 000, this represents majority of the rural household heads in the study area. This suggests that majority of the household heads were faced with high level of poverty since per capita income was less ₦2, 000 daily. About 13% were within the income classification of ₦101, 000 – ₦200, 000, while only 6% are within the income classification of ₦201, 000 – Above. From Table 4.1 household monthly expenditure on food items shows that, averagely each household has N55, 500 spent on food items. Classification further revealed that 91% representing majority of the households were with ₦10, 000 – ₦100, 000 monthly expenditure classification, about 5% were within ₦101, 000 – ₦200, 000 while 4% were within N201, 000 – Above.

Table. 4.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of Household Heads

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage | Means |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| <i>Household Age</i> | | | 47 |
| 18 - 20 Years | 3 | 3 | |
| 21 - 30 Years | 13 | 13 | |
| 31 - 40 Years | 15 | 14 | |
| 41 - 50 Years | 45 | 43 | |
| 51 - Above Years | 28 | 27 | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|----|----|
| <i>Household Head Gender</i> | | | |
| Female | 3 | 3 | |
| Male | 101 | 97 | |
| <i>Household Marital Status</i> | | | |
| Single | 0 | 0 | |
| Married | 101 | 97 | |
| Widowed | 2 | 2 | |
| Divorced | 1 | 1 | |
| <i>Level of Education</i> | | | |
| Adult Education | 32 | 31 | |
| Primary | 54 | 52 | |
| Secondary | 15 | 14 | |
| Tertiary | 3 | 3 | |
| <i>Farming Experience</i> | | | |
| 1 - 10 Years | 25 | 24 | 19 |
| 11 - 20 Years | 65 | 63 | |
| 21 – Above | 14 | 13 | |
| <i>Household Size</i> | | | |
| 1 - 10 Individuals | 41 | 39 | 13 |
| 11 -20 Individuals | 48 | 46 | |
| 21 – Above | 15 | 14 | |
| <i>Farm Size</i> | | | |
| 1 - 5 ha | 92 | 88 | |
| 6 - 10 ha | 12 | 12 | |
| 11 – Above | 0 | 0 | |
| <i>Land Ownership</i> | | | |
| Inheritance | 98 | 94 | |
| Purchased | 3 | 3 | |
| Rent | 3 | 3 | |

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage | Means |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| <i>Extension Visitation</i> | | | |
| None | 78 | 75 | |
| One a month | 20 | 19 | |
| Twice a month | 6 | 6 | |
| <i>Credit Source</i> | | | |
| Yes | 11 | 11 | |
| No | 93 | 89 | |
| <i>Household Head Income</i> | | | |
| N10, 000 - N100, 000 | 84 | 81 | N43, 000 |
| N101, 000 - N200, 000 | 14 | 13 | |
| 201, 000 – Above | 6 | 6 | |

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage | Means |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| <i>Household Head Expenditure</i> | | | N55, 500 |
| N10, 000 - N100, 000 | 95 | 91 | |
| N101, 000 - N200, 000 | 5 | 5 | |
| N201, 000 – Above | 4 | 4 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2017

4.2 Household Food Insecurity Status

Table 4.2 indicates the percentage of households as classified food secure in Niger State, Nigeria using the food insecurity index. The result from Table 4.2 indicates that 40%, 67% and 49% of the rural households in Niger, Nigeria were food secure with index of 1.08, 1.20 and 1.22 for Lapai, Kontagora and Suleja respectively. Clearly, Suleja had the highest index of 1.22 suggesting that food secure households had the highest index when compared to Kontagora and Lapai with 1.20 and 1.08 respectively. However, Kontagora had the highest number of adult equivalent classified as food secure than either Suleja or Lapai. Overall, the index among the households in the State is estimated at 1.18 with a per capita daily calorie consumption of 2,920.15 kcals as against the per capita daily calorie requirement of 2,473.54 kcal

Total household surplus among households in the State is 0.18 (18%), indicating the extent to which these households classified as food secure exceeded the threshold of 1. Overall, adults equivalent among food secure households is estimated at 167 individuals among the 104 households considering average energy per day requirement of infant with factor equivalent of (0.3) and children of 6 -18 years with factor equivalent of (0.7) given in appendix (1) and appendix (2).

Table 4.2 Summary of Food Secure Households in Niger, Nigeria

| Factor | LAPAI (n = 26) | KONTAGORA (n = 35) | SULEJA (n = 43) | POOLED (n = 104) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| % | 40 | 67 | 49 | 52 |
| Daily consumption | 96110 | 199436 | 192119 | 487665.00 |
| Daily Calorie Requirement | 89244 | 165758 | 158080 | 413082.00 |
| Per capita Daily Consumption | 2670 | 2977 | 3002 | 2920.15 |
| Per capita Daily requirement | 2479 | 2474 | 2470 | 2473.54 |
| Food Security Index | 1.08 | 1.20 | 1.22 | 1.18 |
| Head Count | 0.40 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.52 |
| Shortfall (Pi) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Surplus (Ps) | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.18 |
| Adults equivalent | 36 | 67 | 64 | 167.00 |

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Table 4.3 shows the percentage of households classified as food insecure, an estimated 60%, 33% and 51% of the households in Lapai, Kontagora and Suleja respectively, with overall average of 48% of the total adult equivalent in the study area classified as food insecure. Further indication from Table 4.3 shows that Suleja and Lapai had the highest food insecure

adult equivalent of 66 and 54 respectively, however, Lapai had the highest percentage of household classified as food insecure. Food index further reveals that Lapai, Kontagora and Suleja achieved a status of 0.65, 0.64 and 0.56 respectively, indicating that all the households were below the threshold of 1. Food shortage from Lapai, Kontagora and Suleja shows 0.35 (35%), 0.36 (36%) and 0.44 (44%) respectively.

Table 4.3 Summary of Food Insecure Households in Niger, Nigeria

| Factor | LAPAI (n = 26) | KONTAGORA (n = 35) | SULEJA (n = 43) | POOLED (n = 104) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| % | 60 | 33 | 51 | 48 |
| Daily consumption | 86132 | 52520 | 91476 | 230128.00 |
| Daily Calorie Requirement | 133434 | 81741 | 163482 | 378657.00 |
| Per capita Daily Consumption | 1595 | 1592 | 1386 | 1504.10 |
| Per capita Daily requirement | 2471 | 2477 | 2477 | 2474.88 |
| Food Security Index | 0.65 | 0.64 | 0.56 | 0.61 |
| Head Count | 0.60 | 0.33 | 0.51 | 0.48 |
| Shortfall (Pi) | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.39 |
| Surplus (Ps) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Adults equivalent | 54 | 33 | 66 | 153.00 |

Source: Field Survey, 2017

On the average about 48% of the total households in the study area are food insecure with daily calorie consumption of 230,120 kcals, daily calorie requirement 378, 657, per capita daily consumption 1,504.10 kcal, per capita daily calorie requirement of 2,474.88 kcals. Average index from Table 4.3 reveals that household classified as food insecure achieve a food security status of 0.61 clearly indicating a shortage of 0.39 (39%). Total adult equivalent of household classified food insecure is 153 across the three location surveyed.

Table 4.4 shows the summary of the index of food insecurity among rural households in Niger, Nigeria. The table indicates that total overall daily calorie consumption in the study area is 717,793 kcals, total overall daily calorie requirement is 791,739 kcals, while per capita daily calorie consumption in the study area is 2,243 kcals, per capital daily calorie requirement is 2,474 kcal which is far above the daily per capita calorie consumption. This resulted in an index of 0.91, which suggests that overall Niger, State still faces a serious food security challenges among the household. In all the three locations only Kontagora is food secure because the have meet and surpass the threshold of 1 with an index of 1.02 thereby having a surplus of 0.02. Lapai has the lowest index of 0.82 among the State, suggesting that food insecurity is the highest in the State.

In terms of food shortage, the State has a food deficit of 0.07 (7%) which represents a good signal that, with hard work, government intervention and reduction in the number of population among households, food security can easily be achieved in the near future.

Overall, the State has an adult equivalent of 320 adults from the total households of 104, Suleja had the highest adult equivalent of 130 adults, and this was slightly followed by Kontagora, while Lapai had the least adult equivalent of 90.

Table 4.4 Summary of Food insecurity Households in Niger, Nigeria

| Factor | LAPAI (n = 26) | KONTAGORA (n = 35) | SULEJA (n = 43) | POOLED (n = 104) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| % | | | | |
| Daily consumption | 182242 | 251956 | 283595 | 717793 |
| Daily Calorie Requirement | 222678 | 247499 | 321562 | 791739 |
| Per capita Daily Consumption | 2025 | 2520 | 2182 | 2243 |
| Per capita Daily requirement | 2474 | 2475 | 2474 | 2474 |
| Food Security Index | 0.82 | 1.02 | 0.88 | 0.91 |
| Head Count | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Shortfall (Pi) | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.07 |
| Surplus (Ps) | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Adults equivalent | 90 | 100 | 130 | 320 |

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Various studies adopted the food insecurity index including the works of Ganiyu and Omotayo (2016); Ogundari (2017); Asogwa and Umeh (2012) in different locations of Nigeria.

4.3 Coping Strategy Index (CSI)

Once a household is classified as food insecure, then coping strategy sets in. The strategies are usually employed to mitigate the food shortage. Table 4.5 shows that the study area had seven different coping strategies. Some were extremely severe and irreversible, while others were less severe and reversible. Selling assets, skipping meals and children eating first before adults all represent severe and irreversible coping strategies, while borrowing food or purchasing food on credit, reducing consumption pattern, relying on help from families and friends and eating less preferred meals all represent less severe and reversible coping strategies.

Table 4.5 shows that the most frequent coping strategies adopted by households in Niger, Nigeria were eating less preferred meals 90%. It was followed by children eating first before meals 81%, borrowing or purchasing food on credit 80%, reducing food consumption 77%, Selling assets 65%, relying on families and friends for food 48%, skipping meals 43%. Clearly the study area has a mixture of severe and less severe coping strategies adopted when households is faced with food shortage.

Table 4.5 Frequent Coping Strategies Adaptation Among Households in Niger, Nigeria

| Strategies | Never | | Occasional | | Always | | Total | |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-----|
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Borrowing | 21 | 20.19 | 70 | 67.31 | 13 | 12.50 | 104 | 100 |
| Selling asset | 36 | 34.62 | 44 | 42.31 | 24 | 23.08 | 104 | 100 |
| Skipping meals | 59 | 56.73 | 27 | 25.96 | 18 | 17.31 | 104 | 100 |
| Reduction in consumption | 24 | 23.08 | 67 | 64.42 | 13 | 12.50 | 104 | 100 |
| Reliance on help | 54 | 51.92 | 36 | 34.62 | 14 | 13.46 | 104 | 100 |
| Children first | 20 | 19.23 | 22 | 21.15 | 62 | 59.62 | 104 | 100 |
| Eating less preferred food | 10 | 9.62 | 50 | 48.08 | 44 | 42.31 | 104 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey, 2017

While majority of households adopted eating less preferred foods in the study area, at the same time more people also adopted extremely severe coping strategies like children eating first before adult and the more households adopt such behavior, the higher the tendency of the households being food insecure perpetually. Furthermore, Table 4.5 indicates that moderate coping strategies accounted for 43%, while severe coping strategies accounted for 26% of coping behaviors.

5. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

This paper determined the food insecurity index and frequent coping strategies of rural households in Niger, Nigeria. Food insecurity index reveals that 52% of the rural households in Niger, Nigeria were food secure in that, the households had achieved the threshold for food secure households of 1 and above, while 48% fell short of the threshold and as such classified as food insecure. The moment households get slightest idea of food shortage, immediately they start to take action to counter the problem. Frequent identified coping strategies in the area included eating less preferred meals, children eating first before adults in the households, borrowing food or purchasing on credit, reducing consumption pattern, selling assets, while less frequent coping strategies included relying on help from friends and relatives to eat as well as skipping meals.

On the other hand, the descriptive analysis further revealed that the average age among households in the study area was 47 years; about 97% of the household heads were male and married. The average households size was 13. An estimated 52% of the household heads had primary education certificate. Average farming experience among rural farmer is 19 years, while farm size average was 3 ha with 88% of the household having a farm size of 1 – 5 ha. In term of landownership, 94% owned their farmland through family inheritance and 75% of the household heads had not established contact with extension service agents. Average monthly household heads income was ₦43, 000 while average monthly expenditure among rural household heads was ₦55, 500.

Results from the food insecurity index and CSI represent a fair reflection of household activities in the study area. Therefore, the food insecurity index and CSI finding could be used as yardstick for determining food insecurity index and CSI in other part of the States in Nigeria especially the North central regions that share similarities with Niger, Nigeria.

The research, therefore, strongly recommend that government policies that can alleviate or eliminate poverty among rural households should be encouraged, especially in agriculture since majority of the household heads source of employment is agriculture; for instance, provision of subsidy in agricultural inputs and credit facilities to farmers at a very low interest rate to farmers. Also, household heads are strongly recommended to adopt less severe coping strategies that can easily be reversed, when faced with food insecurity situation.

Reference

- Abubakar, H. (ed.) (1997). *Weight and height table: Improving household food security and nutrition in Kano State: A training manual for agriculture, health, education and community development extension workers*. FAO/KNSG/TCP/NIR/4555 (T) Rome, 217-219.
- Agada, M. O., & Igbokwe, E. M. (2014). Food security and coping strategies among ethnic groups in north central Nigeria. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*, 4 (8), 31-45.
- Asogwa, B. C., & Umeh, J. C. (2012). *Food insecurity determinants among rural farm households in Nigeria*. In International conference on Ecology, Agriculture and Chemical Engineering (ICEACS 2012) December (pp. 18-19).
- Babatunde, R. O., Omotesho, O. A., & Sholotan, O. S. (2007). Socioeconomic characteristics and food security status of farming households in Kwara State, North-Central Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 6(1), 49-58.
- Bickel, G., Nord, M., Price, C., Hamilton, W. & Cook, J. (2000). *Guide to measuring household food security. Measuring Food Security in the United State*. Food and Nutrition Service, USDA, Alexandria VA. March, 2000. No. 6(3).
- Blattman, C., & Miguel, E. (2010). Civil war. *Journal of Economic literature*, 48(1), 3-57.
- Christiaensen, L. J., & Boisvert, R. N. (2000). *On measuring household food vulnerability: Case evidence from Northern Mali*. Ithaca, NY: Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, Cornell University
- Corbett, J. (1988). Famine and household coping strategies. *World development*, 16(9), 1099-1112.
- Devereux, S. (1993). Goats before ploughs: Dilemmas of household response sequencing during food shortages. *IDS bulletin*, 24(4), 52-59.
- Ehebbamen, O. G., Obayelu, A. E., Vaughan, I. O., & Afolabi, W. A. O. (2017). Rural households' food security status and coping strategies in Edo State Nigeria. *International Food Research Journal*, 24(1), 333-340.
- Food Agriculture Organization Statistics. (2016). *Statistical pocketbook*.
- Food Agriculture Organization, & World Food Program (2014). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2014. Strengthening the enabling environment for food security and nutrition*. Rome: FAO 2014.
- Food Agriculture Organization. (2006). *The State of Food and Agriculture, 2006: Food Aid for Food Security?* (No. 37). Food & Agriculture Org.
- Food Agriculture Organization. (2012). *The state of food and agriculture. Investing in agriculture for a better future*. Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations. Rome, 2012. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3028e.pdf>

- Food and Agricultural Organization (2017). State of food security and nutrition in the World in 2017: Building Resilience For... Peace and Food Security. Food & Agriculture Organization.
- Food and Agriculture Organization; International Funds for Agricultural Development & World Food Programme. (2015). *The state of food insecurity in the world: Meeting the 2015 international hunger targets: taking stock of uneven progress*. FAO, IFAD and WFP: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4646e.pdf>
- Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) Projects (2006). Cited in Chapter 3, World food insecurity and malnutrition: Scope, trends, causes and consequences. (accessed from <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep>).
- Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project (2003) and Food Aid Management (FAM). Food Access Indicator Review Washington, D.C.: Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance, Academy for Educational Development, 2003
- Ganiyu, M. O., & Omotayo, A. O. (2016). Effects of livelihood activities on the households' food security in the Ogbomoso South local government area of Oyo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 56(1-2), 107-113.
- Greer, J and E. Thorbecke. 1986. A methodology for measuring food poverty applied to Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics* 24: 59–74.
- Idrisa, Y. L., Gwary, M. M., & Shehu, H. (2008). Analysis of food security status among farming households In Jere local government of Borno State, Nigeria. *Journal of Tropical Agriculture Food Environ Ext*, 7(3), 199-205.
- Ifeoma, I., & Agwu, A. (2014). Assessment of food security situation among farming households in rural areas of Kano state, Nigeria. *Journal of Central European of Agriculture*, 15(1), 94-107.
- Ivanda, D. P., Igbokwe, E. M., & Olatunji, O. M. (2015). Assessment of food security situation of Tiv Farming households in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 19(1), 77-92.
- Joe Brock, Insight: Boko Haram, Taking to Hills, Seize Slave 'Brides,' *Reuters*, November 17, 2013.
- Kuwornu, J. K., Suleyman, D. M., & Amegashie, D. P. (2013). Comparative Analysis of Food Security Status of Farming Households in the Coastal and the Forest Communities of Central Region of Ghana. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(1), 39-61.
- Maxwell, D., & Caldwell, R. (2008). The coping strategies index: field methods manual. Atlanta, GA: CARE
- Obayelu, W. O., Ozkan, B., & Ayanrinde, F. A. (2016). Measuring food security status among households in Osun State, Nigeria. *British Food Journal*, 118(7), 1554-1567.
- Ogundari, K. (2017). Categorizing households into different food security states in Nigeria: the socio-economic and demographic determinants. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 5(1), 8, 1-20.
- Oguntona, E. B., & Akinyele, I. O. (1995). *Nutrient composition of commonly eaten foods in Nigeria-Raw, processed and prepared*. <http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=XF2015022133>

- Olayemi, A. O. (2012). Effects of family size on household food security in Osun State, Nigeria. *Asian journal of agriculture and rural development*, 2(2), 136.
- Olayiwola, S. A., Tashikalma, A. K., & Giroh, D. Y. (2017). Analysis of Food Security Status and Coping Strategies among Rural Households in Oluyole Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Trends in Science and Technology Journal*, 1(2), 28-32.
- Omanukwue, P. (2005) A Review of —How Might Financial Market information be used for Supervisory Purposes? J. Krainer and J.A. Lopezl in *CBN Economic and Financial Review* Vol. 43, No 1.
- Quaye, W. (2008). Food security situation in northern Ghana, coping strategies and related constraints. *African journal of agricultural research*, 3(5), 334-342.
- Shariff, Z. M., & Khor, G. L. (2008). Household food insecurity and coping strategies in a poor rural community in Malaysia. *Nutrition research and practice*, 2(1), 26-34.
- Stefan, D. and K. Pramila, (1998). Changes in Poverty in Rural Ethiopia 1989-1995. Measurement, Robustness Tests and Decomposition. *Centre for the Study of African Economics, Working Paper Series, Paper 7*.
- Watts, M. (1983). Silent violence; food, famine and peasantry in northern Nigeria.
- World Bank (2015). World development indicators, depth of food deficit”, available at: <https://www.data.worldbank.org> (accessed 26 September 2013).

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Recommended Daily Energy intake and Equivalent Scale

| Age category (yrs) | Average energy per day | Factor equivalent |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Children less than 6 yrs | 741 | 0.3 |
| Children (6 – 18) yrs | 1,729 | 0.7 |
| Adults (> 18) yrs | 2,470 | 1.0 |

Source: Kuwornu et al., (2013).

Appendix 2: Adults equivalent for adjusting household size

| Age category in (years) | Male | Female |
|-------------------------|------|--------|
| 0-1 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| 1-2 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| 2-3 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| 3-5 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| 5-7 | 0.74 | 0.70 |
| 7-10 | 0.84 | 0.72 |
| 10-12 | 0.88 | 0.78 |
| 12-14 | 0.96 | 0.84 |
| 14-16 | 1.06 | 0.86 |
| 16-18 | 1-14 | 0.86 |
| 18-30 | 1.04 | 0.80 |
| 30-60 | 1.00 | 0.82 |
| >60 | 0.84 | 0.74 |

Source: Stefan and Pramila (1998).

Appendix 3: common food items eaten

| Food items | Kcal/kg | Food items | Kcal/Kg |
|--------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|
| <i>Staple food</i> | | <i>Fruits</i> | |
| Cassava Flour | 3870 | Plantain | 770 |
| Gari | 3840 | Banana | 960 |
| Soy flour | 2600 | Pineapple | 320 |
| Wheat Grain | 3400 | Apple | 570 |
| Cowpea (Beans) | 5920 | Coconut | 580 |
| Sweet Potato Tuber | 1000 | Guava | 730 |
| Maize Grain | 4120 | Sugarcane | 360 |
| Maize Flour | 3500 | Mongo | 590 |
| Sorghum Grain | 3500 | Pawpaw | 300 |
| Millet Grain | 3500 | <i>Meats & Animal prod</i> | |
| Groundnuts | 5950 | Cow Meat | 2370 |
| <i>Vegetables</i> | | Chicken | 2380 |
| Okro | 4500 | Fish | 2230 |
| Tomato | 880 | Eggs (pieces) | 1400 |
| Pepper | 3930 | <i>Drinks</i> | |
| Onion | 440 | Soft drink | 620 |
| Egg plants | 440 | Orange Juice | 400 |
| Cucumber | 270 | Apple Juice | 550 |
| Pumpkin | 440 | Pineapple | 560 |
| <i>Beverages</i> | | <i>Dairy Products</i> | |
| Cocoa | 1200 | Milk | 4900 |
| Tea | 1200 | Cheese | 4000 |
| Coffee | 4100 | Yoghurt | 4100 |

Source: Oguntona and Akinyele (1985)

Appendix 4: Number of People Affected by Severe Food Insecurity in the World

Number of People Affected by Severe Food Security Challenges - 2014 to 2016

| | Number in millions | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| WORLD | 665.9 | 645.1 | 688.5 |
| AFRICA | 289.5 | 298 | 333.2 |
| <i>Sub-Saharan African</i> | 265 | 275.7 | 306.7 |
| ASIA | 337 | 306.7 | 309.7 |
| LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN | 27.7 | 28.1 | 38.3 |
| N. AMERICA & EUROPE | 15.6 | 17.1 | 13 |

Source: FAO (2017)