Global Scientific JOURNALS

GSJ: Volume 11, Issue 7, July 2023, Online: ISSN 2320-9186

www.globalscientificjournal.com

# ASSESSMENT OF FOOD SECURITY AND POVERTY STATUS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN ONDO EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ONDO STATE, NIGERIA

STEPHEN FOLUSO AYANLEYE, ADEDAPO MICHAEL ADEBOYEJO, KEHINDE VICTOR ADEOSUN.

*Abstract*

*The study was carried out to investigate the assessment of food security and poverty status among households in Ondo East Local Government of Ondo State, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to; describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents in the study area; ascertain food security status among households in the study area; identify factors that determine food security in the study area; determine the poverty status of households in the study area. Multi-stage sampling technique was used in the selection of 120 respondents in the study area. Descriptive Statistics, Dietary Diversification, Likert Rating Scale, Foster-Greer Thorbecke (FGT). Poverty Measures were used to analyze data collected from the field. The study revealed 37.5% and 28.4% of the respondents were within the age group of 41 – 50 years old and 31 – 40 years old respectively. Also, 18.3% of the respondents were within the age group of 51 – 60 years, 12.5% of the respondents were within the age group of 61 years and above. The mean age of the respondents is 42.4 years. This implies that households in the study area are relatively able-bodied which enhance sustainable production. Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) Poverty Measures revealed that 58.3% are poor and 41.7% are non-poor. The result revealed that this result agrees with the World Bank (2012) which expressed about 56% of Nigerians are poverty hidden. Dietary Diversification was used to determine the food security status of the respondents. It shows that majority (97.5%) of the respondents were satisfied with their level of food security while 2.5% of the respondents were not satisfied with their level of food security. The study recommended among others that there is need for government to create right policy and enact policies that are aimed at increasing the income generation ability of rural households.*

*Keywords: Food security, Poverty Status, Households*

## INTRODUCTION

Around the world, 852 million men, women, and children suffer from chronic hunger as a result of extreme poverty, while up to 2 billion people experience periodic food insecurity as a result of different levels of poverty (FAO, 2003). Despite being in a nation with enormous potential wealth, more than two thirds of Nigerians live in poverty. In a home, food security refers to everyone having access to enough food for an active, healthy life at all times. Food security comprises, at the very least, the quick availability of nutrient-adequate and safe foods as well as the assurance of being able to obtain appropriate foods in socially acceptable ways (i.e., without turning to coping mechanisms like scavenging, theft, or emergency food supplies) (FAO, 2003).

In addition to food production, which a significant section of the Nigerian population engages in, accessibility is crucial to achieving a level of food security. Because of the existing regional, economic, and social inequalities, food security at the national level does not ensure that all people, especially the poor, will have access to the minimum nutrition requirement (Alderman and Garcia 1993). Some rural people could experience food insecurity because they don't produce enough food or don't have enough money to buy what they need.

Over 90% of agricultural production in Nigeria comes from rural farming households with limited access to productive resources (resource poverty), which is a serious problem that has to be addressed (Obamiro et al., 2003). It is known that a wide range of variables, which can differ from region to region, influence poverty.

However, Ellis (1998) highlighted household endowments (assets) as significant poverty factors because they enable households to diversify their income sources and so lower the probability of overall income failure. When everyone, at all times, has access to food that is safe, nutritious, and maintains an active lifestyle, there is food security (FAO, 1996). The basic objective of food security is for people to have access to enough food at all times and to be able to use that food to meet their nutritional needs. Food availability, access to food, and food use are the three pillars of food security, according to the World Bank (2001). For farming homes, having access to enough food entails ensuring that the households are able to produce it. The availability of food alone, especially for low-income households, is not sufficient; one must also be able to afford it (Sen, 1981).

Food security is defined as the financial and physical availability of enough food for every member of the home, without an excessive danger of losing that access. Food security has household, national, and international elements in addition to the often-maintained focus on individual food security (Olayemi, 2018). Household food security is essential for individual food security. Non-food elements like health conditions, societal norms, and cultural practises that can influence personal nutrition are also significant at the level of individual food security (Shama, 2012). Food security at the household level means that there is always enough food available. When there is a sufficient amount of food available to the home and the household has a sufficient amount of capacity to effectively meet the demand for the food that is available, there is a sufficient level of access. At the national level, food security means there is enough food available from all sources to meet the population's long-term per capita food needs.

The most significant factors affecting the overall national food supply and the availability of food in the majority of countries are the volume, composition through time, and stability of domestic food production. The volume of food imports and the country's capacity to import food are also significant. At the global level, food security refers to the ability of food-deficient nations to import or otherwise obtain food in the necessary quantities from food-excess nations (Olayemi, 2014). In order to construct a profile of poverty in the research area and to ascertain the impact of household assets on household poverty, this study aims to identify the percentage of sampled homes that are food secure, as well as the factors that determine household food security status.



**Statement of the Problem**

The universal declaration of human rights recognizes the right to an acceptable standard of living, which includes food (Eide, 2001). A key goal of development policy and a gauge of its effectiveness is food security. However, establishing food security remains a significant issue in the majority of urban Nigerian households; food security has many facets. The utilization of the food consumed is another issue related to the lack of food security that households are facing. The productivity of most households is decreased, which hinders their ability to utilize food to its full potential, as a result of various forms of deprivation of basic necessities of life, such as inadequate health care facilities, a lack of potable water, the prevalence of poor sanitation, low levels of literacy, diseases, etc. The end result of these issues these households are having is that the majority of them do not always have enough to eat. (FAO, 2005)

As a result, they are closely associated with hunger and poverty. Gefu (1992), who supported the role people are playing in reducing poverty, claimed that even middle-class households engage in

part-time farming as a survival tactic. Additionally, Mustapha (1991) linked this part-time participation in agriculture to structural changes and economic downturns.

**Objectives of the Study**

The specific objectives of this study are to:

i. examine the socio-economic characteristics of farming households in the study area;
ii. ascertain food security status across households in the study area;
iii. identify factors that determine household food security in the study area;
iv. identify constraints affecting the achievement of food security in the study area;
v. determine the poverty status of households in the study area.

## METHODOLOGY

**Study Area**

Ondo State has geographical Coordinates of 7°10′N 5°05′E. The state is bounded in the north by Ekiti and Kogi States; in the east by Edo State; in the west by Osun and Ogun States; and in the south by the Atlantic Ocean. It has a land area of about 14,793 square kilometers. Ondo State is made up of 18 local government areas (LGAs). The state has a population of 3,460,877 persons made up of 1,745,057 males and 1,715,820 females (NPC, 2007) and the capital town of the state is Akure. The climate of the area is highly favourable for the agrarian activities of her teeming population who grow crops such as cocoa, kola nut, palm tree, and other arable crops like maize, yam and cassava. The annual rainfall is between 1000mm and 1500mm with a high daily temperature of about 300C and relatively high humidity. Ondo State is composed of lowlands and rugged hills with granite outcrops in several places. The vast majority of the population consists of peasant farmers cultivating food and cash crops at a small-scale level. Livestock keeping is a minor occupation of the population of Ondo state dealing in goats, sheep, rabbits and fish farming. Other activities include trading and public service (Amos, 2007).

**Population and Sampling techniques**

The population consist of all rural and urban dwellers in Ondo east local government Area (LGA) of Ondo State. Multi stage sampling procedure was used to select the respondents for the study. In the first stage, six communities were randomly selected from the local government area (LGA). In the second stage, twenty (20) rural and urban dweller were randomly selected using simple random technique out of the five (6) communities selected in stage one. In all hundred (120) rural and urban dwellers constituted the sample size for the study.

**Method of Data Collection**

Primary data was used for the study. Primary data from the rural women was collected with the aid of a well -structured interview schedule. The interview schedule contained both open ended and close ended questions that were divided into sections based on the objectives of the study.

**Data Analysis and Model Specification**

Data generated was analyzed using frequency, percentage, charts, and mean statistics for objectives 1, 3 and 4 while objective 2 was analyzed using multiple regression. Objective 5 was analyzed using foster-Greer-Thorbecke measurement of poverty.

**Descriptive Statistics**

This tool was used to analyze objective 1, 3 and 4. This tool consists of tables, frequency, mean, percentages, charts etc.

**Dietary Food Diversification Index**

This model was used to analyze objective 2 of this study which is to determine the food security status of households in the study area

**Foster-Greer Thorbecke (FGT) Poverty Index**

This model was used to analyze objective 5, which is the measurement of poverty status of rural and urban households in the study area. The Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (1984) class of weighted poverty measures was used to profile the poverty status of the households. The formula is given as follows:

Where α = 0 - 2 and indicate headcount, depth and severity of poverty respectively

P is the poverty index

n is the sample population

q is the number of the poor in the sampled population,

z is the poverty line relevant to a given expenditure unit, and

yi is the farm household per capital expenditure

$$P_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left(1 - {}^{yi}/_{z}\right)^{a} \quad \text{.....(1)}$$

FGT EQUATION

$$p_{o} = \frac{q}{n} \quad \text{..... (2)}$$

$$P_{1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left(1 - {}^{yi}/_{z}\right)^{1} \quad \text{..... (3)}$$

$$P_{2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left(1 - {}^{yi}/_{z}\right)^{2} \quad \text{..... (4)}$$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Socio-economic characteristics of the Respondents**

Table 1 shows the socio-economic characteristics of respondents. The result shows that 37.5% and 28.4% of the respondents were within the age group of 41 – 50 years old and 31 – 40 years old respectively. Also 18.3% of the respondents were within the age group of 51 – 60 years, 12.5% of the respondents were within the age group of 61 years and above. The mean age of the respondents is 42.4 years. This suggests that large percentage of the respondents were in their youthful age and productive age, who still has the strength to undergo physical and tedious works. This also suggests that they are still within economically active years. Ojekunle (2010) in his research on factors influencing small scale cassava processing among rural households in Yewa North Local Government, Ogun State, Nigeria reported that 60% of cassava processors were within the age group of 26 – 45 years old. As presented in Table 1, majority (79.2%) of the respondents were female, while 20.8% were male. This result is not in agreement with the findings of Ehinmowo *et a*l., (2017) where it was reported that (83.4%) of rural households in Ondo East were made of female. The dominance of the female over the male is likely due to the cultural background of most African communities where root and tuber crops such as cassava, yam farmers are left to female to pack, peel and process. Also, the result shows that more than half (51.7%) of the respondents were married, 17.5% were still single, 11.7% were divorced, 10% were widow/widower while 9.2% were separated. It could be that these rural women join efforts with their husbands in the family to generate more income for the family expenditures. Furthermore, the result shows that 44.2% and 35% of the respondents attained secondary and primary level of education respectively, while 19.2 % of the respondents had no formal education, only 1.7% of the respondents had a university degree. This indicates that the level of educational attainment by rural households was low and this could negatively affect the modern technology of agricultural processing. Education had been found to be a major strategy for poverty eradication which ensures production skills that combines land and other factors of production for efficient productive activities (Napata, 2006). The ability to read and write often acquired from formal educational institutions would enable them to utilize effectively and efficiently whatever resources at their disposal (Osondu and Ijioma, 2014). In addition, majority (75.8%) of the respondents had a household size of between 1 – 5 members, while 23.4% of the respondents had a household size of between 6 – 10 members, only 0.8% of the respondents had a household size of 11 and above. This implies that majority of the respondents had a relative considerate household size; this might be owing to the fact that the economic situation in the country does not favour having a large household size and also having a large household size with limited resources to care for them will definitely increase their poverty level (Ojekunle, 2010).

**Table 1: Respondents Distribution based on Socio-economic Characteristics**

| Socio-economic Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age (Years)** | | | |
| <30 | 15 | 12.5 | 42 |
| 31-40 | 34 | 28.4 | |
| 41-50 | 45 | 37.5 | |
| 51-60 | 22 | 18.3 | |
| ≥61 | 4 | 3.3 | |
| **Gender** | | | |
| Male | 25 | 20.8 | |
| Female | 95 | 79.2 | |
| **Marital Status** | | | |
| Single | 21 | 17.5 | |
| Widow/Widower | 12 | 10.0 | |
| Divorced | 14 | 11.7 | |
| Separated | 11 | 9.2 | |
| Married | 62 | 51.7 | |
| **Level of education** | | | |
| No formal education | 23 | 18.2 | |
| Primary education | 42 | 35.0 | |
| Secondary education | 53 | 44.2 | |
| Tertiary education | 2 | 1.7 | |
| **Household Size** | | | |
| <5 | 91 | 75.8 | 4.0 |
| 6-10 | 28 | 23.4 | |
| ≥11 | 1 | 0.8 | |
| **Total** | **120** | **100** | |

***Source: Field Survey, 2023.***



**Estimation of Poverty Status of Respondents**

Table 12 presents the poverty status of the respondents. It shows that more than half (58.3%) of the respondents were poor, while 41.7% of the respondents were non-poor. Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index was used to depict the extent of poverty among the households in the study area. The poverty aversion parameters employed were $P_0$, $P_1$, $P_2$ which means poverty

incidence (head count), gap (depth) and severity respectively. Poverty incidence indicate the percentage of the households falling below the poverty line; poverty depth shows the amount by which the poor fall short of the poverty line and severity is the sum of the square of poverty depth divided by the number of poor households in the sample.

**Table 12: Poverty Status of Respondents**

| Poverty status | Frequency | Percentage (%) | Code |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 70 | 58.3 | 1 |
| Non poor | 50 | 41.7 | 0 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** | |

***Source: Field survey, 2023***

Table 13 shows that the mean per capita income of the respondents is valued at ₦3,846.84, while the poverty line computed was ₦2,564.56, as the two third (2/3) of the per capita expenditure mean. Thus, the processors household that earn less than the value of poverty line was considered poor, while those that earn greater than equal to the value of poverty line were considered to be non-poor.

**Table 13: Estimate of Poverty line of Respondents**

| Estimate of poverty line | Value |
|---|---|
| Mean per capita income | ₦3,846.84 |
| Poverty line | ₦2,564.56 |

***Source: Field survey, 2023***

As shown in Table 14, the poverty incidence ($P_0$) in the study area was 0.58 indicating that 58.0% of the sampled households were actually poor based on the poverty line. The poverty gap ($P_1$) was 0.22. This implies that about 22% of the poverty line is required by the poor households to escape poverty. The poverty severity ($P_2$) among the processor household was 0.11, indicating that the poverty incidence ($P_0$), Poverty depth ($P_1$) and Poverty severity ($P_2$) were 57.1, 16.1 and 5.9% respectively indicating that an average household needed 16.1% of the poverty line to get out poverty

**Table 14: Estimates of Poverty Incidence, Depth and Severity**

| Poverty Aversion | Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Headcount ($P_0$) | 0.58 |
| Depth ($P_1$) | 0.22 |
| Severity ($P_2$) | 0.11 |

**Source: Field survey, 2023**

**Factors Affecting Food Security in the Study Area**

Table 15 shows the distribution of respondents based on the factors affecting food security. Majority of the respondents strongly agreed (44%) that location is one of the predominant factors influencing food security, 29% agreed that culture is a factor influencing food security. 61% of the respondents strongly agreed that high food prices is a major predominant factors influencing household food security. 57% strongly agreed that poor food storage facilities affect food security and 52% of the respondents strongly agreed that right to land for agricultural production which is the main determinant of food security is also a very crucial factor affecting food security in the study area.

**Table 15: Distribution of Respondents based on Factors affecting household food Security**

| Factors | Total | Strongly disagree (%) | Disagree (%) | Undecided (%) | Agree (%) | Strongly Agree (%) | Total (%) | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Location | 120 | 10% | 7% | 17% | 22% | 44% | 100% | 3.83 | 1.33 |
| Culture | 120 | 12% | 9% | 25% | 29% | 25% | 100% | 3.46 | 1.29 |
| Religion | 120 | 14% | 9% | 29% | 36% | 12% | 100% | 3.23 | 1.20 |
| Political system | 120 | 8% | 0% | 24% | 30% | 38% | 100% | 3.9 | 1.16 |
| Selling at harvest due to poverty | 120 | 2% | 6% | 17% | 51% | 24% | 100% | 3.89 | 0.91 |
| Poor weather condition | 120 | 0% | 6% | 22% | 24% | 48% | 100% | 4.14 | 0.96 |
| Lack of time for production | 120 | 10% | 18% | 28% | 18% | 26% | 100% | 3.32 | 1.31 |
| High food prices | | 2% | 4% | 6% | 27% | 61% | 100% | 4.41 | 0.92 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 120 | | | | | | | | |
| Inadequate access to market | 120 | 12% | 10% | 17% | 20% | 41% | 100% | 3.68 | 1.41 |
| Poor food storage facilities | 120 | 6% | 16% | 8% | 13% | 57% | 100% | 3.989796 | 1.37 |
| Right to land for Agricultural production | 120 | 6% | 14% | 9% | 19% | 52% | 100% | 4.021053 | 1.33 |

***Source: Field survey, 2023***

**Constraints towards Food Security**

Table 16 shows the distribution of respondents according to the constraints towards food security. Majority of the respondents agreed to high cost of food items (83%) as an important constraint towards food security in the study area. 74% of the respondents agreed to adverse weather condition as major constraint towards food security and it should be addressed critically, 73% of the respondent chose insufficient food items, 67% agreed on lack of income because without income, there would not be a stable food supply to any household. Lack of transportation (56%) was also chosen by the respondents in the study area as a major constraint. In all the constraints presented to respondents in the study area, the mostly agreed by respondents as constraints to food security are Lack of farmland for food production, Lack of capital for food production, Lack of income, High cost of food items, Adverse weather condition, Insufficient food items, Little access to credit facilities.

**Table 16: Distribution of Respondents according to constraints towards food security**

| | **Total** | **Yes** | **No** | **Total** | **Mean** | **S.D** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of farmland for food production | 120 | 57% | 43% | 100% | 0.43 | 0.50 |
| Lack of capital for food production | 120 | 65% | 35% | 100% | 0.35 | 0.48 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inaccessibility to market | 120 | 42% | 58% | 100% | 0.58 | 0.50 |
| High cost of food items | 120 | 83% | 17% | 100% | 0.17 | 0.38 |
| Little access to credit facilities | 120 | 73% | 27% | 100% | 0.27 | 0.45 |
| No access to credit facilities | 120 | 28% | 72% | 100% | 0.72 | 0.45 |
| Lack of equipment | 120 | 51% | 49% | 100% | 0.49 | 0.50 |
| Insufficient food items | 120 | 68% | 32% | 100% | 0.32 | 0.47 |
| Lack of transportation | 120 | 56% | 44% | 100% | 0.44 | 0.50 |
| Lack of income | 120 | 67% | 33% | 100% | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Lack of culture | 120 | 62% | 38% | 100% | 0.38 | 0.49 |
| Lack of employment | 120 | 32% | 68% | 100% | 0.68 | 0.47 |
| Lack of food market facilities | 120 | 60% | 40% | 100% | 0.40 | 0.49 |
| Adverse weather condition | 120 | 74% | 26% | 100% | 0.26 | 0.44 |



***Source: Field survey, 2023***

**Food Security Status of Respondents**

Table 17 shows the distribution of respondents according to the accessibility and availability of different classes of food (carbohydrate, protein, vitamin, fat and oil, mineral salt and water). The accessibility and availability of all these classes of food determines the food security status Using Food Dietary Diversification of rural households in the study area. The result revealed that the

classes of foods are available and accessible to the households. The accessibility and availability of all these classes of food determines the food security status of households in the study area.

**Table 17: Distribution of Respondents based on Availability and Accessibility to Food**

| Availability | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carbohydrate. | | | | | | |
| Cassava flour | 120 | Yes | No | Total | Mean | S.D |
| Cassava chips | 120 | 73% | 27% | 100% | 0.27 | 0.44616 |
| Yam flour | 120 | 57% | 43% | 100% | 0.43 | 0.49757 |
| Yam | 120 | 91% | 9% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.28763 |
| Sweet Potato | 120 | 94% | 6% | 100% | 0.06 | 0.23863 |
| Maize | 120 | 90% | 10% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.30151 |
| Millet | 120 | 67% | 33% | 100% | 0.33 | 0.47252 |
| Rice | 120 | 81% | 19% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.394277 |
| Sorghum | 120 | 51% | 49% | 100% | 0.479592 | 0.502152 |
| Wheat | 120 | 59% | 41% | 100% | 0.41 | 0.494311 |
| Plantain | 120 | 92% | 8% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27266 |
| Garri | 120 | 91% | 9% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.287623 |
| Fufu | 120 | 97% | 3% | 100% | 0.03 | 0.171447 |
| Bread | 120 | 88% | 12% | 100% | 0.12 | 0.326599 |
| Guinea corn | 120 | 56% | 44% | 100% | 0.44 | 0.498888 |
| Vitamin. | | | | | | |
| Mango | 120 | 95% | 5% | 100% | 0.05 | 0.219043 |
| Pawpaw | 120 | 94% | 6% | 100% | 0.06 | 0.238683 |
| Pineapple | 120 | 92% | 8% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27266 |
| Apple | 120 | 77% | 23% | 100% | 0.23 | 0.422953 |
| Garden egg | 120 | 86% | 14% | 100% | 0.14 | 0.348735 |
| Sugarcane | 120 | 90% | 10% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.301511 |
| Carrot | 120 | 86% | 14% | 100% | 0.14 | 0.348735 |
| Cucumber | 120 | 72% | 28% | 100% | 0.28 | 0.451261 |
| Banana | 120 | 96% | 4% | 100% | 0.04 | 0.196946 |
| Okro | 120 | 90% | 10% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.301511 |
| Watermelon | 120 | 89% | 11% | 100% | 0.11 | 0.314466 |
| Orange | 120 | 77% | 23% | 100% | 0.23 | 0.422953 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Protein | | | | | | |
| Milk | 120 | 79% | 21% | 100% | 0.21 | 0.40936 |
| Fish | 120 | 90% | 10% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.301511 |
| Egg | 120 | 95% | 5% | 100% | 0.05 | 0.219043 |
| Meat | 120 | 82% | 18% | 100% | 0.18 | 0.386123 |
| Crayfish | 120 | 80% | 20% | 100% | 0.2 | 0.402015 |
| Cowpea | 120 | 81% | 19% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.394277 |
| Cheese | 120 | 42% | 58% | 100% | 0.58 | 0.496045 |
| Youghurt | 120 | 43% | 57% | 100% | 0.57 | 0.49757 |
| Beans | 120 | 61% | 39% | 100% | 0.39 | 0.490207 |
| Mineral.Salt | | | | | | |
| Table Salt | 120 | 97% | 3% | 100% | 0.03 | 0.171447 |
| Green vegetable | 120 | 96% | 4% | 100% | 0.04 | 0.196946 |
| Bones | 120 | 91% | 9% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.287623 |
| Soyamilk | 120 | 66% | 34% | 100% | 0.34 | 0.476095 |
| Seafood | 120 | 55% | 45% | 100% | 0.45 | 0.5 |
| Water | | | | | | |
| River | 120 | 72% | 28% | 100% | 0.28 | 0.451261 |
| Lake | 120 | 92% | 8% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27266 |
| Stream | 120 | 27% | 73% | 100% | 0.73 | 0.446196 |
| Reservoir | 120 | 80% | 20% | 100% | 0.2 | 0.402015 |
| Spring | 120 | 81% | 19% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.394277 |
| Fat and Oil | | | | | | |
| Melon | 120 | 61% | 39% | 100% | 0.39 | 0.490207 |
| Vegetable oil | 120 | 98% | 2% | 100% | 0.02 | 0.140705 |
| Groundnut oil | 120 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.25 | 0.3623 |



| Accessibility | Total | Very accessible (%) | Accessible (%) | Not accessible (%) | Total (%) | Mean | S.D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carbohydrate. | | | | | | | |
| Cassava flour | 120 | 53% | 33% | 14% | 100% | 0.27 | 0.45 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cassava chips | 120 | 39% | 29% | 32% | 100% | 0.43 | 0.50 |
| Yam flour | 120 | 57% | 39% | 4% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Yam | 120 | 54% | 42% | 4% | 100% | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Sweet Potato | 120 | 49% | 40% | 11% | 100% | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Maize | 120 | 52% | 44% | 4% | 100% | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Millet | 120 | 33% | 39% | 28% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Rice | 120 | 52% | 42% | 6% | 100% | 0.48 | 0.50 |
| Sorghum | 120 | 26% | 33% | 41% | 100% | 0.41 | 0.49 |
| Wheat | 120 | 42% | 31% | 27% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Plantain | 120 | 70% | 26% | 4% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Garri | 120 | 82% | 16% | 2% | 100% | 0.03 | 0.17 |
| Fufu | 120 | 84% | 15% | 1% | 100% | 0.12 | 0.33 |
| Bread | 120 | 76% | 22% | 2% | 100% | 0.44 | 0.50 |
| Guinea corn | 120 | 42% | 32% | 26% | 100% | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| Vit.mango | 120 | 59% | 37% | 4% | 100% | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Pawpaw | 120 | 75% | 25% | 0% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Pineapple | 120 | 77% | 21% | 2% | 100% | 0.23 | 0.42 |
| Apple | 120 | 44% | 42% | 14% | 100% | 0.14 | 0.35 |
| Garden egg | 120 | 49% | 43% | 8% | 100% | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Sugarcane | 120 | 56% | 30% | 14% | 100% | 0.14 | 0.35 |
| Carrot | 120 | 48% | 38% | 14% | 100% | 0.28 | 0.45 |
| Cucumber | 120 | 51% | 31% | 18% | 100% | 0.04 | 0.20 |
| Banana | 120 | 78% | 22% | 0% | 100% | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Okro | 120 | 78% | 22% | 0% | 100% | 0.11 | 0.31 |
| Watermelon | 120 | 68% | 26% | 6% | 100% | 0.23 | 0.42 |
| Orange | 120 | 51% | 29% | 20% | 100% | 0.21 | 0.41 |
| Protein.Milk | 120 | 62% | 22% | 16% | 100% | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Fish | 120 | 61% | 37% | 2% | 100% | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| Egg | 120 | 65% | 35% | 0% | 100% | 0.18 | 0.39 |
| Meat | 120 | 58% | 32% | 10% | 100% | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| Crayfish | 120 | 43% | 47% | 10% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Cowpea | 120 | 52% | 34% | 14% | 100% | 0.58 | 0.50 |
| Cheese | 120 | 25% | 28% | 47% | 100% | 0.57 | 0.50 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Youghurt | 120 | 25% | 30% | 45% | 100% | 0.39 | 0.49 |
| Beans | 120 | 35% | 40% | 25% | 100% | 0.03 | 0.17 |
| Mineral.Salt. Table Salt | 120 | 65% | 33% | 2% | 100% | 0.04 | 0.20 |
| Green vegetable | 120 | 93% | 7% | 0% | 100% | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Bones | 120 | 83% | 15% | 2% | 100% | 0.34 | 0.48 |
| Soyamilk | 120 | 51% | 28% | 21% | 100% | 0.45 | 0.50 |
| Seafood | 120 | 41% | 28% | 31% | 100% | 0.28 | 0.45 |
| Water.river | 120 | 49% | 37% | 14% | 100% | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Lake | 120 | 71% | 21% | 8% | 100% | 0.73 | 0.45 |
| Stream | 120 | 15% | 31% | 54% | 100% | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| Reservoir | 120 | 53% | 37% | 10% | 100% | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Spring | 120 | 49% | 37% | 14% | 100% | 0.39 | 0.49 |
| F &O. Melon | 120 | 31% | 41% | 28% | 100% | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| Vegetable oil | 120 | 94% | 6% | 0% | 100% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Groundnut oil | 120 | 94% | 6% | 0% | 100% | 0.02 | 0.14 |

**Source: Field survey, 2023**



## CONCLUSION

The Study empirically focused on Analysis of food security and poverty Status of Households in Ondo state, Nigeria. The study revealed that majority of the rural dwellers are male who are relatively young and energetic with the average of 42 years. Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) Poverty Measures further showed respondents in the study area are poor since (58.3%) of the respondents are not above the poverty line. Majority (97.5%) of the respondents were satisfied with their level of food security while 2.5% of the respondents were not satisfied with their level of food security. This suggests that the respondents can still put food on their table not minding their poverty status. Going by the findings of this study, it is generally revealed that rural dwellers play a significant role in ensuring household food security. Ensuring national food self-sufficiency does not necessarily translate into household food security. The need to ensure household food security is not only a function of food supplies but also of demand of purchasing power.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

I. The government should create right policy environment and enact policies that are aimed at increasing the income generation ability of rural dwellers.

II. Government should make poverty reduction efforts aimed at encouraging free, compulsory and quality education at least up to the tertiary level and a population policy that would encourage a family to have less household size.

III. Based on the findings of this study, it is therefore recommended that rural dwellers should be enlightened about birth control measures to reduce household size hence, enhance food security.

IV. Also, they should be encouraged to participate in income-generating activities to boost their household food security

V. Policies should be aimed at ensuring that institutional credit sources reduce the current high interest rate of 12% on loan and the procedural difficulties in securing institutional facilities, so as to ensured farmers access to such credit facilities for increased agricultural production and hence, food security.

VI. Educational level of household head was a significant determinant of food security status of the farm households. Hence, there is need for formal education to be promoted as a means of improving food security as it opens up more income-earning opportunities for the farm households especially in the non-formal sector.



## REFERENCES

Adawo, M. (2011). "Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: A necessity Agenda" *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol.3 (1) pp. 14-19.

Alderman, H., and M. Garcia (1994), "Food security and health security: Explaining the levels of nutritional status in Pakistan", *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 42:485–507.

Alderman. H. and M. Garcia. 1993. "Poverty, Household Food Security and Nutrition in Rural Pakistan" Research Report 96. Washington, D.C; *International Food Policy Research Institute*.

Bradshaw, T. K. (2006). Theories of Poverty and Anti-Poverty Programmes in community Development. *RPRC Working Paper.* No. 5-6.

Dasgupta, P. (1993). An Injury into wellbeing and Destitutean, Oxford Clarendan Press.

Deville de Goyet C., Seaman J and U Geifer. 1978. The Management of Nutritional Emergencies in Large Populations. WHO, Geneva.

Ellis, F. 1998. "Household strategies and Rural Livelihood diversification", *The Journal of Development Studies* 35(1) 1-38

FAO 2003. In The Free Encyclopedia http:\\en.wikipedia org\wiki\food security

FAO, (1996). Technical Background Document, World Food Summit, 1996, Rome.

FAO. 1996. Technical Background Document, World Food Summit, 1996, Rome

Federal Office of Statistics, (1996). Socio-Economic Profile of Nigeria, FOS Lagos.

Foster, J. J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke. 1984. "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures". Econometrica 52(1)

Gefu, J.O. (1981). Part-time Farming as an Urban survival Strategy: A Nigerian Case study. Pp. 295-302.