"THE STRUGGLE IS REAL": AN EXPLORATION OF THE PREVALENCE AND

EXPERIENCES OF LOW-INCOME LATINX UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

NAVIGATING FOOD AND HOUSING INSECURITY AT A FOUR-YEAR

RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

A Thesis

Presented to the faculty of the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

California State University, Sacramento

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Education

(Higher Education Leadership)

by

Alyssa Nicole West

SUMMER
2017

ii

"THE STRUGGLE IS REAL": AN EXPLORATION OF THE PREVALENCE AND

EXPERIENCES OF LOW-INCOME LATINX UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

NAVIGATING FOOD AND HOUSING INSECURITY AT A FOUR-YEAR

RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

A Thesis

by

Alyssa Nicole West

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
José L. Chávez, Ed.D.

_____, Second Reader
Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Ph.D.

_____
Date

Student: <u>Alyssa Nicole West</u>

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the thesis.

_____, Graduate Coordinator   _____
Geni Cowan, Ph.D.   Date

Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

Abstract

of

"THE STRUGGLE IS REAL": AN EXPLORATION OF THE PREVALENCE AND

EXPERIENCES OF LOW-INCOME LATINX UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

NAVIGATING FOOD AND HOUSING INSECURITY AT A FOUR-YEAR

RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

by

Alyssa Nicole West

Brief Literature Review

Institutions of higher education in the United States were originally designed to

cater to students from middle- and upper-class backgrounds. Over the years, however,

changing social, political, and economic factors have led to increased enrollment of

students from low-income backgrounds. While resources have been allocated to support

their recruitment and retention in higher education, the data show that low-income

students, particularly students of color, continue to under-enroll and underperform at

four-year universities in comparison to their wealthier peers (National Center for

Education Statistics, 2015, 2017a). In response to these findings, scholars have

investigated some of the ways in which campus policies, practices, and culture continue

to privilege the wealthy elite and create obstacles to the success and well-being of low-

income students. With food insecurity and housing instability emerging as prevalent

issues on many college campuses, specific attention has been given to the assessment of

how institutional structures impact the ability of students to meet their basic needs (such as food and housing), as it is necessary to satisfy these before higher-order needs (such as self-actualization and academic success) can be pursued (Maslow, 1943).

Problem Statement

Poverty is a critical issue in the state of California. Reports indicate that one in five individuals lives in poverty, and nearly half of the children in the state are poor or near poor (Bohn & Danielson, 2017a; Renwick & Fox, 2016). One approach to improve individual outcomes, while also improving the overall condition of the state, is creating holistically supportive educational environments that are responsive to the needs of low-income student. As such, this study examines whether the existing institutional support systems meet low-income students' needs and how this support, or lack thereof, impacts student success and well-being.

Data Sources

Data were collected from a public four-year research university in California that boasts an enrollment of over 30,000 students, with 40% designated as low-income. As the Latinx (a gender-neutral variation of Latina/o) community is the largest population in the state and experiences the greatest incidences of poverty, this study focused on documenting Latinx student experiences with food and housing insecurity at a four-year university. Purposive sampling was utilized to recruit student participants from the academic department with the highest percentage of Latinx students. Online surveys administered through Qualtrics were distributed to approximately 197 undergraduate students within the identified department. These surveys sought to investigate the

prevalence, impact, and navigational experiences of students facing food and/or housing instability while attending a four-year university. To measure food insecurity, questions from the United States Department of Agriculture U.S. Adult Food Security Survey Module (United States Department of Agriculture, 2012) were utilized, while housing instability was assessed by means of questions adapted from the Housing Instability Index (Rollins, 2012). Questions were also asked concerning the students' awareness and utilization of institutional and community resources.

Conclusions Reached

Food insecurity and housing instability are determined to be prevalent issues impacting the success and well-being of Latinx students at this public four-year research university. Institutional barriers, along with a lack of resources or limited student awareness of the resources available both on and off campus, likely contribute to poorer academic and health outcomes for these students. Based on these findings, institutional leaders should carefully consider how institutional policies and practices could be transformed in order to better support the needs of both low-income students and the economy as a whole.

_____, Committee Chair
José L. Chávez, Ed.D.

_____
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While this thesis is the intellectual product of one author, it truly would not have been possible without the invisible labor and support of many. I would like to thank the following people who, during the past two years, have walked this journey with me:

To my faculty, Dr. José Chávez and Dr. Geni Cowan, thank you for sharing your wisdom and challenging me to be a better academic and leader. Without your guidance and support over the past years this thesis would not have been possible.

To my cohort, your collective energy and enthusiastic motivation to complete this program stimulated my drive to read, write, and study more. Thank you for being a constant source of encouragement.

To the participants in this study, thank you for entrusting me with documenting your lived experiences and struggles.

To my colleagues and mentors, Alma Martinez, Angie Chabram, Clarissa Rojas, Maceo Montoya, Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Sergio de la Mora, Yvette Flores, Ofelia Cuevas, Lorena Márquez, and Susy Zepeda, thank you for being inspirational role models. Special thanks to Carlos Jackson for your generous, unwavering, support over the years. I will always be grateful to you for your guidance and mentorship.

To my partner, Eduardo Alvarado, you inspire me daily. Thank you for being so understanding and supportive throughout this journey.

To my sister, Christal West, thank you for paving the way by being the first in our family to obtain an advanced degree. Thank you, also, for joining me for writing sessions and providing your constant feedback and edits.

To my mother, Sylvia Reyes-West, thank you for always being there and supporting me through every step of the way. From helping with childcare to picking me up from late night classes or study sessions, this truly could not have been possible without you.

Last but not least, Diego- For all of the missed moments together because I had to work, go to school, or do 'homework,' for all those nights you fell asleep without your mommy; for all those times you patiently waited for me to come home, this is for you. Thank you for keeping me centered and providing all your love that helped to get me through difficult moments. I love you more than words can say.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

According to the 2015 Supplemental Poverty Measure conducted by the United

States Census Bureau, the state of California has the highest poverty rate in the nation,

with approximately one in five individuals living in poverty (Renwick & Fox, 2016).

Further reports compiled by the Public Policy Institute of California indicate that nearly

half of the children in California are poor or near poor (Bohn & Danielson, 2017a).

Research suggests that experiencing poverty in the first few years of life may undermine

a child's brain development, adversely affect his or her overall health status, lead to

diminished success in early elementary school grades and lower his or her chances of

ever completing high school (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan,1997; National Scientific Council

on the Developing Child, 2014; Luby, et al, 2013). However, despite these statistics,

many students from low-income backgrounds defy the odds by succeeding academically

and becoming the first members of their families to pursue higher education.

Recent U.S. Census Bureau data show that approximately 63% of students from

low-income families enroll in institutions of higher education immediately after

graduating from high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017a). Some of

the factors that have positively impacted the college attainment rates of low-income

students over the years can be traced to the levels of institutional support offered during

primary and secondary school years (United States Department of Education, 2017b).

For example, full-service community schools, which expanded across the United States

after the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, have formed

partnerships with community organizations and social safety net services to help ensure

that the basic needs of students are met, with the goal of assisting them to succeed

academically and prevent further incidences of poverty (Potapchuk, 2013). These K-12

schools invest in support services that contribute to the retention and holistic well-being

of their students by offering resources such as nutritional support and primary health and

dental services, along with access to counselors and social workers (United States

Department of Education, 2017b). According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943),

these resources help students to meet the lower-level human needs, such as food security,

safety and overall well-being, that must be fulfilled before higher-order needs, such as

self-actualization and academic success, can be fulfilled. With support systems in place

that help to address some of their most basic needs, students have greater potential to

succeed academically and consider post-secondary education.

Additional institutional support structures that have helped improve access to

higher education include early college preparation programs that have been established to

help track educationally and economically disadvantaged K-12 students and guide them

to college. These programs, commonly known as Federal TRIO Programs, emerged in

the mid- to late 1960s as a product of the federal administration's "war on poverty"

(United States Department of Education, 2011). The scope and funding of these

programs vary by institution, but many have had substantial success in improving college

admission and enrollment rates. In one such initiative, 78% of participants completed all

of the coursework required to apply to a public four-year university, in comparison to

42% of seniors in all Californian public high schools. Additionally, 60% of the participants enrolled in a Californian public college, as opposed to an estimated 41% of seniors in all Californian public high schools (Regents of California, 2017).

While the number of low-income students who enroll in college has increased over the years, both their rates of enrollment and degree completion continue to be considerably lower than those of their peers from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. As mentioned previously, data from the National Center for Education Statistics reveal that 63% of students from low-income families enroll in postsecondary education immediately after high school; however, this is in stark contrast to the 83% of students from high-income families (2017a). Furthermore, data from the Educational Longitudinal Study show that only 14% of students of low socioeconomic status (SES) attained a bachelor's degree or higher within eight years of completing high school, in comparison to 29% of students from middle SES and 60% from high SES backgrounds (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). With a focus on Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) as a means to support academic success, this study investigated whether current institutional efforts at the collegiate level adequately meet the basic needs of low-income students.

<div align="center">**Statement of the Problem**</div>

The severe poverty rates in the state of California, along with the educational disparity between low-income students and their counterparts from more privileged backgrounds, demand further attention in order to promote better individual and statewide outcomes. With the Latinx population now comprising the largest

demographic in the state (Department of Finance, 2015), as well as having the greatest rates of poverty in the state (Bohn & Danielson, 2017b), a deeper investigation into how institutions of higher education can meet the needs and support the success of this specific student population is critical. In an effort to better understand some of the needs of this community, this study explored the prevalence and experiences of Latinx students navigating food insecurity and housing instability while enrolled at a four-year research university in California. Additionally, this research examined how these hardships impact the academic success and overall well-being of these students and whether the existing institutional support systems meet their needs.

Using Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) and post-structuralism as a framework, this research places the onus on institutions and how they can better implement support structures and practices that promote the retention and engagement of historically marginalized communities in higher education (Best & Kellner, 1991; Kezar, 2011). Post-structuralism assumes that systems are often set up to promote the success of a dominant group, which, in a privileged setting such as a research university, has traditionally been the wealthy elite (Foucault, 1980). By adopting a poststructuralist framework, this thesis centered on food insecurity and housing instability in higher education as systematic issues rather than personal or individual issues.

In order to investigate the concerns of this research, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the prevalence of Latinx students who experience food insecurity and/or housing instability and what is the impact on student success?

2. How do Latinx students find resources or support to address their needs?

3. To what extent are Latinx students aware of institutional resources, and how do they perceive and utilize them?

Significance of this Study

The initiatives that have been implemented over the years to help promote the academic success of low-income students at the K-12 level have had a profound impact on improving their rates of enrollment in institutions of higher education in California. However, data show that institutions of higher education need to do more to provide support for the changing demographics on their campuses. Recent studies consistently show that low-income and minority students face the most hardships in terms of food and housing security, and, when one considers the achievement gaps in post-secondary education, members of this demographic also significantly underperform their peers. While addressing food and housing needs is not the sole solution to closing achievement gaps, this study seeks to promote an awareness of this relationship in higher education and determine whether improved campus services can positively impact student success.

Since many low-income students attend more affordable public institutions, such as community colleges, their existence and struggles have often gone unnoticed in highly-selective, costlier, four-year universities. To help bring visibility to the experiences of low-income Latinx students at these institutions, the location chosen for this study was at a public four-year research university in California that has been ranked amongst the top 100 colleges in the world. This university is also an emerging Hispanic-

serving institution, which presents an opportunity to determine how this community is truly served.

With California leading the nation in poverty rates, institutions of higher education in this state have a vested social and economic responsibility to ensure that low-income Latinx college students have access to the resources that they require in order to be academically successful. This would not only benefit individual students but also the state as a whole. As such, this research investigated some of the ways in which educational leaders can shift their policies and practices into greater alignment with this objective.

Definition of Terms

CalFresh

"CalFresh (federally known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP) is a federally mandated, state-supervised, and county-operated government entitlement program that provides monthly food benefits to assist low-income households in purchasing the food they need to maintain adequate nutritional levels" (California Department of Social Services, 2017).

First-generation

This definition is inclusive of students whose parents may have some college education, postsecondary certificates, or associate's degrees, but not bachelor's or higher degrees.

Food secure

An individual who has indicated few to no difficulties or limitations with regard

to food access or a reduced quality of diet. As defined by the United States

Department of Agriculture (2016), these individuals may fall within the following

two categories:

    i)   "**High food security**: no reported indications of food-access problems or

          limitations.

    ii) **Marginal food security**: one or two reported indications—typically of

          anxiety over food sufficiency or shortage of food in the house. Little or no

          indication of changes in diets or food intake."

Food insecure

An individual who has indicated a reduced quality of diet or disrupted eating

patterns and/or reduced food intake. As defined by the United States Department

of Agriculture (2016), these individuals may fall within the following two

categories:

    i)   "**Low food security**: reports of reduced quality, variety, or desirability of

          diet. Little or no indication of reduced food intake.

    ii) **Very low food security**: Reports of multiple indications of disrupted

          eating patterns and reduced food intake."

Full service community school

"A full-service community school means a public elementary or secondary school

that works with its local educational agency and community-based organizations,

nonprofit organizations, and other public or private entities to provide a coordinated and integrated set of comprehensive academic, social, and health services that respond to the needs of its students, students' family members, and community members. In addition, a full-service community school promotes family engagement by bringing together many partners in order to offer a range of supports and opportunities for students, students' family members, and community members" (United States Department of Education, 2017b).

Housing instability

"Scholars and policymakers have not yet established a common definition of housing instability; [it has been referred to as] including, but not limited to: moving frequently, foreclosure, doubling up, episodic homelessness, difficulty paying housing costs, or moving because of housing costs" (Priester, Foster & Shaw, 2017).

Latinx

"A person of Latin American origin or descent (used as a gender-neutral or non-binary alternative to Latino or Latina)" (Latinx, n.d.).

Low-income

For the purpose of this research, low-income status indicates having an unmet financial need. In the case of the student respondents in this study, low-income status is determined by students indicating that they had received need-based financial aid. *See 'Need-based aid' for eligibility.*

Need-based aid

Aid that may come in the form of federal or state grants, university grants, scholarships, awards, or subsidized loans intended to help cover the estimated costs of attending an institution of higher education. To be eligible for need-based aid, a student's expected family contribution (EFC) must not exceed the estimated costs of attendance (COA). Expected family contribution is determined by the data a student reports on his or her Free Application for Federal Student Aid or California Dream Act application.

Part-time undergraduate student

A student who is registered for no more than 10 units per quarter throughout an academic year. Between attending classes and completing readings and assignments, this usually entails an academic workload of no more than 30 hours per week.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is the nation's largest federal program, providing nutritional assistance to millions of eligible low-income individuals and families. In California, it is referred to as CalFresh (United States Department of Agriculture, 2016).

Social safety net

A collection of services provided by the state or other institutions that attempt to prevent individuals from falling into poverty (Broton, Frank & Rab, 2014).

Undergraduate student *(full-time)*

> A student who is registered for at least 12 units per quarter throughout an
> academic year. Between attending classes, completing readings and assignments,
> this usually entails an academic workload of at least 36 hours per week.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

This chapter provided an introduction to poverty in the state of California and
how it relates to institutions of higher education. Specific attention was given to students,
predominantly low-income, Latinx, and first-generation, who experience food insecurity
and housing instability while attending college and how these factors impact their
academic success. The consequences of these experiences not only impact the well-being
of individual students, but also threatens the state's economy if students cannot thrive or
persist in college due to a lack of resources or awareness of how to access these
resources. To expand upon this introduction, Chapter Two conducts a literature review
that focuses on low-income students in higher education; it also provides an overview of
the current research into food insecurity and housing instability in higher education.
Chapter Three discusses the research methodology used in this study, while Chapter Four
presents and analyzes the findings. Finally, Chapter Five summarizes the research and
provide recommendations for administrators who seek to address these issues on their
campuses.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The belief that education is the key to success is commonly shared by many

people in the United States. Some may even argue that education has the power to serve

as "the great equalizer" and that, regardless of a person's background, if they work hard

enough, they can become successful and achieve the "American Dream." While

education does have the potential to improve an individual's personal outcomes, the

belief that educational systems provide equal playing fields for everyone is one that can

be contested. In failing to consider the historical foundations of the United States and

how its social, political, and economic structures have subsequently influenced the

nation's educational systems, proponents of this ideology unfairly critique individual

success, or lack thereof, without considering how systematic factors privilege certain

groups and disadvantage others.

This literature review focuses on how low-income Latinx students in higher

education experience inequities as a result of structural factors or institutional policies.

An overview of the historical trajectory of low-income students accessing higher

education is provided, as well as some of the contemporary issues that they face on

college campuses.   Using Maslow's hierarchy of needs as a foundation for the

exploration of the experiences of low-income students, this chapter specifically focuses

on issues of food and housing insecurity; in addition, it utilizes a poststructuralist lens to

critique how the presence or absence of institutional support with regard to these issues impacts the success of Latinx students while attending college. Post-structuralism emphasizes that all societal structures are shaped by historical factors and assumes that systems are often set up to promote the success of the dominant group, which, in the setting of four-year universities, has traditionally been the White wealthy elite (Foucault, 1980). Post-structuralism offers a three-stage framework for critically assessing the implications that the long-standing oppressive structures and practices of certain institutions have for low-income students: " (1) Revelation-exposing practices that privilege one group and strain and constrain another group; (2) Deconstruction-examining the impact of specific institutional structures, policies, and practices; and (3) Reconstruction-providing ideas for new or revised institutional structures, policies and practices" (Kezar, Walpole, and Perna, 2015, p. 244). By using this framework, the researcher seeks to not only shed light on the barriers that low-income Latinx students may face but also to offer recommendations for campus leaders who intend to create more equitable institutions of higher education.

A Brief History of Low-income and Minority Students in Higher Education

In her book *Recognizing and Serving Low-Income Students in Higher Education*, Adriana Kezar (2011) provides context for this chapter's brief overview of the foundations of higher education as they relate to access for individuals from varying socioeconomic statuses:

During the Renaissance (1300s and 1400s), when colleges emerged, there was some philosophical support for the intellectual abilities of all human beings

regardless of economic status […] universities provided scholarships, had low-cost tuition, and sought students from various social statuses (Lucas, 1994). However, over time, universities became finishing schools for the sons of the gentry or vocational schools for civil bureaucrats (typically middle class) […] For much of the following 800 years, colleges and universities became exclusively for the wealthy in Europe (Lucas, 1994). The core structures and culture of higher education, from its beginning, have supported the interests of middle- and high-income students and communities (p. 5).

While this historical snapshot provides insight into how higher education systems developed in Europe, institutions within the United States followed a similar path. In the mid-1600s, amidst colonialism and the spread of religion, institutions of higher education began to surface in the United States; they were founded by religious organizations to train future clergymen. Since the racialized and gendered ideologies of the time limited the educational opportunities of people of color and women, the privilege of obtaining access to higher education was granted predominantly to White Anglo-Saxon men, regardless of their socioeconomic status. However, with the expansion of the United States, colleges had begun to adopt elitist modes of operation by the late 1700s, imposing high tuition costs and offering minimal opportunities for financial assistance, thus limiting access to low-income individuals (Kezar, 2011). By minimizing the number of low-income students who could enroll and privileging the elite, the foundations of and the cultures within institutions of higher education became overwhelmingly influenced by well-off individuals who were predominantly from White families.

The mid-late 1800s marked a major turning point in the history of the United States, as the Industrial Revolution and the continued growth of the economy created a demand for an educated workforce. In 1862, the passage of the First Morrill Act (also known as the Land Grant Act) occurred, which provided federally donated lands for the building of public colleges in the United States that focused on agricultural and technical education (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2012). This marked the first federal involvement in higher education and served as a catalyst for the development of many new colleges. As a result of the First Morrill Act, educational offerings expanded to provide members of the working class with the opportunities to study agriculture, the mechanical arts, military science, and classical studies. While this improved access for most individuals from lower-class backgrounds, racialized tensions in the post-slavery South posed difficulties for the admission of Black students into these colleges, which was addressed by the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890. This Act granted additional funding to further the mission of the 1862 Act but prohibited the distribution of federal funds to states that made distinctions based on race in college admissions. However, states that provided separate land grant institutions for Blacks were eligible to receive funds (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2012). This stimulated the development of historically Black colleges and universities, as segregation was still very much prevalent, and Blacks were generally denied admission to traditionally White institutions. Both the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Morrill Act of 1890 marked the beginnings of greater efforts to expand access to higher education to students from low-income and minority backgrounds.

With the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, many new colleges emerged, including the first community college, Joliet Junior College, which was founded in Illinois in 1901. The focus of community colleges was on teaching general education, leaving universities to focus on research (Drury, 2003). Though beneficial in terms of promoting student access, the design of this model had an elitist motive, as it would allow universities to avoid "having to deal with students who may be less intellectually able or prepared than their peers" (Drury, 2003, p. 1). As such, from their inception and throughout their later development, community colleges generally offered more open access, while universities became more elitist and selective in their admission processes. Additionally, tuition costs varied between the two systems, thus prompting more low-income students to enroll in community colleges for reasons of affordability.

With the establishment of community colleges in the early 1900s, enrollment in higher education increased, as this system provided individuals with the possibility of receiving advanced degrees and studying in their local communities; in addition, this approach to study offered cheaper fees and less of a time commitment when compared to four-year universities. While their initial curricular offerings focused on liberal arts education, as a result of the Great Depression era, community colleges began to offer job-training programs by the 1930s as a means to address widespread unemployment (American Association of Community colleges, 2017). Furthermore, in 1944, the United States Congress passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to both encourage WWII veterans to attend college and to finance their studies, as they feared there would not be enough jobs to accommodate those returning from service. This act, also known as the

GI Bill of Rights, not only sparked large boosts in enrollment and a consequent rapid growth in the number of community colleges, but also set the precedent for financial assistance programs that exist today, as the Bill created the expectation that the government should invest in the financial well-being of its citizens (American Association of Community Colleges, 2017; Fuller, 2014).

Following the establishment of the G.I. Bill in 1944, there were an unprecedented amount of financial investments in higher education intended to support both veterans and civilians alike, particularly those from underprivileged backgrounds. In 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act was signed, which helped encourage the emergence of federally funded educational outreach programs intended to support historically underserved communities in higher education (United States Department of Education, 2011). In the following year, the Higher Education Act of 1965 was signed into law to "strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education" (Higher Education Act, 1965, p. 1219). This Act, signed a year after President Lyndon B. Johnson had declared a "war on poverty," was monumental, as it solidified federal financial investments in higher education and sought to bring social and economic reform throughout the nation by granting additional support to those who needed it most. This not only included financial assistance programs but also the funding of specialized programs that focused on the recruitment and retention of low-income and historically underserved communities in higher education.

While the Higher Education Act of 1965 was intended to create more equitable educational attainment outcomes for historically underrepresented communities, it is important to note some of the other major socio-political events that contributed to the transformation of educational institutions that occurred around this time. Prior to the signing of the Higher Education Act, several landmark civil rights cases were won, and a number of anti-discrimination policies were enacted, leading to more equitable educational opportunities for minorities. Mendez v. Westminster (1946) was a Californian civil rights case that argued against the use of "discriminatory practices against the pupils of Mexican descent in the public schools" and eventually led to the desegregation of all public schools in the state. This case informed the arguments in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), which ruled "separate but equal" as unconstitutional in public education, thus leading to desegregation of all public schools in the nation. While these two cases helped lead to integration, racial minorities were still faced with many discriminatory practices in all areas of life, including education, employment, and access to resources, all of which helped to fuel the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. In response to the movement's agitation for social justice, the Civil Rights Act, which prohibited discrimination against individuals based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, was signed into law in 1964 by President Lyndon Johnson. In addition, in the following year, Executive Order 11246 was issued, which ordered all federal contractors to take "take affirmative action to expand job opportunities for minorities" as a means to redress historical inequities (American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity, n.d.). The Civil Rights Act, along with affirmative action

policies, sought to provide equal opportunities for all and served as an impetus to ensure

that public institutions, such as universities, were more representative of the communities

they served. In order to be in compliance with affirmative action and anti-discrimination

laws, institutions of higher education reformed their recruitment, admissions, and hiring

processes, redesigning them with the intention of increasing the number of women and

minority students in all fields and disciplines, as they had historically been significantly

underrepresented. While these programs helped to increase the admissions rates of the

aforementioned groups, some argued against them, claiming that they granted unfair

privileges to less qualified minority applicants, as exemplified in the Bakke v. Regents of

the University of California case (1978). While the Bakke case upheld the usage of

affirmative action and the consideration of race in admissions processes, it deemed the

use of racial quotas to be unconstitutional. Several challenges to affirmative action

occurred during the subsequent years, finally leading to the passing of Proposition 209

(1996) in California, which abolished all public-sector affirmative action programs in the

state, including those in place at public universities. This led to a drastic decline in the

number of minority students enrolling in higher education.

  With the elimination of affirmative action in California in 1996, educational

leaders faced the challenge of ensuring that the student demographics of universities

adequately reflected the increasingly diverse demographics of the state without the use of

preferential treatment. One approach to doing so was to rely on early college

preparedness programs that targeted communities evidencing low rates of college

attainment, as doing so did not privilege individuals based on any defining

characteristics, such as race, sex, ethnicity, or nationality. Since significant achievement gaps have existed within communities that are largely low-income and under-resourced, these efforts have essentially served to benefit students from these demographics. Moreover, as minorities experience poverty at greater rates than Whites (Bohn & Danielson, 2017b), the intersectionality of these identities has resulted in early academic outreach programs primarily benefitting students from these backgrounds. Although many of these programs have been successful in instilling a college-going culture amongst the students that they assist, limited access to resources has restricted their ability to serve all students in the state who come from under-resourced communities.

While targeted efforts to increase the eligibility and admission of individuals from backgrounds that feature low rates of college attainment (i.e., predominantly first-generation, low-income, and minority students) have been effective, the experiences of these students within institutions of higher education are often not comparable with those of their middle- and high-income peers. The following section provides an overview of some of the current-day issues that low-income college students face and how institutional culture and policies have influenced these educational disparities. Furthermore, as the Latinx community experiences high incidences of poverty (Macartney, Bishaw, & Fontenot, 2013) and is the fastest growing and largest demographic on college campuses in the U.S. (Krogstad & Fry, 2014), special attention is given to this population.

Revelation: Racial and Class Privilege in Higher Education

As discussed previously, the foundational structures of higher education were established to cater to predominantly White middle- and high-income students, thus leading to this positionality informing the cultures, organization, and policies of college campuses. With regard to the issue of class privilege, Adriana Kezar (2011) provides a comprehensive list of "Unquestioned Assumptions of Middle- and High- Income Students in Postsecondary Education" that represents some of the many ways in which middle- and high-income students are privileged on college campuses in comparison to their low-income peers. These assumptions focus on how middle- and high-income students generally do not have to worry about challenges such as the following:

> …financial stress, fear of debt, lack of discretionary funding, working long hours, living far from campus, lack of transportation, needing childcare, crowded housing conditions, having to attend low resourced schools because they are convenient, staying close to and helping family, lack of role models for college, lack of knowledge about college, having difficulty understanding FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) and college admission processes, being less likely to feel faculty are approachable or have a similar background to them, feeling like outsiders socially, being unable to find peers, not understanding social etiquette of middle- and high- income, feeling they have to give up their culture to be successful, and feeling pressured to enroll in a major that is lucrative rather than their passion (p. 19) .

While there are many other assumptions and policies to consider that may hinder the success of low-income students, this brief list serves to highlight some of the ways in which this ever-growing population has been systemically disadvantaged within higher education. For Latinx students who identify as low-income, these stressors may be compounded by a number of additional issues that have been well documented as impacting their success. For instance, Harper and Hurtado (2007) found that, when compared to their White counterparts, students of color frequently perceive their campus environments as more hostile and antagonistic. This may not only create unhealthy learning environments but may also discourage low-income Latinx students from seeking support if they experience hardships. Additionally, other researchers have found that students of color experience greater rates of discrimination and prejudice than their White peers (Ancis, Sedlack, & Mohr, 2000; Cabrera & Nora, 1994; Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagedorn, 1999; Feagin, 1992; Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Hurtado, 1992; Lewis, Chelser, & Forman, 2000; Smedley, Meyers & Harrell, 1993). This once again negatively impacts how Latinx students perceive campus climate, which can lead to feelings of unbelonging. In addition to feeling like they may not belong, Latinx students are also more likely to lack access to faculty mentors who resemble them or understand their cultural background, as the tenure rates of faculty members of color lag considerably behind those of White faculty members (Harvey, 2001). This lack of faculty representation not only negatively impacts the ways in which Latinx students can be supported on an individual level, but also limits the amount of institutional advocacy for marginalized communities on campus at large.

By exposing some of the various hardships that Latinx students may face, it can be seen how these experiences can negatively impact their likelihood of achieving academic success. If educational leaders seek to be more supportive of the growing low-income Latinx student community, the application of Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) would suggest first examining to what extent lower-level needs, such as food and housing, are met, as these are necessary to address before higher-order needs, such as self-actualization and academic success, can be fulfilled. As such, the following section focuses on deconstructing some of the institutional policies and practices that impact low-income students, with specific attention given to financial, food, and housing barriers.

Financial Barriers

For low-income students, costs of attendance, along with the availability of financial aid, play a critical role in choice of college and the ability to persist in their studies. The ways in which institutions determine their costs of attendance also directly impact student eligibility for federal financial aid. However, despite this relationship, there are no mandated formulas or methodologies for guiding institutions when it comes to determining costs of attendance, which consequently affects the availability of student aid (United States Department of Education, 2017a). The Higher Education Act (1965; 2008) identifies the specific types of expenses that must be included when calculating costs of attendance for the purpose of federal student aid. However, institutions of higher education have autonomy in terms of determining reasonable budgets for each expense (United States Department of Education, 2017a). To help define appropriate and reasonable budgets, institutions can assess average costs of attendance by means of

periodic surveys and an evaluation of the local market. As there are no mandated

regulations that inform the ways in which institutions determine costs of attendance, there

are likely to be discrepancies between the estimated and actual costs of attendance. For

example, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development found that institutions

appear to systematically underestimate students' living expenses, particularly those living

off-campus (2015). This could be due to poor assessments of student expenses;

alternatively, it may be done intentionally in order to maintain the institutions' appeal to

students in terms of affordability. Research also found that allowances for off-campus

living expenses varied dramatically amongst institutions within close geographic

proximity of each other, which once again highlights the disparities in how institutions

calculate costs of living (Kelchen, Hosch, & Goldrick-Rab, 2014). So, while some

institutions may appear to offer substantial financial aid to cover the (under)estimated

costs of attendance, the amounts provided may actually prove insufficient to meet all of a

student's needs, thus placing a student at risk of facing adverse situations.

Although financial support programs are intended to provide support to low-

income students (with some colleges even offering tuition-free programs), many students

still face difficulties in meeting their basic needs. For example, in the California

community college system, eligible low-income students can apply for the Board of

Governors (BOG) fee waiver to waive enrollment fees; however, a recent report found

that one in three community college students struggle with some form of housing

instability (Wood, Harris, & Delgado, 2016). Additionally, within the University of

California system, students from families that earn less than $80,000 per year qualify to

have their tuition fees covered by gift aid, yet recent data show that 48% of

undergraduate students face some form of food insecurity (Martinez, Maynard, Ritchie,

2016). This clearly demonstrates that the current financial resources provided to assist

low-income students in their pursuit of a higher education are insufficient to adequately

support them. To provide further insight into the ways in which low-income students

may be systematically disadvantaged, the following two sections examine some of the

policies that represent barriers for students in terms of food and housing security.

Food Security Barriers

It is estimated that one in eight Californians struggle with food insecurity

(California Association of Food Banks, 2017). While this statistic may seem ironic, as

California claims the title of having the sixth-largest economy in the world, what is even

more surprising is the fact that eligible Californians rank amongst the lowest to

participate in and receive benefits from federally funded nutritional support programs

(Call & Shimada, 2016; Cunnyngham, 2016). One of these programs, the Supplemental

Nutrition and Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as "food stamps" and now

known as CalFresh in California), is the nation's largest nutritional assistance program; it

provides up to $194 per month in food assistance benefits to eligible low-income

applicants, including college students (United States Department of Agriculture, 2017a).

In 2013, approximately only 66% of eligible Californians participated in and received

SNAP benefits (CalFresh), whereas the nationwide participation averages were around

85% (Call & Shimada, 2016; Cunnyngham, 2016). This clearly indicates systemic faults

within the state of California and its institutions of higher education, as the needs of

vulnerable populations are going unmet despite the fact that resources intended to support them exist. The underutilization of this particular resource also negatively impacts the state as a whole: If 100% of eligible participants in California enrolled in CalFresh, not only would their nutritional intakes and overall livelihoods be improved, but it has been estimated that billions of dollars in additional economic activity would be generated, thus improving the economy at large (Call & Shimada, 2016). This would occur as a result of the SNAP-provided grocery funds freeing up household dollars, which could in turn be spent on taxable goods. Through the support of SNAP, everyone would benefit, as individual needs could be met, the economy could be stimulated, and the incidences of poverty could be reduced.

Although the reasons for the underutilization of available resources could be further explored, a lack of awareness and barriers in terms of in eligibility/enrollment are likely be contributing factors. This may be particularly true for low-income college students, as very few campuses have dedicated programs or staff charged with the task of addressing food insecurity on their campuses, despite the prevalence of this problem. One of the largest and most recent national studies on food insecurity on college campuses found 48% of student respondents indicated they had experienced low or very low levels of food security, with Black, Latinx, and first-generation students being most impacted (Dubick, Mathews, & Cady, 2016). Despite the large percentage of students who indicated that they had experienced food insecurity, only 25% of the respondents reported utilizing the support offered by SNAP (Dubick, Mathews, & Cady, 2016).

Although a lack of institutional support in registering college students for SNAP may be a contributing factor to the low utilization rates, the requirements listed for eligibility can also be considered as barriers. For students, these requirements essentially entail that one must be enrolled at least half-time in post-secondary education while also working 20 hours per week, participate in a state- or federally funded work study program, or have a dependent child in order to be eligible for food assistance (United States Department of Agriculture, 2016). Exceptions are solely made for seniors, children, pregnant women, or those who are exempt for physical or mental health reasons. Since the majority of students at four-year universities attend school full-time, rather than part-time (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017b), this requires that, on top of an academic work week of approximately 40 hours, students must also work a significant amount of hours, have a dependent, or qualify for an exception in order to receive assistance. While being employed as a student, specifically on campus, has been found to have positive impacts on development and academic performance (Astin, 1993; Chen & DesJardins, 2008), working too many hours, such as 20 hours per week or more, has been tied to poor academic performance and attrition (Astin, 1993; King, 2003). So, while this public resource may exist to support students' nutritional needs, the eligibility requirements for receiving these benefits may in fact negatively impact their academic success.

For those individuals who do utilize SNAP/CalFresh, the ways in which this supplemental nutrition program extends its benefits can be seen as incompatible with their needs. Although CalFresh provides a substantial amount of funding with which

individuals can purchase food, this is predominantly restricted to grocery purchases, rather than prepared meals. For students who have academic and work obligations, dedicating time to go grocery shopping and prepare home-cooked meals can be difficult. Not only is time a factor, but students may not have access to areas in which they can store and prepare their groceries, they may lack appropriate transportation to go grocery shopping, and not all vendors may be equipped to accept their electronic benefits card for the purpose of food purchases. Additionally, as there are often stigmas associated with utilizing public benefits, students may also be confronted with hostile climates if the community or campus does not openly cater to individuals who rely upon this resource.

As mentioned previously, since college campuses were not designed to cater to the needs of low-income individuals, the issue of food insecurity has largely gone unnoticed; this has only changed in relatively recent years as a result of these communities growing. In response, there has been an increase in the number of studies that seek to explore and respond to the issue of food insecurity on various campuses. One of the ways in which administrative and student leaders have sought to address this issue is through the implementation of food pantries on their respective campuses. As of May 2017, almost 500 institutions have joined the College and University Food Bank Alliance, which means that 500 colleges and universities have, or are in the process of making available, food pantries on their campuses (College and University Food Bank Alliance, 2017). While food pantries are definitely a positive approach to addressing emergency food needs, more systemic action needs to be taken, as the issue of food insecurity is extremely prevalent and has profound impacts on students well beyond just

hunger. Experiencing food insecurity has been found to lead to poor academic outcomes and prolonged degree-completion times (Alaimo, Olson & Frongillo, 2001; Bergerson, 2006; Cady, 2014; Jyoti, Frongillo & Jones, 2005; Winicki & Jemison, 2003). Furthermore, poor physical and mental health and impaired cognitive, social, and emotional development have determined to be outcomes related to experiencing food insecurity (Chilton & Rose, 2009). While the gravity of the impact of this issue can depend on age of exposure and other social factors, food insecurity poses risks that negatively impact individuals in all age groups. Since college students come from diverse backgrounds and circumstances, responding appropriately to each student's needs requires trained professionals who can serve as case managers and ensure that students receive the support that they require to remain healthy and successful while pursuing their education. While food pantries are a good start, food insecurity cannot be seen as a single-dimension issue nor have a one-size-fits-all response approach.

Since a number of social safety net programs intended to support low-income individuals, such as SNAP or food bank organizations, already exist, the responsibility lies on campus leaders to reach out and build community partnerships intended to ensure that these resources are accessible to students. This approach would be somewhat similar to the previously discussed full-service community schools model, which attempts to bring community organizations together to ensure that the holistic needs of students are met. By bringing to light some of the institutional barriers that exist, this creates a reflective path for institutions to consider how they can transform their campus culture,

create shifts in institutional policies, and build better networks within the community to better support the needs of low-income and food insecure students.

Housing Security Barriers

As mentioned in the federal report, *Barriers to Success: Housing Insecurity Amongst U.S. College Students,* low-income and first-generation students continue to graduate at lower rates than their higher income peers, and challenges related to student housing likely contribute to this gap (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2015). One of the difficulties low-income students face in terms of housing involves financial aid. Although federal legislation requires institutions of higher education to incorporate expenses related to room and board in the estimated costs of attendance, these costs may not always be accurately reflected or fully covered by financial aid. As mentioned previously, discrepancies in terms of how institutions determine the costs of attendance have been found, which consequently impact the amount of aid a student may receive. Furthermore, though some financial assistance programs have been designed to support low-income students by offering a substantial amount of gift aid, the amounts they offer may only be sufficient to cover tuition-related expenses, leaving other expenses, such as room and board, textbooks, and transportation, to be covered through loans or other means.

Since Latinx students demonstrate a high tendency to loan aversion, many of these students may instead opt to attend a low-cost institution instead of those that may be better academic fits, enroll in college part-time, work while in school, live in affordable rather than ideal housing, or even cut back on costs at the expense of their own

well-being or academic performance in order to get by. While these strategies demonstrate some of the ways in which low-income students strive to actualize their dreams of obtaining a higher education, the limited amount of gift aid means that they have inequitable educational experiences when compared to their higher income peers, as they frequently struggle to find ways to pay for their unfunded expenses.

Students who do opt to take loans still face challenges, as federally mandated restrictions on aid disbursement can impact how they pay for housing expenses incurred before classes begin. For example, the earliest that institutions may disburse federal Title VI aid is ten days before classes begin. Additionally, some institutions cannot disburse direct loans for first-year, first-time borrowers until 30 days after the first day of class (United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2015). These institutional policies unfairly disadvantage students who have limited financial resources, as it may prove difficult to secure and maintain payments for their housing when financial aid is unavailable.

While issues relating to financial aid can impact how low-income students pay for their housing, constrained financial resources can also limit where they live and thus limit the developmental benefits that come along with their housing options. Statistics show that living on campus or even near campus leads to higher levels of engagement and better student outcomes (Astin, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Pascarella, Terenzini, and Bliming, 1994). However, for low-income students, living on or near campus is often not possible due to the exponentially higher costs involved. For example, at many schools in California, the costs of on-campus room and board can

outweigh the costs of tuition and fees (Gordon, 2015). As student housing often plays a critical role in recruitment, competitive universities tend to invest in offering trendy, luxurious units rather than affordable ones, thus driving up costs. This systematically creates economically-based educational inequities, as only wealthier students can afford to live on-campus. Furthermore, the high demand for housing near college campuses has driven low-income students and even residents out of local campus communities, causing them to seek housing in more affordable areas, which are usually further away. This phenomenon, referred to as "studentification," occurs as a result of college enrollment figures rapidly outpacing the development of student housing (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2015). With the number of enrollments outpacing the availability of student housing, private developers have capitalized on this demand by building high-end complexes in college communities in an attempt to appeal to the luxurious preferences of millennials (La Roche, Flanigan, & Copeland, 2010). Since wealthier students are able to afford and occupy these units, little attention has been paid to, and few investments have been made in, building affordable housing for low-income students.

The student housing market has also caused low-income students to double up (i.e., to have housemates/roommates) in their housing arrangements in order to minimize their housing costs. While living with friends and roommates can support positive social development, this may not always be the case, as clashing personalities and a greater number of shared responsibilities can lead to conflict and unhealthy living/learning spaces. Furthermore, sharing housing between multiple people can also lead to greater

exposure to illnesses, thus impacting student well-being and success. These are situations that wealthier or more privileged students may not have to worry about, as they can afford to live on their own or move into alternative accommodations if the need arises.

In addition to some students being forced to live further away from campus or in crowded living conditions, the high costs of living, along with increasing tuition costs, have caused the number of displaced to students to increase rapidly over the years. In 2013, 58,000 students were identified as homeless on the Federal Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), representing a 75% increase over the previous three years (Ashtari, 2014). Experts note that the number of homeless students may actually be significantly higher, as some students may not ever complete the FAFSA, others may not fully identify as being homeless despite lacking a stable place of residence, and some may not disclose their homeless status due to the stigma attached to it. In California, a recent student survey found that 8% to 12% of the approximately 460,000 students in the California State University (CSU) students were homeless (Crutchfield et al., 2016). Despite the astounding prevalence of student homelessness, this issue has been somewhat invisibilized, as institutions have yet to acknowledge and make resources available to displaced students. Of the 23 campuses in the CSU system, only five incorporate students' food and housing needs as part of their student success directives and university missions (Crutchfield, 2012). Out of these five campuses, only two have implemented programs intended to address housing instability. With California experiencing increased enrollment of low-income students in higher education, statewide to create collaborations

between institutions, government agencies, and community organizations are required to better understand, respond to, and prevent housing instability within higher education.

Rationale for the Study

As California has the highest poverty rates in the nation (Renwick & Fox, 2016), this research seeks to bring greater awareness to low-income student experiences within this state, specifically as it relates to food and housing security. A few studies have explored food insecurity and housing instability in Californian colleges (Crutchfield, 2012; Crutchfield et al, 2016; Wood, Harris, Delgado, 2016); however, given that the majority of low-income students enroll in low-cost institutions, most of these have focused on community colleges or state schools. Since the experiences of low-income minority students are often invisibilized at highly selective, large, public universities that have traditionally catered to White middle- and high-income students, this research sought to gain insight into their experiences. In addition, as legislation continually seeks to improve the educational outcomes of low-income and historically underrepresented and underserved students, college administrators have a responsibility to ensure that they are prepared to meet the holistic needs of these growing populations on their campuses.

Summary

This chapter provided a brief historical overview of low-income student enrollment in higher education, along with some of the challenges they face in relation to this positionality. Specific attention was paid to analyzing the prevalence of food insecurity and housing instability amongst college students and how these factors impact their success. While the enrollment rate of low-income students still lags considerably

behind those of middle- and high-income students, this population is ever-growing, and administrators must consider whether existing student support services meet the needs of these changing campus demographics.

Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methods used to explore the prevalence and experiences of low-income Latinx students who have faced or are currently facing food insecurity and/or housing instability while attending a highly selective four-year research university. First, a description of the research design is provided, as well as the rationale behind the selection of this approach for the purposes of this study. Second, the research site and participant selection process are discussed. Finally, this chapter concludes by summarizing the data collection process and analysis procedures.

Research Design and Rationale

To explore the prevalence of food and housing insecurity amongst Latinx undergraduate students, a research design based on quantitative methods was employed in this study. Creswell (2013) defines a quantitative approach as "one in which the investigator primarily uses post-positivist claims for developing knowledge (i.e., cause and effect thinking, reduction to specific variables and hypotheses and questions, use of measurement and observation, and the test of theories), employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data." The rationale for utilizing this methodology was to numerically capture the prevalence, impact, and resource utilization of low-income Latinx students who experience food insecurity and housing instability.

Selection of Site

The selected research site ranks as one of the top public universities in California; it boasts a total enrollment of approximately 35,000 students, with an estimated 40% of its undergraduate population coming from low-income families and 40% identifying as first-generation college students. The demographic makeup of this institution is fairly diverse, with an undergraduate student profile of 26% White, 35% Asian/Pacific Islander, 21% Latinx, 12% international, 4% African American/Black, and 1% Native American/Alaskan Native. The annual costs of attendance are upwards of $30,000 per year, and with such a large demographic of low-income students (40%), it is likely that this sample population contains students who have experienced financial difficulties, particularly from diverse backgrounds.

Participant Selection

In order to gain insight into the experiences of low-income Latinx students who face food insecurity and/or housing instability at a highly selective research university, purposeful sampling was employed to recruit undergraduate student participants with this positionality. Purposeful sampling allows a researcher to narrow sample criteria in order to meet the specific objectives of a research study (Creswell, 2013). In order to identify an appropriate population sample, the researcher conducted preliminary research to identify an academic program with a large enrollment of Latinx students and a large percentage of students who received need-based aid. This information was determined with reference to data collected from the campus' office of Budget and Institutional Analysis, which indicated that 97% of students in this academic department identified as

Latinx and 93.3% of those who received financial aid received need-based aid. By limiting the recruitment to students from a single department, it was possible to control for academic impacts, as all students experienced similar levels of academic rigor.

Data Collection

Online surveys administered through Qualtrics were distributed to approximately 197 undergraduate students; these surveys sought to investigate the prevalence, impact, and navigational experiences of students facing food insecurity and/or housing instability while attending a four-year university. The undergraduate participants in the population sample were recruited via email; they were sent a link that gave them the choice to participate in the anonymous online survey. This survey consisted of 56 questions, which were mostly multiple choice, and took approximately 15 minutes to complete. Students were sent an initial email, along with two emails that reminded them to complete the survey, and it remained open for approximately two and a half weeks.

Instrumentation

To measure food insecurity, questions from the United States Department of Agriculture U.S. Adult Food Security Survey Module (United States Department of Agriculture, 2012) were utilized. Additionally, housing instability was assessed through questions adapted from the Housing Instability Index (Rollins, 2012). Questions were also asked about the students' awareness and utilization of campus-specific resources, as well as the academic and holistic impacts their situation may have had on them, if applicable.

Data Analysis Procedures

To determine levels of food and housing security, commonly used data collection instruments such as the United States Department of Agriculture U.S. Adult Food Security Survey Module and the Housing Instability Index provided templates for coding and analyzing responses. In addition, descriptive statistics was employed to correlate findings with academic performance, impact, and awareness and utilization of resources.

Limitations of the Study

While the focus on low-income Latinx students was chosen with reference to statewide poverty rates, using purposeful sampling within one academic program may not provide sufficiently broad insight into all student experiences. Additionally, although the usage of quantitative methods proved beneficial for quantifying the occurrence of food and housing insecurity in this study, future studies may wish to utilize qualitative methods to gain in-depth understanding of individual experiences and determine if any recurring themes emerge. Finally, as this study focused solely on one university, its findings cannot be generalized to all institutions of higher education.

Ethical Considerations

Role of the researcher

Any research project is subject to researcher bias, given that the researcher will have an interest in exploring a particular topic. In an effort to minimize such bias, disclosure of the relationship of the researcher to the research problem is essential in order to provide transparency and ensure the integrity of the research. The lens through which this research examines its theme is that of a first-generation, low-income, minority

individual's experience at a highly selective public university, similar to those of the participants. The author's experience of living this reality, having had imposter syndrome, and encountering difficulty in navigating resources prompted this study; in addition, the researcher currently serves student populations from similar backgrounds. In utilizing a "backyard" convenience sample, the researcher's identity and experiences may have had a positive or negative influence on the individuals who responded to the recruitment efforts and the ways in which they responded, based on their level of comfort with the researcher.

As the online student survey requested the disclosure of sensitive information, it was extremely important to protect participant confidentiality and ensure that the manner in which the questions were asked caused minimal discomfort. Some of the ways in which discomfort was reduced were making the survey accessible online (rather than conducting in-person interviews), ensuring that it was anonymous, and allowing students to skip questions that they did not feel comfortable answering. Students were also notified that, through the process of informed consent, they were able to withdraw their participation at any time and have their responses discarded if they so wished. All data gathered were stored in a secure password-protected online database, and all of the ethical research protocol procedures outlined by the Institutional Review Board were followed.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology that was used to explore the prevalence of students who experience food insecurity and/or housing insecurity

while attending a highly selective research university and the impact that these factors

have. By adopting a quantitative methods approach, the researcher hoped to shed light on

the issues of food insecurity and housing instability in higher education amongst low-

income Latinx students. A summary of these findings is provided in the following

chapter.

Chapter Four

DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the prevalence and

experiences of Latinx students who navigate food insecurity and/or housing

instability while attending a four-year research university. Additionally, the

researcher sought to explore the impact of these experiences on student success

and whether students perceived institutional resources as sufficient in supporting

their needs. Data for this inquiry were gathered through an online questionnaire,

and quantitative results were organized in order to answer the following research

questions:

1. What is the prevalence of Latinx students who experience food insecurity

   and/or housing instability and what is the impact on student success?

2. How do Latinx students find resources or support to address their needs?

3. To what extent are Latinx students aware of institutional resources, and how

   do they perceive and utilize them?

In this chapter, data collected from the research will be presented under the following

main themes: demographics, finances, food security, housing stability, and resources.

Following the presentation of the findings an analysis will be provided to determine

how the findings correspond to the research presented in the review of the literature.

Findings and Interpretations

Demographic Data of Participants

Recruitment for this study was conducted within a single academic department, and the population sample was identified by preliminary research that indicated that this department had a large enrollment of low-income Latinx students. The online survey was distributed to 197 students, of which 50 participated, thus leading to a response rate of 25.38%. A total of 56 questions were asked; however, some respondents chose to skip certain questions, which have been noted in the findings. Of the 50 respondents, 41 identified as female, 7 as male, and 2 as trans/gender non-conforming. Participants were between the ages of 18 to 27 years old. Ninety-six percent (48) of the participants identified as first-generation and 94% (47) had also attended the university for more than one year. Table 1 provides a breakdown of generalizable class standing, classified by years of attendance rather than by freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior standing. In the survey, class standing was organized by years to avoid any possible confusion for students who may have transferred units and also to provide the best insight into how long individual had been navigating this specific institution. Table 2 indicates whether the respondents identified themselves as being first generation, undocumented, an Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) student, having a disability, being a transfer student, or learning English as a second language. While a specific analysis was not conducted with regard to these identities, demographic insights help to provide awareness of how intersectional identities are represented within this population. For instance, in addition to the majority noting that they were of first-generation college student status,

62% (31) of the participants identified themselves as being EOP students. Educational

Opportunity Program students are traditionally first-generation college students who

come from low-income backgrounds.

Table 1

Years at Institution

Years at Institution	Response Count (out of 50)	Response Percent
Less than one	3	6%
More than one	11	22%
More than two	11	22%
More than three	15	30%
More than four	10	20%

Table 2

Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	Response Count (out of 50)	Response Percent
AB540/DACA Recipient	6	12%
English as second language	9	18%
EOP Student	31	62%
First-generation	48	96%
Student with disability	3	6%
Transfer student	5	10%

Finances

Many Latinx students depend on financial assistance in order to persist in higher education. Question 10 of the survey asked participants to indicate whether they received financial aid; 100% (50) of the respondents indicated yes. Question 11 asked them to identify which forms of financial aid they were currently receiving and the results are presented in Table 3. Six participants indicated that they relied solely on grants, and one indicated that they relied solely on loans, while the majority of the participants relied on more than one form of aid. Only 60% of the respondents relied upon loans to help finance their education, while 96% utilized grants. This finding is consistent with prior research, which has found that Latinx students rely heavily on financial aid, more specifically gift aid, and exhibit modest behaviors in terms of utilizing loans to finance their education (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008).

Table 3

Types of Aid Received

Type of Aid	Response Count (out of 50)	Response Percent
Grants	48	96%
Loans	30	60%
Scholarships	18	36%
Work-study	25	50%

In terms of employment, 35 out of 45 respondents (78%) were employed and the average amount of hours they worked per week are shown in Table 4. Participants who

worked 1-10 hours per week earned an average monthly income of $349, those who worked 10-15 hours earned an average monthly income of $416, those who worked 15-20 hours earned an average monthly income of $611, and those who worked 20-30 hours per week earned an average monthly income of $666.

While working provides additional income for students as they finance their way through school, the findings indicated that those who worked 20-30 hours per week, as well as those who were unemployed, reported lower overall grade point averages in comparison to those who worked between 1-20 hours per week. These findings reiterate how engagement opportunities such as employment can have positive academic benefits (Astin, 1993; Chen & DesJardins, 2008), while not being engaged or being overly engaged (i.e., working more than 20 hours per week) can result in significantly poorer academic outcomes (Astin, 1993; King, 2003).

Table 4

Employment

Number of Hours Worked	Response Count (out of 45)	Response Percent	Average Monthly Income	Average GPA
20-30 hours per week	8	18%	$666	2.77
15-20 hours per week	7	16%	$611	3.11
10-15 hours per week	7	16%	$416	3.04
1-10 hours per week	13	29%	$349	3.04
Unemployed	10	22%		2.88

Food Security

Participants were asked a series of 10 questions (See Appendix B, Q33 through Q42), which were adapted from the United States Adult Food Security Survey Module, to screen for levels of food security. The responses were then coded into raw scores that indicated the students' food security status on the Adult Food Security Scale (USDA, 2012). Of the 50 participants, 5 did not respond, thus leaving only 45 respondents. Out of these 45, 34 (75%) experienced either low or very low levels of food security (see Table 5). This rate is significantly higher than the overall national averages (48%) found in previous studies (Dubick, Matthews, Cady, 2016).

Table 5

Food Security

Food Security Level	Response Count (Out of 45)	Response Percent
High food security	5	11%
Marginal food security	6	13%
Low food security	11	24%
Very low food security	23	51%

Impacts of food insecurity

To follow up on the findings pertaining to food insecurity, participants were asked about the impacts of experiencing this hardship. Question 43 asked participants to rate their agreement with the following statement: "As a result of experiencing food insecurity, my academic performance during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted."

Of the 50, only 44 responded and 25 (57%) indicated that their academic performance was negatively impacted as a result of experiencing food insecurity.

Question 44 asked participants to rate their agreement with the following statement: "As a result of experiencing food insecurity, my overall health and well-being during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted." Of the 50, only 44 responded and 28 of the 44 (64%) indicated that their overall well-being was negatively impacted as a result of experiencing food insecurity. Disaggregation of these responses can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

Negative Impacts of Food Insecurity

	Academic	Impact	Well-being	Impact
Agreement with Statement	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent
Strongly agree	5	11%	5	11%
Agree	20	45%	23	52%
Disagree	8	18%	7	16%
Strongly disagree	3	7%	1	2%
Not applicable	8	18%	8	18%

Housing Stability

When the current living situations of the respondents were assessed, most indicated they had some place of stable residency, whether they were living in dorms, off-campus, or commuting from home. Only one participant indicated that they were currently without stable housing and one participant did not respond. In terms of living arrangements, no

students lived alone. Nine students lived with two other individuals, eighteen lived with three, nine lived with four, seven lived with five, and six lived with six or more people in their housing arrangements. This reflects the trends in doubling up for affordability reasons.

Utilizing the Housing Stability Index (Rollins, 2012), ten questions (Q19 through Q28) were asked to determine housing stability; eight of these questions, along with a summary of the responses, can be found in Table 7. The two questions that were not included did not elicit a 'yes/no' response; therefore, they were not integrated into the table. One of these two questions that were not listed asked participants to indicate how many times they had moved over the past six months, with a response of two or more serving as a risk factor for housing instability. Two participants indicated they had moved twice over the past six months, and seven indicated they had moved once. The other question asked participants to indicate whether it was likely that they would be able to pay their rent/mortgage for the upcoming month. 49 students responded, with 40 (82%) stating it was likely, while 9 (18%) stated it was unlikely.

Table 7

Housing Stability

In the past 6 months… (out of 49 respondents)	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
…have you had to live somewhere that you did not want to live?	13	27%	36	73%
…have you had difficulty paying for your housing?	29	59%	20	41%
…have you had trouble getting housing?	10	20%	39	80%
…have you had to borrow money to pay your rent/mortgage payment?	32	65%	17	35%
…have you had trouble with a landlord?	6	12%	43	88%
…has your landlord threatened to evict you?	2	4%	47	96%
…have you been served an eviction notice?	1	2%	48	98%
Do you expect that you will be able to stay in your current housing for the next 6 months?	33	67%	16	33%

To obtain deeper insight into student housing experiences, participants were additionally asked about where they had slept during the previous 12 months (Q30). These finding can be found in Table 8. Of the 50 participants, 41 responded, with 28 (68%) indicating they had slept in a single location over the past 12 months, while 13 (32%) indicated two or more locations. Of the options presented, many indicated they had stayed in unstable or precarious locations. Seven participants disclosed they had temporarily stayed with a relative or friend or had couch surfed until they found other housing. One student had stayed at a hotel or motel (not for vacation or work purposes), without a permanent home to return to. Two students had slept in an indoor area, such as a 24-hour

study room, the common area of a dorm, or other general indoor areas not intended for human habitation. Lastly, one student had slept in an enclosed area/space not meant for human habitation, such as a car/truck, an abandoned building, a tent, or an unconverted garage. Participants were also asked if they had ever experienced homelessness while in college (Q29), to which three of the students indicated yes. The percentage of students at this 4-year research university who had experienced homelessness (6%) is slightly below the figure provided in the findings of Dr. Rashida Crutchfield (2012), who assessed homelessness within the California State University system (8-12%). In her study, Dr. Rashida Crutchfield, like many others who study homelessness, presumes that the actual percentage of students who experience homelessness may be significantly higher than that which is documented. This is due to difficulties with disclosure, along with students perhaps not fully identifying with the term "homeless" as a result of preconceived stereotypes and stigmas. Findings within this study would concur with this notion, as a large percentage of students (17%) indicated that they had temporarily stayed with a relative, friend, or couch surfed until they found other housing, which, in essence, reflects a lack of stable and permanent residence.

Table 8

Housing Accommodations While in College

Location	Response Count (Out of 41)	Response Percent
At a shelter	0	0%
Campus or university housing	12	29%
In a camper	0	0%
In an enclosed area/space with a roof not meant for human habitation, such as an abandoned building, a car or truck, a van, an RV or camper, an encampment or tent, or an unconverted garage, attic, or a basement	1	2%
In a rented or owned house, a mobile home, or an apartment (alone or with roommates or friends)	33	80%
In transitional housing or an independent living program	0	0%
In an indoor location such as a 24-hour room, the common area of a dorm, a general indoor campus area, or any general indoor area not meant for human habitation	2	5%
An outdoor location, such as a street, a sidewalk, or an alley, a bus or train stop, a camping ground or woods, a park, a beach, a riverbed, or under a bridge or overpass	0	0%
Sorority/fraternity house	0	0%
Temporarily at a hotel or motel, without a permanent home to return to (not on vacation or business travel)	1	2%
Temporarily staying with a relative, friend, or couch surfing until you found other housing	7	17%

Impacts of housing instability

To determine the impacts of housing instability, students were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed with the statement that "as a result of experiencing housing instability, their academic performance was negatively impacted." The prevalence of this impact can be seen in Table 9. Nineteen of the 44 respondents (43%) responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had experienced negative academic impacts as a result of housing instability. Furthermore, 19 out of 29 respondents (66%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "as a result of experiencing housing instability, their overall well-being was negatively impacted." This clearly shows a strong correlation with Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) and how it is necessary to meet basic needs, such as housing, before full attention can be given to meeting high-order needs, such self-fulfillment and psychological requirements.

Table 9

Negative Impacts of Housing Instability

	Academic	Impact	Well-being	Impact
Agreement with negative impact	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent	Response Count (out of 29)	Response Percent
Strongly agree	6	14%	8	28%
Agree	13	29%	11	38%
Disagree	9	20%	9	31%
Strongly disagree	2	5%	1	3%
Not applicable	14	32%	0	0%

Resources

In terms of resource awareness (see Table 10), participants at this research site expressed greater awareness of how to access support for issues relating to food insecurity in comparison to support for housing needs. Twenty-two out of 44 respondents (50%) indicated they knew where to go in order to access support in terms of food insecurity, whereas only eight students (18%) knew where to find support if faced with housing instability. While students appeared to be better informed regarding the resources available for addressing food insecurity, both of these low percentages unfortunately indicate that half or less than half of the students know where to go to find support for addressing either need. What is worth mentioning, however, is that, at the research site, there are no centralized services or resource centers dedicated to addressing food or housing insecurity. There are food support programs that have been lightly publicized; however, no resources exist that are intended to address homelessness or housing instability. This may explain why fewer students are aware of where to go to support for housing instability.

Table 10

Resource Awareness

When experiencing…	food insecurity, I know where I can find support on campus		housing instability, I know where I can find support on campus	
Agreement with statement	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent
Strongly agree	2	5%	1	2%
Agree	21	48%	7	16%
Disagree	17	39%	24	55%
Strongly disagree	4	9%	12	27%

In addition to determining how aware students were of the availability of resources, the researcher sought to explore whether they felt that the resources intended to address food and housing needs currently provided on campus were adequate (see Table 11). Since many respondents indicated that they did not know where to go to access such resources, it is possible that many had never used these resources and were thus unable to speak to their effectiveness. This may be why more than half of the students responded "not applicable" when asked whether the resources available on campus were adequate. Among those who did provide their opinions, more disagreed than agreed that the available resources sufficiently met their needs. This shows that students may have a more negative than positive perception of institutional support.

Table 11

Perception of Institutional Support

The resources provided on campus…	to address food insecurity sufficiently meet my needs		to address housing instability sufficiently meet my needs	
Agreement with statement	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent
Strongly agree	1	2%	0	0%
Agree	8	18%	5	11%
Disagree	10	23%	10	23%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Not applicable	25	57%	29	66%

While the on-campus resources intended to address food insecurity and housing instability may be minimal at this institution, the researcher thought it would be worthwhile to highlight the patterns of resource utilization of all student resource centers as a means of assessing student resource-seeking/utilization behaviors. A list of these resource centers and information regarding their patterns of utilization are provided in Table 12. Students were asked to indicate whether they had utilized the services available from any of the student resource centers on campus; the results indicated that approximately 80% (39 students) had used resources from at least one center, with many (31 out of 39 students) having used the resources offered by two or more centers. With the majority of the respondents identifying as first-generation college students, this provides a positive sign that students are aware of some of the resources available on campus and have utilized them when required. The fact that many have used resources from two or more student

centers is also a positive sign, as it indicates there is some sort of institutional trust amongst students when it comes to relying upon the support provided by these resources. Unfortunately, despite Latinx students being well connected to student resource centers, data from Table 10 showed they are still uninformed about how to find support for food and housing related matters. This could be the result of poor publicity and not adequately considering how these issues may be impacting this community. Providing greater publicity regarding the resources and services that are currently available, both on and off campus, could serve as a good first step toward improving resource utilization and addressing issues related to food insecurity and housing instability.

Table 12

On-campus Resource Utilization

Have you ever utilized services from any of the following on-campus programs? Select all that apply	Response Count (out of 50)	Response Percent
Academic Success Center	17	34%
African Diaspora Retention Center	1	2%
Chicanx Retention Center	18	46%
EOP	19	38%
Food Pantry	12	24%
Immigration Center	10	20%
LGBTQIA Center	4	8%
Native Retention Center	1	2%
Recruitment and Retention Center	13	26%
Student Health Center	19	38%
Student Housing	10	20%
Women's Center	16	32%
No/No response	11	22%

In addition to exploring students' perceptions, awareness, and utilization of on-campus resources, as assessment of off-campus resource utilization was conducted in order to determine if students were aware of, or received any support from, outside agencies (see Table 13). Almost one-fifth of the participants reported receiving assistance from CalFresh, while very few indicated using the resources offered by other community programs. It is interesting to note that there was one student who utilized the resources provided by Women, Infants, and Children, which is a program that provides supplemental food, healthcare referrals, and nutritional education for low-income women

who are pregnant, nursing, or have a dependent child of up to five years of age (United States Department of Agriculture, 2017b). While it is not surprising that this student was a parent, what was surprising was that this student had experienced both food insecurity and housing instability while possibly either being pregnant, nursing or having a child under the age of five in their care. This shows how multifaceted food insecurity and housing instability is among student populations, as their lack of funding or resources may not only impact themselves, but also young children or anyone else who may be under their care.

Table 13

Off-campus Resource Utilization

Have you ever utilized services from any of the following off-campus programs? Select all that apply	Response Count (out of 50)	Response Percent
CalFresh	9	18%
Childcare assistance	2	4%
Off campus food bank	3	6%
Medicaid	4	8%
Unemployment insurance	2	4%
WIC	1	2%
No/No response	35	70%

To explore some of the reasons why students may not take advantage of these off-campus resources, the respondents were asked to identify any potential barriers that may

exist (see Table 14). Overwhelmingly, students indicated they simply neither knew how to access the resources nor had even heard of them. Additionally, a small but significant percentage the of respondents (19%) stated that utilizing public benefits/off-campus resources felt too embarrassing. This is unfortunate, as stigmas regarding resource utilization may prevent students from receiving the help that they may desperately need. Lack of transportation and ineligibility were also cited as factors affecting their access to resources.

Table 14

Reasons for Not Using Off-campus Resources

If you do not use any of these resources, please indicate why. Select all that apply	Response Count (out of 37)	Response Percent
Do not believe in using social services	1	3%
Do not know how to access	21	57%
Do not need assistance	5	27%
Have not heard of the resource	13	35%
It is embarrassing	7	19%
Not eligible	9	24%
Transportation	2	5%

To complete the analysis of resource utilization, the researcher explored whether participants had disclosed their hardships to or had sought support from any faculty or staff members, peers, or on-campus resource centers. Responses to this inquiry can be found in Table 15. While a significant amount of the participants stated they did not

disclose their experience to anyone (38%), an equal amount stated they had sought support from their peers. This suggests that peers are currently the most significant source of support for those navigating situations that involve food insecurity or housing instability. As a comparison, an average of only about 12% of the students sought support from faculty, staff, or on-campus resource centers. This goes to show that future investments in food and housing resources must integrate peer education/outreach, as students demonstrate a greater reliance on their peers for support.

Table 15

System of Support

During your food/housing emergency, did you seek support from any of the following?	Response Count (out of 44)	Response Percent
Staff	6	14%
Faculty	4	9%
Peers	17	39%
On-campus resource center	5	11%
Did not disclose	17	38%
Have yet to experience a food/housing emergency	13	30%

Summary

In Chapter Four, the data gathered from the online Undergraduate Food Security and Housing Stability Survey (see appendix) were organized and presented under the themes of the prevalence and impact of food insecurity/housing instability, student awareness and utilization of resources, and student perceptions of institutional support.

In terms of prevalence, the findings indicated that 75% of Latinx student respondents had low or very low levels of food security, with 6% also disclosing they had been homeless during their time at this institution. Further exploration of these students' housing experiences also revealed that, over the past six months, more than half of the respondents (59%) had difficulty paying their rent, and 65% reported having to borrow money to pay for their housing.

Those who experienced food insecurity or housing instability overwhelmingly reported experiencing negative impacts on their academics and well-being. In light of these experiences, however, many students expressed that they were unaware of where to go for support or help in meeting their food or housing needs. This could be reflective of systematic barriers rather than a lack of personal awareness, as students frequently accessed a variety of other non-food or housing-related resource centers on campus. For those who had sought on-campus support for food insecurity or housing instability, more disagreed than agreed that the resources adequately met their needs. This shows that students may have a more negative than positive perception of the institutional support offered. Additionally, students were more likely to disclose their hardships to peers rather than faculty or staff members, which may indicate low levels of trust in institutions.

Overall, food insecurity and housing instability were determined to be prevalent issues impacting the success and well-being of Latinx students enrolled at this four-year research university. The lack of resources or awareness of resources, both on-campus

and off-campus, can likely be a contributing factor to poor academic and health

outcomes.

Chapter Five

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

As California leads the nation in poverty rates, and Latinx individuals now comprise the largest demographic in the state (both overall and in terms of those who experience poverty), this research sought to explore how this population can be better supported in their educational pursuits, with the goal of ensuring them more prosperous futures. Since highly selective four-year colleges provide some of the best educational opportunities and outcomes for students, this research investigated whether they meet the needs of low-income Latinx students, as these institutions have traditionally catered to individuals from more affluent backgrounds. By using Maslow's hierarchy of needs and post-structuralism as a theoretical framework, this research focused specifically on the prevalence and impacts of food and housing insecurity and how the how the presence or absence of institutional support with regard to these issues impacts student success. To investigate the core topic of this research, the following research questions were asked:

1. What is the prevalence of Latinx students who experience food insecurity and/or housing instability and what is the impact on student success?

2. How do Latinx students find resources or support to address their needs?

3. To what extent are Latinx students aware of institutional resources, and how do they perceive and utilize them?

The population sampled for this research was recruited from a public four-year research university in California. Purposeful sampling was utilized to recruit participants

from the academic department that had the greatest percentage of Latinx students who also exhibited high levels of financial need. The recruitment of students from one department allowed for academic impacts to be controlled for, as all students experienced similar levels of academic rigor. As such, 197 students were invited to participate, of which 50 Latinx undergraduate students responded, representing a population sample of approximately 25%. Quantitative data were gathered via an online survey that consisted of 56 questions; these questions focused on the participants' demographics, finances, food security, housing stability, and awareness and utilization of resources. In order to address the research questions, the data gathered from this survey were analyzed and presented under the aforementioned themes.

Conclusions

The data collected during this research indicated that many Latinx undergraduate students face insecurities in terms of meeting their food and housing needs. Approximately 75% of the respondents indicated low or very low levels of food security, which is significantly greater than the approximately 48% average reported in recent studies (Dubick, Mathews, & Cady, 2016; Martinez, Maynard, Ritchie, 2016). Additionally, more than half of the respondents (59%) had encountered difficulty in paying rent, and 6% even disclosed they had been homeless while attending this university. Those who had experienced food insecurity or housing instability overwhelmingly reported experiencing negative impacts on their academics and well-being. Unfortunately, many students cited a lack of awareness of how to access

resources, both on and off campus. In addition, many students had never disclosed their hardships to faculty or staff members.

These are alarming findings, as Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory (1943) argues that physiological needs, such as securing food and housing, must be met before an individual can invest energy into higher order tasks, such as self-actualization and academic success. Despite food and housing expenses being factored into financial assistance packages, it appears that systemic barriers still exist, as many low-income students reported encountering difficulties in satisfying their basic needs. The struggles that students face in terms of meeting their needs are not only material but have also been found to negatively impact their academic performance and well-being (Alaimo, Olson & Frongillo, 2001; Bergerson, 2006; Cady, 2014; Chilton & Rose, 2009; Jyoti, Frongillo & Jones, 2005; Winicki & Jemison, 2003).

Recommendations

The data collected during this research imply that greater institutional support is necessary in order to better serve low-income students. Over the past 40 years, the percentage of students from low-income families enrolling in two and four-year colleges after high school has nearly doubled (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016), yet their existence and needs have yet to be fully acknowledged on college campuses. In recognition of this institutional shortcoming, this chapter focuses on the final tenet of post-structuralism, reconstruction, as a means to "provide ideas for new or revised institutional structures, policies and practices" to better support the success of low-income Latinx students (Kezar, Walpole, and Pema, 2015). The recommendations

provided below represent ways in which institutions of higher education, particularly four-year universities, can reconstruct their campuses to be more responsive to the needs of the rapidly growing low-income Latinx student population. These recommendations are organized under the following themes: finances, food security, housing stability, and institutional support and navigation of resources.

Finances

1. **Provide More Gift Aid to Low-income Students**

   Researchers have consistently found that low-income students who receive substantial amounts of financial aid are more likely to enroll in college and succeed at higher rates (Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 2001; Avery & Hoxby, 2004; Campbell, Cochrane, Love, & Bruecker, 2017; Haskins, Holzer, & Lerman, 2009; Heller, 1997; Heller & Rasmussen, 2002; Long & Riley, 2007; Mortenson, 1997; Mundel, 2008). This is particularly true for students who receive greater amounts of gift aid, as they do not have to worry about the burden of loans, working to fund their education, or putting a strain on limited budgets. While some institutions have supported low-income students by covering their tuition and fees with gift aid, this still leaves a substantial amount of unpaid expenses, such as room and board, books, and/or transportation, that must be covered by loans or out-of-pocket.

   When applying Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) to a collegial and financial context, this theory would postulate that it is more important for students to have their basic needs (such as food and shelter) funded before their tuition-related expenses are

covered (as these represent higher-order needs). While it is necessary to have tuition and fees covered in order to have "student" status, students would have a limited capacity to excel intellectually if their physiological needs are not met. Therefore, it would be recommended that, when administrators develop financial support programs for low-income students, they should place high priority on ensuring there are grants or resources available for necessities such as food and housing, as these are critical to student success. Since costs of room and board have been found to be more expensive than the tuition fees at many four-year universities, greater support in covering these expenses with gift aid could substantially reduce the prevalence and negative impacts of food and housing insecurity on college campuses.

2. **Modify Loan Policies**

If institutions are unable to provide greater amounts of gift aid, taking out loans could significantly help students who have limited access to financial resources. However, in order for loans to become more appealing to communities who have historically underutilized them, some modifications should be made in order to maximize their effectiveness. For example, providing zero or low-interest loans and developing loan-forgiveness programs specifically aimed at low-income, first-generation students could help to alleviate their concerns regarding debt and repayment. Furthermore, if students do opt to take out loans, ensuring that their aid is provided in a timely manner could also better support them. Current disbursement policies may conflict with students' needs, as expenses such as payments for off-campus housing are sometimes incurred weeks before a student's financial aid is

available. As 64% of respondents in this research indicated that they have had to

borrow money or ask friends or family for money in order to pay rent, encouraging

the usage of loans and adjusting the times when aid is accessible could help minimize

to this trend.

3. **Improve Financial Literacy**

Improving students' financial literacy and awareness of the various financial

resources available could serve as a feasible means of enhancing the livelihood and

success of low-income individuals. This may include more financial education at the

high school and college level, along with culturally relevant workshops for students

and parents who are exploring options to pay for college. Since college costs, debt,

and repayment are a major concern for many, particularly amongst students of color,

being informed about financial options could help to ease their concerns and better

prepare them for their educational and economic futures.

4. **Carefully Assess Estimated Costs of Attendance**

As stated previously, there are currently no institutionalized formulas utilized to

determine estimated costs of attendance, which directly impacts the amount of

financial aid a student may be offered. Since tuition is a fixed amount determined by

the institution, one way in which costs of living could be better estimated is by

partnering with local housing authorities and nutrition experts to develop some type of

data-based formula to more accurately calculate the costs of off-campus living.

Having an accurate reflection of estimated living expenses will allow students to

receive more appropriate funding and reduce the likelihood of financial emergencies

occurring. For low-income students who rely heavily upon financial aid and fixed

budgets to meet all of their needs, any deviation from what has been estimated can be

detrimental.

To expand upon the methods that may be used to accurately calculate costs of

attendance, most universities only estimate and fund living costs for the academic year

(fall through spring), while many off-campus housing contracts are for a full year. For

students who can only afford to live off-campus, this situation leaves them both

without financial support for the summer months and with the stress of carefully

monitoring their expenses so as to make ends meet for a whole year. To help alleviate

this burden, financial aid administrators could work to provide additional funding for

students who must enter 12-month housing leases. Alternatively, campuses could

develop partnerships with local housing complexes and incentivize them to operate

under a month-to-month or academic year structure, so students can pay them in

accordance with their housing needs and availability of their financial aid.

5.   Provide More On-campus Employment Opportunities

Astin's (1999) theory of involvement suggests that the more students are involved

in their college experiences, the more gains they will make in terms of personal

development, learning, and satisfaction with their colleges. Since many low-income

students rely upon employment as a means of funding their ways through school,

providing on-campus job opportunities would allow these students to meet their

financial needs while remaining involved with their campus environments.

Structuring these opportunities in meaningful ways (perhaps as counting towards

internship or academic credit) can also allow students to benefit from them, as they can enhance, rather than detract, from their formal educational experiences (Kezar, Walpole, & Perna, 2015). As on-campus employment opportunities may be limited, providing opportunities for local off-campus employers to recruit student employees could serve as an additional system of financial support. Student affairs practitioners, however, should work to ensure that all recruiters (both on and off-campus) structure their opportunities in ways that benefit, rather than hinder, students and their success. This can be monitored by establishing guidelines for posting on campus recruitment databases.

Food Security

1. **Periodically Assess Student Food Security Levels**

   Although expenses relating to food are factored into the estimated costs of attendance and financial aid packages, there are still large numbers of students who experience food insecurity while attending college (Dubick, Mathews, & Cady, 2016). In accordance with what was documented in the literature review, data collected from this research show that food insecurity negatively impacts academic performance and well-being. To ensure that students are having all of their needs met, it is critical for campus staff to assess whether all students have the financial and/or nutritional resources required to be food secure. While this may seem like an immense task, as some campuses have over 30,000 students, it can easily be accomplished by integrating questions into mandatory advising sessions or annual student questionnaires. This would not only help to ensure that students receive

direct support from campus staff if they are in need of resources, but would also help

to inform campus administrators about what must be done in order to ensure there are

high levels of food security on their campus.

2. **Establish Better Partnerships with Local, State, and Federal Resources**

   To respond to incidences of food insecurity, campus administrators should make

sure that adequate resources are available to address students' needs. Fortunately,

there are many federal, state, and local entities that have well-established programs in

place that students can utilize; all that is required is greater awareness and access to

these resources. One of the ways in which campuses can expand the amount of

student resources that they offer is by establishing partnerships with local food banks

or community gardens if none exist on campus. By doing so, students could be

provided with access to free or low-cost food items/fresh produce at no cost to the

institution. Additionally, partnerships could be developed with CalFresh in which

representatives would be made available to help promote the program and enroll

eligible students. Once again, this is a program that provides substantial benefits (up

to $194 in grocery credit per eligible individual) that come at no cost to the

institution. Finally, collaborations with policymakers are also essential, as growing

trends in student hunger have become a statewide and national issue that demand

greater attention than individual institutions may be able to provide. These options all

represent practical ways of providing greater access to resources that come at a

minimal institutional cost.

3. **Redesign On-campus Dining Options**

Many college campuses have on-campus dining options; however, these are often limited to restaurants, cafés, or fast-food outlets. For students who rely upon public assistance programs such as SNAP to pay for their meals, this can create barriers in food access, as their benefits can only be used to purchase groceries, as opposed to prepared meals. Redesigning campus dining options to be more inclusive of students who rely on SNAP to meet their nutritional needs could be a positive step toward better supporting low-income students. One of the ways in which this could be done is by working towards getting campus convenience stores or markets certified to accept EBT methods of payments. Moreover, institutional leaders could advocate for allowing SNAP benefits to be utilized at all on-campus dining facilities at the state and federal levels.

Another way in which institutional leaders could redesign their campuses to be more responsive to the needs of low-income students is by providing more areas where students can store, reheat, or prepare their meals brought from home. As home-cooked meals are often more affordable than eating out, students may skip meals, as they prefer to go home to prepare food. Being unable able to refrigerate or reheat meals may discourage students from bringing food to campus.

Housing Stability

1. **Provide More Affordable On-campus Housing to Support Engagement**

    Research shows that living on-campus leads to higher levels of engagement and better outcomes (Astin, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Pascarella, Terenzini, and Bliming, 1994). However, as campus enrollments have outpaced the availability

of on-campus housing, access to on-campus accommodation, particularly at affordable rates, is limited. As such, providing affordable on-campus housing for low-income students would allow these students to be better situated in terms of promoting their academic success. Research shows that low-income Latinx students, particularly those who also identify as first-generation, face a multitude of challenges in adapting to and navigating the systems of higher education (Ancis, Sedlack, & Mohr, 2000; Cabrera & Nora, 1994; Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagedorn, 1999; Feagin, 1992; Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, 1992; Kezar, 2011; Lewis, Chelser, & Forman, 2000; Smedley, Meyers & Harrell, 1993). Providing opportunities for these students to live on-campus at affordable rates could help to minimize some of these challenges and make them feel more integrated into campus life. Moreover, the development of living-learning programs focused on historically marginalized social classes could also help to encourage a greater sense of community and provide more support for students from low-income backgrounds. These programs have been well-documented as having a high impact on student success and can help to support positive academic and developmental outcomes (Brower & Inkelas, 2010; Tinto, 2003).

2. **Develop Partnerships With Local Housing Agencies**

While affordable on-campus housing would be ideal for students, limited campus space and institutional budgets present serious challenges to providing such accommodation. In response, developing partnerships with local housing agencies could represent a way of ensuring that students have access to housing that is

affordable and tailored to their needs. Such partnerships could integrate resources

that could benefit low-income students, such as subsidized housing, payment plans, or

free campus parking/transportation. Furthermore, financial aid administrators could

also work with local housing agencies to ensure that affordable off-campus units are

reserved for students with high need, rather than open to all interested students. This

would alleviate the burden of trying to find affordable housing and ensure that

students with the greatest need will receive priority in securing housing that fits their

budget. In creating these partnerships, not only would students have access to more

stable housing, but the culture created by the partnership would encourage students to

feel more supported by the university.

3. **Provide Access to Emergency Housing Resources**

While there are some students who identify as homeless when they first apply to a

four-year university, researchers found that there are many students who first

experience homelessness while in school as a result of losing a job, parents being

unable to pay fees, or fleeing domestic violence (Berg-Cross & Green, 2009; Paden,

2012). In response to this finding, providing access to temporary emergency shelters,

along with support from staff to help students to secure permanent housing, could

significantly help to address the issue of student homelessness. This could also

prevent students from living in unsafe conditions. Student affairs officials should

work closely with student housing and case managers to develop action plans that can

better support students who experience such hardships. Campus officials can also

consider devloping collaborations with local hotels for housing vouchers or

community resource centers that provide emergency housing services if on-campus housing is unavailable.

Institutional Support and Navigation of Resources

1. **Improve Resource Awareness**

Social capital is needed to smoothly navigate complex higher education systems; this can be particularly challenging for first-generation students, as they may be unfamiliar with how to access the available support systems and resources. The findings of this research indicate that, despite resources being available, many students did not know how to access them. For example, more than half of the respondents indicated they did would not know where to go for support should they experience food insecurity or housing instability. To support low-income students, especially those who also identify as first-generation, campus administrators can work to ensure that all students are made aware of the resources that exist on campus. This can be accomplished by integrating the promotion of resource awareness into orientation programs or through creating easily accessible links to resources on student email or advising portals. Furthermore, campuses should create centralized student services and designate staff members as points of contact to assist students who experience issues related to food and housing insecurity. These points of contact should be easily identifiable staff members who are aware of the resources available and to whom students can go to comfortably disclose their hardships. Creating centralized services, designating points of contact, and promoting greater visibility to available resources not only helps to provide greater access to resources

but also helps create a culture that acknowledges and validates the experiences of low-income students. If low-income students perceive the campus as being invested in their well-being and success, they are likely to have a greater sense of belonging and improve their educational outcomes.

2. **Train Faculty, Staff, and Students on How to Respond to Hardships Pertaining to Food and Housing**

The findings of this thesis indicate that students are more likely to disclose their hardships to their peers than faculty or campus staff members. In response to this finding, it would be beneficial to develop a peer support training program that would inform student employees (such as peer counselors or student resident advisors) or interested peers about how to be an ally and how they could support those who may be experiencing food or housing insecurity. This could include educating students about social class privilege, discussing what to do or say if a peer discloses an economic hardship, informing individuals about the resources available to low-income students, and teaching them how to access those resources. Faculty and staff members could also benefit from being trained, as their daily interactions with students place them in an ideal position to promote, and serve as links to, resources. By training peers, faculty, and staff in how to respond to these situations, a greater culture of support for low-income students can be fostered.

In conclusion, this chapter drew upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) and poststructuralism (Foucault, 1980; Kezar, Walpole, and Perna, 2015) to outline ways in which institutional leaders can reform their campus policies, practices, and cultures to

better support the needs of low-income students. In addition to modifying internal structures, the full-service community school models that have been adopted by many K-12 schools provide an ideal framework for institutions that seek to provide external links to community resources in order to ensure that the holistic needs of their students are met. Future studies may seek to explore how such partnerships can be implemented and how they may impact student success at the collegiate level.

APPENDIX A

Invitation to Participate and Informed Consent

"The struggle is real": an exploration of the prevalence and experiences of undergraduate students experiencing food insecurity and housing instability while pursuing higher education

You are invited to participate in a research study which will contribute to the literature on students experiencing food insecurities and housing instability while pursuing higher education. My name is Alyssa West and I am a Master's student at California State University, Sacramento, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. The purpose of this research is to explore the prevalence and experiences of students experiencing food insecurities and housing instability at a four-year research university.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey. Your participation in this study will last approximately 15 minutes.

There are some possible risks involved for participants. These risks are emotional in nature as you will be asked to share your personal experiences. There are some benefits to this research, particularly that your shared experiences can contribute to highlighting the needs of students on campus that often are invisibilized.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. You have the right not to participate at all or to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. You may choose to cease your participation in the survey at any time and have your data removed. All students will be eligible to enter into a drawing for a $50 university bookstore gift card.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Measures to insure your confidentiality are enacted through the implementation of an anonymous survey and to have all data secured online through password protected access. The printed data obtained will be maintained in a safe, locked location and will be destroyed after a period of three years after the study is completed.

If you have any questions about the research please email me at alyssawest@csus.edu, or the faculty advisor, Jose Chavez, at chavez@csus.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project please call the Office of Research Affairs, California State University, Sacramento, (916) 278-5674, or email irb@csus.edu.

Your consent below indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

- ❍ I consent to participate
- ❍ I do not consent to participate

APPENDIX B

Undergraduate Survey

Q1. What is your major?

Q2. How many years have you completed at UC Davis?

- ○ Less than 1 year

- ○ More than 1 year

- ○ More than 2 years

- ○ More than 3 years

- ○ More than 4 years

Q3. What is your approximate cumulative GPA?

Q4. Age

Q5. Gender

Q6. Where is your hometown?

Q7. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin? Question and categories extracted

from the American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

- ❑ No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin

- ❑ Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano

- ❑ Yes, Puerto Rican

- ❑ Yes, Cuban

- ❑ Yes, another Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin- Indicate origin, for example,

Argentinian, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, and so on.

_____

Q8. What is your race? Select all that apply: Question and categories extracted from the

American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

❑ White

❑ Black or African American

❑ American Indian or Alaska Native- Print name of enrolled or principal tribe

_____

❑ Asian Indian

❑ Chinese

❑ Filipino

❑ Japanese

❑ Korean

❑ Vietnamese

❑ Native Hawaiian

❑ Guamanian or Chamorro

❑ Samoan

❑ Other Pacific Islander-Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on

_____

❑ Other Asian-Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani,

Cambodian, and so on. _____

❑ Some other race -Please indicate _____

Q9. Are you any of the following? Select all that apply:

- ❑ Transfer student

- ❑ Student with disability

- ❑ First-generation college student

- ❑ Former foster youth

- ❑ International student

- ❑ Out-of-state student

- ❑ EOP (educational opportunity program) student

- ❑ ESL (English as a second language) student

- ❑ Veteran

- ❑ Active duty military personnel

- ❑ U.S. citizen

- ❑ DREAM student

- ❑ DACA student

- ❑ Prefer not to answer

Q10. Do you currently receive financial aid?

- ❍ Yes

- ❍ No

Q11. What forms of financial aid are you currently receiving? Select all that apply:

❑ Grants

❑ Loans

❑ Scholarships

❑ Work-Study

❑ Other _____

❑ Not applicable

Q12. Are you currently employed?

❍ Yes

❍ No

Q13. If employed, approximately how many hours per week do you work?

❍ 1-10 hours

❍ 10-15 hours

❍ 15-20 hours

❍ 20-30 hours

❍ 30-40 hours

❍ more than 40 hours

❍ unemployed

Q14. What is your average gross monthly income (before taxes and not including

reimbursements from financial aid)? Note: Monthly income sources can be from paid

jobs (work-study included), paid internships, or money given to you from others (such as

parents). Please do not include financial aid.

Q15. Please indicate which option best describes your current living situation:

- ○ Currently living in the campus dorms

- ○ Currently living in on-campus apartment housing

- ○ Currently living in off-campus housing (such as an apartment or house)

- ○ Currently living at home and commuting

- ○ Currently living at a shelter or transitional facility

- ○ Currently without stable housing

- ○ Currently living out of a car or other site not is not typically used for standard

  housing

- ○ Currently staying on the couch of a friends, family, or strangers place of residence

- ○ Currently staying in a mixture of the options listed above

- ○ Other _____

Q16. If applicable, approximately how much do you spend per month on rent? (not

including utilities)

Q17. How many other people live in your housing arrangement?

- ○ Just myself

- ○ 2

- ○ 3

- ○ 4

- ○ 5

○ 6+

Q18. Please choose how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statement: I get along with the people I live with.

  ○ Strongly agree

  ○ Agree

  ○ Disagree

  ○ Strongly disagree

  ○ Not applicable

Q19. In the past 6 months, have you had to live somewhere that you did not want to live?

  ○ Yes

  ○ No

Q20. In the past 6 months, have you had difficulty (or were unable to) pay for your housing?

  ○ Yes

  ○ No

Q21. Have you had trouble getting housing in the past 6 months?

  ○ Yes

  ○ No

Q22. Do you expect that you will be able to stay in your current housing for the next 6 months?

  ○ Yes

○ No

Q23. In the past 6 months, have you had to borrow money or ask friends/family or others for money to pay your rent/mortgage payment?

○ Yes

○ No

Q24. In the past 6 months, how many times have you moved?

Q25. Have you had trouble with a landlord in the past 6 months?

○ Yes

○ No

Q26. In the past 6 months, has your landlord threatened to evict you?

○ Yes

○ No

Q27. In the past 6 months, have you been served an eviction notice?

○ Yes

○ No

Q28. How likely is it that you will be able to pay for your housing (e.g. rent/mortgage) this month?

○ Unlikely

○ Likely

Q29. Since starting college have you ever been homeless?

○ Yes

○ No

Q30. In the past 12 months, have you slept in any of the following places? Please check all that apply:

- ❏ Campus or university housing

- ❏ Sorority/fraternity house

- ❏ In a rented or owned house, mobile home, or apartment (alone or with roommates or friends)

- ❏ At a shelter

- ❏ In a camper

- ❏ Temporarily staying with a relative, friend, or couch surfing until you found other housing

- ❏ Temporarily at a hotel or motel without a permanent home to return to (not on vacation or business travel)

- ❏ In a transitional housing or independent living program

- ❏ Indoor location such as 24-hour room, dorm common areas, general indoor campus area, or any general indoor area not meant for human habitation

- ❏ Outdoor location such as street, sidewalk, or alley, bus or train stop, campground or woods, park, beach, or riverbed, under bridge or overpass

- ❏ In a closed area/space with a room not meant for human habitation such as abandoned building, car or truck, van, RV, or camper, encampment or tent, or unconverted garage, attic, or basement

Q31. Do you share most of your meals with people living in your household (i.e., family

members/housemates) or manage your own meals?

  ○ Manage my own meals

  ○ Share meals

Q32. Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the

last 12 months:

  ○ Enough of the kinds of food I want to eat

  ○ Enough but not always the kinds of food I want

  ○ Sometimes not enough to eat

  ○ Often not enough to eat

Q33. Please indicate your response to the following statement: "I worried my food

would run out before I got money to buy more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or

never true for you in the last 12 months?

  ○ Often true

  ○ Sometimes true

  ○ Never true

Q34. Please indicate your response to the following statement: "The food that I bought

just didn't last and I didn't have money to get more." Was that often true, sometimes true,

or never true for you in the last 12 months?

  ○ Often true

  ○ Sometimes true

  ○ Never true

Q35. Please indicate your response to the following statement: "I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

◯ Often true

◯ Sometimes true

◯ Never true

Q36. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Q37. If yes to the question above, how often did this happen?

◯ Almost every month

◯ Some months but not every month

◯ Only 1 or 2 months

◯ Not applicable

Q38. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money for food?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Q39. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food?

    ❍ Yes

    ❍ No

Q40. In the last 12 months, did you lose weight because there wasn't enough money for food?

    ❍ Yes

    ❍ No

Q41. In the last 12 months, did you ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

    ❍ Yes

    ❍ No

Q42. If yes above, how often did this happen?

    ❍ Almost every month

    ❍ Some months but not every month

    ❍ Only 1 or 2 months

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

Q43. As a result of experiencing food insecurity, my academic performance during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree
- ○ Not applicable

Q44. As a result of experiencing food insecurity, my overall health and well-being during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree
- ○ Not applicable

Q45. As a result of experiencing housing instability, my academic performance during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree
- ○ Not applicable

Q46. As a result of experiencing housing instability, my overall health and well-being during that particular quarter/time was negatively impacted.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree
- ○ Not applicable

Q47. In your opinion, how would rate the prevalence of food insecurity or housing instability experienced by undergraduate students?

- ○ Extremely prevalent
- ○ Moderately prevalent
- ○ Not very prevalent

Q48. During your undergraduate career have you been in situations in which you could have benefited from any of the following? Select all that apply:

- ❑ Meals Assistance Program
- ❑ Short-Term Emergency Housing
- ❑ Emergency financial aid
- ❑ Not applicable

Q49. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: When experiencing food insecurity, I know where I can go on campus for institutional support.

- ○ Strongly agree

- ○ Agree

- ○ Disagree

- ○ Strongly disagree

Q50. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: The resources provided on campus to address food insecurity sufficiently meet my needs

- ○ Strongly agree

- ○ Agree

- ○ Disagree

- ○ Strongly disagree

- ○ I have yet to utilize any resources

Q51. Please rate your agreement with the following statement:

When experiencing housing instability, I know where I can go on campus for institutional support.

- ○ Strongly agree

- ○ Agree

- ○ Disagree

- ○ Strongly disagree

Q52. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: The resources provided on campus to address housing instability sufficiently meet my needs

- ○ Strongly agree

- ○ Agree

- ○ Disagree

- ○ Strongly disagree

- ○ I have yet to utilize any resources

Q53. During the time of your food/housing emergency did you seek out support from any of the following? Select all that apply:

- ❑ On campus resource center

- ❑ Faculty Member or Instructor

- ❑ Staff

- ❑ Peers

- ❑ I did not disclose it to anyone affiliated with the university

- ❑ I have not yet had to experience a food/housing emergency

Q54. Have you ever utilized services from any of the following off-campus programs?

Select all that apply:

- ❑ Cal fresh (a.k.a. "food stamps"/EBT)

- ❑ Off campus food pantry/food bank

- ❑ Homeless shelter

- ❑ Transitional living

- ❑ Subsidized housing (i.e. HUD/Housing Choice Voucher formerly known as
  Section 8)

- ❑ CalWORKs

- ❑ WIC

- ❑ TANF

- ❑ SSI

- ❑ SSDI

- ❑ Medicaid

- ❑ Child care assistance

- ❑ Unemployment insurance

- ❑ Utility Assistance

- ❑ Earned Income Tax Credit

- ❑ Veteran's benefits

Q55. If you do not use any of these resources, please indicate why? Select all that apply:

❑ I am not eligible

❑ I have not heard of the programs

❑ I do not need assistance

❑ I do not have access to these resources

❑ I do not know how to access these resources

❑ I do not believe in using social services

❑ It is embarrassing to have to use social services

❑ I do not have transportation

❑ I already use one or more of the above programs

❑ Other _____

Q56. Have you ever utilized services from any of the following on-campus programs?

Select all that apply:

- ❑ AB540 & Undocumented Student Center

- ❑ Center for African Diaspora Student Success

- ❑ Center for Native American and Indigenous Peoples

- ❑ Chicana/o and Latina/o Retention Center

- ❑ Cross Cultural Center

- ❑ Educational Opportunity Program

- ❑ Guardian Scholars Program

- ❑ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual Resource Center

- ❑ Services for International Students & Scholars

- ❑ Student Academic Success Center

- ❑ Student Disability Center

- ❑ Student Health and Counseling Services

- ❑ Student Housing

- ❑ Student Recruitment and Retention Center

- ❑ The Pantry

- ❑ Women's Resources & Research Center

- ❑ Other _____

Thank you for taking this survey! Please clink on the link below if you would like to be

entered into a drawing to win a $50 Bookstore gift card.

SURVEY DRAWING

If you need to speak to someone immediately about your situation, please refer to the

following resources for assistance:

Campus Resource List

resources.campus.edu

Office of Student Support & Judicial Affairs- Case Managers

"Higher Education Case Managers serve their University and individual students by

coordinating prevention, intervention, and support efforts across campus and community

systems to assist at risk students and students facing crises, life traumas, and other

barriers that impede success."

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (2001). *Access denied: Restoring the nation's commitment to equal educational opportunity*. Washington D.C.

Alaimo, K., Olson, C.M., & Frongillo, E.A. Jr. (2001). Food insufficiency and American school-aged children's cognitive, academic, and psychosocial development. *Pediatrics*, 108(1), 44-53.

American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity. (n.d.). More history of affirmative action policies from the 1960s. Retrieved from https://www.aaaed.org/aaaed/History_of_Affirmative_Action.asp

American Association of Community Colleges. (2017). Community colleges from past to present. Retrieved from

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx

Ancis, J., Sedlacek, W., & Mohr, J. (2000). Student Perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling Development*, 78(2), 180-185.

Ashtari, S. (2014, December 26). A look into the 'double lives' of America's homeless college students. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/12/26/college-student-homeless-boston_n_6145980.html.

Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. (2012). *The land grant tradition.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/library/the-land-grant-tradition/file

Astin, A. W. (1985). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avery, Christopher, and Caroline Hoxby. 2004. "Do and Should Financial Aid Packages Affect Students' College Choices?" In *College Choices: The Economics of Where to Go, When to Go, and How to Pay For It,* edited by C. Hoxby. University of Chicago Press.

Bergerson, T. (2006). *Race, poverty, and academic achievement*. Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20100615185000/http://www.doh.wa.gov//SBOH/ESS/documents/Race&Poverty.pdf

Best, S., & Kellner, D., (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interpretations*. Basingstoke, England: Macmillan.

Berg-Cross, L., & Green, R. (2009). The impact of the recession on college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24*, 2–6.

Bohn, S. & Danielson, C. (2017a). *Just the facts: Child poverty in California*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/jtf/JTF_ChildPovertyJTF.pdf

Bohn, S. & Danielson, C. (2017b). *Just the facts: Poverty in California.* San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/publication/poverty-in-california/

Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. (1997). "The Effects of Poverty on Children," *The Future of Children* 7 (2), 55-71.

Broton, K., Frank, V., & Goldrick-Rab, S. (2014). Safety, security, and college attainment: An investigation of undergraduates' basic needs and institutional response. Madison, WI: Wisconsin HOPE Lab

Brower, A. & Inkelas K. (2010). Living-learning programs: One high-impact educational practice we now know a lot about. *Association of American Colleges & Universities,* 96 (2), 36-43.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Budget and Institutional Analysis. (2017). *Student financial support trend report*.

Cabrera, A.F., & Nora, A. (1994). College students' perceptions of prejudice and

    discrimination and their feelings of alienation: A construct validation approach.

    The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 16(3-4), 387-409.

Cabrera, A.F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E., & Hagedorn, L.S. (1999).

    Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students: A comparison between

    White students and African-American students. *The Journal of Higher Education*,

    70(2), 134-160.

Cady, C. L. (2014). Food insecurity as a student issue. *Journal of College and Character*,

    15(4), 265-272.

California Association of Food Banks. (2017). *Hunger Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cafoodbanks.org/hunger-factsheet

California Department of Social Services. (2017). *CalFresh*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/calfresh

Call, J. & Shimada, T. (2016). Lost dollars, empty plates: The impact of CalFresh on

    state and local economies. *California Food Policy Advocates*.

Campbell, C., Cochrane, D., Love, I., & Bruecker, E. (2017). Aiding Success: The Role

    of Federal and State Financial Aid in Supporting California Community College

    Students (pp. 1-34). Washington, DC: Association of Community College Trustees

    in collaboration with The Institute for College Access and Success.

Chen, R., & DesJardins, S. (2008). Exploring the effects of financial aid on the gap in

    student dropout risks by income level. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(1), 1-18.

Chilton, M., & Rose, D. (2009). A Rights-Based Approach to Food Insecurity in the

    United States. American Journal of Public Health, 99(7), 1203–1211.

    http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.130229

College and University Food Bank Alliance. (2017). *Our members*. Retrieved from

    https://sites.temple.edu/cufba/members/

Creswell, J. (2013) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods*

    approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crutchfield, R., Clark, K, Gamez, S., Green, A., Munson, D., & Stribling, H. (2016).

    Serving displaced and food insecure students in the California State Universities.

    Long Beach, CA.

Crutchfield, R. (2012). "If I don't fight for it I have nothing": Experiences of homeless

    youth scaling the collegiate mountain (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

    ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3530671).

Cunningham, A., & Santiago, D. (2008). *Student aversion to borrowing: Who borrows*

    and who doesn't. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Cunnyngham, K. (2016). Reaching those in need: Estimates of state supplemental

    nutrition assistance program participation rates in 2013. *Mathematica Policy*

    Research.

Department of Finance. (2015). *Governor's Budget Summary 2015-2016:*

    Demographic information. Retrieved from http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2015-

    16/pdf/BudgetSummary/DemographicInformation.pdf

Drury, R. L. (2003). Community colleges in America: A historical perspective. *Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges, 8*(1), 1-7.

Dubick, J., Mathews, B., & Cady, C. L. (2016). *Hunger on campus: The challenge of food insecurity for college students*. Retrieved from https://studentsagainsthunger.org/hunger-on-campus/

Feagin, J.R. (1992). The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against Black students in White colleges. *Journal of Black Studies*, 22(4), 546-78.

Feagin, J.R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Michael Foucault: Power/knowledge: Selected writings and other writings 1972-1977 by Michael Foucault* (pp. 78-108). New York, NY: The Harvester Press.

Fuller, M. B. (2014). A history of financial aid to students. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 44(1), 42-68.

Gilman, S. E., Kawachi, I., Fitzmaurice, G. M., & Buka, S. L. (2003). Socioeconomic status, family disruption and residential stability in childhood: Relation to onset, recurrence, and remission of major depression. *Psychological Medicine*, 33, 1341–1355.

Gordon, L. (2015, August 16). College students move off campus as room and board costs rise. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com

Harper, S.R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates. In S.R. Harper & L.D. Patton (Eds.), *Responding to the realities of race on campus. New Directions for Student Services* (pp.7-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harvey, W. (2001). *Minorities in Higher Education, 2000-01*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Haskins, R., Holzer, H., & Lerman, R.I. (2009). *Promoting economic mobility by increasing postsecondary education.* Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Heller, D. E. (1997). Student price response in higher education: An update to Leslie and Brinkman. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6), 624–659.

Heller, D.E., & Rasmussen, C.J. (2002). Merit scholarships and colleges access: Evidence from Florida and Michigan. In D. E. Heller & P. Marin (Eds), *Who should we help? The negative social consequences of merit scholarships* (pp. 25-40). Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Higher Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-329, § 79 Stat 1219 (1965).

Higher Education Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-315 § 122 Stat 3078 (2008).

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63 (5), 539-569.

Johnson, H., Cook, K., & Cuellar-Mejia, M. (2014). Making college possible for low-income students: Grant and scholarship aid in California. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

Jyoti, D.F., Frongillo, E. A. Jr., & Jones, S.J., (2005). Food insecurity affects school

children's academic performance, weight gain, and social skills. *Journal of*

Nutrition, 135(12), 2831-2839.

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2011). *Recognizing and serving low-income students in postsecondary*

education: An examination of institutional policies, practices, and culture. New

York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A., Walpole, M., & Pema, L. (2015). Engaging low-income students. In John Q.

Harper and Shaun Harper (Ed.), *Student engagement in higher education:*

Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations

(pp.237-255). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kelchen, R., Hosch, B.J., & Goldrick-Rab, S. (2014). "The costs of college attendance:

trends, variation, and accuracy in institutional living cost allowances." Prepared for

presentation at the annual meetings of the Association of Public Policy and

Management, October 2014.

King, J.E. (2003). Nontraditional attendance and persistence: The cost of students'

choices. *New Directions in Higher Education*, 121, 69-83.

Krogstad, J.M. & Fry, R. (2014, April 24). More Hispanics, Blacks enrolling in college,

but lag in bachelor's degrees. *Pew Research Center.* Retrieved from

http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/04/24/more-hispanics-blacks-

enrolling-in-college-but-lag-in-bachelors-degrees/

La Roche, C., Flanigan, M., & Copeland, P. (2010). Student housing: Trends, preferences

and needs. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3 (10), 45-50.

Latinx [Def. 1]. (n.d.). In *Oxford Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from

https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/latinx.

Lewis, A.E., Chelser, M., & Forman, T.A. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies

on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *The*

Journal of Negro Education, 57(1), 58-77.

Long, B.T., & Riley, E. (2007). Financial aid: A broken bridge to college access?

Harvard Educational Review, 77(1), 39-63.

Luby, J., Belden, A., Botteron, K., Marrus, N., Harms, M., Babb, C., Nishino, T., &

Barch, D. (2013). "The Effects of Poverty on Childhood Brain Development: The

Mediating Effect of Caregiving and Stressful Life Events," *Journal of the*

American Medical Association: Pediatrics, 167 (12): 1135–42.

Lucas, C. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Macartney, S., Bishaw, A., & Fontenot, K. (2013). Poverty rates for selected detailed race

and Hispanic groups by state and place: 2007–2011. U.S. Department of

Commerce, United States Census Bureau: Washington, DC, USA.

Martinez, S., Maynard, K., & Ritchie, L. (2016). UC global food initiative: Student food

access and security study. Oakland, CA: Nutrition Policy Institute.

Maslow, A. H. (1943) A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, 50, 370-396.

Mendez v. Westminster School District, et al., 64 F. Supp. 544 (S.D. Cal. 1946).

Mortenson, T. (1997). Georgia's HOPE scholarship program: Good intentions, strong

funding, bad design. *Postsecondary Education Opportunity*, 56, 1-3.

Mundel, D. S. (2008). What do we know about the impact of grants to college students? In S. Baum, M. McPherson, & P. Steele (Eds.), *The effectiveness of student aid policies: What the research tells us* (pp. 9–38). Washington, DC : The College Board.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Postsecondary attainment: Differences by socioeconomic status*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/coe_tva.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). Percentage of recent high school completers enrolled in 2-year and 4-year colleges, by income level: 1975 through 2015. *Digest of Education Statistics*.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017a). *The condition of education: Immediate college enrollment rate.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cpa.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017b). *The condition of education: Characteristics of postsecondary students.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csb.asp

National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2014). Excessive stress disrupts the development of brain architecture, *Journal of Children's Services,* 9 (2), pp.143-153. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCS-01-2014-0006

Paden, N. (2012). *Homeless students? Not at my university: The reality of homeless college students.* Paper presented at the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences Annual Conference, Las Vegas, NV.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1994). The impact of residential life on students. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls*, (pp, 22-52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Priester, M.A., Foster, K., & Shaw, T. (2017). Are discrimination and social capital related to housing instability? *Housing Policy Debate*, (27) 1, 120-136.

Regents of California. (2017). *About Early Academic Outreach Program*. Retrieved from http://www.eaop.org/about.html

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Renwick, T., & Fox, L. (2016) The supplemental poverty measure: 2015. (Report No. P60-258). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Rollins, C., Glass, N.E., Perrin, N.A., Billhardt, K.A., Clough, A., Barnes, J., Hanson, G.C., & Bloom, T.L. (2012). Housing instability is as strong a predictor of poor health outcomes as level of danger in an abusive relationship: Findings from the SHARE Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 623-643.

Smedley, B., Meyers, H., & Harrell, S. (1993). Minority-status stresses and the college adjustment of ethnic minority freshman. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(4), 434-452.

Tinto, V. (2003). Learning better together: The impact of learning communities on student success. *Higher Education monograph series*, *1*(8), 1-8.

United States Department of Agriculture. (2012). *U.S. adult food security survey module: three-stage design, with screeners.* Retrieved from https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/8279/ad2012.pdf

United States Department of Agriculture. (2016). *Supplemental nutrition assistance program: Students*. Retrieved from https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/students

United States Department of Agriculture. (2017a). *Supplemental nutrition assistance program: Eligibility*. Retrieved from https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/eligibility

United States Department of Agriculture. (2017b). *Women, infants, and children (WIC)*. Retrieved from https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic/women-infants-andchildren-wic

United States Department of Education. (2011). *History of the federal TRIO programs*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/trio/triohistory.html

United States Department of Education. (2017a). *Federal student aid handbook*. Retrieved from https://ifap.ed.gov/fsahandbook/attachments/1617FSAHbkActiveIndexMaster.pdf

United States Department of Education. (2017b). *Full-service community schools program*. Retrieved from https://innovation.ed.gov/what-we-do/parental-options/full-service-community-schools-program-fscs/

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2015). Barriers to success: Housing insecurity for U.S. college students. *Insights into Housing and Community Development Policy.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Development and Research.

Winicki, J., & Jemison, K. (2003). Food insecurity and hunger in the kindergarten

   classroom: Its effects on learning and growth. *Contemporary Economic Policy*,

   21(2). 145-157.

Wood, J.L., Harris III, F., & Delgado, N.R. (2016). Struggling to survive-striving to

   succeed: Food and housing insecurities in the community college. San Diego, CA:

   Community College Equity Assessment Lab (CCEAL).