

Food Insecurity is Associated with Depression among a Vulnerable Workforce: Early
Care and Education Workers

Ivory Hong Loh

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Public Health

University of Washington

2020

Committee:

Jennifer Otten

Vanessa M. Oddo

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Nutritional Sciences

©Copyright 2020
Ivory Hong Loh

University of Washington

Abstract

Food Insecurity is Associated with Depression among a Vulnerable Workforce: Early
Care and Education Workers

Ivory Hong Loh

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Jennifer Otten

Nutritional Sciences

This study aimed to explore the association between food insecurity and depression among early care and education (ECE) workers, a vulnerable population often working in precarious conditions. We utilized cross-sectional data from a study exploring the effects of wage on ECE centers. Participants were enrolled between August 2017 and December 2018. Food insecurity was measured using the validated six-item U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module and participants were categorized as food secure (score=0-1), low food security (score=2- 4), and very low food security (score=5-6). Depression (defined as a score ≥ 16) was measured using the 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale-Revised. We employed a logistic regression model to examine the relationship between food insecurity and depression. All models controlled for marital status, nativity, race/ethnicity, number of children in the household, job title, weekly hours of work, education, income, and study site. Participants were from Seattle (40%) and South King County (26%), Washington, and Austin, Texas (34%). Participants included 313 ECE workers from 49 ECE centers. A majority of participants were female, non-Hispanic White, born in the U.S., and did not have children. Compared to being food secure, very low and low food insecurity were associated with a 4.95 (95% CI: 2.29,

10.67) and 2.69 (95% CI: 1.29, 5.63) higher odds of depression, respectively. Policies and center-level interventions that address both food insecurity and depression may be warranted, in order to protect and improve the health of this valuable, yet vulnerable, segment of the U.S. workforce.

Introduction

In 2018, 11% of US households (14.3 million individuals) experienced low or very low food security, defined as households that lack stable access to sufficient food⁽¹⁾. Food insecurity is associated with greater depressive symptoms among both the general US population⁽²⁻⁴⁾ and a more vulnerable population: female welfare recipients⁽⁵⁾. Food insecurity is more prevalent among households with children⁽⁶⁾, and food insecurity may contribute to children's self-perceived psychological distress⁽⁷⁾. Prior studies also find high prevalence rates of both food insecurity and depression among the early care and education (ECE) workforce⁽⁸⁻¹⁰⁾, a vulnerable population who typically earns low wages, works long hours, and lacks fringe benefits^(8, 9). Despite the high prevalence rates of both food insecurity and depression, and the precarious work conditions faced by ECE workers in the US, studies have yet to explore the relationship between food insecurity and depression among this population⁽⁸⁾.

Several prior studies have examined the relationship between food insecurity and adverse mental health outcomes⁽¹¹⁻¹⁵⁾, and most report that food insecurity is associated with a higher prevalence of depressive symptoms in the US^(2-5, 11, 16-18). In particular, a 2019 meta-analysis (N=57 cross-sectional studies)⁽¹²⁾ reported that the odds of depression were 174% higher among those who were food insecure (compared to food secure). Similarly, a longitudinal study reported a dose-response relationship between food insecurity and depressive symptoms and poor mental health, among women at risk of or living with HIV, i.e., women experiencing more severe food insecurity had higher odds of probable depression when compared with food secure women⁽¹⁸⁾. At the same time, longitudinal analyses suggest that the relationship could be bidirectional, meaning that food insecurity is both associated with depressive symptoms, and depressive symptoms are associated with food insecurity⁽¹¹⁾. For example, a 2016 analysis using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Birth Cohort reported that severe maternal depression was associated with a higher probability of child (79%) and household (69%) food insecurity⁽⁴⁾.

There are several mechanisms through which food insecurity might directly be related to mental health. First, food insecurity may act as a toxic stressor, as individuals are plagued with a constant anxiety about household food supply and worried about

meeting practical needs^(11, 15). Chronic stress has been found to induce physiological changes, including hyper-activation of the HPA axis and increased cortisol levels, that predispose individuals to depression⁽¹⁹⁾. In addition, the way in which an individual interprets their food insecurity status relative to the psychosocial environment and their social positioning may evoke shame, as well as trigger stress and adverse physiological responses⁽²⁾. Furthermore, the early life stress hypothesis posits that individuals who experience food insecurity during key developmental phases may be more vulnerable to poor mental health conditions in later adulthood⁽¹¹⁾. Food insecurity may also be related to poor mental health by limiting one's ability to consume a nutritious diet^(2, 20), provide self-care, and/or adhere to medical recommendations^(11, 15). Poor self-management of chronic mental and physical health conditions may also increase an individual's health care costs, which in turn, can lead to additional financial strain, continued food insecurity and limited access to healthcare.

Food insecurity may also indirectly harm mental health. For example, the initial onset of food insecurity is associated with obesity among women⁽¹⁵⁾ and weight stigma and bias can have detrimental effects on mental and physical health⁽²¹⁾. Although SNAP participation is associated with a significant reduction in both prevalence and severity of food insecurity⁽¹⁴⁾, it is also plausible that participation in food assistance programs and the associated stigma associated with receiving food assistance adversely influence mental health^(3, 5).

The ECE workforce is a particularly vulnerable, yet very important, segment of the US workforce. ECE jobs are often precarious or low quality, characterized by low wages, high stress, long hours, lack of fringe benefits, and short tenure⁽⁸⁾. Compared to national averages or women of similar demographics, this workforce has been found to have unhealthier diets, lower rates of physical activity, and less hours of sleep, and higher rates of obesity, depression, and diabetes^(8, 9). Moreover, this population has a high prevalence of both food insecurity and depression⁽⁸⁻¹⁰⁾. A study in North Carolina found that 36% of ECE workers reported clinically depressive symptoms—about five times the national rate of depression for Americans⁽⁸⁾. Similarly, a 2017 Arkansas workforce study reported that 33% of their sample of ECE teachers were at risk for depression, and 40% reported being food insecure⁽¹⁰⁾.

The primary objective of this analysis was to explore the association between food insecurity and depression among ECE workers. The secondary objective of this analysis was to investigate the extent to which the relationship between food insecurity and depression varied by wages and participation in food assistance programs. A better understanding of this relationship is needed to inform interventions and policies that are designed to improve the health and wellbeing of the ECE workforce, which may benefit the workers themselves as well as the children that they care for^(22, 23).

Methods

The cross-sectional data presented in this paper were collected as part of baseline data collection from a prospective study exploring the effects of wage on early care and education centers in Seattle and South King County, Washington, and Austin, Texas.

Participants, Recruitment, and Data Collection

The study population and study recruitment are described in detail elsewhere⁽⁹⁾. Briefly, between August 2017 and December 2018, 49 ECE centers (in Seattle [N=16], South King County [N=16], and Austin [N=17]) were recruited and enrolled. Workers at these sites were invited to participate in the study. Out of 504 workers who initially expressed interest in participating, 366 enrolled in the study and completed the baseline questionnaire. Out of these 366 participants, 313 workers had complete case information. Participants were compensated with a \$30 gift card upon completion of the baseline survey.

The baseline survey was offered online or on paper. Data were collected on sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, education, marital status, household and individual annual income, food assistance participation), employment characteristics (e.g., job title, average paid hours of work per week), and workers' health (e.g., self-reported depressive symptoms and food security).

Key Exposure Variable

The primary exposure was food insecurity, which was measured using the validated six-item U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module developed by the National Center for Health Statistics⁽²⁴⁾. This module queries individuals about their household food situation with questions about how often in the last 12 months the participant and/or adults in his/her household ran out of food and did not have money to

buy more and how often they were could not afford to eat balanced meals. Participants were also asked questions (yes/no) about whether they and/or adults in their household reduced the size of meals or skipped meals due to lack of money for food in the last 12 months. Affirmative answers to these questions were summed to form a household raw score (range= 0-6). Using established guidelines⁽²⁴⁾, participants were categorized into three categories: normal to high food security (score = 0 to 1), low food security (score = 2 to 4), and very low food security (score = 5 to 6). Participants categorized in the normal to high food security group are referred to as “food secure” throughout this manuscript.

Key Outcome Variable

The primary outcome was depression, which was measured using the 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale-Revised (CESD-R)⁽²⁵⁾. Respondents answered questions about how often they experience nine different groups of depressive symptoms: sadness, loss of interest, appetite, sleep, thinking/concentration, guilt, tired, movement, and suicidal ideation. Each item was scored as follows: 0 (“not at all or less than one day”), 1 (“1-2 days”), 2 (“3-4 days”), and 3 (“5-7 days, or nearly every day for 2 weeks”). The overall CESD-R score is a sum of the responses to the twenty questions and ranges from 0-60⁽²⁵⁾. For the purposes of this analysis and using previously established cutoffs from the CESD-R, participants were coded into binary categories: clinically significant depression (score ≥ 16) and not depressed (score < 16)⁽²⁵⁾.

Effect Measure Modifiers and Confounders

Based on prior literature^(3, 5, 17, 26), we hypothesized that the effect of food insecurity and depression may vary by wage and food assistance program participation. Food assistance participation was defined as self-reported participation in at least one food assistance program, which included Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), farmers market WIC program, food bank, and reduced-price or free school program.

Workers’ wages were collected as a continuous variable. Wage was dichotomized based on the median value for each study site (i.e., $<$ median versus \geq median). The hourly wage median at each study site was \$17.35 in Seattle, \$14.08 in South King County, and \$14.82 in Austin.

A directed acyclic graph (DAG) was used to identify potential confounders, which were defined as variables associated with the exposure and outcome that are not along the causal pathway⁽²⁷⁾. Existing literature was used to support assumptions made about the role of each variable and the completeness of our DAG. From our DAG, a minimally sufficient set of confounders was identified and included as covariates in our primary model. Confounders included age (continuous), marital status (never married, now married, other), birth country (U.S. versus other), race/ethnicity (Non-Hispanic Black/African American, Non-Hispanic White, Other, Hispanic), number of children in the household (0, 1, ≥ 2 children), job title (center director, lead teacher or instructor, teacher or instructor, assistant teacher or instructor, other), average paid hours of work per week (continuous), highest level of education (\leq high school/GED, some college/associates/ECE certificate, \geq bachelor's degree), total household income ($>$ \$25,000, \$25,000-\$49,999, \geq \$50,000, don't know), and an indicator variable for study site (Seattle, South King County, Austin).

Statistical Analysis

A logistic regression model examined the relationship between food insecurity and depression, and controlled for the aforementioned covariates.

Two sensitivity analyses were performed for the primary model. First, sex was included as an additional covariate in the model, because 94% of our sample was female. Second, annual household income was replaced with annual individual income, as a covariate. Our primary model assumed that household income more strongly influences food insecurity and depression versus individual income.

Finally, in two separate models, an interaction term was used to assess whether food assistance participation (food assistance (yes/no) X food insecurity) and wage (median wage (below/at or above) X food insecurity) modified the association between food insecurity and depression.

All statistical analyses were conducted in STATA 13 (StataCorp., College Station, TX).

Results

Our primary model included 313 ECE workers, with complete case information, from 49 ECE centers in Seattle, WA (n=126, 40%), South King County, WA (n=81,

26%), and Austin, TX (n=106, 34%). Demographic characteristics by food security status are presented in Table 1. The majority of participants was female (94%), non-Hispanic White (56%), born in the US (86%), and did not have children (63%). Compared with workers who reported being food secure, workers who reported low and very low food security, on average, had lower household incomes. A greater proportion of these workers also reported never been married, having two or more child dependents, having less than a Bachelor's degree, earning wages below the site median, and participating in food assistance programs. Workers who reported that they were food secure were generally older.

Mean CESD-R depression raw scores increased with higher levels of food insecurity (Figure 1). In the primary logistic regression model, after controlling for covariates, very low and low food insecurity, compared to being food secure, were associated with a 4.95 (95% Confidence Interval [CI]: 2.29, 10.67) and 2.69 (95% CI: 1.29, 5.63) higher odds of depression, respectively (Table 2). In the sensitivity analyses, the magnitude, direction, and statistical significance were similar when we controlled for sex (low food security OR = 2.75; 95% CI: 1.32, 5.79, very low food security OR = 5.00; 95% CI: 12.31, 10.83) and when household annual income was replaced with individual annual income (low food security OR = 3.06; 95% CI: 1.49, 6.27; very low food security OR = 5.49; 95% CI: 2.63, 11.46) (Table 3).

Table 4 presents estimates, stratified by food assistance program participation and wage status. The association between food insecurity and depression did not vary by participation in a food assistance program ($p = 0.71$) or median site wage ($p = 0.41$).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the association between food insecurity and depression among ECE workers. Prevalence rates for food insecurity and depression in our sample were 41% and 39%, respectively, which are higher than national prevalence rates of food insecurity among American households (11%)⁽²⁸⁾ and of depression among US females (9%)⁽²⁹⁾. However, the prevalence rates in our sample were comparable or higher to rates noted in recent studies with ECE samples and nursing home employees, a comparable low-wage worker population^(8, 10, 22, 26).

Our findings are consistent with that of several previous studies that look at the association between food insecurity and depression among vulnerable populations and predominantly female samples^(4, 5, 18, 30). In a recent cross-sectional analysis of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (2011-2014), authors report a dose-response relationship between food insecurity and depressive symptoms among diabetic adults with an odds ratio of similar magnitude to those noted in our study⁽³⁰⁾. Another cross-sectional analysis of low-income, diabetic participants, in King County, WA also found that being food insecure (versus secure) was associated with almost 3-times higher odds of depression, which was similar in magnitude to our finding for adults who had low food security⁽³¹⁾. Results from the Women's Employment Study similarly reported that household food insufficiency was associated with depression among low-income female welfare recipients⁽⁵⁾. Using longitudinal data, Tuthill et al. ⁽¹⁸⁾ found that women with very low food security had 5-times the odds of depression, compared to food secure women⁽¹⁸⁾, which was similar in magnitude to our study findings.

We did not find that food assistance participation modified the association between food insecurity and depression. These findings differ from that of some related studies, which reported that the association between with food insecurity and depression varied by food assistance program participation^(2, 3, 17, 32). Some nationally representative data suggest that the association between food insecurity and emotional distress or depression was higher among SNAP participants than SNAP-eligible nonparticipants^(2, 3). Heflin and Ziliak's⁽²⁾ longitudinal analysis also noted that the magnitude of the association between food insufficiency (i.e., food insecurity with hunger) and emotional distress was larger when participants were initially transitioning onto SNAP, possibly due to the increased stigma and participants' inexperience in navigating the system. Similarly, Leung et. al concluded that the odds of depression, in relation to food insecurity, were higher for most SNAP participants versus SNAP-eligible nonparticipants⁽³⁾. Unlike these studies, which focused on only SNAP participation, our study examined the heterogeneity in the association by food program participation in any food assistance program (i.e., not SNAP specifically). In addition, only 12% of sample participants (n=37) were enrolled in SNAP and/or had members of their households receiving SNAP benefits. In general, the prevalence of food program participation was much smaller than

that of previous studies^(2, 3). This may have been attributable to differences in SNAP eligibility requirements, as our study focused on ECE workers in only two states rather than a nationally representative sample. These differences in methodology and sampling could have contributed to differences in our findings versus prior studies. The lack of effect modification noted in our study may also be due to the fact that food assistance participation could be acting as a mediator rather than an effect modifier of the relationship between food insecurity and mental health.

Our study also did not find that individual-level wage modified the association between food insecurity and depression. We hypothesized that those with the lowest wage would have a larger magnitude of effect between food insecurity and depression. So this result was surprising considering the interrelationship between financial instability and food insecurity⁽²⁶⁾; household financial income is consistently found to be the strongest predictor of food insecurity risk⁽¹⁴⁾ and the association between financial instability and poor mental health is well-documented^(13, 18, 26). One possible explanation for our findings may have to do with the narrow range of income represented in this sample. Our overall sample size was also relatively small and therefore, we may have been insufficiently powered to detect heterogeneity in the association. Another possible explanation for our findings may be related to whether the respondent was the primary wage earner in the household, and thus, subject to higher levels of stress due to financial strain. For example, a study examining low-wage nursing home workers, which is also a highly vulnerable workforce, did find that the association of depression with household financial strain and food insufficiency varied by primary wage earner status⁽²⁶⁾. Among primary wage earner participants, the odds of depressive symptoms were found to be 3.6 times higher in relation to food insufficiency (vs. food security), whereas food insufficiency was not associated with depressive symptoms, among non-primary wage earners⁽²⁶⁾. Our survey did not include a measure that would allow for identification of primary wage earner status.

Overall, this study suggests the need for policies and interventions that address both mental health and food insecurity in this valuable yet vulnerable workforce. A well-nourished and healthy ECE workforce is needed to optimize the growth and development of the next generation. More children than ever are enrolled in ECE programs and these

children spend a significant amount of developmental time and may receive most of their daily nutrition in this setting^(33, 34). In order to provide high quality care and education to the children they serve, ECE workers need support in their work environments; one possible approach to help optimize their working conditions and health is through population-level strategies^(22, 23). Potential policy-level strategies could include incorporating ECE workers as recipients of the federally reimbursed nutritious meals and snacks already served on-site to children via the Child and Adult Care Food Program or adopting legislation or provisions that improve financial security for ECE workers (e.g., tax credits, raised minimum wage, wage ladders⁽³⁵⁾). Centers could also provide workers with resources and connections to nutrition education and food assistance programs. Based on the national 2000 Food Stamp Program Access Study⁽³⁶⁾, misunderstandings and uncertainty around eligibility for food stamp benefits limited over half of their sample of potentially eligible individuals (n=1220) from participating in the food stamp program, suggesting that population-specific outreach and education around food assistance participation eligibility may encourage participation in food assistance programs⁽³⁶⁾. Centers can also look for opportunities to create on-site programs or create synergies with existing local food assistance programs (e.g., home preparation meal-kits, weekly produce markets or food pantry for staff and families served by the center). For example, Hungry Harvest partners with various public schools in Baltimore City to provide reduced-cost, recovered produce to staff, students, and their families in low-income neighborhoods⁽³⁷⁾. In Seattle and South King County, the Good Food Bags program provides a weekly subscription to subsidized, fresh produce from local farms to lower-income families through preschools, community centers, and other community partner organizations⁽³⁸⁾. On-site programs, especially established through a community effort⁽³⁹⁾, are not only more accessible but may also reduce the stigma associated with food assistance⁽³⁶⁾ and thereby encourage use of these resources. Finally, potential center-level interventions could include routine staff training on mental health and emotional wellbeing, coping skills, and stress management techniques, which can also be practiced with the children they care for.

There are several limitations of this analysis. This analysis was a cross-sectional design, which precludes our ability to infer a causal relationship between food insecurity

and depression. In addition, our study also included a relatively small sample of predominantly female, non-Hispanic white, and low-wage ECE workers in two states, which limits its generalizability. Nonetheless, key strengths of this study include the use of validated measures and a rigorous assessment of the relationship between food insecurity and depression among a sample of ECE workers.

Conclusion

This study finds that food insecurity is associated with depression. Considering the high prevalence rates of food insecurity and depression among ECE workers, policies and center-level interventions that address both food insecurity and depression may be warranted in order to protect and improve the health of this valuable, yet vulnerable, workforce. A healthy ECE workforce is vital to the delivery of quality childcare.

References

1. Usda ERS (2019) Food Security in the U.S. -- Interactive Charts and Highlights.
2. Colleen MH & James PZ (2008) Food Insufficiency, Food Stamp Participation, and Mental Health. *Social Science Quarterly* 89, 706-727.
3. Leung CW, Epel ES, Willett WC *et al.* (2015) Household Food Insecurity Is Positively Associated with Depression among Low-Income Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participants and Income-Eligible Nonparticipants. *The Journal of nutrition* 145, 622-627.
4. Noonan K, Corman H Reichman NE (2016) Effects of maternal depression on family food insecurity. *Economics and Human Biology* 22, 201-215.
5. Heflin CM, Siefert K Williams DR (2005) Food insufficiency and women's mental health: Findings from a 3-year panel of welfare recipients. *Social Science & Medicine* 61, 1971-1982.
6. Coleman-Jensen A, Rabbitt MP, Gregory CA *et al.* (2018) *Household Food Security in the United States in 2017*. Economic Research Report Number 256.
7. Leung CW, Stewart AL, Portela-Parra ET *et al.* (2020) Understanding the Psychological Distress of Food Insecurity: A Qualitative Study of Children's Experiences and Related Coping Strategies. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics* 120, 395-403.
8. Linnan L, Arandia G, Bateman LA *et al.* (2017) The Health and Working Conditions of Women Employed in Child Care. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 14, 283.
9. Otten JJ, Bradford VA, Stover B *et al.* (2019) The Culture Of Health In Early Care And Education: Workers' Wages, Health, And Job Characteristics. *Health affairs (Project Hope)* 38, 709-720.
10. McKelvey L, Forsman A Morrison-Ward J (2017) *Arkansas Workforce Study: Instructional Staff in Child Care & Early Childhood Education, 2017*.
11. Maynard M, Andrade L, Packull-McCormick S *et al.* (2018) Food Insecurity and Mental Health among Females in High-Income Countries. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 15, 1424.

12. Arenas DJ, Thomas A, Wang J *et al.* (2019) A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Depression, Anxiety, and Sleep Disorders in US Adults with Food Insecurity. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 1-9.
13. Jessiman-Perreault G & McIntyre L (2017) The household food insecurity gradient and potential reductions in adverse population mental health outcomes in Canadian adults. *SSM - Population Health* 3, 464-472.
14. Loopstra R (2018) Interventions to address household food insecurity in high-income countries. *The Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 77, 270-281.
15. Gundersen C & Ziliak JP (2015) Food Insecurity And Health Outcomes. *Health affairs (Project Hope)* 34, 1830-1839.
16. Brostow D, Gunzburger E, Abbate L *et al.* (2019) Mental Illness, Not Weight Status, Predicts Increased Odds of Food Insecurity in the Health and Retirement Study (OR02-06-19). *Current Developments in Nutrition* 3.
17. Kim K & Frongillo EA (2007) Participation in Food Assistance Programs Modifies the Relation of Food Insecurity with Weight and Depression in Elders. *The Journal of Nutrition* 137, 1005-1010.
18. Tuthill EL, Sheira LA, Palar K *et al.* (2019) Persistent Food Insecurity Is Associated with Adverse Mental Health among Women Living with or at Risk of HIV in the United States. *The Journal of Nutrition* 149, 240-248.
19. Dean J & Keshavan M (2017) The neurobiology of depression: An integrated view. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry* 27, 101-111.
20. Rao TSS, Asha MR, Ramesh BN *et al.* (2008) Understanding nutrition, depression and mental illnesses. *Indian journal of psychiatry* 50, 77-82.
21. Tomiyama AJ, Carr D, Granberg EM *et al.* (2018) How and why weight stigma drives the obesity 'epidemic' and harms health. *BMC medicine* 16, 123.
22. Whitaker RC, Becker BD, Herman AN *et al.* (2013) The Physical and Mental Health of Head Start Staff: The Pennsylvania Head Start Staff Wellness Survey, 2012. *Peer Reviewed* 10, E181.
23. Cumming T (2017) Early Childhood Educators' Well-Being: An Updated Review of the Literature. *Early Childhood Education Journal* 45, 583-593.

24. Department of Agriculture ERS (2012) U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module: Six-Item Short Form Economic Research Service, USDA. Washington (DC): USDA.
25. Eaton WW, Smith C, Ybarra M *et al.* (2004) Center for Epidemiological Depression Scale: review and revision (CESD and CESD-R). In *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes assessment*, 3rd ed., pp. 363– 377 [ME Maruish, editor]. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
26. Okechukwu CA, El Ayadi AM, Tamers SL *et al.* (2012) Household Food Insufficiency, Financial Strain, Work–Family Spillover, and Depressive Symptoms in the Working Class: The Work, Family, and Health Network Study. *American journal of public health* 102, 126-133.
27. Glymour MM (2006) 16. Using Causal Diagrams to Understand Common Problems in Social Epidemiology. In *Methods in Social Epidemiology*.
28. Usda ERS (2019) The prevalence of food insecurity in 2018 is down from 2017.
29. National Institute of Mental H (2019) Major Depression.
30. Montgomery MJ, Lu DJ, Ratliff MS *et al.* (2017) Food Insecurity and Depression Among Adults With Diabetes: Results From the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *The Diabetes educator* 43, 260.
31. Silverman J, Krieger J, Kiefer M *et al.* (2015) The Relationship Between Food Insecurity and Depression, Diabetes Distress and Medication Adherence Among Low-Income Patients with Poorly-Controlled Diabetes. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 30, 1476-1480.
32. Oddo VM & Mabli J (2015) Association of Participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Psychological Distress. *American journal of public health* 105, e30-e35.
33. Alberdi G, McNamara A, Lindsay K *et al.* (2016) The association between childcare and risk of childhood overweight and obesity in children aged 5 years and under: a systematic review. *European Journal of Pediatrics* 175, 1277-1294.
34. Kaphingst KM & Story M (2009) Child care as an untapped setting for obesity prevention: state child care licensing regulations related to nutrition, physical

- activity, and media use for preschool-aged children in the United States. *Peer Reviewed* 6, A11.
35. Economic Opportunity I (2005) Washington State Career and Wage Ladder Evaluation.
 36. Bartlett S, Burstein N, Hamilton W *et al.* (2004) *Food Stamp Program Access Study final report*. vol. 3-013-3., *E-FAN*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Research Service.
 37. Hungry H About Produce in a SNAP, vol. 2019.
 38. Alliance T Good Food Bags. <http://www.tilthalliance.org/about/good-food-bags> (accessed Web Page)
 39. Snelling A, Maroto M, Jacknowitz A *et al.* (2014) Key Factors for School-Based Food Pantries: Perspectives From Food Bank and School Pantry Personnel. *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition* 9, 350-361.

Table 1: Characteristics of a cohort of 313 early care and education (ECE) providers in Washington and Texas participating in baseline data collection of a prospective study exploring the effects of wage on ECE provider health, by food security status, 2017

Demographic Factor*	Food Secure (n=185)	Low Food Security (n=64)	Very Low Food Security (n=64)
Age, mean (SD)	39.5 (13)	35.5 (13)	33.3 (12)
Sex, n (%)			
Male	13 (7%)	5 (8%)	2 (3%)
Female	171 (93%)	59 (92%)	61 (97%)
Birth Country, n (%)			
United States	155 (84%)	55 (86%)	58 (91%)
Another Country	30 (16%)	9 (14%)	6 (9%)
Study Site, n (%)			
Seattle, WA	81 (44%)	26 (41%)	19 (30%)
South King County, WA	50 (27%)	16 (25%)	15 (23%)
Austin, TX	54 (29%)	22 (34%)	30 (47%)
Race/Ethnicity, n (%)			
Non-Hispanic White	118 (64%)	30 (47%)	27 (42%)
Non-Hispanic Black/African-American	17 (9%)	10 (16%)	14 (22%)
Non-Hispanic, Other	27 (15%)	3 (5%)	6 (9%)
Hispanic	23 (12%)	21 (33%)	17 (27%)
Marital Status, n (%)			
Never Married	78 (42%)	28 (44%)	40 (63%)
Now Married	85 (46%)	20 (31%)	13 (20%)
Divorced, Widowed, Separated or Other	22 (12%)	16 (25%)	11 (17%)
Number of Children (<18) in Household, mean (SD)			
0	125 (68%)	32 (50%)	40 (63%)
1	33 (18%)	15 (23%)	8 (13%)
2 or more	27 (15%)	17 (27%)	16 (25%)
Highest Level of Education, n (%)			

≤High School or GED	17 (9%)	18 (28%)	16 (25%)
Some college, Associate's degree, ECE certificate	65 (35%)	23 (36%)	32 (50%)
Bachelor's degree or higher	103 (56%)	23 (36%)	16 (25%)
ECE Job Title, n (%)			
Center Director	20 (11%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)
Lead Teacher or Instructor	55 (30%)	24 (38%)	28 (44%)
Teacher or Instructor	50 (27%)	14 (22%)	14 (22%)
Assistant Teacher or Instructor	41 (22%)	12 (19%)	13 (20%)
Other	19 (10%)	11 (17%)	6 (9%)
Average Paid Hours of Work Per Week, mean (SD)			
	37.7 (8)	37.2 (7)	36.5 (8)
Individual Annual Income, \$10,000, mean (SD)			
	31783.5 (12055)	25013.3 (10254)	23543.2 (10005)
Household Income, mean (SD)			
	67196.3 (45483)	41856.7 (35268)	37149.5 (24695)
Household income, n (%)			
Below \$25,000	22 (12%)	20 (31%)	20 (31%)
\$25,000-\$49,999	55 (30%)	20 (31%)	28 (43%)
\$50,000 or more	96 (52%)	18 (28%)	15 (23%)
Don't know	12 (7%)	6 (9%)	1 (2%)
Hourly Wage in Comparison to Median Site Wage, n (%)			
Below median	73 (41%)	34 (55%)	41 (66%)
Median or above	106 (59%)	28 (45%)	21 (34%)
Depression CESD-R Score[†], mean (SD)			
	11.8 (8)	18.7 (12)	23.1 (12)
Categorical Depression based on CESD-R Score[‡], n (%)			
Non-clinical Depression	138 (75%)	31 (48%)	21 (33%)
Clinical Depression	47 (25%)	33 (52%)	43 (67%)
USDA Food Security 6-item Raw Score[§], mean (SD)			
	0.2 (0.4)	2.8 (0.8)	5.6 (0.5)
Food Assistance Program Participation, n (%)			
No	153 (83%)	44 (69%)	44 (69%)
Yes	32 (17%)	20 (31%)	20 (31%)

* Percentages provided for each demographic factor reflect proportions of participants in each food security subgroup (i.e., for each demographic factor, percentages within the same column sum to 100%).

† The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale-Revised (CESD-R) scores are based on responses to twenty questions and range from 0 to 60, with higher scores indicating more depressive symptoms⁽²⁵⁾.

‡ Categorical depression was based on the CESD-R scores from 0-60 and categorized accordingly: 1) Non-clinical Depression (score= 0-16) and 2) Clinical Depression, including Major, Probable, Possible, and Sub-threshold Depression (score \geq 16), based on previously established cutoffs⁽²⁵⁾.

§ The USDA Food Security 6-item Raw Scores ranged from 0 to 6, with a higher score being indicative of more severe food insecurity. Food security was categorized accordingly: Normal to High Food Security (score = 0 to 1), 2) Low Food Security (score = 2-4), and 3) Very Low Security (score = 5-6)⁽²⁴⁾.

|| Out of total 313 sample, 37 (12%) participants or members of their households received SNAP benefits, 22 (7%) received WIC benefits, 4 (1%) received farmers market nutrition program for WIC, 13 (4%) received benefits from food bank or pantry, 24 (8%) received benefits from free or reduced school breakfast or lunch for kids, and 1 (0.3%) received benefits from another program.

Table 2: Primary model with logistic regression estimates (odds ratios) for the association between food insecurity and depression among a cohort of 313 early care and education (ECE) providers in Washington and Texas*

	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	p-value
Low Food Security (N=64)	2.69	(1.29, 5.63)	0.011
Very Low Food Security (N=64)	4.95	(2.29, 10.67)	0.000

* Presented values are estimated using logistic regression models for the association between food insecurity and depression after controlling for age, marital status, birth country, race/ethnicity, number of children in the household, job title, average paid hours of work per week, highest level of education, total household income, and an indicator variable for study site. The reference group is participants who are food secure (N=185).

Table 3: Sensitivity analyses with logistic regression estimates (odds ratio) for the association between food insecurity and depression among a cohort of 313 early care and education (ECE) Providers in Washington and Texas*

	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	p-value
Sensitivity Analysis 1: Primary Model + Sex (N=311)[†]			
Low Food Security (n=64)	2.75	(1.32, 5.79)	0.009
Very Low Food Security (n=63)	5.00	(2.31, 10.83)	0.000
Sensitivity Analysis 2: Primary Model, replacing <i>Annual Household Income</i> with <i>Annual Individual Income</i> (N=299)[‡]			
Low Food Security (n=61)	3.06	(1.49, 6.27)	0.002
Very Low Food Security (n=62)	5.49	(2.63, 11.46)	0.000

* Presented values are estimated using logistic regression models for the association between food insecurity and depression. The primary model controls for age, marital status, birth country, race/ethnicity, number of children in the household, job title, average paid hours of work per week, highest level of education, total household income, and an indicator variable for study site.

[†] The reference group is participants who are food secure (n=184).

[‡] The reference group is participants who are food secure (n=176).

Table 4: Logistic regression estimates (odds ratios) for the association between food insecurity and depression among a cohort of early care and education (ECE) providers in Washington and Texas, stratified by food assistance program participation and wage*

	Food Assistance Program Participation (N=313) [†]		Individual Wage (N=303) [†]	
	Yes (n=72)	No (n=241)	Below site median (n=146) [‡]	At or above site median (n=155)
Low Food Security	2.58 (0.41, 16.35)	2.73 (1.17, 6.38)	1.62 (0.52, 5.04)	4.11 (1.28, 13.24)
Very Low Food Security	6.77 (1.02, 44.80)	6.11 (2.48, 15.02)	6.67 (2.19, 20.38)	5.18 (1.32, 20.32)
Global <i>p</i> value	0.71		0.41	

* Presented values are estimated using logistic regression models for the association between food insecurity and depression after controlling for age, marital status, birth country, race/ethnicity, number of children in the household, job title, average paid hours of work per week, highest level of education, total household income, and an indicator variable for study site.

[†] The reference group is participants who are food secure.

[‡] Individuals with a job title of center director that earned below median site wage (n=1) were not included in this model.

Figure Legend

Figure 1: Mean USDA food security and CESD-R depression raw scores by food security status among 313 early care and education providers