



Associations between Food Security Status and Diet-Related Outcomes among Students at a Large, Public Midwestern University



Cindy W. Leung, ScD, MPH; Julia A. Wolfson, PhD, MPP; Jacob Lahne, PhD, MS; Mikayla R. Barry, MPH; Nicole Kasper, PhD; Alicia J. Cohen, MD, MSc

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Submitted 20 January 2019
Accepted 25 June 2019

Keywords:

Food insecurity
Dietary intake
Cooking and food agency
Body mass index
College students

2212-2672/Copyright © 2019 by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2019.06.251>

ABSTRACT

Background Food insecurity is a growing issue of concern on college campuses. While many studies have focused on predictors of food insecurity, fewer studies have examined how food insecurity affects diet and diet-related outcomes among college students.

Objective The objective of this study was to examine differences in dietary intake, food and cooking agency, and body mass index (calculated as kg/m²) by food security status in a sample of college students at a large, public midwestern university.

Design We conducted a cross-sectional online survey administered from March to June 2018.

Participants Students were recruited from a random sample (n=2,000) provided by the university, which included an oversample of minority racial/ethnic students from lower-income households and first-generation students. The response rate was 43% (n=851). After excluding students with missing data, the final sample was 754 enrolled students.

Main outcome measures Food security status was measured using the US Adult Food Security Survey Module. Dietary intake was assessed using the National Cancer Institute dietary screener questionnaire. Cooking and food agency was measured using the Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale, a new validated questionnaire. Body mass index was calculated from self-reported height and weight.

Statistical analysis performed Differences between food security categories and diet-related outcomes were examined using generalized linear models. Models adjusted for sociodemographic covariates, such as student's age, sex, race/ethnicity, and receipt of financial aid.

Results Compared to students with high food security, low food security was associated with lower intake of fruits, and very low food security was associated with higher intakes of total added sugar and added sugar from sugar-sweetened beverages. Marginal and very low food security were positively associated with body mass index. Marginal, low, and very low food security were inversely associated with cooking and food agency.

Conclusions Students with food insecurity experience diet-related challenges that could translate into health disparities over time. More research is needed to understand the longitudinal effects of food insecurity on student health and well being.

J Acad Nutr Diet. 2019;119(10):1623-1631.

The Continuing Professional Education (CPE) quiz for this article is available for free to Academy members through the MyCDRGo app (available for iOS and Android devices) and through www.jandonline.org (click on "CPE" in the menu and then "Academy Journal CPE Articles"). Log in with your Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics or Commission on Dietetic Registration username and password, click "Journal Article Quiz" on the next page, then click the "Additional Journal CPE quizzes" button to view a list of available quizzes. Non-members may take CPE quizzes by sending a request to journal@eatright.org. There is a fee of \$45 per quiz (includes quiz and copy of article) for non-member Journal CPE. CPE quizzes are valid for 1 year after the issue date in which the articles are published.

FOOD INSECURITY, A CONDITION OF LIMITED OR UNCERTAIN access to nutritious food, is a critical socioeconomic issue that can lead to health disparities across the life course.¹ In 2017, 11.8% of US households were food insecure.² However, recent studies have demonstrated levels of food insecurity on college campuses three to four times higher than the general population.^{3,4} Because college represents a unique period when young adults attempt to gain upward economic and social mobility, food insecurity on college campuses is an alarming academic and health issue.

To date, much of the research on food insecurity among college students has focused on the prevalence and risk factors for food insecurity.³ A report across 66 institutions from the Wisconsin HOPE Lab estimated that almost half of students across all institutions were not able to afford balanced meals, and 25% to 31% of students skipped meals due to financial constraints.⁴ In another report on food insecurity across the 10 University of California campuses, food insecurity was more common among students from underrepresented or disadvantaged backgrounds, including students of minority race/ethnicity, older age, those who were financially independent from their parents, and students from low-income families.⁵ These studies are important for identifying student groups to target with interventions. However, research is needed to understand how food insecurity is associated with health behaviors and health outcomes, specifically in the college population.

Food insecurity has also been associated with lower academic performance and poorer mental health among college students.⁶⁻¹⁰ Fewer studies have examined associations between food insecurity and dietary intake, even though nutritional inadequacy and disrupted eating patterns are fundamental to the conceptualization of food insecurity.² In previous studies, students experiencing food insecurity had lower intake of fruits and vegetables compared to food-secure students, but associations with other foods or nutrients are unknown.¹¹⁻¹³ Furthermore, only two prior studies assessed dietary intake with a more comprehensive screener, while most studies have relied on self-reported intake of basic food groups. Other studies have examined associations between student food insecurity and diet-related outcomes—such as cooking efficacy and body mass index (BMI; calculated as kg/m^2)—with mixed results.^{7,14-17} Differences in these associations may be attributed to the differential ways in which cooking efficacy is defined, such as the ability to prepare certain types of foods (eg, vegetables), the ability to cook from scratch, or the ability to cook a healthy meal. A new method of examining cooking efficacy is through cooking and food agency, which is based on the intersection of one's abilities, skills, and social structure to provide them the agency or capacity to cook and prepare food.¹⁸ The objectives of this study were to examine differences in dietary intake, food and cooking agency, and BMI by food security status in a sample of college students at a large, public Midwestern university.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Survey Design and Study Population

An online (Qualtrics) survey was sent to a sample of 2,000 students enrolled during the Winter (January to April) 2018 term at the University of Michigan. The student sample was generated by the Office of the Registrar to include undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree students, with an oversample of students of minority race/ethnicity backgrounds, from households with incomes <\$65,000, and first-generation college students. All students received a pre-survey notification e-mail, the survey link, and up to four reminder e-mails. In total, students had 3 weeks to complete the survey. Students were recruited in waves until all 2,000 students were contacted. Data collection occurred from March to June 2018.

RESEARCH SNAPSHOT

Research Question: How do dietary intake, cooking and food agency, and body mass index differ by food security status among college students?

Key Findings: In a diverse sample of 754 college students, very low food security was associated with higher intake of added sugar, higher body mass index, and lower cooking and food agency. Marginal food security was also associated with higher body mass index and lower cooking and food agency. These associations were observed independent of sociodemographic factors.

Overall, 851 students responded, yielding a response rate of 43%. Informed consent was obtained at the beginning of the survey, and a second layer of consent was requested to link their survey responses to student record data from the Office of the Registrar to obtain demographic data. If consent for the latter was not provided, students had the option of self-reporting these variables in the first part of the survey. Among all respondents, 92% consented to link their survey responses to their data from the Office of the Registrar. Students received a \$10 [Amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com) gift card upon completion of the survey. Respondents who had missing data for sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, residency, food security status, or outcomes of the present study were excluded, yielding an analytic sample of 754 students. The study was approved by the Health Sciences and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan.

Food Security Status

Food security status was measured using the 10-item US Adult Food Security Survey Module.¹⁹ Questions are ordered by severity and attribute experiences and behaviors to insufficient resources to acquire food over the past 12 months. Affirmative responses to the 10 items were summed to create a total score. Food security categories were assigned according to US Department of Agriculture guidelines: high food security (score of 0), marginal food security (score of 1 to 2), low food security (score of 3 to 5), and very low food security (score of 6 to 10). Per US Department of Agriculture definitions, high food security refers to individuals who had no issues or anxiety about consistent food access. Marginal food security refers to individuals who may have worried about their food running out, but the quality and quantity of foods consumed was unaffected. Low food security refers to individuals who may have reduced the quality or diversity of foods consumed, but the quantity of foods consumed was unaffected. Very low food security refers to individuals whose quality, quantity, and diversity of foods consumed were disrupted due to insufficient resources. Food insecurity is used to refer to both categories of low and very low food security.

Outcomes

The three primary outcomes of interest were dietary intake, food and cooking agency, and BMI.

Dietary intake was assessed using the National Cancer Institute dietary screener questionnaire.²⁰ The National

Cancer Institute screener is composed of 26 questions pertaining to how frequently specific foods and beverages were consumed during the past month. Predicted intakes of food groups and nutrients were estimated using publicly available scoring algorithms, which were developed from nationally representative dietary data and account for the participant's age and sex.²⁰ The dietary outcomes for analysis were intakes of fruits (in cup equivalents), vegetables (in cup equivalents), dairy (in cup equivalents), whole grains (in ounce equivalents), added sugars (in teaspoon equivalents), calcium (in milligrams), and fiber (in grams). Cooking and food agency was measured using the Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale (CAFPAS).¹⁸ CAFPAS is a 28-item scale that measures cooking and food agency through various statements about cooking and food provisions. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The measure can be divided onto three subscales: food self-efficacy (perception of cooking skills and food procurement, 13 items; Cronbach's $\alpha=.92$), food attitudes (attitudes toward food and cooking, 10 items; Cronbach's $\alpha=.62$), and structure (barriers to cooking and food preparation, 6 items; Cronbach's $\alpha=.77$). An additional question, "My school responsibilities prevent me from having time to prepare meals," was added to the structure subscale. The scores of each subscale were standardized to facilitate comparison across subscales. The overall CAFPAS score (Cronbach's $\alpha=.87$) represents the sum of the three standardized subscales, and a higher score is indicative of greater cooking and food agency. BMI was calculated from self-reported height and weight.

Statistical Analysis

Post-stratification weights were constructed to account for non-response and unequal representation by certain demographic groups among the survey respondents. Weights were constructed from all possible combinations of sex (male, female), race/ethnicity (white, black, Asian, Hispanic, other), residency (in state, out of state), and degree type (undergraduate, graduate/professional) using data from the Office of the Registrar on student enrollment in the Winter 2018 term. These weights were applied to all subsequent analyses to generate results that were representative of the university student body ($n=36,208$).

Sociodemographic characteristics of students by food security categories were compared using χ^2 tests for categorical variables and univariate regression for continuous variables. Next, we compared dietary intake by food security categories using generalized linear models with a gamma distribution and log-link function to account for the skewed distributions of most dietary variables.²¹ Relative differences are interpreted as the percentage difference between groups. To examine associations with cooking and food agency and BMI, multivariable-adjusted least squares means were estimated using generalized linear models with cooking and food agency or BMI as the outcomes and food security categories as the predictors. Adjustments for multiple comparisons were performed using the Tukey-Kramer method. Covariates in all models included student's age, sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, first-generation student status, and receipt of financial aid, and were hypothesized to be potential confounders of the relationships between food security status and diet-related outcomes.

All statistical tests were two-sided and significance was considered at the $P<0.05$ level. Statistical analyses were performed in SAS, version 9.4.²²

RESULTS

According to US Department of Agriculture categories for food security, 52.3% of students had high food security, 16.6% had marginal food security, 15.8% had low food security, and 15.3% had very low food security. Sociodemographic characteristics of students by food security status are shown in Table 1. Combined levels of marginal, low, and very low food security were higher among females, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and other race/ethnicity or multiracial students, first-generation college students, and students who received financial aid.

Among all students, mean intakes of whole grains, fruits, and vegetables were low, while mean intakes of added sugar were high (Table 2). After adjustment for sociodemographic variables and multiple comparisons, there were significant differences in dietary intake by food security status. Students with very low food security had 9% lower intake of whole grains (95% CI -17% to 0%), 9% lower intake of fruits (95% CI -17% to -1%), 3% lower intake of fiber (95% CI -7% to -0%), 8% higher intake of total added sugar (95% CI 2% to 14%), and 21% higher intake of added sugar from sugar-sweetened beverages (95% CI 12% to 30%) compared to students with high food security. Differences in total added sugar and added sugar from sugar-sweetened beverages remained significant after adjustment for multiple comparisons. Similarly, students with low food security had 17% lower intake of fruits (95% CI -24% to -10%), 5% lower intake of vegetables (95% CI -9% to -0%), and 4% lower intake of calcium (95% CI -7% to -1%) compared to students with high food security. After adjustment for multiple comparisons, fruit intake was significantly lower among students with low food security compared to marginal food security, though other associations were attenuated. Compared to students with high food security, students with marginal food security had 5% higher intakes of total added sugar (95% CI 0% to 11%) and 10% higher intake of added sugar from sugar-sweetened beverages (95% CI 2% to 18%); however, these associations were attenuated after adjustment for multiple comparisons.

In the total sample, the mean BMI was 24.2 (standard error [SE]=0.2) and the mean CAFPAS score was 15.8 (SE=0.07). Multivariate-adjusted least square mean CAFPAS and BMI scores are shown in Table 3. Compared to high food security, the differences in mean BMI between marginal and very low food security were $+2.3$ (SE=0.5; $P<0.001$) and $+2.6$ (SE=0.5; $P<0.001$), respectively. Marginal, low, and very low food security were also associated with lower CAFPAS scores (ie, lower cooking and food agency). Compared to high food security, CAFPAS scores were 0.8 points lower among students with marginal food security, 1.5 points lower for low food security, and 1.1 points lower for very low food security. When looking at the CAFPAS subscales individually, differences were observed on the food self-efficacy subscale (high vs marginal food security difference: -0.3 [SE=0.1]; $P=0.02$), food attitudes subscale (high vs low food security difference: -0.5 [SE=0.1]; $P<0.001$; marginal vs low food security difference: -0.5 [SE=0.1]; $P=0.0002$), and the structure subscale (high vs marginal food security difference: -0.6 [SE=0.1];

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of students by food security status among college students at a large public university (n=754)

Characteristic	Food Security Status					P value
	Total	High (52.3%)	Marginal (16.6%)	Low (15.8%)	Very low (15.3%)	
	←—————mean (standard error)—————→					
Age, y	22.4 (0.1)	22.5 (0.2)	22.4 (0.3)	22.2 (0.2)	22.7 (0.4)	0.72
	←—————n (%)—————→					
Sex						<0.001
Male	265 (47.7)	144 (54.3)	44 (12.8)	41 (15.1)	36 (17.8)	
Female	489 (52.3)	224 (50.5)	91 (20.1)	92 (16.4)	82 (13.0)	
Race/ethnicity						<0.001
White	214 (60.6)	98 (51.1)	43 (16.3)	39 (15.8)	34 (16.8)	
Black	90 (5.6)	32 (41.7)	12 (12.2)	16 (15.4)	30 (30.7)	
Hispanic	143 (3.4)	60 (46.0)	29 (20.3)	24 (12.7)	30 (21.0)	
Asian	247 (25.0)	148 (59.5)	37 (15.2)	46 (16.4)	16 (8.9)	
Other/multiracial	60 (5.4)	30 (47.4)	14 (29.0)	8 (14.9)	8 (8.6)	
Degree type						<0.001
Undergraduate	693 (73.3)	334 (52.3)	125 (16.6)	126 (16.8)	108 (14.3)	
Graduate	61 (26.8)	34 (52.4)	10 (16.7)	7 (13.0)	10 (18.0)	
First-generation student						<0.001
No	455 (75.1)	235 (54.3)	86 (15.6)	71 (14.4)	63 (15.7)	
Yes	299 (24.9)	133 (46.1)	49 (19.5)	62 (20.1)	55 (14.3)	
Financial aid						<0.001
No	107 (16.8)	71 (64.7)	17 (15.2)	13 (11.6)	6 (8.6)	
Yes	647 (83.2)	297 (49.8)	118 (16.9)	120 (16.6)	112 (16.7)	

$P < 0.0001$; high vs low food security difference: -0.9 [SE=0.1]; $P < 0.001$; high vs very low food security difference: -0.9 [SE=0.1]; $P < 0.0001$; marginal vs low food security difference: -0.3 [SE=0.1]; $P = 0.03$). Results were similar in unweighted analyses (Tables 4 and 5).

DISCUSSION

Food insecurity is a growing concern on college campuses. In the present study of 754 students at a large, public mid-western university, students with low food security had lower mean intakes of fruits, and students with very low food security had higher mean intakes of added sugar from sugar-sweetened beverages, after adjusting for sociodemographic characteristics. These differences in diet by food security categories are consistent with prior studies of college students and the general population.^{11-13,23-25} For example, a study of students at the University of Alberta found that severely food-insecure students had lower intakes of fruits, vegetables, and legumes.¹¹ A prior study at the same institution as the present study found that marginal and low food security were both associated with lower fruit and vegetable consumption among students living off campus without food provision.¹³ Food insecurity was also associated with higher

consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages among lower-income adults in a national sample.²³ Compared to students with high food security, mean BMI was also significantly higher among marginal and very-low-food-secure students, and cooking and food agency scores was significantly lower among marginal-, low-, and very-low-food-secure students.

College students face several challenges to healthy eating, including learning how to cook and acquire food, wanting to eat out with peers, balancing the cost of school and other financial obligations, and navigating a new food environment. Food insecurity can exacerbate these existing challenges, making it even more difficult for students to maintain proper nutrition while balancing their academic responsibilities.¹⁴ In the present study, when compared to high-food-secure students, marginal-, low-, and very-low-food-secure students all had lower scores on the CAFPAS structure subscale, which includes items like not having enough time to plan or prepare meals and that responsibilities for family, social life, school, and work affect their ability to prepare meals.¹⁸ Furthermore, marginal-food-secure students reported lower food self-efficacy and low-food-secure students had more negative attitudes around cooking and food preparation. These findings are similar to a prior study by Knol and colleagues¹⁵ that found very-low-

Table 2. Multivariable-adjusted relative differences in dietary intake^a as measured by the dietary screener questionnaire, by food security status among college students (n=754)

Variable	Total, mean (SE ^b)	Food Security Status											
		High			Marginal			Low			Very Low		
		Mean (SE)	RD ^c	95% CI	Mean (SE)	RD	95% CI	Mean (SE)	RD	95% CI	Mean (SE)	RD	95% CI
Whole grains ^d	0.77 (0.02)	0.77 (0.02)	ref	—	0.80 (0.04)	1.08	0.99 to 1.19	0.78 (0.05)	1.02	0.93 to 1.12	0.70 (0.03)	0.91 ^e	0.83 to 1.00
Fruits ^f	0.89 (0.02)	0.94 (0.02)	ref	—	0.94 (0.04)	1.03	0.94 to 1.11	0.77 (0.03)	0.83 ^{e,g}	0.76 to 0.90	0.86 (0.04)	0.91	0.83 to 0.99
Vegetables ^f	1.41 (0.01)	1.43 (0.02)	ref	—	0.94 (0.04)	1.03	0.99 to 1.08	1.34 (0.03)	0.95 ^e	0.91 to 1.00	1.41 (0.03)	0.99	0.94 to 1.03
Dairy ^f	1.62 (0.02)	1.64 (0.03)	ref	—	1.62 (0.05)	1.02	0.96 to 1.08	1.52 (0.05)	0.94	0.89 to 1.00	1.68 (0.07)	1.00	0.94 to 1.06
Added sugar ^h	15.0 (0.17)	14.8 (0.24)	ref	—	15.1 (0.34)	1.05	1.00 to 1.11	14.6 (0.50)	1.00	0.95 to 1.05	16.1 (0.46)	1.08 ^g	1.02 to 1.14
Added sugar from SSBs ^{hi}	6.1 (0.11)	5.9 (0.16)	ref	—	6.0 (0.20)	1.10	1.02 to 1.18	5.9 (0.32)	1.02	0.95 to 1.10	7.2 (0.33)	1.21 ^{gj}	1.12 to 1.30
Calcium (mg)	997 (7.7)	1,007 (10.6)	ref	—	996 (20.1)	1.02	0.99 to 1.05	954 (18.1)	0.96 ^e	0.93 to 0.99	1023 (23.2)	0.99	0.96 to 1.03
Fiber (g)	16.5 (0.12)	16.6 (0.18)	ref	—	16.6 (0.27)	1.02	0.99 to 1.06	16.1 (0.30)	0.98	0.95 to 1.02	16.2 (0.29)	0.97	0.93 to 1.00

^aAdjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, first-generation college student, and financial aid.^bSE=standard error.^cRD=relative difference. RDs are interpreted as the percentage difference between each group and the reference group (ie, high food security).^dUnits are ounce equivalents.^eSignificantly different from marginal food security after Tukey-Kramer adjustment for multiple comparisons.^fUnits are cup equivalents.^gSignificantly different from high food security after Tukey-Kramer adjustment for multiple comparisons.^hUnits are teaspoon equivalents.ⁱSSB=sugar-sweetened beverage.^jSignificantly different from low food security after Tukey-Kramer adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Table 3. Multivariable-adjusted least squares means^a (standard errors) of body mass index and Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale scores by food security status among college students (n=754)

Variable	Total	Food Security Status			
		High	Marginal	Low	Very low
		←—————mean (standard error)—————→			
Body mass index	24.2 (0.2)	23.5 (0.4)	25.8 (0.5) ^b	24.7 (0.5)	26.1 (0.5) ^b
Cooking and food agency ^c	15.8 (0.07)	16.4 (0.1)	15.6 (0.2) ^b	14.9 (0.2) ^{bd}	15.2 (0.2) ^b
Food self-efficacy subscale	4.5 (0.04)	4.5 (0.1)	4.2 (0.1) ^b	4.4 (0.1)	4.4 (0.1)
Food attitudes subscale	7.5 (0.04)	7.7 (0.1)	7.8 (0.1)	7.2 (0.1) ^{bd}	7.5 (0.1)
Structure subscale	3.8 (0.04)	4.2 (0.1)	3.6 (0.1) ^b	3.3 (0.1) ^{bd}	3.3 (0.1) ^b

^aAdjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, first-generation college student, and financial aid.

^bSignificantly different from high food security.

^cMeasured using the Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale, where a higher score indicates higher cooking and food agency.

^dSignificantly different from marginal food security.

food-secure students had lower cooking self-efficacy and food preparation scores than food-insecure students, using the seven-item Food Preparation and Purchasing Behaviors Questionnaire. Together, these studies present initial evidence that food-insecure college students face additional barriers to healthy eating concerning nutrition knowledge, perceived efficacy, and attitudes toward cooking and food preparation. In addition to having limited financial resources and exposure to an unfamiliar food environment, this combination of factors could explain the observed associations between food-security categories and dietary intake.

Although we found a positive association between food insecurity and BMI in the present study, this association has not been consistent in prior research. Several studies have noted higher mean BMI or higher prevalence of overweight/obesity when comparing food-insecure to food-secure students; however, these differences disappeared after statistical

adjustment or no statistical adjustment was performed.^{7,17,26} In one study at a Malaysian university, food insecurity was positively associated with the fat mass index, but no associations were observed with the other anthropometric measures.²⁷ Prior studies that examined traditional BMI categories rather than continuous BMI may have missed this association, given that college students may be less likely to be overweight or obese compared to the general population. While the differences in mean dietary intake and BMI may not appear large or result in clinically significant health differences during the college years, the fact that these disparities are already apparent in young adulthood could hold important implications for weight-related health in later life.²⁸ Cross-sectional studies have found that food insecurity is associated with obesity and higher burden of chronic disease in non-college adult populations.²⁹⁻³⁴ In a prospective analysis, moderate weight gain of 2.5 to 10 kg during

Table 4. Unweighted multivariate-adjusted relative differences in dietary intake^a as measured by the dietary screener questionnaire, by food security status among college students (n=754)

Variable	Food Security Status							
	High		Marginal		Low		Very Low	
	RD ^b	95% CI	RD	95% CI	RD	95% CI	RD	95% CI
Whole grains (oz eq)	ref	—	1.01	0.93 to 1.10	0.99	0.91 to 1.08	1.01	0.92 to 1.10
Fruits (cup eq)	ref	—	0.99	0.92 to 1.08	0.82 ^{cd}	0.76 to 0.89	0.82 ^{cd}	0.75 to 0.89
Vegetables (cup eq)	ref	—	1.00	0.95 to 1.04	0.95	0.91 to 1.00	0.94	0.90 to 0.99
Dairy (cup eq)	ref	—	0.98	0.92 to 1.03	0.96	0.90 to 1.01	1.02	0.96 to 1.08
Added sugar (tsp eq)	ref	—	1.01	0.96 to 1.06	0.99	0.95 to 1.04	1.03	0.98 to 1.09
Added sugar from SSBs (tsp eq)	ref	—	1.01	0.94 to 1.09	1.01	0.94 to 1.09	1.12 ^c	1.03 to 1.22
Calcium (mg)	ref	—	0.99	0.97 to 1.02	0.97	0.94 to 1.00	0.99	0.96 to 1.02
Fiber (g)	ref	—	1.01	0.98 to 1.04	0.97	0.94 to 1.00	0.97	0.94 to 1.00

^aAdjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, first-generation college student, and financial aid.

^bRD=relative difference. RDs are interpreted as the percentage difference between each group and the reference group (ie, high food security).

^cSignificantly different from high food security after Tukey-Kramer adjustment for multiple comparisons.

^dSignificantly different from marginal food security after Tukey-Kramer adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Table 5. Unweighted multivariable-adjusted least squares means^a (standard errors) of body mass index and Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale scores by food security status among college students (n=754)

Variable	Total	Food Security Status			
		High	Marginal	Low	Very low
		← mean (standard error) →			
Body mass index	24.2 (0.2)	23.4 (0.3)	25.1 (0.4) ^b	24.3 (0.4)	24.4 (0.5)
Cooking and food agency ^c	15.7 (0.1)	16.3 (0.1)	15.4 (0.2) ^b	15.2 (0.2) ^b	15.2 (0.2) ^b
Food self-efficacy subscale	4.4 (0.03)	4.5 (0.1)	4.1 (0.1) ^b	4.2 (0.1)	4.2 (0.1)
Food attitudes subscale	7.6 (0.03)	7.7 (0.1)	7.6 (0.1)	7.5 (0.1)	7.6 (0.1)
Structure subscale	3.8 (0.04)	4.1 (0.1)	3.7 (0.1) ^b	3.5 (0.1) ^b	3.4 (0.1) ^{bd}

^aAdjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, first-generation college student, and financial aid.

^bSignificantly different from high food security.

^cMeasured using the Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale, where a higher score indicates higher cooking and food agency.

^dSignificantly different from marginal food security.

adulthood was associated with increased incidence of type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obesity-related cancer, and mortality in later life.³⁵

To address the dual burden of food security and inadequate nutrition, one strategy that universities have employed is to open on-campus food pantries to help ensure nutritious food access, and a space to provide nutrition education, cooking lessons, and connections to other social services. While food pantries are not a perfect solution to campus food insecurity, they can act as a first step in recognizing the existence of food insecurity among students.³⁶ At the present time, more research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of food pantries in alleviating food insecurity and diet-related health disparities, as well as whether food pantry use may result in additional anxiety, stigma, or other unintended consequences among college students.³⁷

This study has some limitations. First, the data are cross-sectional, making it difficult to determine the temporality of some of the associations studied. For example, food and cooking agency could be a predictor of food insecurity if students with lower food agency spend more money on prepared meals, leading to a faster depletion of their food budget. Food and cooking agency is a relatively novel concept in the nutrition literature and more research is needed to understand how this measure performs in a college population, with particular respect to food attitudes. Second, dietary intake was assessed using a screener that focused primarily on whole grains, fruits, vegetables, and a few nutrients. Although this screener has been validated, it does not capture overall dietary quality, total energy intake, macronutrient composition, or meal patterns, which could also vary by food-security status. Measurement error may also result from social desirability bias, because college students may be savvy about which foods are perceived as healthy or unhealthy. Similarly, BMI was estimated from self-reported height and weight, which may have lowered the precision in the observed associations. However, prior studies have established the reliability and validity of self-reported height and weight data among adolescents³⁸⁻⁴¹ and college students.⁴²⁻⁴⁴ These studies conclude that while measurement error does exist, the discrepancy is not substantial and self-reported height and weight remains an economical method of

obtaining these data from college students. Future studies may want to consider measuring height, weight, and other anthropometric measurements to reduce this bias. Another limitation is that the time frame in which food security was assessed was over the past 12 months, while outcomes were measured at the time of the survey. Food security can vary over the semester, month, or season, and may have resulted in exposure misclassification. More rigorous studies of college food insecurity are needed that can better address these limitations, including longitudinal studies with repeated measures of current food security, socioeconomic factors, dietary intake, and health behaviors, to better understand the complex nature of these associations. Finally, the response rate of the present study was 43%. Although this response is higher than other studies of student food insecurity,^{4,5,45} and the student population was weighted based on sex, race/ethnicity, degree type, and residency, there is still the potential for non-generalizability and non-response bias if students who did not respond to our survey differed from survey respondents in other meaningful characteristics, such as parental income or socioeconomic status. Additional research is needed at similar institutions to better understand the internal and external validity of the study's findings.

CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, college food insecurity was associated with aspects of lower dietary quality, greater perceived barriers to cooking and food preparation, and higher BMI, which may have lifelong implications for health and well being. Although further research is needed to understand the long-term health and academic consequences of experiencing food insecurity during college, the high prevalence of food insecurity across diverse institutions of higher learning should compel campus administrators to find sustainable solutions that ensure the availability of affordable, nutritious foods in order to promote food security and healthful eating habits for all college students.

References

1. Cook JT, Frank DA. Food security, poverty, and human development in the United States. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2008;1136:193-209.

2. Coleman-Jensen A, Rabbitt MP, Gregory CA, Singh A. *Household Food Security in the United States in 2017*. ERR-256. Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service; 2018.
3. Bruening M, Argo K, Payne-Sturges D, Laska MN. The struggle is real: A systematic review of food insecurity on postsecondary education campuses. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2017;117(11):1767-1791.
4. Goldrick-Rab S, Richardson J, Schneider JA, Hernandez A, Cady C. Wisconsin HOPE Lab. Still Hungry and Homeless in College. <https://hope4college.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Wisconsin-HOPE-Lab-Still-Hungry-and-Homeless.pdf>. Published April 2018. Accessed July 2, 2019.
5. Global Food Initiative: Food and Housing Security at the University of California. University of California Office of the President. https://www.ucop.edu/global-food-initiative/_files/food-housing-security.pdf. Published December 2017. Accessed July 2, 2019.
6. Martinez SM, Frongillo EA, Leung C, Ritchie L. No food for thought: Food insecurity is related to poor mental health and lower academic performance among students in California's public university system [published online ahead of print June 1, 2018]. *J Health Psychol*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105318783028>.
7. Bruening M, van Woerden I, Todd M, Laska MN. Hungry to learn: The prevalence and effects of food insecurity on health behaviors and outcomes over time among a diverse sample of university freshmen. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2018;15(1):9.
8. Payne-Sturges DC, Tjaden A, Caldeira KM, Vincent KB, Arria AM. Student hunger on campus: Food insecurity among college students and implications for academic institutions. *Am J Health Promot*. 2018;32(2):349-354.
9. Maroto ME, Snelling A, Linck H. Food insecurity among community college students: Prevalence and association with grade point average. *Comm Coll J Res Pract*. 2014;39.
10. Silva MR, Kleinert WL, Sheppard AV, et al. The relationship between food security, housing stability, and school performance among college students in an urban university. *J Coll Stud Ret*. 2017;19:284-299.
11. Farahbakhsh J, Hanbazaza M, Ball GD, Farmer AP, Maximova K, Willows ND. Food insecure student clients of a university-based food bank have compromised health, dietary intake and academic quality. *Nutr Diet*. 2017;74(1):67-73.
12. Gallegos D, Ramsey R, Ong KW. Food insecurity: Is it an issue among tertiary students? *High Educ*. 2014;67:497-510.
13. Mirabitur E, Peterson KE, Rathz C, Matlen S, Kasper N. Predictors of college-student food security and fruit and vegetable intake differ by housing type. *J Am Coll Health*. 2016;64(7):555-564.
14. Gaines A, Robb CA, Knol LL, Sickler S. Examining the role of financial factors, resources and skills in predicting food security status among college students. *Int J Consum Stud*. 2014;38:374-384.
15. Knol LL, Robb CA, McKinley EM, Wood M. Very low food security status is related to lower cooking self-efficacy and less frequent food preparation behaviors among college students. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2019;51(3):357-363.
16. Bruening M, Brennhof S, van Woerden I, Todd M, Laska M. Factors related to the high rates of food insecurity among diverse, urban college freshmen. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2016;116(9):1450-1457.
17. McArthur LH, Fasczewski KS, Wartinger E, Miller J. Freshmen at a university in Appalachia experience a higher rate of campus than family food insecurity. *J Community Health*. 2018;43(5):969-976.
18. Lahne J, Wolfson JA, Trubek A. Development of the Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale (CAFPAS): A new measurement tool for individual cooking practice. *Food Qual Prefer*. 2017;62:96-105.
19. *US Adult Food Security Survey Module. Three-Stage Design, with Screeners*. Washington, DC: Economic Research Service, US Department of Agriculture; 2012.
20. *Dietary Screener Questionnaire (DSQ) in the NHANES 2009-10*. Washington, DC: Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, Division of Cancer Control & Population Sciences, National Cancer Institute; 2018.
21. McCullagh P, Nelder JA. *Generalized Linear Models*. 2nd ed. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 1989.
22. SAS [computer program]. Version 9.4. Cary, NC: SAS Institute; 2013.
23. Leung CW, Epel ES, Ritchie LD, Crawford PB, Laraia BA. Food insecurity is inversely associated with diet quality of lower-income adults. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2014;114(12):1943-1953 e1942.
24. Cunningham TJ, Barradas DT, Rosenberg KD, May AL, Kroelinger CD, Ahluwalia IB. Is maternal food security a predictor of food and drink intake among toddlers in Oregon? *Matern Child Health J*. 2012;16(suppl 2):339-346.
25. Theodoridis X, Grammatikopoulou MG, Gkiouras K, et al. Food insecurity and Mediterranean diet adherence among Greek university students. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2018;28(5):477-485.
26. Kassier S, Veldman F. Food security status and academic performance of students on financial aid: The case of University of KwaZulu-Natal. *Alternation*; 2014:248-264.
27. Nur Atiqah A, Norazmir MN, Khairil Anuar MI, Mohd Fahmi M, Norazlan Shah H. Food security status: It's association with inflammatory marker and lipid profile among young adult. *Int Food Res J*. 2015;22:1855-1863.
28. Owen CG, Kapetanakis VV, Rudnicka AR, et al. Body mass index in early and middle adult life: Prospective associations with myocardial infarction, stroke and diabetes over a 30-year period: The British Regional Heart Study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(9):e008105.
29. Seligman HK, Laraia BA, Kushel MB. Food insecurity is associated with chronic disease among low-income NHANES participants. *J Nutr*. 2010;140(2):304-310.
30. Gregory CA, Coleman-Jensen A. *Food Insecurity, Chronic Disease, and Health Among Working-Age Adults*. ERR-235. Washington, DC: Economic Research Service, US Department of Agriculture; 2017.
31. Leung C, Tester J, Laraia B. Household food insecurity and ideal cardiovascular health factors in US adults. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017;177(5):730-732.
32. Pan L, Sherry B, Njai R, Blanck HM. Food insecurity is associated with obesity among US adults in 12 states. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2012;112(9):1403-1409.
33. Saiz AM Jr, Aul AM, Malecki KM, et al. Food insecurity and cardiovascular health: Findings from a statewide population health survey in Wisconsin. *Prev Med*. 2016;93:1-6.
34. Laraia B. Food insecurity and chronic disease. *Adv Nutr*. 2013;4:203-212.
35. Zheng Y, Manson JE, Yuan C, et al. Associations of weight gain from early to middle adulthood with major health outcomes later in life. *JAMA*. 2017;318(3):255-269.
36. Goldrick-Rab S, Cady C, Coca V. *Campus Food Pantries: Insights from a National Survey*. Philadelphia, PA: The Hope Center, Temple University; 2018.
37. Fram MS, Frongillo EA. Backpack programs and the crisis narrative of child hunger—A critical review of the rationale, targeting, and potential benefits and harms of an expanding but untested model of practice. *Adv Nutr*. 2018;9(1):1-8.
38. Himes JH, Hannan P, Wall M, Neumark-Sztainer D. Factors associated with errors in self-reports of stature, weight, and body mass index in Minnesota adolescents. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2005;15(4):272-278.
39. Field AE, Aneja P, Rosner B. The validity of self-reported weight change among adolescents and young adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2007;15(9):2357-2364.
40. Kee CC, Lim KH, Sumarni MG, et al. Validity of self-reported weight and height: A cross-sectional study among Malaysian adolescents. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017;17(1):85.
41. Brener ND, McManus T, Galuska DA, Lowry R, Wechsler H. Reliability and validity of self-reported height and weight among high school students. *J Adolesc Health*. 2003;32(4):281-287.
42. Lim LL, Seubsman SA, Sleigh A. Validity of self-reported weight, height, and body mass index among university students in Thailand: Implications for population studies of obesity in developing countries. *Popul Health Metr*. 2009;7:15.
43. Gunnare NA, Silliman K, Morris MN. Accuracy of self-reported weight and role of gender, body mass index, weight satisfaction, weighing behavior, and physical activity among rural college students. *Body Image*. 2013;10:406-410.
44. Olfert MD, Barr ML, Charlier CM, et al. Self-reported vs. measured height, weight, and BMI in young adults. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(10):E2216. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15102216>.
45. Patton-Lopez MM, Lopez-Cevallos DF, Cancel-Tirado DI, Vazquez L. Prevalence and correlates of food insecurity among students attending a midsize rural university in Oregon. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2014;46(3):209-214.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

C. W. Leung is an assistant professor, M. R. Barry is a doctoral student, and N. Kasper is a postdoctoral scholar, Department of Nutritional Sciences, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor. J. A. Wolfson is an assistant professor, Department of Nutritional Sciences and Department of Health Management and Policy, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor. J. Lahne is an assistant professor, Department of Food Science and Technology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg. A. J. Cohen is a research investigator, Providence VA Medical Center, and an assistant professor, Department of Family Medicine, Warren Alpert Medical School and Department of Health Services, Policy, and Practice, School of Public Health, Brown University, Providence, RI.

Address correspondence to: Cindy W. Leung, ScD, MPH, Department of Nutritional Sciences, University of Michigan School of Public Health, 1415 Washington Heights, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2029. E-mail: cindyleung@post.harvard.edu

STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

FUNDING/SUPPORT

This study was supported by a grant from Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan. Dr Leung was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (4R00HD084758).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge Sara Farooqui for assistance with data collection, and the study participants for their participation in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

C. W. Leung contributed in formulating the research question, designing the study, collecting and analyzing the data, and writing the first draft of the manuscript. J. A. Wolfson and J. Lahne contributed to the interpretation of the results and critically revising the manuscript. M. R. Barry contributed to the literature review and critically revising the manuscript. N. Kasper and A. J. Cohen contributed to formulating the research question, designing the study, and critically revising the manuscript. All authors reviewed and commented on subsequent drafts of the manuscript.