**Table II:** The distribution of food insecurity prevalence across biographical attributes

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **n (%),[%]\*** | **By multi-item measure** | | | **p-value\*\*** | | **By single-item measure** | |
| **Food secure** | **Food insecure without hunger** | **Food insecure with hunger** | **Food insecure** | **p-value\*\*** |
| **%** | **%** | **%** | **%** |
| Total student sample | 1 416 | 16 | 24.5 | 59.5 |  | | 65.1 |  |
| **Gender (n = 1 392)** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 864 (62.3), [61.7] | 12.6 | 21.6 | 65.8 | | < 0.001 | 70.5 | < 0.001 |
| Female | 518 (37.5), [38.2] | 17.7 | 27.2 | 55.1 | | 60.4 |
| **Ethnicity (n = 1 388)** | | | | | | | | |
| African | 967 (69.7), [63.0] | 5.8 | 22.5 | 71.7 | | < 0.001 | 79.0 | < 0.001 |
| White | 319 (23.0, [29.0] | 42.6 | 32.0 | 25.4 | | 23.6 |
| Coloured | 81 (5.8), [5.0] | 19.8 | 23.5 | 56.8 | | 65.6 |
| Indian | 17 (0.9), [0.8] | 47.1 | 29.4 | 23.5 | | 23.5 |
| Chose not to indicate | 4 (0.6), [1.0] |  |  |  | |  |
| **Relationship status (n = 1 145)** | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 876 (62.6) | 14.0 | 23.7 | 62.2 | | 0.026 | 67.4 | < 0.001 |
| In a relationship, but not married | 485 (34.5) | 18.8 | 26.2 | 55.1 | | 61.3 |
| Married | 30 (2.1) | 16.7 | 33.3 | 50.0 | | 34.5 |
| Other | 7 (1.0) | 37.5 | 37.5 | 25.0 | | 25.0 |
| **Level of study (n = 1 392)** | | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduates | 1 256 (90.2), [74.0] | 14.7 | 24.6 | 60.5 | | 0.001 | 65.8 | < 0.001 |
| Postgraduates | 136 (9.8), [21.0] | 25.0 | 27.9 | 47.1 | | 50.7 |
| **Faculty of study (n = 1 400)** | | | | | | | | |
| Economics and management sciences | 318 (22.7), [15.4] | 16.0 | 27.0 | 56.9 | | < 0.001 | 66.1 | < 0.001 |
| Education | 152 (10.9), [24.0] | 13.2 | 23.0 | 63.8 | | 66.4 |
| Health sciences | 101 (7.2), [8.4] | 36.6 | 29.7 | 33.7 | | 38.4 |
| Law | 86 (6.1), [10.8] | 14.0 | 25.6 | 60.5 | | 58.3 |
| Natural and agricultural sciences | 341 (24.4), [18.3] | 12.6 | 23.8 | 63.6 | | 70.2 |
| Humanities | 388 (27.7), [22.4] | 14.2 | 23.5 | 62.4 | | 65.6 |
| Theology | 14 (1.0), [0.9] | 28.6 | 21.4 | 50.0 | | 50.0 |
| **First-generation student (n = 1 415)** | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 682 (57.0) | 8.3 | 24.9 | 66.8 | | < 0.001 | 72.6 | < 0.001 |
| No | 733 (43.0) | 23.0 | 24.6 | 52.4 | | 27.4 |
| **Who pays for the tuition fees?**\*\*\* **(n = 1 415)** | | | | | | | | |
| Self | 124 (8.8) | 16.4 | 25.5 | 58.2 | | < 0.001 | 65.5 | < 0.001 |
| Parents, relatives or a benefactor | 661 (46.7) | 18.8 | 25.4 | 55.8 | | 60.5 |
| Bank loan | 138 (9.8) | 18.5 | 18.5 | 63.1 | | 68.3 |
| Other type of loan | 239 (16.9) | 4.2 | 21.1 | 74.7 | | 80.5 |
| Merit bursary | 205 (14.5) | 13.9 | 33.7 | 52.5 | | 60.6 |
| Other type of bursary | 300 (21.2) | 9.6 | 26.8 | 63.6 | | 70.5 |
| Employer | 23 (1.6) | 36.4 | 18.2 | 45.5 | | 45.5 |
| **Employed (n = 1 372)** | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1 141 (83.2) | 14.0 | 25.3 | 60.8 | | < 0.001 | 66.1 | < 0.001 |
| Yes | 231 (16.8) | 27.5 | 22.2 | 50.3 | | 51.3 |
| **Supports someone else financially (n = 1 413)** | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1 108 (78.4) | 17.0 | 25.5 | 57.6 | | 0.004 | 63.2 | 0.044 |
| Yes | 305 (21.6) | 12.5 | 21.3 | 66.2 | |  | 69.5 |  |

\*: Percentages in square brackets indicate the presentation of the row group in the entire university student population (n = 31 014) to indicate representation

\*\*: p-value for the chi-square analysis of the cross-tabulation of all the categorical variables under a particular group heading (p-value < 0.010 represents statistical significance)

\*\*\*: Students could choose more than one option (p-values computed only for n = 1 137 where respondents chose only one option)