Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

ASSESSMENT OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY IN ZONE A AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA OF KOGI STATE, NIGERIA

OPALUWA, H.I., OPEYEMI, G., DANJUMA S., AND ADEYEMI, M.
Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture,
Kogi State University Anyigba, P.M.B. 1008,
Anyigba Kogi State, Nigeria

**** Corresponding Author: OPALUWA, H.I.***
E-mail: opaluwa.hi@ksu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT
Poverty has remained a multidimensional problem, yet it has traditionally been measured in empirical studies with income. This often times fail to account for other dimensions of deprivations experienced by rural dwellers. This study assessed Multidimensional poverty in Zone A area of Kogi State Agricultural Development Project, Nigeria. The data for the study were drawn from household survey conducted in 2019/2020 farming season through the use of structured questionnaire. A multi-staged random sampling technique was used to draw the sample. A total sample of 120 respondents was used. The study utilized both descriptive and inferential statistics which include the use of frequency, percentages, FGT methodologies to assess the extent of multidimensional poverty and regression analyses to assess the determinants of multidimensional poverty in the study area. The result of the study showed that 84.16% of the sampled households were non-poor while 15.84% were poor. The result of the study also reveals that the intensity of poverty (A) was 0.366 and the multidimensional poverty index was 0.058 while Sanitation, Education and Household assets contributed most to the incidence and severity of multidimensional poverty among the households respectively. The major determinants of multidimensional poverty across the various constructs of deprivation include Age, household size, membership of cooperative/association and farming experience. The study concluded that poverty alleviation efforts should go beyond using income approach alone, rather other dimensions of deprivations should be given attention. The study recommends that socio-economic factors should be considered in the design and implementations of poverty programs.

Keywords: Deprivation, Multidimensional Poverty, Kogi State, Nigeria
https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jafs.v19i2.6

1.0 INTRODUCTION
Poverty is one of the gravest challenges facing the world today, with a staggering 40 per cent of the world's population living with the reality or the threat of extreme poverty. Consequently, that one in every five persons is living in a state of poverty so abject that it threatens survival (Gustavo and Kostas, 2007). Globally, extreme poverty continues to be a rural phenomenon despite increasing urbanization. Consequently, out of the world's 1.2 billion extremely poor people, 75 percent live in rural areas and, they largely depend on agriculture, forestry, fisheries and related activities for survival (Gustavo and Kostas, 2007). Most of the poor live in the developing world i.e. in Africa, Asia and Latin America with Africa having an estimated value of over 200 million people

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

wallowing in abject poverty (World Bank 2010). On the average, 45 to 50 per cent of sub-Saharan Africans live below the international poverty line of one American dollar a day (World Bank 2010). In West Africa, it is reported that almost all the countries, including Nigeria are classified as either low income economies by the World Bank or low human development countries by the UNDP (Alaye-Ogan, 2018).

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), in a report on poverty and inequality from September 2018 to October 2019, reported 40 per cent of people in the continent's most populous country lived below its poverty line of 137,430 Naira ($381.75) per year. Nigeria is the top oil exporter in Africa, which has helped to create wealth related to crude sales that account for more than half of the Government's revenue. The Nigerian economy grew strongly at an average annual rate in excess of 6 per cent over the last decade, even during the global financial crisis (IMF 2013), ranked Nigeria as one of the fastest growing economies globally. Most shocking is that the June report of world poverty World Poverty Clock (2018) indicated that 86.9 million people in Nigeria spend less than 1.90 USD per day and while by February 2019. There was an addition of over 3 million people that slipped into poverty making over 91 million Nigerians (people) live in extreme poverty (Worldwide Poverty Click, 2018).

Furthermore, the benefit of growth has not been equitably shared as income inequality increased from 0.42 per cent in 2004 to 0.45 per cent in 2010. Therefore, the theoretical arguments and empirical evidence from the literature that associate faster economic growth with poverty reduction seem to be failing in the Nigerian context (Ajakaiye and Jerome, 2014). Not surprisingly, major issues in policy debates include how to proffer explanations and reconcile this paradoxical trend, and the need to investigate the key mechanisms through which growth can be translated into sustainable poverty reduction. This, no doubt, would require adequate measurement of poverty, an issue to which researchers and policy makers have given much prominence in recent years (Ajakaiye and Jerome, 2014).

Poverty, as recognized by the Laeken Indicators (Atkinson et al., 2002; Marlier, et al., 2006), is a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon that is normally best defined relative to the living standards of the society in which it is found. Moreover, traditional methods of aggregating data have exacerbated measurement error and made it impossible accurately to assess changes in poverty when measured traditionally and hence to evaluate the effectiveness of policy. New statistical techniques, borrowed from psychology, provide a means of overcoming these problems (Marlier et al., 2006). Lately, research interests have shifted to understanding poverty in its multidimensional form (Wagle, 2005; Bourguignon and Chakravarty, 2003; Atkinson, 2003). This interest has been furthered by the increasing availability of relevant data (Alkire and Foster, 2011) and the inability of the one-dimensional measure to capture multiple deprivations. This multidimensional form draws largely on the basic needs argument and Sen's capability approach (Duclos and Araar, 2006; &Wagle, 2008).

According to Nigeria Poverty Profile (NPP), 2010 released by the NBS, (2012), food poverty in Kogi state was 50.1%, absolute poverty 67.1%, dollar per day 67.3% and per capita expenditure was 73.5%. While based on derived subjective poverty measure, 58.7% were core poor, 38.0% moderate poor, and 3.3% non-poor. This is disheartening. However, in spite of the importance of multidimensional measure of poverty in enhancing the knowledge and understanding

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

required to promote a sustainable campaign against poverty, previous efforts at measuring poverty in Nigeria have always focused on monetary measures of poverty such as income/expenditure as indicator of poverty and income distribution as the basis for inequality analysis. Studies that examined multidimensional poverty are still very scanty in Kogi State, hence the extent of deprivation still remain unclear. It is against this background that this study seeks to carry out an assessment of multidimensional poverty in Zone A area of Agricultural Development Project in Kogi State, Nigeria. This study is beneficial to foreign nations, development institutions and organizations interested in bridging the development gap that exist in Kogi State, Nigeria. The study is of great importance to donor agency, financial institutions and Government in particular most especially in policy formation. The main objective of the study is the assessment of multidimensional poverty in Zone A Agricultural Development Project Area of Kogi State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to;

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of rural households in selected areas in Zone A ADP area of Kogi State;
2. examine the multidimensional poverty profile of the respondents in the study area;
3. examine the determinants of poverty in the study area; and,
4. identify the coping strategies adopted by the respondents in the event of poverty.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 The Study Area

The study was carried out in Kogi State, Nigeria. Kogi State lies between longitudes 5^{o} 40‘E and 7^{o} 49‘E; and latitudes 6o 33‘N and 8o 44‘N. It is bounded to the South by Anambra and Edo States; and to the North by Niger, Nassarawa and Federal Capital Territory; to the East by Benue and Enugu States. On the Western flank it shares a common border with Ondo, Ekiti and Kwara States (Kogi A.D.P, 1993). The state which is structured into 21 LGA’s is comprised of three major ethnic groups: Igala, Ebira and Okun (Yoruba); other minor groups include: Bassa Komo, Bassa Nge, Kakanda, Kupa, Ogori-Magongo, Nupe, Oworo, Gwari, etc. (Kogi State Government, 2008). The State has about 2 million hectares of cultivable land with only about 0.5 million hectares currently under cultivation (KOSEEDS, 2004). The major food crops grown in the State are cassava, yam, cocoyam, sweet potato, maize, sorghum, rice, millet, cowpea, pigeon pea, ground nut, bambara nut, melon, banana and plantain. Fruits and leafy vegetables such as okra, pepper, fluted pumpkin and spinach are highly cultivated in the area. Tree crops grown in the state are cocoa, coffee, cashew, oil palm, citrus and kolanut. Cattle, sheep, goats and poultry are the major animal reared. Fish farming is common along the riverine areas.

2.2 Method of Data Collection

Primary data was used for the study and the main instrument used for data collection was structured questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised of both open-ended and close-ended questions. The data was structured in line with the study research objectives. This study collected data on such socioeconomic characteristics as age, gender, education level, household size, primary occupation, farming experience, income, etc. Also asked were questions on the households’ poverty status, such as housing, health, household asset, Sanitation and Education etc.

2.3 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

The study utilized a multi-stage random sampling technique to select the study respondents. In the first stage, Zone A with

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

zonal headquarters at Aiyetoro-Gbede was purposively selected. The zone covers five LGA of the State. The LGA include: - Ijumu, Kabba-Bunu, Mapamuro, Yagba-East and yagba-West. The second stage, involve a random selection of two local government areas namely Ijumu and Yagba-East LGA. In the third stage, two rural farming communities were randomly selected from each of the selected Local Government Area making a total of four (4) rural communities. Stage four involve the random selection of thirty famers (30) from each rural farming communities making a total of one hundred and twenty (120) respondents.

2.4 Analytical techniques

Data obtained was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Objective one was achieved using descriptive statistics which include the use of simple percentages and frequencies. Objective two was achieved using Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). Objective three was achieved using Ordinary Least Square regression model.

2.5 Multidimensional Poverty Index

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) provides an aggregated poverty measure that reflects the prevalence of poverty and the joint distribution of deprivations. Also, it complements money based measures by considering multiple deprivations and their overlap based on the MPI by (Alkire et al., 2011).

2.6 Multidimensional poverty indices

Multidimensional headcount ratio (H)

The headcount is the proportion of people who are poor; the multidimensional head count ratio (*H*) is expressed as:

$$H = \frac{q}{n} \quad - \quad - \quad - (1)$$

with *q* as the number of multi-dimensionally poor, and *n* as the total population.

Intensity (or breadth) of poverty (A)

It is the average deprivation score for the multidimensional poor and can be expressed as:

$$A = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i k}{q} \quad - \quad - \quad - (2)$$

where:

*c*i(*k*) is the censored deprivation score of individual *i*, and *q* is the number of multidimensional poor. Following Alkire et al. (2011) and Aboaba et al. (2019), the Multidimensional Poverty Index is mathematically expressed as:

MPI = $H \times A$ - - - *(3)*

A household was considered multidimensional poor if it had a total deprivation of no less than 20% (or 0.2) because it shows that the household had been deprived in one or more of the weighted dimensions.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Socioeconomics Characteristics of Farming Households

63 respondents representing 52.94% were between the age of 21-40 years and above. The result implies that majority of the respondents were between 21-40 years. 48.74% were male while 61 respondents representing 51.26% were female. The result implies that majority of the respondents were females. 6.72% were single, 75 respondents representing 63.03% were married, 3 respondents representing 2.52% were divorced while 33 respondents representing 27.73% were widowed. The result implies that majority of the respondents are married. 78 respondents representing 65.55% have 6-10 persons in their households, 33 respondents representing 27.73% have 11-15 persons in their households while 2 respondents representing 1.68% have 15 and

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

above persons in their households. The result implies that majority of the respondents have 6-10 households. 72 respondents representing 60.50% had 6-10 years of schooling, and 43 respondents representing 36.13% had 11-15 years of formal education. The result implies that majority of the respondents had 6-10 years of formal education. 56 respondents representing 47.06% had farming experience between 11-20 years, 32 respondents representing 26.89% had farming experience of. The result implies that majority of the respondents have farming experience of 11-20 years. 56 respondents representing 47.06% said salaried job was their primary occupation, 32 respondents representing 4.20% reported trading is their primary occupation while none of the respondents represents craft and artisans. The result implies that majority of the respondents were salaried workers.

Furthermore, 94 respondents representing 78.99% indicated that they were members of cooperative society/association while 25 respondents representing 21.01% indicated they were non-members of cooperative society/association. The result implies that majority of the respondents were members of cooperative society/association. Membership of cooperative/association is necessary for informed decision making for successful access and utilization of credits. 92 respondents representing 77.31% had 1-5 hectares of farmland. 64 respondents representing 70.59% said no that they have no access to extension agent in the last 12 months. The result implies that majority of the respondents does not have access to extension agents in the last 12 months. Result in Table 4.1 shows that greater proportion (41.18%) of the respondents noted that they earned between ₦ 100,0001-200,000 annual income, (34.45%) earned between ₦ 200,001-300,000 while only 3.36% earned greater than ₦ 400, 000. This is in consonance with the findings of Akerele *et al.,* (2018) that higher income would avail the farmers enough money to procure inputs for the next farming season, hire labour when needed and reduce borrowing rate from cooperative societies and other credit organizations.

3.2 Multidimensional Poverty Profile of the Households

The multidimensional poverty estimates were derived using five dimensions of deprivations namely sanitation, housing, health, education, Sanitation and household assets with equal weights assigned to all. For each dimension, thresholds were set which is the first cut-off to identify if the household is deprived in that dimension. A second cut-off, k was set which states the extent to which a household can be deprived to be considered multidimensional poor. The result revealed that the poverty headcount (H_o) in the study was 0.158, the intensity of poverty (A_o) was 0.366 while the multidimensional poverty index (M_o) was 0.058. The result revealed that the study poverty headcount (H_o) was less than the poverty intensity (A_o). This implies that efforts aimed at alleviating poverty in the study area should focus more on reducing the deprivation share of each of the dimensions of poverty than on reducing the number of the number of poor. This finding was however, not in consistence with the findings of Alkire *et al*. (2011) that changes in MPI in Nigeria, Lesotho and Kenya are achieved by reduction in head count ratio (H_o) and hardly by a reduction in poverty intensity (A_o).

The relative contributions of dimensions to multidimensional poverty revealed that education deprivation contributed the highest to multidimensional poverty with 19.90%. The result further revealed that Sanitation contributed next to poverty in the study area (19.10%). The result consequently revealed poor household assets contributes (18.70%) to multidimensional poverty in the study area, health contributes (16.60%) while poor housing contribute the least 9.32% to the

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

multidimensional poverty in the study area. This indicates that multidimensional poverty of households in the study area can be mainly attributed to lack of access to basic education, poor sanitation, low level of household assets and poor health condition of household heads. These can therefore be interpreted as the major drivers of deprivation in the study area. Education may offer individuals a way out of poverty as skills acquired can increase the productivity of people and their earnings (Tilak, 2002). Also education can be regarded as a basic need which can help to fulfil other basic needs and thereby lead to improvements in quality of life (Tilak, 2002). According to Ataguba *et al*., (2013) rural dwellers, those with little or no formal education and large households tend to have higher deprivation headcounts than urban dwellers. Rural dwellers are more likely to be poorer due to the nature of their environment, living conditions and lack of access to basic amenities and constrained opportunities.

3.3 The Factors Influencing Poverty in the Study Area

An estimate of the binary logistic regression analysis on the factors influencing the farmers` poverty status in the study area was presented in Table 4. The model's log likelihood ratio of -17.036387 and Pseudo R^2 value of 0.6740 indicate that all variables included in the model significantly affect the probability of the respondents' poverty status at 1%. Out of the seven explanatory variables included in the model, four significantly affect the likelihood of respondents' level of deprivation i.e. multidimensional poverty Index. The table above shows that Age has positive coefficient and statistically significant at 1%. The result of the study was consistent with Bruck and Workneh Kebede (2013) that large number of members who are of working age would have more opportunity to improve their livelihood through increased production and consequently higher income**.** Also education can be regarded as a basic need which can help to fulfil other basic needs and thereby lead to improvements in quality of life (Tilak, 2002).

Household size has negative coefficient and statistically significant 5%. The result shows that multidimensional poverty increases with decrease in household size. This is strange and inconsistence with a prior expectation. Ataguba et al., (2013) reported similar results where multidimensional poverty increases with decrease in the size of household members. This result was however not consistent with the findings of Chaudhry, (2009) and Arif, (2004) in separate studies, both reported that large household size keep the individual or household in the state of poverty. Farming experience has negative coefficient and statistically significant at 5% and work off farm has positive coefficient and statistically significant at 5%.

3.4 Sampled Households` coping strategies in the event of poverty

From the table 5 above which shows the respondents coping strategies, borrowing good from friends and relative with a the mean of 2.025 which is greater than the critical mean of 2.00 which implies that the measure is a coping strategy adopted by the respondents. Also, Skipping one or two meals per day (2.38), Skipping eating for whole day (2.24), Engaging in criminal practices like prostitution and theft (2.34), Parents abandoning children to fend for themselves (2.27), reducing the number of people eating in the household (2.02), and Increased reliance on wild food (2.23).Also, short-term alteration in crop and livestock production pattern, Begging for good on streets and Mortgaging and selling of streets have a mean score of 2.43, 2.21 and 2.40 respectively which is above the critical mean of 2.00 which implies that majority of the respondents agreed that short-term alteration in crop and livestock production pattern, Begging for good on streets and Mortgaging

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

and selling of streets are effective coping strategies for household poverty. Distress migration (2.18) and buying food on credit (2.06) were also effective coping strategies adopted by the households.

4.0 CONCLUSION

These days the concept of poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon is receiving increasing attention. This study set out to appraise non-monetary multidimensional poverty in Zone A area of Kogi State Agricultural Development Project, Kogi State, Nigeria. The study established that poverty in the study area encompasses five dimensions namely; health, housing, sanitation, education and low household asset holding. The results of the study showed that low access and poor education contributes the highest to multidimensional poverty followed by sanitation, household assets, low access to quality health facilities and poor housing all contributes to multidimensional poverty in the study area.

The result of the study also reveals that some socio economics factors also influence multidimensional poverty in the study area. These socio economic factors include age, household size, farming experience and off-farm work were important and significant socio economic factors influencing sampled household multidimensional poverty in the study. Based on findings from the study, the study recommended that efforts geared at poverty reduction should focus more on reduction of poverty intensity or depth than on poverty head count in the study area.

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

REFERENCES

Ajakaiye, O., & Jerome, A. (2014). Economic Development: The Experience of sub-Saharan Africa. In B. Currie-Alder, R. Kanbur, D. Malone, and R. Medhora (eds), *International Development: Ideas, Experience, and Prospects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alaye-Ogan,. D. (2018). Rural Poverty among Women in Nigeria: A Case Study of Abuja Satellite Communities of Nigeria; A Dissertation Submitted to the School of Post Graduate Studies, St Clement University, Turks and Caicoss Island, British West Indies.

Alkire, S., & Foster, J. (2011). Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. *Journal of Public Economics, 95*(7-8), 476-487. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.006.

Arif, G. M. (2004). Child health and poverty in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*. *43*(3): 211-238.

Ataguba, J.E., Ichoku, H. E. & W. M. Fonta (2013). Multidimensional poverty assessment: applying the capability approach. *International Journal of Social Economics, 40* (4), 331-354.

Atkinson, A. (2003). Multidimensional deprivation: Contrasting social welfare and counting approaches, *Journal of Economic Inequality, 1*(1), 51-65.

Atkinson, A. B., Marlier, T., Nolan, B., & Vandenbroucke, F. (2002). *Social indicators: The EU and social inclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brück T. & Kebede S. W., (2013). Dynamics and Drivers of Consumption and Multidimensional Poverty: Evidence from Rural Ethiopia, IZA Discussion Paper No. 7364, April 2013.

Chakravarty, S. (2003). A Generalized Human Development Index. Available at SSRN: https// ssrn.com/abstract=377624.

Chaudhry I.S. (2009). Poverty Alleviation in Southern Punjab (Pakistan): An Empirical Evidence from the Project Area of Asian Development Bank, International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 1(23), 23-32.

Duclos, J.Y. & Araar, A. (2006). Poverty and Equity: Measurement, Policy, and Estimation with DAD, Springer, Berlin.

Gustavo, A. & Kotas, S. (2007).Rural Development and Poverty Reduction: Is Agriculture Still the Key? ESA Working Paper No.07-02.

Marlier, E., Atkinson, T., Cantillon, B., & Nolan, B. (2006). *The EU and social inclusion: Facing the challenges*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Tilak, J.B.G. (2002). Education and poverty, Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, 3, 191-207.

Wagle, U. (2005). Multidimensional poverty measurement with economic well-being, capability, and social inclusion: a case from Kathmandu, Nepal. *Journal of Human Development,* 6, 301-28.

Wagle, U. (2008). Multidimensional Poverty Measurement: Concepts and Applications, Springer, New York, NY.

World Bank (2010). Poverty World Development Report: *Oxford University Press.*

World Poverty Clock (2018). *The percentage of Nigerians living in extreme poverty could increase by 2030.*

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

APPENDIX

Table 1: Socioeconomics Characteristics of Farming Households

Socioeconomic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
Age (years)			
21-30	-	-	
31-40	63	52.94	42.30
41-50	31	26.05	
51-60	25	21.01	
>60	-	0	
Sex			
Male	58	48.74	
Female	61	51.26	
Marital Status			
Single	8	6.72	
Married	75	63.03	
Divorced	3	2.52	
Widowed	33	27.73	
Years of Schooling (years)			
1-5	4	3.36	
6-10	72	60.50	8 years
11-15	43	36.13	
>15	-	-	
Household size			
1-5	6	5.04	
6-10	78	65.55	8 person
11-15	33	27.73	
>15	2	1.68	
Farm size (Hectare)			
1-5	92	77.31	
6-10	25	21.01	2.6
>10	2	1.68	
Farming Experience			
≤ 10	31	26.05	
11-20	56	47.06	13 years
21-30	32	26.89	
Annual income (N)			
≤ 100,000	21	17.65	
N100,001-N200,000	49	41.18	
N200,001-N300,000	41	34.45	N275,320.10
N300,001-N400,000	4	3.36	
>N400,000	4	3.36	

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

Membership of Association.		
Yes	94	78.99
No	25	21.01
Extension Contact		
Yes	35	29.41
No	84	70.59
Primary Occupation		
Farming	31	26.05
Salaried	56	47.06
Trading	32	26.89
Craft & Artisans`-	-	
Total	119	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Table 2: Household Multidimensional Poverty Index

K	Multidimensional Poverty Index (M_o)	Head Count Ratio (H_o)	Poverty intensity (A_o)
	0.058	0.158	0.366

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Table 3: Relative Contributions of Dimensions to Multidimensional Poverty Index

K	Dimension	Percentage
1.	Housing	9.32
2.	Sanitation	19.10
3.	Education	19.90
4.	Health	16.16
5.	Household Assets	18.70

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences
Volume 19, Number 2, October 2021, pp 51 - 62

Table 4: Factors influencing the respondents` poverty status

Variables	**Coef.**	**Std. Err.**	**Z**	**P > |z|**
Age	5.361452	1.238481	4.33	0.000
Gender	-1.810257	2.072974	-0.87	0.383
Household size	-3.465614	1.412966	-2.45	0.014
Formal education	-2.082396	1.6291	-1.28	0.201
Cooperative Memb.	1.200446	2.71637	0.44	0.659
Farming_exp	-4.579197	2.10778	-2.17	0.030
Work_off-farm	4.537546	1.85672	2.44	0.015
_cons	-.1937966	8.838401	-0.02	0.983
Number of Obs.`	119			
LR Chi2 (7)	70.44			
Prob > chi2	0.0000			
Pseudo R2	0.6740			
Log likelihood	-17.036387			

Table 5: Coping strategies by the effects o f household poverty

S/N	Coping Strategies	MEAN	STD. DEV.
1	Eating foods that are less preferred	1.67	.6778
2	Reduction in quality and quantity of food consumed	1.83	.6678
3	Borrowing good from friends and relative	2.02	.588
4	Mothers limiting their own food intake in order to ensure that their children get enough to eat	1.78	.636
5	Skipping one or two meals per day	2.38	.713
6	Skipping eating for whole day	2.24	.468
7	Engaging in criminal practices like prostitution and theft	2.34	.796
8	Parents abandoning children to fend for themselves	2.27	.485
9	Reducing the number of people eating in the household	2.02	.520
10	Increased reliance on wild food	2.23	.459
11	Short-term alteration in crop and livestock production pattern	2.43	.708
12	Begging for good on streets	2.21	.430
13	Mortgaging and selling of streets	2.40	.693
14	Distress migration	2.18	.431
15	Eating cheaper meals out of home	1.92	.584
16	Engaging in off-farm jobs to increase household income e.g trading driving civil service etc.	1.83	.692
17	Buying food on credit	2.06	.563
18	Diversion of money meant for other purposes to buy food	1.94	.667

Sources: Field Survey, 2021.