Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Analysis of the Socio-Economic Determinants of Household Exposure to Food Insecurity Characterized by Meal Deprivation in Senegal: A Multinomial Logistic Regression Approach

Mamadou moustapha ka

mamadoumoustapha.ka@ucad.edu.sn

Cheikh Anta Diop University

Research Article

Keywords: Food Insecurity, Meal Deprivation, household exposure, multinomial logistic regression

Posted Date: March 5th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8910319/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Good health depends entirely on individuals getting the proper nutritional supplement so every human being remains healthy and balanced. However, this first basic need is not met for numerous families globally. Food supply shortages remain for a very large number of households. The ongoing nature of this problem raises key questions of how frequently families experience food insecurity and the extensive social and economic significance of such deprivation on a national and global level.

The objective of this study is to analyze the social and economic determinants of household exposure to food insecurity characterized by meal deprivation in Senegal.

In this study, multinomial logistic regression is used to identify factors associated with different degrees of food insecurity. Unlike a binary model, this approach distinguishes multiple levels of food deprivation intensity.

The results robustly establish that the frequency of cash income shortages is the primary driver of food insecurity across all levels, with an effect that escalates significantly in more severe cases. While educational attainment provides a moderate but significant buffer against moderate food insecurity, broader national economic conditions only show a significant impact on severe situations. These findings underscore the necessity of a multi-tiered approach that integrates micro-level interventions (income support, education) with macroeconomic policies (stabilization, inclusive growth)

1- Introduction

Ensuring the health and well-being of every individual requires regular access to sufficient and balanced nutrition. Yet this basic need remains unmet for many families around the world. A significant number of households continue to face food shortages. The persistence of this situation raises critical questions about how frequently families experience episodes of food insecurity and about the broader socio-economic consequences that such deprivation entails at both national and global levels. Beyond the mere insufficiency of food intake, hunger carries far-reaching and complex effects, often undermining physical health, psychological well-being, and social cohesion within communities.

The dominant theoretical framework for understanding food vulnerability draws on the work of Amartya Sen (1981) in *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. In this study, Sen fundamentally reshaped the understanding of famine by demonstrating that it does not stem solely from a lack of available food, but rather from a failure of individuals' "entitlements," that is, their ability to access food through legal and economic means.

Within this perspective, socio-economic factors are not mere peripheral variables; they constitute the core mechanisms underlying food vulnerability. In fact, food insecurity is strongly shaped by a range of socio-economic determinants that vary across regions and contexts. This framework highlights the importance of including household income, educational level, family size, and access to resources as

key explanatory variables in empirical analyses. A clear understanding of these factors is therefore essential for designing effective interventions aimed at strengthening food security.

Since the 1996 World Food Summit in Rome, food security has been defined as a condition in which all individuals, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 2020). Food insecurity represents the opposite condition, meaning the inability to secure adequate, safe, and nutritious food at all times. An index of food security can thus be constructed around four core dimensions: food availability, food access, stability of consumption, and the fulfillment of individual dietary preferences.

Food insecurity refers specifically to the failure to secure such adequate nourishment. Food vulnerability, by contrast, describes the susceptibility of populations to food insecurity risks, encompassing both exposure to shocks and a limited capacity to cope with them.

With regard to socio-economic determinants, income remains a central factor. Low-income households are consistently found to be more exposed to food insecurity, as evidenced by studies conducted in Pakistan and Iran, where poverty is directly associated with limited food access (Joulaei et al., 2023). Education also plays a decisive role. Higher educational level among household heads is generally associated with improved food security, as educated individuals tend to manage resources more effectively (Shair et al., 2024). These authors further note that larger households often face heightened food insecurity due to increased resource demands placed on already constrained financial means. In addition, Goda et al. (2023) observe that while urban areas are affected by higher food prices, they exhibit different vulnerability patterns compared to rural regions, where agricultural factors remain particularly influential.

Conversely, some argue that food insecurity cannot be attributed solely to socio-economic determinants. Environmental conditions and policy failures may also exacerbate the problem, underscoring the need for a comprehensive and multidimensional approach to addressing food vulnerability.

In this context, it becomes essential to assess how frequently families experience episodes of food deprivation, to identify the socio-economic triggers behind such situations, and to understand how these experiences shape both present living conditions and future prospects.

The objective of this study is to analyze the social and economic determinants of household exposure to food insecurity characterized by meal deprivation in Senegal. More specifically, the study seeks to identify statistically significant predictors of food insecurity across different levels of intensity and to quantify the magnitude of each effect through the interpretation of odds ratios derived from a multinomial logistic regression model.

This analysis will allow us to shed the light on the key challenges associated with household food insecurity and to inform policy responses designed to improve the living conditions of vulnerable populations.

2- Literature Review

Recent studies have reinforced and refined the relationship between socio-economic status and food vulnerability.

In this regard, Ruel et al. (2010) examine the specific challenges posed by rapid urbanization for food security, highlighting the emergence of new forms of vulnerability in slums and informal settlements. Similarly, Krishna (2010), drawing on longitudinal studies in India, traces pathways into and out of poverty, showing that health-related events, climate shocks, and economic crises are major drivers pushing households into food insecurity.

Wilkinson and Pickett (2009), in *The Spirit Level*, argue that more unequal societies experience a higher incidence of social problems, including food insecurity. Their findings suggest that inequality, independently of average income levels, undermines social cohesion and equitable access to resources.

In the same vein, Barrett (2010) identifies a strong link between income levels and food insecurity. His analysis shows that persistent poverty generates “poverty traps” that prevent households from investing in productive assets necessary to escape food deprivation.

Banerjee and Duflo (2011), notably through randomized controlled experiments presented in *Poor Economics*, demonstrate that income constraints limit not only access to food but also dietary diversity and nutritional quality. They emphasize the complex trade-offs poor households must make between food, health, education, and other essential expenditures.

Loopstra et al. (2019) further document a strong association between precarious employment, unemployment, and food insecurity in Europe and North America. Their findings indicate that transitioning into unemployment can double or even triple the risk of experiencing food insecurity.

More recently, Niles et al. (2021) identify job loss as the primary predictor of food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic, while noting that 45% of respondents who had not lost their jobs nevertheless reported experiencing food-related hardship.

However, Burke et al. (2022), through multivariate analyses, show that while disparities in income, employment, and wealth explain a substantial share of food insecurity inequalities, they do not account for them entirely. This suggests the presence of additional structural or discriminatory mechanisms.

Goda et al. (2023) identify key demographic and socio-economic determinants of household food insecurity, with particular emphasis on the scale of urban poverty. They advocate strategies aimed at strengthening household resilience, including measures to improve socio-economic conditions and address household size dynamics.

Finally, Shair et al. (2024) insist on the importance of improving education and economic conditions to enhance food access and overall food security.

Overall, the literature review shows that the analysis of food vulnerability has evolved significantly since Sen's entitlement framework. The focus has shifted from purely economic entitlements to a more integrated perspective integrating power relations, structural inequalities, gender, social capital, and resilience. Food insecurity emerges from a complex interaction between microeconomic factors such as income, education, and employment and macroeconomic conditions, including national economic performance. The theoretical framework maintains that access to food depends on the economic capacity of households (Sen, 1981), which is itself conditioned by human capital and the opportunities provided by the environment. Despite the variety of methodological approaches, a broad consensus exists: achieving sustainable reductions in food vulnerability requires addressing both immediate economic constraints and the structural socio-economic inequalities that produce them.

3- Methodology

Multinomial logistic regression is a statistical technique used to predict the probabilities of a categorical dependent variable with more than two unordered outcomes, based on a set of independent variables. The method models the relationship between predictors and the log-odds of membership in a given outcome category relative to a selected reference category.

Logistic regression is a staple in social science research due to its ability to facilitate *ceteris paribus* reasoning. Specifically, it functions by isolating the individual effects of each variable, allowing researchers to identify the residual impact of an explanatory variable on the outcome of interest while controlling for all other predictors included in the model.

We have the following model $U_{ij} = \alpha + \beta V_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}$

Formally, for a set of outcomes J, the probability of an individual i falling into category j (j ≠ reference category) is modeled as follows:

$$Prob(y_i = j(r\acute{e}f\acute{e}rence) = \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta_j V_i}}{1 + \sum_{k=0}^{i} e^{\alpha + \beta_k V_i}}$$

Where v_i the vector of explanatory variables and β_j represents the coefficient vector specific to the category.

In this study, multinomial logistic regression is used to identify factors associated with different degrees of food insecurity. Unlike a binary model, this approach distinguishes multiple levels of food deprivation intensity.

In this study the dependent variable frequency of food shortage includes four categories: **Never (reference category)**, Once or twice a year (occasional insecurity), Several times (moderate insecurity), Many times (severe insecurity)

The estimated model is specified as follows:

$\log (P(Y = j)/P(Y = J)) = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ (Gender) $+\beta_2$ (Economic conditions) $+\beta_3$ (Frequency of income shortage) $+\beta_4$ (Employment)$+\beta_5$ (Education level) $+\varepsilon$

Where:

- *Y* represents the dependent variable (frequency of food shortage)
- *j* denotes a specific category of food insecurity
- *J* represents the reference category (Never)
- (P (Y = j) represents the probability of an individual falling into the category j
- β_0 represents the intercept (or constant term).
- β_1, β_2, β_3, β_4, β_5 are the regression coefficients corresponding to each predictor
- ε is the error term

Dependent Variable Categories:

- **J (Reference)**: Never
- j = 1: Just once or twice a year (Occasional insecurity)
- j = 2: Sometimes (Moderate insecurity)
- j = 3: Often (Severe insecurity)

Model Interpretation:

This equation models the logarithm of the odds ratio between the probability of belonging to category *j* and the probability of belonging to the reference category J (Never). The model estimates the impact of five socio-economic predictors on the likelihood of experiencing different levels of food insecurity. The coefficient β represents the marginal effect of each explanatory variable on the log-odds of being in category j compared to the baseline. By exponentiating these coefficients, we obtain the odds ratios, which indicate the proportional change in the odds of belonging to category j for every unit increase in the predictor

Data Description

The dataset is drawn from Afrobarometer survey data. Afrobarometer is a pan-African, non-partisan research network that produces reliable data on Africans' experiences and evaluations of democracy, governance, and quality of life. Round 9 surveys, conducted in June 2024, cover at least 39 countries. Afrobarometer conducts face-to-face interviews in respondents preferred languages using nationally representative samples. The network employs national probability samples designed to represent all voting-age citizens within a country. The sampling strategy ensures that every adult citizen has an equal and known probability of selection. Random selection methods are applied at each stage of sampling, with probability proportional to population size wherever feasible. This approach ensures that larger (more populous) geographic units have proportionally higher probabilities of inclusion in the sample.

In Senegal, the Afrobarometer team interviewed 1,200 adult respondents in June 2023/2024. A sample of this size yields national-level results with a margin of error of+/-3 percentage points at a 95% confidence level. The sampling design is area-based, stratified, multi-stage, and clustered.

It should be noted that the dataset excludes individuals living in institutional settings, such as students in university residences, hospitalized patients, incarcerated individuals, and residents of retirement homes.

4- Discussion and Interpretation of Results

Table 1
Results of the multinomial logistic regression.

Predictor	Coeff.	E.S.	Z	p-value	OR	95% CI
Just once or twice per year vs. Never						
Intercept	-2.007	0.470	-4.27***	< 0.001	0.134	[0.054; 0.337]
Gender (Female)	0.152	0.225	0.67	0.500	1.164	[0.749; 1.810]
Economic conditions	-0.048	0.101	-0.48	0.632	0.953	[0.782; 1.162]
Cash income shortage	0.265	0.102	2.60**	0.009	1.304	[1.068; 1.592]
Primary employment	-0.074	0.042	-1.77	0.077	0.929	[0.856; 1.008]
Education level	0.009	0.049	0.17	0.862	1.009	[0.916; 1.110]
Sometimes vs. Never						
Intercept	-1.758	0.336	-5.23***	< 0.001	0.173	[0.089; 0.333]
Gender (Female)	0.205	0.153	1.33	0.182	1.227	[0.909; 1.657]
Economic conditions	-0.090	0.071	-1.27	0.205	0.914	[0.796; 1.050]
Cash income shortage	0.670	0.078	8.60***	< 0.001	1.955	[1.678; 2.278]
Primary employment	-0.015	0.028	-0.54	0.591	0.985	[0.931; 1.041]
Education level	-0.129	0.036	-3.58***	< 0.001	0.879	[0.819; 0.943]
Several times vs. Never						
Intercept	-3.671	0.491	-7.47***	< 0.001	0.026	[0.010; 0.067]
Gender (Female)	-0.001	0.202	-0.01	0.996	0.999	[0.672; 1.485]
Economic conditions	-0.246	0.100	-2.47*	0.013	0.782	[0.643; 0.950]
Cash income shortage	1.196	0.117	10.26***	< 0.001	3.308	[2.632; 4.157]
Primary employment	-0.029	0.038	-0.77	0.443	0.971	[0.901; 1.046]
Education level	-0.080	0.047	-1.68	0.093	0.923	[0.841; 1.013]

Source

Author.

Note

**** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05. Yellow* highlighted cells indicate statistically significant effects.

The table above summarizes the multinomial estimation results for each comparison relative to the reference category (Never). It reports the coefficients, standard errors, z-statistics, p-values, odds ratios, and 95% confidence intervals. The “Never” category serves as the baseline, illustrating how predictors influence the log-odds of each outcome relative to this reference. The odds ratios (OR) measure the effect size; an OR > 1 indicates an increased likelihood of the outcome occurring compared to the baseline, while an OR < 1 indicates a decreased likelihood. The distance from 1 quantifies the intensity of the effect.

4.1- Frequency of Cash Income Shortages: The Primary Determinant

The frequency of cash income shortages emerges as the most robust and significant predictor of food insecurity across all levels of intensity ((p < 0.01 for occasional insecurity; p < 0.001 for moderate and severe levels).

- **Occasional Insecurity**: Each unit increase in the frequency of income shortages increases the odds of experiencing occasional food insecurity by a factor of 1.304 (95% CI: [1.068; 1.592]). Although moderate, this effect confirms the direct link between temporary financial constraints and difficulties in food access.
- **Moderate Insecurity**: The impact intensifies considerably, with an odds ratio of 1.955 (95% CI: [1.678; 2.278]). A one-unit increase in the frequency of income shortages nearly doubles the likelihood of falling into moderate food insecurity.
- **Severe Insecurity**: The effect peaks with an odds ratio of 3.308 (95% CI: [2.632; 4.157]), representing more than a threefold increase. This near-exponential relationship suggests that recurring financial constraints are the primary mechanism driving households toward severe, chronic food insecurity.

From an economic perspective, these findings corroborate Sen’s (1981) theory of economic entitlement and food access. Food insecurity is not primarily a matter of physical availability but rather the financial capacity to acquire goods. The observed gradient (1.30 → 1.96 → 3.31) reveals a process of progressive vulnerability: while households facing financial hurdles may initially preserve minimal food access, the recurrence of income shortages erodes this resilience, leading to increasingly frequent and intense states of food insecurity.

4.2- Education Level: A Moderate but Varied Protective Effect

Education level exerts a statistically significant effect only in the case of moderate food insecurity (coefficient = -0.129; p < 0,001), with an odds ratio of 0.879 (95% CI: [0.819; 0.943]). Each additional level of education reduces the odds of experiencing moderate food insecurity by 12.1%. This protective effect is explained in one part that education improves employability and the ability to generate stable income; and in another part by the fact that more educated individuals often possess better financial planning

skills and a greater capacity for optimizing household food expenditures. These findings align with Shair et al. (2024), who emphasize the important role of education in bolstering food access and overall security.

In contrast, education does not show a significant impact on occasional insecurity (p = 0.862) or severe insecurity (p = 0.093). This suggests that while education acts as a buffer against intermediate levels of vulnerability, it may not provide a sufficient bulwark against major economic shocks or extreme poverty.

4.3- Economic Conditions of the Country: An Effect on Severe Insecurity

Perceived national economic conditions show a statistically significant effect only for severe food insecurity (coefficient = − 0.246; p = 0.013), with an odds ratio of 0.782 (95% CI: [0.643; 0.950]). The negative coefficient indicates that improved national economic conditions are associated with a 21.8% reduction in the odds of severe food insecurity. Conversely, economic downturns are linked to an increase in severe deprivation. In other words, as economic conditions deteriorate, the prevalence of severe food insecurity increases. The broader macroeconomic environment influences food security because economic downturns are typically accompanied by rising food prices, which erode household purchasing power.

The lack of statistical significance for occasional (p = 0.632) and moderate (p = 0.205) insecurity suggests that households possess short-term coping mechanisms such as drawing on savings, family assistance, or reducing non-essential spending that allow them to cushion temporary macroeconomic shocks. It is only when economic conditions remain depressed over the long term that these adaptation strategies are depleted, leading to what we define as chronic food insecurity.

4.4- Gender: No Statistically Significant Differential Effect

Contrary to findings in many food insecurity studies, gender does not appear to exert a statistically significant effect at any level of food insecurity (p = 0.500 for occasional; p = 0.182 for moderate; p = 0.996 for severe).

Within this dataset, vulnerability appears to be driven more strongly by economic factors than by gender-based differences.

4.5- Employment Type: No Direct Significant Effect

The main type of employment does not show statistically significant effects across insecurity levels (p = 0.077 for occasional; p = 0.591 for moderate; p = 0.443 for severe), although the effect for occasional insecurity is marginally close to conventional significance thresholds. This finding suggests that sector of employment alone is less decisive than income stability and regularity. A formal job may provide insufficient wages, while informal activities may generate adequate and stable income. What matters most is the reliability of monetary flows rather than employment classification per se.

5- Conclusion

Food insecurity remains a major socio-economic development challenge, affecting health, productivity, and overall well-being. Identifying its determinants is essential for designing effective public policies.

The econometric analysis, conducted via the multinomial logistic regression framework in this paper, has allowed for the identification and quantification of the primary drivers of food insecurity across three distinct levels: occasional, moderate, and severe. This multinomial approach provides significant methodological leverage by uncovering heterogeneous effects that vary according to the intensity of food insecurity.

The results robustly establish that the frequency of cash income shortages is the primary driver of food insecurity across all levels, with an effect that escalates significantly in more severe cases. While educational attainment provides a moderate but significant buffer against moderate food insecurity, broader national economic conditions only show a significant impact on severe situations. These findings underscore the necessity of a multi-tiered approach that integrates micro-level interventions (income support, education) with macroeconomic policies (stabilization, inclusive growth)

Theoretically, these results provide empirical validation for Sen's (1981) "entitlements" framework: food insecurity is fundamentally an issue of economic access rather than physical availability. The near-exponential relationship between financial constraints and food insecurity suggests the presence of potential poverty traps.

Future research should expand on several key dimensions. A longitudinal analysis to capture the transition dynamics between different food insecurity states over time; exploration of the interactions between determinants; taking into account additional variables, such as social capital and access to social safety nets.

Declarations

Author Contribution

i am the only author

References

1. Barrett, et al. Measuring Food Insecurity. Science. 2010;327:825. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1182768.
2. FAO. 2020. L'état de la sécurité alimentaire et de la nutrition dans le monde 2020. Transformer les systèmes alimentaires pour une alimentation saine et abordable. Rome, FAO.
3. Goda ET, Boshera TD, Ketema M. Examining the effect of demographic and socioeconomic factors on household food insecurity in Lideta subcity, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Int J Popul Stud.

2023;0(0):1060. https://doi.org/10.36922/ijps.1060.

4. https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.109.110791
5. Joulaei H, Keshani P, Foroozanfar Z, Afrashteh S, Hosseinkhani Z, Mohsenpour MA, Moghimi G, Homayouni Meymandi A. Food insecurity status and its contributing factors in slums' dwellers of southwest Iran, 2021: a cross-sectional study. Arch Public Health. 2023;81(1):38. 10.1186/s13690-023-01049-8. PMID: 36899422; PMCID: PMC9999310.
6. Judith Favereau. Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo. (2011), Poor Economics. A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty. Œconomia - History/Methodology/Philosophy, 2012, pp.252–257. ff10.4074/S2113520712012078ff. ffhal-02092621
7. Krishna KR. Agroecosystems of South India: nutrient dynamics, ecology and productivity. Universal-; 2010.
8. Loopstra R, Reeves A, Tarasuk V. The rise of hunger among low-income households: an analysis of the risks of food insecurity between 2004 and 2016 in a population-based study of UK adults. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2019;73(7):668–73. 10.1136/jech-2018-211194. Epub 2019 Apr 29. PMID: 31036607.
9. Marie T, Ruel JL, Garrett C, Hawkes MJ, Cohen. The Food, Fuel, and Financial Crises Affect the Urban and Rural Poor Disproportionately: A Review of the Evidence1,2, The Journal of Nutrition, 140, Issue 1,2010, pages 170 S-176S, ISSN 0022-3166,.
10. Niles MT, Multi-Site A. Analysis of the Prevalence of Food Insecurity in the United States, before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Curr Dev Nutr. 2021;5(12):nzab135. 10.1093/cdn/nzab135. PMID: 34934898; PMCID: PMC8677520.
11. Sen AK. Poverty and Famines. An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1981a.
12. Shair W, Afzal H, Ahmad AG, Iftikhar R. Exploring the Determinants of Food Insecurity in Pakistan. Pakistan J Humanit Social Sci. 2024;12(3):2681–9. https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2024.v12i3.2494.
13. Wilkinson RD, Pickett K. The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better. Bloomsbury Publishing; Allen Lane/Penguin Group UK; 2009.