SOMETIMES TOO HUNGRY TO CONCENTRATE:

NONTRADITIONAL AND TRADITIONAL FIRST-GENERATION STUDENTS'

EDUCATIONAL FOOD PRACTICES

A Dissertation

By

MARISSA RENEE CISNEROS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of

Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOHY

Chair of Committee,	William Alex Mcintosh
Co-Chair of Committee,	Sarah Gatson
Committee Members,	Wendy Moore
	Nancy Plankey-Videla
Head of Department,	Jane Sell

May 2020

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

In the long-valued narrative of meritocracy in the United States, 'Pulling oneself up by the bootstraps' is a myth which has been enacted to undermine the structural, even intentional, reality of the inequity between people. Literature on low rates of educational success of marginalized students tend to focus on how to greater prioritize the role of 'student'. Most literature identifies individualistic methods to increase educational success of marginalized students. To counter this, I apply an intersectional approach to Bourdieu's theory of practice to investigate how differential hazards and barriers negatively influence food experiences in higher education. I do this by collecting survey data on two different marginalized groups' (nontraditional and first-generation students) food practices at the higher education institution of study. I use logistic regression to analyze how work effects campus meal skipping while controlling for appropriate variables by student label. I then use logistic regression to identify propensity to use alternative food networks controlling for appropriate variables by student label. From this analysis I illuminate how efforts to obtain food in a field of institutional foodscape, varies by differential barriers and burdens within higher education putting strain on educational access and success. These barriers and burdens are dictated by the individual's personal and socio-historical interactions with said institution. This navigation is further affected by the interaction of capital; not only to the development of the individual's habitus but also ability to interact and take full advantage of access and hurdles of said foodscape barriers and burdens.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Deborah Ann Cisneros, whom without none of this would have been possible. I remember you saying, “I know I didn’t do anything, but I feel like I was a part of this.” That was because you were momma. You are a pillar of unrelenting force, a momma bird saying: fly b*tch. To my father, Louie Castillo Cisneros, your love fuels my spirit. Gunny, I will always want to make you proud. To my big brother, David Anthony Villareal, there was a time in my life where no one believed I could make it to college. You always supported my dreams, even in their earliest forms. You always let me vent my frustrations to you, you know me, and always have offered hulk shoulders to lean on. And I hope you know I will always have a shoulder for you to lean on.

To Francisco Deleon Castillo and Angelita Torres Castillo. Abuelita, I know you’re looking down at me, caring less about any of this and just happy that I am happy because you love me. Abuelo, you are a cannon of stone and love, a patriarch in an unsteady time. Thank you teaching my father how to be a great dad. To my grandpa, Bobbie Calderón Hatol, our Sunday breakfast talks grounded me during this. Thank you for being such an awesome grandpops!

To Ruby Treviño Martinez, Ha! Look at what you did! You took no crap from any man, played by your own rules, taught my grandma and mom to do the same and now look! Una Doctora! Te Amo Great Grandma! I know you course through my veins, as with Great Great Grandma Estefana Cuéllar Treviño who gives me kindness, and I love you both for that. Thank you for all the strength, stubbornness, and perseverance. Grandma Lilian Saenz, I have few memories of you, but thank you for the yummy food.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. William Mcintosh, for being an awesome chair who was there for me throughout all of this. There were often times where I considered leaving my first year, what kept me here is that I didn't want to let you down. Also, Dr. Sarah Gatson, thank you for being so emotionally available. Undoubtedly, you helped so much with the writing and research aspect but also you were there for me beyond the research. I had gotten to a point where I didn't think I was sick, and doctors agreed. You insisted I seek health care and figure out why I was feeling how I felt, my life quality is so much better. In a lot of ways both Dr. Mcintosh and you fought for me to fight for me, and fought for me to relax and breathe and believe in myself. You are great colleagues and true friends.

I would also like to thank Dr. Wendy Moore and Dr. Nancy Plankey-Videla. I lost count how many times I cried in front of you, Dr. Moore. I often wonder what would have happened if you would have not pushed me for the PhD. Realistically, that was not an option because you wouldn't have let it. Dr. Plankey-Videla, thank you for always pushing me to know more, and refine more.

I would like also to thank my home the Southside of San Antonio for my family lineage and resolve. Furthermore, I would like to thank my cousin, Christopher Temps Hatol, for being so proud of me. I know you are kicking it with Uncle Dude right now.

Dr. Vicky Elias, I couldn't have done this without you. Go Jaguars!

Finally, I would like to thank my two awesome cats, who's fluffiness and cuddling kept me some what sane through this whole ordeal. We've grown from kittens to cats together over the past 15 years and I hope for many more purrs.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

This dissertation was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Advisor William Alex Mcintosh PhD of the Department of Sociology and Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Sciences, Rural Sociology and Community Studies, Texas A&M University; and Department of Nutrition and Food Science, Texas A&M University. Further supervise by Co-Advisor Sarah Gatson PhD, Wendy Moore PhD, and Nancy Plankey-Videla PhD of the Sociology Department

Data collection and recruitment was done collaboratively with Dr. Vicky Elias (first and second wave data), Dr. Liset Leal-Vaquez (first wave data), (second wave data:) Dr. Sukho Lee, Dr. Jiyeon Kim, Dr. Kyoungho Seo, and Dr. Joungbo Ko. Specifically, Dr. Vicky Elias aided in survey structure and overall wording of questions. While data collection was done collaboratively the theory, methods, analyses and all other work completed for this dissertation was completed independently by I, the student.

Funding Sources

Graduate study was supported by a Texas A&M University Diversity Fellowship and a Texas A&M Sociology Department graduate assistantship. Graduate study was also supported by participation in USDA-AFRI grant, “Actionable Links between Soil Function, Ecosystem Services, and Stakeholder Perceptions to Overcome Barriers to Improved Soil Management.” under Dr. William Mcintosh.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION, MORE THAN NUMBERS

Reflection One

6/2016 Confession: I'm a lot softer than I like to admit.

I sat in a library building a report on the first round of data. It was disheartening yet nothing I didn't expect. The USDA likes to call it food insecurity, but it's hunger. It's pain. I had gone through it, I had known. I was sitting next to people I didn't know, yet still felt connected to. Tears welled up and streaked my face. I continued working, because what else was there?

I knew when I began my dissertation endeavor that I wanted my piece to speak to people the way Patricia Williams's work had (1991). A large endeavor for a young scholar like myself, but I wanted it to not just be a literature review that regurgitated what we already knew, a question, data and statistical models, and findings. That, in my heart, I knew went against everything I believed in.

"But what do I believe in? What am I trying to do? What am I trying to invoke that is akin to Patricia Williams's work?" These thoughts pulsed in my head as I stared at an outline of this chapter. I sat, six years of graduate school exhaustion seeping from my fingers onto the keyboard. I sought solace in Williams's (1991) book, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*, it spoke to me and I wasn't sure why. *"Maybe that's where I need to start,"* I thought, *"figuring out why her work speaks to me?"* Not far in, everything snapped into place:

"'What's so new,' asks my sister, losing interest rapidly, 'about a schizophrenic black lady pouring her heart out about food stamps and polar bears?'" (Williams 1991:7)

A similar question could be applied to my work. Contemporary research is saturated with food insecurity, so why does my work matter? What is so new about a crazy, *fiery*[1], Latin@

[1] Prevailing narrative which frames cis-gender Latinx women as "hot," with uncontrollable emotions, including hypersexuality, making us dangerous and a threat, see Chavez's *The Latino Threat* (Chavez 2013).

writing about unequal access to food and education? Instantly, Karen Washington's speech at the Food Summit filled my mind (Nierenberg 2016): "We don't need statistics to tell us who is poor, who is hungry, sick, nor a mapping of a so-called food desert… We need to understand that behind those numbers is a person. A human being" (9:16 minutes).

And so, my purpose placed at the forefront, what I believed in became clear.

This is what makes Patricia Williams's (1991) work so powerful. Her work, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights,* while an intensive legal analysis, puts the humanness and human emotionality up front (Williams 1991). While models and data are important, it is essential to understand that behind all these words is a person. Behind all these numbers are living breathing people, trying desperately to go from powerless to powerful in a country structurally built to prevent their full inclusion as human beings, citizens.

> *Reflection Two*
>
> *6/2017 I'm an Enigma, this gives me Authority*
>
> *I stood there in professional clothes that made me feel itchy and out of place. Food conferences were my favorite. Unlike major [disciplinary] conferences that tended to leave me insecure and drained, food conferences invigorated my research. I had grown though since the last food conference I attended. My eyes were jaded, or I was less naïve, one of those two.*
>
> *"So before I start this presentation on food insecurity of nontraditional students primarily of color in higher education, I just wanted to see how many in here started at community college?" I raised my hand, and I stood there… alone. "Let's talk about this empirically," I said keeping my composure, but inside I was screaming. "Well, this explains why no one has cared to put this puzzle together."*

When approaching this research endeavor, I was amazed at the gaps in the literature. While the link between food security and higher education was fairly present, research on

nontraditional students and/or students of color and food security was largely missing[2] . After reflecting, it became obvious that most academics use the student body of their university as research subjects, and students of color, especially nontraditional students of color, are largely missing from the traditional Predominately White Institution (PWI) university student base.

This is seen when considering national educational statistics. For instance, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) the percentage of all U.S. residents enrolled in a degree granting postsecondary institution in 2015 who were White Americans was 58%, while Black Americans 15% and Latinx Americans 17% of the total enrollment population (National Center for Education Statistics 2017). This is not taking into account retention, or the type/prestige of the Universities students of color attend.[3] When considering the research interests within these higher institutions, diversity of the graduate student population goes a long way in understanding how student of color representation is lacking. In 2014 the total enrollment for postbaccalaureate programs (including both masters and doctoral programs) was 65% for White Americans, 14.5% for Black Americans, and 9% for Latinx Americans. Again, this does not consider retention/completion rates, or the institution type/prestige (Musu-Gillette et al. 2017) . Thus, if the presence of nontraditional students of color is minimized in locations/populations of scholarly research production, while simultaneously the producers of research are not diverse in terms of race and ethnicity, then investigations into marginalized people's structural realities and lived experiences will remain minimized if not wholly invisible.

[2] Despite limitations, two very influential articles broke ground for higher education, race, and food security: (Bruening et al. 2016; Freudenberg et al. 2011)
[3] Further investigated in Chapter 2 subheading: The false narrative of meritocracy, page 14.

Such minimization of voice is why autoethnographic excerpts and reflexivity occur throughout my dissertation as it explicates the quantitative analyses. The absence of marginalized persons in the education system and scholarly production would otherwise heighten the danger of the objectification of my research participants and their lived experiences, as well as doing further violence to my own, sociologically-driven, recognition and deployment of my intersectional theoretical perspective (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Crenshaw 1988; Jazeel and Mcfarlane 2007). Sociology has what Bourdieu refers to as an objectifying gaze, and this generates power in the hands of scholars in terms of who has the privilege to create meaning and cultural power (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Again, it is important to remember that behind these numbers are living beings, not abstract marvels to simply explicate an interesting aspect of oppression. This is why it is important to provide reflexive writings on the production of work, so as to provide not only an awareness of the "sociohistorical conditions" which the academic lives within while producing knowledge, but also to put forth the "social and intellectual unconscious embedded in analytic tools and operations" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:36). In short, there are reasons I approached the framing of the literature review and analysis from the position of Bourdieu's use of *practice*, which is reflected in the reflexive excerpts provided (Robbins 2012). In the tradition of Bourdieu, this use of reflexivity offers a greater "scope and solidity" of social scientific knowledge production and the position which I, the researcher, occupies (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:37).

Such framing of my positioning and generation of social scientific knowledge is at its roots the intersectional positioning of theory and knowledge. As Crenshaw (1989) explains, intersectionality highlights power dynamics and allows for the acknowledgement of how these dynamics persist in the social relations of generation of knowledge, thus normalizing and

perpetuating their existence (Carbado et al. 2019). By providing reflexive writings, I allow for the acknowledgement of the power dynamic in the position I hold within the research: as being present for data collection and interactions with participants. Reflexive writing furthers the intersectional movement of "*re*writing and *re*righting our position in history" as marginalized bodies within the academic system, as opposed to the outward interpretation of alleged distinct and mutually exclusive categories that are used to define us (Harris 2016:112; Smith 2012:29). Intersectional reflexive writing is also purposed with breaking the division between, and acknowledging the interaction of, past and present, meso and micro, and actively investigates the development of theory (Harris 2016:112).

The risk of producing poverty porn[4] creates symbolic violence in the analyzing and writing of this research (Brooker et al. 2015; Lewis 1966; Swidler 1986). Many authors, especially critical authors, often face emotional barriers and hardship when their personal approaches and dedication to social justice clash with dedication to research participants (McQueeney and Lavelle 2017). I, on the other hand, face the hardship of identifying with the research population on various levels. This leads to a very close relationship to the participants in the study and identifying with the research I am analyzing at a very emotional level. Some would view this as a distortion of the data, when in reality my positioning can provide a deeper understanding to how the research population interacts with the structural power mechanisms affecting us and how this affects our everyday lived experience. As well, I argue that there is emotional labor in confronting the symbolic violence that is always looming over my work – due

[4] Poverty porn (Brooker et al. 2015), is the complex portrayal of the lower class to higher echelons, in a way that generates sympathy and outrage. This often leads to stigmatizing feelings from the research population, as well as victimization. In contrast to lower class feelings of violation, poverty porn often generates the perception of a *culture of poverty* (Lewis 1966) from those of the upper echelons, with deterministic views of poverty and its subsequent effects.

to structural mechanisms of oppression becoming visible in the analysis, I use emotional reflexivity to identify, contextualize, and analyze emotionality and its link to understanding and responding to structural power mechanisms in my research population and consequently my community and myself (McQueeney and Lavelle 2017:83).

Reflection Three

> *I stood in front of my committee; my proposal defense presentation was going well. I had gone in rather confident because I had presented my preliminary research before as a conference presentation. I talked about hunger, working during university, the effects this had on GPA. I continued, mentioning how these realities perpetuate myths of inferiority and yet are linked to the historical stripping of wealth of people of color through treaty violations, slavery, and other mechanisms of disenfranchisement. All the while making quips on my own experiences, or what I've seen from students to explain what was occurring. Then my throat tightened. I could feel tears coming and I was so angry at myself. "What are you doing, you are supposed to show that you're a professional who knows what she is talking about?" I scolded myself, told myself to stop, did everything I could think of, but tears kept streaming down my face. "I'm sorry," I said. I kept trying to continue on, but nothing could stop my tears. I stepped outside to speak to a committee member who had phoned in. I was confused, and frustrated, but she and I identified the mechanisms causing so many tears. I went back in, finishing stronger than before. This is the power of not denying emotions in research on marginalized people. Emotionality is complex, but instead of making research that denies the emotional trauma that comes with lived experiences of hunger and oppression, you gain the ability to make research that confronts the trauma. Explicating the emotions will hopefully lead to better mechanisms of resisting the causes of such trauma in the first place.*

Overall, this dissertation seeks to explicate how poverty, higher educational access and food access are intertwined yet not often disentangled and analyzed, and then put back together to allow us to use our sociological imagination to empathize with our fellows. Furthermore, I intend to explicate how food access goes beyond food security (as a dollar amount), and proximity to grocery stores. In doing so, I will be able to make visible the structural mechanisms that help to reify the racialized narrative within the country, which hides behind the narrative of meritocracy. The issue I interrogate herein is that The United States has long valued the narrative of meritocracy, and value of 'pulling oneself up by the bootstraps', despite often ignoring the

structural and institutional ways in which resources and access differ by racialized and class lines. Thus, this meritocratic narrative not only acts as a way to undermine recognition of the inequity in the United States but also reifies the racial hierarchy of the United States.

In order to interrogate this issue, in chapter two I investigate more broadly into tools of structural and institutional oppression. I explain how food access and education are linked to each other through the overarching concept of poverty. I then show how these systems of inequality and the United States' exoticized cultural obsession with 'grit' feed into each other. In doing so I show how cultural 'grit' condones educational and nutritional disenfranchisement and acts as a means to justify poverty as 'important' to American ideals (Gorski 2016; Kwon 2018; Ris 2015). Chapter three is centered on my methodological approach to the social phenomena, generating hypotheses from the research questions, and provide descriptive data. In chapter four, I apply the empirical analysis, questioning the sociological implications of my findings. I conclude this research in chapter five by looking back at the autoethnographic excerpts and quantitative analysis, considering the theoretical implications and what this research finds overall. I consider how this research could impact policy.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW, INTERSECTIONAL THEORY OF PRACTICE

Reflection Four

Like all teenagers, I did not get along with my parents. All this resentment was centered around their perception of the path to the middle class through the military, whereas I could've cared less about the middle class and only wanted to attend a university/college for culinary school. Years passed, and many struggles and growth finally led to being accepted for a sociology graduate program. Though graduating from a university, they were still nervous as this was well outside of their area of cultural knowledge. What my grandfather said to comfort my mother I will never forget, "well she'll do good there. After all she looks white."

2.1 Missing Variables to The Theory

My grandfather grew up an impoverished Latino, working from the age of nine, and within his statement is a cultural perception that I have grown to see as commonplace for impoverished Latinx to hold. However, the question then becomes why is it that white people are perceived to do better at university? Why would I do well at University simply because of my lighter skin? There is a dominant narrative that claims this is due to the perception that White Americans work harder towards their educational studies as opposed to other skills or are genetically programmed to be smarter thus are better in their educational attainment (Feagin 2013; Swidler 1986). I believe my grandfather was using an alternative narrative, touching on the microinteractional ease I presumably would have with White academics, and a corresponding ability to avoid feelings of otherness (Mcnamara Horvat 2003; Swidler 1986). I suggest that while my grandfather made a good point in terms of colorism and interaction, I still endured socio-historical structural effects due to being a person of color from an impoverished family. These beliefs my grandfather had considered micro-situational issues of race, but I believe these micro-situations are reinforced by macro-situations of race and poverty. By applying Bourdieu's work on *the theory of practice* to higher educational access, I will show how the macro-situation

of race and resource distribution in the United States has created barriers and strain in educational attainment despite the dominant meritocratic narrative.

This will be done by illuminating how the racialized class hierarchy in America affects agents at every point of Bourdieu's equation of the *theory of practice.* I intend to do this by using an intersectional lens to frame Bourdieu's *theory of practice.* This framing allows for a socio-historical understanding of the university food phenomena to be investigated as well as investigations into the place of race, geo-social location, and other ascribed social axes. Bourdieu's approach does not consider many different social axes in his work, despite French colonialism existing in his time. While other scholars have applied race to capital and habitus, most of their applications were micro situated and/or did not give enough attention to the overarching outcome of *practice* (Devine-Eller 2005; Mcnamara Horvat 2003).With these considerations Bourdieu can be limited in theoretical application.

By framing Bourdieu's *theory of practice* through an intersectional lens I can move beyond a two-dimensional framing of the individual interaction with structure. Intersectionality is rooted in Black Feminist Theory and Critical Race Theory and considered both "a method and a disposition," both a "heuristic and analytic tool" (Carbado et al. 2019:312). Intersectionality considers the multiplicative way that identities are built and effect the ways in which the social world is experienced. Identity is ever changing, and built with the intertwinement of race, class, gender, geo-historical location (Choo and Ferree 2010; Harris 1990; King 1988). Many make the mistake of believing intersectionality is simply the consideration of how people hold more than one axis in their social roles and how this affects their everyday life, often in an additive sense (Choo and Ferree 2010; Harris 1990). Intersectionality goes beyond this, important here is that in employing an intersectional lens we can both expose instances of marginalization as well

as decontextualize them, allowing us to find the political and historical means of production (Carbado et al. 2019; Crenshaw 1989; Harris 2016). For instance, it is not simply that a phenomena is racialized, but intersectionality requires scholars to question: how a phenomena became racialized (Artiles 2013). Further, we are able to turn this lens on ourselves and on our means of resistance, in order to identify how power dynamics can continue to produce and legitimate marginalization even when espousing equality and resistance to oppression (Carbado et al. 2019:304; Crenshaw 1989). Intersectionality further demands mutual identification of how structures of oppression are related and thus how differing categorical ascriptions share commonalities as well as differences leading to cross-movement building (Carbado et al. 2019:306; Roberts and Jesudason 2013).

I believe this addition of intersectional theory to the application of Bourdieu's *theory of practice* can strengthen and address many of these missing power dynamics of Bourdieu's theory. Furthermore, this reexamination will allow for a better theoretical foundation for a quantitative approach to analysis.

When faced with the challenge of explaining how food resources, educational resources, economic resources are interrelated in both a micro and macro-institutional way, and how a student's response to this interrelation is affected by their everyday lived experiences built by their intergenerational socio-historical positioning I knew I had my work cut out for me. I was dealing with what I have been told most sociologists at my level of development deal with: I see connections in everything, but this can easily lead to a tangle of concepts that can seem convoluted and unnecessary.

This approach offers me an avenue to explain how different forms of capital, an agent's disposition, the macro institutions and systemic realities tie together to affect the agents'

experiences and options within a field. Thomson (2012) shows that Bourdieu makes clear that despite there being different forms of cultural capital, they are ultimately influenced by economic capital. This I will not contest, but in my explanation and utilization of Bourdieu's *theory of practice* I will show that while the capitalist nation of the United States does ultimately hold economic capital as the highest life determinant, the oppressive forces at play are not merely limited to a class marker. Ultimately, I will use an intersectional reframing of Bourdieu's *theory of practice* to elaborate and examine the hazards and barriers created due to a racially classed distribution of resources. In order to do this, I must first situate higher education within the meritocratic.

2.2 Meritocracy in Higher Education: De Jure Grit De Facto Capital

> *The American Dream: "The dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to his ability or achievement"* (Adams 1955; 404).

The United States is obsessed with what is referred to as grit; this is rooted in the meritocratic narrative, which is considered a key element of the United States culture and path to the American Dream. Before I explain grit, I will first explain how United States society created the meritocratic narrative by embedding cultural myths into our national rhetoric. Then I will conceptualize the contemporary meritocratic narrative, show how it is a false narrative, then explain how it is still touted in the United States education system despite the disconnect from the data. From there I will explain the concept of grit and its use to justify the disparity embedded in the meritocratic narrative. Further explaining grit alleviates upper/middle class guilt despite the inequalities, meritocracy maintains and reifies.

Meritocracy is framed as the major component of American culture; its contemporary usage is rooted in puritanical beliefs that many authors wrote on, dispersing these beliefs into American culture (McNamee 2013). The best known of these novels is Horatio Alger's works which used a narrative formula of 'pulling ones-self up by the bootstraps' (Lawton 2015; Marsden 1992). So compelling was Alger's formula that literary researchers note the literary world was permanently altered to follow Alger's one dimensionality (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:12). Literature moved from multiple heroes in a novel to one, to Alger's creation of the one-dimensional "bourgeoisie hero" (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:14). Alger produced 107 novels during his time establishing a cultural narrative of American equality still seen today (Ihamon, W.T. 1976)

Here I draw primarily from Ihamon's (1976) work on Horatio Alger. In Horatio Alger's novels, the main character is always a young man (around 14 years old) with an Anglo-Saxon name who is in poverty. There are always paternal problems, sometimes the mother is present and she is either his real mother (and thus good and wholesome) or a false mother (and thus evil). All evil present in the books are "aberrant, not systemic, [and] not structural" (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:17). In every novel the protagonist, the most famous of which is Ragged Dick, through self-reliance, is able to pull himself out of poverty, thus going from Ragged Dick to Richard Hunter Esquire(Ihamon, W.T. 1976:24). This idea of success in wealth is always characterized by material attainment that mimics others with wealth, such as certain furnishings or pocket watches (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:18). He is able to accomplish success through honest hard work and because of something special about him. Alger highlights this 'something special' by various characters cast as his friends(Ihamon, W.T. 1976:17). It is through "grit and wit" that Ragged Dick pulls himself out of squalor (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:17). The result of portraying honest hard work and wit leading to success results in Alger's portrayal of the impoverished as

bad people such as thieves. These poor are sent away by the end of the novel, usually by the hero catching them and shipping them off. While there are rare "honest poor," Dick and the others who succeeded help to pull them out of poverty (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:18). Finally, there is also an idea of "too much wealth" in Alger's formula (Ihamon, W.T. 1976). Those who have too much wealth horde their resources and seek to exploit others. By the end of the book, the protagonist and his friends always vanquish the corrupt wealthy hoarder, as well as the bad thieving poor, leaving only those who are prosperous and good upper class (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:18).

Ihamon, W.T. (1976) shows that from Horatio Alger's novels, we see that the framing of the American dream as achievable for all, as long as you have enough wit, work hard, and are honorable. If there is a barrier to your wealth accruement, it is an individual issue that you can overcome, not an overarching structural issue (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:17). If you are strong enough and self-reliant, you can overcome this evil. Those who fail to succeed are inherently flawed in a morally negative way and disappear by the end of the novel (Ihamon, W.T. 1976). Those who inherited their wealth and seek to exploit others for more also disappear by the end of the novel(Ihamon, W.T. 1976). This leaves a utopic city of simply good upper/middle class people who earned their way into wealth (Ihamon, W.T. 1976).

There is a fatal flaw in the formula that Alger downplays, the same flaw downplayed at the root of the meritocratic narrative. In Alger's works, the protagonists are inevitably successful because of "luck." This luck is usually in the form of inheritance or a kind benefactor (Coletu 2018:87; Ihamon, W.T. 1976:19). Most often this capital is received by his wealthy estranged father who reconnects with him or the main character saves a young boy and the boy's father is wealthy and takes him under his wing (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:19). The main character is able to learn from these male figures and receive enough money quickly to become successful (Ihamon,

W.T. 1976). In this way there is a flaw in the meritocratic narrative of 'pulling yourself up by the bootstraps' from honest good work, as success would not have been possible without this aid (Coletu 2018; Ihamon, W.T. 1976).

We see the same disconnect of inheritance and "pulling yourself up by the bootstraps" in the contemporary meritocratic narrative. Meritocracy is conceptualized as "a social system in which individuals get ahead and earn reward in direct proportion to their individual efforts and ability" (McNamee 2013: 17). There are four tenets to meritocracy: talent, attitude, hard work, and high moral standard (McNamee 2013). Meritocracy then is a façade of equality but in actuality is an ideology for inequality. As in order for meritocratic reward to exist there must also be an undeserving class present, making inequality integral to meritocracy (Lawton 2015; McNamee 2013). The façade posits that in system based on merit all can achieve if they put in the effort and have the ability. Yet, inequalities exist that inhibit merit accumulation, furthermore discriminatory issues based on various factors (most noted in literature as race and sex) affect individual interactions as well as resource distribution (Au 2016; Kwon 2018; Lawton 2015; McNamee 2013). As a result, the ethos of American meritocracy puts an emphasis on individual merit accumulation without taking into account historically linked structural inhibitors.

2.2.1 The False Narrative of Meritocracy

In order to further explicate how the meritocratic narrative is false due to structurally embedded inequality I will provide a more thorough explanation of the barriers and obstacles first generation and nontraditional students face, whilst further explaining how this is a deeply racialized issue. Here I show the historical effects of racialization pertaining to economic and structural mechanisms has been understated in scholarly literature on higher educational success.

There are many articles that pertain to the barriers faced by first generation students, while aggregating the non-traditional student (NTS) label into first generation. Many of these articles use the terms for NTS and first generation interchangeably, or simply state in the start of their articles that first generation students are more likely to be NTS and seemingly denotes an increased likelihood of university/college drop-rate (attrition) (Langrehr et al. 2015). I have scientific qualms with such assertions, as while there may be empirical evidence to overlap and drop rates, often conceptualization and empirics of NTS are not provided (Langrehr et al. 2015). Essential to this overall research is understanding their difference, despite the empirical reality that the two labels often overlap.

NTS is a loosely defined term, with there being relatively large variance in NTS conceptualization (Langrehr et al. 2015). Despite this, NTS is most often conceptualized as older than the average age of attendance (24), roles beyond a student, part time enrollment, delayed attendance from high school graduation, employed full time, or a commuter (Langrehr et al. 2015:880). While any of these markers have allowed for NTS ascription, Langrehr et al. (2015) found that NTS is usually conceptualized by older than average age of attendance plus another determinant. Their work, which sought to evaluate the common scholarly conception of NTS, found that in the last 20 years NTS was not studied as a general population but with specificity other determinants, such as NTS who are primary care givers (Langrehr et al. 2015).

I seek to provide a broader theoretical view of the NTS marker in order to show how first generation students and NTS have different institutional and structural interactions. As a result, I conceptualize NTS as any undergraduate student who is older than the average age of attendance with any the sub-determinants. While first generation students are conceptualized as any students whose parents did not complete a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution (Stebleton and

Soria 2012:8). While there is some deviation in how first-generation students are conceptualized, this definition is in line with federal trio programs and is the most commonly used conceptualization (Stebleton and Soria 2012:8).

Despite the lacking conceptualization, the results of previous articles are useful in showing generalized barriers faced by first-generation students and NTS. Students of color are overrepresented in terms of first-generation students and NTS which is rooted in the structural issue of access (Brock 2010; Pyne and Means 2013). Most universities and colleges did not desegregate until after the passage of The Civil Rights Act,[5] which occurred only 54 years ago (Stefkovich and Leas 1994). As a result, access to higher education is still new, and while higher institutions are noted as accepting more students of color than ever, access is not the same as success (Brock 2010:110).

Success is measured as "persistence and degree attainment", and for students of color, NTS, and women the success rates have not significantly risen in the last 40 years (Brock 2010:110). Even in terms of access, the spike in student of color enrollment is largely attributed to nonselective institutions, with Black and Latinx Americans disproportionately enrolled in (2 year) community colleges in 2005 (Brock 2010). Institution of attendance is important as students beginning at a four-year university are twice as likely to finish (Brock 2010). When

[5] May 17, 1954 was the date the *Brown vs. Board of Edu*cation decision was made; the Supreme Court ruling school segregation as unconstitutional. While the effectiveness of this ruling can be questioned, with judges still recently ordering schools to desegregate, *Brown vs. Board of Education* is often noted as the ruling that desegregated schools. Yet, while *Brown v. Board I* effectively ruled that segregation was unconstitutional and explicitly included higher education, *Brown v. Board II*, which required desegregation with deliberate speed. *Brown v. Board II* did not explicitly make higher education applicable. Legal scholars note that higher education did not begin to desegregate until 1964, though the recent ruling which shows maintained de jure systems of segregation was in 1992 with The *United States Vs. Fordice 1992* (Stefkovich and Leas 1994).

controlling for institution and type of degree sought, there is a large disparity in success by race(Musu-Gillette et al. 2016:108). Musu-Gillette et al. (2016) shows that White students are more than twice as likely to finish in 4 years than Black students, and 10% higher than Latinx students. Overall rates of completion within 6 years shows that Black (41%) and Latinx (53%) students less likely to finish than White students (63%) (Musu-Gillette et al. 2016:108). These numbers become even starker when considering rates of completions for students of color who begin at a 2-year institution (community college). Their rates of completion are less than 10% (Black Students: 3%, Latinx 6%) (Orozco and Cauthen 2009).

When investigating possible reasons there is a tendency in the literature that NTS and first generation students (who are predominately of color) lack educational value or motivation (Petty 2014). Taking into consideration that community college students have a higher tendency to be NTS and first generation students (Brock 2010), I investigated this assertion in the literature by comparing rates of educational intention by race. Students attending community college tend to have intentions of bachelor's degree with the majority seeking advanced degrees; relatively few students have the intention of only an associates or certificate (NCES QuickStats 2014). This data shows that, Black and Latinx students were almost equal in their intention to obtain an advanced degree with a slightly higher rate seeking a doctoral degree (NCES QuickStats 2014).

Given these intentions (NCES QuickStats 2014), and our knowledge of completion rates for students of color attending community college two realities become clear:

1. Students of color who begin at a two-year institution value education, and overall enter community college with educational motivation.

2. They largely fail.

In my quest to explicate how the meritocratic narrative is false, I feel it important to further highlight that those students of color who do make it into an advanced degree program were simply not more talented or willing to work harder. Students of color enrolling in advanced degrees in the United States have not increased greatly in the last 16 years (NCES 2019). Black Students attending at 2016 rates less than .4 million, and Latinx at less than .3 million where as White students attend at rates over 1.6 million (NCES 2019; U.S. Department of Education 2018). When considering the data provided on beginning community college, students of color's 6-year completion rate it becomes apparent that they likely make up a small percentage of the post-baccalaureate enrollment population of color. In fact, the attrition rates for graduate students of color is significantly higher than their white counter parts, and first generation student of color attrition is considered overrepresented in attrition rates of students of color (Gardner 2013; Gardner and Holley 2011).

Previous literature has identified various barriers faced by NTS and first-generation students. The following intersectional examination of the prevailing narrative of NTS and first-generation students shows how discourses of resistance can act to reproduce and legitimize marginalization (Carbado et al. 2019:304; Crenshaw 1989). For example, one barrier often noted was that NTS and/or first-generation students tended to be 'historically underserved students' (Stebleton and Soria 2012). Having the label of a 'historically underserved' comes with varied barriers considering race, class, and gender; as well as a myriad of other markers due to geo-historical differences in intergenerational experiences and trauma. It is here we see a lacking of consideration of intersectionality which considers these myriad of markers, and this lack of investigation can lead to other heart-wrenching statements that stop short of interrogation of

economic and structural barriers, individualizing the issues faced by NTS and first generation students, despite these students vocalizing their perception of structural barriers (Petty 2014; Stebleton and Soria 2012).

A major trend amongst literature is the identification of working long hours, one researcher noting that non-returning students can spend long hours working off campus and the disconnect from college life these hours bring (Bowl 2001; Petty 2014; Stebleton and Soria 2012). This disconnect is also identified as feelings of being torn between two identities; that is who the students feel they are as a worker and then trying to fit the role of student when on campus (Bowl 2001; Orbe 2004). Yet few researchers investigate into why students work these long hours, despite noting that NTS and first generation students tend to be financially independent much earlier than their counter parts, have greater responsibilities, and less time to devote to their education overall (Matus-Grossman and Gooden 2002; Orozco and Cauthen 2009; Stebleton and Soria 2012) . One study that did have a control for "competing job responsibilities" and "competing family responsibilities" when investigating barriers for first generation students[6] and found a high relationship between success and competing responsibilities ($p<.001$) (Stebleton and Soria 2012:13). Yet, Stebleton and Soria (2012:12) focused the discussion and recommendations on campus experience, awareness of initiatives on campus to recommend to first generation students, community options (for writing or speaking skills) in order to gain confidence. Also recommending discussion and dialogue for these students, and mental health awareness and aid (Stebleton and Soria 2012:14). This is seemingly sensible for the progression of the discussion as the author begins it by referring to another study

[6] This researcher amalgamated NTS and first generation, noting one of the barriers faced by first generation students is that they often are NTS, though they did not have a variable control in their data for this.

that found that first generation students "possess an external locus of control, placing blame on external situational factors that may impact academic outcomes rather than assuming personal responsibility" (Stebleton and Soria 2012:12)

Another article sums up the overall trend of ignoring the structural economic factors endured by first generation (and NTS) students when interrogating ways to motivate these students. Petty (2014:259) identifies the 5 needs in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, with the first and most important motivator being physiological needs followed by safety needs. The focus is then cast on the subsequent needs (social, esteem, self-actualization).

Articles such as these push the need to motivate students whose success rates are the lowest, they do so by identifying issues of inclusion, issues of self-esteem and imposter syndrome, the need to push the importance of an education in terms of offering the student a better more holistic view of themselves. Yet they do this without recommending university accountability to the elitism that results in a torn feeling between 'home culture' and 'higher education' culture (Orbe 2004). Higher education culture is elitist culture (Pyne and Means 2013). Recommending pushes to learn this culture which separates them from their home culture does nothing to build a student's self-esteem, and instead identifies their culture as lesser, fixing the NTS and first-generation student by teaching them to act like the higher-class environment they are in. More importantly, such articles actively ignore the real economic realities faced by NTS and first-generation students who are often students of color. They are likely to not have the accumulated wealth due to the racial hierarchy to handle the large spike of tuition, thus are burdened with the option of greater debt or greater work-responsibilities.

Literature has identified a negative relationship between hours worked a week and hours spent a week studying, grade point average, and overall completion rates (Orozco and Cauthen

2009). Yet, the push is to motivate students to work harder on their studies and become more involved with the university. These literatures push such a narrative with little to no investigation into the reasons why NTS and first-generation students need to work more. Nor any investigation on how to lower the need to work more by reducing cost of attendance. Cahalan et al. (2019) show that while there has been a spike in tuition since the 1980's, the Pell Grant maximum award has not increased significantly to adjust for the tuition increase. There is a narrative that students who are first-generation and NTS, particularly these students who are of color, will be likely to receive scholarships and grants, this is empirically false as the scholarship amounts are not increasing at the same rate as tuition amounts (Cahalan et al. 2019; Golden 2017). This is the narrative of grit.

2.2.2 Grittiness: The Privilege of Deficit Motivation

Let me state again one of the quotes that deficit frames students who endure the structural and economic outcomes of a classist and racialized country: "[they] possess an external locus of control, placing blame on external situational factors that may impact academic outcomes rather than assuming personal responsibility"(Stebleton and Soria 2012:12). This statement is dripping with the meritocratic narrative. Yet, as shown, the data is present showing job and family responsibilities are higher for certain students, particularly students of color and/or students from poverty, which both are overrepresented as NTS and first-generation students (Engle and Tinto 2008:3; Stebleton and Soria 2012).

Upper- and middle-class Americans are well aware of the structural flaws of meritocratic ideology(Ris 2015:11). The narrative they have produced in order to justify such flaws and alleviate guilt is the concept of "grit" (Kwon 2018; Ris 2015:11; Yu 2006:328). British writers originally defined the grit concept as persistence despite challenges, with American's adding the

relation of poverty to grit (Ris 2015:3). Furthermore, grit is considered a positive trait obtained outside of the education system (Ris 2015). When considering these usages of grit, I conceptualize grit as resilience and self-pride that developed through adversity from poverty. It is a concept so key to upholding meritocracy that we see it present not only in Horatio Alger's novels (Ris 2015) but also in contemporary popular culture. Evidence is shown in figure 1[7] (24), where I have listed examples of popular movies from 1988-2016. All movies tell of poverty-stricken youth, who through mentorship and adversity achieve class mobility. In almost all of the movies the skills they learned through poverty are validated as valuable skills in their new 'high class culture.' Skills that become integral to defeating the protagonist or achieving their goals.

[7] Information for figure 4 largely derived from (IMDb 2019b, 2019f, 2019i, 2019h, 2019g, 2019c, 2019d, 2019e, 2019a) and reviewing movies.

Movie	Year	Summary
Dangerous Minds (Smith 1995)	1995	A new teacher finds herself challenged with bright but underachieving students of color in an "inner city." Learns how to teach them while not disregarding their culture and life situations. Gives them hope for the future.
Precious (Daniels 2009)	2009	Based in 1987 Harlem, young black girl pregnant with her second child due to incestuous rape deals with emotional abuse at home. She is sent to an alternative school, where her teacher gives her new hope in life. By the end of the movie, she goes from being illiterate to reading and writing at an 8th grade level. She seemingly begins an aim for University.
Stomp the Yard (White 2007)	2007	Street dancer, D.J. Williams, is a young Black man from inner city Los Angeles. His younger studious brother Duron dreamed of going to a University. A street dance competition leads to Duron being murdered and D.J. being tried for aggravated assault. In response, DJ's mother sends him to live with his Aunt and Uncle with the hopes it will give him a second chance at life. His Uncle works at a HBCU, and gets him into the University on a work-study program. DJ gets recruited by a fraternity for his dance abilities and by blending the old 'refined' step dance methods with his new 'krunk' step methods they overcome their rivals.
Step Up (Fletcher 2006)	2006	After being caught vandalizing a building, street dancer Tyler Gage has to serve his community service at a dance school. He gains a scholarship and brings his street dance abilities to the school. Blending the old 'refined' dance methods with his new street methods he is able to succeed.
Stand and Deliver (Menendez 1988)	1988	Teacher at East Los Angeles school teaches underperforming Latinx students' math and eventually calculus. He has push back from the school that the students will be unable to do this but he believes that because nothing is expected of the students they underperform. By pushing the students, they pass their AP calculus exam. They are accused of cheating at the end of their summer and retake a new exam after a summer without classes with only one day's notification. Through adversity and ability to rigorously study on little sleep and under extreme pressure, they pass the exam, make their teacher proud, and prove their abilities.
Dope (Famuyiwa 2015)	2015	Young Black man, Malcolm Adekanbi, is from the 'Bottoms,' a neighborhood in Inglewood California. He has to send in his Harvard application. While he has academic ability, as he is a self-proclaimed 'geek,' his counselor tells him he will not get in because he is from a low class crime ridden neighborhood. Malcolm, despite nearly perfect SAT scores and straight A's, is nervous about his personal essay. This nervousness is because he worries, he is a 'cliché,' noting he is a young black man in poverty, raised by a single mother. He accidently falls into trouble during the application period and has the option to sell drugs or be murdered. With his friends, he uses his intellect to get out of trouble and finish his application. The movie ends with a monologue of him proclaiming that it is his in-between situation, of being a geeky black kid from the 'hood,' that allows him to see the different angles and points of views often unseen. With the movie ending alluding to his Harvard acceptance.
Drumline (Stone III 2002)	2002	Devon, a young Black drummer from Harlem, is recruited to a southern University on his drumming skills. His urban style clashes with the 'refined' style of the university. By merging the two, they are able to win a drum competition and saving his university position as well as the position of the band director.
Lean On Me (Avildsen 1989)	1989	A strict disciplinarian principle is recruited as principal to a high school, named Eastside High in 1987, as a last ditch effort before the school is shut down due to low academic performance. The school is known for gang violence and drug use. Through disciplinarian action, the teacher gives students hope for the future despite the problems of the urban area. He pushes performance and perseverance. The movie ends with a picture of the graduating seniors of Eastside High class of 1988.

Akeelah and The Bee (Atchison 2006)	2006	Akeelah is a smart young Black girl in South Los Angeles. The movie suggests that due to the impoverishment of her school and her family's social position she does not try at academics because she is not challenged. Recognized for her potential she is pushed to compete at the national spelling bee. Disciplinarian Dr. Larabee, an English professor, helps her. In the end, her community helps her learn her final 5,000 words.

Figure 1: Examples of grit in cultural narrative.

The prevalence of grit in the pop culture rhetoric shows how integral of an ideology it is. Thus, inequality is not just a necessity of meritocracy but a positive in that those who endure inequalities then have a better reward by using grit (Ris 2015:9). As a result, conversations on grit occur most from middle/upper class parents in fear that their children do not have the structures necessary in their life to obtain such a valuable asset (Ris 2015). This is notable for Alger's books as well as they were relatively pricey in their day and consumed mostly by middle/upper class adolescents (Ris 2015:4) . Ris (2015) notes that these families are well aware of the inequalities present in the system with parents knowing that some students will not have the same means to access merit. Yet, Ris (2015) continues, they believe that grit holds equal to greater weight than professional/academic merit. Grit then acts to alleviate the guilt of structural inequality for those in the upper/middle class as those 'rare honest poor' in poverty will be able to pull themselves out of the situation with their valuable grit asset and they will be justly rewarded[8]. Thus, it is only those without grit and determination, who are deserving of their impoverished situation that will suffer in squalor. It is McNamee (2013) who states that "the greater inequality" in resource distribution "the more compelling and persuasive" the ideology

[8] Purposeful overlay here, seen from (Ihamon, W.T. 1976:18).

needs to be (17). Grit provides this persuasion, as without it the inequalities of meritocracy would be too blaring.

The structural barriers that are a reality for students are wholly ignored in meritocratic ideology. This lacking, is addressed in grit ideology, but even when good intentioned efforts are made to address the achievement gap, the methods in which those who adhere to grit ideology address structural barriers is to increase a student's grittiness (Gorski 2016). Gorski (2016), sums up the problem of this approach by noting the most common of barriers impoverished students face which impact educational outcomes are "housing instability, food insecurity, inequitable access to high-quality schools, unjust school policies" and that of these "…none are related in any way to a students' grittiness" (Gorski 2016:382). He notes that adhering to grit ideology, and working from it, will never threaten the existing educational disparities and "side steps the core causes of those disparities" (Gorski 2016:383). In doing this, the 'work harder,' mentality becomes a weaponized rhetoric that perpetuates a system of physical, emotional, and mental labors and abuses of the marginalized peoples in the nation.

Furthermore, grit ideology simplifies the varied experiences of students, creating the false measuring stick notated of oppression. More specifically, the homogenizing of students who are NTS or first generation, the amalgamation of these two markers, the notation that 'they are often students of color' without investigating why this is or the differences of experiences for NTS and first-generation students who are white or who are students of color. This culminates to an additive form of intersectionality[9], which is a bastardization and defacing of the original Black

[9] That is: It is hard to be a first generation student, it must be extra hard for first generation nontraditional students, it must be the hardest for first generation nontraditional students of color (Harris 1990).

feminists who operationalized the term, ignores the historical realities in which these students live.

2.2.3 Resilience and Intersectionality

Grit is closely related to, and often interchanged with, the concept of resilience, which is overcoming oppressive structures through adversity. Given the resurgence of this concept I find it important here to make note of its uses and problematic nature. This resurgence of the resilience concepts are being implemented as solutions to racism and oppression as opposed to a trauma response (Harper and Speed 2012; Paz-Amor 2015). The articles highlight the unique perspectives and adversity offered by different cultures or as outcomes of forms of oppression (Paz-Amor 2015; Vandsburger, Harrigan, and Biggerstaff 2008; Villenas and Deyhle 2015). However, often these concepts are used individualistically, and through intersectional framing put forth by Crenshaw (1989) we understand that there are macro-structural and political instances that cause these oppressive forces which create said resilience. By framing resistance to oppressive forces as an individual approach and means to overcome we are ignoring the disparate group struggles occurring due to a politically strategized distribution of resources and burden (Artiles 2013). Further, as opposed to working to dismantle the active structural forces which create deficit and oppression, the resilience concept often reframes said oppressions and deficits as strengths, thus resilience becomes dependent upon these deficit-based models (Harper and Speed 2012:2). This then continues the stigmatization of the marginalized groups, and de-emphasizes the structural factors at play (Harper and Speed 2012). While many works have the good intentions of reframing resilience to encompass community based resistance (Mcguire 2010), intersectionality calls for the investigation of acts of resistance and perpetuate the marginalization of peoples (Carbado et al. 2019:304). As laid out here, the concept of resilience

is shown to obstruct and not aid in the mental health or political advancement of those enduring social inequality trauma, and as a result the trauma may continue and be compounded[10](Harper and Speed 2012). The question then becomes, how can we reconsider how we can illuminate the macro-structural inequalities, and how they interact differently with marginalized people? Also, how we can build upon the marginalizeds' persistence while simultaneously breaking down these barriers.

The meritocratic narrative, and grit ideology embedded in our culture ignores the socio-historical structural realities of students. In order to investigate the hazards barriers placed in front of students I will illuminate the barriers and obstacles they encounter, in doing so situate the overlooked area of student food negotiation and the need for a *theory of educational food practice*. This will allow me the rhetorical space, divorced from the colonizers individualized meritocratic rhetoric, to interrogate and analyze my research questions.

2.3 [(HABITUS)(CAPITAL)]+FIELD=PRACTICE

In order to position this section, I first need you to consider this narrative:

Reflection Five

"Engle and Tinto (2008) noted that the <u>acknowledged</u>[11] barriers decrease the chances for first generation, low-income students to persist in college through graduation. Disadvantaged students have a lack of academic motivation, therefore it becomes apparent why students lack interest in college" (Petty 2014:134). The yellow highlighter ink felt aggressive, the words condescending. I sat back from the article and thought back to conversations with students.

There were times I've seen students who hadn't ate and their blood sugar low. Asking if everything was ok their insistence was that they had food, just between school

[10] An insight here, on how the resilience concept can continue and compound trauma would be John Henryism see: "Coping and Metabolic Syndrome Among Young Black Adults" (Brody et al. 2018)

[11] In article emphasized with italics, emphasis mimicked with underline.

and work they hadn't time to eat. We would talk and laugh and reflect on similar experiences.

Colloquially, it is humorous to talk about the 'college ramen days,' which refers to a time when you have so little money in college you can only afford ramen noodles (Higgins 2016). Yet, statements such as these are within the grit narrative. These statements and responses, as well as in articles that seek to motivate NTS and first-generation students, invalidate the everyday lived experiences of these students (Petty 2014; Stebleton and Soria 2012). My above invocation of grit narrative in reflection five, as students of color who are all NTS and first-generation, was not purposed around guilt alleviation. Instead, which is often overlooked, it acted as a salve to our shared pain. Despite this pain being shared, grit ideology also separates us, as we as individuals are expected to find our own means and ways to overcome (Gorski 2016). After all, coming together and stating that what we are offered isn't enough, that would be greedy, and lazy; and just another example of how we have an external locus of control[12]. This is the harm of grit ideology; the individualizing aspect of grit allows us to laugh at our shared pain but keeps us from reflecting on the structural factors at play and methods to overcome them as a community.

How is it that one of the largest colloquial references to the expected grit hardships of college deals with food, yet food insecurity on campus has only recently begun to be researched? And how is it that those most prone to be food insecure in university were almost completely absent from higher education food security research? The epistemological violence of grit narrative reproduction through empirical avoidance is endured by these students. This reflects a larger problem identified in the section, *The false narrative of meritocracy* (page 14): research on

[12] See (Stebleton and Soria 2012).

NTS and first-generation student success actively ignores the structural and economic factors affecting success despite these factors being the most fundamental needs and how that interacts with the cultural factors.

The meritocratic narrative ignores historically placed structural inequalities; even when the structural inequalities are recognized the concept of grit allows for the everyday educational[13] outcomes of these inequalities to be invalidated. As seen in reflection five (page 27) these inequalities are still tangible and affecting everyday experiences despite an appeasing narrative that says, 'we will be even more grateful for our success later'(Ris 2015). I posit that the line between those who grit their teeth and bare it in higher education versus those who leave or never begin does not lay in levels of morality or adversity but often in the actors' practice which is consisted of capital, habitus, and field, to be explained below (Robbins 2012) . For instance, consider the reflection mentioned above: students were gritting their teeth and baring the hardships laid out by a structural inequitable system. In comparing a student's choice as opposed to a hypothetical actor who instead chooses to go to a 2-year vocational school, the meritocratic narrative dictates that the student is investing in their future by putting their mindset in forward thinking as opposed to the benefits of the "right now" that vocational training provides, making the student a better social creature[14]. Yet, as shown in the previous section, those who enter 2-year programs are often thinking of their future, yet various social forces cause attrition. Here, I use Bourdieu's formula of practice in order to situate the various social forces the students meet, notating when either NTS and/or first generation are predisposed to these social forces. This

[13] Here I state educational due to the focus of this project, it should be noted that the outcomes of the racialized, classed, and sexist hierarchy affect every nuance of a marginalized person's life.
[14] Here seen is the remnants of the puritanical roots from which the United States meritocratic narratives is derived (McNamee 2013).

section culminates to the need for an investigation of food capital as it resides in the first levels of Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

2.3.1 Practice

Bourdieu developed the theory of practice in order to consider the interconnection between individual agents and structures. When Bourdieu speaks of "structures," he is referring to both "material and ideational" structures (Grenfell 2012:45). His consideration for both the objective and subjective effect of structure allows researchers to take into account the social geo-historical reality in which agents live (Maton 2012:52) This theory also allows for the understanding that structures serve in terms of "material, economic, and organizational" (structured) and the cultural mechanisms of thoughts and actions that generates a "symbolic system" (structuring structure) (Grenfell 2012). Bourdieu simplifies how structure and structuring structure is interrelated with social space and means of access as well as agency of the actor through the equation (Maton 2012:50):

$$[(\text{HABITUS})(\text{CAPITAL})]+\text{FIELD}=\text{PRACTICE}$$

Practice is comprised of a multiplicative relationship between one's disposition (habitus) and position in the field in terms of power and resources (capital), which is "within the state of play in the social arena" (field) (Maton 2012:50).

Habitus was developed to explain the "structured and structuring structure" that that affects the actor (Maton 2012:50). Habitus, while upon first reading seems convoluted. Once deconstructed is simplified to expressions in forms such as "predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination" that are the result of "organizing action[s]" (50) that were systematically ordered due to the structured system, such as a family's history and resulting "upbringing" or

"educational experiences" (Maton 2012:50). These are not randomly assigned actions as the system is organized in a way that the actions of the system are dictated to actors based on their social markers (Maton 2012). Essentially, we carry our history, as well as our families' history within us. Maton (2012) notes, that you cannot see a person's habitus, but the effects of habitus can be seen (61). Our habitus is interrelated with field in the sense that our habitus is conditioned by the structures of the field (Thomson 2012).

There are multiple analogies to explain field, but best here is the analogy of *le champ,* which is a playing field where there is a goal in mind and many oppositions attempting to keep you from achieving this goal (Thomson 2012). It should be further noted, that only players are allowed on the field, that is the field is semi-autonomous (Thomson 2012). Thomson (2012) notes that in this way there are organizing principles within a field, such as the racial and class hierarchy, and gendered sexism. For instance, one issue noted by students, is night courses, as most student services are closed during these times. Students who need to work often need to take participate in night courses, but often this means that most student services, including the cafeteria, are closed while on campus (Matus-Grossman and Gooden 2002). This is something that directly affects nontraditional students and first-generation students. Students of color are also over represented in these areas as they are more likely to be first generation and/or NTS. Research has found that students of color work are more likely to work during university (Orozco and Cauthen 2009). Furthermore, of the students who work, students of color work on average 36 hours more a week that White students (Orozco and Cauthen 2009; Tuttle, Mckinney, and Rago 2005). The interactions with a Universities field is structured by the overarching structures of the larger social field which has led to a need for students of color to work a higher than average number of hours work.

This is rooted in an intentionally-stymied accumulation of wealth due to the racialized hierarchy within the county. Examples of this can be seen in the form of stolen land from Latinx Americans' and stolen wealth and bodily autonomy to work by Black Americans, though there are many more examples (Gonzales 2009; Hausmann et al. 2013; Katznelson 2005; Telles and Ortiz 2008). Additionally, this classing of Latinx and Black American's has led to painful interactions with administration as well as campus climate (Pyne and Means 2013). This can further lead to hesitation to seek out student services, further fueling the perception of 'isolation' from the campus culture. In this example, the relation between habitus and field becomes apparent.

Also shown in the above example on night courses, capital has great importance as it fuels the development and maintenance of a field over time. As capital is the driving force the process of and the product of a field (Thomson 2012:67). Capital can be explained as power, and Bourdieu focused on four kinds of power: economic, cultural, social, and symbolic (considered as credentials and can be exchanged for other capital, one form is a credit score) (Montoya et al. 2016; Moore 2012). In the *le champ* analogy of field, it is explained that people enter a field with different levels of the different forms of capitals, this is then used to procure more capital to advance through the field (Thomson 2012:66). The more capital accumulated the quicker an actor can advance through a field (Thomson 2012).

One way to consider practice, and the navigation of a field or social space by cultural capital is to consider Crossley's (2012:88) map of social space. This model is a two dimensional plane with the y-axis containing the volume of capital, and the x-axis containing composition of capital(Crossley 2012). From this map dots may be placed to represent the level of cultural and economic capital a person may possess in order to navigate a social space to achieve a goal

(Crossley 2012). It is important to note that even two agents who may fall on -2,-2 simultaneously may progress differently, as habitus should never be ignored. As habitus is different from cultural capital, and deals with previously held dispositions due to invisible relationships (Maton 2012). Also, unseen here is Doxa, which can be considered unwritten rules (Deer 2012). While many may confuse this with cultural capital, there is a difference, as doxa is less of a culture and more an unspoken agreement on social rules (Deer 2012). Habitus and field interplay here to reify doxa. Consider the following reflection:

> *Reflection Six*
>
> *Location: teaching at a university with a large NTS population.*
>
> *It was a good day, like most days. I loved teaching here. Even on my worst days, I just felt comfortable teaching. I never got to feel that way at my current university. The only times I was uncomfortable were the days that I was too busy to give it my all, and I was nervous I would let my students down.*
>
> *Location: College Station Texas*
>
> *Fast forward a few months, I'm working out with a person.*
>
> *"Oh," she responded in humorous shock to explaining I was from a very lower-class neighborhood, "I would have never guessed! You come off like that awkward professor, you know that kind of classy."*
>
> *I stifled a laugh, "that's because I'm always trying really hard, so even when I'm not trying, I come off a way now. (she nodded in understanding) Yeah, it's weird. While I'm in the thick of it, it's as though no matter how I dress, no matter how hard I try, I still come off different. It's like I can't escape my hood. Which is kind of a love-hate thing for me, because it's in places I can feel it bothering people."*

In this reflection the underlying notion is that I had obtained the cultural capital necessary to "play the game," or navigate the field, yet still struggled to progress (Thomson 2012:66). This is due to doxa, there are many unwritten rules that those whom intergenerationally have navigated such field have been indoctrinated into (Deer 2012). Fellow researchers who were part of the Academic/A&M legacy and my difference in habitus, plus the field of A&M academia, meant reaffirmation of 'difference' during interactions with others. Whereas, at the nontraditional

university, it was a newly-built Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) that targets first generation students, the doxa of elitism of the ivory tower (Bourdieu) were nonexistent (Deer 2012; Robbins 2012). In essence, the elitism to which faculty contribute and perpetuate varies by campus, and as a result, students from less elite campuses may not be indoctrinated into the same doxa.

So then, despite habitus and doxa, we could use Crossley's (2012:88) map as an example of how the theory of practice is in sum a strategy of practice to achieve goals or reach the end of the map. Yet it is also noted, that in researching social space, the first step is to reflect on previous knowledge of the social development of space (Hardy 2012). We are to question how this knowledge was built, how it came to be, and how the doctrines affected and/or maintained the space (Robbins 2012). Often over looked, large fields have subfields, and that borders of fields are often blurred with fields interconnected (Thomson 2012). These subfields, such as negotiating family and/or work responsibility, may have been minor fields to those who fit the dominate academic body, but are major practice affects for marginalized agents.

Most knowledge developed on such social space neglected the interworking's of fields, for instance how there is a subfield of food practice within the overall field of higher education. As a result, I suggest a multi-plane map which considers the varied forms of marginalization within the hierarchy of the United States. This takes into consideration intersectionality, as opposed to the prevalent use of additive intersection of students, such as previously stated tendencies to amalgamate NTS, first generation, and other underserved markers (Bowl 2001; Petty 2014; Stebleton and Soria 2012). This is important, as in the original two dimensional map, burdens can be considered additive. Additive intersectionality, which is problematic and does not follow the original tenets of intersectionality, contains tacit portrays of oppression as equal (King

1988; Marsden 1992). By creating a rhetoric of equivalency in oppressions additive intersectionality ignores the different historical, institutional, geographical, and cultural realities as well as the various impacts of racism on communities (King 1988). Instead, by providing acknowledgement of the interworking's of subfields and how this interaction with individuals differs based on policy and social rhetoric, greater insight is allowed.

Building from Crossley's (2012) considerations, I consider multiple planes which represent subfields within a field, and though different all planes culminate to the practice of higher education. Some agents will primarily play in a subfield, with the subfield being the major field within their practice. This is due to the difference of agent interaction with social structures due to habitus. This difference in interaction with structures is represented as buildings; which while present throughout all planes will be different interactions. Further, there is interconnection of these various planes. For instance, one structure would be the financial aid office, which every student must interact with; yet the interaction with the financial aid office will directly affect work responsibility which is another plane.

While many would note work as simple a variable of capital, it is in its own plane when considering higher education. While it is undeniably linked to capital, a NTS in their 30's may have a decent portion of wealth and choose to attend university but be unable to relinquish their job as the main priority. This is a different interaction with the plane of work than an 18-year-old whose family has a fair amount of wealth accumulation. This form of capital will allow the agent the ability to stay on the top plane and maintain work as a subfield, if it is a field to interact with at all. Furthermore, the arrows note how these fields can change in level of priority in terms of practice. Where you enter in terms of priority of field for practice, and also your overall practice, will usually be dictated by your habitus, and the previous structural interactions.

Another way this map can be used is to explicate the different resources available at different institutions of higher education. For instance, an institution that is new and prioritizes offering affordable tuition, has many less resources for students, such as a different level of resources for student health care, student food resources, and student tutoring services. Research and graduate education advising may be limited as well. Other institutions that are more prestigious often have a greater number of resources and better graduate advisement (i.e. steps to apply to graduate school, research for a better robust c.v.). In this way, while the goal of the field may be the same, access to the field with least obstacles and most ease will be limited. The structures (financial aid, registrar's office, cafeteria) are present within every field, but the interactions will vary by field. Again, this was developed by being reflective on those who theorized on higher education as a field before me. Higher education is not a broad overarching field, it differs by university and community college and as shown those differences are heavily classed and racialized. Previous literature on students speaks of higher education as a base access, that all universities have a financial aid office and all U.S. citizen students nationally have access to financial aid based off the same formula (Cahalan et al. 2019). So, the experiences will be similar with variation based mostly on demographic markers. Yet, theorizing such as this ignores how Universities have varied resources, the geographic locations have different interactions for these students, and campus culture leads to varied interactions.

Further, I have identified that this is not an isolated phenomenon, but instead these methods of maintaining power dynamics of communities has been identified throughout the United States (Winer 1996). The structural realities faced by students, affect their initial access to higher education, particularly the higher echelons of higher education in terms of both field and capital. This further affects their ease of cultural interactions as well as once on campus.

Additionally, this knowledge of structural violence, and structural mechanisms to maintain segregation are known, which then affects the habitus of new and continuing University students. These barriers and obstacles are likely particularly salient for students of color, first generation and non-traditional students.

2.4 Students and Food Networks

Field, capital, and habitus come together to form a theory of practice, which is used to accomplish an overall goal. The theory of practice is important here because it takes into account the individual and structural levels. I showed how there are sub-fields within the field of higher education. These sub-fields cannot be ignored as they contribute to the overall practice of an agent.

One subfield that has been largely ignored is the field of food and foodways. This field is important to the overall practice of higher education as it is at the first level of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. This first level is identified as containing the essential physiological needs of agents, including air, water, food and other essentials (Petty 2014). Petty notes (2014), that until this level is met, progression to other levels such as social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization are theorized as unable to be endeavored (259). As noted earlier, these higher levels of Maslow's law are often overlooked in previous literature even when faced with significant variable outcomes (Petty 2014; Stebleton and Soria 2012). This is theoretical neglect as noted burdens of NTS and first generation students include the likelihood of being from a low income family, financial strain while attending college, dividing time between working and studying, a person of color, obligation to other responsibilities outside of college (such as family financial responsibility), student involvement barriers, lack of cultural/social readiness, inadequate educational readiness subsequently leading to self-esteem issues. The majority of barriers

identified are financially or systemically situated, but little is investigated on why working outside of the university is necessary, simply that it is a burden leading to high attrition rates (Orozco and Cauthen 2009).

An investigation into the food subfield will offer illumination as to why these barriers and obstacles (such as working outside the university) are burdens which are faced. Food is a major subfield that must be navigated by students in order to survive university. Some students face greater obstacles with food than others, and the students who do must make difficult choices that may affect their university performance. The field of food will have different structures based on the University to be navigated, this includes structures as cafeteria hours, the location of the University, and whether you reside within the University dorm system. The capital of the student also comes into play and will also dictate other structural access, such as whether the bus system of the surrounding area of the university is an important negotiator in the food field. The habitus of the student also comes into play for various reasons. Some students will have access to parental capital, of which the food negotiation maybe inhibited due to the habitus of said student. Furthermore, perceptions of aid, perceptions of student loans and various other negotiations where in sum the habitus of the student will be influenced by the geo-historical intergenerational standing of the student.

In approaching food as a subfield of the higher education practice, we then allow ourselves to expand our theories in order to understand food practice as series of dimensions that work together. It also allows us the room to understand food practice as a sub practice of higher education practice. This is something often overlooked, despite the research present that identifies food security as affecting higher educational achievement (Cady 2014).

While food security is important in situating how hunger is perceived in the United States, this study seeks to look beyond food security. There are several reasons why but is primarily on with the lacking intersectionality of food security research in the University system. There have been several studies on food security, and more recently we have seen research on food security in the University system (Gaines et al. 2014; Gallegos et al. 2014; Freudenber et al. 2011). Despite growth in food access research on university students there are several research study limitations, primarily issues dealing with sample size, limited diversity and aggregation of NTS and traditional students or eliminating older students.

While there have been a few studies that took into consideration NTS, first generation students, and students of color they were either weighted substantially due to the small percentage of campus representation[15] or the (n) of such students is limited due to the small race/NTS populations on traditional predominately White (PWI) campuses resulting in little insight into the demographic (Freudenberg, Manzo, Jones, Kwan, Tsui, and Gagnon, 2011; Patton-Lopez, 2014). In this way, university food security research often falls into the classic trap of additive intersectionality that is if food security is hard for traditional students, those who have race and class markers must suffer more. As a result, research is needed with methodology that addresses the race and sample size limitations found in other studies and provides insight on nontraditional students. This could be done by oversampling students of color and nontraditional students at PWI's or collecting data from a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) or Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Additionally, research should delve more deeply into how food security is affected by cultural factors such as the presence of extended family and enclave processes, assimilation, and food sources. Simply documenting food security of students demographically does not untangle the structural and cultural frameworks at play. The lacking research

[15] These studies often caution in interpretation of analyses when considering nontraditional students and/or students of color. For instance Freudenberg et al. notes that their study weighted key demographics in order to successfully represent their student base (2011).

into these areas of marginalized students' food navigation and security fits in line with the overall rhetoric of food security activism. That is the lacking presence of people of color doing research on food security or leading and representing initiatives (Morales 2011). For instance, the Community Food Security Coalition, is noted as having low representation of people of color, with many notable people attending and participating but not seen in leadership (Morales 2011). This resulted in slow and problematic movement in dealing with food insecurity for communities of color. While progress did eventually occur, resentment remained for the slow progress (Alkon and Agyeman 2011; Morales 2011).

In order to actively move away from the dominant marginalized problem of food security research both on and off campus I seek to provide a more robust understanding into how food is navigated, procured, and affects the higher educational practice of marginalized students. Overall this will provide a greater intersectional understanding of what differing students endure, and how it goes beyond capital and food security, illuminating how marginalized students have different food practices.

In positioning the situation of food intake of marginalized students first we must consider three of the seven interrelated paradigms of household food security. First there is a generational difference in food security both at large and within the household (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017). This results in the possibility of there being different levels of food security within the same home occurring simultaneously; this is usually centered on the importance to the child's food intake prioritized over the parents (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017). The second and third paradigms are closely related. The second is that food security is not necessarily a fundamental need and to treat it as such would be misinformed. Individuals and households have a "wider livelihood of considerations" that are taken into account when planning a food budget (Maxwell and Smith 1992:4). Maxwell and Smith (1992) note that in order to preserve an asset or meet an objective some individuals are willing to go hungry. They stress the importance of studying food security in "the context of livelihood security," which leads into paradigm three, that the "sensitivity, resilience and sustainability of livelihood systems are crucial: interventions should support the adaptability and flexibility of vulnerable livelihood systems" (1992:4).

When considering the importance of food in Maslow's law, but then understanding the documented paradigms that food can and is often sacrificial when protecting children or achieving a goal, we arrive at why looking beyond food security is important. The previous research on college students and food security tends to treat food insecurity as a consequence of college, and rarely takes into account the possibility that instead food insecurity is a sacrifice *for* college (Freudenberg et al. 2011; Gaines et al. 2014; Gallegos et al. 2014; Kittra 2013; Gorman 2014; Hughes et al. 2011; Koller 2014; Magoc 2012; Maroto 2014; Miceviski 2014; Patton-Lopez et al. 2014).

From here we understand that students are not able to fully neglect food, but there are negotiations that must be made in how they navigate the food system and how that will affect their education. In order to further investigate these navigations, I have arrived at the following research questions:

Given the prevalence of data on the academic benefit of not working while attending higher education, does government food aid while in higher education school adequately address food insecurity? More specifically:

- How does work play into the propensity of a student body primarily of non-traditional students of color to skip eating meals on campus?
- Does the effect of work and campus meal skipping differ for a student body primarily comprised of first-generation traditional students of color status?
- When controlling for government aid does the need to work become no longer significant for a student body primarily of non-traditional students of color?
- Does the control of government aid differ for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students of color status?

Are students of a predominately NTS of color more likely to rely on community food networks as forces of food accessibility are increasingly strained? Does this differ to first-generation students of color primarily of traditional status? More specifically:

- What alternative programs to governmental aid are sought out to aid in food practice for a student body primarily comprised of non-traditional students of color?
- Does this differ for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students of color?
- How does social networks play a role in navigating and accessing food for a student body primarily of non-traditional students of color?
- Is this different for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students?

By answering these questions, I hope to intersectionally extend Reese's (2019) work in *Black food geographies: race, self-reliance, and food access in Washington, D.C.,* on antiblackness and food geographies. Akin to her research on Black neighborhoods and food networks, I hope to show how despite the active narrative of inclusivity and meritocracy, the implicit policies and practices which constrain the movement of students within university systems (Reese 2019). Through the classed and racialized shaping of the food environment, we see that all students are affected, and their practices and navigations of the environment will then be dependent further on their habitus, capital, and the larger social field in which they navigate.

Now that the ground work of theoretical framings are developed, in the next chapter I will explain how I generated the hypotheses, I approached the analyses, and collected data. In chapter four I report my findings and conclude this dissertation with a conceptualization of *educational food practice.*

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

In the last chapter we interrogated the rule that there are barriers and obstacles that students face which have been classed and raced. In that interrogation, I showed the need for a theory of educational food practice, which considers the food practice of students within the higher education system. In applying this theory to my analysis, I intend to investigate the difference in practice of students from a predominately Latinx university in the south.

In this study, I collected data on two different samples of students within a predominately Latinx population. The major difference of these two samples is traditional/non-traditional status (primarily around age and living situation), with other student demographics being relatively similar. Theoretically, a comparison of their slopes would be adequate in showing the differences in educational food practices, which was what my hypotheses centered around. Yet while the populations had similar burdens and barriers to confront, the social forces and life experiences that lead to said barriers and burdens were different. Consequently, their navigation of the educational food practices' field was markedly different. These differences made it so that the original models to compare the populations were unable to be produced.

Their difference is still important, and the findings illuminated burdens and accessibility issues. While simply reporting the adjusted hypotheses is an option, I feel that to do so impedes producing a true and nuanced report of the findings; as the resulting findings were found due to the lack of model fit in the original hypotheses. In an effort to provide due diligence to an examination of the issue, I will report these analyses to include the original hypotheses, the changes in direction, and how this change in direction further illuminated the issue and rule. The issue being that The United States has long valued the narrative of meritocracy, and value of 'pulling oneself up by the bootstraps', as I discussed above on page 11. Despite often ignoring

the structural and institutional ways in which resources and access differ by racial and class lines. Thus, this meritocratic narrative not only acts as a way to undermine recognition of the inequity in the United States but also reifies the racial hierarchy of the United State. The rule is that these hazards and barriers are created due to differential distribution of resources specifically in terms of food capital. These hazards and barriers then strain educational access. I conclude by explaining how these two populations, though often aggregated in academic research, are so fundamentally different that any form of aid or recommendations that attempts to aggregate their experiences are doing both populations disfavor. These outcomes speak to the need for intersectional equity programs to support student success that explicitly confront the hegemonic policy framings of a racialized and classed meritocratic system.

3.1 Study Design

In chapter one I explained that the overall issue I seek to interrogate is that the United States has long valued the narrative of meritocracy, and individualistic value of 'pulling oneself up by the bootstraps.' This is our national myth and narrative as we elide and ignore the structural and institutional ways in which resources and access differ by racial and class lines[16]. Thus, this narrative not only acts to undermine the structural, even intentional, reality of the inequity between people in the United States, but also reifies the racial hierarchy of the United States. I then showed how this issue is continued and reified through the rule of

[16] One example of how this national myth of self-reliance and 'pulling ones-self up by the boot straps is a myth that also acts to ignore the differential distribution of wealth and resources can be found in chapter four of Coontz (1992). Wherein Coontz interrogates the myth of self-reliance in homesteading, the need to rely on community to make it through the winter, and Black exemption from owning land. Here we see not only a tradition of dependence on others, and government access to land through the government, but also the explicit restriction of land to those deemed unworthy (Coontz 1992).

differential hazards and barriers created due to a disparity in distribution of resources, specifically in terms of food capital, strain, and educational access. This rule was elaborated on in the previous chapter where I arrived at research questions intended to investigate the differences in educational food practice experiences for two sets of differently marginalized peoples whom are often grouped together, first-generation and NTS.

The reasoning behind orienting the research questions around the particular differences in barriers faced by marginalized peoples is to illuminate the issue of undermining inequity in meritocracy. I intend to show that differential barriers and hazards are real, and that meritocracy does not appropriately address the needs and circumstances of these differently set groups. Such research questions address the additive effect of amalgamating "burden," wherein all burden can be overcome through grit and resilience with the reward equal to the extent of effort put in. This approach generates burden as additive, leading to a meritocratic framework that ignores the differences in needs, and the circumstances of different burdens. It is in this way that equity is undermined, resulting in aid intended to help marginalized students that is then inappropriate or inadequate.

In order to examine these differences in burdens I administered two online surveys within the same structural entity (N) but of two different samples (n) resulting in:

Wave One- Comprised primarily of non-traditional students

Wave Two- Comprised primarily of traditional first-generation students

(See table 1 and 2 (page 57, 58) for sample population comparison (*n*)).

This data was coded and analyzed in Stata statistical software. Regression was used to identify differences in educational food practice.

In order to obtain this difference in waves, I collected data on the same research population (N) in two different time periods. In the spring of 2016, an online survey focused on educational food practice was administered to the university of study's students. During this time (spring 2016) the university of study was an upper institution, providing only junior and senior level course work requiring students acquire their freshman and sophomore level course work from other higher educational institutions, i.e. community college. As a result, most of the university of study's student body (N) was comprised of non-traditional students who had taken lower level classes at a community college. The following fall (2017) the university of study expanded into a full-service four-year university, and the University began providing lower-level course work, seemingly actively recruiting first generation traditional students recently graduated from regular high schools.

The second round of data was collected after this expansion generating a change in the population demographic. In Fall of 2018[17] a second online survey was administered intended to measure educational food practice of the first-attendance-at-college university of study population (N). By waiting a year and a half to administer the second round of surveys I was able to obtain a data sample *(n)* of a student population (N) that is in a more traditional university atmosphere.

As noted in chapter two, often these two demographics (non-traditional students and first generation students) are amalgamated, and so I aimed to illuminate their differences so as to show not only how this amalgamation does a disservice to social science, but also illuminate how an additive approach to burden can be harmful when considering policy and research on student

[17] Fall 2018 data (n) is part of a larger project intended to measure changes in health behavior for Freshman students.

body. Also, this highlights the rule my dissertation intends to investigate, that structural and institutional resources and access differ by racialized and class lines. The structural and institutional interaction of students then is different and due to this resource distribution social inequity is continued. By having the intervention occur naturally within the structure holding the research population I have the unique opportunity to research how changes to the structure, as well as the difference of traditional/non-traditional status affects the barriers and burdens of obtaining food.

In order to analyze my research questions, I created the following hypotheses from which I built the survey questions (appendix 1 page 96) from:

> In order to approach the first set of questions I intended to test the following hypothesis:
>
> The propensity to skip meals on campus due to a lack of money will be different based on traditional status with work having a negative effect on skipping meals, even when controlling for government food aid.
>
> To test the second set of questions I intended to test the following hypothesis:
>
> The use of alternative food programs (soup kitchens, food pantries, food banks, church, senior food delivery programs) will be important by differing life forces from the traditional status of students. These life forces include transport time to grocery store, means of transportation, stretching food budget by sharing food, children, and government food aid.

These hypotheses consider differences in structural and institutional interaction. My survey questions were derived from these hypotheses, though later these hypotheses are altered in order to better approach the data collected. In these hypotheses structure was considered from: work, level of burden of transportation, transport time to grocery store, and children. Institutions included government food aid, food banks, food pantries, and soup kitchens. Structural and Institutional interaction influenced students' propensity to skip meals on campus due to lack of money, the use of alternative food programs, and sharing food with friends and family in order to

stretch the food budget. Furthermore, in order to collect food security data, the survey included the USDA food security survey three-stage design module with screeners (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017; Coleman-Jensen, Gregory, and Rabbitt 2019).

In order analyze these structural and institutional actions on students I developed research questions that consider life forces, everyday structures that undergraduates interact with to obtain food, and alternatives to obtaining these foods in the face of burdens. These questions went beyond the hypotheses to include various structures, including whether the student lived with family, in a dorm, or on their own, whether the student was married, and age.[18] By doing this I aimed at obtaining information that could illuminate not just the economic burdens and barriers of acquiring food, but also how the students' foodscape and interactions affects food acquisition.

After data collection of both waves of students (further explained below) I eventually used the variables found in figures 2, 3, 4, and 5 (page 50-53) for analysis. While I tried to have the same research questions present in both surveys, an important consideration is changes to the structure as well as temporality. For instance, there was not dormitory access for the first wave of students, but accessible for the second wave of students. This greatly affects the foodscape of students. It was also important to understand the theoretical implications of the changing student population. For instance, in the second hypothesis I considered the number of children present in the household for wave 1, and for wave two whether or not there was children in the household. This is due to the large age difference, many those in the second wave who had children in the home, indicated they were living with family and in other questions indicated that these children were primarily

[18] These questions were tested for reliability and validity through student volunteers. These volunteers would read and answer the survey questions, identifying any questions that were confusing or convoluted.

not theirs. These children present could then be considered not in their primary care. Comparatively, first wave students through various indicators, showed that those who had children in their home were likely the primary care givers. As a result, in terms of barrier priority, children in the home was a greater burden, and interpreting the number of children was a greater indicator of the level of barrier. Whereas having a child in the home was a lesser burden, with little indication that the number of children present was linked to other variables in the hypothesis. Below I show how the concepts found in the hypotheses were measured in the surveys from wave 1 and wave 2.

First Wave Hypothesis One Variables

bapaso	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	31	25	25
1	91	73.39	98.39
2	2	1.61	100
Total	124	100	

bapaso = Has participant used the services of a food bank, food pantry, and/or soup kitchen in the last 6 months 0=never, 1= 1 to 3 times, 2=4 or more times.

govfoodaid	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	98	79.03	79.03
1	23	18.55	97.58
2	3	2.42	100
Total	124	100	

govfood aid= Has the participant received Wic or Snap benefits in the last 6 months 0=Neither, 1= WIC or SNAP, 2= Both.

campskip	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	42	34.43	34.43
1	80	65.57	100
Total	122	100	

campskip= Has the participant ever skipped a meal on campus because food options were outside the participants budget. (0=no, 1=yes)

Work	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	49	39.52	39.52
1	75	60.48	100
Total	124	100	

Work= Is the participant currently employed. 0=no 1=yes

Figure 2: First wave hypothesis one.

Second Wave Hypothesis One Variables

govfoodaid	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	101	89.38	89.38
1	9	7.96	97.35
2	3	2.65	100
Total	113	100	

govfoodaid= Has the participant received Wic or Snap benefits in the last 6 months 0=None, 1= WIC or SNAP, 2= Both.

work	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	63	55.26	55.26
1	51	44.74	100
Total	114	100	

Work= Is the participant currently employed. 0=no 1=yes

livechildren	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	75	65.79	65.79
1	39	34.21	100
Total	114	100	

livechildren= does the participant live with children under the age of 18. 0=no, 1=yes

dorm	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	65	57.02	57.02
1	49	42.98	100
Total	114	100	

dorm= Does the participant live in a dorm. 1=yes, 0=no

stretbud	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	78	69.64	69.64
1	34	30.36	100
Total	112	100	

Stretbud= Does the participant ever share meals with family or close friends to stretch the food budget. 1=yes, 0=no

campskip	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	78	68.42	68.42
1	36	31.58	100
Total	114	100	

campskip= Has the participant ever skipped a meal on campus because food options were outside the participants budget. 0=no, 1=yes.

Figure 3: Second wave hypothesis one variables.

First Wave Hypothesis Two Variables

age	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	53	42.74	42.74
2	58	46.77	89.52
3	11	8.87	98.39
4	2	1.61	100
Total	124	100	

age = Age of student, 1= 18-29, 2= 30-49, 3=50-64, 4=65 or over.

marriage	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	52	41.94	41.94
2	11	8.87	50.81
3	49	39.52	90.32
4	1	0.81	91.13
5	9	7.26	98.39
6	2	1.61	100
Total	124	100	

marriage= Participants marital status. 1= single/never married, 2=cohabitating, 3=married, 4= separated, 5= divorced, 6= widowed.

stretbud	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	67	54.47	54.47
1	56	45.53	100
Total	123	100	

Stretbud= Does the participant ever share meals with family or close friends to stretch the food budget. 1=yes, 0=no

numchild	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	67	54.03	54.03
1	28	22.58	76.61
2	15	12.1	88.71
3	6	4.84	93.55
4	8	6.45	100
Total	124	100	

numchild= number of children under 18 years of age living with participant. 1= 1 child, 2= 2 children, 3=3 children, 4=4 or more children.

Work	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	49	39.52	39.52
1	75	60.48	100
Total	124	100	

Work= Is the participant currently employed. 0=no 1=yes

Figure 4: First wave hypothesis two variables.

Second Wave Hypothesis Two Variables

travgroc	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	25	22.32	22.32
2	53	47.32	69.64
3	28	25	94.64
4	4	3.57	98.21
6	2	1.79	100
Total	112	100	

travgroc = How long it takes participant to get to full grocery store. 1= 0-5 minutes, 2=5-10 minutes, 3= 10-20 minutes, 4=20-30 minutes, 5=30-45 minutes, 6=more than 45 minutes.

transportburden	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	94	83.93	83.93
2	1	0.89	84.82
3	1	0.89	85.71
5	14	12.5	98.21
6	2	1.79	100
Total	112	100	

transportburden= Amount of burden in transport to grocery store. 1= personal car, 2= public transportation (bus etc.), 3= walk, 4=bike, 5=get a ride from family or friends, 6=cab app (uber, lyft)

work	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	63	55.26	55.26
1	51	44.74	100
Total	114	100	

Work= Is the participant currently employed. 0=no 1=yes.

livechildren	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	75	65.79	65.79
1	39	34.21	100
Total	114	100	

livechildren= does the participant live with children under the age of 18. 0=no, 1=yes.

Figure 5: Second wave hypothesis two variables.

3.2 Data

In order to collect this data, online surveys were used. In order to recruit participants, flyers and email advertisements were used for the first wave of participants. Flyers and email advertisements were used for the second wave of participants as well, along with researchers going to different classrooms to give a brief recruitment speech. Through active recruitment the first wave of data collection resulted in 124 completed surveys and the second wave resulted in 114 completed surveys. A codebook (appendix 2 page 115) of the first and second wave of data was coded in Excel Microsoft and uploaded to Stata 16. Demographics of wave 1 and wave 2 sample data (n) were tabulated producing table 1 (page 57) and table 2 (page 58).

3.2.1 First Wave Data.

From these tables (page 57 and 58) we see the first wave sample (n) is primarily comprised of people of color (66.87%), with most of the student survey sample (n) being Latinx (57.26%). The survey sample (n) is also comprised of primarily students who identify as women (71.77%), with a slightly higher proportion of the survey sample (n) falling into the 30-39 age range, and 54.03% had no children. It is important here to note that none of the survey sample (n) reported freshmen status and only 2 participants identified as sophomores. With this in mind, as well as the overall <21 age population of the university of study (N), it can be confidently stated that the majority of the 18-29 age range of the survey sample (n) was over <21.

Of the first wave survey sample (n), 49% suffered from some form of low food security, with 21.77 percent suffering from very low food security. This percentage is disheartening as the term very low food security is conceptualized by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) as: “reports of multiple indications of disrupted eating patterns and reduced food intake” (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017:1) Which contains a with-child household raw score of 8-

18, and a non-child household raw score of 6-10. Further, the USDA reported that 4.9% of the national population experiences very low food security in 2016 (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017). The first wave survey sample (n) has more than 5 times the national rate of very low food security. When comparing food security by age there is a trend of lower food security for the 18-29 and 30-49 age group. A chi-squared test showed a statistically significant (.03) relationship between these two variables. Most of the sample reported senior status (59.68%). While there appears to be a relationship to higher education level and food security the relationship was not statistically significant.

3.3.2 Second Wave Data.

Similarly, the second wave of data is comprised primarily of people of color (89.48%) (n), with an almost 10% rise in respondents identifying as Latinx (66.67%) (n). There was over 20% drop in student respondents identifying at White (10.53%) in the second wave of data (n). The second wave is also comprised primarily of respondents identifying as women (n), though to a lesser extent (64.4%). The sample (n) is comprised primarily of 18 (69.3%) and 19 (28.95%) respondents with 95.61% of respondents reported freshman status.

17.09% of respondents (n) reported some form of low food security (a raw score of 3-7 with-child household, and 3-5 non-child household), with 2.56% reporting very low food security. While this is a much lesser number than the first wave of data it is important to remember this is still 5.29% higher than the national rates of low and very low food security for 2017 (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2017). In order to provide comparison to the first wave of data, a chi square analysis was run on the variables of age and overall food security. There was no significance in age and overall food security relationship ($p>.05$) causing us to accept the null

hypothesis that the variables are independent of each other. This is possibly due to the lack of variation in age of the survey sample.

Race	Percent
Black	#
Asian/Pacific Islander	#
Latinx	57.26
Multiracial	2.42
Native American/American Indian	0.81
White	33.87
Other	0.81

Gender	Percent
Man	28.23
Woman	71.77

Age	Percent
18-29	42.74
30-49	46.77
50-64	8.87
65 or over	1.61

Overall Food Security Score	Percent
Secure	29.84
Marginal Food Security	30.65
Low Food Security	21.77
Very Low Food Security	17.24

Overall Food Security by Age

Overall Food Security by Age	18-29	30-49	50-64	65 or over	Total
Secure	14	15	6	2	37
Marginal	13	23	2	0	38
Low Food Security	18	7	2	0	27
Very Low Food Security	8	13	1	0	22
Total	53	58	11	2	124

FS by Age
Pearson Chi2=17.79
Pr=.038

Higher Education Level	Percent
Freshman	0
Sophomore	1.61
Junior	24.19
Senior	59.68
Masters/Continuing Edu	14.52

Education Level and Food Security

Higher Education Level by Food Security	0	1	2	3	Total
Freshman	0	0	0	0	0
Sophomore	1	0	1	0	2
Junior	8	12	3	7	30
Senior	22	23	17	12	74
Masters/Continuing Edu	6	3	6	3	18
Total	37	38	27	22	124

Table 1: First wave demographics.

Race	Percent
Black	11.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	#
Latinx	66.67
Multiracial	7.02
Native American/American Indian	0
White	10.53
Other	0.88

Gender	Column1
Man	35.96
Woman	64.04

Age	Column1
18	69.3
19	28.95
20	0.88
21	0
22	0
23	0.88

Overall Food Security Score	Percent
Secure	54.70
Marginal Food Security	28.21
Low Food Security	14.53
Very Low Food Security	2.56

Overall Food Security by Age

Overall Food Security by Age	18	19	20	23	Total
Secure	45	15	1	0	61
Marginal	24	8	0	1	33
Low Food Security	8	9	0	0	17
Very Low Food Security	2	1	0	0	3
Total	79	33	1	1	114
Pearson Chi2=8.83					
Pr=.45					

Higher Education Level	Percent
Freshman	95.61
Sophomore	2.63
Junior	1.75
Senior	0
Masters/Continuing Edu	0

Education Level and Food Security

Higher Education Level by Food Security	0	1	2	3	Total
Freshman	59	31	17	2	109
Sophomore	1	1	0	1	3
Junior	1	1	0	0	2
Total	61	33	17	3	114

Table 2: Second wave demographics.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS

4.1 Hypotheses

The following research questions guided the analyses:

How does work play into the propensity of a student body primarily of non-traditional

students of color to skip eating meals on campus?

- Does the effect of work and campus meal skipping differ for a student body primarily comprised of first-generation traditional students of color status?
- When controlling for government aid does the need to work become no longer significant for a student body primarily of non-traditional students of color?
- Does the control of government aid differ for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students of color status?

What alternative means to governmental aide are sought out to aid in food practice for a student body primarily comprised of non-traditional students of color?

- Does this differ for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students of color?
- How does social networks play a role in navigating and accessing food for a student body primarily of non-traditional students of color?
- Is this different for a student body primarily of first-generation traditional students?

In order to approach the first set of questions I intended to test the following hypothesis:

> The propensity to skip meals on campus due to a lack of money will be different based on traditional status with work having a negative effect on skipping meals, even when controlling for government food aid.

To test the second set of questions I intended to test the following hypothesis:

> The use of alternative food programs (soup kitchens, food pantries, food banks, church, senior food delivery programs) will be important by differing life and structural forces by traditional status of students. These life and structural forces include transport time to grocery store, means of transportation, stretching food budget by sharing food, children, government food aid.

4.1.1 Hypothesis One

In order to test the first hypothesis, I ran the same logistic regression for the first and second wave of data which would allow me to compare their slopes which would indicate the differences in models due to population (N) changes. The dependent variable (campskip) is a dichotomous variable assessing whether the student had ever skipped a meal at school because they could not afford food (see figure 2, page 50). Due to the dependent variable "campskip" being dichotomous, logistic regression was utilized. The independent variables were: whether or not the student worked (work), whether or not the student participated in a government food aid program (govfoodaid) and food bank, food pantry, or soup kitchen use (bapaso) (see figure 2 page 50). (logit campskip work govfoodaid bapaso).

By controlling for govfoodaid, and bapaso, I would be able to recognize the effects of employment on likelihood to skip a meal on campus. Given that research shows GPA is negatively affected by working during higher education (Orozco and Cauthen 2009) the ideal outcome would be for work to not be significantly related to campskip when controlling for govfoodaid and bapaso.

The following output was generated:

campskip	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P>z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
govfoodaid	1.237146	0.5636673	2.19	0.028	0.1323785	2.341914
Work	-1.11101	0.4345365	-2.56	0.011	-1.962684	-0.2593316
Bapaso	-0.09389	0.4344186	-0.22	0.829	-0.9453379	0.7575515
_cons	1.202739	0.492524	2.44	0.015	0.2374094	2.168068

Table 3: Wave 1 hypothesis 1 output.

The analysis of the first wave of data (table 3) shows that for students who worked, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is 1.11 less than those who are not working, controlling for the others x variables. This is significant as z=-2.56, P==.01. For students who were on government food aid, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restrains is 1.24 higher than those who are not on government food aid, controlling for the other x variables. This is significant as z=2.19, P=.03. For those students who use food banks, food pantries, or soup kitchens, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .09 less than those who do not use food banks, food pantries, or soup kitchens.

In order to test the fit of the model, the linktest command was used to produce _hat and _hatsq; _hat was statistically significant as z= 2.32, P=.02). This suggests that the model is acceptable and I may consider the output adequate in assessing school Population (N) (Eric Vittinghoff, Stephen C. Shiboski, David V. Glidden 2005). Considering the overall output, for the first wave of the survey sample (non-traditional), being employed was the only control that significantly lowered the likelihood of skipping a meal on campus. While there was a slight negative effect of food banks, food pantries, and soup kitchens, it was not significant. Interestingly, you are more likely to skip a meal on campus due to participating in a government food aid program. These findings will be further expanded on in the next chapter.

A second logistic regression was planned on the second wave of data with the same variables (logit campskip work govfoodaid bapaso) in order to produce a comparison of slopes (fix wording). However, the model fit was inadequate, with the linktest yielding a _hat that is statistically not significant (z=.32, P=.75). As a result, findings could not be reported which could test the hypothesis with original intent.

As a result of these findings I considered the changes in survey populations and resources for hypothesis revision. I intended to test likelihood to skip meals on campus but with consideration to the differences in life circumstances and social forces for the second wave of data. Taking into consideration the difference in age distribution and life forces and structural that commonly are incumbent to younger students I generated the following caveat to the hypothesis that considers the theory of educational food practice.

> The propensity to skip meals on campus due to a lack of money will be different based on traditional status, which will be affected by the student's barriers and life/structural forces (field and capital).
>
> > For nontraditional students work has a negative effect on skipping meals, even when controlling for government food aid.
> >
> > For traditional students shared meals between close families and friends will have a negative effect on propensity to skip meals on campus, whereas work and government food aid will not be a significant factor.

With this hypothesis, I can test the second wave of students with a consideration for the different educational food practice at play. To do this I used the stata code: logit campskip dorm stretbud livechildren work govfoodaid.

As shown in figure 3 (page 51), campskip is a dichotomous variable, which is why I continue to utilize logistic regression. The independent variables were: whether or not the participant lives with children under the age of 18 (livechildren), whether or not the student lives in a dorm (dorm), whether or not the student shares meals with family or friends to stretch the food budget (stretbud), whether or not the student is employed (work), and whether or not the student uses government food aid (govfoodaid) (see figure 3 page 51). (logit campskip livechildren dorm stretbud work govfoodaid).

Campskip	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P>z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livechildren	0.39715	0.4775476	0.83	0.406	-0.5388261	1.333126
Dorm	-0.86409	0.5051607	-1.71	0.087	-1.85419	0.1260032
Stretbud	0.95153	0.4555859	2.09	0.037	0.0585977	1.844462
Work	0.134657	0.4423953	0.3	0.761	-0.7324219	1.001736
govfoodaid	0.033266	0.5272485	0.06	0.95	-1.000122	1.066654
_cons	-1.03822	0.4797149	-2.16	0.03	-1.978448	-0.098

Table 4: Wave 2 hypothesis 1 output.

The analysis of the second wave of data (table 4 page 63) shows that for students who live with children (under 18 years of age), their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .40 more than those who do not live with children (under 18 years of age), controlling for the other x variables. This is not significant as z=.83, P=.40. For students who were living in a dorm, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .86 less than those who do not live in a dorm, controlling for the other x variables. This is not significant as z=-1.71, P=.09. For students who stretch their budgets by sharing food with close friends and family, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .95 more than those who are not sharing food with close friends and family, controlling for the other x variables. This is significant as z=2.09, P=.04. For students who work, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .13 more than those who do not work controlling for the other x variables. This is not significant as z=.3, P=.76. For students who use government food aid, their predicted log odds of skipping a meal on campus due to budget restraints is .03 higher than those who are not on government food aid, controlling for the other x variables. This is not significant as z=.06, P=.95.

In order to test the fit of the model fit, the linktest command was used to produce _hat and _hatsq. _hat was statistically significant as z= 1.96, P=.05, and _hatsq is not statistically

significant. This suggests that the model is acceptable, and I may consider the output adequate in assessing school Population (N) (Eric Vittinghoff, Stephen C. Shiboski, David V. Glidden 2005).

This output shows that for this wave of students (traditional first generation), the means of reducing meal skipping on campus (work) of non-traditional first-generation students is not an applicable means of meal skipping reduction for traditional first-generation students of this sample. Those who rely on stretching their budget with close family and friends (stretbud) are likely to be skipping meals on campus when hungry, which is likely due to distance from their networks while on campus. Important to consider, is that living in a dorm does not significantly reduce the likelihood to skip a meal on campus when hungry, despite those residing in a dorm being required to purchase a meal plan. I can accept my modified hypothesis 1. This leads to the second hypothesis to interpret.

5.1.2 Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis to interpret is:

> The use of alternative food programs (soup kitchens, food pantries, food banks, church, senior food delivery programs) will be important by differing life and structural forces by traditional status of students. These life and structural forces include transport time to grocery store, means of transportation, stretching food budget by sharing food, children, government food aid.

This hypothesis is more apt to the differences between the two waves of students. While the original intention was to run the same regression analysis on both waves and compare the slopes, given what occurred in the previous hypothesis I decided it would be better to consider the theoretical implications of the differences in age and access.

For the first wave of students, there was greater variance in age, it would stand to reason that difference in age would impact the difference in knowledge and access to these alternative food programs. The greater age variance also meant that a larger number of students were married and were guardians of children. Furthermore, working played a large role in campus meal consumption and I was interested in whether this trend continued here. I also wanted to see how stretching the food budget by sharing meals with close friends and family impacted the use of alternative food networks.

In order to test this hypothesis, I used factor analysis to generate the variable altfoodnetworks (see appendix 3 page 122). A factor analysis was performed on the variables church, bapaso, and sendeliv. These variables pertained to use of alternative food networks to supplement food intake as: obtaining food through church meals, food banks, pantries, and soup kitchens, and senior delivery systems. This variable is representative of the alternative food options was ascertained by the survey and was used as the dependent variable. The independent variables were age, marriage, numchild, work, stretbud (see figure 4 page 52). The regression analysis (reg altfoodnetworks age marriage numchild work stretbud) generated the following output:

altfoodnet~s	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age	-0.45978	0.1457346	-3.15	0.002	-0.7484262	-0.1711346
marriage	0.156847	0.0798604	1.96	0.052	-0.001327	0.3150203
numchild	-0.00352	0.0751227	-0.05	0.963	-0.1523112	0.1452688
Work	-0.01335	0.184029	-0.07	0.942	-0.3778386	0.3511466
stretbud	-0.09552	0.1862905	-0.51	0.609	-0.4644901	0.2734537
_cons	0.493394	0.322811	1.53	0.129	-0.1459738	1.132762

Table 5 Wave 1 hypothesis 2 output.

The analysis of the first wave of data shows (table 5) that in terms of the partial slope b_1, for every interval increase in age there is a .46 decrease in the altfoodnetworks variable, given all other x variables remain constant. This is significant as t=-3.15, P=.002. For partial slope b_2, if a student was married there was an increase of the altfoodnetworks variable by .16, given all other x variables remain constant. This is significant as t=1.96, p=.05. For partial slope b_3, for every increase of a child in the home there was a decrease of the altfoodnetworks variable by .004, given all other x variables remain constant. This is not significant as t=-.05, p=.96. For partial slope b_4, if the student worked there was a decrease of the altfoodnetworks variable by .01, given all other x variables remain constant. This is not significant as t=-.04, p=.94. For partial slope b_5, if a student shared meals in order to stretch the food budget there was a decrease of the altfoodnetworks variable by .10, given all other x variables remain constant. This is not significant as t=-.51, p=.61.

In order to test the fit of the model, the linktest command was used to produce _hat and _hatsq. _hat was statistically significant as t=3.17, P=.002, and _hatsq is not statistically significant. This suggests that the model is acceptable and I may consider the output adequate in assessing school population (Eric Vittinghoff, Stephen C. Shiboski, David V. Glidden 2005).

For the second wave of students, I considered how transportation burden (transportburden) and travel time to the grocery story (travgroc) would impact access and knowledge of these alternative food networks. Furthermore, work was noted in the literature as being a major factor in lowering University GPA, there was a high prevalence of working students, yet the first hypothesis showed that there was no significance in the relationship between working and skipping a meal on campus when hungry due to budget constraints. I wanted to see if there was a relationship with working (work) and seeking out and utilizing these

networks. Finally, I wanted to see if there was any relationship to the presence of children in the household (livechildren) and the likelihood to seek out alternative food networks. College attendance of a child affects SNAP foodaid of the family, and with a considerable number of student in the second wave noting they live with their relatives I was interested if they sought out alternative networks for their family due to this lowering of aid.

In order to run this analysis, I regressed the dependent variable altfoodnetworks (see appendix 3 page 122), and the independent variables travgroc, transportburden, work, livechildren (reg altfoodnetworks travgroc transportburden work livechildren) (see figure 5 page 53). This generated the following output:

altfoodnet~s	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
travgroc	0.221363	0.1112871	1.99	0.05	0.000017	0.4427083
transportburden	-0.17353	0.0779898	-2.23	0.029	-0.3286495	-0.0184124
work	0.087734	0.2108223	0.42	0.678	-0.3315831	0.507051
livechildren	0.235707	0.2239835	1.05	0.296	-0.2097873	0.681201
_cons	-0.33	0.3165177	-1.04	0.3	-0.9595392	0.2995426

Table 6: Wave 2 hypothesis 2 output.

The analysis of the second wave of data (table 6) shows that in terms of the partial slope b_1, for every interval increase travel time to the grocery story there is a .22 increase in the altfoodnetworks variable, given all other x variables remain constant. This is significant as t=1.99, P=.05. For partial slope b_2, for every interval increase of travel burden there is a -.17 decrease of the altfoodnetworks variable, given all other x variables remain constant. This is significant as t=-2.23, p=.03. For partial slope b_3, if the student worked there was an increase of the altfoodnetworks variable by .09, given all other x variables remain constant. For b_4 if there

were children present in the student's home, there was a .24 increase of the altfoodnetworks variable, given all other x variables remain constant. This is not significant as t=1.05, p=30.

In order to test the fit of the model, the linktest command was used to produce _hat and _hatsq. _hat was statistically significant as t=2.68, P=.009, and _hatsq is not statistically significant. This suggests that the model is acceptable, and I may consider the output adequate in assessing school population. With these outcomes, I can accept my second hypothesis.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Throughout this dissertation I have sought to explore the United States' long-valued narrative of meritocracy and effort, often expressed in the rhetoric of 'pulling oneself up by the bootstraps.' While considering how this narrative ignores the structural and institutional ways in which resources and access differ by racialized and class lines. The meritocratic narrative thus undermines the inequity of people in the United States and reifies the racial and class hierarchy of the United States. During investigation of this issue, I developed the rule that hazards and barriers are created due to the racial and classed differential distribution of resources, specifically in terms of food capital which strains food access in an educational setting. Through the contextualization of this rule, I found I need to develop a *theory of educational food practice*. I sought to develop this theory by performing an analysis on various elements of two student demographics that are often amalgamated. By performing my analysis my hypotheses morphed, which I believe bettered my understanding of how this theory should be conceptualized.

5.1 Theory of Educational Food Practice

As stated before: [(HABITUS)(CAPITAL)] +FIELD=PRACTICE

I sought to develop a *theory of educational food practice* in order to properly explicate how burdens and barriers are differentially experienced in terms of food access and burden maintenance. Habitus is an agent's disposition due to family history, upbringing and/or experience. While it is not at the forefront of my hypotheses, they affect questions of how to approach institutional interaction, and this in effect guides food acquisition questions that are faced by students. Seemingly, the racialized and class effects of socio-historical and institutional interactions affect how the students navigate burdens, barriers, and alternative foodways. The maintenance of these food burdens and overcoming of said barriers, and navigations of foodways are affected heavily by a student's habitus which includes their socio-historical understandings of how they are supposed to interact with institutions (Maton 2012).

An example of how habitus is present here pertains to questions on whether to live in a dorm and obtain a meal plan for the first-generation traditional students. This is an economic burden, as it appears cheaper to live off campus; yet many students were motivated or without other option than to undergo this burden (42.98% of second wave students resided in a dormitory), for cultural or possibly familial motivations. This choice will motivate food options and responses to the questions within the hypotheses beyond just the "campskip" variable[19]. Questions such as distance to the grocery store, transportation, access to alternative food networks and many more will be affected. Further, habitus motivators of whether to live in a dorm demonstrates how the theory of practice is a formula, and habitus is only one piece of the formula which interacts with institutions. The first wave of research did not have this question as an option as there were no dorms available.

[19] Has the participant ever skipped a meal on campus because food options were outside the participants budget, see: figure 3 page 51.

As freshman dormitory living is now required, field is demonstrated here as there are many exemptions for student housing that are linked to the original conception of the university as one focused on providing access and resources to nontraditional students. Yet further evident in the artifact of the housing exemption form is the motivating shift towards a more traditional student population. Many of the options for exemption focuses but not limited to on living with a close immediate relative, age, marriage, or land ownership. However, recalled from earlier in my dissertation, students of color are much more likely to be financially independent at the start of University (Orozco and Cauthen 2009; Tuttle et al. 2005). The vastly disparate racial distribution of wealth demonstrates how the housing\land ownership statement is problematic and shows how race has been classed (Cahalan et al. 2019). This is linked to historical wage theft and land dispossession (Daniel 2013). Gender was not a social marker referred to heavily in this analysis, but, put simply: given that marriage is an option, and not financial independence from family (with home outside of parents), the marriage option genders the rhetoric of the exemption form and infantizes single adults. Living on campus further affects interactions with the food environment as it dictates time of on-campus food consumption. Night classes become strained as dining hours on most campuses end fairly early. In this way, unless the student goes off campus later in the evening and travels to a food location, their class options become limited.

This example of dormitories shows how the changing of a field can greatly impact the educational food practice of a student, which thus influences the overall educational practice. Different forms of capital are also present within the analysis, through the form of social capital, economic capital, and social capital. These capitals affect access to networks that may alleviate the burden of navigating the field of educational food practice. For instance, the variable

stretbud[20] requires social capital to establish communal food safety nets. The necessity to work is also dictated by capital, but also as shown in the analyses, capital does not singularly dictate practice. While working greatly aided ability to access and manage food burdens for nontraditional first-generation students, work did not significantly alter first generation traditional student access. This is further dictated by field, as entry level positions which are of access to younger generations such as the second wave, coupled with the generalized rise in cost of living and tuition and fees, creates a strain in economic capital accumulation. As a result, while work is a form of economic capital attainment that can possibly alleviate some students from skipping meals on campus, the overall educational food practice is much more complex and needs to consider the students habitus and field.

In sum, a student's educational food practice is comprised by a student's:

1. Habitus, which contains socially indoctrinated understandings of socio-historical and institutional interactions with the higher educational food system. This will affect how a student perceives their options and negotiations of food burdens and access. Also, how they decide to resist the trauma of these burdens while in school. For instance, seeking out alternative food networks, stretching their food budget amongst family and friends, or balancing longer work hours with studying.
2. Capital- Power and resources to obtain food, both economically, familial, culturally, temporally, and spatially. Power and resources to obtain food has been classed and raced due to national historical discrimination and expropriation of marginalized bodies. Alternative means of capital to obtain and negotiate food burdens are often relied upon.

[20] Does the participant ever share meals with family or close friends to stretch the food budget, see: figure 3 page 51.

3. Field, a semi-autonomous field that contains organizing principles of the organization that must be navigated to achieve the goal of obtaining enough food to survive the higher educational system until graduation. This field is also influenced by the larger social food field, which is then influenced by the larger overarching higher educational field, and contemporary social field. Major organizing principles of this field will be the food options at the university, primarily the cafeteria and vending machines. In terms of influence of larger social food structure, some organizing principles at play will be distance to closest food options. Some higher educational structures within the higher education field will be class times, access to meal plans, dormitories, access to university parking (which provides access to surrounding food options), dwindling student aid and rising tuition and fee costs. In terms of larger contemporary social structure, organizing principles will be the racial and classed negotiations of restaurant and grocery store locations of the university, the general country-wide rising cost of living, tuition and fees costs, public transportation access, and stagnant wages.

I believe that the [(HABITUS)(CAPITAL)] portion of the equation should not be ignored. There are multiple forms of capital, and its multiplicative interaction with habitus results in the understanding that in terms of practice: social understandings of cultural and institutional interactions and approaches to food ways will be greatly affected by a person's capital. For instance, a Latinx student may be culturally indoctrinated to the idea that in economically vulnerable times they are expected to stretch their food budget by sharing meals with their family. Yet, if that student moved to attend university, reliance on that family capital is likely stymied; thus, their internal workings will navigate them in another direction, relying or seeking out another form of capital.

From there is the field portion of the formula resulting in, [(HABITUS)(CAPITAL)]+FIELD. In sum, with the combination of habitus and capital comes the navigation of the field. For example, it may be culturally understood in a person's family that at 18 years of age a person should be fully independent, and that education is very important. An 18-year-old student, who does not have a lot of economic or familial capital, may wish to attend a university as a freshman, and they are required to stay in the dorms. Due to the state of the larger higher education field, they may depend on their student loans to cover their costs of attendance and living. The higher education food field then means that they navigate their food environment with the purchase and dependency on a meal card. Thus, utilizing that card and being sure to attend all cafeteria hours becomes important. Making other options in the field, such as other food holders (e.g. food trucks, food carts) that attend the university, not part of the way they accomplish their goal of obtaining enough food to survive the higher educational food system. If they discover their financial aid is not enough and work becomes a necessity, they may find it imperative to first seek a job on campus as a student worker, as they will then still be able to fully utilize their meal card.

From this we see the result of a theory of educational food practice which is: an individual's efforts to obtain food in a field of varied institutional foodscape barriers and burdens of higher education. These barriers and burdens are dictated by the individual's personal and socio-historical interactions with said institution. This navigation is further affected by the interaction of capital; not only to the development of the individual's habitus but also ability to interact and take full advantage of access to hurdles of said foodscape barriers and burdens. These interactions sum to the practice of navigation, negotiation, and hustling of food in order to

maintain caloric intake with the least possible negative effect on the overall higher educational endeavor.

5.2 Theoretical Applications

This dissertation provides insight to an often-overlooked issue in food security, which is the multi-institutional interactions that combine to create a food environment that must be navigated. This navigation is impacted by an actor's habitus and capital, but the interactions themselves are not divorced from the institutions' historical legacies of interactions. These understandings and legacies are linked to race, class, and gendered understandings of social organization. While there have been recent organizational publications focused on race that takes these interactions into account (Ray 2019; Reese 2019), the theoretical tools here can offer a greater intersectional application.

Reese's (2019) book, *Black Food Geographies,* foregrounds Black agency in a so-called "food desert." Despite the focus on the black body, many of her theoretical concepts are applicable here. The term 'food desert,' which is defined as "a low-income census tract where a substantial number or share of residents have low access to a supermarket or a grocery store" (Reese 2019:6), is actively resisted. This is a neutral term that perpetuates the status quo and begets humanitarians to aid in charity to food desert locations, offering support to "manage these symptoms" (Reese 2019:7). This aid does nothing to dismantle the structural causes of these conditions (Reese 2019). Further, 'food desert' is noted as conjuring images of nothingness, yet residents of food deserts manage to create and sustain food networks and communities (Reese 2019:9). As a result, 'food apartheid' is a more applicable term as it takes into consideration the "structural causes behind the condition" and considers "the exclusionary [(i.e. segregation and dispossession)] practices" that created the food environment (Reese 2019:7).

It is important to remember that while people are beginning to research these meso-level interactions and what that means for marginalized agents' navigation and creation of foodways, it is not a competition. With work on food apartheids, building upon each-others' theoretical framings in order to further food justice is the goal. When considering the physical navigation of the food landscape it is important to consider agency of the actor, and how this agency is constrained to spatialized and structural barriers (Reese 2019). A Bourdieuan framing allows for the theoretical space necessary for a diverse student body which considers an intersectional context of overlapping organizational navigation of these spatialized and structural barriers.

Reese (2019) considers time a social determinant of health that perpetuates disparities. This consideration of time as a value as well as a burden can be seen in my research. In the university context, time as a value and burden is evident, for instance consider the findings of the first analysis which analyzes the likelihood to skip a meal on campus when hungry due to budget constraints (table 3 page 60, table 4 page 63). Work for non-traditional students was a likely indicator that the student would not skip a meal. However, it was not an indicator for the second wave of students, despite 44.74% of those students working. Of these 44.74% of students working in the second wave, 21.94% work 20 or more hours a week. This shows that traditional first-generation students are in a vulnerable temporal position, as they are students who recently graduated high school with minimal work experience. Ones who do not have the familial ties to cover cost, or a full scholarship, then attend university under the expectation to either be shackled with debt the remainder of their days or work enough to cover the expenses. Linking again to the larger social context of stagnant financial aid and spiking tuition and fee costs (Cahalan et al. 2019). Also, these financial expectations are put upon their shoulders while they

are simultaneously infantized and forced to balance multiple social roles. Consider again the excerpt from chapter 2's field notes:

> *Excerpt from Reflection Five (Page 27)*
>
> *There were times I've seen students who hadn't ate and their blood sugar low. Asking if everything was ok their insistence was that they had food, just between school and work they hadn't time to eat. We would talk and laugh and reflect on similar experiences.*

This excerpt demonstrates how harmful these temporal exploitations can be to a person's physical and mental state. While the physical strain is in the forefront of the excerpt, hidden is the emotional strain that comes with it. The 'pull yourself up by the bootstraps' mentality, 'give it 110%,' yet what about when the student has no more to give? What about the mental anguish when failing their midterm because they hadn't had time to study? Or even more so, when they were so busy rushing from class to work to class, that they did not eat and was too hungry to concentrate in class?

Sample of Other-Write In Output
Other, please specify:
spiritual health
confidence
Finances (higher food costs)
Better quality food means better overall body health
Grades
social interaction
Only providing snacks is not helpful
Everything on list for me, physical, mental, moods/emotions, academic achievement sometimes too hungry to concentrate

Participant Response Distribution		
Answer	**%**	**Count**
Physical health	24.86%	92
Mental health	21.62%	80
Academic achievement	23.24%	86
Moods / emotions	21.89%	81

Other, please specify:	.05%	19
Total		370

Figure 6: Question: Q28 - Eating higher quality and healthier foods choices can impact: (Select all that apply) (See Appendix 1, page 96)

Consider the write-ins above (Figure 6 page 77), this is a survey question in the first wave of research which I did not use in the analyses. The question and options provided are seen in figure 6 (page 77). Students were offered the opportunity to check multiple boxes in what they felt eating higher quality and healthier food options impacted. These responses show how students understand there is a pathology of the body and institutional system relationship. Shown emotionally in fill ins of "social interaction," "confidence," and "spiritual health" and in system interactions in response of "grades," "finances (higher food costs)." Reese (2019) notes that in this pathology there is an awareness of negotiations that occur when considering system interaction and bodily awareness. Negotiations are comprised of cost versus burden, with sometimes agents choosing a higher cost food item due to the burden of acquisition. That is apparent here. Also, apparent, that sometimes the burden endured is a grade/lecture burden, as the write in points out: "Everything on list for me, physical, mental, moods/emotions, academic achievement sometimes too hungry to concentrate." This is a high cost to bear, especially when lectures are paid for as well.

5.2.1 Asset versus Deficiency

While the findings the theoretical framings unearth can be hard to read it should be remembered that this dissertation was not intended to yield poverty porn. As noted in Chapter 1 (page 1) poverty porn exoticizes the lower class, eliciting sympathy and outrage to higher echelons, often in an entertaining way (Brooker et al. 2015:1379). These feelings are not acted on to dismantle the system that created poverty, instead often perceptions of a 'culture of

poverty' is generated, which leads to a deterministic view of poverty and subsequent effects (Brooker et al. 2015; Lewis 1966). Poverty porn then, paints upon the participants (n) and population of study (N) ideologies of deficit, yet what we see in the analyses is that students are creating a place for food acquisition despite burden. Reese notes that amongst the hardship of food navigation is the concept of *place-making* which, in terms of foodscapes and foodways, is the acquiring of food and experiencing the community while doing so (Reese 2019:8). This is an important concept to consider as it is imperative to consider the active resistance to the environment these marginalized students endure.

The importance of considering *place-making* is key at two levels. First, by only focusing on the deficit and lack in the foodscape these marginalized students endure, and the hardship that follows, we are creating a label that becomes inscribed on the bodies of these students. This was pointed out by Reese (2019:44–46) in terms of Black agency and the problematic nature of the term "food desert"; this approach to deficit is applicable here too. As, by focusing only on the deficit, and the resulting failures which becomes inscribed on a student's body, we see the individualized 'college ramen days' as a rhetorical device in the larger myth-maintenance of the bootstraps model of American meritocracy.

In contrast, we have the second reason why focusing on place-making is important. By focusing on the place-making that is occurring, we can seek methods of empowerment. The data shows that students are already forming strategic community methods of sculpting their own foodways. While this may not be resistance in the form of active organizing and protest, we do see active resistance to the system. Sharing meals to stretch the budget, active interaction of and with the food system to find alternative methods to continue their educational goals, this is resistance.

What needs to be considered here is not these 'sad underprivileged students' and focus not on 'how awful their hunger is.' Instead, we need to consider how we can provide them with tools to further their resistance, to fight and subvert the trauma they are experiencing.

Policy Recommendation

Reflection Seven

I remember bawling my eyes out on the bus. Financial aid issues, as always. Every semester it was a new surprise. Of course, I managed to figure it out, like always. Another loan here, an extra hustle there, there was always a way.

I remember working in hot kitchens and going to school. I remember my mom, someone who lived and breathed the mantra of working through sickness, walking into the emergency room with a look I had never seen before. "Is she scared?" I couldn't believe it was possible. I turned a simple cough into a chest infection, the infection I made even worse by my refusal to take days off. "Oh, refusal or that I could not?" How entwined capitalistic exploitation and grit ideology is.

Now I look back and where did my 20s go? It's a good thing starting professors make a lot of money or all that hardship wouldn't have been worth it. Oh…wait…

I guess that's not the point, but then what is the point? What is the point of my higher education? I remember the pride of that hardship, that grit. I did it and no one can ever take that from me. But also, I remember when I bawled my eyes out on the bus, sitting there surrounded by people, feeling completely alone. That isolation was something I felt constantly while trying to balance all that was required of me at university. Yet on the bus, in that moment, the isolation welled up and struck me all at once. The constant isolation and vulnerability hurt more than any of the degradation that occurred while at University. I always felt like I was alone on a tight-rope over a canyon, and at any moment I would fall. I remember the confidence I had when I first started my undergraduate degree, I was so fearless. Looking back those days are long gone. 10 years in a White space will do that to you, I guess.

Maybe the point is to do everything I can to help students not feel alone anymore? To not feel so vulnerable? To help them not endure those constant fears and tightropes I walked.

Maybe the point of all this is so that the next time I find out a student hasn't eaten in over a day more can be done than just giving them a handful of chocolates and laughing with them in feigned nostalgia about the trauma she's enduring?

University of Texas has recently unveiled plans to offer tuition waivers for students whose family makes less than $65,000 a year (Romo and Mcinerny 2019). I learned this in July, when a National Public Radio (NPR) article began trending on my social media account (Romo

and Mcinerny 2019). I was already steeped in my data and theoretical framings at this point and distinctly remember rolling my eyes. There are a lot more costs to university than tuition. This is a salve but does not heal the wound.

This dissertation shows how there is much more to the burden of university than tuition costs. There are several spatial and temporal issues to consider, further what about students whose expected family contribution is higher than $65,000 but are financially independent? Even taking the expected family contribution out of the equation, there is still the issue of food, technology needs, transportation costs, housing costs, and many more; there are several living needs that must be met while attending university. These living needs must be met during a temporally and economically vulnerable time period. I will not pretend to have a solution to many of the burdens unearthed in this dissertation. However, I do believe we can build upon the place-making assets visible in this dissertation.

This policy recommendation is modeled after the legal advocacy that led to the largely successful organizing of the Coalition of Low-Wage and Immigrant Worker Advocates (CLIWA), which aimed for "a standard for wages, working conditions, and the right to organize" (Garea and Stern 2010:125). While car-washing advocacy may seem unrelated to higher educational food justice I believe this is highly applicable. The progression from a litigation model to a greater community-based model has many overarching themes to what many higher educational food initiatives face.

When lawyers began advocating for car-wash employees they did so through a litigation model which considered individual claims and is focused on "remedying past wrongs" or "preventing future wrongs" (Garea and Stern 2010:127). However by following this approach, clients serve a passive role, with the voice of lawyers favored (Garea and Stern 2010). This

power dynamic is similar to the administrator/student dynamic of interactions in educational food initiatives. Students have little power, as administrators negotiate with other administrators and professors, delegate grant money and research programs that they think will be the most effective for students. This continues the infantilization and deficit inscription on marginalized student bodies. Furthermore, these initiatives are meant to build and aid students in the future, but students in present are negotiating and navigating the foodscape. Building upon the present would have greater immediate impact.

When considering the future versus the present, these advocates found that they needed to nourish and teach skills necessary to fight back and solve problems, while taking into greater consideration broad inequities and abuse (Garea and Stern 2010). Similarly, if we move from an initiative model into a community-based model, we can promote student political agency and build upon the place-making already occurring. By involving students in the following steps, which are taken directly from Garea and Stern's (2010:127) writing on CLIWA advocacy, I believe higher educational community food efforts can better address the caloric needs of students:

1. Legislative advocacy
2. Organize to achieve large scale university solutions
3. Collaboration and constant communication with a network of food researchers and activists.
4. Administrative commitment to permanent change.
5. Unionization of students to empower them and provide voice.
6. Program monitoring and enforcement.

(Garea and Stern 2010:127)

The first step, legislative advocacy, should be taught and intricate to course work. By providing courses that require policy investigations and recommendations we provide tools to understand legislative actions. This cannot stop with course work, there should a community food assembly within the university comprised of both students and administrators. Their purpose should be to identify and advocate for community food, caloric, and nutritional needs of students at a broad university scale. For instance, subsidizing cafeteria costs. This is also a part of step two, but step two should be open to voices outside the community food assembly.

Step two also allows students to learn how to investigate and develop grant proposals to fund university solutions. The university solutions priority can be decided upon through various means, evaluation of community applicability and voting are only two of the way's priority can be decided upon. I stress that this is not a one solution issue, and there needs to be multiple community food endeavors in order to address the varied needs of students. Some recommendations and different needs that are met can be seen in table 7 (page 83).

In order to implement these solutions networking with other food researchers and activists (step 3), i.e. the city's food council, is imperative. Furthermore, administrators need to be committed to change (step 4), even in the face of revenue or bid loss from food vendors. Accountability of the university for this commitment can be maintained by unionizing students, which will further their empowerment and provide voice to their needs (step 5). Finally, higher educational community food efforts should be annually reviewed at the minimum by an outside entity (i.e. city's food counsel), administrative entity, and a student entity, in order to allow transparency and continued accountability and function.

Activity	Community Building	Immediate Food Outcome	Sustainability	Likely to have food/knowledge returns	Low-Med-High temporal investment
Community garden	X		X	X	High
Community meals (potluck style)	X	X	X	X	Med
Car share for grocery-store app	X	X			Low
Food pantry		X			Medium

Table 7: Comparison of food action recommendations.

Reflection Eight

"What now?" I thought. Graduate school aside I had been slowly putting this dissertation together for years. It wasn't an astonishing life changing paper, in fact all I could think about were parts I wanted to change or rewrite. Of course, I'd do that forever if given the chance. No, this wasn't an amazing dissertation, but it was done, and weird excitement filled me. Bold! That's how I felt! I felt bold! I also felt weird. Out of place.

"So… I just send my conclusion to my chair then? Finish my edits, and defend?" I thought. There must be some better way to end this, a line of knowledge, a quote. "Oh a quote! To signify the end of a chapter of my life, to signify new beginnings!" I thought excitedly.

I went to Esmeralda Santiago's book, she was canon I looked up to and whose life I have always been in awe of. So many nights as a child I stayed up, head nodding, fighting off sleep, just a few more pages. "Her." I would think slipping into sleep, "I want to be like her." Her autobiography ended with her finishing school as well, what were the last words of that?

> *"I had forgotten the Puerto Rican saying that Tata muttered in our direction whenever we boasted about something we had done: Aláte pollo, que mañana te guisan. Boast now, chicken, tomorrow you'll be stew"(Santiago 2004:337).*

"Oh," I chuckled, "yeah, I guess now I get to look forward to defending this." I think I'll make good caldo.

WORKS CITED

Adams, James Truslow. 1955. *The Epic of America 1931*. Boston:Little.

Alkon, Alison Hope, and Julian Agyeman. 2011. *Cultivating Food Justice : Race, Class, and Sustainability*. MIT Press.

Artiles, Alfredo J. 2013. "Untangling the Racialization of Disabilities An Intersectionality Critique Across Disability Models 1." *Du Bois Review* 10(2):329–47.

Atchison, Doug. 2006. *Akeelah and the Bee*. USA: Lionsgate.

Au, Wayne. 2016. "Meritocracy 2.0: High-Stakes, Standardized Testing as a Racial Project of Neoliberal Multiculturalism." *Educational Policy* 30(1):39–62.

Avildsen, John. 1989. *Lean on Me*. USA: Warner Bros. Pictures.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bowl, Marion. 2001. "Experiencing the Barriers: Non-Traditional Students Entering Higher Education." *Research Papers in Education* 16(2):141–60.

Brock, Thomas. 2010. *Young Adults and Higher Education: Barriers and Breakthroughs to Success*. Vol. 20.

Brody, Gene H., Tianyi Yu, Gregory E. Miller, Katherine B. Ehrlich, and Edith Chen. 2018. "John Henryism Coping and Metabolic Syndrome among Young Black Adults." *Psychosomatic Medicine* 80(2):216–21.

Brooker, Phil, John Vines, Selina Sutton, Julie Barnett, Tom Feltwell, and Shaun Lawson. 2015. "Debating Poverty Porn on Twitter." *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '15* 3177–86.

Bruening, Meg, Stephanie Brennhofer, Irene van Woerden, Michael Todd, and Melissa Laska.

2016. “Factors Related to the High Rates of Food Insecurity among Diverse, Urban College Freshmen.” *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics* 116(9):1450–57.

Cady, Clare L. 2014. “Food Insecurity as a Student Issue.” *Journal of College and Character* 15(4).

Cahalan, M., L. W. Perna, M. Yamashita, J. Wright-Kim, and N. Jiang. 2019. *Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States: Historical Trend Report.* D.C., Washington.

Carbado, Devon W., Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Vickie M. Mays, and Barbara Tomlinson. 2019. “INTERSECTIONALITY Mapping the Movements of a Theory 1.” *Du Bois Review* 10(2):303–12.

Chavez, Leo R. (Leo Ralph). 2013. *The Latino Threat : Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. 2nd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Choo, Hae Yeon, and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. “Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities.” *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129–49.

Coleman-Jensen, Alisha, Christian A. Gregory, and Matthew P. Rabbitt. 2019. “USDA ERS - Survey Tools.” *USDA*. Retrieved September 2, 2019 (https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#guide).

Coleman-Jensen, Alisha, Matthew P. Rabbitt, Christian A. Gregory, and Anita Singh. 2017. *United States Department of Agriculture Household Food Security in the United States in 2016*.

Coletu, Ebony E. A. 2018. “Funding the American Dream: On the Biographic Mediation of Aid and Institutional Change in Horatio Alger Scholarship Narratives.” *Autobiography Studies* 33(1):83–108.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1992. *The Way We Never Were : American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics [1989].” *University of Chicago Legal Forum F 139* 139–68.

Crenshaw, Williams. 1988. “Toward a Race-Conscious Pedagogy in Legal Education.” *National Black Law Jouirnal* 11(1):1–14.

Crossley, Nick. 2012. “Social Class.” Pp. 85–97 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenfall. Durham: Acumen.

Daniel, Pete. 2013. *Dispossession : Discrimination Against African American Farmers in the Age of Civil Rights*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Daniels, Lee. 2009. *Precious*. USA: Lionsgate.

Deer, Cécile. 2012. “Doxa.” Pp. 114–25 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts,* edited by M. Grenfall. Durham: Acumen.

Devine-Eller, Audrey. 2005. “Rethinking Bourdieu on Race: A Critical Review of Cultural Capital and Habitus in the Sociology of Education Qualitative Literature.” *Rutgers University* 28:1–26.

Engle, Jennifer, and Vincent Tinto. 2008. *Moving Beyond Access College Success for Low-Income, First Generation Students*. Washington, D.C.: Pell Institute. http://www.pellinstitute.org/publications-Moving_Beyond_Access_2008.shtml

Eric Vittinghoff, Stephen C. Shiboski, David V. Glidden, Charles E. McCulloch. 2005. *Regression Methods in Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival, and Repeated Measures Models*. edited by W. W. Gail, M., Krickeberg K., Samet J., Tsiatis A. San Francisco.

Famuyiwa, Rick. 2015. *Dope*. USA: Open Road Films, Stage 6 Films.

Feagin, Joe R. 2013. *The White Racial Frame : Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Fletcher, Anne. 2006. *Step Up*. USA: Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures.

Freudenberg, Nicholas, Luis Manzo, Hollie Jones, Amy Kwan, Emma Tsui, and Monica Gagnon. 2011. *Food Insecurity at CUNY: Results from a Survey of CUNY Undergraduate Students A Report from: The Campaign for a Healthy CUNY*. New York. https://www.gc.cuny.edu/cuny_gc/media/cuny-graduate-center/pdf/centers/center%20for%20human%20environments/cunyfoodinsecurity.pdf

Gardner, Susan K. 2013. "The Challenges of First-Generation Doctoral Students." *NEW DIRECTIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION* 2013(163):43–54.

Gardner, Susan K., and Karri A. Holley. 2011. "Those invisible barriers are real": The Progression of First-Generation Students Through Doctoral Education." *Equity and Excellence in Education* 44(1):77–92.

Garea, Sustan, and Sasha Alexandra Stern. 2010. "From Legal Advocacy to Organizing: Progressive Lawyering and the Los Angeles Car Wash Campaign." Pp. 125–40 in *Working For Justice: The L.A. Model of ORganizing and Advocacy*, edited by R. Milkman, J. Bloom, and V. Narro. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Golden, Noah Asher. 2017. "There's Still That Window That's Open": The Problem With "Grit"." *Urban Education* 52(3):343–69.

Gonzales, Manuel. 2009. *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States - Manuel G. Gonzales - Google Books*. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gorski, Paul C. 2016. "Poverty and the Ideological Imperative: A Call to Unhook from Deficit and Grit Ideology and to Strive for Structural Ideology in Teacher Education." *Journal of*

Education for Teaching 42(4):378–86.

Grenfell, Michael. 2012. *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*. 2nd ed. edited by M. Grenfall. Bristol: Acumen.

Hardy, Cheryl. 2012. “Social Space.” Pp. 229–49 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenfall. Durham: Acumen.

Harper, DJ, and E. Speed. 2012. "Uncovering Recovery: The Resistible Rise of Recovery and Resilience." *Studies in Social Justice,* Special Issue on the Politics of resilience and recovery in mental health care, [In press].

Harris, Angela P. 1990. “Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory.” *Standord Law Review* 42(3):463–527.

Harris, Kate Lockwood. 2016. “Reflexive Voicing: A Communicative Approach to Intersectional Writing.” *Qualitative Research* 16(1):111–27.

Hausmann, Leslie R. M., C. Kent Kwoh, Michael J. Hannon, and Said A. Ibrahim. 2013. “Perceived Racial Discrimination in Health Care and Race Differences in Physician Trust.” *Race and Social Problems* 2013(5):113-120.

Higgins, Marissa. 2016. “The 11 Best Ways To Make Ramen In Your College Dorm Room, According To Reddit.” *Bustle*. Retrieved November 3, 2019 (https://www.bustle.com/articles/180632-the-11-best-ways-to-make-ramen-in-your-college-dorm-room-according-to-reddit).

Ihamon, W.T., Jr. 1976. “Horatio Alger and American Modernism: The One-Dimensional Social Formula.” *American Studies* 17(2):11–27.

IMDb. 2019a. “Akeelah and the Bee (2006) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMBd.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0437800/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019b. “Dangerous Minds (1995) - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0112792/?ref_=nv_sr_1).

IMDb. 2019c. “Dope (2015) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMBd.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt3850214/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019d. “Drumline (2002) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0303933/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019e. “Lean on Me (1989) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMBd.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0097722/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019f. “Precious (2009) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0929632/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019g. “Stand and Deliver (1988) - Plot Summary - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0094027/plotsummary).

IMDb. 2019h. “Step Up (2006) - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0462590/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1).

IMDb. 2019i. “Stomp the Yard (2007) - IMDb.” *IMDb.Com*. Retrieved February 8, 2019 (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0775539/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1).

Jazeel, Tariq, and Colin Mcfarlane. 2007. “Responsible Learning: Cultures of Knowledge Production and the North-South Divide.” *Antipode* 39(5):781–89.

Katznelson, Ira. 2005. *When Affirmative Action Was White : An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

King, Deborah K. 1988. “Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology.” *Signs* 14(1):42–72.

Kwon, Hye Won. 2018. “The Sociology of Grit: Cross-Cultural Approaches to Social

Stratification." PhD dissertation, Doctor of Philosophy, University of Iowa.

Langrehr, Kimberly J., Julia C. Phillips, Alexis Melville, and Koun Eum. 2015. "Determinants of Nontraditional Student Status: A Methodological Review of the Research." *College Student Development* 56(8):876–81.

Lawton, Anne. 2015. "The Meritocracy Myth and The Illusion of Equal Employment Opportunity." *Minnesota Law Review* 85(1):587–659.

Lewis, O. 1966. "The Culture of Poverty." *Scientific American* 215(4):19–25.

Marsden, Madonna. 1992. "The American Myth of Success: Visions and Revisions." Pp. 134–48 in *Popular Culture: An Introductory Text*, edited by J. Nachbar and K. Lause. Madison: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

Maton, Karl. 2012. "Habitus." Pp. 48–65 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenhell. Durham: Acumen.

Matus-Grossman, Lisa, and Susan Gooden. 2002. *Opening Doors: Student's Perspectives on Juggling Work, Family, and College*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. https://www.mdrc.org/publication/opening-doors-students-perspectives-juggling-work-family-and-college.

Maxwell, Simon, and Marisol Smith. 1992. "Household Food Security: A Conceptual Review." *Household food security: Concepts, indicators, measurements 1992 (1):1-72.*

Mcguire, Patricia D. 2010. "Exploring Resilience and Indigenous Ways of Knowing." *A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health* 8(2):117–31.

Mcnamara Horvat, Erin. 2003. "The Interactive Effects of Race and Class in Educational Research: Theoretical Insights from the Work of Pierre Bourdieu." *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education* 2(1).

McNamee, Stephen. 2013. *The Meritocracy Myth*. Third. edited by S. Stanton, C. Hansen, and K. Lyons. Lanham: Rowman & Little Field.

McQueeney, Krista, and Kristen M. Lavelle. 2017. "Emotional Labor in Critical Ethnographic Work: In the Field and Behind the Desk." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 46(1):81–107.

Menendez, Ramon. 1988. *Stand and Deliver*. USA: Warner Bros.

Montoya, Roberto, Cheryl E. Matias, Naomi W. M. Nishi, and Geneva L. Sarcedo. 2016. "Words Are Wind: Using Du Bois and Bourdieu to 'Unveil' the Capricious Nature of Gifted and Talented Programs." *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* 14(1):127–43.

Moore, Rob. 2012. "Capital." Pp. 98–113 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenfall. Durham: Acumen.

Morales, Alfonso. 2011. "Growing Food and Justice: Dismantling Racism through Sustainable Food Systems." in *Growing Food Justice: Race, Class, and Sustainability*, edited by A. H. Alkon and J. Agyeman. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Musu-Gillette, L., C. de Brey, J. McFarland, W. Hussar, W. Sonnenberg, and S. Wilkinson-Flicker. 2017. *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2017*.

Musu-Gillette, L., J. Robinson, J. McFarland, A. KewalRamani, A. Zhang, and S. Wilkinson-Flicker. 2016. *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2016*.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2017. "Digest of Education Statistics, 2016 - Chapter 3: Postsecondary Education." *NCES*. Retrieved October 24, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/ch_3.asp).

NCES. 2019. "The Condition of Education - Postsecondary Education - Postsecondary Students -

Postbaccalaureate Enrollment - Indicator May (2019).” *National Center for Educational Statistics*. Retrieved June 13, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_chb.asp).

NCES QuickStats. 2014. “QuickStats.” *U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved November 3, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/Datalab/QuickStats/Output).

Nierenberg, Danielle. 2016. “Food Tank Washington, DC Summit 2016 - Opening Keynote: Karen Washington - YouTube.” Retrieved November 2, 2019 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EEAHU56Q3wo).

Orbe, P. Mark. 2004. “Negotiating Multiple Identities Within Multiple Frames: An Analysis of First-Generation College Students.” *Communication Education* 53(2):131–49.

Orozco, Viany, and Nancy Cauthen. 2009. *Work Less, Study More, & Succeed*. Demos: Postsecdary Success Series. New York: Demos. https://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/WorkLessStudyMore_Demos.pdf.

Paz-Amor, Windy. 2015. “Damned If You Do-Damned If You Don’t: A Queer Woman of Color’ s Journey of Trauma, Agency, and Leadership.” PhD dissertation, Doctor of Education, University of Vermont.

Petty, Tanjula. 2014. “Motivating First-Generation Students To Academic Success and College Completion.” *College Student Journal* 48(1):133–40.

Pyne, Kimberly B., and Darris R. Means. 2013. “Underrepresented and in/Visible: A Hispanic First-Generation Student’s Narratives of College.” *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 6(3):186–98.

Ray, Victor. 2019. “A Theory of Racialized Organizations.” *American Sociological Review* 84(1):26–53.

Reese, Ashanté M. 2019. *Black Food Geographies : Race, Self-Reliance, and Food Access in Washington, D.C.*Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press

Ris, Ethan W. 2015. "Grit: A Short History of a Useful Concept." *Journal of Educational Controversy* 10(1):1–18.

Robbins, Derek. 2012. "Theory of Practice." Pp. 26–43 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenfall. Durham: Berne Convention.

Roberts, Dorothy, and Sujatha Jesudason. 2013. "Movement Intersectionality: The Case of Race, Gender, Disability, and Genetic Technologies." *Du Bois Review* 10(2):313–28.

Romo, Vanessa, and Claire Mcinerny. 2019. "University of Texas-Austin To Offer Free Tuition For In-State Students In 2020 : NPR." Retrieved October 23, 2019 (https://www.npr.org/2019/07/10/740387601/university-of-texas-austin-promises-free-tuition-for-low-income-students-in-2020).

Santiago, Esmeralda. 2004. *The Turkish Lover*. Cambridge: A Merloyd Lawrence Book, Da Capo Priss.

Smith. 1995. *Dangerous Minds*. United States: Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Stebleton, Michael J., and Krista M. Soria. 2012. "Breaking Down Barriers: Academic Obstacles of First-Generation Students at Research Universities." *The Learning Assistance Review* 17(2):7–20.

Stefkovich, Jacqueline A., and Terrence Leas. 1994. "A Legal History of Desegregation in Higher Education." *Journal of Negro Education* 63(3):406.

Stone III, Charles. 2002. *Drumline*. USA: 20th Century Studios.

Swidler, Ann. 1986. “Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies.” *American Sociological Review* 51(2):273–86.

Telles, Edward Eric, and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion : Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Thomson, Patricia. 2012. “Field.” Pp. 65–82 in *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by M. Grenfell. Durham: Acumen.

Tuttle, Tina, Jeff Mckinney, and Melanie Rago. 2005. *College Students Working: The Choice Nexus*. Indiana Project On Academic Success. Bloomington: Indiana Project on Academic Success Smith Center for Research.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. 2018. "FAST FACTS Enrollment Question: Do You Have Information on Postsecondary Enrollment Rates?" https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98

Vandsburger, Etty, Marcia Harrigan, and Marilyn Biggerstaff. 2008. “We Make It: Themes of Stress and Resiliency as Told by Women in Families Living in Poverty.” *Journal of Family Social Work* 11(1):17–35.

Villenas, Sofia, and Donna Deyhle. 2015. “Curriculum Inquiry Critical Race Theory and Ethnographies Challenging the Stereotypes: Latino Families, Schooling, Resilience and Resistance.” 29(4):413–43.

White, Sylvain. 2007. *Stomp the Yard*. USA: Sony Pictures Entertainment Motion Picture Group.

Williams, Patricia J. 1991. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Winer, Langdon. 1996. “Do Artifcats Have Politics.” Pp. 28–40 in *The Social Shaping of Technology*, edited by D. Makenzie and J. Wajcman. Ballmoor: Open University Press.

Yu, Tianlong. 2006. “Challenging the Politics of the ‘Model Minority’ Stereotype: A Case for Educational Equality.” *Equity and Excellence in Education* 39(4):325–33.

APPENDIX ONE: SURVEY QUESTIONS[21]

[21] Due to the collaborative nature of this research project only questions specifically dealing with my dissertation were included. Survey was also cleaned of geo-identifiers.

Q8 What is your birth date?

_____

Q9 What is your age?

_____

Q10 Are you

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Other (3)

Q11 Which of the following best describes you?

- White (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- Hispanic (3)
- Asian (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
- American Indian or Native Alaskan (6)
- Mixed race (7)
- Other (8)

Q12 Are you a

- Freshman (1)
- Sophomore (2)
- Junior (3)
- Senior (4)
- Other (5)

Q14 What is your marital status

- ○ Single / Never married (1)
- ○ Married (2)
- ○ Divorced or separated (3)
- ○ Widowed (4)
- ○ Cohabiting (5)

Q15 Do you live with any children under the age of 18?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Skip To: Q16 If Do you live with any children under the age of 18? = Yes
Skip To: Q17 If Do you live with any children under the age of 18? = No

---

Q16 How many?

- ○ 1 (1)
- ○ 2 (2)
- ○ 3 (3)
- ○ 4 or more (4)

Q17 Do you live in the dorm on campus?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Skip To: Q19 If Do you live in the dorm on campus? = Yes

Skip To: Q18 If Do you live in the dorm on campus? = No

Q18 Which of these describe where you live? (mark all that apply)

- ☐ On my own (1)
- ☐ With my parents or other adult family members (2)
- ☐ With my spouse or partner (3)
- ☐ With a roommate (4)
- ☐ I am temporarily staying with family or friends (couch surfing or house hopping)? (5)
- ☐ I don't currently have a residence or am homeless (6)

Q19 Have you every skipped a meal because campus food options are outside of your budget?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Q20 Which of these best describe your employment?

- ○ I am not employed (1)
- ○ On average, I work 40 or more hours per week (2)
- ○ On average, I work between 20 and 40 hours per week (3)
- ○ On average, I work less than 20 hours per week (4)

Q21 We would like to know more about your job. Check all that apply:

- [ ] My job is strenuous requiring lifting, pulling, carrying throughout your shift. (1)
- [ ] There is no air conditioner where I work and it gets hot in the summer. (2)
- [ ] I work outside or around stoves or other things that produce heat. (3)
- [ ] I stand through most of my shift. (4)
- [ ] I am able to sit through most of my shift. (5)
- [ ] Often at my job, a shift is longer than 6 hours and I am not guaranteed at least 1 five minute break. (6)
- [ ] I often am able to work on school work at my job. (7)
- [ ] When I leave work I often feel exhausted, dehydrated, and hungry (8)
- [ ] When I leave my work all I can think about is sleep (9)
- [ ] When I leave my work, I am tired, but not dehydrated or hungry. (10)
- [ ] When I leave my work I am not tired and look forward to the rest of the day. (11)

End of Block: Who Are You?

Start of Block: Proximity to Immigration

Start of Block: Optional Preliminary

Q25 These next questions are about the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months, since September of last year and whether you were able to afford the food you need.

Q26 Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months:

- ○ We have enough but not the kinds of food we want (1)
- ○ Sometimes we don't have enough to eat (2)
- ○ Often we don't have enough to eat (3)
- ○ We always have enough of the kinds of food we want (4)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (5)

Skip To: Q27 If Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months: = Often we don't have enough to eat

Skip To: End of Block If Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months: = We always have enough of the kinds of food we want

Skip To: Q27 If Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months: = Sometimes we don't have enough to eat

Skip To: Q28 If Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months: = We have enough but not the kinds of food we want

Skip To: End of Block If Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months: = Don't know or refuse to answer

Q27 Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell us if that is a reason why you don't always have enough to eat.

- [ ] Not enough money for food (1)
- [ ] Too hard to get to the store (2)
- [ ] On a diet (3)
- [ ] No working stove available (4)
- [ ] Not able to cook or eat because of health problems (5)

Skip To: End of Block If Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell us if... = Not enough money for food

Skip To: End of Block If Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell us if... = On a diet

Skip To: End of Block If Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell us if... = No working stove available

Skip To: End of Block If Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell us if... = Not able to cook or eat because of health problems

Q28 Here are some reasons why people don't always have the kinds of food they want or need. For each one, please tell us if that is a reason why you don't always have the kinds of food you want or need.

- ○ Not enough money for food (1)
- ○ Too hard to get to the store (2)
- ○ On a diet (3)
- ○ Kinds of food we want not available (4)
- ○ Good quality food not available (5)

End of Block: Optional Preliminary

Start of Block: Household Stage I

Q29 Now you will read several statements that people have made about their food situation. For these statements, please tell us whether the statement was often true, sometimes true, or never true for you or your household in the last 12 months.

Q30 “I worried whether our food would run out before we got money to buy more.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

- Often true (1)
- Sometimes true (2)
- Never true (3)
- Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q31 “The food that we bought just didn’t last, and we didn’t have money to get more.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

- Often true (1)
- Sometimes true (2)
- Never true (3)
- Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q32 “We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the past 12 months?

- ○ Often true (1)
- ○ Sometimes true (2)
- ○ Never true (3)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

End of Block: Household Stage I

Start of Block: Screener for Stage 2 Adult-Referenced Questions

Q33 In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

Skip To: Q34 If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals... = Yes

Skip To: Q35 If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals... = No

Skip To: Q35 If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals... = Don't know

Q34 How often did this happen - almost every month, some months but not every month, or only 1 or 2 months?

- ○ Almost every month (1)
- ○ Some months but not every month (2)
- ○ Only 1 or 2 months (3)
- ○ Don't know (4)

Q35 In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

Q36 In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

Q37 In the last 12 months, did you lose weight because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

End of Block: Screener for Stage 2 Adult-Referenced Questions

---

Start of Block: Screener for Stage 3 Adult-Referenced Questions

Q38 In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

Skip To: Q39 If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever not eat for a whole day bec... = Yes

Skip To: End of Block If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever not eat for a whole day bec... = No

Skip To: End of Block If In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever not eat for a whole day bec... = Don't know

Q39 How often did this happen?

- ○ Almost every month (1)
- ○ Some months but not every month (2)
- ○ Only 1 or 2 months (3)
- ○ Don't know (4)

End of Block: Screener for Stage 3 Adult-Referenced Questions

Start of Block: Child Stage 1

Q40 Are there any children in your household?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (3)

Skip To: Q41 If Are there any children in your household? = Yes

Skip To: Q50 If Are there any children in your household? = No

Skip To: Q50 If Are there any children in your household? = Don't know or refuse to answer

Q41 Now you are going to read several statements that people have made about the food situation of their children. For these statements, please tell us whether the statement was OFTEN true, SOMETIMES true, or NEVER true in the last 12 months for your child or children living in the household who are under 18 years old

Q42 “We relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed the children because we were running out of money to buy food.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

- ○ Often true (1)
- ○ Sometimes true (2)
- ○ Never true (3)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q43 “We couldn’t feed the children a balanced meal because we couldn’t afford that.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

- ○ Often true (1)
- ○ Sometimes true (2)
- ○ Never true (3)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q44 "The children were not eating enough because we just couldn’t afford enough food.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

- ○ Often true (1)
- ○ Sometimes true (2)
- ○ Never true (3)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q45 In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of any of the children's meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (3)

Q46 In the last 12 months, did any of the children ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (3)

Skip To: Q47 If In the last 12 months, did any of the children ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money... = Yes

Skip To: Q48 If In the last 12 months, did any of the children ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money... = No

Skip To: Q48 If In the last 12 months, did any of the children ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money... = Don't know or refuse to answer

Q47 How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only one or two months?

- ○ Almost every month (1)
- ○ Some months but not every month (2)
- ○ Only 1 or 2 months (3)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (4)

Q48 In the last 12 months, were the children ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (3)

Q49 In the last 12 months, did any of the children ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know or refuse to answer (3)

Q50 In the last 12 months, did you or any member of your household receive benefits from: (check all that apply)

- ☐ Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC) (1)
- ☐ Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamps) (2)

Q51 In the last month, how many times did you or anyone in your family get food from any of the following? (Select all that apply):

	Never (1)[22]	1 to 3 times (2)	4 or more times (3)
Church (1)	☐	☐	☐
Community Garden or Farmers Market (2)	☐	☐	☐
Fast food restaurant (3)	☐	☐	☐
Sit down restaurant (4)	☐	☐	☐
Food bank, food pantry or soup kitchen (5)	☐	☐	☐
University or school cafeteria (6)	☐	☐	☐
Senior meal/home delivery (7)	☐	☐	☐

[22] This survey question data was manipulated in statistical analysis to make wave 1 and wave 2 compatable.

Q52 Do you ever share meals with friends or family so you can save money or stretch your grocery budget?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Q53 What is your primary transportation to purchase groceries or food items?

- ○ Personal car (1)
- ○ Public transportation (bus etc.) (2)
- ○ Walk (3)
- ○ Bike (4)
- ○ Get a ride from family or friends (5)
- ○ Other, please specify: (6) _____

Q54 How long does it take to travel to the place where you usually buy groceries?

- ○ 0 -5 minutes (1)
- ○ 5 –10 minutes (2)
- ○ 10 –20 minutes (3)
- ○ 20 –30 minutes (4)
- ○ 30–45 minutes (5)
- ○ More than 45 minutes (6)

End of Block: Child Stage 1

Start of Block: Instruct 3

First Wave Specific:

Q28 **Eating higher quality and healthier foods choices can impact:**
(Select all that apply)

- ☐ Physical health (1)
- ☐ Mental health (2)
- ☐ Academic achievement (3)
- ☐ Moods / emotions (4)
- ☐ Other, please specify: (5) _____

APPENDIX TWO: CODE BOOK

CODEBOOK

QID9_TEXT=age

QID9_Text =Gender
Changed variable gender in excel
male =0
female =1

QID11 = race

1 =Black
2 =Asian Pacific Islander
3 =Hispanic/Latinx
4 =Multi-Racial
5 =Native American/American Indian
6 =White
7 =Other

QID12 = hiedulvl

higher edu class status
1 = freshman
2= softmore
3= junior
4= senior
5= graduate or professional
6= continuing edu

QID14= marriage

1= single/nevermarried
2=cohabitating
3=married
4=seperated
5=divorced
6=widowed

QID16= numchild

number of children in household
0=0
1=1
2=2
3=3
4=4 or more

QID17 = dorm
do you live in a dorm on campus
no=0
yes= 1

QID18

living situation
turned into two variables
relative = parents/gardian/other relatives
and
sigother =with spouse or partner

relative
1=yes
0=no

sigother
1=yes
0=no

QID20=campskip
skipping food on campus because too expensive
1=yes
0=no

QID19=employed
hours worked per week on average
0 = I am not employed
3= On average, I work 40 or more hours per week
2= On average, I work between 20 and 40 hours per week
1= On average, I work less than 20

work
created new variable
0= I am not employed
1+2+3 = working

QID21 = workexhaust
created scale
sum all

0=no job

2= My job is strenuous requiring lifting, pulling, carrying throughout your shift.

2= There is no air conditioner where I work and it gets hot in the summer

2= I work outside or around stoves or other things that produce heat

2= I stand through most of my shift

2=I am able to sit through most of my shift

2=Often at my job, a shift is longer than 6 hours and I am not guaranteed at least 1 five minute break.

1= I often am able to work on school work at my job

2= When I leave work I often feel exhausted, dehydrated, and hungry

2= When I leave my work all i can think about is sleep

1= When I leave my work, I am tired, but not dehydrated or hungry

1= When I leave my work I am not tired and look forward to the rest of the day.

QID26 = screenerFS
1 = We have enough but not the kinds of food we want
2= Sometimes we don't have enough to eat
3= Often we don't have enough to eat
4= We always have enough of the kinds of food we want
9= Don't know or refuse to answer

QID27=screenerFS2
1=not enough money for food
2= too hard to get to the store
3=on a diet
4=no working stove available
5=not able to cook or eat because of health problem
9=Don't know or refuse to answer

QID28=screenerFS3
1=not enough money for food
2=too hard to get to the store
3= on a diet
4= kinds of food we want not available
5=good quality food not available

QID30=Q2S1FS

House hold stage 1 Food Security q2

1= often true
1= sometimes true
0 never true
.= don't know or refuse to answer

QID31 = Q3S1FS
House hold stage 1 food security q3
1= often true
1= sometimes true
0 = never true
. =don't know refuse to answer

QID32= Q4S1FS
House hold stage 1 food security q4

1= often true
1= sometimes true

0= never true
. = don't know or refuse to answer

QID33= Q8S2FS
HS S2 FS q 8
1= yes
0= no
. = don't know

QID34= Q8aS2
HS S2 FS Q8a
1= Almost every month
1= Some months but not every month
0= Only 1 or 2 months

QID35=Q9S2FS
HS S2 FS Q9
1 = yes
2=no

QID36= Q10S2FS
HS S2 FS Q10
1=yes
0=no

QID37= Q11S2FS
Hs S2 FS Q11
1= Yes
0=No

QID38= Q12S3FS
HS S3 FS Q12

1= Yes
0=No

QID39= Q12aS3FS
HS S3 FS Q12a
1= Almost every month
1= Some months but not every month
0= Only 1 or 2 months
0=Skipped, no on 12, or screened out

QID40= ChildrenFSScreener
1= yes
0=no

QID42= Q5FSC1
HS Child Screener Q5

1= Often true
1= Sometiems true
0=Never true or screeened out
.=refuesed or don't know

QID43=Q6FSC1
1=often true
1= sometimes true
0 never true

QID44=Q7FSC1
1=Often true
1= Sometimes true
0=Never true

QID45=Q13FSC1

1 =yes
0 =no
.=don't know or refuse or no children

QID46= Q14FSC1
1=Yes
0=No
.=don't know

QID47= Q14aFSC1
1=Almost every month
1= Some months but not every month
0=Only 1 or 2 months
0= no on 14 and skipped

QID48= Q15FSC1
1=Yes
0=No
.=Refused

QID49= Q16FSC1
1=Yes
0=No
.=Refused

FSScore

0= High food security = 0
1=Marginal food security =1-2
2=Low food security = 3-7
3=Very low food security = 8-18

FSChildScore
0= High food security = 0
1=Marginal food security = 1-2
2=Low food security =3-5
3=Very low food security =6-10

OverallFSScore
0=High food security

1=Marginal food security
2=Low food security
3=Very low food security

QID50=govfoodaid
0=None
1= Wic or Snap
2= Both

QID51a =church
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

QID51b = gardenfarmers
community garden
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

QID51c =fastfood
fast food restaurants
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

QID51d =fullservrest
full service restaurants
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

QID51e = bapaso
food bank pantry or soup kitchen
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

schoolcaf
0=never
1=1to3 times
2=4 or more times

QID51f = sendeliv
senior delivery
0=never
1=1 to 3 times
2= 4 or more times

Q52= stretbud
0=no
1=yes

Q53= transportburden
1= personal car
2= public transportation (bus etc.)
3= walk
4=bike
5= get a ride from family or friends
6= taxi type (lyft)

Q54= travgroc
travel time to food

1= 0-5 minutes
2= 5-10 minutes
3= 10-20 minutes
4= 20-30 minutes
5=30-45 minutes
6= more than 45 minutes

APPENDIX THREE: FACTOR LOADINGS ALTFOODNETWORKS

Wave One

```
. factor church bapaso sendeliv, pcf
(obs=123)

Factor analysis/correlation                      Number of obs    =        123
    Method: principal-component factors          Retained factors =          1
    Rotation: (unrotated)                        Number of params =          3
```

Factor	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor1	2.50211	2.15524	0.8340	0.8340
Factor2	0.34688	0.19586	0.1156	0.9497
Factor3	0.15101	.	0.0503	1.0000

```
    LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(3)  =  246.22 Prob>chi2 = 0.0000

Factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances
```

Variable	Factor1	Uniqueness
church	0.8719	0.2398
bapaso	0.9266	0.1415
sendeliv	0.9399	0.1166

```
. rotate

Factor analysis/correlation                      Number of obs    =        123
    Method: principal-component factors          Retained factors =          1
    Rotation: orthogonal varimax (Kaiser off)    Number of params =          3
```

Factor	Variance	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor1	2.50211	.	0.8340	0.8340

```
    LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(3)  =  246.22 Prob>chi2 = 0.0000

Rotated factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances
```

Variable	Factor1	Uniqueness
church	0.8719	0.2398
bapaso	0.9266	0.1415
sendeliv	0.9399	0.1166

```
Factor rotation matrix
```

	Factor1
Factor1	1.0000

```
. predict altfoodnetworks
(option regression assumed; regression scoring)

Scoring coefficients (method = regression; based on varimax rotated factors)
```

Variable	Factor1
church	0.34847
bapaso	0.37031
sendeliv	0.37563

Wave Two

```
. factor church bapaso sendeliv
(obs=88)

Factor analysis/correlation                      Number of obs    =         88
    Method: principal factors                    Retained factors =          1
    Rotation: (unrotated)                        Number of params =          3

    Factor  |  Eigenvalue   Difference        Proportion   Cumulative
------------+------------------------------------------------------------
    Factor1 |      0.06345      0.08168           11.0221      11.0221
    Factor2 |     -0.01824      0.02122           -3.1678       7.8543
    Factor3 |     -0.03946            .           -6.8543       1.0000

    LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(3)  =    0.25 Prob>chi2 = 0.9691

Factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances

    Variable |   Factor1 |  Uniqueness
-------------+-----------+------------
      church |    0.1585 |      0.9749
      bapaso |    0.1245 |      0.9845
    sendeliv |   -0.1510 |      0.9772

. factor church bapaso sendeliv, pcf
(obs=88)

Factor analysis/correlation                      Number of obs    =         88
    Method: principal-component factors          Retained factors =          1
    Rotation: (unrotated)                        Number of params =          3

    Factor  |  Eigenvalue   Difference        Proportion   Cumulative
------------+------------------------------------------------------------
    Factor1 |      1.06143      0.08115            0.3538       0.3538
    Factor2 |      0.98029      0.02201            0.3268       0.6806
    Factor3 |      0.95828            .            0.3194       1.0000

    LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(3)  =    0.25 Prob>chi2 = 0.9691

Factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances

    Variable |   Factor1 |  Uniqueness
-------------+-----------+------------
      church |    0.6457 |      0.5831
      bapaso |    0.5144 |      0.7354
    sendeliv |   -0.6164 |      0.6200

. rotate

Factor analysis/correlation                      Number of obs    =         88
    Method: principal-component factors          Retained factors =          1
    Rotation: orthogonal varimax (Kaiser off)    Number of params =          3

    Factor  |  Variance   Difference        Proportion   Cumulative
------------+------------------------------------------------------------
    Factor1 |      1.06143            .            0.3538       0.3538

    LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(3)  =    0.25 Prob>chi2 = 0.9691
```

Rotated factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances

Variable	Factor1	Uniqueness
church	0.6457	0.5831
bapaso	0.5144	0.7354
sendeliv	-0.6164	0.6200

Factor rotation matrix

	Factor1
Factor1	1.0000

. predict altfoodnetworks
(option **regression** assumed; regression scoring)

Scoring coefficients (method = regression; based on varimax rotated factors)

Variable	Factor1
church	0.60832
bapaso	0.48458
sendeliv	-0.58073