

A Multi-Site Analysis of the Prevalence of Food Security in the United States, before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Authors and Institutions:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Meredith T. Niles | University of Vermont |
| Alyssa W Beavers | Wayne State University |
| Lauren A. Clay | D'Youville College |
| Marcelle M. Dougan | San José State University |
| Giselle A. Pignotti | San José State University |
| Stephanie Rogus | New Mexico State University |
| Mateja R. Savoie-Roskos | Utah State University |
| Rachel E. Schattman | University of Maine, Orono |
| Rachel M. Zack | The Greater Boston Food Bank |
| Francesco Acciai | Arizona State University |
| Deanne Allegro | Auburn University at Montgomery |
| Emily H. Belarmino | University of Vermont |
| Farryl Bertmann | University of Vermont |
| Erin Biehl | Johns Hopkins University |
| Nick Birk | The Greater Boston Food Bank |
| Jessica Bishop-Royse | DePaul University |
| Christine Bozlak | University at Albany- State University of New York |
| Brianna Bradley | Johns Hopkins University |
| Barrett P. Brenton | Binghamton University |
| James Buszkiewicz | University of Washington |
| Brittney N. Cavaliere | Connecticut Food Bank/Foodshare |
| Young Cho | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Eric M. Clark | University of Vermont |
| Kathryn Coakley | University of New Mexico |
| Jeanne Coffin-Schmitt | Cornell University |
| Sarah M. Collier | University of Washington |
| Casey Coombs | Utah State University |
| Anne Dressel | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Adam Drewnowski | University of Washington |
| Tom Evans | University of Arizona |
| Beth J Feingold | University at Albany- State University of New York |
| Lauren Fiechtner | MassGeneral Hospital for Children |
| Kathryn J. Fiorella | Cornell University |
| Katie Funderburk | Auburn University |
| Preety Gadhoke | St. John's University (at the time of study administration) |
| Diana Gonzales-Pacheco | University of New Mexico |
| Amelia Greiner Safi | Cornell University |
| Sen Gu | St. John's University |
| Karla L. Hanson | Cornell University |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Amy Harley | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Kaitlyn Harper | Johns Hopkins University |
| Akiko S. Hosler | University at Albany- State University of New York |
| Alan Ismach | University of Washington |
| Anna Josephson | University of Arizona |
| Linnea Laestadius | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Heidi LeBlanc | Utah State University |
| Laura R. Lewis | Washington State University |
| Michelle M Litton | Wayne State University |
| Katie S. Martin | Connecticut Food Bank/Foodshare |
| Shadai Martin | New Mexico State University |
| Sarah Martinelli | Arizona State University |
| John Mazzeo | DePaul University |
| Scott C. Merrill | University of Vermont |
| Roni Neff | Johns Hopkins University |
| Esther Nguyen | University of Washington |
| Punam Ohri-Vachaspati | Arizona State University |
| Abigail Orbe | Connecticut Food Bank/Foodshare |
| Jennifer J. Otten | University of Washington |
| Sondra Parmer | Auburn University |
| Salome Pemberton | Hunter College, City University of New York |
| Zain Al Abdeen Qusair | DePaul University |
| Victoria Rivkina | DePaul University |
| Joelle Robinson | Johns Hopkins University |
| Chelsea M. Rose | University of Washington |
| Saloumeh Sadeghzadeh | Binghamton University |
| Brinda Sivaramakrishnan | Tacoma Community College |
| Mariana Torres Arroyo | University at Albany- State University of New York |
| McKenna Voorhees | Utah State University |
| Kathryn Yerxa | University of Maine, Orono |

1
2 **Abstract**

3 *Background.* The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly affected food systems including food security.
4 Understanding how the COVID-19 pandemic impacted food security is important to provide
5 support, and identify long-term impacts and needs.

6
7 *Objective.* Our team- the National Food Access and COVID research Team (NFACT) was
8 formed to assess food security over different U.S. study sites throughout the pandemic, using
9 common instruments and measurements. Here we present results from 18 study sites across
10 15 states and nationally over the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic.

11
12 *Methods.* A validated survey instrument was developed and implemented in whole or part

13 across the sites throughout the first year of the pandemic, representing 22 separate surveys.
14 Sampling methods for each study site were convenience, representative, or high-risk targeted.
15 Food security was measured using the USDA six-item module. Food security prevalence was
16 analyzed using analysis of variance by sampling method to statistically significant differences.

17
18 *Results.* In total, more than 27,000 people responded to the surveys. We find higher prevalence
19 of food insecurity (low or very low food security) since the COVID-19 pandemic, as compared to
20 before the pandemic. In nearly all study sites, we find higher prevalence of food insecurity
21 among Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC), households with children, and those
22 with job disruptions. We also demonstrate lingering food insecurity, with high or increased
23 prevalence over time in sites with repeat surveys. We find no statistically significant differences
24 between convenience and representative surveys, but statistically higher prevalence of food
25 insecurity among high-risk compared to convenience surveys.

26
27 *Conclusions.* This comprehensive multi-study site effort demonstrates higher prevalence of food
28 insecurity since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, which in multiple survey sites
29 continues throughout the first year of the pandemic. These impacts were prevalent for certain
30 demographic groups, and most pronounced for surveys targeting high-risk populations.

31

32 Keywords: food security, COVID-19, survey sampling, food insecurity, high-risk,

33

34

35 **Introduction**

36 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was declared a pandemic by the World Health
37 Organization in March 2020 (1), with widespread impact across the United States (U.S.) and
38 globally. As of April 12, 2021, the U.S. had over 20% of confirmed cases and about 19% of the
39 COVID-19-related deaths globally (2). Furthermore, COVID-19 was the third leading cause of
40 death in the U.S. in 2020 (3).

41

42 The pandemic caused major disruptions to the U.S. economy, food system, and overall health
43 and wellbeing of Americans. The unemployment rate in the U.S. reached an unprecedented
44 high of 14.8% in April 2020 (4), with job disruptions concentrated in low-paying jobs,
45 disproportionately affecting Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) (5). Although the

46 unemployment rate declined to 6.7% in December 2020, the economic effects of the pandemic
47 are likely to persist for years, consistent with the Great Recession of 2008 (6). The need to
48 social distance and quarantine to contain disease spread led to stockpiling, placing a strain on
49 the food supply chain, which was unable to adequately respond to the pandemic, resulting in
50 food access concerns for many Americans (7). This, in combination with widespread disruption
51 in employment, increased food-related hardship for many Americans, particularly those most
52 vulnerable to economic disruption (8).

53
54 Disasters, like hurricanes, and public health emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic disrupt
55 built and social environments, and their impacts persist long after they occur (9-11). Disasters
56 tend to impact housing stability, household composition, and financial obligations, which can
57 limit resources for food and lead to food-related hardship (12). Groups most vulnerable to
58 disasters were disproportionately affected during the pandemic, including low-income
59 households, single-headed households with children, adults living alone, and Black- and
60 Hispanic-headed households (13-15). The COVID-19 pandemic magnified the health disparities
61 that exist among low-income households, who were already more likely to struggle to meet
62 basic needs (15).

63
64 Food insecurity, or the inability to consistently obtain enough, desirable, varied, and nutritious
65 foods (16), is heightened during disasters and emergencies (17, 18). Emergency nutrition
66 response aims to assist affected individuals; however coordinating enough high-quality food
67 remains a challenge in a post-disaster setting (19, 20). Quickly assessing food insecurity to
68 inform pandemic relief efforts was a challenging task; for instance, the national food insecurity
69 statistics for 2020 from the U.S. Census Bureau, measured using the USDA's Household Food
70 Security Survey Module (HFSS), will not be released until September 2021 (21). As a result,
71 agencies, organizations, and researchers deployed surveys and produced estimates to

72 determine the impact of the pandemic on food insecurity. For example, the U.S. Census
73 Bureau released the Household Pulse Survey that captures food insufficiency and Feeding
74 America released projected food insecurity prevalence for 2020 and 2021 based on changes in
75 unemployment and poverty (21-23). Nationally representative surveys found that food
76 insecurity drastically increased at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, from 11% in 2018 up to
77 38% in March 2020 (24). This is especially high considering the impact of economic downturn
78 during the Great Recession of 2008 when food insecurity peaked at much lower 15% in 2011
79 (13, 25). In addition, households that were food insecure prior to the pandemic were more likely
80 to have their situations exacerbated due to less job flexibility, higher risk of job loss/furlough,
81 and fewer resources/support to allow for complying with social distancing recommendations
82 (15). Although the early months of the pandemic may have been the peak of food insecurity
83 and insufficiency, higher than usual rates have persisted as the COVID-19 pandemic continues
84 (26).

85
86 Despite several early surveys assessing food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic, and
87 continued efforts to measure food insufficiency through the Census Household Pulse Survey,
88 there have been few collaborative efforts to monitor and measure food insecurity across diverse
89 geographic and social contexts, and to compare data. In May 2020, a national collaboration of
90 researchers - The National Food Access and COVID Research Team (NFACT) - was formed to
91 examine COVID-19 impacts on food access, food insecurity, and the overall food system. This
92 study reports the findings of this collaborative effort, with data from 18 study sites including a
93 nationally representative sample, to better understand food insecurity over diverse regions and
94 timeframes. The study examined overall levels of food insecurity, as well as food insecurity
95 among households with children, households that experienced job disruption, and participants
96 identifying as BIPOC. We further assessed how different survey implementation methods

97 associate with different levels of food insecurity, and report results from multiple time points
98 within the same study site, based on data availability.

99

100 **Methods**

101 *Survey Development*

102 A survey instrument, known as the NFACT Survey Version 1.0 (27) was developed in March
103 2020. This survey was developed in consultation with key stakeholders in the state of Vermont,
104 where it was first implemented, and drew from the existing literature on food security and food
105 access. Where possible, validated questions and instruments were used. The survey was
106 piloted in Vermont, with 25 adult residents in late March, and validation methods (e.g. Cronbach
107 alpha, factor analysis) were used to test the internal validity of questions with key constructs
108 ($\alpha > 0.70$) (28). A second version of the survey was released in May 2020 to reflect
109 changes in the COVID-19 context (29) and include new questions. The surveys included
110 questions on food access, food security, food purchasing, food assistance program
111 participation, dietary intake, perceptions of COVID-19, and individual and household
112 sociodemographic characteristics. The questions utilized in this study were included in both
113 surveys and across study sites.

114

115 *NFACT Study Sites and Data Collection*

116 NFACT represents 18 study sites across 15 states, as well as a national sample (Figure 1).
117 NFACT study sites distributed the NFACT surveys (in whole or part) online pursuing one of
118 three sampling strategies: 1) Convenience sampling in partnership with community
119 organizations, stakeholders, social media, and/or news media, which are not representative of a
120 state population (ten sites); 2) Quota sampling using survey panels administered by Qualtrics
121 (Provo, UT), a survey research company, in which the quotas aimed to achieve state
122 representation on some characteristics (e.g. race, ethnicity, income) (eight sites); or 3) Quota or

123 convenience sampling in which certain high-risk populations (e.g. low-income, BIPOC, or
124 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants) were targeted (six sites). In
125 some cases where high-risk populations were targeted, these groups were oversampled to
126 ensure adequate representation in the overall study sample. Table 1 provides specific details
127 about the sampling strategies, target populations, representation of the data, and survey fielding
128 dates. Potential participants under age 18 were excluded across all study sites. All study sites
129 administered the survey in English; in Arizona, California-Bay Area, Maine, Massachusetts,
130 Nationally, NY-Capital Region, New Mexico, and Utah, surveys were also administered in
131 Spanish. IRB approval was obtained by each study site prior to commencing data collection.

132

133 *Measures*

134 Food security was assessed using the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) 6-item
135 Short Form Food Security Survey Module (30) which is designed to identify households with
136 food insecurity. In most sites, participants were asked to complete 6-items about the year
137 before COVID-19 and since the COVID-19 pandemic began in March 2020, though a few sites
138 only asked these questions since the COVID-19 pandemic began. In some more recent
139 surveys (i.e. Massachusetts, NY-Central/Upstate and the second Washington survey) and in
140 Michigan respondents answered questions about food security in the past 30 days, which is
141 validated through the USDA module. Following standard USDA scoring, a score of 2-6 was
142 categorized as food insecure (30). It is important to note that the pre-pandemic food security
143 responses were retrospective, and were answered at the same time as the questions about
144 current food security. Households with children were determined with a question about
145 household composition by age. Households with any members ages 0-17 years were classified
146 as a household with children. Job disruption was assessed by asking participants if their
147 household experienced a job disruption since the start of the pandemic, including job loss,
148 furlough, or loss of hours/income reduction, categories which were not mutually exclusive.

149 Participants indicating any negative job impact were categorized as experiencing a job
150 disruption. BIPOC classification was determined based on survey questions about race and
151 ethnicity. Participants indicating any race or ethnicity besides non-Hispanic White (NHW) were
152 classified as BIPOC. Participants indicating NHW were classified as such and Hispanic of any
153 race were classified as Hispanic.

154

155 *Data aggregation and analysis*

156 Food insecurity prevalence (overall and for specific populations of interest) by study site and
157 survey were aggregated into a single dataset for analysis in Stata 16.0 (31). While we primarily
158 report descriptive statistics of the results across the multiple sites, we also used analysis of
159 variance (ANOVA) with Scheffe multiple comparison tests (32) to assess whether there are
160 statistically significant differences in prevalence of food insecurity (overall and for key sub-
161 populations) between surveys based on the three different sampling techniques (i.e.
162 convenience, representative, and high-risk). We report p values <0.05 as statistically significant
163 in the results.

164

165 **Results**

166 *Respondent Characteristics*

167 The sample included 27,168 adults from across the U.S. with data on food insecurity. The racial
168 and ethnic make-up of the sample overall was 70.0% NHW, and 28.6% BIPOC, with 1.4% of
169 respondents not identifying race or ethnicity. Among BIPOC respondents, 8.0% identified as
170 non-Hispanic Black, 11.9% as Hispanic, and 8.1% other races or multiracial (Table 2). Given
171 the diversity of NFACT study sites, including their sample size and demographic make-up, the
172 number of respondents with demographic characteristics or life experiences (e.g. job disruption
173 or children in the household) varied across study sites. There was a large variation in the
174 proportion of BIPOC respondents across study sites, because of differences in population

175 composition, but also because some study sites oversampled BIPOC respondents. Slightly
176 over 40% of respondents (40.6%) had children in the household, ranging from 19.2% of
177 households in Maine to 85.6% of households in the California, Bay Area. Among all
178 respondents, 35.3% had experienced some type of job disruption since the COVID-19
179 pandemic began, ranging from a low of 10.8% of respondents in a second Washington State
180 survey in early 2021, to 76.5% of respondents in a NY Capital Region survey in January and
181 February 2021. Among representative samples, the range varied from 37.6% in the national
182 sample to 61.3% in the NY- Capital region in October-January.

183

184 *Overall Prevalence of Food Insecurity*

185 We found higher levels of food insecurity reported since the COVID-19 pandemic began, as
186 compared to reported for the pre-COVID-19 pandemic period. This finding was consistent in all
187 20 sites that asked about food insecurity both before and during the COVID-19 pandemic
188 (Figure 2), with the exception of the New Mexico site (where no change was found). The
189 prevalence of food insecurity across study sites during the COVID-19 pandemic ranged from
190 10.8% in a Central/Upstate New York convenience survey from October-December 2020 (which
191 asked about the last 30 days), to 73.9% in a New York City high-risk survey in July/August 2020
192 which oversampled BIPOC, low-income respondents. Among states that represented state
193 characteristics, food insecurity prevalence ranged from 28.8% in Maryland to 36.2% in
194 Wisconsin since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. In sites that gathered data on the time
195 periods both before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, the rate of increase ranged from 0% in
196 New Mexico to a 65% increase among respondents in the California Bay Area. We found that
197 both convenience and representative samples had significantly lower prevalence of food
198 insecurity both before and since the COVID-19 pandemic, as compared to surveys targeting
199 high-risk populations, though the percent change did not significantly differ across survey
200 sample type (Table 3).

201
202 *Prevalence of Food Insecurity Among BIPOC Respondents*
203 In all survey sites that collected data on food insecurity before and during the COVID-19
204 pandemic, we found that food insecurity increased for BIPOC respondents since the onset of
205 the COVID-19 pandemic, with the exception of New Mexico. Furthermore, we found that the
206 prevalence of food insecurity among BIPOC respondents during the COVID-19 pandemic was
207 higher than the overall prevalence of food insecurity in the majority of study sites (Figure 3);
208 however, it is worth noting that this was also true for pre-COVID-19 food insecurity. The highest
209 percent increase in food insecurity was identified in the California Bay Area (54.2% increase in
210 food insecurity among BIPOC respondents). However, the highest prevalence of food insecurity
211 during the COVID-19 pandemic among BIPOC respondents was identified in the NY Capital
212 Region (83.8%). We found the prevalence of BIPOC food insecurity during the COVID-19
213 pandemic was significantly different ($p=0.048$) for convenience (40.2%) versus high-risk (55.1%)
214 survey types.

215
216 Furthermore, we disaggregated race and ethnicity data when a particular survey had at least 30
217 respondents identifying within a specific race or ethnic group (Figure 4). This additional
218 breakdown further highlights disparities in food insecurity across many study sites among
219 BIPOC respondents, as compared to NHW respondents. For example, while the majority of
220 surveys found the prevalence of food insecurity was higher for BIPOC respondents both before
221 and during the COVID-19 pandemic, the opposite is true of NHW respondents (i.e. the majority
222 of surveys found the prevalence of food insecurity among NHW respondents before and during
223 the COVID-19 pandemic was lower than the site's overall food insecurity).

224
225 *Prevalence of Food Insecurity Among Households with Children*

226 In all but one survey (New Mexico) with data on food insecurity before and during the COVID-19
227 pandemic, food insecurity increased among households with children (Figure 5). The highest
228 reported percent change was in Massachusetts (a 62.1% increase), while the overall highest
229 prevalence during the COVID-19 pandemic was 69.3% food insecurity among households with
230 children in a Utah survey focused on SNAP participants. In surveys representative of the state
231 population, the prevalence of food insecurity among households with children ranged from
232 41.7% in Vermont in August/September 2020 to 56% in Arizona. Convenience surveys had
233 statistically lower food insecurity prevalence as compared to high-risk survey populations both
234 before the COVID-19 pandemic ($p=0.042$), and during the COVID-19 pandemic ($p=0.003$)
235 (Table 3).

236

237 *Prevalence of Food Insecurity Among Respondents Experiencing Job Disruption*

238 Food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic was higher in all surveys and study sites among
239 respondents facing a job disruption, as compared to the overall prevalence of food insecurity in
240 those sites (Figure 6). The range of food insecurity among respondents with job disruptions
241 ranged from 21.5% in Central/Upstate New York up to 77.2% in New York City among all
242 surveys. Among surveys with state-wide representative samples on some characteristics, the
243 prevalence of food insecurity for those with job disruptions ranged from 38.7% in Vermont in
244 August/September 2020 to 59.8% in Wisconsin. Convenience surveys had statistically lower
245 food insecurity prevalence as compared to high-risk survey populations for any job disruption
246 ($p=0.003$), job loss ($p=0.003$), and reduction in hours ($p=0.036$) (Table 3).

247

248 **Discussion**

249 In this study, food insecurity was assessed in multiple sites using a common measurement
250 instrument. Key trends in food insecurity were highly consistent among research sites, albeit
251 with some significant differences in magnitude depending on survey type. This study utilized

252 three different sampling methods (representative, convenience, and targeted high-risk
253 populations), allowing us to compare results between both study sites and sampling strategies.
254 Notably, there were no statistically significant differences in our findings between convenience
255 and representative samples, though high risk populations were consistently more likely to report
256 food insecurity than those recruited through convenience samples. Nearly all study sites that
257 assessed both current and pre-COVID-19 food insecurity found a higher prevalence of food
258 insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic as compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic.
259 Furthermore, the majority of surveys and sites found higher prevalence among BIPOC
260 respondents as compared to the overall food insecurity prevalence and that of NHW
261 respondents in the same area. All but one survey found higher prevalence of food insecurity for
262 households with children during the COVID-19 pandemic as compared to the overall food
263 insecurity prevalence in a given site, and all surveys found higher prevalence of food insecurity
264 among respondents reporting job disruptions compared to those with no job disruptions.
265 Importantly, among study sites that conducted repeated surveys, all found continued increase in
266 food insecurity as the pandemic continued, demonstrating the ongoing and escalating effects of
267 the COVID-19 pandemic. Below we further elaborate on three key findings, and discuss their
268 implications for future programming and policy.

269 First, food insecurity increased across nearly all research sites between the pre- and during-
270 pandemic periods. These results are consistent with several other national surveys examining
271 the impact of COVID-19 on food insecurity. For example, data from the Census Household
272 Pulse Survey and the COVID Impact Survey used probability sampling to obtain nationally
273 representative samples. In the COVID Impact Survey, data collected in early April 2020 was
274 extended using models to show that the overall prevalence of food insecurity was more than
275 double the predicted rate (33). These same researchers found similar estimates of food
276 insecurity increases using data from the Census Household Pulse Survey (34). The NFACT

277 survey results support these findings across study sites, where direct data collection has
278 occurred (as opposed to modelled results). Notably, NFACT sites that utilized a representative
279 high-risk sampling approach were more likely than surveys using a convenience or
280 representative sample to document higher prevalence of food insecurity since the onset of the
281 COVID-19 pandemic. These results suggest that targeted oversampling of high-risk populations
282 is likely to detect higher food insecurity outcomes, an important finding for future surveys and
283 methodologies. Furthermore, when assessing overall food insecurity before or during the
284 COVID-19 pandemic there were no statistically significant differences in food insecurity
285 prevalence between convenience and representative sampling approaches. Among all survey
286 approaches there were no significant differences in the percent change of prevalence of food
287 insecurity, suggesting that the rate of change was fairly consistent across all survey types.
288 These results provide important findings for researchers who must balance different priorities
289 when determining a sampling approach in the future (e.g. cost, timeframe for data collection,
290 ability to represent data at a state-level).

291 It should also be noted that our results show clear differences in food insecurity in different U.S.
292 regions. These differences may be partially attributed to problems in the food supply-chain and
293 community purchasing behavior (i.e. stockpiling), especially at the beginning of the pandemic
294 (33). Another likely cause for variation is the inconsistent national approach to pandemic
295 related restrictions such as stay-at-home orders, restrictions on businesses, and quarantine
296 requirements. Variation in state response to the threat of rising food insecurity is best
297 exemplified in state waivers authorized through SNAP and the Women, Infants and Children
298 (WIC) program and administered through the USDA Food and Nutrition Services (FNS).
299 Specifically, states had discretion about which benefits and waivers to request. While some
300 states made repeated requests for a wide range of allowances authorized by Congress, others
301 requested only a few (35, 36). It is likely that variation in states' applications of extra benefits

302 and temporary waivers influenced differences in food insecurity across our study sites. We
303 suggest that future research examine the relative effects of extra benefits and waivers granted
304 to states, and their influence on both programmatic enrollment and food security outcomes.

305 Second, our study found that some populations have experienced higher rates of food insecurity
306 since the COVID-19 pandemic. Consistent with recent studies (33, 37), BIPOC populations
307 reported higher rates of food insecurity than NHW respondents in nearly all NFACT study sites
308 both before and since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, the three sampling
309 approaches used by NFACT sites found strikingly similar results. There was no statistical
310 difference between sampling strategies with the exception of convenience and targeted high-
311 risk approaches, specifically when addressing food insecurity among BIPOC respondents
312 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Several other national surveys using professional survey
313 platforms (Qualtrics and Turk Prime) have similarly found higher food insecurity rates among
314 Black and Hispanic respondents compared with NHW respondents (15, 24). The only study to
315 provide food insecurity data for Native American respondents found that this population also has
316 a higher rate of food insecurity than NHW populations since the beginning of the pandemic (24).

317 Our research and the work of others (38, 39) clearly shows that the short-term effects of the
318 pandemic expose underlying racial and economic inequalities, but also highlights that BIPOC
319 respondents faced higher prevalence of food insecurity before the COVID-19 pandemic. As a
320 result, strategic policy interventions that include short-term relief and long-term programmatic
321 efforts to support underserved individuals, households, and communities is needed (38).

322 As well, our research also found that the pandemic has disproportionately affected households
323 with children. While it is estimated that the overall prevalence of food insecurity doubled in the
324 early days of the pandemic, it is estimated that food insecurity among households with children
325 tripled during that time period (37). Again, our analysis showed few differences in our results by
326 sampling strategy, with these differences being limited to comparing convenience and high-risk

327 approaches. Several other studies support our findings, showing consistently that households
328 with children are experiencing high levels of food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic (15,
329 24).

330 One likely contributor to this trend was the shift to online education, which increased challenges
331 for families that depended on free or reduced price school meals. While federal support such as
332 the Pandemic EBT (P-EBT) program provided additional benefits to families who normally would
333 qualify for these free and reduced-price meals (40), additional hurdles in accessing school
334 meals were reported. For example, the national NFACT survey conducted in the summer of
335 2020 found that participation in the school meals program dropped during the beginning of the
336 pandemic. Further, between 45 and 55% of survey respondents who utilized school meal pick-
337 ups during the pandemic reported difficulties with availability of delivery, meal pick-up sites
338 being open, and the quantity of food provided (41). Compounding these challenges, low income
339 families with children were more likely to lose income during the COVID-19 pandemic compared
340 to households without children (40). These findings strongly suggest a need for increased
341 support for school food programs, enabling these important programs to ensure that meals
342 reach families in need. Similarly, NFACT sites universally found higher prevalence of food
343 insecurity among households that experienced job or income loss during the pandemic
344 compared to households with no change in employment status, a finding aligned with other
345 recent research (15, 24, 42).

346 Third, several of our sites conducted repeated surveys, providing insights into the prevalence of
347 food insecurity over time, both within and across regions. Four NFACT study sites have
348 conducted more than one round of surveys (New York City, New York Capital Region, Vermont,
349 and Washington state), while more recent surveys (Massachusetts and the second Washington
350 state survey) were designed to elucidate respondent experiences with food insecurity within the
351 past 30-days, providing a more current understanding of food insecurity prevalence. All follow-

352 up studies found an increasing prevalence of food security as the pandemic continues, with
353 each additional survey demonstrating higher prevalence of food insecurity. All of these rounds
354 of surveys measured food insecurity since the COVID-19 pandemic began, suggesting that
355 additional numbers of individuals continue to become food insecure, even after the initial
356 impacts of COVID-19 have been felt. Likewise, the recent NFACT Massachusetts survey,
357 measuring food insecurity prevalence in the last 30 days, found that nearly 30% of respondents
358 were classified as food insecure at the end of 2020. This prevalence is significantly higher than
359 the pre-pandemic level of 8.4% for this state (13), though it should be noted the pre-pandemic
360 level for Massachusetts respondents was much higher than observed pre-pandemic levels.

361 This evidence corroborates other studies suggesting that food insecurity levels are likely to
362 persist above pre-pandemic levels for an extended period of time as occurred after the Great
363 Recession and past disasters (13, 17, 20). As noted by Hernandez and Holtzclaw (43), the
364 combined impact of a pandemic and a recession are unique in modern memory. However, the
365 slow recovery from the 2008 Great Recession in the United States is instructive. It took eleven
366 years for food insecurity levels to return to pre-recession levels after the Great Recession;
367 according to national data, food insecurity went from 11.1% in 2007 to 14.6% in 2008, reaching
368 a peak of 14.9% in 2011, and back to 11.1% only in 2018 (13). Similarly, high levels of food
369 insecurity were observed up to five years following other disasters, such as after Hurricanes
370 Katrina and Harvey (20, 44). Besides factors such as age, race/ethnicity, and income, other
371 factors such as support systems, community and generalized self-efficacy are also critical when
372 addressing food insecurity in a post-disaster context. A 5-year follow-up study on Hurricane
373 Katrina revealed that post-disaster food insecurity levels were associated with poor physical and
374 mental health, as well as low social support, generalized self-efficacy, and sense of community
375 (17, 44). Considering that the pandemic has disproportionately affected racial and ethnic
376 minorities, these populations are likely to experience higher levels of food insecurity and be

377 affected by its long-lasting health effects even after the economy recovers. Taken together,
378 these results suggest that the impact of COVID-19 on food security in the U.S. is far from over,
379 and additional support systems and policies will be necessary to continue to alleviate the long-
380 term impacts of the global pandemic and recession.

381

382 *Limitations*

383 In presenting our results, we recognize two key limitations. First, research that requires
384 participants to report eating or food-related behaviors is challenged by both recall and social
385 desirability bias (45). Retrospectively asking participants about food insecurity has been shown
386 to lead to overestimation of pre-COVID prevalence of food insecurity (34), suggesting our study
387 may contain similar overestimations. However, we try to address this potential limitation by
388 reporting percent change between pre and during COVID-19 food security, in addition to
389 absolute prevalence of food insecurity, though if the overall pre-pandemic levels of food
390 insecurity are lower, our absolute food insecurity prevalence is likely underestimated. While
391 there has been some skepticism about the high prevalence of food insecurity reported since the
392 COVID-19 pandemic began, our results confirm this high prevalence while providing a more
393 robust measure to benchmark changes. Second, surveys across all research sites included in
394 this study were administered online, limiting respondents to those with computer skills and
395 internet access. This potentially introduced a barrier for some (though not all) elderly or low-
396 income potential respondents (46, 47), as well as those living in rural areas without reliable
397 internet (48). Our study employed a number of methods to overcome this challenge across
398 different sampling strategies. These strategies included partnering with non-profit and
399 community organizations as well as government assistance programs to advertise the survey,
400 and seeking economic representation through sampling targets. Notably, our results show no
401 statistically significant difference between sites using convenience and representative samples,
402 indicating that even for study sites that employed a convenience sampling approach, this

403 potential bias did not have a significant influence on our findings. While differences did emerge
404 when representative and targeted high-risk samples were compared, we argue that this shows
405 the importance of purposeful sampling in target communities.

406
407 A number of U.S. studies have explored the impact of COVID-19 on food insecurity prevalence
408 since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, though most have been national samples,
409 modelling efforts, or single site-specific studies. Here, we report the results from a nationwide
410 collaborative effort across 18 study sites and a nationally representative sample, including 22
411 surveys since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The scale of our work provides data
412 from more than 27,000 people, and more completely demonstrates the economic hardship the
413 COVID-19 pandemic has had for many people. Consistent increases in food insecurity are
414 prevalent, as well as further evidence that the pandemic has exacerbated racial and ethnic
415 disparities in food insecurity that existed prior to the pandemic. Surveys conducted in study
416 sites more than once also demonstrate an increasing prevalence of food insecurity since the
417 COVID-19 pandemic began, and more recent studies reaffirm that high prevalence of food
418 insecurity, compared to before the COVID-19 pandemic, continues. These findings point to the
419 clear continued need for additional programmatic and policy assistance to provide food
420 insecurity and economic relief. Our future work will continue to conduct additional surveys and
421 comparative analysis to quantify changes in food access, food security, and food assistance use
422 as the U.S. recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic.

423
424 **Acknowledgements:**

425 This research is conducted as part of The National Food Access and COVID research Team
426 (NFACT), which is implementing common measurements and tools across study sites in the
427 US. NFACT is a national collaboration of researchers committed to rigorous, comparative, and
428 timely food access research during the time of COVID. We do this through collaborative, open

429 access research that prioritizes communication to key decision-makers while building our
430 scientific understanding of food system behaviors and policies.

431
432 We are grateful to the Nutrition and Obesity Policy Research and Evaluation Network
433 (NOPREN) for their support of the ad-hoc COVID-19 Food Security Surveys subgroup that
434 shared insights and surveys relevant to this project. We thank Christi Sherlock at The University
435 of Vermont for her assistance with project management.

436
437 **Conflicts of Interest**

438 The Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding support:

Alabama: No funding to report.

Arizona: This project was supported by a COVID-19 seed grant from the College of Health Solutions, Arizona State University.

California-Bay Area: This project was supported by the College of Health and Human Sciences, San Jose State University.

Chicago/Illinois: This project was supported by the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, DePaul University

Connecticut: Generous funding was provided to Foodshare by the Hunger to Health Collaboratory.

Maine: We would like to thank the University of Maine School of Food and Agriculture and the George J. Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions for their financial support.

Maryland: This research was supported by a Directed Research grant from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future.

Massachusetts: Funding for The Greater Boston Food Bank team was provided by the Hunger to Health Collaboratory.

Michigan: Funding was provided from Wayne State University faculty startup funds.

National: This research was supported by the College of Health Solutions, Arizona State University with support from the college's COVID-19 seed grant and the university's Investigator Research Funds; the University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Rapid COVID-19 seed grant; a Directed Research grant from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future; and the University of Vermont, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Gund Institute for Environment, Office of the Vice President of Research, and the UVM ARS Food Systems Research Center.

New York City: Special thanks to the Vincentian Institute for Social Action for sponsoring both studies.

NY State: Funded by the Natural Hazards Center, Quick Response Grant. The Quick Response program is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation (Award #1635593). Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF or the Natural Hazards Center.

NY Capital Region: Funding for the Qualtrics Panel Survey was provided by the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research. Funding for the non-Qualtrics Panel Survey was provided by UAlbany President's COVID-19 MHD Engaged Researchers Seed Funding Program.

NY Central/Upstate: This work was supported by a Cornell Atkinson Center COVID-19 Rapid Response Fund award.

Utah: We would like to thank the Utah Create Better Health Program, Utah State University Extension, and the Utah Department of Workforce Services for their support and assistance with this project.

Vermont: Funding was provided by The University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Office of the Vice President of Research, The Gund Institute for Environment, and the UVM ARS Food Systems Research Center.

Washington: The WAFOOD survey team wishes to thank the UW Population Health Initiative (UWPHI), the UW School of Public Health (UWSPH), and the Department of Epidemiology for their support.

439

440 **State Specific Acknowledgements**

441 **Alabama:** We thank Auburn University at Montgomery, the Alabama Cooperative Extension
442 System at Auburn University, county Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Educators, the
443 Alabama Department of Public Health, End Child Hunger in Alabama and the Montgomery Area
444 Food Bank for assisting in dissemination of the survey.

445 **Arizona:** We thank all the members of the ASU Food policy and environment research group as
446 well as Dr. Aggie J Yellow Horse for their helpful feedback on the survey instrument. We also
447 would like to thank Marina Acosta Ortiz for her assistance with the translation of the survey. This
448 project was supported by a COVID-19 seed grant from the College of
449 Health Solutions, Arizona State University.

450 **California-Bay Area:** We wish to thank the study participants for their time and dedication in
451 completing the survey. Thank you also to our community partners for helping distribute the
452 survey to potential participants. This project was supported by the College of Health and Human
453 Sciences, San Jose State University.

454 **Chicago/Illinois:** This project was supported by the College of Liberal Arts and Social
455 Sciences, DePaul University

456 **Connecticut:** Generous funding was provided to Foodshare by the Hunger to Health
457 Collaboratory.

458 **Maine:** We would like to thank the University of Maine School of Food and Agriculture and the
459 George J. Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions for their financial support.

460 **Maryland:** This research was supported by a Directed Research grant from the Johns Hopkins
461 Center for a Livable Future.

462 **Massachusetts:** Funding for The Greater Boston Food Bank team was provided by the Hunger
463 to Health Collaboratory.

464 **Michigan:** Funding was provided from Wayne State University faculty startup funds.

465 **National:** This research was supported by the College of Health Solutions, Arizona State
466 University with support from the college's COVID-19 seed grant and the university's Investigator
467 Research Funds; the University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Rapid
468 COVID-19 seed grant; a Directed Research grant from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable
469 Future; and the University of Vermont, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Gund
470 Institute for Environment, Office of the Vice President of Research, and the UVM ARS Food
471 Systems Research Center.

472 **New Mexico:** We would like to thank the many community organizations and institutions that
473 assisted with the dissemination of our survey, particularly New Mexico First, New Mexico
474 Thrives, Presbyterian Healthcare Services, and New Mexico State Extension. We also want to
475 thank Gaby Phillips and Aracely Tellez for help with translating the survey into Spanish.

476 **New York City:** We would like to thank all the New Yorkers, including St. John's University and
477 its many community partners who participated in this study. Special thanks to the Vincentian
478 Institute for Social Action for sponsoring both studies.

479 **NY State:** Funded by the Natural Hazards Center, Quick Response Grant. The Quick Response
480 program is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation (Award #1635593).
481 Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of
482 the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF or the Natural Hazards Center.

483 **NY Capital Region:** Funding for the Qualtrics Panel Survey was provided by the Foundation for
484 Food and Agriculture Research. Funding for the non-Qualtrics Panel Survey was provided by
485 UAlbany President's COVID-19 MHD Engaged Researchers Seed Funding Program.

486 **NY Central:** Our team is very grateful to our partners at the Cornell Cooperative Extension
487 offices in Broome, Cortland, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oswego, and Seneca offices; to the NY

488 Department of Environment and Conservation; and to all the others who helped with survey
489 design, distribution, and applications of findings. We are also grateful to the survey respondents
490 themselves, and doubly so to those who volunteered and who are participating in follow up
491 interviews. This work was supported by a Cornell Atkinson Center COVID-19 Rapid Response
492 Fund award.

493 **Utah:** We would like to thank the Utah Create Better Health Program, Utah State University
494 Extension, and the Utah Department of Workforce Services for their support and assistance with
495 this project. We would also like to thank the Utah SNAP-eligible individuals who completed the
496 survey.

497 **Vermont:** We would like to thank many community partners for assisting with the dissemination
498 of the survey especially: Community College of Vermont, Farm to Institution New
499 England, Front Porch Forum, Hunger Free Vermont, Rural Vermont, Salvation Farms,
500 Support and Services at Home (SASH), VT Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, VT
501 Department of Agriculture, VT Department of Children and Families, VT Department of Health,
502 VT Farm to Plate Network, VT Foodbank, VT Retail and Grocers Association, VT Sustainable
503 Jobs Fund. We would like to thank many community collaborations especially: Funding was
504 provided by The University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Office of
505 the Vice President of Research, The Gund Institute for Environment, and the UVM ARS Food
506 Systems Research Center.

507 **Washington:** We wish to thank numerous community partners and stakeholders who helped
508 shape this project. Among those are: WA Department of Health, WA Department of Agriculture,
509 WA Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition, WA SNAP-Ed, KC Local Food Initiative, Northwest
510 Harvest, Washington State University (WSU) Extension, United Way of WA, and numerous food
511 banks, food pantries, charitable organizations community organizations, county health
512 departments, and local health jurisdictions.

513

514

515 **Author Contributions**

516 The research design, data collection, and analysis of individual site data was conducted by site-
517 level NFACT teams (see supplementary materials for all authors). A.W.B, L.A.C., M.M.D.,
518 M.T.N., G.A.P., M.S.R., S.R. R.S., and R.Z. wrote and edited the paper. M.T.N. conducted the
519 analysis comparing the study site types and food security prevalence. M.T.N. had primary
520 responsibility for final content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

521 **References**

522

- 523 1. World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2021.
- 524 2. World Health Organization (WHO). Timeline: WHO's COVID-19 Response. 2021 [cited];
525 Available from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/interactive-timeline?gclid=Cj0KCQjw38-DBhDpARIsADJ3kjin0CXSKxbndgAdwrXTCf1_VkG_S57hl4sbxqJ6SYw92H9JJlp3KrckaAs8FEALw_wcB#
- 526
- 527
- 528
- 529 3. Ahmad FB, Cisewski JA, Miniño A, Anderson RN. Provisional Mortality Data — United
530 States, 2020; 2020 April 9, 2021.
- 531 4. Falk G, Carter JA, Nicchitta IA, Nyhof EC, Romero PD. Unemployment Rates During the
532 COVID-19 Pandemic: In Brief. Congressional Research Service; 2021.
- 533 5. Center on Budget Policy and Priorities (CBPP). Tracking the COVID-19 Recession's
534 Effects on Food, Housing, and Employment Hardships. 2021.
- 535 6. Center on Budget Policy and Priorities (CBPP). Chart Book: The Legacy of the Great
536 Recession; 2019 June 6, 2019.
- 537 7. Chenarides L, Manfredo M, Richards TJ. COVID-19 and Food Supply Chains. Applied
538 Economic Perspectives and Policy. 2020;43:270-9.
- 539 8. Loopstra R, Tarasuk V. Severity of household food insecurity is sensitive to change in
540 household income and employment status among low-income families. J Nutr. 2013
541 Aug;143:1316-23.
- 542 9. Alesch DJ, Arendt LA, Holly JN. Managing for Long-Term Community Recovery in the
543 Aftermath of Disaster: Public Entity Risk Institute; 2009.
- 544 10. Haas JE, Kates R, Bowden MJ. Reconstruction Following Disaster. Cambridge, MA and
545 London, UK: The MIT Press; 1977.
- 546 11. Johnson LA, Hayashi H. Synthesis Efforts in Disaster Recovery Research. International
547 Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters. 2012;30:212-38.
- 548 12. Esnard AM, Sapat A. Population/Community Displacement. Handbook of Disaster
549 Research: Springer, Cham; 2018. p. 431-46.
- 550 13. Coleman-Jensen A, Rabbitt MP, Gregory CA, Singh A. Household Food Security in the
551 United States in 2018: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economic Research
552 Service; 2019.
- 553 14. Thomas DSK, Phillips BD, Lovekamp WE, Fothergill A. Social Vulnerability to Disasters:
554 CRC Press; 2013.

- 555 15. Wolfson JA, Leung CW. Food Insecurity During COVID-19: An Acute Crisis With Long-
556 Term Health Implications. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2020;110:1763-5.
- 557 16. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). *An Introduction to the Basic*
558 *Concepts of Food Security*; 2008.
- 559 17. Clay LA, Papas MA, Gill KB, Abramson DM. Factors Associated with Continued Food
560 Insecurity among Households Recovering from Hurricane Katrina. *International Journal of*
561 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018;15:1647.
- 562 18. Nord M, Coleman-Jensen A, Andrews M, Carlson S. *Household Food Security in the*
563 *United States, 2009: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economic Research*
564 *Service*; 2010.
- 565 19. Marchione TJ. Foods provided through U.S. Government Emergency Food Aid
566 Programs: policies and customs governing their formulation, selection and distribution. *J Nutr*.
567 2002 Jul;132:2104S-11S.
- 568 20. Clay LA, Ross AD. Factors Associated with Food Insecurity Following Hurricane Harvey
569 in Texas. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17:762.
- 570 21. (FRAC). FRaAC. *Defining food insecurity and measuring it during COVID-19*. 2021.
- 571 22. Feeding America. *The impact of the coronavirus on food security in 2020 & 2021*; 2021.
- 572 23. Gundersen C, Hake M, Dewey A, Engelhard E. Food Insecurity during COVID-19.
573 *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*. 2021;43:153-61.
- 574 24. Fitzpatrick KM, Harris C, Drawve G, Willis DE. Assessing Food Insecurity Among US
575 Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition*.
576 2021;16:1-18.
- 577 25. Christian P. Impact of the economic crisis and increase in food prices on child mortality:
578 exploring nutritional pathways. *J Nutr*. 2010 Jan;140:177S-81S.
- 579 26. United States Census Bureau. *Measuring household experiences during the coronavirus*
580 *pandemic*. 2021.
- 581 27. Niles MT, Neff R, Biehl E, Bertmann F, Morgan EH, Wentworth T. *Food Access and*
582 *Security During Coronavirus Survey- Version 1.0. V2 ed: Harvard Dataverse*; 2020.
- 583 28. Niles MT, Bertmann F, Belarmino EH, Wentworth T, Biehl E, Neff R. *The Early Food*
584 *Insecurity Impacts of COVID-19*. *Nutrients*. 2020 Jul 15;12.
- 585 29. Niles MT, Neff R, Biehl E, Bertmann F, Belarmino EH, Acciai F, Ohri-Vachaspati P. *Food*
586 *Access and Food Security During COVID-19 Survey- Version 2.1. V3 ed: Harvard Dataverse*;
587 2020.
- 588 30. United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service. *U.S. household*
589 *food security survey module: six-item short form*. 2012 [cited 18-Jun-2021]; Available from:
590 [https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#six)
591 [tools/#six](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#six)
- 592 31. 2019. *S. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.
593 2019.
- 594 32. Jaccard J, Becker MA, Wood G. Pairwise multiple comparison procedures: A review.
595 *Psychological Bulletin*. 1984;96:589-96.
- 596 33. Schanzenbach D, Pitts A. *Food Insecurity During COVID-19 in Households with*
597 *Children: Results by Racial and Ethnic Groups: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern*
598 *University*; 2020 July 9, 2020.
- 599 34. Schanzenbach D, Pitts A. *Food Insecurity in the Census Household Pulse Survey Data*
600 *Tables: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University*; 2020 June 1, 2020.
- 601 35. Rocco P, Béland D, Waddan A. Stuck in neutral? Federalism, policy instruments, and
602 counter-cyclical responses to COVID-19 in the United States. *Policy and Society*. 2020;39:458-
603 77.
- 604 36. USDA-FNS. *SNAP: COVID-19 Waivers by State*. 2021 [cited; Available from:
605 <https://www.fns.usda.gov/disaster/pandemic/COVID-19/snap-waivers-flexibilities>

- 606 37. Schanzenbach D, Pitts A. Estimates of Food Insecurity During the COVID-19 Crisis:
607 Results from the COVID Impact Survey, Week 1 (April 20–26, 2020): Institute for Policy
608 Research, Northwestern University; 2020 May 13, 2020.
- 609 38. Perry BL, Aronson B, Pescosolido BA. Pandemic Precarity: COVID-19 Is Exposing and
610 Exacerbating Inequalities in the American Heartland. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
611 *Sciences of the United States of America*. 2021 February 23, 2021;118.
- 612 39. Swinburne M. Chapter 28: Using SNAP to Address Food Insecurity During the COVID-
613 19 Pandemic. In: Burris S, de Guia S, Gable L, Levin DE, Parmet WE, Terry NP, editors.
614 COVID-19 Policy Playbook: Legal Recommendations for a Safer, More Equitable Future.
615 Boston: Public Health Law Watch; 2021. p. 170-3.
- 616 40. Bauer L, Broady K, Edelberg W, O'Donnell J. Ten Facts About COVID-19 and the U.S.
617 Economy: Brookings; 2020 September 17, 2020.
- 618 41. Ohri-Vachaspati P, Acciai F, Martinelli S, Harper K, Bertmann FM, Belarmino E, Neff R,
619 Niles M. Food Assistance Program Participation among US Households during the COVID-19
620 Pandemic. 2020.
- 621 42. Berkowitz SA, Basu S. Unmet Social Needs And Worse Mental Health After Expiration
622 Of COVID-19 Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. *Health Affairs*. 2021;40:426-34.
- 623 43. Hernandez DC, Holtzclaw LE. Commentary: The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic and
624 the Economic Recession on Food Insecurity: Short- and Long-term Recommendations to Assist
625 Families and Communities. *Family and Community Health*. 2021;44:84-6.
- 626 44. Clay LA, Papas MA, Gill KB, Abramson DM. Application of a Theoretical Model Toward
627 Understanding Continued Food Insecurity Post Hurricane Katrina. *Disaster Medicine and Public*
628 *Health Preparedness*. 2018;12:47-56.
- 629 45. Njai R, Siegel P, Yin S, Liao Y. Prevalence of Perceived Food and Housing Security —
630 15 States, 2013; 2017 January 13, 2017. Report No.: 66.
- 631 46. Kelfve S, Kivi M, Johansson B, Lindwall M. Going web or staying paper? The use of
632 web-surveys among older people. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2020 Oct 8;20:252.
- 633 47. Pew Research Center al. Demographics of Internet and Home Broadband Usage in the
634 United States. 2021.
- 635 48. Perrin A. Digital Gap between Rural and Nonrural America Persists; 2019.

Table 1. Study sites and relevant methods for each site.

| Study Site | Target population | Sample and Recruitment | Weighting | Representative of State | Dates in Field |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alabama | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via social media and community organizations | No weighting | No | June-July 2020 |
| Arizona | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity) with oversampling of low-income population with Qualtrics | Weighted on income | Yes | July-August 2020 |
| California- Bay Area | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via social media and community organizations | No weighting | No | August-November 2020 |
| Chicago/ Illinois | High-risk population | High-risk sample. Survey panel sampling with Qualtrics to meet specific race, ethnicity, income and education quotas. Oversampled low-income population (50%), Black (50%), Hispanic (50%) and 50% high school education or less | No weighting | No | June-July 2020 |
| Connecticut | Oversampled low-income population | High-risk sample. Survey panel with oversampled low-income population, but representative on race and ethnicity with Qualtrics | No weighting | No | August 2020 |
| Maine | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (income) with Qualtrics | No weighting | Yes | August-September 2020 |
| Maryland | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity and income) with Qualtrics | No weighting | Yes | July-September 2020 |
| Massachusetts | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity, education, age, gender, geographic region) with oversampling of low-income population with Qualtrics | Weighted on household income, age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, geographic region | Yes | October 2020 - January 2021 |
| Michigan | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via social media | No weighting | No | June -June 2020 |
| National | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity) and oversampling of low-income population with Qualtrics | Weighted on income | Yes | July-August 2020 |
| New Mexico | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via social media and community organizations | No weighting | No | May-June 2020 |
| New York City (May/ June) | High-risk population | High-risk sample. Nested quota via social media campaign, community-based organizations, convenience sample, and survey consumer panel sampling via Qualtrics to meet specific race/ethnicity, income and education quotas. This includes an oversampling of Blacks (50%), | No weighting | No | May-June 2020 |

| Study Site | Target population | Sample and Recruitment | Weighting | Representative of State | Dates in Field |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | Hispanics (50%), high school education or less (50%), and low income (50% below \$25,000 annual income before taxes). | | | |
| New York City (July/ August) | High-risk population | High-risk sample. Non-proportional quota sample, recruited by Qualtrics. Oversampled low-income population (50%), Black (40%), Hispanic (40%), Native American (20%) and 50% high school education or less. | No weighting | No | July-August 2020 |
| NY State except NYC | High-risk population | High-risk sample. Non--proportional quota sample recruited by Qualtrics. Quotas: low-income or low-education (50%), Black (50%) and Hispanic (50%). | No weighting | No | July-September 2020 |
| NY- Capital Region (Oct-Jan) | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity and income) with Qualtrics | No weighting | Yes | October 2020-January 2021 |
| NY- Capital Region (Jan/Feb) | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via social media and community organizations | No weighting | No | January-February 2021 |
| NY Central / Upstate | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via listservs, social media, community organizations | No weighting | No | October-December 2020 |
| Utah | High-risk population | Convenience sample. Recruited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants through state list-serv of current SNAP recipients | No weighting | No | July-September 2020 |
| Vermont (March/ April) | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via listservs, social media, community organizations | No weighting | No | March-April 2020 |
| Vermont (May/June)† | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via listservs, social media, community organizations | No weighting | No | May- June 2020 |
| Vermont (August/ Sept) | General population | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity and income) with Qualtrics | No weighting | Yes | July-September 2020 |
| Washington State (June/July) | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via listservs, social media, community organizations | No weighting | No | June-July 2020 |
| Washington State (Dec/Jan) | General population | Convenience sample. Recruitment via listservs, social media, community organizations, recontact of wave respondents | No weighting | No | December 2020-January 2021 |
| Wisconsin | General population. | Representative sample with survey panel (on race, ethnicity and income) with Qualtrics. Oversample Milwaukee area. | No weighting | Yes | July-October 2020 |

† Longitudinal sample of a subset of the same people who responded to the Vermont March/April survey

Table 2. Total number of respondents and sub-population characteristics by study site.

| Study Site | Total Respondents ¹ | With Children | Job Disruption/ (Reduced Income) | BIPOC ² | NHW ³ | NHB ⁴ | Hispanic | Other or Multiple Races |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Alabama | 1247 | 541 | 546 | 226 | 1061 | 142 | 27 | 86 |
| Arizona | 576 | 189 | 221 | 268 | 352 | 32 | 194 | 42 |
| California- Bay Area | 724 | 620 | 321 | 232 | 223 | 6 | 122 | 49 |
| Chicago/ Illinois | 680 | 379 | 314 | 498 | 169 | 215 | 258 | 103 |
| Connecticut | 512 | 199 | 286 | 158 | 354 | 56 | 73 | 54 |
| Maine | 504 | 97 | 193 | 42 | 477 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Maryland | 903 | 330 | 368 | 427 | 555 | 239 | 91 | 97 |
| Massachusetts | 2939 | 1098 | 1467 | 748 | 2191 | 202 | 292 | 254 |
| Michigan | 484 | 237 | 279 | 64 | 418 | 25 | 18 | 21 |
| National | 1510 | 515 | 568 | 585 | 925 | 212 | 255 | 118 |
| New Mexico | 1415 | 406 | 261 | 494 | 843 | 15 | 362 | 117 |
| New York City (May/ June) | 1,165 | 599 | 494 | 876 | 289 | 252 | 496 | 128 |
| New York City (July/August) | 525 | 317 | 285 | 484 | 41 | 154 | 123 | 102 |
| NY State | 494 | 207 | 189 | 494 | n/a | 260 | 234 | |
| NY -Capital Region (Oct-Jan) | 479 | 167 | 294 | 156 | 353 | 43 | 42 | 71 |
| NY-Capital Region (Jan-Feb) | 427 | 283 | 327 | 137 | 317 | 62 | 56 | 19 |
| NY- Central/Upstate | 434 | 120 | 144 | 30 | 380 | 2 | 10 | 22 |
| Utah | 644 | 219 | 277 | 102 | 392 | 12 | 61 | 56 |
| Vermont (March /April) | 3016 | 913 | 1103 | 150 | 2603 | 5 | 45 | 104 |
| Vermont (May/ June) | 1212 | 383 | 294 | 57 | 1137 | 3 | 19 | 37 |
| Vermont (August/ Sept) | 578 | 178 | 270 | 49 | 551 | 6 | 17 | 26 |
| Washington State (June/July) | 2514 | 1095 | 636 | 592 | 1910 | 93 | 210 | 289 |
| Washington State (Dec/Jan) | 3169 | 1541 | 343 | 737 | 2647 | 98 | 283 | 356 |
| Wisconsin | 1017 | 393 | 430 | 181 | 836 | 58 | 80 | 43 |

| Study Site | Total Respondents ¹ | With Children | Job Disruption/ (Reduced Income) | BIPOC ² | NHW ³ | NHB ⁴ | Hispanic | Other or Multiple Races |
|------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| TOTAL | 27168 | 11026 | 9589 | 7787 | 19024 | 2195 | 3235 | 2202 |
| % of total | | 40.6% | 35.3% | 28.7% | 70.0% | 8.1% | 11.9% | 8.1% |

1 Indicates number of total respondents with food security data

2 Black, Indigenous, People of Color respondents. Number includes anyone identifying as other than non-Hispanic white.

3 Non-Hispanic White (NHW)

4 Non-Hispanic Black (NHB)

Table 3. Overall prevalence of food insecurity across different measures and time periods by survey type. P values that are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) are lightly shaded for emphasis, and were obtained through ANOVAs with Scheffe multiple comparisons.

| Prevalence of Food Insecurity | Timeframe | Survey Type | | | P Values | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Convenience | State Representative | High Risk | Convenience-High Risk | Convenience-Representative | Representative-High Risk |
| Overall Food Insecurity | Before COVID-19 | 21.8% | 23.9% | 43.6% | 0.002 | 0.918 | 0.004 |
| | Since COVID-19 | 30.2% | 32.1% | 54.3% | 0.000 | 0.933 | 0.002 |
| | Percent Change | 36.9% | 34.7% | 26.9% | 0.561 | 0.971 | 0.701 |
| BIPOC Food Insecurity | Before COVID-19 | 29.5% | 32.1% | 37.3% | 0.211 | 0.818 | 0.497 |
| | Since COVID-19 | 40.2% | 40.6% | 55.1% | 0.048 | 0.999 | 0.078 |
| | Percent Change | 32.0% | 29.5% | 36.0% | 0.892 | 0.957 | 0.743 |
| Households with Children Food Insecurity | Before COVID-19 | 30.1% | 37.2% | 44.1% | 0.042 | 0.389 | 0.424 |
| | Since COVID-19 | 39.0% | 49.2% | 57.6% | 0.003 | 0.117 | 0.272 |
| | Percent Change | 31.8% | 33.4% | 32.7% | 0.995 | 0.983 | 0.997 |
| Job Disruption Food Insecurity | Any Job Disruption | 43.5% | 50.1% | 64.8% | 0.003 | 0.489 | 0.058 |
| | Job Loss | 51.3% | 60.8% | 72.1% | 0.003 | 0.216 | 0.168 |
| | Furlough | 44.2% | 51.2% | 63.1% | 0.081 | 0.679 | 0.383 |




Figure 1. NFACT study sites. Blue states and regions represent sites in addition to the national sample strategy, which includes additional data from all states. Visual credit: Samuel F. Rosenblatt




Figure 2. Overall prevalence of food insecurity across NFACT surveys and study sites.




Figure 3. Prevalence of food insecurity before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the percent change, among BIPOC respondents, by study site.




Figure 4. Prevalence of food insecurity before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the percent change, among different racial and ethnic groups, by study site. Disaggregated race and ethnicity food insecurity prevalence is only reported for sites where at least 30 respondents identified as a specific race or ethnic group.




Figure 5. Prevalence of food insecurity before and during the COVID-19 pandemic among households with children in a study site, and the percent change.




Figure 6. Prevalence of food insecurity since the COVID-19 pandemic among respondents with any job disruption, job loss, furlough, and/or reduction in hours, by study site.

