

© **Khaykhadaeva O. D., 2019**

Buryat State University, Ulan-Ude

Food security is an important topic in the fields of development studies and developments economics. The way food security is theorized, measured and analyzed affects the policies that will be adopted. This paper engages in the debates on the theory and policy of food security analysis. It presents a comparative analysis of different approaches to food security analysis proposed by in the academic world or by international organizations.

Keywords: food security, food, basic needs, food availability

Food security is an important topic within the fields of development studies and development economics. The way food security is theorized, measured and analyzed affects the policies that will be adopted. The aim of this paper is to critically review different approaches to the analysis of food security.

Main approaches to the analysis of food security

This paper presents five approaches to food security: 1) food availability, 2) income-based, 3) basic needs, 4) entitlement, 5) sustainable livelihoods.

Food availability approach

Food availability approach is the oldest and still influential one. Although the main ideas of this approach trace back to Giovanni Botero (1588), it was Thomas Malthus (1789) who popularized it. This approach is known now also as Malthusian approach.

Availability approach makes emphasis on the balance or imbalance between population and food. In order to be in balance, the growth rate of food availability should not be lower than the growth rate of population. Therefore, according to this approach, food security is simply a matter of per capita food availability. In autarky economy, this depends on food production and stocks, while in an open economy it also depends on food trading.

Before 1970s, this approach was the reference approach for international political and academic community. Moreover, this approach is reflected in the definition of food security at the World Food Conference of 1974: "Availability at all times of adequate world food supplies of basic foodstuffs to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption and to offset fluctuations in production and prices" (UN, 1974).

The policy implications of this approach are next:

1. On the demand side, the need to reduce population growth rate (i.e. fertility rate) through appropriate policies;

2. On the supply side, the need to increase food production through boost of agricultural productivity.

In 1996, the World Food Summit adopted an advanced definition of food security that includes, in addition to availability, other dimensions of food

security — access to and utilization of food. But despite this, a narrow sectoral focus on agricultural supply, productivity and technology still dominates discourse and practice concerning food security. One of the main characteristics of any approach to food security is its units of analysis. The unit of analysis can range from the world in total to a country, a region, a community, a household, an individual. Moreover, from an economic point of view, the approach can focus on a single sector, a cluster of sectors (e.g. the «food system» or «chain») or can be economy-wide (Burchi and De Munro, 2016). The food availability approach uses the country or the world and the agricultural sector as units of analysis.

Income-based approach

Economists have criticized the focus on food security for being too concentrated on one sector — agricultural production. Since economy consists of many interconnected sectors, food security cannot be viewed as problem of exclusively agricultural sector. That is why there was an attempt to shift the analysis towards national economies. This shift meant an introduction into analysis of such variables as GDP, economic growth, and other indicators.

However, the most salient shift was from food availability at the macro-level to income at the micro-level (Griffitz and Khan, 1977; Haq, 1976; Reuthinger and Selowsky, 1976; Reuthinger, 1977). This approach resembles the approach used for poverty assessment. Poverty is a lack of sufficient income needed to buy a bundle of goods to guarantee a survival of a person. Food insecurity is a lack of income needed to buy enough food for survival, i.e. food insecurity is a subcategory of poverty (Sibrian et al, 2007; Sibrian, 2008). Food is converted into calories, if people's calorie availability is lower than a threshold defined by international nutritionists, they are identified as being food insecure. The main unit of analysis in this approach is a household.

Basic needs approach

In 1976, the International Labor Organization (ILO) proposed the basic needs approach as a new development model (ILO, 1976). The primary causes

of policy shift were problems of poverty and unemployment. A process concerned on satisfaction of basic needs was viewed as development. Although different authors suggested different lists of basic needs, but in many cases they included food, shelter and clothing (Denton, 1996).

The discourse on basic needs in the development literature has affected debates on food security, giving rise to food first view (Maxwell and Smith, 1992; Maxwell, 1996). In this approach, food is seen as a primary element in food security. This approach is behind the view of food security as «The ability ... to satisfy adequately food consumption needs for a normal healthy life at all times (Sarris, 1989). The unit of analysis in this approach is a household or an individual.

The main advantage of this approach compared to income-based approach is the possibility of focusing directly on commodity (food) rather than on the income needed to buy it. In this approach, for analysis price information is not needed. Besides this, this approach pays attention to short-term food security, it tells whether households have enough food to feed all members of the household in a given time (Burchi and De Muro, 2016).

Entitlement approach

In the 1980s, economist Amartya Sen has elaborated entitlement approach that shifted the focus from national food availability to people's access to food. Entitlements depend on two elements: 1) personal endowments, i.e. the resources a person owns (land, house, non-tangible assets, etc.) (Osmani, 1995); 2) the «exchange entitlement mapping» (Sen, 1981), i.e. the set of goods a person has access to through production and trade. A decrease of endowment can lead the person to starvation.

The entitlement failure may take different forms. Entitlement failure can happen because of reduction in the food production («direct entitlement failure») or because of a fall in the food exchange rate («trade entitlement failure») (Sen, 1981). Food producers experience the «direct entitlement failure» as a result of a decrease in their production. The «trade entitlement failure» is experienced by people who produce goods other than food when terms of exchange change negatively. Moreover, people who live on both the consumption of their produced products (e.g. milk) and its sale to get other food, risk suffering from both direct and trading entitlement failure (Burchi and Munro, 2016).

This framework has been recommended for famine, hunger and undernourishment analysis. Dreze and Sen write:

If people go hungry on a regular basis all the time or seasonally, the explanations of that have to be thought in the way the entitlement system in operation fail to give the person involved adequate means of securing enough food. Seeing hunger as entitlement failure points to possible remedies as well as helping us to understand the forces that generate hunger and sustain it.

(Dreze and Sen, 1980: 24)

The entitlement approach gives more relevance to the socio-economic conditions of people, in this way it contributes to re-addressing the problem of famine and hunger. «Starvation is a matter of some people not having enough food to eat and not a matter of there being not enough food to eat» (Sen, 1981). Consequently, addition of the access dimension greatly influenced the notion of food security.

It should be noted that Sen's work visibly impacted elaboration of two important definitions of food security: «All people at all times have both physical and economic access to the basic food they need» (FAO, 1983), and «Access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life» (World Bank, 1986).

Having enough food at the national level is necessary condition, but not enough for food security. Consequently, in order to conduct food security assessment, we need more information, such as assets, employment, education, wages, prices, etc.

As for units of analysis, the entitlement framework refers to both individuals and families. However, to analyze children's food security one needs to consider a household as a whole.

Using entitlement framework rather previous ones improves food security assessment notable. Food availability approach shortcomings: there are many evidences for the presence of food insecurity in countries with sufficient food per capita. Income-based approach shortcoming: income is not the only instrument for assessing food. Given that income hardly measured in rural areas of developing countries, a focus on entitlement framework in more preferable (Burchi and De Muro, 2016). Furthermore, full set of assets provides more information on long-term wealth that income which reflects only short-run economic status of a household or person. Compared with the food first approach, the entitlement framework allows to predict future food deprivation: for example, a small amount of assets means that the individual may have more problems accessing enough food in the future.

Sustainable Livelihood approach

The sustainable Livelihood framework is a general approach to development and poverty. The «emphasis on livelihood» was given by Chambers (1983), who introduced elements of this approach with a focus on rural development and poverty. This framework was popular among development organizations. Flexible, holistic, pragmatic nature of this approach allowed it to be adopted by nongovernmental organizations (e.g. CARE, Oxfam), governmental organizations (e.g. DFID, USD, NZAP, SDC) and UN agencies (e.g. FAO, IFAD, WFP). Some organizations have elaborated their own versions of Sustainable Livelihood frameworks. Development organizations have prepared guidelines and handbooks on applying the Sustainable Livelihood framework in practice.

The Sustainable Livelihoods framework has similarities with the basic needs approach and the entitlement approach. Similar to basic needs approach,

it focuses on «gaining a living» (Chambers and Conway, 1992) that is “the necessities of life” rather than on human development (i.e. human flourishing). Similar to entitlement approach, it focuses on the «means» of securing a living. Actually, the Sustainable Livelihood approach is concerned with the assets (tangible, intangible) at the disposal of a household which reminds the concept of «endowments» in the entitlement approach. The assets in this framework are classified in five categories: natural capital, physical capital, human capital, financial capital, and social capital. This approach is mostly presented as people-oriented.

The Sustainable Livelihood framework has been applied to different development issues, including food security (Devereux et al, 2004; Hussein, 2002; WP, 1998; Young et al, 2001). The Sustainable Livelihood framework has some advantages in the analysis of food security. First, it has long term perspective. Second, it focuses on the context (economic, political, social, cultural, physical, etc.) These two analytical peculiarities in combination with the study of household assets bring three interconnected concepts to the analysis of food security:

1. Explicit consideration of adverse trends, risks and shocks, seasonality leads to the concept of vulnerability that according to Chambers (1995) «means not lack or want but exposure and defenselessness». It has two sides: the external side of exposure to shocks, stress and risk; and the internal side of defenselessness, meaning a lack of means to cope without damaging loss».

2. Related to vulnerability and resilience, the idea of sustainability is one of the main principles of the Sustainable Livelihood framework «a livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future» (DFID, 1999).

3. Coping strategies, which «represent a set of activities that are undertaken, in particular sequence, by a household in response to exogenous shocks that lead to declining food availability» (Curtis, 1993), are included in the general livelihood strategies (activities that people undertake in order to fulfill their own goals).

The Sustainable Livelihood framework is comprehensive one in comparison with previous approaches, moreover it is policy and project-oriented. But despite this fact, it has some shortcomings in food security analysis. The starting point of this approach is the household's assets and related livelihood strategies, rather than “what life we lead and what we can or cannot do, can or cannot be (Sen, 1987). Therefore,

1) Sustainable Livelihood framework is more suitable for analysis of food crisis and emergencies rather than general food security and development issues;

2) agency and freedom issues are missed in this approach;

3) the relationship between food and people is not analyzed deeply in this framework;

4) the unit of analysis in this approach is the household or the community, not the individual person, therefore, intra-household inequalities in the distribution of food may be overlooked.

Conclusion

This paper presents an attempt to provide a review of different approaches for the analysis of food security: food availability, approach, income-based approach, basic needs approach, entitlement approach, sustainable livelihood approach. Furthermore, it tries to identify linkages between different approaches. While examining different frameworks, we have tried to analyze the debates which have been going on in the academic field and within international organization during several decades.

Since the topic of food security and analysis of it remains very important, it is necessary to improve methodology of analysis and elaborate new, more comprehensive approaches to the analysis of food security. This can be a venue for future research. ■

-
1. Burchi F., 2011. Democracy, institutions and famines in developing and emerging countries. *Rev. Can. Etud. Dev.* 32 (1), 17–31.
 2. Burchi F., De Muro, P., 2007. Education for Rural People and Food Security: A Crosscountry Analysis. FAO, Rome.
 3. Burchi F., De Muro P., 2016. From food availability to nutritional capabilities. *Food Policy.* 60, 10-19.
 4. Chambers R., 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First.* Longman, New York.
 5. Chambers R., 1987. Sustainable livelihoods, environment and development: putting poor rural people first. IDS Discussion Paper 240. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
 6. Chambers R., 1995. Poverty and livelihoods: whose reality counts? *Environ. Urban* 7, 173–204.
 7. Chambers R., Conway, G., 1992. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
 8. Corbett J., 1988. Famine and household coping strategies. *World Dev.* 16 (9), 1099–1112.
 9. Curtis P.K., 1993. Famine Household Coping Strategies: Their Usefulness for Understanding Household Response to Armed Conflict. Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford, January 24.
 10. Das Gupta M., 1987. Selective discrimination against female children in rural Punjab, India. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* 13 (1), 77–100.
 11. Davies S., 1993. Are coping strategies a cop out? *IDS. Bull-I Dev. Stud.* 24 (4), 60–72.
 12. Denton J.A., 1990. Society and the official world: a reintroduction to sociology. General Hall, Dix Hills, New York.
 13. Department for International Development, 1999. Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheet: Introduction. DFID, London.
 14. Devereux S., Baulch, B., Hussein, K., Shoham, J., Sida, H., Wilcock, D., 2004. Improving the analysis of food insecurity, Food insecurity measurement, livelihoods approaches and policy: applications in FIVIMS, Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems FIVIMS. FAO, Rome.

15. Drize J., Sen, A., 1989. *Hunger and Public Action*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
16. Ellis F., 2000. *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
17. Food and Agriculture Organization, 1983. *World Food Security: a Reappraisal of the Concepts and Approaches*, Director General's Report, Rome.
18. Food and Agriculture Organization, 1996. *Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action*. FAO, Rome.
19. Food and Agriculture Organization, 2001. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2001*. FAO, Rome.
20. Food and Agriculture Organization, 2006. *The Right to Food Guidelines: Information Papers and Case Studies*. FAO, Rome.
21. Frankenberger T. R., 1992. Indicators and data collection methods for assessing household food security. In: Maxwell, S., Frankenberger, T.R. (Eds.), *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators, Measurements. A Technical Review*. UNICEF and IFAD, New York and Rome, pp. 73–134.
22. Griffin K., Khan, A.R., 1977. *Poverty and Landlessness in Rural Asia*. ILO, Geneva.
23. Haq, M., 1976. *The Poverty Curtain*. Columbia University Press, New York.
24. Harriss B., 1995. The intrafamily distribution of hunger in South Asia. In: Drize, J., Sen, A., Hussain, A. (Eds.), *The Political Economy of Hunger: Selected Essays*. WIDER, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
25. Hoddinott J., Yohannes, Y., 2002. *Dietary Diversity as a Food Security Indicator*. FCND Discussion Paper 136. IFPRI, Washington.
26. Howe P., Devereux, S., 2004. *Famine intensity and magnitude scales: a proposal for an instrumental definition of famine*. *Disasters* 28 (4), 353–372.
27. Hussein K., 2002. The relevance of livelihoods approaches to food insecurity measurement. *ELDIS/IDS*.
28. International Labour Organization, 1976. *Employment, Growth, and Basic Needs, a One World Problem*. ILO, Geneva.
29. Kent G., 2005. *Freedom from Want: The Human Right to Adequate Food*. Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C.
30. Кьннеманн R., Epal-Ratjen, S., 2004. *The Right to Food: A Resource Manual for NGOs*. AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, Washington D.C.
31. Magrabi F.M., Chung, Y.S., Cha, S.S., Yang, S.J., 1991. *The Economics of Household Consumption*. Praeger Publishers, New York.
32. Maslow A.H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychol. Rev.* 50, 370–396.
33. Maxwell D., 1996. Measuring food insecurity: the frequency and severity of “coping strategies”. *Food Policy* 21 (3), 291–303.
34. Maxwell S., 1996. Food security: a post-modern perspective. *Food Policy* 21 (2), 155–170.
35. Maxwell S., Smith, M., 1992. Household food security: a conceptual review. In: Maxwell, S., Frankenberger, T.R. (Eds.), *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators, Measurements. A Technical Review*. UNICEF and IFAD, New York and Rome, pp. 1–72.
36. Maxwell D., Ahiadeke, C., Levin, C., Armar-Klemesu, M., Zakariah, S., Lamptey, G.M., 1999. Alternative food-security indicators: revisiting the frequency and severity of “coping strategies”. *Food Policy* 24, 411–429.
37. Maxwell D., Watkins, B., Wheeler, R., Collins, G., 2003. The coping strategies index: a tool for rapid measurement of household food security and the impact of food aid programs in humanitarian emergencies. *Field Methods Manual*. Developed for CARE Eastern and Central Africa Regional Management Unit CARE-EARMU and World Food Programme Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping VAM Unit.
38. Osmani S., 1995. The entitlement approach to famine: an assessment. In: Basu, K., Pattanaik, P., Suzumura, K. (Eds.), *Choice, Welfare and Development*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (Chapter 12).
39. Reardon T., Matlon, P.M., 1989. Seasonal food insecurity and vulnerability in drought-affected regions of Burkina Faso. In: Sahn, D. (Ed.), *Causes and Implications of Seasonal Variability in Household Food Security*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D., pp. 118–136.
40. Reutlinger S., 1977. Malnutrition: a poverty or a food problem? *World Dev.* 5 (8), 715–724.
41. Reutlinger S., Selowsky, M., 1976. *Malnutrition and Poverty: Magnitude and Policy Options*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
42. Sarris A.H., 1989. *Food Security and International Security*. Discussion Paper 301. Centre for Economic Policy Research, London.
43. Scoones I., 1998. *Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis*. Working Paper 72. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
44. Sen A.K., 1981. Ingredients of famine analysis: availability and entitlements. *Q. J. Econ.* 96 (3), 433–464.
45. Sen A.K., 1983. Development: which way now? *Econ. J.* 93 (372), 745–762.
46. Sen A.K., 1987. *The standard of living*. In: Hawthorn, G. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, M.A.
47. Sen A.K., 1995. *Inequality Re-examined*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, M.A.
48. Sen A.K., 1999. Development as Freedom. In: Knopf, A. (Ed.). Oxford University Press, New York.
49. Sen A.K., 2004b. Elements of a theory of human rights. *Phil. Pub. Aff.* 32, 315–356.
50. Shue H., 1996. *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
51. Sibrian R., 2008. *Driving Food Security Information from National Household Budget Surveys*. FAO, Rome.
52. Sibrian R., Ramasawmy, S., Mernies, J., 2007. *Measuring hunger at sub-national levels from household surveys using the FAO approach: Manual*. Working Paper No. ESS/ESSA/005e. FAO, Statistics Division, Rome.
53. Stewart F., 1985. *Basic Needs in Developing Countries*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D.
54. Streeten P., 1981. *First Things First*. Oxford University Press for the World Bank, Oxford.
55. Svedberg P., 2002. *Poverty and Undernutrition Indian*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
56. United Nations Development Programme, 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. UNDP, New York.
57. United Nations Development Programme, 2000. *Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development*. UNDP, New York.
58. World Bank, 1986. *Poverty and hunger: issues and options for food security in developing countries*. World Bank, Washington D.C.
59. World Food Programme, 1998. *Food Security, Livelihoods and Food Aid Interventions, Background Paper, Time for Change: Food Aid and Development Consultation*, Rome, 23–24 October.

60. Young H., Jaspars, S., Brown, R., Frize, J., Khogali, H., 2001. Food-security assessments in emergencies: a livelihoods approach, paper 36. Humanitarian Practice Network, Overseas Development Institute, London

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

Burchi F., 2011. Democracy, institutions and famines in developing and emerging countries. *Rev. Can. Etud. Dev.* 32 (1), 17–31.

Burchi F., De Muro, P., 2007. Education for Rural People and Food Security: A Crosscountry Analysis. FAO, Rome.

Burchi F., De Muro P., 2016. From food availability to nutritional capabilities. *Food Policy.* 60, 10-19.

Chambers R., 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First.* Longman, New York.

Chambers R., 1987. Sustainable livelihoods, environment and development: putting poor rural people first. IDS Discussion Paper 240. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

Chambers R., 1995. Poverty and livelihoods: whose reality counts? *Environ. Urban* 7, 173–204.

Chambers R., Conway, G., 1992. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

Corbett J., 1988. Famine and household coping strategies. *World Dev.* 16 (9), 1099–1112.

Curtis P.K., 1993. Famine Household Coping Strategies: Their Usefulness for Understanding Household Response to Armed Conflict. Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford, January 24.

Das Gupta M., 1987. Selective discrimination against female children in rural Punjab, India. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* 13 (1), 77–100.

Davies S., 1993. Are coping strategies a cop out? *IDS. Bull-I Dev. Stud.* 24 (4), 60–72.

Denton J.A., 1990. Society and the official world: a reintroduction to sociology. General Hall, Dix Hills, New York.

Department for International Development, 1999. Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheet: Introduction. DFID, London.

Devereux S., Baulch, B., Hussein, K., Shoham, J., Sida, H., Wilcock, D., 2004. Improving the analysis of food insecurity, Food insecurity measurement, livelihoods approaches and policy: applications in FIVIMS, Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems FIVIMS. FAO, Rome.

Dgize J., Sen, A., 1989. *Hunger and Public Action.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ellis F., 2000. *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Food and Agriculture Organization, 1983. *World Food Security: a Reappraisal of the Concepts and Approaches,* Director General's Report, Rome.

Food and Agriculture Organization, 1996. *Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action.* FAO, Rome.

Food and Agriculture Organization, 2001. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2001.* FAO, Rome.

Food and Agriculture Organization, 2006. *The Right to Food Guidelines: Information Papers and Case Studies.* FAO, Rome.

Frankenberger T. R., 1992. Indicators and data collection methods for assessing household food security. In: Maxwell, S., Frankenberger, T.R. (Eds.), *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators, Measurements. A Technical Review.* UNICEF and IFAD, New York and Rome, pp. 73–134.

Griffin K., Khan, A.R., 1977. *Poverty and Landlessness in Rural Asia.* ILO, Geneva.

Haq, M., 1976. *The Poverty Curtain.* Columbia University Press, New York.

Harriss B., 1995. The intrafamily distribution of hunger in South Asia. In: Dgize, J., Sen, A., Hussain, A. (Eds.), *The Political Economy of Hunger: Selected Essays.* WIDER, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Hoddinott J., Yohannes, Y., 2002. Dietary Diversity as a Food Security Indicator. FCND Discussion Paper 136. IFPRI, Washington.

Howe P., Devereux, S., 2004. Famine intensity and magnitude scales: a proposal for an instrumental definition of famine. *Disasters* 28 (4), 353–372.

Hussein K., 2002. The relevance of livelihoods approaches to food insecurity measurement. *ELDIS/IDS.*

International Labour Organization, 1976. *Employment, Growth, and Basic Needs, a One World Problem.* ILO, Geneva.

Kent G., 2005. *Freedom from Want: The Human Right to Adequate Food.* Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C.

Kьnnemann R., Epal-Ratjen, S., 2004. *The Right to Food: A Resource Manual for NGOs.* AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, Washington D.C.

Magrabi F.M., Chung, Y.S., Cha, S.S., Yang, S.J., 1991. *The Economics of Household Consumption.* Praeger Publishers, New York.

Maslow A.H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychol. Rev.* 50, 370–396.

Maxwell D., 1996. Measuring food insecurity: the frequency and severity of “coping strategies”. *Food Policy* 21 (3), 291–303.

Maxwell S., 1996. Food security: a post-modern perspective. *Food Policy* 21 (2), 155–170.

Maxwell S., Smith, M., 1992. Household food security: a conceptual review. In: Maxwell, S., Frankenberger, T.R. (Eds.), *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators, Measurements. A Technical Review.* UNICEF and IFAD, New York and Rome, pp. 1–72.

Maxwell D., Ahiadeke, C., Levin, C., Armar-Klemesu, M., Zakariah, S., Lamptey, G.M., 1999. Alternative food-security indicators: revisiting the frequency and severity of “coping strategies”. *Food Policy* 24, 411–429.

Maxwell D., Watkins, B., Wheeler, R., Collins, G., 2003. The coping strategies index: a tool for rapid measurement of household food security and the impact of food aid programs in humanitarian emergencies. Field Methods Manual. Developed for CARE Eastern and Central Africa Regional Management Unit CARE-EARMU and World Food Programme Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping VAM Unit.

Osmani S., 1995. The entitlement approach to famine: an assessment. In: Basu, K., Pattanaik, P., Suzumura, K. (Eds.), Choice, Welfare and Development. Oxford University Press, Oxford (Chapter 12).

Reardon T., Matlon, P.M., 1989. Seasonal food insecurity and vulnerability in drought-affected regions of Burkina Faso In: Sahn, D. (Ed.), Causes and Implications of Seasonal Variability in Household Food Security. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D., pp. 118–136.

Reutlinger S., 1977. Malnutrition: a poverty or a food problem? World Dev. 5 (8), 715–724.

Reutlinger S., Selowsky, M., 1976. Malnutrition and Poverty: Magnitude and Policy Options. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Sarris A.H., 1989. Food Security and International Security. Discussion Paper 301. Centre for Economic Policy Research, London.

Scoones I., 1998. Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis. Working Paper 72. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

Sen A.K., 1981. Ingredients of famine analysis: availability and entitlements. Q. J. Econ. 96 (3), 433–464.

Sen A.K., 1983. Development: which way now? Econ. J. 93 (372), 745–762.

Sen A.K., 1987. The standard of living. In: Hawthorn, G. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, M.A.

Sen A.K., 1995. Inequality Re-examined. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, M.A..

Sen A.K., 1999. Development as Freedom. In: Knopf, A. (Ed.). Oxford University Press, New York.

Sen A.K., 2004b. Elements of a theory of human rights. Phil. Pub. Aff. 32, 315–356.

Shue H., 1996. Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Sibrian R., 2008. Driving Food Security Information from National Household Budget Surveys. FAO, Rome.

Sibrian R., Ramasawmy, S., Mernies, J., 2007. Measuring hunger at sub-national levels from household surveys using the FAO approach: Manual. Working Paper No. ESS/ESSA/005e. FAO, Statistics Division, Rome.

Stewart F., 1985. Basic Needs in Developing Countries. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D..

Streeten P., 1981. First Things First. Oxford University Press for the World Bank, Oxford.

Svedberg P., 2002. Poverty and Undernutrition Indian. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

United Nations Development Programme, 1994. Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security. UNDP, New York.

United Nations Development Programme, 2000. Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development. UNDP, New York.

World Bank, 1986. Poverty and hunger: issues and options for food security in developing countries. World Bank, Washington D.C.

World Food Programme, 1998. Food Security, Livelihoods and Food Aid Interventions, Background Paper, Time for Change: Food Aid and Development Consultation, Rome, 23–24 October.

Young H., Jaspars, S., Brown, R., Frize, J., Khogali, H., 2001. Food-security assessments in emergencies: a livelihoods approach, paper 36. Humanitarian Practice Network, Overseas Development Institute, London

Анализ продовольственной безопасности: новые подходы

© Хайхадаева О.Д., 2019

Продовольственная безопасность является важной темой в исследовании развития и экономики развития. От того, как развита теория продовольственной безопасности, как измеряется и анализируется продовольственная безопасность, зависит принятая политика продовольственной безопасности. Данная статья посвящена изучению теории и политики анализа продовольственной безопасности. В ней проводится сравнительный анализ различных подходов к анализу продовольственной безопасности, которые предлагаются академическим миром и международными организациями.

Ключевые слова: продовольствие, продовольственная безопасность, основные нужды, доступность продуктов питания
