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Abstract

Today a lot of people in the world experience food insecurity. In this paper a qualitative content analysis method has been used in order to answer the following question:

*How does the European Union work with food security? More specifically, this paper investigates if the EU’s focus is on strengthening people’s entitlements or on increasing the availability of food, e.g. through increasing the production of food.*

This analysis was able to confirm that the 23 European Union projects (within the international cooperation and development context) which were analysed focus their attempts to achieve food security in a variety of different ways. Around half the projects include elements of improving both entitlements and food availability/production, whilst roughly half of the projects aim to improve only one of the above-mentioned elements. It was possible to identify Sen’s entitlement approach in the European Union projects; however, the paper reached the conclusion that although the entitlement approach to achieving food security is clearly very influential in the projects, it is not the only influence present.
1 Introduction

In 2015 the United Nations (UN) set 17 Sustainable Development Goals as part of the “2030 Agenda for sustainable development” (United Nations a, n.d.).

One of the sustainable development goals is to “[e]nd hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture” (United Nations b, n.d). It is stated that a change is needed in the global food and agricultural system in order to feed the growing global population. Today 45 per cent of children under the age of five who die do so because of malnutrition. One of the targets of sustainable development goal number two is to “end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular poor people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round” by 2030 (United Nations b, n.d).

1.1 Food Security – Introduction and Definition

There is a need to increase the production of food in the coming years because of population growth and an increase in consumption due to greater economic possibilities. The latter will result in a greater amount of people able to consume fish as well as dairy and meat products. It is estimated that the global population will have increased to 9 billion people by around 2050. This dramatic increase will present enormous challenges since already today one in seven people is not able to obtain a sufficient amount of protein and energy (Godfray et al., 2010: 812). According to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 70 per cent more food will be needed by 2050 compared to the food that was produced in 2009 (FAO, 2009). To sum up, it seems certain that the demand of food will increase. Therefore, the question of how the problem of hunger should be fought today and in the future arises.

As the term “food security”, which is included in the UN’s sustainable development goals (United Nations b, n.d), takes such a central place in this thesis it is necessary to provide a definition. According to Pinstrup-Andersen (2009: 5), food security is defined as the state of “enough food [being] available, whether at the global, national, community or
household level” (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2009: 5). For the purpose of this paper, however, the FAO’s definition of food security has been chosen: “Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.” (FAO, 2017). This definition was chosen due to the fact that it is very similar to the European Commission view on food security, “[f]ood and nutrition security is about ensuring that everybody is able to access sufficient, affordable and nutritious food” (European Commission, 2018). Besides, the EU and the FAO work closely together to fight food insecurity (European Commission, 2018 a), so it seems plausible that they have a similar perspective on food security. The EU is also the “largest single source of voluntary funding to FAO” (European Commission, 2018 a).

It should be noted that insufficient food production and availability in a specific country are not the only causes of food insecurity and hunger. A case study on food security in Argentina, where 5,5 millions (in the year 2012) of people suffer from food insecurity, by Feeney and MacClay demonstrates that it is not the lack of food that is the problem. The country has the ability to feed its own population and to export food to the rest of the world. The problem, for a large number of people, who did not acquire a healthy diet, lay in a lack of income or of healthy nutritional habits, noting the country’s capacity to produce enough food (Feeney and MacClay, 2016). This example illustrates the fact that food security is a complex issue with many different potential causes that need to be taken into account.

1.2 Research Question/Purpose

The purpose of this study is to get a better understanding of how the European Union (EU) works with food security. The European Union works with food security in many different sectors and contexts e. g. agricultural policies for European farmers, rules related to hygiene and a rule aimed at the consumers so that they have the right to make an informed choice (Directorate-General for Communication, 2017: 3,14). In order to narrow down the many ways in which the EU works with food security, the focus of this paper will be exclusively on the Directorate- General of International Cooperation and Development. There are still 795 million people in the world that experience hunger
(2015) (FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015: 4) and every person going hungry is one too many. With regard to fighting hunger and malnutrition globally the EU states that “[t]he EU has taken on a leading role in this drive” (European Commission, 2018 b: 3). It is therefore interesting to investigate how this large player works with food security. As previously mentioned, the need to increase the production of food is evident (FAO, 2009).

However, Amartya Sen, presented later in this paper, introduced a different approach to hunger: entitlements (Sen, 1983 a, Sen 1983). According to Sen, too much focus has been put on food availability in relation to hunger and not enough focus has been put on entitlements (Sen, 1983 a). For many of us, the first thought that comes to mind when thinking of hunger and food insecurity is the lack of food. Thus, it seems logical to come to the conclusion that the solution would be to increase the availability of food. The purpose of this paper is not to try to establish if it is better to focus on entitlements or on food availability. This aspect is open for future research and investigations. Instead, this paper will investigate how a leading player on food security, the European Union, has chosen to tackle the issue of food insecurity by analysing EU projects in international cooperation and development. As already mentioned, food insecurity is a reality for a large number of people worldwide. According to most projections, the problem will get worse in the future, with an increasing global population. Questions such as the following arise: how are we going to solve this pressing matter? How are we working with it today? Are the ideas of Sen present in the fight against food insecurity? When thinking of all these different questions, a research question arose. In light of the different approaches on how to address food security, this paper will try to answer the following question:

How does the European Union work with food security? More specifically, this paper investigates if the EU’s focus is on strengthening people’s entitlements or on increasing the availability of food, e.g. through increasing the production of food.

In order to answer the question, different European Union projects in the international cooperation and development sector connected to food security will be analysed and categorised depending on whether they, focus on strengthening the entitlement of the
population, as Sen does, or if they focus on enhancing the food production and availability of food.

1.2.1 Scope of investigation

It is important to notice that this paper does not focus on the policies and politics of food security in general; this paper will instead exclusively investigate the practical goals of the European Union concerning food security in projects within the Directorate-General of International Cooperation and Development. To clarify this paper studies EU projects which are being realised outside of the EU and its member states. This limit was placed on the scope of the investigation due to the time allotted for the paper in order to achieve a depth in the investigation and not just a shallow report, as would have been the case in a more exhaustive and broad investigation.

2. Previous Research and Theory

This section of the paper will present the Amartya Sen’s entitlements approach as well as some perspectives on food production and food availability. These will be followed by a brief section on previous research on the European Union and food security. Finally, the European Union’s view on food security based on the EU’s policy framework established in 2010, “EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges” (European Commission, 2010: 0), will be introduced.

2.1 Sen’s Theory of Entitlements

Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen is well known for his research in economics, public health and gender issues (Harvard University, 2017). In order to categorise the different European Union projects, it is necessary to understand Sen’s definition of the term “entitlements”. His approach was presented in his book Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation and in his article “Development which way now” both written in 1983. In those texts Sen claimed that too much focus had been put on economic growth per se and not on the benefits and advantages it brings such as for example health and higher education. When speaking of traditional development
economics, much of the emphasis has been put on national product, total income and the total supply of goods instead of people's entitlements and capabilities (Sen, 1983:754).

The term “[e]ntitlement refers to the set of alternative commodity bundles that a person can command in a society using the totality of rights and opportunities that he or she faces” (Sen, 1983: 754). In a market economy one can explain entitlements as the amount of money a person can obtain by selling their labour power, from the social security benefits he or she receives (if there are any), or from ownership rights (Sen, 1983: 754-756). The amount of money then determines the commodity bundle the person can purchase, i.e. his or her entitlements. If the commodity bundle allows the person to access well-nourished food he or she does not starve (Sen, 1983: 755).

According to Sen, it is crucial for a person's economic development what options they dispose of. If they, for example, “can live long, escape avoidable morbidity, be well nourished, be able to read and write and communicate, take part in literary and scientific pursuits and so forth” (Sen, 1983: 754) they have a wider array of options. The main objective here is for people to be able to put themselves over chance instead of it being circumstances and chance that controls them (Sen, 1983: 754). In other words, one must check if the measures and projects taken really have improved people's capabilities and entitlements, through for example education.

Sen does not consider lack of food to be an adequate explanation for hunger and starvation. He mentions this repeatedly and further supports his argument by illustrating it with examples of famines that occurred without there being a decline of food availability (Sen, 1983a). According to Sen, the food availability decline (FAD) approach does not explain the causal mechanism of starvation or the relation between people and food, nor why some starve and others do not (Sen, 1983a: 154), “[t]he problems of starvation, hunger and famines in the world could be better analysed through the concept of entitlement than through the use of traditional variables of food supply and population size” (Sen, 1983:755).

Sen explains the entitlement approach as “going from economic phenomena into social, political and legal issues” (Sen, 1983a: 154). “A person's ability to command food [...]


depends on the entitlement relations that govern possession and use in society. It depends on what he owns, what exchange possibilities are offered to him, what is given to him free and what is taken away from him” (Sen, 1983a: 154-155) and “[f]or most of humanity, about the only commodity a person has to sell is labour power, so that the person’s entitlements depend crucially on his or her ability to find a job, the wage rate for that job, and the prices of commodities that her or she wishes to buy” (Sen, 1983: 755).

These excerpts illustrate a few characteristics of Sen’s entitlement approach. From his observations, it becomes clear that one way of strengthening a person’s entitlements would be to empower their social and political position and their legal rights. One could presume that this also includes their access to legal assistance and their ability to participate in decision-making processes in the community. A creation of forums where people can bring forward their ideas could be a way to achieve that. Besides, a person’s entitlements can be enhanced by the acquisition of ownership of for example land. If a farmer becomes the owner of the land he or she is cultivating, his or her entitlements have improved. As is mentioned above, Sen speaks about a person’s labour power and how different aspects can strengthen and influence a person’s entitlements relations related to their work. In addition to his thoughts on wage rates and the ability to find a job one could add other factors such as strengthening or founding unions and implementing a minimum wage.

According to Sen, another influence that determine a person’s exchange entitlements is “the social security benefits he is entitled to and the taxes, etc., he must pay” (Sen, 1983a: 3-4). It can therefore be assumed that a person who is entitled to social security benefits is in a better position if unemployed or in need of medical care; the person then has better entitlements than a person who is not entitled to social security benefits. Lastly, the market, exchange possibilities and the prices of products he or she wishes to buy also influence a person’s entitlements.

In the book, Sen writes about income and how, in a market economy, it "give[s] one entitlement to food” (Sen, 1983a: 155), and clarifies in his article that “income itself provides an inadequate basis for analysing a person's entitlements” (Sen, 1983: 756). If,
for example, a person’s income is increased, this does not necessarily improve their entitlements if such an entitlement (e.g. medical care) is not available (Sen, 1983: 756). Sen, however, states that it is better to focus on income:

[It]is a good deal better than the focus on total food output and population size. [...] But when it comes to health, or education, or social equality, or self-respect, or freedom from social harassment, income is miles of the target (Sen, 1983: 756).

Income as such is understood to be partly helpful in analysing people's entitlements but one cannot assume that an increased income automaticity improves a person's entitlements. Later, when analysing the European Union’s projects, it is necessary to look beyond the goals of income itself to see if the increased income has led to, or is the result of, an enhancement of entitlements or not. One must also consider the order of preference presented by Sen.

To conclude, Sen does not lobby against producing more food; he merely advocates for the focus to be put on peoples entitlements to obtain food instead (Sen 1983 a: 159 - 160). When analysing the European Union’s projects related to food security, the presented aspects of Sen’s entitlement approach will serve as a compass in order to determine if a project focuses on enhancing people’s entitlements or not. For the purpose of this paper, Sen’s approach was chosen due to the fact that it presents an unconventional way to look at and explain hunger, it is perhaps not a very common way to look at and study food security.

2.2. Food Production and Food Availability

As presented above, Sen believes that the problem of food insecurity should be solved by strengthening people’s entitlements (Sen, 1983:755). In his article “A Fresh Look at the Roots of Food Insecurity”, Craig Pearson explains his position on the subject. At the beginning of the article he states “The reason we have food insecurity is simple: food production and its distribution do not meet the needs of the world’s population” (Pearson, 2012: 19). It is apparent that his opinion is different from Sen’s. Later on the same page, Pearson again makes the connection between food insecurity and decline in availability. With respect to food insecurity being a problem throughout history, he
states: “[h]istorically it has been manifest in local famines, caused by crop failures, plagues, war or an increased population” (Pearson, 2012: 19).

According to Pearson there are three solutions to the problem of food insecurity: “increasing the area under food production; increasing productivity per unit area; and increasing the connectivity within our food system so we do not waste as much food from the point of production to the end-point of consumption” (Pearson, 2012: 27). As these three suggestions are all about improving the food production chain in order to improve the availability of food, Pearson clearly represents the view that food security may be achieved by increasing food availability. Pearson elaborates his arguments by discussing which of the three solutions would be best in the fight against food insecurity, “[m]y thesis is that the most realistic, and greatest, gains will be through improving connectivity; that is, through closing or, at least, making our food systems less leaky and wasteful” (Pearson, 2012: 27).

As mentioned above Pearson believes the easiest way to improve food security would be to reduce the leaks and waste in the food systems (Pearson, 2012). This line of reasons runs counter to Sen mainly because it involves increasing the availability of food and it is not connected to strengthening peoples’ entitlements. So even though Pearson suggests that the focus should be on reducing waste, for the purpose of this paper he will be considered a proponent of increased food production and food availability.

Pearson is not the only one who believes that the problem of food insecurity needs to be solved by increasing food production or changing the way we produce food. Foley et al. (2011) write in their article Solutions for a cultivated planet that “[t]o meet the world’s future food security and sustainability needs, food production must grow substantially while, at the same time, agriculture’s environmental footprint must shrink dramatically” (Foley et al., 2011: 337).

Even though the authors mention food price shocks at markets (which one could assume would be connected to people’s ability to obtain food, in other words – entitlements) their focus is on how the food production needs to be improved in order to meet future needs (Foley et al., 2011: 337). The authors present and discuss different problems with
the current agricultural system and solutions on how to improve them. Their main point is that agriculture needs to “meet the twin challenges of food security and environmental sustainability” (Foley et al., 2011: 341). In order to achieve this goal, they propose four guidelines. The guidelines include, for example, new practices, better data and decision tools, and the advice to keep in mind that not one single path will lead to food security and a satisfactory environmental performance of agriculture (Foley et al., 2011: 341). To conclude Foley et al. and Pearson, both focus on improvements within the agricultural sector, but they differ on which improvements are most needed.

2.3 The European Union and Food Security

There is some previous research on the European Union and its relation to food security. The encountered articles focus mostly on food security within the European Union and its member states.

In the article *Economic patriotism in European agriculture*, Wyn Grant writes about how food security has re-entered the discourse agenda in the European Union and, according to Grant, this provided those “who would like to see [the] traditional productionist approaches to agriculture restored” with stronger arguments (Grant, 2012: 432). The food security discourse has thus experienced a shift of balance “from consumptionist to productionist discourses” (Grant, 2012: 423). The article describes the different opinions among the member states in the European Union and their solution to the food security challenge, for example that “Britain has a history of liberalism” (Grant, 2012: 428) and believes that “functioning markets are fundamental to ensuring global food security” (Grant, 2012: 427). France on the other hand believes that the food security challenge should be achieved by: “traditional remedies of subsidy and protection, representing [...] the ‘protectionist’ approach” (Grant, 2012: 427). The member states are thus divided into two sides where some member states are positive and in favour of the continuation of subsidies and protection in the agricultural sector whereas other member states are in favour of a more market oriented and commercial agricultural policy. In order to provide reconciliation between the two sides new reforms of the CAP were implemented (Grant, 2012: 421, 423).
The above-mentioned article is an example on some previous research of food security within the context of the European Union, in this case how the revived food security discourse in the European Union has altered the discourses and separated the opinion of different member states. Even though the article mentions global food security, it centres on the agricultural policies and discourses affecting EU and its member states.

Another article *Disentangling the consensus frame of food security: The case of the EU Common Agricultural Policy reform debate* identify different food security frames in the “Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) post-2013 reform process” (Candel et al. 2014: 47). The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was introduced in 1962 mainly as a way to guarantee food provision in Europe (Candel et al. 2014: 47). The article concludes that the different frames are in conflict with each other and overlap and thus have resulted in complicated debates. The authors concluded that the productionist and environmental sub-frames were the ones most used out of the six different sub-frames (Candel et al. 2014: 47). The authors state that the main focus of the productionist sub-frame lies on increasing the production of food in the European Union (Candel et al. 2014: 50), while the main goal of the environmentalist frame is for the CAP to be refocused to include both food production and the environment, as they are both important parts of European agriculture (Candel et al. 2014: 51). One could therefore conclude that since the article presents these two frames (in relation to agricultural politics) to be the most occurring ones, there is a lack of a global perspective when it comes to food security and the European Union, particularly when it comes to food security in developing countries.

The author of this paper agrees with Candel et al.’s view that food security within a EU context has not received much attention in academic journals. (Candel et al. 2014: 47). In the two above-mentioned articles, one can detect the productionist approach; it is thus an approach present in the food security discourse in the European Union. The focus on food production is also present in this paper as one of the main categories (presented later) is food availability/production. It can also be noted that the focus of the articles lies mostly on food security concerning the European Union and its member states. According to the author of this paper there is a gap in the previous research concerning food security and the European Union with the perspective of food security
in developing countries. This paper intends to partly fill this gap with research about the European Union and food security in the context of international cooperation and development.

The objective of this paper is to investigate where the focus of the European Union is in relation to food security. Therefore an introduction to the European Union's perspective will be presented here. In the year 2010 the European Union established “[a]n EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges” (European Commission, 2010: 1).

The EU recognises that food insecurity is a reality for over 1 billion people and decided therefore to increase the financial support to those developing countries worst affected. In the document, the EU and its member states claim to be “the most important and reliable players in the world food security, both financially and politically” (European Commission, 2010: 2). In the future the EU wants its leadership in the global food security agenda to be strengthened, they point out that there is a need for “a new common food security policy,” (European Commission, 2010: 2) to meet future challenges. These challenges consist in, for example, an increased global population, the impacts of climate change and an increased pressure on natural resources. The framework serves as way for the EU and its member states to unite in the fight against food insecurity (European Commission, 2010: 2). Since the EU is such an important player in the fight against global food insecurity, it seemed an obvious choice for this paper to investigate its focus.

The European Union has adopted four pillars for its dealings with food security. The first one, “increasing availability of food” (European Commission, 2010: 3) is very much in line with the “food availability/production category” of this paper, which will be presented. This pillar focuses on enhancing the availability of food to the growing global population (European Commission, 2010: 3), which according to Sen should not be central in fighting hunger. The EU believes that the main focus should be on “sustainable small-scale food production” (European Commission, 2010: 4) and this should be done through, e.g., introducing new crops, integrated pest management and other methods which will increase the availability of food. Up to this point in the description of the first
pillar only elements of the “food availability/production category” are mentioned. However, when the issue of “[s]ecure access to land and secure land tenure and use rights” (European Commission, 2010: 4) in order to achieve an increased production of food among small holder farmers is raised elements from the “entitlement” category are included. Other objectives such as encouraging host countries and investors to use internationally recognised principles as guidelines as well as to support development of these principles are being presented by the EU (European Commission, 2010: 4). It is worth noting that the first pillar “increasing availability of food” (European Commission, 2010: 3) is given more space and hence more weight in the policy framework document than the other three pillars. The first one is explained and discussed on one and a half pages; the same amount of space is split between the following three pillars.

The second pillar, “improving access to food” (European Commission, 2010: 5), is more connected to the entitlement approach proposed by Sen. The focus here is on improving employment and income-earning possibilities thus increasing access to food. The aim is to make more food affordable for more people. Social transfer mechanism should be implemented in conjunction with support for vulnerable population groups, above all women (European Commission, 2010: 5). Many similarities with Sen’s entitlements approach can be detected here, for example, a focus on women, on improving employment and on improving income-earnings possibilities.

The third and fourth pillars are named “[i]mproving nutritional adequacy of food intake” (European Commission, 2010: 6) and “[i]mproving crisis prevention and management” (European Commission, 2010: 6). The third pillar focuses on establishing nutrition policies, education and setting up coordination between different mechanisms, while the fourth one focuses on resilience against food-related crises, something that rural producers and communities are in need of.

Finally, the document states that in order to achieve food security, the investments that are made need to conform to a number of conditions in order to be as effective as possible. One of these is the need for the investments, e.g. assistance programmes, “to coincide with national and regional policies and reforms on agriculture and food security” (European Commission, 2010: 7). Besides, even though all pillars should be
addressed, the EU aims to prioritise other related dimensions, which are “smallholder agricultural development, governance, regional integration, and assistance mechanisms for vulnerable populations” (Commission, 2010: 8).

This part briefly presented a few aspects of how the EU intends to proceed in order to improve food security. It was unfortunately not possible to present an exhaustive analysis of the entire document in this thesis. One can, however, detect the presence of both elements in the framework policy. Sen’s approach to food insecurity as well as aspects which are more in line with Pearson are presented in the document. This paper will try to answer the question of two sides (entitlements or food availability/production) the EU gives preference to in the context of international cooperation and development.

3. Method

As previously stated, this analysis will use European Union projects connected to food security exclusively within the Directorate-General of International Cooperation and Development, thus other areas in which the EU works with food security is not part of this investigation. In the analysis of how the EU works with food security the qualitative content analysis research method as described in the Qualitative Content Analysis article by Margrit Schreier (Schreier, 2013) will be used. This method was chosen due to its flexibility and ability to reduce data (Schreier, 2013: 170), which it does in a systematic way in order to make the analysis as objective as possible. As suggested by Schreier, this was done “by assigning successive parts of the material to the categories of a coding frame.” (Schreier, 2013: 170). Only material relevant to the research question was examined. This was to make sure that all aspects were included and that no relevant information was missed due to the “lens of one’s assumptions and expectations” (Schreier, 2013: 171).

3.1 Qualitative Content Analysis.

In her description of the process of qualitative content analysis, Schreier uses different steps. The first, “deciding on a research question”, has already been addressed. The
second, “selecting material”, will be described later in this section. It is the third step, “[b]uilding a coding frame”, that will be presented here. Choosing two main categories (“Food Availability/Production” and “Entitlements”) is in line with Schreier, who asserts that there must be at least one main category and two sub-categories (Schreier, 2013: 174). This paper is an attempt to categorise different European Union projects; more specifically it will be attempted to assign the project aims to either one or both of the two main categories. As this paper is principally based on the concept of Sen, it seemed a promising choice to ground one category on his entitlement approach and the second one on food production and availability, i.e. the approach he opposes (Sen, 1983: 755). The sub-categories will be presented later in this section; however, it was decided not to adopt Schreier’s requirement for the sub-categories (within the same main category) being mutually exclusive (Schreier, 2013: 175). This was done due to the fact that the sub-categories only serve as guidelines during the categorisation process; they are not to be analysed further after categorisation.

In order to build a coding frame, this paper used around one third of the projects (8 out of the 23 different projects), which were randomly chosen. Since adjustments to the coding frame could be done later in the process, the selection of projects does not appear to have affected the coding frame negatively. Due to time limitations, it was not possible to go through all the projects for building the coding frame. The selected projects were first summarised. Then sub-categories of each project were identified and the project was categorised. The two main categories were created in a concept-driven way, while the sub-categories were constructed in a data-driven way in order to get a good description of the material; this process is described by Schreier (2013: 176). Once the sub-categories had been identified, definitions of the different categories were created (as presented later in this paper). After the creation of sub-categories, the categorisation of the different projects began. It was the “objectives” and “impacts” parts of the projects that were analysed and categorised. This was done in order to make the categorisation systematic and as unbiased as possible. All the projects included a testimony of some sort, e.g. by a beneficiary of the project. Since the content of the testimonies varied, they were not included in the analysis. The analysis of “objectives” and “impacts” appeared to be the best way to respond to the research question. The relevant information for the research question was first categorised one time and later
on a second time. Since there were only a few rare cases in which a section received a different categorisation category, it can be safely assumed that the coding frame and the method are reliable.

3.2 Material

The material (i.e. the projects), which was used in order to analyse how the European Union works with food security, was retrieved from the website https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/search/site_en. The projects are conducted by the Directorate- General of International Cooperation and Development, which is the department of the Commission responsible for “EU policy on development and delivering international aid” (European Commission, nd.) It is therefore reasonable to assume that the information analysed in this paper reflects the EU’s actions on this subject at least in the context of international cooperation and development. The analysed material describes projects related to food security which the EU has supported. In order to find the projects relevant for the analysis, the following steps were applied: ordering the material by choosing “Projects” under “Content Type” and “Food and Nutrition Security” under “Sectors” yields 79 hits. In order to further single out projects to analyse, only those projects which are presented under the tab “Story” were chosen [i.e. those projects which included a testimony]. This is because these projects present the objectives and impacts very clearly (they contain headlines describing objectives and impacts). This made it possible to ascertain that the analysis indeed examines the intentions and aims of the projects. Another aspect that made the projects which included a “Story” a suitable choice was the fact that they usually provide the reader with more information about the objectives (even though the testimonies were not analysed these projects provided the reader with more information than other projects). The projects that do not include the tab “Story” were not analysed. This is due to the fact that the majority of them provide insufficient information. The information provided is usually not clear enough; or they are written in another language than English, or they do not have objectives and impacts as headlines. It should be noted that even though the projects are all categorised under “Food and Nutrition Security”, they are or were funded by different instruments. This might be an explanation for how they differ in their focus.
After taking all these steps, there were 26 projects left. Out of these 26, three were excluded from the analysis because they did not fulfil the requirements. If a project did not mention any objectives which could be connected to either food production or the enhancement of people’s entitlements, or if there was no mention of reducing hunger, it was excluded. If this was not the case but the objectives and impacts were still very unclear, the project was also excluded from the analysis. These two conditions were in place in the case of three projects which were excluded.

The project “Improving food security for households in urban and peri-urban settlements of Mazar-i-Sharif” (ICD, 2018 c) gives us an example of unclear aims. The stated aim of the project is “[d]eveloping better understanding of the catchment resources such as forests, pastures, irrigated lands and rain-fed cultivated land”, (ICD, 2018 c) however, it is not clear who is the recipient of this new knowledge or what purpose it will have. Another project which was excluded was “A new stove is benefitting businesses, the environment and people’s health in Laos” (ICD -, 2018 f). It aims to “improve the quality, efficiency and safety of stoves in Laos” (ICD -, 2018 f) and to “replace 25% of the national stove market by the end of the fourth year” (ICD -, 2018 f). Since there is no mention of food security or food production or of the strengthening entitlements, this project was excluded from the analysis.

A few projects simply had the objective “to improve food security” (ICD -, 2018 b) if no further examples were given on how to achieve that objective, the objective in question was excluded from the analysis. If all the objectives and impacts were unclear, the entire project was excluded. An aim of the project was also categorised as unclear when the provided information was scant and made it impossible to assign the aim to one of the main categories or if the lack of information made it possible to categorise it in either of the main categories. If all the aims were unclear/excluded, the entire project was excluded from the analysis.
3.3 The Main and Sub-categories

In order to properly analyse which of the two main categories ("entitlements" and "food availability and production") the different projects aim to influence in order to alleviate hunger, the two main categories were broken down into several sub-categories. The aim of the investigation was not to go into depth about the different aspects of these sub-categories, but rather use them in order to establish the focus of the projects in regards to the two main categories.

After a portion of the material was analysed the sub-categories were established by the method of successive summarising, they were created in a data-driven way. As described in the Schreier article, the steps of the definition are four; this paper has adopted the first three stages, leaving out the fourth stage, “decision rules”. This stage seemed unnecessary since there is no need in this paper for the sub-categories to be mutually exclusive; they merely serve as a guideline in assigning the goals of the projects to a main category. Since the aim of the paper is to establish where the focus of the projects lies, not the specific aspects of the different sub-categories it was considered to be sufficient if a goal was assigned to one of the main categories. The other stages, “a category name, a description of what is meant by that name, [and] positive examples” were adopted (Schreier, 2013: 176). All the main categories and sub-categories are presented later in Table 1.

3.3.1 Entitlements

In this main category we find the projects that have the “objectives” and “impacts” aimed at improving people’s entitlements. This includes measures which were taken to improve people’s possibilities to control their lives, to have an enhanced ability to influence society or their community and to receive education or training. The sub-categories that constitute this category were “education”, “empowerment and benefits”, “communication” and “organisations and associations”.

“Education” is a sub-category where a project aim was placed if its purpose is to train,
educate or increase people’s knowledge. This could be done through workshops or educational sessions. In the project “Food security and sustainable farming approaches in Mongolia”, there is an example of education: “[t]o improve access of the most vulnerable to quality food and nutrition education” (ICD -, 2018 t).

The sub-category “empowerment and benefits” focuses on empowering people, especially women, e.g. to raise their voice in the decision-making process, as in the project in Niger (ICD -, 2018 d) as well as the implementation of social security benefits for workers and people in general. “To offer good working conditions, salary and benefits for producers and workers in the plantations and packing houses[.]”(ICD -, 2018 e) is one of the objectives of the project in the Dominican Republic. The sub-category also entails project aims to help people to receive ownership rights of their land and to receive social security benefits.

“Communication” is another sub-category, which entails improved communication as in the project in Niger where the objective is for farmers to have a better communication and be able to participate in the decision-making process with the government (ICD -, 2018 d).

The fourth and last sub-category in the “entitlement” category is a collective group for associations, organisations and networks. The aims that focus on implementing or strengthening these kinds of establishments were placed here. “Support capacity building of central and local branches of the Tajikistan Veterinary Association” (ICD -, 2018 u) is a clear example of how the aim of the project is to support associations

3.3.2 Food Availability and Food Production

A project aim was placed in this main category if it has the objective of increasing the harvest or improving the food production in some other way or increasing the availability of food. This could be by making food production more sustainable or by using the resources more efficiently.

At the first stage of analysing the projects, two sub-categories were created. The first
sub-category was named “farming systems and farming techniques”. This sub-category includes aims which mention new or improved farming techniques e.g. plastic tunnelling, irrigation systems, new farming tools, certification and different types of seeds. The project “Conservation agriculture” (ICD -, 2018 q) provides us with an example: “[i]mprove soil health by removal of hard-pan structures, increased nitrogen fixation through legume crops, and increased organic matter content through harvest residues and green manuring” (ICD -, 2018 q).

The second sub-category was named “increased productivity”. Thus, project goals were placed in this sub-category if they indicated an improvement of access to food, increased sustainability of food production or improved management of fish stock. Indicators such as “increased productivity” and “increased food availability” served as a help to place the project aims in this sub-category. The cases in which people are simply given food were also placed here as this clearly increases their access to food. The project “Sharing the Fruits of our Labour in Cape Verde” provides us with an example: “Increased banana crop production” (ICD -, 2018 n).

**Table 1 Analytical framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entitlements</strong></td>
<td><em>Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Empowerment and benefits</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Communication</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Organisations and associations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Availability and Food Production</strong></td>
<td><em>Farming systems and farming techniques</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Increased productivity</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 Analysis by Means of the Main and Sub-categories

When analysing the projects and their goals, every project aim relevant to the research question was classified as belonging to either one or both of the main categories. In order to facilitate the classification process, the above-described sub-categories were
used. Each time a project aim was identified as belonging to one of the above-mentioned sub-categories, it was registered as belonging to relevant main category, “entitlements” or “food availability/production”.

If a project aim belonged in multiple sub-categories belonging to the same main category (e.g. “education” and “communication”, which both belong to the category “entitlements”), the main category was only registered once - this is the main reason why there was no need for the sub-categories to be mutually exclusive. However, if the aim involved multiple sub-categories belonging to different main categories, both were registered. For example a project aim involving the two sub-categories “education” and “empowerment and benefits” only resulted in one registration of “entitlements”, while a project aim dealing with the sub-categories “education” and “increased productivity” resulted in the registration of both main categories (“entitlements” and “food availability/production”).

One of the project aims from the project “Innovation and learning around the System of Rice Intensification [...]” (ICD -, 2018 o) gives us an example of the coding process. The project aim was:

> [t]o develop more productive and more sustainable agriculture practices, based on scientific knowledge combined with local wisdom and experiences. New methods should improve farmers’ livelihood while protecting the environment (ICD -, 2018 o).

In this project aim three different sub-categories were detected. Since the project aim was “[t]o develop more productive and more sustainable agriculture practices” (ICD -, 2018 o) the sub-category “increased productivity” was registered. At the same time the project aim was to improve methods and farming techniques, resulting in the registration of a different sub-category “farming systems and farming techniques”. Lastly the development of the above mentioned project aims were combined with “scientific knowledge [...], local wisdom and experiences” (ICD -, 2018 o), which means that there needed to be an improved communication among the local farmers and scientists, this resulted in the registration of the sub-category “communication”. This project aim thus resulted in one registration of the main category “entitlements” and one registration of the main category “food availability and production”. This since the sub-
categories “increased productivity” and “farming systems and farming techniques” belong to the same main category and are thus only registered one time.

This way of categorisation was chosen due to its simplicity and clarity and the fact that it reduced the necessity for strictness when determining the categorisation of the goals in the sub-category. Having analysed and categorised the entire material it was noted that a different course of action might have been preferable. The annexation of at least one other sub-category under the “food availability/production” would have made the figures more representative when analysing certain aspects of the results. Nevertheless, chosen method and its application are arguably still suitable for the purpose of answering the research question. The broad definitions of the sub-categories under food availability/production had many positive effects as well. When the goal, for example, was unclear or the writer was not familiar with a particular measure but there still was no doubt that the goal belonged to the food availability/production category, the categorisation was affected positively from the fact that the sub-categories did not play an important role.

3.4 Source Criticism

As previously mentioned the used material was, publicised on the European Union website. It seems therefore fair to assume that the analysed material is reliable; since it solely consists of primary sources. There is of course a risk of the projects being presented in a biased manner. Since this paper solely is interested in the goals and intentions of the projects and not the results a possible biased presentation of the projects results would be irrelevant. The important point is to see if the focus lies on strengthening entitlements or increasing food production; it is not important for the purpose of this paper how and if this has been achieved.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

It should be noted that the research question is very broad. This leads to a validity problem since the EU works with food security not only in the area analysed in this
paper, but also in other ones, which technically should be included in an exhaustive answer to the research question. However, this would go beyond the scope of a paper like this one. So the analysed material in this paper has been, as previously mentioned, chosen in such a way as to make it possible to focus on one specific area in which the EU works with food security. Thus it is important to remember that this paper only looks at how the EU works with food security in the Directorate-General within International Cooperation and Development. One aspect which contributes to improved validity is the fact that the used material was retrieved from the primary source (the EU). In order to get a deeper understanding of the theme, more projects could have been analysed, and each project could have been studied more in-depth. This, however, was not possible due to the limited time frame of this university course. The projects chosen for analysis are deemed to suit the purpose of the research question of this paper and thus the validity is expected to be satisfactory. Even though it is hard for a study in social science to achieve a high level of reliability, reliability is deemed to be at least satisfactory in this paper. While a certain degree of subjectivity on the part of the author is difficult to avoid, the choice of the method of qualitative content analysis is expected to have reduced this subjectivity. The author has attempted to correctly interpret the purposes of the projects. The fact that all the analysed material is written in English may have negatively affected the reliability since English is not the author’s mother tongue, but overall the reliability can still be considered to be satisfactory.

4. Analysis

Summarising the results, one can state that the EU has a variety of projects related to food security. Some projects focus on both entitlements and the availability/production of food while other projects focus on only one of the two. 23 projects are included in this analysis and a table summarising the results is presented later in this section (Table 2). As previously mentioned, this paper will try to answer the following question:

*How does the European Union work with food security? More specifically, this paper investigates if the EU’s focus is on strengthening people’s entitlements or on increasing the availability of food e.g. through increasing the production of food.*
The focus of this analysis lies on the aims of the chosen projects, not on their results. Besides, it will not be attempted to establish which goals or methods are the best ones in order to achieve the expected result. This paper will merely establish where the emphasis of the projects lies and, above all, if they focus on Sen’s entitlement approach or on increasing food availability and food production. The figures presented in Table 2 (below) serve as a guide to determine the focus, but as previously stated, the different sub-categories will not be further discussed since they merely serve as guidelines.

As presented in the section “Material”, the projects were retrieved from the “International Cooperation and Development” website of the European Commission.

Table 2 has been created in order to give the reader a clearer, more summarised picture, of the focuses of the different projects. In the table the number of goals (of each project) assigned to the two main categories are presented. It also presents how many of the goals (of each project) which were excluded from the analysis due to the goals being unclear or not related to the research question.

It becomes evident that there are many projects which display elements of both strengthening of entitlements and improving food availability/production. Furthermore, it turns out that the European Union attempts to fight food insecurity in many different ways from tagging tuna to helping Haitians get identification documents. In many ways, the projects show that there is a blend of focuses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nr of goals categorised in the main category “Entitlements”</th>
<th>Nr goals categorised in the main category “Food availability/Production”</th>
<th>Nr of goals that were excluded since they were unclear or did not relate to the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sowing seeds for better livelihoods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing local agricultural production in Eritrea through [...]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food security and sustainable farming approaches in Mongolia</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking up for the next generation of farmers in Niger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative livelihoods for sugar cane belt in Fiji</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing fruits of our labour in Cape Verde</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Banana accompanying measures (BAM) for the Dominican Republic</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinda farmers club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of mother and child health services in Uzbekistan, [...]</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing daily meals for schoolchildren living in [...] Gambia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMARTFISH - Sustainable fishing in Madagascar</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global food security portal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable tuna resource management in the Atlantic Ocean</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying measures for sugar [...] , Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small changes can make a difference</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector reform contract for rural development [...] DRET- Programme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation agriculture</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the competitiveness of the Colombian dairy sector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother and child health and nutrition</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Resilience Action (PRO-ACT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Better veterinary services in rural Tajikistan</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving food safety-supporting private sector development in Benin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation and learning around the System of Rice [...]</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 The Results

The project “Banana Accompanying Measures (BAM) for the Dominican Republic” (ICD -, 2018 e) is a very illustrative example of a project with the aim of embracing the two main categories. This includes, for example, improving working conditions for workers and increasing the production of bananas.

To produce bananas in a more sustainable way, maintaining the natural resources which allow farmers to produce good quality bananas also in the future. The producers and workers learn proper biodiversity management and better management of soil fertility, water, pesticides and plastic waste, which are the most important environmental challenges for the banana sector (ICD -, 2018 e).

This excerpt clearly demonstrates the presence of the food availability and production approach and the intention to make food production more sustainable. But there would be no use implementing all these changes if the farmers and workers were not taught how and why to use them, hence a way to strengthen their entitlements is also included. This knowledge that the EU wants to provide them with is supposed to help them to grow bananas in the future.

One can draw the same conclusions from the project “Small changes can make a difference”, where both “entitlements” and “food availability/production” are present in the goals of the project (ICD -, 2018 s). The excerpt “[m]en, women and children living in remote upland areas have increased knowledge and capacities to implement nutrition sensitive farming techniques and are aware of healthy nutrition principles and practices” (ICD -, 2018 s) serves as another example of how people's entitlements can be strengthened through an increase in knowledge while the production and availability of food is also improved (ICD -, 2018 s). The project “Food security and sustainable farming approaches in Mongolia” (ICD -, 2018 t) includes both educational objectives and the introduction of new farming techniques, more specifically green houses. Table 2 summarises several other projects that include both entitlement and food availability/production aspects. There are some projects which do not include any aspects of entitlements or food availability/production respectively and around half of the projects include only aspects of one of the two main categories.
4.1.1 Projects without “Entitlements”

There are eight projects that do not present any aspects of entitlements. It is not surprising that the intention of these projects is to increase the productivity or availability of food. This is done, for example, by improving irrigation systems and introducing new crops. Some of the projects only present the aim of increasing food productivity “[t]he project purpose is to increase the productivity of small rain-fed farming, [and] the predominantly farming system” (ICD -, 2018 b) this is the goal of “Sowing seeds for better livelihoods”. Due to the fact that precisely this aspect is the core of the food availability/production category, it was obvious to place this project in that particular category.

When analysing and reflecting on the results, one should keep in mind that the provided information about the aims of the projects, was very scant in several cases. It is possible that if the projects further included a description of how the aims were supposed to be achieved or what was supposed to be achieved by increasing productivity, perhaps it would have been possible to detect some sort of entitlements involved. Since this was not the case for these eight projects, no such conclusion can be made, however.

One project which stands out from the rest (those lacking of entitlements) is the "Mother and child health and nutrition” (ICD -, 2018 h) project. This is because this project, unlike the others, which are connected to agriculture, is connected to health. The aim of this project is, among other things, to “contribute to the reduction of child and maternal under nutrition in Timor-Leste by supporting the implementation of Mother and Child Health and Nutrition – Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programme [...]” (ICD -, 2018 h). Since no assistance other than (supposedly) food was given to the women and children, this project was categorised as food availability/production. One could argue that their entitlements were indirectly improved, but according to Sen “the ability to acquire food has to be earned” (Sen 1999: 162). Therefore this project is placed in the food availability/production category. One could also argue that since those targeted are women and children the project could at least result in an increase of their empowerments (entitlements), but as they are only given food and nothing more, e.g healthcare, it was decided to categorise this project solely in the food
availability/production category. However it is still interesting to look at this project since its approach is different from those of the other projects.

4.1.2 Projects without “Food Availability/Production”

There are only four projects which do not include any aspects of food production and food availability. As a health-related project has already been discussed, it seems appropriate to give an account of the other health-related project, though this one solely has entitlement aspects. The project “Improvement of mother and child health services in Uzbekistan, phase II” (ICD -, 2018 j) presents another perspective on the strengthening of entitlements. Compared to the second objective, the first objective was less clear: “[t]o contribute to the human development in Uzbekistan with special emphasis on Mother and Child Health Care (MDGs 4 and 5)” (ICD -, 2018 j). Since it, can be assumed that the children and mothers receive health care, the project is categorised as a resulting in strengthening of their entitlements. The second objective of the project presents a slightly clearer picture of the intentions:

Support the Ministry of Health to increase the quality of mother and child health care services, and to increase the capacity of families to make informed choices about health and nutrition (ICD -, 2018 j).

This aim was difficult to categorise since supporting the Ministry of Health does not automatically entail a strengthening of people’s entitlements. However, the second part of the goal is to improve “the capacity of families to make informed choice about health and nutrition” (ICD -, 2018 j). This excerpt can be interpreted as a way for the families to receive some sort of information, training or education about their health and nutrition; the aim is thus categorised as “entitlement”.

Continuing with the other projects which do not entail any aspects of food production, the projects “Cabinda farmers club” (ICD -, 2018 g) and “Speaking up for the next generation of farmers in Niger” will be presented (ICD -, 2018 d). These two projects represent cases where the focus is solely on strengthening people’s entitlements, e.g. by helping women to participate more in the decision-making process, increasing communication between associations and governments, and training family farmers (ICD -, 2018 d, ICD -, 2018 g). The “Cabinda farmers club” (ICD -, 2018 g) project does
not, however, present much detailed information about the aims of the project. In this paper, it is placed in the “entitlement” category.

The last project which does not present any goals of increasing food availability/production is “Alternative livelihoods for sugar cane belt in Fiji” (ICD -, 2018 i). However, this project presents many unclear goals, such as “[r]estor[ing] and improve[ing] incomes of farmers, [...]” (ICD -, 2018 i) and “reduc[ing] economic vulnerabilities for redundant mill workers and their families” (ICD -, 2018 i). The only aim that was categorised is:

[t]he foundation was registered as an NGO in 2001 and works with Fiji’s rural communities, teaching them skills that enable the[m] to be self-reliant and become entrepreneurs (ICD -, 2018 i).

It can be assumed that the skills the people in the rural communities will acquire from teaching represent an improvement of their entitlements. However, this project is not a clear example of strengthening of entitlements.

During the analysis of the projects some interesting observation were made. Even though these projects do not have any intention to increase food availability or production, three out of four projects are directed at farmers. This is interesting since the projects solely focus on strengthening entitlements but as they are directed towards helping farmers, one could still assume that elements of the production of food are present since farmers and food production are closely linked.

Another interesting project is “Innovation and learning around the System of Rice Intensification [...]” (ICD -, 2018 o). The title indicates that this is a project which is connected to the agricultural sector and possibly has the intention of implementing a new farming technique. But when the results are studied, one can see that the majority of the aims are categorised as “entitlements”. Hence “Innovation and learning around the System of Rice Intensification [...]” (ICD -, 2018 o)is a positive example of a project which has the aim of strengthening entitlements in the agricultural sector.
4.1.3 Difficulties

Sen points out the problematic aspect of income, i.e. that an increased income does not automatically improve one’s entitlements: “income itself provides an inadequate basis for analysing a person’s entitlements” (Sen, 1983: 756). Therefore a cautious approach was chosen for this paper when dealing with this particular concept during the analysis of the aims of the projects. There are five different projects which mention “income” among their aims. One of the aims was mentioned above in the excerpt from the “Alternative Livelihoods for Sugar Cane Belt in Fiji” (ICD - , 2018 i) project, as an example of an unclear goal. Another project which has an income-related aim is “Innovation and learning around the System of Rice Intensification […]” (ICD - , 2018 o). Its intention is “[t]o generate more income for small-scale farmers to improve their household conditions, food security, and nutrition” (ICD - , 2018 o). Since neither “food security” nor “household conditions” are very specific, it is not possible to interpret this increase in income as a strengthening of entitlements. Besides, when Sen discusses “income” as a means to strengthen entitlements, he places it “miles of target” (Sen, 1983: 756) when compared to other efforts. The other projects that include “income” were also difficult to interpret. For the reasons stated above, however, those goals could still be categorised due to the fact that other aspects of the goal could be categorised without this difficulty.

4.1.4 Summarising the Results

In Table 2, it can see that the different projects differ greatly in their goals and focuses. There are, for example, eight projects that do not aim at strengthening entitlements, whereas there are only four projects which do not have any intention of increasing the availability of food and the food production. Thus, there are twice as many projects which focus only on increasing the productivity/availability of food than projects which only strive to strengthen entitlements. There seems to be an increased focus on increasing food production/availability. This is not in line with Sen, according to whom too much emphasis has been put on the issue of food production.

The balancing of world supply and world population has nevertheless received a lot of attention [...]. While a fall in food availability per head for the world as a whole is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for intensification of hunger in the world, it has typically been assumed that the two are rather well correlated with each other (Sen, 1983 a: 159).
Clearly, the eight projects which only focus on food availability/production do not have goals which Sen would consider as an appropriate way of solving the problem of food insecurity.

In total, there are 12 projects that can be clearly categorised as belonging to either one or the other main category, while the number of projects which include both types of aims ("entitlements" and "food availability/production") is 11. These results are arguably reliable for the following reason: either a project includes both main categories or only one, i.e. no emphasis has been put on the amount of goals. As discussed previously in the method part, these results would remain the same had there been more specific sub-categories. We will now proceed to the remaining results, which should be analysed a bit more cautiously. Table 2 presents 23 projects. In ten of them, the majority of the goals belong to the “entitlements” category, while in ten others, the bigger part belongs to the “food production” category. In the remaining three projects, the goals are evenly distributed between the two categories. As explained previously, different sub-categories belonging to the same main category were only represented once. This leads to some uncertainty when claiming that a certain main category prevails. Since the same rules, however, were applied to both categories and the author did not notice any particular main category being more neglected than the other, the figures still function as an illustrative way to express the results. Looking at these results, one can draw the conclusion that the focuses of the projects are relatively evenly distributed between the two main categories.

It is not possible to present all the different goals of each project in this analysis. However, it has been attempted to put forward examples that demonstrate different aspects of the different types of projects and goals. What we are able to read from Table 2 is that there are some projects which have no intention of strengthening entitlements and some projects which are not aimed at increasing food production and availability. We can draw the conclusion that the number of projects which include both intentions (11) is nearly the same as the number (12) of projects which exclude one of the categories. Thus, there is a slightly higher tendency among the projects to focus on only “entitlements” or “food production” than to include both of them, but the difference is marginal.
It is interesting to compare the different sectors which the projects are part of or directed at. This paper concludes that many of the projects are directed at farmers, which comes as no surprise since the majority of the projects are part of the agricultural sector (including two projects which are aimed at the fishery sector). This observation may seem trivial when investigating food security; food and the agriculture are very much connected, after all. However, in light of the fact that this paper has discussed and analysed Sen’s approach and as his approach is in many ways present in the policy framework of the EU, it seems noteworthy that there are surprisingly few projects which are not placed in the agricultural category. There are two projects which are aimed at healthcare and the supplementary feeding programme, but the majority are related to the agricultural sector in some way. It seems promising to combine the different aims of strengthening entitlements and of increasing food availability, but it appears that people outside the agricultural sector are not receiving as much help through projects which focus on food security as people involved in it. It can therefore be assumed that this group of people outside the agricultural sector may have been overlooked and fallen between the cracks when it comes to projects related to food security.
5. Concluding Remarks

How does the European Union work with food security? The author of this paper reaches the conclusion that the EU works with food security in many different ways and in different sectors, even though the agricultural sector is clearly the one that takes centre stage. The projects which have been analysed focus on different aspects of food security. Around half of the projects include both the strengthening of entitlements as well as a focus on food availability and production. The remaining projects only focus on strengthening one of the two categories.

It is therefore possible to draw the conclusion that Sen’s entitlement approach is present in the work of the European Union on food security. While his approach is clearly very influential, it does not seem to occupy an unchallenged position in the EU’s projects. In ten of the projects, the majority of the goals are directed at improving people’s entitlements, whereas in ten others, the majority are directed at increasing food availability and production. It thus seems fair to say that the overall focus is evenly distributed between the two approaches. This paper, however, has pointed to the possibility of some population groups being left out, due to the fact that the majority of the projects are connected to the agricultural sector in some way. After all, it is not only farmers (and those employed in the agricultural sector) who are in need of having their entitlements improved.
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