Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Journal

The Official Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Journal homepage: https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/afnrj



Original Article

Assessment of community food security: empirical evidence from the adjunct communities of Federal University Dutse, Nigeria



Gabriel Ternenge AHUNGWA¹*^(D), Emmanuel Nkwi GAMA²^(D) & Martins Olusegun ORIFAH²^(D)

¹Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness, Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State, Nigeria. ²Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State, Nigeria. **DOI:** https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194

Editor: Dr Onyekachi Chukwu, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, NIGERIA

Received: June 6, 2024 Accepted: August 21, 2024 Available online: September 30, 2024

Peer-review: Externally peerreviewed



Copyright: © 2024 Author(s) This is an open access article under the licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<u>https://</u> <u>creativecommons.org/licenses/by/</u> <u>4.0/</u>) which permits unrestricted use distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the origina author and source are credited.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support

Community food security (CFS) attempts to bring out the nuances in food security analysis, especially the age-long misconception of equating food availability with food security. Under this new paradigm, food security is achieved only when communities obtain a safe, culturally and socially acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice. A four-stage sampling approach was adopted to select respondents in the six communities adjacent to Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State. Data were

ABSTRACT

that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice. A four-stage sampling approach was adopted to select respondents in the six communities adjacent to Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State. Data were collected using a questionnaire from 184 households in the communities and analysed using descriptive statistics and the Household Hunger Scale (HHS) and the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) to determine the food security status of the communities and the Problem Confrontation Index to determine the constraints to CFS. Results showed weak infrastructural support without educational, health, financial, and agricultural support systems. Further, results showed that 59.24 and 24.46% of the respondents experienced moderate and severe hunger, respectively, while 16.30% were without hunger. The prime constraints to sustainable community food security hovered around insufficient farmland (PCI = 273), drought (PCI = 267), lack of agricultural facilities (PCI = 266), and high cost of farming inputs (PCI = 256). Conclusively, the study revealed that food insecurity (hunger) is endemic (83.70%) in the adjunct communities, and concerted efforts should be targeted at improving the infrastructural base of the communities.

KEYWORDS: Anti-hunger strategy, Agricultural support systems, Infrastructure, Hunger scale.

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1970s, the concept of food security has been used to address many elements of food crises at all levels. Food security is defined on five levels: individual, household, national, regional, and global. The conditionality of food security was described as all individuals having constant physical and economic access to adequate and nutritious food to live an active and healthy life (Perez-Escamilla, 2017). However, the aforementioned approach to food security is usually seen as inadequate for addressing the social and environmental challenges associated with food security strategies. Community food security (CFS) has emerged due to activities aimed at supporting policies that account for all aspects (social, cultural, and environmental) within a community's food system that can affect food availability, cost, and quality for individual households or the community as a whole (Anderson & Cook, 1999). CFS, which was first proposed in the late 1990s, envisions a future in which all community residents have access to a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet provided by a sustainable food system that promotes community self-reliance, social justice, and democratic decision-making (Engler-Stringer, 2014; Colleen & Hayes-Conroy, 2015, Slade & Carter 2016). CFS focuses on individual or household food security within a social framework, while implicitly acknowledging the larger food system's vital role in providing food security. Developed as an anti-hunger and community development strategy, Andrée et al. (2017) and Kaiser et al. (2015) asserted that CFS helps policymakers and other practitioners improve their understanding of the barriers to food security at various levels of analysis, especially among community's low-income households.

The significance of CFS in Nigeria and the global search for food security cannot be overstated. World Health Organisation (2024), statistics cast doubt on the achievement of the food security goal, with 2.33 billion people worldwide experiencing moderate to severe food insecurity. On the home front, Nigeria is classified as a Low-Income Food Deficit (LIFD) country, with a significant prevalence of undernourished persons (Jung, 2023; Wudil *et al.*, 2023). These indexes are skewed toward the rural and poor peasant farmers. Achieving the food security objective will remain a mirage unless attention is paid to the communities where food is produced. Thus, boosting community access to food will result in national food security, and the overarching goal of providing safe and unhindered access to food. The necessity to examine CFS to examine the infrastructural supports for food production, and community food security status in Jigawa State has become imperative.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted among the six contiguous communities of the Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State. Dutse which is home to the University is located in the Northwest, Nigeria on Latitude 10º 42' to 12º 07' N and Longitude 9º 20' to 10º31' E (Medium Term Sector Strategy, MTSS, 2022). It is bounded in the North by Taura, Birnin Kudu in the south, and eastward by Kiyawa local government areas while the eastern flank is bordered by Kano State. Consequent to the establishment of the University on 9th February 2011 (Federal University Dutse, FUD, 2024), several communities were relocated to pave the way for the University. The affected communities are Maja, Hausawa, Sherifai, Bulori, Kargo and Gurungu. The choice of these communities was borne out of their clearly defined indices: shared sets of values or culture, communities' sense of belonging, commitment and fulfilment of communities' needs rather than mere geographical space. The climate of Dutse is semi-arid type, defined by a long dry season of mostly eight months (October - May). The rainy season falls between June to September with an annual rainfall of 900 to 1000mm while the prevailing temperature ranges between 12.2° – 41.7^oc (Barau, 2015, Nura et al, 2023). (Fig. 1).



Figure 1. Map of Dutse showing the study area. Source: Olorontoba et al. (2015)



AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194 Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A three-stage sample selection technique was utilized to determine the appropriate sample size for the investigation. First, villages adjacent to Federal University Dutse were purposefully selected based on well-defined communal indicators. Second, a census of all households in each selected community was conducted (1,916 households) as presented in Table 1. Third, the probability proportion to size (PPS) sampling technique was used to determine a sample size of 184 households in the communities based on statistical considerations (Yamane's and Bowley's allocation formulae). A confidence level of 95% and an error margin of less than 10%, which is typical in agricultural socio-economic research (Nyariki, 2009) was used for the study.

Yamane's formula is expressed as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \tag{1}$$

Where, n = sample size, N = sample frame, e = precision level (7%).

The Bowley's proportion allocation formula will then be used to select respondents from each community as;

$$ni = n \frac{Ni}{N}$$

Where, n_i = Sample size at ith strata, n = total sample size.

(2)

61

15

16 30

51

184

SN Community No. of Sample Households (N) Size (n) Maja 1 117 11 2

635

154

163

317

530 1,916

Table	1:	Samn	le	Size	Sel	lection	Matrix
rance		Damp		DILL		UUUU	TAUTA

Source: Field survey, 2024.

Method of Data Analysis

Hausawa

Sherifai

Bulori

Kargo

Total

Gurungu

3

4

5

6

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS 22) and Microsoft Excel office 2019 were used to re-code, arrange, and analyse the raw data from the survey questionnaire. The study area employed descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, arithmetic and weighted mean, and standard deviation to depict the accessibility and availability of infrastructure supporting food production. The Household Hunger Scale (HHS) and Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) were



AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194

Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

employed to ascertain the food security statuses of the community. The Problem Confrontation Index (PCI) was employed to ascertain the degree of obstacles hindering the achievement of CFS objectives.

The Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) captured household behaviours, signifying insufficient food quality and quantity, and anxiety over insecure access. Household Hunger Scale (HHS) on the other hand built around three generic questions (modified to nine) about perceptions of a household on varying degrees of hunger by the number of times a household has experienced hunger within the past 30 days prior to this survey.

Three scoring options for scoring the response to each question are:

Never (0 times) =0 score (none or light hunger)

Rarely/ Sometimes (1-10 times) = 1 score (moderate hunger)

Often (more than 10 times) = 2 scores (severe hunger)

The problem confrontation index (PCI) identified, measured, and ranked the constraints in order of the level of severity using the weighted scores (Alaka, 2023). Mathematically, PCI is expressed in this study as;

$$PCI = P_{nc} * 0 + P_{ls} * 1 + P_{s} * 2$$
(3)

Where PCI = problem confrontation index, P_{nc} = number of respondents who rated or graded the constraints as no constraint, P_{ls} = number of respondents who rated the constraints as less severe constraint, and P_s = number of respondents who rated or graded the constraints as a severe constraint.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Community infrastructural support and Food Systems

The concept of CFS places greater emphasis on community infrastructure because improved infrastructure can greatly enhance food security. Result in Table 2 shows communities' access to Islamic education (MWS = 1.96) and primary school (1.54), while means of transportation were mainly by foot (MWS = 1.81), cart driven (MWS = 1.77), bicycles (MWS = 1.82), motorcycles (MWS = 1.86) and tricycles (MWS = 1.83). Water sources in the communities were personal dug wells (MWS = 1.73), community wells (MWS = 1.89) and boreholes (MWS = 1.73). However, communities' health facilities, financial and agricultural institutions were completely not available. Similarly, the communities have

no access to market facilities except, kiosks. Also, access to secondary and tertiary education in the communities was limited. The consequence is that rural infrastructures are necessary for rural development (Memon *et al.*, 2020), and their absence can have a detrimental impact on food

security. This result is consistent with the findings of Nyor (2016), Daudu *et al.* (2018), Sari *et al.* (2019), and Adama *et al.* (2022), who all reiterated the considerable effects of rural infrastructures on community food security objectives.

Table 2. Availability and Accessibility of Community Infrastructure (n = 184)

Туре	Infrastructure facility	Accessible	Not	WS	MWS
-58-			Accessible		
Schools	Islamiyya	176 (352)	8 (8)	360	1.96
	Primary	100 (200)	84 (84)	248	1.54
	Secondary	80 (160)	104 (104)	264	1.43
	Tertiary	69(138)	115 (115)	253	1.37
Health facility	Community health centre	20 (40)	164 (164)	204	1.11
-	Primary health centre	52 (104)	132 (132)	236	1.28
	Secondary health centre	10 (20)	174 (174)	194	1.05
Financial	Micro-finance Bank	5 (10)	179 (179)	189	1.03
institutions	Cooperative society	48 (96)	136 (136)	232	1.26
	Thrift and loan	37 (74)	146 (146)	220	1.19
	Commercial Bank	10 (20)	174 (174)	194	1.05
	Development Bank	0 (0)	184 (184)	184	1.00
Market	Local weekly market	0 (0)	184 (184)	184	1.00
	Daily market	30 (60)	154 (154)	214	1.16
	Shops/kiosks	109 (218)	75 (75)	293	1.59
Agricultural	ADP office	0 (0)	184 (184)	184	1.00
institutions	Agricultural training centre	20 (40)	164 (164)	204	1.11
	Veterinary clinic	0 (0)	184 (184)	184	1.00
	Agricultural processing centre	0 (0)	184 (184)	184	1.00
	Storage facilities	44 (88)	140 (140)	228	1.24
Road network	Footpaths	115 (230)	69 (69)	299	1.62
	Laterite road	69 (138)	115 (115)	253	1.37
	Coal tarred road	78 (156)	106 (106)	256	1.39
Means of	Foot mainly	150 (300)	34 (34)	334	1.81
Transportation	Cart driven	141 (282)	43 (43)	325	1.77
	Bicycle	154 (308)	27 (27)	335	1.82
	Motorcycle	159 (318)	25 (25)	343	1.86
	Tricycle	153 (306)	31 (31)	337	1.83
	Vehicle	70 (140)	114 (114)	254	1.38
Water supply	Stream	0 (0)	184 (184)	368	1.00
	Personal dug well	143 (286)	40 (40)	326	1.77
	Communal well	149 (298)	36 (36)	348	1.89
	Borehole	134 (268)	50 (50)	318	1.73
	Tap water	70 (140)	114 (114)	254	1.38
	Reservoir (Rain water	60 (120)	124 (124)	244	1.33
	harvesting)				
Housing Mud bricks (thatched)		145 (290)	39 (39)	329	1.79
facilities	Mud bricks (zinc roofs)	140 (280)	47 (47)	327	1.78
	Cement bricks (thatched)	149 (298)	35 (35)	333	1.81
	Cement bricks (zinc roof)	153 (306)	31 (31)	337	1.83

Values in parenthesis represent weighted scores, WS = weight score, MWS = Mean weight score. The threshold = 1.5. Source: Field survey, 2024



AFNRJ | <u>https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194</u> Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Community Food Security Status

The Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) and Household Hunger Scale (HHS) were jointly used to determine the status of the community's food security status. Results in Table 3 showed that the weighted mean scores, except, responses to questions 3 and 7 were above the threshold of food security (MWS≥2.00). This implies respondents' affirmation to the existence and experience of food insecurity in the communities. The validity of this result is in consonance with the submission of Winne et al. (2011) who averred that communities are considered food insecure if the following conditions are true: there are inadequate resources from which people can purchase foods; the available food purchasing resources are not accessible to all community members; the food available through the resources is insufficient in quantity or variety; the food available is not competitively priced and thus is not affordable to all households; there are inadequate food assistance resources.

The nexus of hunger and community food security enhance the understanding of the barriers to food security at different levels of analysis (Gallegos et al., 2023). The HHS food insecurity indicators (Table 4) showed that 59.24 and 24.46% of the respondents experienced moderate and severe hunger, respectively. However, 16.30% of the communities' members attested they have never experienced hunger. This result shows that the proportion of communities that experienced food insecurity is about 84%. This result is in harmony with the findings of Sari et al. (2019) and Dehrashid et al. (2021) where similar distributions were made.

. Table 3:	Community	Food	Insecurity	Indicators	(n =	184)
------------	-----------	------	------------	------------	------	------

S/N	CFS Indicators	Responses			WS	MWS	
0		Often	Some times	Never			
1	Was there ever no food of any kind to eat in your house because of lack of resources to get food?	57	76	51	374	2.03	
2	Did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food?	48	98	38	378	2.05	
3	Did you or any household member go a whole day and night without eating anything at all because there was not enough food?	13	33	138	243	1.32	
4	Did you worry that your household would not have enough food?	54	80	50	372	2.02	
5	Were you or any household member not able to eat the kinds of foods you preferred because of a lack of resources?	77	49	58	387	2.10	
6	Did you or any household member have to eat a limited variety of foods due to a lack of resources?	75	62	47	396	2.15	
7	Did you or any household member have to eat some foods that you really did not want to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food?	15	52	117	266	1.45	
8	Did you or any household member have to eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food?	50	84	50	368	2.00	
9	Did you or any household member have to eat fewer meals in a day because there was not enough food?	55	77	52	371	2.02	

*N=number of responses, WS = weight score, MWS = Mean weight score. The threshold point = 2.00 Source: Field survey, 2024

Factors influencing Community Food Security

solving food security challenges at all levels. The array of the underlying social, economic, environmental and institutional factors that affect the quantity, quality, and affordability of food (Table 5) shows that the community

Factors influencing community food security are complex and multidimensional. Understanding these is key to

> AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194 Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

food security objective is constrained by most factors included in the analysis especially; production factors (insufficient farmland, PCI = 273 and high cost of productive inputs, PCI = 256); social infrastructural factors (lack of agricultural support facilities, PCI = 266 and lack of markets, MWS = 246); environmental factors (drought, PCI = 269 and flooding, PCI = 256); sociocultural constraints (socially unacceptable foods, PCI = 246 and gender disparity, PCI = 205) as well as sociopolitical factors (insufficient government support, PCI = 244 and Insufficient support for food production (Govt, NGOs), PCI = 144). The severity of production constraints for instance, implies that sustainable community food security can be achieved with improved land administration regimes and strong agricultural infrastructural support. This result aligns with the finding of Wudil et al. (2023) that low agricultural productivity and subsequent food insecurity are as a result of fragmented land holding, over reliance on rainfall,

extreme climate events and poor economic base. Also, this result is corroborated by the submission of Wabwoba & Wakhungu (2013) that the CFS objective is constrained by group members' participation, land tenure-related issues, gender disparities, and unstable rainfall regimes.

Table 4: Community Food Security Status (n = 184)

HHS Indicators	Responses		Food Security Status	
	Frequency	%		
Never (0 times)	30	16.30	No hunger	
Sometimes (1 – 10 times)	109	59.24	Moderate hunger	
Often (more than 10 times)	45	24.46	Severe hunger	

Source: Field survey, 2024

Ta	ble	5:	Constraints	to Commu	nity l	Food	Security	System	(n = 184)
----	-----	----	-------------	----------	--------	------	----------	--------	-----------

Constraints	Factor/Indicators	Severe	Less	Not a	PCI	Rank
			severe	constraint		
	Limited livelihood options	24 (48)	45 (45)	115 (0)	93	25
Production	Insufficient farmlands	104 (208)	65 (65)	15 (0)	273	1
constraints	High cost of productive inputs	89 (178)	78 (78)	17 (0)	256	4
	Labour unavailability/cost high cost	67 (134)	43 (43)	74 (0)	177	21
	Unavailability of Schools	59 (118)	63 (63)	62 (0)	181	20
	Markets facilities	91 (182)	64 (64)	29 (0)	246	7
G . 1	Lack of agricultural support facilities (e.g. training centres, storage facilities etc)	102 (204)	62 (62)	20 (0)	266	3
Social	Lack of health facilities	76 (152)	83 (83)	25 (0)	235	11
infrastructure	Lack of financial institutions	68 (136)	79 (79)	37 (0)	147	22
	Poor road network	58 (116)	72 (72)	54 (0)	188	17
	Poor transportation facilities	53 (106)	94 (94)	37 (0)	200	14.5
	Poor water supply system	84 (168)	76 (76)	24 (0)	244	8.5
	Drought	106 (212)	57 (57)	21 (0)	269	2
	Flooding	97 (194)	62 (62)	25 (0)	256	5
Environmental	Desertification/desert encroachment	72 (144)	54 (54)	58 (0)	198	16
factors	Soil erosion	63 (126)	58 (58)	63 (0)	184	18
	Loss of biodiversity	32 (64)	81 (81)	71 (0)	145	23
	Erratic rainfall regime	76 (154)	63 (63)	45 (0)	217	12
Cultural/social	Availability of culturally/socially unacceptable foods	85 (170)	76 (76)	23 (0)	246	7
constraints	Gender disparity in agriculture	62 (124)	81 (81)	41 (0)	205	13
	Lack of food assistance/aid	64 (128)	54 (54)	66 (0)	182	19
Socio-Political	Insufficient support for food production (Govt, NGOs)	81 (162)	75 (75)	28 (0)	237	10
constraints	Poor food policy framework	64 (128)	72 (72)	48 (0)	200	14.5
	Inadequate support from the government	90 (180)	64 (64)	34 (0)	244	8.5
	Lack of community social networks	30 (60)	84 (84)	70 (0)	144	24

*cut-off point MWS ≥2.00. Values in parenthesis represent (mean scores)



AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194

Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Community food security as global efforts is aimed at promoting strategies to address social, cultural and environmental factors, capable of influencing food availability, cost and quality of food within a community's food system. Findings from this study attest that food insecurity (hunger) is endemic among the communities surrounding Federal University Dutse which are characterised by weak rural infrastructural base and inadequate agricultural and food support systems. The study recommends that for the communities to improve food security, community projects targeted at addressing the myriad of production and infrastructural systems are essential to support the communities' food systems for improved and sustainable food security.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank Dr Kehide Omifolaji for the geospatial survey of the adjunct villages. Equally, the authors are immensely grateful to the staff members of Jigawa State Agricultural Development Authority (JARDA) for assisting in data collection.

Authors' Contributions

Author GTA managed the conceptualisation and design of the research, development of data collection instrument, analysis and interpretation, and revision of the manuscript. Author ENG managed the literature review, data collection, and interpretation of data and wrote the first draft. Author MOO managed the development of research methodology, data entry and coding, interpretation of data, and review and editing of the first draft. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical Statement

Not applicable

REFERENCE

- Adama, A. M., Abdullahi, N. L., Obaje, G., Nwohu, J. U., Umaru, F. E., Yahaya, I. A., Agboola, M., Abubakar, S. A., Msheliza, N. E. & Yusuf, S. (2022). Effect of Infrastructural Deficits on Food Security in Kogi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, *10*(10), 156-164. www.questjournals.org
- Alaka, K. O. (2023) Assessing Household Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Smallholder Farmer's Investments in Climate Smart Agriculture Practices in Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. FARA Research Report 7(40), 510-520. https://doi.org/10.59101/frr072340

- Anderson, M. D. & Cook, J. T. (1999). Community food security: Practice in need of theory? *Agriculture and Human Values*, *16*, 141–150. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007580809588
- Andrée, P., Ballamingie, P., Piazza, S. & Jarosiewicz, S. (2017). Can Community-Based Initiatives Address the Conundrum of Improving Household Food Access While Supporting Local Smallholder Farmer Livelihoods?. In: Knezevic, I., Blay-Palmer, A., Levkoe, C., Mount, P., Nelson, E. (eds) Nourishing Communities. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57000-6_5
- Barau, R. M. (2015). Urban Morphology Dynamics and Environmental Changes in Kano, Nigeria.Land Use Policy, 307-317
- Colleen, H., & Hayes-Conroy, A. (2015). Understanding Cultural Acceptability for Urban Food Policy. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 30(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412214555433
- Daudu, S. A., Omotayo, A. O., Aremu, A. O. & Omotoso, A. B. (2018). Rural infrastructure and profitability of food crop production in Oyo state, Nigeria. *Applied Ecology and Environmental Research*, 16(4), 4655-4665. http://dx.doi.org/10.15666/aeer/1604_46554665
- de Oliveira V. M., Parenti, E. & Neiva, S. D. S. (2021). Food Security: Conceptual History and Pillars. In: Leal Filho, W., Azul, A.M., Brandli, L., Özuyar, P.G., Wall, T. (eds) Zero Hunger. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Springer, Cham. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69626-3_21-1</u>
- Dehrashid, A. A., Bijani, M., Valizadeh, N., Dehrashid., H. A., Nasrollahizadeh, B. & Mohammadi, A. (2021). Food security assessment in rural areas: evidence from Iran. *Agriculture and Food Security*, *10*(17), 1-18. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-021-00291-z</u>
- Engler-Stringer, R. (2014). Food Security. In: Michalos A.C. (eds) Encyclopaedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. Springer, Dordrecht. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_1073</u>
- FAO (2018). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2018: Building climate resilience for food security and nutrition. https://www.fao.org/3/I9553EN/i9553en.pdf
- FUD (Federal University Dutse) (2024). What we are all about. https://fud.edu.ng/index.php/about/#:~:text=The% 20federal%20University%20Dutse%20(FUD,in%2 0the%20north%20western%20Nigeria.
- Gallegos, D., Booth, S., Pollard, C. M., Chilton, M. & Kleve, S. (2023). Food security definition, measures and advocacy priorities in high-income



AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194

Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

countries: A Delphi consensus study. *Public Health Nutrition*, 26(10), 1986-

1996. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980023000915

- Gemeda, O. D., Korecha, D. & Garedew, W. (2023). Determinants of climate change adaptation strategies and existing barriers in Southwestern parts of Ethiopia. *Climate Services*, 30, 100376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2023.100376
- Hoque, M. J., Hossain, M. I., Sarker, M. A. & Mithun, M.N.A.S. (2021). Problem Confrontation of Sugarcane Farmers in Natore District of Bangladesh. Int. J. Agril. Res. Innov. Tech. 11(1): 101-108. <u>https://doi.org/10.3329/ijarit.v11i1.54472</u>
- Jung, I. (2023). Food Insecurity in Nigeria: Food Supply Matters: Nigeria. Selected Issues Papers, 2023(018), A001. <u>https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400236921.01</u> 8.A001
- Kaiser, M. L., Usher, K., and Spees, C. (2015). Community Food Security Strategies: An Exploratory Study of Their Potential for Food Insecure Households with Children, *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk:* 6(2), 2. Available at: <u>http://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatris</u> <u>k/vol6/iss2/2</u>
- Kura, N. U., Usman, S. U. & Khalil, M. S. (2023). Flood Vulnerability Assessment of A Semi-Arid Region: A Case Study of Dutsein Jigawa State, Nigeria. Journal of Environmental Issues and Climate Change, 2(1), 20-30
- Memon, J. A. & El Bilali, H. (2020). Rural Infrastructure and Food Security. In: Leal Filho, W., Azul, A.M., Brandli, L., Özuyar, P.G., Wall, T. (eds) Zero Hunger. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Springer, Cham. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95675-6_44</u>
- MTSS (Medium Term Sector Strategy) (2022). Environmental Sector – 2022 – 2024 Medium Term Sector Strategy. <u>https://jigawastate.gov.ng/uploads/Jigawa%20State</u> <u>%20Government_2023-</u> <u>2025%20MTSS_ENVIRONMENT%20SECTOR.</u> pdf
- Nyariki, D. M. (2009). Household Data Collection for Socio-Economic Research in Agriculture: Approaches and Challenges in Developing Countries. *Journal of Social Science*, 19(2), 91-99. https://doi.org/<u>10.1080/09718923.2009.11892696</u>
- Nyor, A. K. (2016). Inadequate infrastructure: The bane behind food loss and food security in the savannah zone of Ghana. *Journal of Developments in Sustainable Agriculture*, *11*(1), 43-47. https://doi.org/10.11178/jdsa.11.43

- Oloruntoba, A., Abdulsalam, R. Y., Ahungwa, G. T. & Nasiru, A. (2016). A Survey of the Agricultural Extension Outreach Communities in Jigawa State. A TETFund Institution-Based Research Fund (IBRF) – 2015 Intervention Grant.
- Perez-Escamilla, R. (2017). Food Security and the 2015– 2030 Sustainable Development Goals: From Human to Planetary Health. *Curr* Dev Nutr.,1(7), e000513. <u>https://cdn.nutrition.org/article/S2475-</u> 2991(22)14472-0/fulltext
- Sari, D. W., Yudhaa, P. C. A. & Restikasari, W. (2019). The Effect of Economic and Social Infrastructure on Household Food Security in Indonesia. *Journal Ekonomi Indonesia*, 8(2), 191–201. <u>https://doi.org/10.52813/jei.v8i2.4</u>
- Slade, C. & Carter, J. (2016). Towards institutional fit? The reality of institutional capacity through two food security exemplars. *Geoforum*, *76*, 100-113. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.09.001</u>
- Sonnino, R., Marsden, T., & Moragues-Faus, A. (2016). Rationalities and convergences in food security narratives: towards a place-based approach. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41(4): 477-489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.09.001
- Wabwoba, M. S. N. & Wakhungu, J. W. (2013). Factors affecting sustainability of community food security projects in Kiambu County, Kenya. Agriculture and Food Security, 2, 9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/2048-7010-2-9</u>
- Winne M., Joseph, H. & Fisher, A. (2011). Community food security: A guide to concept, design, and implementation. 2011. http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-andinstitutes/johns-hopkinscenter-for-alivablefuture/_pdf/projects/FPN/how_to_guide/gett ing_started/CFS.pdf
- World Health Organisation (2024). Hunger numbers stubbornly high for three consecutive years as global crises deepen: UN report 2023. <u>https://www.who.int/news/item/24-07-2024-</u> <u>hunger-numbers-stubbornly-high-for-threeconsecutive-years-as-global-crises-deepen--unreport#</u>
- Wudil, A. H., Ali, A., Raza, H. A., Mehmood, H. Z. & Sannoh, A. B. (2023). Determinants of food security in Nigeria: Empirical evidence from beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries rice farmers of the Kano River Irrigation Project. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 7, 999932.



AFNRJ | https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174194

Published by Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.