

MUSHROOM DEMAND AND POVERTY INCIDENCE AMONG MUSHROOM CONSUMERS IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA

Adegbenjo, A. E. H.

*Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management,
Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria.
E-mail-adegebenjoae@funaab.edu.ng*

Abstract

Mushroom has economic, food and medicinal value to a large proportion of human populace. This study assessed the rate of mushroom demand and the poverty level among mushroom consumers in the study area. Non-probability sampling method was used to select 30% of Local Government Areas (LGAs) from Lagos (5), Ogun (6) and Oyo (9) States. Four communities were selected purposively from each LGA and a snow-ball sampling approach used in selecting 5 respondents from each community, making a total of 400 respondents. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, Linear Almost Ideal Demand System (LA-AIDS) model was used to estimate the elasticity of mushroom demand while Foster Greer Thorbecke (FGT) was used to determine poverty incidence among the respondents. Comparing mushroom with other related food items using LA-AIDS, the log likelihood ratio (R^2) value ranged from 0.1823 for mushroom to 0.7602 for 'ponmo', while the compensated own price for all the food items were far from 1, indicating that the demand for these food items were price inelastic. From FGT analysis, 28.5% were below the poverty line, showing that most of these mushroom consumers are not poor. The rate of mushroom demand is increasing and therefore, there is need to encourage mushroom cultivation and production in the country.

Key Words- *Poverty line; Elasticity, Snow-ball, Price inelastic, Food*

Introduction

Mushrooms have long been valued as tasty, nutritious food by different societies throughout the world. In the developing world, including Africa, mushrooms are used as food and medicine in many societies. Edible mushrooms include many fungal species that are either harvested wild or cultivated. Easily cultivatable and common wild mushrooms are often available in markets, and those that are more difficult to obtain (such as the prized truffle and matsutake) may be collected on a smaller scale by private gatherers. Some preparations may render certain poisonous mushrooms fit for consumption (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edible_mushroom).

Mushrooms are a nutritionally sound food that are of even greater value to vegetarian. They are added to sauces and relishes for flavouring, often they are consumed as meat substitutes. The importance of mushroom in the agrarian economy of the world needs no emphasis because of its nutritional and medicinal value. The mushrooms have long ago drawn attention of human beings as a food, nutritionally and medicinally and are a leading food component (Chilton, 1993).

Food consumption has been a subject of research all over the world especially in developing countries where food expenditure accounts for a relatively large share of household income. Studies on food consumption shed light on food related nutritional policies. They provide estimate of how food consumption is affected by change in price, income and taxation policies (Dunne and Edkins, 2008). Food consumption in Nigeria has been an important issue, not only because it is related to poverty and food security, but also because it is highly correlated with the standard of living and household resource.

Due to the nutritional and medicinal values of mushrooms, its role in food security, environmental conservation, and income generation; this study therefore, examined the rate of mushroom demand and its consumption among the poor and non-poor in Ogun, Oyo and Lagos States of south western Nigeria.

Methodology

Data Collection and Sampling Procedure

The instrument of data collection was structured questionnaire. Non probability sampling method was used for this study. Based on reconnaissance survey, 3 States were selected from Southwest Nigeria; they are Lagos, Oyo and Ogun States. From each State, sampling

intensity of Local Government Areas (LGAs) was done by selecting 10% of LGAs present in each States, thus, 5 LGAs in Lagos State (out of 20 LGAs in Lagos State) , 9 LGAs in Oyo State (out of 33 LGAs in Oyo State) and 6 LGAs in Ogun State (out of 20 LGAs in Ogun State) Wikipedia, 2019. Four communities were selected purposively because both local and exotic mushrooms were commonly available in the communities and a snow ball sampling approach was use to select 5 respondents (majorly, the household heads) from each communities making a total number of 400 respondents.

Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to determine the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area. Linear Approximate Almost Ideal Demand system (LA-AIDS) developed by Deaton and Muellbauer (1980) which was further modified by Akbay *et al.*(2007) was use to estimate own price, cross price, and income elasticities of demand for the consumption of mushroom species in the study area.

$$W_i = \alpha_i + \sum_j \gamma_{ij} \ln P_j + \beta_i \ln \left(\frac{X}{P} \right) \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

And the cross price elasticity is calculated thus

$$\sum_{ij} = -1 + \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{w_i} - \beta_i \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

And the income elasticity is

$$\eta_i = 1 + \frac{\beta_i}{w_i} \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Consumption of mushroom by the poor or non-poor consumers in the study area was estimated by using the Foster- Greer- Thorbecke (1984).

$$P_\alpha = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{Z-Y}{Z} + 1 \right]^\alpha \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

This section focuses on the socio-economic characteristics of household heads in the study area to facilitate an understanding of how they impact on the household food demand in the study area. The socio-economic characteristics considered are age, gender, marital status, household size, education and primary occupation of the respondents as shown in Table 1. Others are household head monthly income group, food expenditure and mushroom expenditure. About half (58.50%) of the household heads were male while only (41.50%) of them were female. It can be inferred from the distribution that food demand decisions are dominated by male- headed households in the study area and majority (63.50%) of the respondents were married with only 30.00% of them being single. This shows that marriage does affect household consumption and most married couples are conscious of their food intake. Table 2 revealed the monthly income of household heads, food expenditure and mushroom expenditure of the households. The results showed that majority of the respondents earns above N 60,000 monthly. This indicated that majority of responds are well to do because they dwell majorly in urban areas. According to the Nigerian Living Standard Survey (NLSS) released by the National Bureau of Statistics covering the year 2019, reported that 52.1% of rural dwellers in Nigeria are poor, while only 18.04% of urban dwellers are classified as poor. According to NBS, on average, 4 out of 10 individuals in Nigeria has real per capita expenditures below N137,430 per year, which translates to N376.5 per day (nairametric.com, 05/10/2020, 05:30am).

Table 1- Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency (Oyo)	Frequency (Ogun)	Frequency (Lagos)	Frequency (Pooled)
AGE				
30 Years & below	12(6.7)	10(8.3)	6(6.0)	28 (7.0)
31 - 40	32(17.7)	22(18.3)	16(16.0)	70 (17.5)
41 - 50	65(36.1)	32(26.8)	23(23.0)	120 (30.0)
51 - 60	38(21.1)	31(25.8)	28(28.0)	97(24.3)
61 - 70	23(12.8)	15(12.5)	12(12.0)	50 (12.5)
71 Years & above	10(5.6)	10(8.3)	15(15.0)	35 (8.8)
Mean Age (yrs)				49.76
GENDER				
Male	112(62.2)	66(55.0)	56(56.0)	234(58.5)
Female	68(37.8)	54(45.0)	44(44.0)	166(41.5)
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	43(23.9)	34(28.3)	43(43.0)	120(30.0)
Married	127(70.6)	76(63.3)	51(51.0)	254(63.5)
Divorced	4(2.2)	7(5.9)	0(0.0)	11(2.8)
Widowed	6(3.3)	3(2.5)	6(6.0)	15(3.8)
HOUSEHOLD SIZE				
1 - 4 members	110(61.1)	48(40.0)	65(65.0)	223(55.8)
5 - 8 members	70(38.9)	72(60.0)	35(35.0)	177(44.3)
Mean HH size	3.87	3.28	3.79	4.10
EDUCATION				
No Formal	9(5.0)	2(1.7)	0(0.0)	11(2.8)
Secondary	25(13.9)	20(16.7)	17(17.0)	62(15.5)
Tertiary	146(81.1)	98(81.6)	83(83.0)	327(81.8)
Mean Education(yrs)	12.66	13.93	12.37	14.94
OCCUPATION				
Business	22(12.2)	13(10.8)	32(32.0)	67(16.8)
Civil Servant	108(60.0)	77(64.2)	31(31.0)	216(54.0)
Farming	12(6.7)	8(6.7)	7(7.0)	27(6.8)
Public Servant	7(3.9)	3(2.5)	6(6.0)	16(4.0)
Researcher	16(8.9)	10(8.3)	16(16.0)	42(10.5)
Student	15(8.3)	9(7.5)	8(8.0)	32(8.0)

Table 2: Distribution of Households by Monthly Income, Food Expenditure and Mushroom Expenditure

	Oyo	Ogun	Lagos	Frequency(pooled)
Monthly income group				
20000 Naira or less	16(7.8)	10(8.3)	7(7.0)	33(8.3)
20001 - 40000	11(6.1)	3(2.5)	6(6.0)	21(5.3)
40001 - 60000	9(5.0)	6(5.0)	7(7.0)	23(5.8)
60001 - 80000	15(8.3)	14(11.7)	5(5.0)	35(8.8)
80001 - 100000	18(10.0)	14(11.7)	13(13.0)	46(11.5)
100001 - 120000	18(10.0)	5(4.2)	4(4.0)	18(4.5)
120001 - 140000	21(11.7)	19(15.8)	13(13.0)	54(13.5)
140001 - 160000	21(11.7)	14(11.7)	8(8.0)	44(11.0)
160001 - 180000	14(7.8)	7(5.8)	9(9.0)	31(7.8)
180001 - 200000	9(5.0)	7(5.8)	9(9.0)	26(6.5)
200001 Naira or More	28(15.6)	21(17.5)	19(19.0)	69(17.3)
Mean	135324.1	139721.8	146369	139404.64
Spent on Food items + mushrooms				
10000 Naira or below	21(11.7)	19(15.8)	17(17.0)	57(14.3)
10001 - 20000	55(30.6)	43(35.8)	28(28.0)	126(31.5)
20001 -30000	47(26.1)	32(26.7)	31(31.0)	110(27.5)
30001 -40000	38(21.1)	18(15.0)	6(6.0)	62(15.5)
40001 - 50000	10(5.6)	7(5.8)	10(10.0)	27(6.8)
50001 Naira or more	9(5.0)	1(0.8)	8(8.0)	18(4.5)
Mean	21342.56	24031.5	24311.6	24151.55
Spent on mushroom and mushroom products				
1000 Naira or less	45(25.0)	33(27.5)	19(19.0)	97(24.3)
1001 - 2000	42(23.3)	23(19.2)	17(17.0)	82(20.5)
2001 - 3000	21(11.7)	20(16.7)	14(14.0)	55(13.8)
3001 - 4000	29(16.1)	18(15.0)	19(19.0)	66(16.5)
4001 - 5000	21(11.7)	10(8.3)	9(9.0)	40(10.0)
5001 - 6000	10(5.6)	5(4.2)	10(10.0)	25(6.3)
6001 Naira or more	12(6.7)	11(9.2)	12(12.0)	35(8.8)
Mean	3087.22	2989.73	3100.68	3169.40

Description of Mushroom Substitute Prices, Expenditure and Budget Share

Table 3 shows the average price per unit of all the food items considered in the study area. From the table, the average (mean) price per kilogram of mushroom was N1392.90, while the price ranged between N200.00

and N4000.00. The mean price per crate of egg was least (N913.65) and the price ranged between N40.00 and N500.00. The average monthly expenditure was N3169.40 for mushrooms and N4861.13 for fish, and N1716.28, N932.48, N2739.38, N6548.86 and N8018.25 for meat, egg, "ponmo", cray fish and snail respectively.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Price, Quantity, Expenses and Budget Share for Each of the Food items in the Study Areas

Description	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Error	Standard Deviation
Purchase Price					
Mushroom products (₦/kg)	200.00	4000.00	1169.61	107.59	1392.90
Fish (₦/kg)	400.00	10000.00	4851.83	120.60	2184.20
Meat (₦/kg)	250.00	8500.00	1734.99	82.19	1587.28
Egg (₦/ Crate)	40.00	5000.00	913.65	25.26	456.01
'ponmo' (₦/kg)	600.00	6800.00	2648.86	126.52	1678.54
Crayfish (₦/kg)	1200.00	10000.00	6724.49	206.32	2888.42
Snail (₦/kg)	800.00	20000.00	7562.13	581.26	7556.42
Purchase Quantity					
Mushroom products (Kg/ Month)	0.10	33.00	2.56	0.13	2.51
Fish (Kg/ Month)	0.00	24.00	3.86	0.14	2.79
Meat (Kg/ Month)	0.00	5.00	1.24	0.05	0.91
Egg (Crate/month)	0.00	10.80	2.03	0.09	1.72
'ponmo' (Kg/ Month)	0.00	4.00	1.27	0.08	1.58
Crayfish (Kg/ Month)	0.00	4.00	1.63	0.09	1.89
Snail (Kg/ Month)	0.00	16.00	2.73	0.24	4.70
Food Expenses (₦/ month)					
Mushroom products	200.00	4000.00	1328.91	98.43	978.43
Fish	400.00	10000.00	4861.13	100.33	2006.68
Meat	250.00	8500.00	1716.28	76.73	1534.70
Egg	40.00	5000.00	932.48	20.94	418.84
'ponmo'	600.00	6800.00	2739.38	61.27	1225.44
Crayfish	1200.00	10000.00	6548.86	110.32	2206.51
Snail	800.00	20000.00	8018.25	261.99	5239.80
Food Budget Share					
Mushroom products	96.97	3400.00	1388.91	29.98	599.66
Fish	33.33	2000.00	1086.80	20.19	403.82
Meat	62.50	8500.00	1544.33	74.73	1494.64
Egg	4.63	1666.67	482.93	10.78	215.57
'ponmo'	250.00	1700.00	963.52	13.90	277.98
Crayfish	1500.00	3000.00	2015.40	12.59	251.87
Snail	200.00	4000.00	1280.51	36.53	730.69

Determinants of Food Demand

Table 4 presents the results of LA-AIDS for the expenditure share equations. The R^2 values ranged from 0.1823 for mushroom to 0.7602 for 'ponmo'. From the result, socio-economic factors affect different food items. For instance, age of the household heads positively influenced the demand for snail at 5 percent level in the study area. This implies that an increase in the age of household head increases the expenditure shares for snail. However, age of the household head negatively influenced the demand for meat at the demand for meat at 1 percent level in the study area. This implies that an increase in the age of household head decreases the expenditure shares for meat.

The coefficient of household size is positive and significant at 10 percent level for mushrooms. This means that an increase in household size will lead to increase in expenditure and demand for mushrooms.

Also from table 4, the results reveal that the impact of gender of household head is positive and significant at 1 percent for meat. This implies that the male-headed households demand higher quantity of meat, possibly because of the believe that the household head must eat the best of the meat prepared because he believed that he is contributing the larger percentage in terms of household upkeep or the African mentality incurred into female that the man is the head of the house and must eat the best of the food being prepared.

Table 4:Parameters of Estimated LA-AIDS Model of Household Mushroom Demand

Variables Mushroom Egg	Dependent Variable: Expenditure Share of						
	Fish	Meat	'ponmo'	Crayfish	Snail		
	Price Co-efficient						
Constant	0.017992 (0.3272)	0.58173*** (16.97)	0.36632*** (13.47)	0.42576*** (19.8)	0.20256*** (4.636)	-0.727*** (-10.88)	0.13264
LNPMUSH	0.049691* (7.159)	-	-0.00358 (-1.188)	0.01029*** (-3.797)	0.01507*** (-2.644)	-0.00265 (-0.4723)	-0.00685
LNPFISH	0.011266* (-2.918)	0.01127*** (24.46)	0.02845*** (-10.68)	-0.00502** (-1.819)	-0.0148*** (-2.728)	0.05671*** (-14.37)	-0.00497
LNPMEAT	-0.003577 (-1.188)	0.02845*** (-10.68)	0.05647*** (19.74)	0.01815*** (-8.852)	0.00328 (0.9025)	0.00831*** (-2.646)	-0.00128
LNPPONM	0.010287* (-3.797)	-0.00502** (-1.819)	0.01815*** (-8.852)	0.11538*** (29.73)	0.05648*** (-13.92)	0.01588*** (-5.774)	-0.00956
LNPC/FISH	0.015068* (-2.644)	-0.0148*** (-2.728)	0.003278 (0.9025)	0.05648*** (-13.92)	0.094344** (10.06)	-0.0237*** (-4.344)	0.012424
LNPSNAIL	-0.002647 (-0.4723)	0.05671*** (-14.37)	0.00831*** (-2.646)	0.01588*** (-5.774)	-0.0237*** (-4.344)	0.11222*** (13.58)	-0.00498
LNPEGG	-0.006846	-0.00497	-0.00128	-0.00956	0.012424	-0.00498	0.015211
LN(M/P)	0.021639 (1.374)	-0.1191*** (-12.15)	0.10183*** (-13.08)	0.08755*** (-14.1)	-0.00845 (-0.665)	0.32687*** (17.03)	-0.03158
	SOCIO-ECONOMIC COEFFICIENTS						
AGE	0.0002553 (-0.8411)	-0.00018 (-0.9742)	-0.00032* (-2.184)	-5.3E-05 (-0.4722)	0.000245 (1.059)	0.00062** (1.668)	-6.2E-05
GENDER	0.0013093 (-0.1604)	0.004776 (0.9695)	0.010502** (2.675)	-0.00114 (-0.3792)	0.000472 (0.0752)	-0.01393 (-1.395)	0.000631
MSTAT	-0.011398 (-1.301)	0.003803 (0.7227)	0.009302* (2.213)	-7.2E-05 (-0.0221)	-0.01096 (-1.636)	0.010013 (0.9351)	-0.00069
HHSIZ	0.0039429 (1.72)	** (0.4496)	0.000618 (-0.3277)	-0.00036 (1.54)	0.001298 (-0.2139)	-0.00037 (-2.074)	0.000694
EDUYRS	0.0008163 (0.603)	5 (-1.558)	-0.00126 (-0.6475)	-0.00042 (-1.359)	-0.0677 (0.0251)	2.59E-05 (0.687)	0.001138 0.067407
OCCP	0.027264* (3.353)	** (-1.962)	-0.00958* (0.5846)	0.00229 (-1.571)	-0.00471 (-0.1479)	-0.00092 (-1.218)	-0.01212 -0.00222
RSQUARE	0.1823	0.7369	0.6274	0.7602	0.2033	0.4936	

**Elasticity Estimates of Food Demand
Hicksian (compensated) elasticities**

Hicksian (Compensated) elasticities in this study were reduced to contain only the price effects, and compensate for the effect of income on demand in line with Taljaard *et al.*, (2003) as shown in table 5. The values of the compensated elasticities of six out of seven food types computed were generally higher than the uncompensated elasticities and this is in agreement with other past studies such as Abdulai and Aubert, (2004) and Koc and Alpay, (2002).

Compensated own-price elasticities of almost all the food types are of the expected signs (i.e carry negative signs) which are consistent with economic theory. The compensated own-price elasticities for all the food types are far from 1 in absolute value, indicating a low response to changes in food prices (i.e. price inelastic). The compensated own-price elasticity for egg (-0.52) indicate that 1% increase in price of egg does not affect the demand for egg. These relatively occur to all other items: mushroom (-0.45), crayfish (-0.36), snail (-0.31),

Elasticity Estimates of Food Demand

Hicksian (compensated) elasticities

Hicksian (Compensated) elasticities in this study were reduced to contain only the price effects, and compensate for the effect of income on demand in line with Taljaard *et al.*, (2003) as shown in table 5. The values of the compensated elasticities of six out of seven food types computed were generally higher than the uncompensated elasticities and this is in agreement with other past studies such as Abdulai and Aubert, (2004) and Koc and Alpay, (2002).

Compensated own-price elasticities of almost all the food types are of the expected signs (i.e carry negative signs) which are consistent with economic theory. The compensated own-price elasticities for all the food types are far from 1 in absolute value, indicating a low response to changes in food prices (i.e. price inelastic). The compensated own-price elasticity for egg (-0.52) indicate that 1% increase in price of egg does not affect the demand for egg. These relatively occur to all other items: mushroom (-0.45), crayfish (-0.36), snail (-0.31), fish (-0.15) and meat (-0.03) indicate that increase in prices of crayfish, snail, meat and fish will not affect their demand. It can be deduced from the results that the demand for these food items are own-price inelastic. This depicts the importance of egg, mushroom, crayfish, snail, meat and fish in the diet of households in the study area. These food items are the major protein sources to the common people and are of very much importance in consumption because of their nutritional values. Consequently, no particular meal can be completed without these food items.

Marshallian (Uncompensated) Elasticities

These uncompensated elasticities contain both the income and price effects (Taljaard *et al.*, 2003). As

shown in table 5, the uncompensated own-price elasticities were relatively inelastic, but carry negative signs as expected a priori i.e normal goods. The own-price elasticity of snail (-0.91) suggests that a 1 percent increase in price of snail would not affect the demand for snail. This is followed by own-price elasticities for cray fish (-0.59), mushroom (-0.58), egg (-0.58) and fish (-0.21) respectively. This means that the demand for these food items (crayfish, mushroom, egg and fish) will not affect its demand with price increase. This depicts the importance of egg, mushroom, crayfish, snail, and fish in the diet of households in the study area. These food items are the major protein sources to the common people and are of very much importance in consumption because of their nutritional values. Consequently, no particular meal can be completed without these food items.

Uncompensated cross-price elasticities were mostly positive with some few negative signs. This suggests that there is the prevalence of substitution and complementary relationships between all the food items. This also suggests how the consumers react to price changes of one food item with respect to quantity demanded of other food items. The cross price elasticity revealed that fish and meat are substitute goods to mushroom; "*ponmo*" and egg are substitute good to fish, crayfish and egg are substitute good to meat while fish is a substitute good to "*ponmo*"

Expenditure Elasticities

The estimated expenditure elasticities of all the food items except meat were positive which implies that demand for these food items can be expected to increase as income increases. Expenditure elasticity for snail

Table 5- LA/AIDS Cross Price, Own Price and Expenditure and Budget Share Elasticities Results

Cross Price Elasticities							
Change in price of							
w.r.t	Mushroom	Fish	Meat	‘ponmo’	Crayfish	Snail	Egg
Marshallian / uncompensated elasticity							
Mushroom	-0.5851	0.0126	0.1282	-0.0031	-0.0600	-0.148	-0.0955
Fish	-0.1334	-0.2115	-0.1601	0.1038	-0.0565	-0.430	0.0221
Meat	-0.0433	-0.1160	0.0051	-0.1215	0.0162	-0.107	0.0204
‘ponmo’	-0.1102	0.0409	-0.1203	0.1937	-0.2367	-0.186	-0.1842
Crayfish	-0.1770	0.0728	0.4350	-0.3443	-0.5900	-0.373	0.5829
Snail	-0.0745	-0.1360	0.3058	0.0738	-0.0912	-0.9102	0.1036
Egg	-0.0666	-0.0050	0.0350	-0.0631	0.0541	0.0315	-0.5216
Hicksian / compensated elasticity							
w.r.t	Mushroom	Fish	Meat	‘ponmo’	Crayfish	Snail	Egg
Mushroom	-0.4496	0.0516	0.0566	0.0152	0.0497	0.1040	-0.0873
Fish	0.0821	-0.1495	-0.2739	0.1329	0.1181	-0.0295	0.0352
Meat	0.0311	-0.0946	-0.0342	-0.1114	0.0765	0.0317	0.0250
‘ponmo’	0.0139	0.0766	-0.1859	0.2104	-0.1361	0.0454	-0.1766
Crayfish	0.1025	0.1532	0.2874	-0.3066	-0.3635	0.1469	0.5999
Snail	0.2461	-0.0439	0.1365	0.1171	0.1684	-0.3140	0.1230
Egg	-0.0261	0.0066	0.0136	-0.0576	0.0869	0.0156	-0.5191
Food type	own price elasticity (Marshallian)	own price elasticity (Hicksian)	Exp				
Mushroom	-0.5851	-0.4496	1.1901				
Fish	-0.2115	-0.1495	0.3422				
Meat	0.0051	-0.0342	-0.6286				
‘ponmo’	0.1937	0.2104	0.1607				
Crayfish	-0.5900	-0.3635	0.9640				
Snail	-0.9102	-0.3140	2.2137				
Egg	-0.5216	-0.5191	0.0723				
Budget Share							
Mushroom	0.1138						
Fish	0.1811						
‘ponmo’	0.0625						
Meat	0.1043						
Crayfish	0.2349						
Snail	0.2693						
Egg	0.0340						

Determination of Poverty Level among the Respondents.

The poverty incidence, poverty gap and poverty severity was determined among the respondents in Oyo, Lagos and Ogun states (pooled) using the Foster Geary Thorbeck poverty index method and the results are presented in Table 6. It was observed that incidence of poverty (P_0) estimated was 28.50. This implies that

28.50% of the respondents fell below the poverty line, while 71.50% were above the poverty line. This was better result than that of National Bureau of Statistics (2005) who presented poverty line in 2004 to be 54.4%. Also the severity of poverty in the study area shows that $P_2=0.2758$ which indicate that poverty is not very severe in the study area because P_2 is less than 1.

Table 6- Poverty Incidence, Gap and Severity among the Respondents in the Study Area.

Category	Oyo	Ogun	Lagos	Pooled
Poverty incidence(P_0)	30.00	27.50	28.00	28.50
Poverty gap (P_1)	0.1482 (14.82)	0.1207 (12.07)	0.1386 (13.86)	0.1378 (13.78)
Poverty severity (P_2)	0.2964 (29.64)	0.2414 (24.14)	0.2773 (27.73)	0.2756 (27.56)

Conclusion

Conclusively, household size has a positive effect on food intake of the respondents and this is because they want their household to benefit in nutritious food intake and to avoid the risk involved when faced with the challenges of hidden hunger. Also, there is prevalence of substitution and complementary relationship between all food items studied. This shows how consumers react to price changes of one food item with respects to quantity demanded of other food items i. e consumers tend to shift to inexpensive related food item rather than the expensive ones. Likewise, poverty is not relatively severe among the mushroom consumers in the study area because a fewer number of the respondents falls below the poverty line and the poverty severity is very far from 1.

References

- Abdulai, A. and Aubert, D. (2004). A cross-section analysis of household demand for food and nutrients in Tanzania. *Agricultural Economics*, 31: 67–79.
- Akbay C., Boiz I., W. S Chern. (2007). Household Food Consumption in Turkey. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 34(2) 209-231.
- Chilton M.D. (1993). Agrobacterium gene transfer: progress on a “poor man's vector” for maize. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 90(8): pp 3119-3120. doi: 10.1073/pnas .90.8. 3119
- Deaton, A., and J. Muellbauer, (1980), *Economics and Consumer Behavior*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Pp 1756
- Dunne P, Edkins B (2008). The demand for food in South Africa, *Economics society South Africa, South Africa Journal of Economics* 76(1): 104-117 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edible_mushroom (accessed on October 13, 2015 03:45 am).
- Koç A. and Alpay S. (2002). Household Demand in Turkey: An Application of Almost Ideal Demand System With Spatial Cost Index. Department of Economics, Bilkent University, Bilkent, 06533 Ankara, Turkey. Fax: +90--3 1 2 - - 2 6 6 - 5 1 4 0 . E - m a i l : galpay@bilkent.edu.tr. <https://nairametrics.com/2020/05/04/breaking-over-82-million-nigerians-are-poor-northern-states-dominate-list/> Assessed 10/05/2020 05:30am
- Taljaard, P.R, Alemu, A.G. and H.D van Schalkwayk (2003). A linearized almost ideal demand system (LA-AIDS). Estimation for demand for meat in South Africa“. Contributed paper presented at 41st Annual conference of the Agricultural Economics Association of South Africa (AEASA), Pectoria South Africa. pp 243-257