

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## **Food insecurity prevalence among tertiary students in Ghana**

Evelyn Agbetsise<sup>1</sup>, Crystal Bubune Letsa<sup>2,3</sup>, Charlotte Abra Esime Ofori<sup>2</sup>, Geoffrey Adebayo Asalu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Family and Community Health, School of Public Health, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ho, Ghana

<sup>2</sup>Regional Institute for Population Studies, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana

<sup>3</sup>Science and Technology Policy Research Institute, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR-STEPRI)

Corresponding Author

Email: [gasalu@uhas.edu.gh](mailto:gasalu@uhas.edu.gh) (GA)

26

## 27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** Food insecurity (FI) is a collective term for inadequate access to available,  
29 affordable, and safe nutritious food. FI could affect students' health and academic performance  
30 adversely. Currently, there is a paucity of research on food insecurity among tertiary students  
31 in Ghana. This study determined the prevalence of food insecurity among tertiary students in  
32 an Eastern city of Ghana.

33 **Materials and methods:** A descriptive cross-sectional study design was employed. A  
34 multistage sampling technique was used to select 411 respondents from four tertiary  
35 institutions. The United States Department of Agriculture Adult Household Food Security  
36 Survey (HFSS) Module tool was used to collect information on students' food insecurity status.  
37 Data were entered with Epi-data version 3.0 software and then exported into Stata/MP version  
38 16.0 for analysis. For all statistical tests, a p-value < 0.05 was considered significant.

39 **Results:** The prevalence of food insecurity was 61.0 %. Of these, 40.4 % had very low food  
40 security and 20.2% had low food security. Multiple logistic regression showed that the odds of  
41 food insecurity were significantly higher for students who did not have family support  
42 [AOR=2.56 (95% CI:1.17 - 5.63), p= 0.019] as compared to those who had family support and  
43 students whose fathers were farmers compared to fathers who were employed [AOR=2.71  
44 (95% CI:1.49 - 4.92), p= 0.001].

45 **Conclusion:** The study found high levels of food insecurity among tertiary students in Hohoe.  
46 An insight into food insecurity among this at-risk population group requires further  
47 investigation and action. There is an urgent need for research to better understand the severity  
48 and persistence of food insecurity among higher education students in Ghana.

49

50

51 **Keywords:** Tertiary students, Ghana, Food insecurity, Food security

52

53

54

## 55 **Introduction**

56 The right to adequate food is a basic human right and essential to health and well-being (1,2).  
57 Food security is defined as when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to  
58 sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an  
59 active and healthy life (3). However, Food insecurity (FI) is a collective term for inadequate  
60 access to available, affordable, and safe nutritious food. FI has become a growing public health  
61 issue worldwide and a barrier to attaining Sustainable Development Goals 1 and 2; ending  
62 poverty in all its forms and hunger by 2030 (1).

63 The negative consequences of FI are experienced more in low-and middle-income countries,  
64 especially in sub-Saharan Africa, Southeastern and Western Asia (4). Data has shown that  
65 approximately 60% of food insecure populations live in low-income countries (4) and about  
66 52.5.% are in Africa (5). In Ghana, the prevalence of FI is high. For instance, in 2022 almost  
67 half of households were food insecure (6) .Food security has only increased from 5 % to 11.6  
68 % from 2009 to 2020 (7).

69 An increasing number of studies have drawn attention to the high rates of food insecurity  
70 experienced on college campuses, especially in high-income and low and middle income  
71 countries (8–10). In the USA an estimated average of 14.9% of college (11) students are at risk  
72 of being food insecure, about 38–48% in Australia (12) and 17% in Europe (13). Also, up to  
73 65% of FI rates were reported among tertiary students in South Africa (14). In Nigeria, a study  
74 showed that about 80.7 % of tertiary students were food insecure (18).

75 FI among college and tertiary students has received too little attention (1,15,16) especially in  
76 LMICs (17). Research has shown that college students face many challenges, which make them  
77 vulnerable to food insecurity (19,20). Students tend to perform poorly in their academics when  
78 faced with problems of food insecurity. They are more likely to make poor food choices,  
79 become overweight or obese, and be physically inactive (21,22)

80 Moreover ,extensive financial demands such as hostel fees, utility bills, price of learning  
81 materials, and rate of tuition fees contribute to exacerbate food insecurity problems among  
82 students (19,23–25). The rising cost of higher education and delays in receiving student loans  
83 make most students in higher institutions at risk of FI (26). Other factors such as financial  
84 barriers to affordable food, lack of time for shopping and cooking, lack of cooking skills, and

85 the struggle to have access to quality food, increases vulnerability to food insecurity (27–29).  
86 Other studies have shown that financial hardship, unemployment, high cost of student  
87 accommodation, poor skills in food management, increased reliance on borrowed money, and  
88 ineligibility for food assistance programs contribute to an increased risk of food insecurity  
89 (24,25).

90 Currently, there is a paucity of research on food insecurity among tertiary students in Ghana.  
91 A recent study among university students in Ghana pointed to about 60% being food insecure  
92 (30). However, this study suffers from an inadequate research design where respondents were  
93 not representative of the population under consideration and were recruited via emails resulting  
94 in low response rates.

95 Hohoe a city located at eastern end of Ghana, can be described as a tertiary educational hub of  
96 the Volta region. The tertiary educational institutions in the city include; two Colleges of  
97 Education, a university, and a Midwifery Training College. This presents a unique setting to  
98 assess the prevalence and associated factors of food insecurity among tertiary students in  
99 Ghana. This study provides new insight into the state of food insecurity among post-secondary  
100 students in Ghana. The study is also important for providing evidence for action on the state of  
101 food insecurity among tertiary students in Ghana.

102

103

## 104 **Materials and methods**

### 105 **Study design and Sampling procedure**

106 A descriptive cross-sectional study design was employed in assessing the prevalence of food  
107 insecurity and associated factors among tertiary students. The study was conducted on the  
108 campuses of all the tertiary institutions in the Hohoe municipality of Ghana namely, Hohoe  
109 Midwifery Training College, St. Theresa's College of Education, St. Francis College of  
110 Education, and the University of Health and Allied Sciences (Fred Newton Binka School of  
111 Public Health). The population of interest was students aged 18 years and above. However,  
112 postgraduate students and students who were staying with their parents/ guardians were  
113 excluded from the study.

114 A multistage sampling method was used in selecting 411 students. The survey was conducted  
115 from June to September 2021. Before the data collection, data collection instruments were pre-  
116 tested. The structured questionnaire was sectioned into two - section A contains questions on  
117 socio-demographic characteristics, while Section B contains questions on the food security  
118 status of the respondents. The food security status of respondents over the past 12 months was  
119 assessed using an adapted 10-item United States Department of Agriculture Adult Household  
120 Food Security Survey Module (USDA HFSSM)<sup>31</sup>. A maximum time of twenty-minute was  
121 used in taking data from each respondent.

122 The study adhered to all ethical standards regarding human participation in research and  
123 received ethical clearance from the University of Health and Allied Sciences Research Ethics  
124 Committee (UHAS-REC A.9 12051 20-21), Ho. Participants consent were sought and each  
125 participant signed a written consent form. Also, the study complied with COVID-19 prevention  
126 protocols such as physical distancing, handwashing, and wearing masks during data collection.

127

## 128 **Variable and measurement**

### 129 **Food security**

130 The food security status of respondents over the past 12 months was assessed using an adapted  
131 10-item United States Department of Agriculture Adult Household Food Security Survey  
132 Module (USDA HFSSM). Apart from this survey tool's wide usage and applicability, it is also  
133 less burdensome to respondents (31). A respondent's affirmative responses ("yes, often,  
134 sometimes, almost every month, and certain months but not every month") were scored as one  
135 and the food security score was computed as the sum of individual responses, ranging from 0-  
136 10. A response of "no" or "never" was not counted. Food security scores were divided into four  
137 categories and described as follows; (score of 0) - high food security; no limitation to food  
138 accessibility, (score of 1-2) - marginal food insecurity; one or two anxieties over food  
139 sufficiency but little or no change in their dietary intake, (score of 3-5)- low food security; low  
140 or reduced food quality or desirability of diet), (score of 6-10) - very low food security; several  
141 indications of disrupted eating patterns and reduced food intake.

142 Moreover, the overall scores were further categorized into either food secure or food insecure.  
143 A high and marginal food security status with 0-2 scores were categorized as food secure

144 whereas the low and very low food security status with 3-10 scores (32) were deemed to be  
145 food insecure.

## 146 **Anthropometry**

147 Anthropometric measurements of respondents were conducted by trained research assistants  
148 using calibrated equipment and following a set of guidelines(33) Each respondent was weighed  
149 to the nearest 0.1 kg using a Personal digital weighing scale. Height was measured to the nearest  
150 0.1 cm using a portable stadiometer (Seca 213). The weight and height were used to calculate  
151 the respondent's Body Mass Index (BMI). The calculation of BMI was done by dividing weight  
152 in kilograms by height in square meters (kg/m<sup>2</sup>). The Body Mass Index of individuals was  
153 classified as underweight (<18.5), normal (18.5-24.9), overweight (25.0-29.9), and obese (≥  
154 30).

155

## 156 **Statistical Analysis**

157 Descriptive statistics was used to explore socio-demographic characteristics and the prevalence  
158 of food insecurity. A Chi-square test was used to determine the bivariate associations between  
159 food insecurity and other variables. Variables that were associated with food insecurity  
160 significantly at the bivariate level, were further assessed with multivariate logistic regression  
161 to identify the factors associated with food insecurity.

162 Data generated from the questionnaires was analyzed using Stata/MP version 16.0. Study  
163 results are presented in tables, graphs, and charts. Results were reported as odds ratios at 95%  
164 confidence intervals. For all statistical tests, a p-value less than 0.05 was considered significant.

165

166

## 167 **Results**

### 168 **Sociodemographic Characteristics of Respondents**

169 A total of four hundred and eleven (411) respondents participated in this study with a mean age  
170 and standard deviation of 21.8 ±2.4 (See Table 1). The majority (64.0%) of the respondents  
171 were females. Most (98.0%) respondents were not married and without children (96.1 %).  
172 Almost half of the respondents belonged to the Ewe ethnic group (49.6%). Regarding academic

173 levels, almost half of the respondents were in the first year (42.8%). A majority (72.6%) of the  
174 respondents were residents on-campus with approximately 67% of them in shared apartments.  
175 A greater number (53.8%) received a monthly allowance of 160-300 GH¢ and almost all  
176 (94.7%) spent an amount of 5-15 GH¢ daily on food. (That is about \$0.89-2.55 at the time the  
177 data was being collected). About (97.3%) had their source of allowance from a parent/guardian  
178 and a majority (83.0%) did not receive family support for their education. Most of the  
179 respondents reported that their fathers were employed in formal/white-collared jobs (43.8%).  
180 The majority (60.1%) of their mothers were working in the informal sector. Out of the 411  
181 respondents, (67.2%) had normal weight for height and were in the normal BMI group (24.49-  
182 29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>).

183

### 184 **Food Security Evaluation**

185 Fig 1 shows the levels of food security among tertiary students. The overall prevalence of food  
186 insecurity among respondents was 60.6% and of these, 40.4% had very low food security  
187 status, 20.2 % had low food security status, 25.5% had marginal food insecurity, and 13.9 %  
188 reported high food security status over 12 months.

189

### 190 **Fig 1: Levels of Food Security among Tertiary Students**

191

## 192 **Bivariate Association between Sociodemographic Characteristics** 193 **and Food Insecurity Among Tertiary Students**

194 Table 1 shows results from the bivariate association between sociodemographic Characteristics  
195 and food insecurity among tertiary students. Food insecurity status was significantly associated  
196 with gender ( $p < 0.009$ ), students' residence ( $p < 0.047$ ), family support ( $p < 0.001$ ), father's  
197 occupation ( $p < 0.001$ ), mother's occupation ( $p < 0.013$ ), and body mass index ( $p < 0.044$ )

### 198 **Table 1: Bivariate Association between Sociodemographic Characteristics and Food Insecurity** 199 **Among Tertiary Students**

Variables	Food Insecure [60.6% (n=249)]	Food secured [ 39.4% (n=162)]	Total (%) (n=i)	Chi-square(p- value)
-----------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------

<b>School of affiliation</b>				9.96 (0.019)
Franco	68.7 (114)	31.3 (52)	40.4 (166)	
UHAS	54.5 (61)	45.5 (51)	112 (27.3)	
Hohoe MTC	46.7 (21)	53.3 (24)	45 (11.0)	
Theresco	60.2 (53)	39.8 (35)	88 (21.4)	
<b>Sex</b>				6.72 (0.009)**
Male	68.9 (102)	31.0 (46)	148 (36.0)	
Female	55.9 (147)	44.1 (116)	263 (64.0)	
<b>Monthly stipend</b>				4.82 (0.090)
Ghc15-150	62.9 (78)	37.1 (46)	124 (30.2)	
Ghc160-300	62.9 (139)	37.1 (82)	221 (53.2)	
Ghc301+	48.5 (32)	51.5 (34)	66 (16.1)	
<b>Amount spent on food</b>				1.15(0.563)
GHC 5-9	62.7 (151)	37.3 (90)	241 (58.6)	
GHC 10-15	58.1 (86)	41.9 (62)	148 (36.0)	
GHC 16 or more	54.6 (12)	45.5 (10)	22 (5.4)	
<b>Father's occupation</b>				16.64 (0.000)**
Formal	49.4 (89)	50.6 (91)	180 (43.8)	
Informal	69.3 (160)	30.7 (71)	231 (64.2)	
<b>Mother's occupation</b>				6.03(0.014)**
Formal <sup>a</sup>	50 (49)	50.0 (49)	98 (23.8)	
Informal <sup>b</sup>	63.9 (200)	36.1 (113)	313 (76.2)	
<b>BMI</b>				8.08(0.044)**
Underweight	60.0 (24)	40.0 (16)	9.7 (40)	
Healthy	64.9 (179)	35.1 (97)	67.2 (276)	
Overweight	49.3 (34)	50.7 (35)	16.8 (69)	
Obese	46.2 (12)	53.9 (14)	6.3 (26)	
<b>Family support</b>				11.50(0.003)**
Yes	56.9 (194)	43.1 (147)	83.0 (341)	
No	79.6 (39)	20.4 (10)	11.9 (49)	
May be	76.2 (16)	23.8 (5)	5.1 (21)	
<b>Source of support</b>				0.04(0.834)
Parents/guardian	60.5 (242)	39.5 (158)	97.3 (400)	
Spouse	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)	2.7 (11)	
<b>Type of residence</b>				3.93(0.047)**
On-campus	63.3 (198)	36.7 (115)	76.2 (313)	
Off-campus	52.0 (51)	47.9 (47)	23.8 (98)	
<b>Living arrangement</b>				5.72(0.057)
Alone	74.2 (46)	25.8 (16)	15.1 (62)	
Roommates	57.8 (159)	42.2 (116)	66.9 (275)	
Parent/spouse	59.5 (44)	40.5 (30)	18.0 (74)	
<b>Mean Age in years (standard deviation)</b>				22 ( ± 2.4)

200 Abbreviation: GHC - Ghana Cedis, \$1= GHC10.0, \*\*. Significant at P ≤ 0.05

201



## 202 **Multivariate analysis**

203 In Table 2, logistic regression results of the predictors of food insecurity are presented. At the  
 204 multivariate level, (Table 2) Family support was a significant factor associated with food  
 205 security. Respondents who did not have support from their external family were 2 times more  
 206 likely to have food insecurity as compared to those with family support. [AOR=2.56 (95% CI:  
 207 1.17 - 5.63), p= 0.019]. Also, respondents whose fathers were farmers were 2 times more likely  
 208 to have food insecurity as compared to fathers who were in other forms of employment.  
 209 [AOR=2.71 (95% CI: 1.49 - 4.92), p= 0.001]. Respondents whose mothers are farmers were  
 210 (72%) less likely to have food insecurity than those employed but this was not statistically  
 211 significant. [AOR= 1.28 (95% CI: 0.53 - 3.06), p= 0.586]. Respondents whose mothers are  
 212 farmers were (72%) less likely to have food insecurity than those employed but this was not  
 213 statistically significant. [AOR= 1.28 (95% CI: 0.53 - 3.06), p= 0.586]. Also, the occupations  
 214 of mothers as traders and artisans were 1.19 times more likely and (52%) less likely to have  
 215 food insecurity as compared to those employed. [AOR= 1.19 (95% CI: 0.70 - 2.03), p= 0.515]  
 216 and [AOR= 0.48 (95% CI: 0.10 - 2.35), p= 0.365] respectively.

217 **Table 2: Multivariate Logistic Regression of Factors Associated with Food Insecurity**  
 218 **Among Tertiary Students**

Variables	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]
<b>Name of school</b>				
Franco				
<b>UHAS</b>	1.20	0.44	0.620	0.59 - 2.45
Hohoe MTC	0.54	0.20	0.103	0.26 - 1.13
Theresco	0.77	0.25	0.436	0.41 - 1.47
Age	1.12	0.06	0.032	1.01 - 1.23
<b>Sex</b>				
Male				
Female	0.85	0.23	0.547	0.51 - 1.43
<b>Father's occupation</b>				
Formal				
Informal**	1.79	0.43	0.015	1.12 - 2.87
<b>Mother's occupation</b>				
Formal				
Informal	1.13	0.31	0.644	0.67 - 1.93
<b>BMI</b>				
Underweight				
Normal	1.08	0.40	0.835	0.52 - 2.24
Overweight	0.58	0.25	0.212	0.25 - 1.36

Obese	0.47	0.26	0.180	0.16	1.41
<b>Family support</b>					
Yes					
No**	2.31	0.89	0.029	1.09	4.92
May be	1.74	1.06	0.361	0.53	5.77
<b>Type of residence</b>					
On campus					
Off campus	0.64	0.22	0.201	0.32	1.27
Constant	0.19	0.25	0.198	0.02	2.36

219 \* Factors associated with food insecurity among tertiary students. Significant p-values  
220 are in bold.

## 221 **Discussion**

222 In this present study, the overall prevalence of food insecurity was found to be (60.6%) and the  
223 result suggests that food insecurity may be a common and severe issue among tertiary students in  
224 Ghana (30). This figure is higher than the national average of food insecure households (6). This  
225 finding supports evidence of food insecurity is higher among college students than households  
226 making it a public health priority. For instance, the average FI among college students stands at  
227 43.5 % higher than 17% among households (8). FI rate ranges between 38-34 % among college  
228 students whereas household rates were around 5-10% (12,34) and a study in Portugal indicated  
229 17. 5% among university students and 10.1 % among households (13).

230 In some colleges in South Africa for example, prevalence rates of 65% and 65.3% were reported  
231 among students in Free State and Kwazulu Natal Universities respectively(14,35). Further, a  
232 study among university students in Nigeria had an FI rate of 80.7%<sup>29</sup> (18) . It is worth noting  
233 that this study was conducted immediately after the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown which  
234 worsened the food security status of most college students (32) the study showed a lower FI rate  
235 as compared to studies on the continent. A possible explanation of variability in the prevalence  
236 rate might be due to differences in the data collection instrument used in these studies (15). Also,  
237 research suggests that measuring an elusive concept like food insecurity can be difficult (36).

238 The current study found that the father's occupation type was a significant factor associated with  
239 food insecurity. Students whose fathers worked in the informal sector were more likely to  
240 experience food insecurity as compared to those whose fathers were in formal employment. In  
241 Ghana, the formal sector is mostly government employees working across all sectors of the  
242 economy, and informal sector workers mostly include farmers, artisans, and traders is the largest  
243 employer. Also, students who do not receive family support showed higher odds of being food  
244 insecure. Parental occupation, especially fathers' occupation reflects the financial capability of  
245 most students to acquire or access food since traditionally fathers are the main breadwinner of the  
246 family. In Sub-Saharan Africa, informal workers like farmers especially smallholder farmers  
247 remain among the poorest people (Castaneda et al., 2016) and it is not surprising their students  
248 whose parents work in the formal sector were likely to be food insecure. These results are  
249 consistent with a study in Nigeria where food insecurity was significantly less in students who  
250 received financial support from their parents or guardian (18). Also, another study found that

251 students who depend only on parents or guardians for money are at an increased risk of food  
252 insecurity as compared to those with other sources of income (14).

253 Limited financial resources and poverty are known key predictors of food insecurity among college  
254 students (9,15,24). Several reports have also shown that financial-related factors, like student  
255 loans, low-income status, or spending habits make students more prone to food insecurity (24).  
256 Similarly, Hughes and colleagues reported that students who did not have familial financial  
257 support had increased odds of experiencing food insecurity as compared to those receiving support  
258 (38). Therefore, food vouchers, food scholarship, and cash assistants are predominant interventions  
259 used to reduce FI among college students (15).

260 Within the institutions of higher education assessed for food insecurity a student in the University  
261 of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS) had higher odds of being food insecure as compared to a  
262 student at St. Francis College of Education. However, the risk of food insecurity was lower among  
263 students from Hohoe Midwifery Training College (MTC) and those from St. Theresa College of  
264 Education (Theresco). Although the associations were not statistically significant, these results  
265 give credence to how financial aid and food scholarships tend to lower FI rates. Students from the  
266 other colleges receive monthly stipends and a hot meal a day funded by the government. Although  
267 University students also have access to students' loan, they are meager and might not be sufficient  
268 to meet the demands of university education. Studies have shown a lower risk of food insecurity  
269 among college students receiving a monthly allowance and daily expenditure(18,35,39). Another  
270 possible explanation for observed higher FI among university students than other tertiary students  
271 is the issue of food literacy. Food literacy is the term used for the practical ability of an individual  
272 able to plan, manage, select, prepare, and eat healthy foods (40). Studies have shown that FI among  
273 students of higher education is also linked to poor food literacy (15). As compared to other tertiary  
274 students in Hohoe, UHAS students do not receive hot meals and lack adequate eating places on  
275 campus.

276 There are various limitations to this study. The study relied on a cross-sectional study design and  
277 self-reported data from students thus subject to recall bias and misinterpretations. The study area  
278 consisted of one all-female school which may account for the overrepresentation of female  
279 students in the sample. Notwithstanding these limitations, this study makes significant

280 contributions to food insecurity research of these at-risk population groups, given the paucity of  
281 studies among tertiary students in Ghana.

282

283

## 284 **Conclusions**

285 The findings of this study suggest that food insecurity among tertiary students in Hohoe was high.  
286 Moreover, the results of this research showed that limited familial and financial support were the  
287 main factors associated with food insecurity. Insight into food insecurity among this at-risk  
288 population requires further investigation and action. There is a need for research to better  
289 understand the severity and persistence of food insecurity among higher education students in  
290 Ghana. Given the current situation, there is an urgent need to address food insecurity among  
291 tertiary students in Hohoe. Priority should be given to improving access, availability, and  
292 affordability of food on campus.

293

294

## 295 **Acknowledgments**

296 We appreciate all of the participants who made this research possible.

297

298

## 299 **References**

- 300 1. Pérez-Escamilla R. Food security and the 2015-2030 sustainable development goals: From  
301 human to planetary health. *Curr Dev Nutr.* 2017;1(7):1–8.
- 302 2. Mikkonen J RD. social determinants of health. Vol. 2, *Angewandte Chemie International*  
303 *Edition*, 6(11), 951–952. 2019.
- 304 3. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations. Contribution of terrestrial  
305 animal source food to healthy diets for improved nutrition and health outcomes. 2023;


- 306 4. Boukezia R. Managing Fiscal Risks in the Middle East and North Africa. Vol. 2023,  
307 Departmental Papers. 2023. 1 p.
- 308 5. Resilience B, Peace FOR, Security F. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the  
309 World 2023. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. 2023.
- 310 6. Ghana Statistical service. Ghana annual household income and expenditure survey:  
311 Quarterly food insecurity report. 2022;
- 312 7. Álvares L, Amaral TF. Food insecurity and associated factors in the Portuguese  
313 population. *Food Nutr Bull.* 2014;35(4):S395–402.
- 314 8. Wooten R, Spence M, Colby S, Steeves EA. Assessing food insecurity prevalence and  
315 associated factors among college students enrolled in a university in the Southeast USA.  
316 *Public Health Nutr.* 2019;22(3):383–90.
- 317 9. El Zein A, Shelnutz KP, Colby S, Vilaro MJ, Zhou W, Greene G, et al. Prevalence and  
318 correlates of food insecurity among US college students: a multi-institutional study. *BMC*  
319 *Public Health.* 2019;19:1–12.
- 320 10. Bruening M, Brennhofers S, Van Woerden I, Todd M, Laska M. Factors related to the high  
321 rates of food insecurity among diverse, urban college freshmen. *J Acad Nutr Diet.*  
322 2016;116(9):1450–7.
- 323 11. Wolfson JA, Insolera N, Cohen A, Leung CW. The effect of food insecurity during  
324 college on graduation and type of degree attained: Evidence from a nationally  
325 representative longitudinal survey. *Public Health Nutr.* 2022;25(2):389–97.
- 326 12. Whatnall MC, Hutchesson MJ, Patterson AJ. Predictors of food insecurity among  
327 Australian university students: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*  
328 2020;17(1):60.
- 329 13. Marques B, Azevedo J, Rodrigues I, Rainho C, Gonçalves C. Food insecurity levels  
330 among university students: A cross-sectional study. *Societies.* 2022;12(6):174.
- 331 14. Van den Berg L, Raubenheimer J. Food insecurity among students at the University of the  
332 Free State, South Africa. *South African J Clin Nutr.* 2015;28(4):160–9.

- 333 15. Landry MJ, Gundersen C, Eicher-Miller HA. Food Insecurity on College and University  
334 Campuses: A Context and Rationale for Solutions. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2021;122(3):519–24.
- 335 16. Davidson AR, Morrell JS. Food insecurity prevalence among university students in New  
336 Hampshire. *J Hunger Environ Nutr.* 2020;15(1):118–27.
- 337 17. Shi Y, Davies A, Allman-Farinelli M. The association between food insecurity and dietary  
338 outcomes in university students: a systematic review. *J Acad Nutr Diet.*  
339 2021;121(12):2475–500.
- 340 18. Ukegbu P, Nwofia B, Ndudiri U, Uwakwe N, Uwaegbute A. Food insecurity and  
341 associated factors among university students. *Food Nutr Bull.* 2019;40(2):271–81.
- 342 19. Loofbourrow BM, Scherr RE. Food Insecurity in Higher Education: A Contemporary  
343 Review of Impacts and Explorations of Solutions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*  
344 2023;20(10):5884.
- 345 20. DeBate R, Himmelgreen D, Gupton J, Heuer JN. Food insecurity, well-being, and  
346 academic success among college students: implications for post COVID-19 pandemic  
347 programming. *Ecol Food Nutr.* 2021;60(5):564–79.
- 348 21. Singh A, Dhanasekaran D, Ganamurali N, Preethi L, Sabarathinam S. Junk food-induced  
349 obesity-a growing threat to youngsters during the pandemic. *Obes Med.* 2021;26:100364.
- 350 22. Brunt AR, Rhee YS. Obesity and lifestyle in US college students related to living  
351 arrangements. *Appetite.* 2008;51(3):615–21.
- 352 23. Keller M, Von Kahle B, Gordon B, van Woerden I. Prevalence and demographic profiles  
353 of food insecure college students at main and satellite campuses in northwestern USA.  
354 *Nutr Health.* 2023;29(3):541–8.
- 355 24. Gaines A, Robb CA, Knol LL, Sickler S. Examining the role of financial factors,  
356 resources and skills in predicting food security status among college students. *Int J*  
357 *Consum Stud.* 2014;38(4):374–84.
- 358 25. Knol LL, Robb CA, McKinley EM, Wood M. Food insecurity, self-rated health, and  
359 obesity among college students. *Am J Heal Educ.* 2017;48(4):248–55.

- 360 26. Freudenberg N, Goldrick-Rab S, Poppendieck J. College students and SNAP: The new  
361 face of food insecurity in the United States. *Am J Public Health*. 2019;109(12):1652–8.
- 362 27. Zigmont V, Linsmeier A, Gallup P. Understanding the why of college student food  
363 insecurity. *J Hunger Environ Nutr*. 2021;16(5):595–610.
- 364 28. Lindsley K, King C. Food insecurity of campus-residing Alaskan college students. *J Acad  
365 Nutr Diet*. 2014;9(114):A94.
- 366 29. Chaparro MP, Zaghoul SS, Holck P, Dobbs J. Food insecurity prevalence among college  
367 students at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. *Public Health Nutr*. 2009;12(11):2097–  
368 103.
- 369 30. Anderson K, Bansah A, Holben D. Food Security, Health, and Diet of Ghanaian College  
370 Students. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2021;121(10):A152.
- 371 31. Landry MJ, Heying E, Qamar Z, Hagedorn-Hatfield RL, Savoie-Roskos MR, Cuite CL, et  
372 al. Advancing college food security: priority research gaps. *Nutr Res Rev*. 2023;1–34.
- 373 32. Davitt ED, Heer MM, Winham DM, Knoblauch ST, Shelley MC. Effects of COVID-19  
374 on university student food security. *Nutrients*. 2021;13(6):1932.
- 375 33. Marfell-Jones MJ, Stewart AD, De Ridder JH. International standards for anthropometric  
376 assessment. 2012.
- 377 34. Murray S, Peterson C, Primo C, Elliott C, Otlowski M, Auckland S, et al. Prevalence of  
378 food insecurity and satisfaction with on-campus food choices among Australian university  
379 students. *Int J Sustain High Educ*. 2021;22(4):731–46.
- 380 35. Job N. FOOD SECURITY STATUS AND RELATED FACTORS OF  
381 UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID AT THE  
382 UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL, PIETERMARITZBURG CAMPUS. 2014.
- 383 36. Barrett CB. Measuring food insecurity. *Science (80- )*. 2010;327(5967):825–8.
- 384 37. Castaneda R, Doan D, Newhouse DL, Nguyen M, Uematsu H, Azevedo JP. Who are the  
385 poor in the developing world? *World Bank Policy Res Work Pap*. 2016;(7844).
- 386 38. Hughes R, Serebryanikova I, Donaldson K, Leveritt M. Student food insecurity: The



- 387 skeleton in the university closet. *Nutr Diet.* 2011;68(1):27–32.
- 388 39. Nunnery DL, Labban JD, Dharod JM. Interrelationship between food security status,  
389 home availability of variety of fruits and vegetables and their dietary intake among low-  
390 income pregnant women. *Public Health Nutr.* 2018;21(4):807–15.
- 391 40. Vidgen HA, Gallegos D. Defining food literacy and its components. *Appetite.*  
392 2014;76:50–9.
- 393
- 394



Figure