Malta - Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)

FAO Statistics Division

Report generated on: July 8, 2021

Visit our data catalog at: https://microdata.fao.org/index.php

Overview

Identification

ID NUMBER
MLT_2020_FIES_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS

Overview

ABSTRACT
Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 2.1 commits countries to end hunger, ensure access by all people to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year around. Indicator 2.1.2, "Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)", provides internationally-comparable estimates of the proportion of the population facing difficulties in accessing food. More detailed background information is available at http://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/fies/en/ .

The FIES-based indicators are compiled using the FIES survey module, containing 8 questions. Two indicators can be computed:

1. The proportion of the population experiencing moderate or severe food insecurity (SDG indicator 2.1.2),

2. The proportion of the population experiencing severe food insecurity.

These data were collected by FAO through the Gallup World Poll. General information on the methodology can be found here: https://www.gallup.com/178667/gallup-world-poll-work.aspx. National institutions can also collect FIES data by including the FIES survey module in nationally representative surveys.

Microdata can be used to calculate the indicator 2.1.2 at national level. Instructions for computing this indicator are described in the methodological document available in the documentations tab. Disaggregating results at sub-national level is not encouraged because estimates will suffer from substantial sampling and measurement error.

KIND OF DATA
Sample survey data [ssd]

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
Individuals

Scope

NOTES
This dataset contains demographic variables related to number of adults and children in the household, age, education, area (urban/rural), gender, and income. Also, the FIES survey module includes the following questions to compute the FIES-based indicators:

During the last 12 months, was there a time when, because of lack of money or other resources:

1. You were worried you would not have enough food to eat?

2. You were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food?

3. You ate only a few kinds of foods?

4. You had to skip a meal?

5. You ate less than you thought you should?

6. Your household ran out of food?

7. You were hungry but did not eat?

8. You went without eating for a whole day?

The dataset also includes derived variables computed by FAO described in the documentation.

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
SDGs		
Food Access		

KEYWORDS
Food Insecurity, SDG

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
National

UNIVERSE
Individuals of 15 years or older with access to landline and/or mobile phones.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
FAO Statistics Division	FAO

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Office of the Chief Statistician	OCS	FAO	Metadata producer

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
MLT_2020_FIES_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS_v01

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI_MLT_2020_FIES_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS_FAO

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

A simple stratified sample design was used for selection of landline phone samples. Within each explicit stratum (service provider) in the case of landline, sample of specified size was drawn using pure Random Digit Dial (RDD) procedures. Sampling was done independently within each stratum. Mobile phone samples were also stratified by service provider and drawn using pure RDD procedures within each strata. All sampled numbers were pre-screened for working status. For respondents contacted by landline telephone, random respondent selection within the household was performed by asking for the person in the household aged 15 and older who had the next birthday. Respondents contacted by mobile telephone were screened for those aged 15 and older; no additional selection procedure was performed. For the purpose of data collection, the total initial sample was split into random subsamples (replicate samples) and released sequentially based on the progress of interviewing in different strata. The goal was to release an optimum amount of sample each time to achieve a high response rate while completing the targeted number of interviews within the field period.
Exclusions: NA
Design effect: 1.32

Weighting

The sample data was weighted to minimize bias in survey-based estimates. The weighting procedure was formulated based on the sample design and was carried out in multiple stages. A probability weight factor (base weight) was constructed to account for selection of telephone numbers from the respective frames and correct for unequal selection probabilities as a result of selecting one adult in landline households and for dual-users coming from both the landline and mobile frame. At the next step, the base weights were post-stratified to adjust for non-response and to match the weighted sample totals to known target population totals obtained from country level census data.

Questionnaires

No content available

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2020-09-06	2020-10-30	N/A

Data Collection Mode

Computer Assisted Telephone Interview [cati]

Data Processing

Data Editing

Statistical validation assesses the quality of the FIES data collected by testing their consistency with the assumptions of the Rasch model. This analysis involves the interpretation of several statistics that reveal 1) items that do not perform well in a given context, 2) cases with highly erratic response patterns, 3) pairs of items that may be redundant, and 4) the proportion of total variance in the population that is accounted for by the measurement model.

Other Processing

As part of the statistical disclosure control process, values for number of children and number of adults that were 10 or above, were recoded as "10+" and categories for area were combined into "urban/suburbs" and "towns/rural".

Data Appraisal

Estimates of Sampling Error

The margin of error is estimated as 3.6 .This is calculated around a proportion at the 95% confidence level. The maximum margin of error was calculated assuming a reported percentage of 50% and takes into account the design effect.