

**Discordant Experiences of Food Insecurity within Households in Cameroon: An examination of data from the 2018 Demographic and Health Surveys**

Caroline E. Owens<sup>1</sup>, Zhenan An<sup>2</sup>, Craig Hadley<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Food is Medicine Institute, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University, Boston, MA; <sup>2</sup> Department of Quantitative Theory and Methods, Emory University, Atlanta, GA;

<sup>3</sup>Department of Anthropology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

**Corresponding author:** Caroline E. Owens, 150 Harrison Avenue, Boston, MA,  
caroline.owens@tufts.edu

**Short title:** Intrahousehold Food Insecurity in Cameroon

**Acknowledgements:**

**Financial Support:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

**Conflict of Interest:** None

**Authorship:** CEO- Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft; ZA- Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Review & Editing; CH- Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft

**Ethical Standards Disclosure:** This study was deemed non-human subject research by the Tufts University Institutional Review Board.



This is an Accepted Manuscript for Public Health Nutrition. This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its DOI 10.1017/S1368980025100578

Public Health Nutrition is published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nutrition Society. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

## Abstract

**Objective:** To assess the degree to which cohabiting couples (men and women) in Cameroon responded differently to the Food Insecurity Experience Scale and, where discordance exists, to test hypothesized drivers of difference.

**Design:** This cross-sectional study employed descriptive statistics and multivariate regression analyses using R.

**Setting:** Nationally representative sample of cohabiting adults in Cameroon.

**Participants:** 2,889 couples (male/female; 5,778 total adults) from the Cameroon Demographic and Health Survey (2018) couples recode.

**Results:** Food insecurity was more prevalent and reported with higher severity among males compared to females. Discordance in reported food insecurity was evident in 57% - 79% of cohabiting couples in the dataset, depending on the measure used. Discordance was not clearly associated with household wealth. Further, among couples with discordant food insecurity experiences, males more often affirmed items that their female partners did not affirm. Contrary to our hypotheses, items reflecting *household* food security did not show greater agreement among couples than did individual items. Of our hypothesized predictors, only current employment status among males was significantly associated with the difference in food security scores among couples.

**Conclusions:** This study highlights the importance of examining intrahousehold differences in food security. Understanding how individuals within a household experience and perceive their food situation and the underlying factors driving disparities is crucial for improving the effectiveness of targeted food and nutrition policies.

## Keywords:

food security, gender, wealth, urbanicity, households

## Introduction

In 2023, an estimated 691 to 783 million people experienced food insecurity.<sup>(1)</sup> Defined as limited or uncertain access to nutritionally adequate and safe foods, food insecurity encompasses dimensions of availability, access, utilization, and stability. Globally, women bear a disproportionate burden of food insecurity.<sup>(2,3)</sup> Data from the Gallup World Polls indicate that 53% of the world's food insecure are women, who have a higher probability of reporting food insecurity relative to men, with variation across countries.<sup>(2)</sup> Social and environmental factors, such as racial and ethnic identity, wealth, and rurality, also intersect with sex/gender to influence the risk of food insecurity. For example, rural women in lower- and middle-income countries are more likely than men and their urban counterparts to experience food insecurity and poor health.<sup>(4)</sup> Despite documented disparities, most research on food insecurity relies on household-level metrics, which extrapolate the food insecurity experience of one member, often an adult female, to represent the entire household.<sup>(5)</sup> While widely applied, these metrics assume that all household members have equal physical and social access to food, overlooking research that documents distinct domains of responsibility related to food acquisition and provisioning. Recognizing the limitations of household-level data, a growing number of food insecurity scales now assess individual-level experiences. Among these, the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), is one of the most widely employed.<sup>(6,7)</sup> The FIES examines experiential aspects of food insecurity and has documented cross-cultural relevance and validity. To identify individual-level differences within households, our study examines food insecurity among cohabiting couples in Cameroon, drawing on data from the FIES within the 2018 Demographic and Health Survey.

Our study builds on a longstanding body of research exploring intrahousehold differences in resource allocation. Early studies on sex/gender-based disparities in food and nutrition emerged following observations of sex-skewed mortality, morbidity, and malnutrition. Though studies frequently found that intrahousehold food distribution was sex-neutral after adjusting for body weight and activity patterns,<sup>(8,9)</sup> a pro-male bias was evident in several studies of children and youth in South Asia, reflecting a cultural preference for male offspring.<sup>(10,11)</sup> Notably, these studies from South Asia showed that intrahousehold inequities in food were not necessarily linked to poverty, as inequities did not decrease with income.<sup>(10)</sup> In contrast, greater disparities

were evident among more educated and wealthier groups, which may have reflected the financial stress associated with marriage and dowry costs of daughters. A recent systematic review of food allocation between adults in South Asia confirms these findings, with the highest disparities in households experiencing severe or unexpected food insecurity and in better-off, higher-caste households.<sup>(11)</sup>

Research in several world regions has also shown that while overall food quantity is often allocated equitably within households, disparities are more pronounced in food quality, particularly in micronutrient intake. For example, Gittelsohn et al. found that women and girls in rural Nepal consumed fewer vitamin A and iron-rich foods than other household members due, in part, to culturally prescribed food rules for reproductive-aged females.<sup>(12)</sup> Similarly, research in Guatemala found a pro-male bias in protein allocation, favoring male heads of household.<sup>(13)</sup> Trade-offs between quantity and quality were also evident in studies in the Philippines, where preschoolers had nutritionally favorable diets but received greater portions of less-preferred foods.<sup>(9)</sup> Collectively, these studies suggest that even when food *quantity* is equitable within the household, there may be disparities in food *quality and preferability*, which can drive perceptions of food insecurity.

Experiences with food insecurity are, therefore, driven by social and economic marginalization and control and access to resources. However, as DeRose, Das, and Millman emphasize, women's limited autonomy in public spheres or lack of access to education and income does not necessarily correlate with power or control within households, especially in food-related matters.<sup>(14)</sup> In many contexts, women's greater involvement with food acquisition and preparation may provide more access to food than is afforded to men. Alternatively, women's relations with food may promulgate more sensitivity, worry, or anxiety in response to food insecurity and the pressures of feeding a family. Men and women may also differentially prioritize food over other resources; for instance, Haddad et al. show that women are more likely than men to allocate income toward food, highlighting how control over income can alter intrahousehold food availability.<sup>(15)</sup> Cultural and ideological beliefs—such as perceptions that girls are less active or eat less or food rules that classify specific foods as taboo for certain subgroups—further influence intrahousehold access to food and nutrition.<sup>(9,16)</sup>

Research using experiential food insecurity scales, like the FIES, continues to reveal intrahousehold differences across sex/gender. For instance, in Ethiopia, Hadley et al. used an experiential food security scale among youth and showed that lower household wealth was associated with lower food security for girls but not for boys, although this differential disappeared when food prices rose.<sup>(17)</sup> Closer to our study, research in Bangladesh demonstrated discordance in food insecurity experiences among cohabiting adult men and women.<sup>(18)</sup> Specifically, Coates et al. observed that, when there is discordance, males were more likely to affirm questions about the augmentation of household resources in the public sphere (e.g., taking food on credit), whereas women were more likely to affirm questions about coping in a more private sphere (e.g., borrowing food from a neighbor), including behaviors like reduced consumption and reliance on less preferred or non-normative foods.<sup>(18)</sup> These findings show how sex/gender may influence food insecurity perceptions and responses within households, with clear ramifications for population-level estimates of insecurity and related health inequities. It is likely that other individual and household-level factors, including age, beliefs, attitudes towards gender equality, and wealth, influence discordance between household members by shaping power dynamics and responsibilities; however, these factors have not been robustly examined in a nationally-representative sample. Our analysis seeks to fill this gap by examining how wealth, rurality, and indices of women's empowerment influence sex/gender differences in food insecurity within households.

Data from the Cameroon Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) enable us to explore these dynamics by providing data on covariates and food insecurity using the FIES. Notably, the FIES has also been administered in Cameroon as part of the Gallup World Poll, which assesses factors related to world development indicators, including Sustainable Development Goals. In an analysis of this data, Broussard found that, in sub-Saharan Africa, gender inequality in food insecurity primarily occurred within severe food insecurity, in part due to the high rates of mild or moderate levels of food insecurity in the region.<sup>(2)</sup> Specifically, women were 2.7 percentage points more likely than men to experience severe food insecurity, which could be explained by gender differences in observed covariates (gender differences in household income, educational attainment, and employment status).<sup>(2)</sup> In contrast to regional findings, a recent analysis of data from the Cameroon DHS found that men are more likely to experience food insecurity than women.<sup>(19)</sup> However, to our knowledge, our analysis is the first to explore whether these

disparities persist within cohabiting couples. Despite a rising economic growth rate of nearly 4%, poverty levels in Cameroon have remained relatively stagnant, with an estimated 23% of people living below the international poverty line of US \$2.15 per capita per day in 2023.<sup>(20)</sup> These issues are exacerbated by conflict, particularly in the Northern region, and climate events such as droughts and floods that impact people engaged in the agricultural sector.<sup>(21)</sup>

Our study aimed to identify the extent of agreement among cohabiting mixed-sex couples regarding their individual food insecurity status. We examine whether both partners report the same level of food insecurity and, where discordance exists, investigate hypothesized drivers of discordance. More specifically, we hypothesize that intrahousehold gender differences will occur such that women will report greater food insecurity and that these differences will be driven, in part, by decision-making autonomy, social independence, and attitudes against gender-based intimate partner violence.

We relied on data from the 2018 Demographic and Health Surveys in Cameroon, which focused on couples, each of whom answered the 8-item FIES and provided data on a range of variables that potentially explained any discrepancy. Based on previous research, we hypothesized that, in general, women would report food insecurity more than men; there would be intrahousehold discordance in reported severity of food insecurity; and that, in cases of discordance, women would be more likely to affirm alterations in food behavior. We hypothesized that discordance would be lowest for item 6 of the FIES, “Your household ran out of food,” as the referent for this item is the household, whereas all other items refer to individual experiences. With respect to the degree of discordance, we hypothesized that the difference in men and women’s food security would be greatest in the poorest households, and we hypothesized that in households where the wife experienced lower empowerment, there would be a greater difference in the couple’s food security scores and higher likelihood of discordance classification.

## Methods

The data for this analysis come from the Demographic and Health Surveys ([www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com)). The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) program provides population-representative sample surveys on demographic and health-related topics from numerous lower and middle-income countries. We rely on the couples recode dataset from the

DHS program, which combines household and individual-level variables for couples. For Cameroon, this includes 2924 couples, though we removed 34 couples who were not actively living together because they are not reporting on the same household experience. Analysis was conducted using R.<sup>(22)</sup> This study was deemed non-human subject research by the university review board.

### ***Measuring food security and intrahousehold discordance***

We use individual-level food insecurity, as measured by the FIES, as our primary outcome variable. Our method closely follows the approach outlined in Coates et al (2010, though they used the FANTA scale). For each respondent's answers to the FIES, we used the Food and Agricultural Organization's online tool (<https://fies.shinyapps.io/ExtendedApp/>) to generate item-fit statistics and to produce estimates of each respondent's food security level: secure, moderately insecure, or severely insecure. This analysis revealed that, for women, item 8 (Going the whole day without eating) has an excessively higher outfit statistic (2.575). Our analyses demonstrated that the overall results were unaffected by the inclusion/exclusion of item 8; we therefore retained all FIES items for analyses. The degree and type of intrahousehold discordance (a case in which a female adult member responded affirmatively, and a male member did not and vice versa) were calculated for each item, along with population-level gender differences in responses to each item. Additionally, for each item in the FIES we compared the prevalence of affirmative endorsement by male and female respondents.

### ***Analysis***

Our general analytic strategy for addressing hypotheses 1-4 was to compare mean levels of the FIES for men and women and within couples (hypothesis 1), and across strata of rural/urban place of residence (hypothesis 1) and household wealth (hypothesis 2). We cross-tabulated the food security categories of couples to assess the level and degree of discordance (hypothesis 3). For hypotheses 4 and 5, we calculated the gender-specific prevalence of endorsement by item and used a chi-square test to test for significant differences in item endorsement by gender.

To test hypothesis 6, we fit a multivariable linear regression where the outcome was the *difference* in food security score between members of the couple (woman's food security score - man's food security score). Positive values indicate that the female partner reported as being

*more* food insecure than the male partner. In these models we control household wealth and type of area of residence. To assess whether couples' agreement on their food security status varied by household wealth, we relied on the DHS wealth index, which is generated through principal components analysis of household characteristics and ownership of material goods, land, and animals. This provides an internally consistent wealth ranking within a country. The DHS produces a continuous wealth variable, and a categorical variable labelled as poorest, poor, middle, richer, and richest. Households are also categorized by the DHS as being in an urban or rural setting, and we rely on this classification for our analyses using place of residence.

To operationalize gender-biased power dynamics within the household, we used the survey-based women's empowerment index (SWPER), a measure of women's empowerment for lower and middle-income countries.<sup>(23,24)</sup> SWPER generates estimates of empowerment across three domains indicative of access to assets and agency: social independence, which primarily captures factors that enable women to achieve goals, decision-making, which captures women's participation in household decisions, and attitudes to violence, which captures beliefs about gender norms-related acceptability of intimate partner violence. On each of these factors, we hypothesized that as women scored lower, there would be a greater difference in food security scores and higher likelihood of discordance. For details on the development and calculation of this index, we refer readers to Ewerling et al. 2020; in brief, the *attitude to violence* domain is composed of the following: Beating justified if wife goes out; if wife neglects children; if wife argues with husband; if wife refuses to have sex; if wife burns food. The *social independence* domain was made up of frequency of reading newspaper or magazine; women's education in completed years of schooling; age of woman at first birth (can be imputed for those who have not had a child); age at first cohabitation; age difference (woman's minus husband's age); education difference (woman's minus husband's years of schooling), and the *decision-making* domain was comprised of items representing who decides on respondent's health care; on large household purchases and on visits to family.

## Results

The final analytic sample included 2889 couples, of which 1287 were urban dwellers. The average age difference between couples (woman's age – man's age) was -8.3 years (SD 6.8), and



the average difference in years of education within a couple (woman's education – man's education) was -1.3 (SD 3.5).

**Hypothesis 1:** Women would report food insecurity more than men, with higher severity of reported food insecurity among rural women compared to urban women.

Women reported food insecurity scores that were consistently lower than men, regardless of location. Women reported an average food insecurity score of 3.5 (SD 3), while men reported an average of 4.6 (SD 2.9). Overall food insecurity scores were higher in rural areas compared to urban areas, but similar gender differences in food insecurity occurred in both rural and urban areas. Among rural dwellers, women reported an average food insecurity score of 4 while men reported 4.9; in urban areas, women reported mean scores of 3 and men reported mean scores of 4.2.

**Hypothesis 2:** The difference in men and women's food security would be greatest in the poorest households.

Food insecurity scores were related to household wealth in a dose-response relationship for both men and women, but the *difference* in couples' food insecurity scores was not systematically related to household wealth (Table 1). The Spearman's correlation between household wealth and the difference in food insecurity scores among rural households was 0.035; in urban areas it was 0.032; neither of these was statistically significant. Comparing the proportion of discordance, where households were assigned a one if there were differences in couples' food insecurity scores and zero if there was agreement, across economic strata and location also revealed little in terms of a relationship between agreement and wealth (Table 2).

**Hypothesis 3:** There would be intrahousehold discordance in reported severity of food insecurity.

Next, we compared the categorical levels of food security as reported by each member of a couple to assess the degree of overlap, finding very low levels of concordance between couples living in the same households, as shown in Table 3. Overall, 56% of couples were classified into different food security severity categories. Using the food security score instead of category, we found that 79% of couples did not report the same food security score.

**Hypothesis 4:** Women would be more likely to affirm alterations in food behavior.

**Hypothesis 5:** Discordance would be lowest for item 6, “Your household ran out of food,” as the referent for this item is the household, whereas all other items refer to individual experiences.

Counter to our hypothesis, our item-by-item analysis of the FIES items showed that men were more likely to affirm alterations in food behavior Table 4. Further, contrary to hypothesis 5, item 6, which referred to “the household” did not have the lowest level of discordance; the highest levels of discordance were among the items “worried,” “skipped,” and “hungry,” although the levels of discordance across items was similar.

**Hypothesis 6:** In households where women reported lower decision-making autonomy, social independence, and attitudes against gender-based intimate partner violence, discordance would be greater than in households in which women reported higher empowerment across these domains.

In the multivariate regression predicting the *difference* in couple’s food security scores there was no evidence of any associations between our hypothesized predictor variables and the degree of difference in couple’s assessments. In the OLS model, shown in Table 5, wealth was not significantly associated with the difference in food security. None of the three measures of women’s autonomy and power were associated with the difference in food security. Specifically, the measure of the wife’s decision-making power was not associated with the difference in food security scores (Beta = 0.09, SE 0.11), nor were the measures of attitudes towards spousal violence (0.08 SE 0.09) or social independence (-0.10 SE 0.11). The only variable that emerged as statistically significant was whether the male member of the couple was employed; among couples where the male was employed the average difference in food security scores between men and women was -1.05 whereas among households where the male was not employed the average difference between couples’ food security scores was -1.85. The overall model had very poor fit ( $F= 1.36$ ,  $P=0.20$ ) and the r-square was effectively 0.

## Discussion

Our results, many of which do not support our initial hypotheses, reveal contextual nuances in the distribution of food insecurity across populations and within households. Overall, our results align with findings from other settings that co-residing men and women experience food

insecurity differently, with discordance in reported experience evident in 56% of couples in the Cameroonian DHS dataset. Coates et al. similarly identified discordance in reported food insecurity within 32% of 576 households in Bangladesh, demonstrating intrahousehold variation in two distinct contexts.<sup>(18)</sup> These findings underscore that respondent identity matters for estimates of food insecurity, especially for household-level estimates that may be biased by gender-based reporting. For example, in our sample, if household-level prevalence estimates were extrapolated from individual-level data from female respondents, the experience of food insecurity from male respondents would be substantially underestimated. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 2, “End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture,” relies on the FIES, an indicator for estimating moderate or severe food insecurity in the population.

While we document support for the hypothesis that intrahousehold discordance in food insecurity would occur, we did not find strong support for other hypotheses. In contrast to our primary hypothesis, in this dataset, the prevalence and severity of food insecurity were higher among young adult men than young adult women. Unexpectedly, our analysis revealed that young adult men in this dataset experienced both higher prevalence and greater severity of food insecurity compared to young adult women, which contrasts with the robust body of literature documenting the higher rates among women and girls.<sup>(2)</sup> Although societal norms around family provisioning impact men across the socioeconomic spectrum, these pressures may be particularly acute in lower-income households, where limited resources challenge their ability to fulfill these roles. Food security exhibited a dose-response relationship with household wealth such that men and women in richer households were more food secure than those in poorer households. However, counter to our second hypothesis, the difference in couples’ food insecurity scores was not systematically related to household wealth. It is also conceivable that ongoing conflict in Cameroon contributes to a sense of precarity, which may disproportionately impact men. This could be tested further by examining regional differences in food insecurity while controlling for socioeconomic confounders.

Further, our results do not support our hypothesis that women would be more likely to affirm alterations in food behavior. Across each question in the FIES, men responded affirmatively more than their cohabiting female partners. Though Bishwajit and Yaya find this pattern in their

analysis of DHS Cameroon 2018 data,<sup>(19)</sup> our results expand on their findings by demonstrating its persistent *within* households. Items on the FIES, including “you were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food” and “you ate only a few kinds of foods,” foreground the social dimensions of insecurity; people may respond affirmatively to these items even if their caloric or dietary needs are met. Differences in how people conceive of “healthy, nutritious food” and what constitutes ideal dietary variety may drive affirmative responses even in the context of what may be deemed food security based on caloric sufficiency alone. Unmeasured factors such as lack of desired or preferred foods may partially explain the higher reports of food insecurity among men in our sample. A number of studies have shown that people can consistently rank the desirability of foods;<sup>(25,26)</sup> if men are more concerned with the *quality* of their food intake, we would hypothesize that they would rate their foods as lower in preference. Studies that assess food preferences alongside validated measures of dietary intake, such as 24-hour dietary recalls or food frequency questionnaires, may reveal whether discrepancies between perceived dietary needs and actual intake drive reported food insecurity. Our study does not adjust for body weight or reported activity patterns, both of which may be higher among male partners, driving higher actual and perceived nutrient needs. Building on this idea, it is conceivable that women within the household feel their dietary needs are met at a lower nutrient quantity or quality threshold than men. Alternatively, as proposed by Bishwajit and Yaya, men’s higher food insecurity in Cameroon may reflect societal norms and expectations for men to provide for their families.<sup>(19)</sup>

Cohabiting women and men also evaluated their household’s food security differently, as demonstrated by discordance between couples with item six of the FIES: “your household ran out of food.” Counter to our hypothesis, discordance on this item was not significantly lower than discordance on items that assess individual experiences. Our results differ from those of Coates et al., who document that discordance among couples in Bangladesh was lower for items querying the household’s food situation.<sup>(18)</sup> This discrepancy in our study highlights that cohabiting individuals may have different understandings or perceptions of their household food situation in addition to differences in experience. Qualitative research with Hispanic adults and children in the United States highlights how familial roles, coping strategies, communication, and interpretation shape intrahousehold discordance in food insecurity<sup>(27)</sup>. For instance, when communication or observation of food resources is limited, individuals less involved in food-related tasks may have a diminished awareness of their household’s food situation.

Finally, contrary to expectations, our proposed predictors of discordance — including household socioeconomic traits (wealth, urbanicity), individual characteristics (employment), and indices of women’s empowerment (decision-making, social independence, and attitudes toward intimate partner violence) — were not statistically significant and generally had small effects. Previous studies suggest that the generally disproportionate experience of food insecurity among women compared to men is driven, in part, by societal marginalization and lack of power and autonomy within households. Findings from a recent systematic review suggest that proxies of women’s empowerment within households have a significant effect on household food security and that investment in women’s education and decision-making power are critical for advancing household food security.<sup>(28)</sup> In contrast, our findings suggest that these indicators are not significantly associated with *intrahousehold* differences in food security. As other scholars have suggested, perceptions of empowerment are informed by local meanings and values and intersectional dimensions of identity; therefore, these indices are proxies to the structural determinants and contexts that shape food security rather than culturally attuned representations.<sup>(29)</sup> While our study does not investigate food security across multiple intersections of identity, we do account for differences in livelihood and experience by including place of residence and household wealth in our analysis.

From a policy and public health perspective, these observed sex/gender differences suggest nuance in how progress towards development initiatives, such as “Zero Hunger,” are measured and evaluated. Our analysis suggests the possibility that in the face of the same levels of household food insecurity, the gender of the respondent may influence the measured level of food security. When respondents vary by gender, it is possible then that the household’s food security level may vary depending on who in the household answered the questions. Further research could test this idea by assessing whether respondent gender identity predicts a household’s food security score, after controlling for wealth and sociodemographic characteristics.

Our reliance on proxy indices of women’s empowerment across domains of decision-making, social independence, and attitudes toward intimate partner violence may not fully capture the complex dynamics of empowerment within households. Additionally, self-reported responses are subject to social desirability bias, which may influence accuracy. The cross-sectional nature of

our data also fails to capture temporal variations in food security, which may further vary across livelihood, socioeconomic status, and sex/gender. Due to national security constraints, the 2018 DHS dataset only includes 13 of the intended 41 clusters in the Northwest region and 16 of 40 in the Southwest, limiting national representation. Despite these limitations, our study is among the first to examine intrahousehold variation in food insecurity within Cameroon using nationally representative data.

## **Conclusions**

This study reveals the importance of respondent identity, specifically sex/gender, in measuring food security, challenging assumptions embedded within household-level metrics. Future research could benefit from the development of context-specific metrics or the inclusion of qualitative approaches to better capture the factors driving intrahousehold food security disparities. Additionally, examining intrahousehold food insecurity in diverse settings, including high-income countries, will be essential for understanding these dynamics globally. Such efforts are imperative for alleviating food insecurity, advancing key development aims, and improving human well-being.

## References

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (2023) *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023.*
2. Broussard NH (2019) What explains gender differences in food insecurity? *Food Policy* **83**, 180–194. Elsevier Ltd.
3. Grimaccia E & Naccarato A (2022) Food Insecurity in Europe: A Gender Perspective. *Soc Indic Res* **161**, 649–667. Springer Science and Business Media B.V.
4. Sinclair K, Ahmadigheidari D, Dallmann D, et al. (2019) Rural women: Most likely to experience food insecurity and poor health in low- and middle-income countries. *Glob Food Sec* **23**, 104–115. Elsevier B.V.
5. Webb P, Coates J, Frongillo EA, et al. (2006) *Advances in Developing Country Food Insecurity Measurement. J. Nutr*, vol. 136.
6. Cafiero C, Viviani S & Nord M (2018) Food security measurement in a global context: The food insecurity experience scale. *Measurement (Lond)* **116**, 146–152. Elsevier B.V.
7. Saint Ville A, Po JYT, Sen A, et al. (2019) Food security and the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES): ensuring progress by 2030. *Food Secur*, 483–491. Springer Netherlands.
8. Haddad L, Hoddinott J & Alderman H (1997) *Intrahousehold Resource Allocation in Developing Countries: Models, Methods, and Policy.*
9. Haddad L, Peña C, Nishida C, et al. (1996) *Food security and nutrition implications of intrahousehold bias: a review of literature.*
10. Miller BD (1997) Social class, gender and intrahousehold food allocations to children in South Asia. *Soc. Sci. Med*, vol. 44.

11. Harris-Fry H, Shrestha N, Costello A, et al. (2017) Determinants of intra-household food allocation between adults in South Asia - A systematic review. *Int J Equity Health*. BioMed Central Ltd.
12. Gittelsohn J, Meera Thapa, & Landman LT (1997) Cultural factors, caloric intake and micronutrient sufficiency in rural Nepali households. *Soc. Sci. Med*, vol. 44.
13. Engle PL & Nieves I (1993) Intra-household food distribution among Guatemalan families in a supplementary feeding program: behavior patterns. *Sot. Sci. Med*, vol. 36.
14. Deroose LF, Das M & Millman SR (2000) Does female disadvantage mean lower access to food? *Popul Dev Rev* **26**, 517–547. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
15. Haddad L & Reardon T (1993) Gender Bias in the Allocation of Resources Within Households in Burkina Faso: A Disaggregated Outlay Equivalent Analysis. *J Dev Stud* **29**, 260–276.
16. Messer E (1997) *Intra-household allocation of food and health care: Current findings and understandings-Introduction*. Vol. 44.
17. Hadley C, Lindstrom D, Tessema F, et al. (2008) Gender bias in the food insecurity experience of Ethiopian adolescents. *Soc Sci Med* **66**, 427–438.
18. Coates JC, Webb P, Houser RF, et al. (2010) ‘He said, she said’: Who should speak for households about experiences of food insecurity in Bangladesh? *Food Secur* **2**, 81–95.
19. Bishwajit G & Yaya S (2024) Uncovering the drivers of food insecurity in Cameroon: insights from a nationwide cross-sectional analysis. *BMC Nutr* **10**, 137.
20. World Bank (2024) Cameroon: Overview.
21. Ehiane S & Moyo P (2022) Climate Change, Human Insecurity and Conflict Dynamics in the Lake Chad Region. *J Asian Afr Stud* **57**, 1677–1689. SAGE Publications Ltd.



22. R Core Team (2024) *\_R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing\_*. Vienna, Austria.
23. Ewerling F, Lynch JW, Victora CG, et al. (2017) The SWPER index for women's empowerment in Africa: development and validation of an index based on survey data. *Lancet Glob Health* **5**, e916–e923. Elsevier Ltd.
24. Ewerling F, Raj A, Victora CG, et al. (2020) SWPER Global: A survey-based women's empowerment index expanded from Africa to all low- and middle-income countries. *J Glob Health* **10**. University of Edinburgh.
25. Owens C, Weaver LJ, Kaiser BN, et al. (2022) Context Matters for Food Security: Multi-Sited Evidence of Shared Cultural Models of Food Consumption. *Ecol Food Nutr* **61**, 162–181. Routledge.
26. Weaver LJ, Henderson N & Hadley C (2021) The Social Meaning of Food Consumption Behaviors in Rural Brazil: Agreement and Intracultural Variation. *Field methods* **33**, 372–387. SAGE Publications Inc.
27. Frongillo EA, Fram MS, Escobar-Alegría JL, et al. (2019) Concordance and Discordance of the Knowledge, Understanding, and Description of Children's Experience of Food Insecurity among Hispanic Adults and Children. *Fam Community Health* **42**, 237–244. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
28. Essilfie G, Sebu J, Annim SK, et al. (2021) Women's empowerment and household food security in Ghana. *Int J Soc Econ* **48**, 279–296.
29. Clement F, Buisson MC, Leder S, et al. (2019) From women's empowerment to food security: Revisiting global discourses through a cross-country analysis. *Glob Food Sec*, 160–172. Elsevier B.V.

**Tables**

Table 1. Average difference in reported food insecurity among couples (woman's score - man's score) by wealth and place of residence.

DHS Wealth Index	Urban	Rural
Poorest	-1.6	-1
Poorer	-1	-1.2
Middle	-1.4	-0.41
Richer	-1.3	-1.1
Richest	-1.2	-2.2

Table 2. Degree of discordance between couples' food security assessments by wealth and place of residence.

Wealth Strata	Urban	Rural
Poorest	0.77	0.80
Poorer	0.81	0.79
Middle	0.82	0.80
Richer	0.80	0.79
Richest	0.74	0.72

Table 3. Agreement between couples on their food security status (three-level classifications).

	Men's Level		
Women's Level	Secure	Moderate	Severe
Secure	24%	14%	14%
Moderate	7%	8%	10%
Severe	5%	7%	12%

Table 4. Agreement and discordance between couples on individual Food Insecurity Experience Scale items.

FIES Item	Both disagree	Both agree	Wife (N), Hub (Y)	Wife (Y), Hub (N)	Discordance
Worried	20%	38%	26%	17%	42%
Healthy	16%	46%	25%	13%	38%
Few foods	18%	41%	29%	12%	41%
Skipped	24%	34%	30%	12%	42%
Ate less	22%	37%	28%	13%	41%
Ran out	40%	20%	27%	13%	40%
Hungry	38%	20%	28%	14%	42%
Whole day	55%	9%	23%	12%	35%

Table 5. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression results for predicting intrahousehold differences in food security scores.

Variable	Estimate	Std Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Intercept	-1.82	0.40	-4.56	<0.01
HH Wealth	0.00	0.00	1.11	0.27
Rural	0.39	0.19	2.11	0.04
Decision making	0.07	0.11	0.66	0.51
Social autonomy	-0.11	0.09	-1.28	0.20
IPV attitudes	0.07	0.09	0.85	0.40
HH size	0.00	0.02	-0.24	0.81
Male, employed	0.77	0.37	2.10	0.04
Female, employed	-0.26	0.16	-1.63	0.10