FOOD INSUFFICIENCY AMONG LGBT ADULTS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC
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OVERVIEW

Previous research has found that more LGBT than non-LGBT people have experienced inadequate or uncertain access to food. This study provides information about current experiences of food insufficiency—defined as sometimes or often not having enough to eat in the last 7 days—in a nationally representative household sample of LGBT and non-LGBT people. Using data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau on the Household Pulse Survey, this study found that food insufficiency was more common among LGBT than non-LGBT people (12.7% vs. 7.8%) in the period between July 21 to October 11, 2021.

Findings also indicate that food insufficiency was more common among some parts of the LGBT community. More LGBT people of color experienced food insufficiency at some point during the summer or early fall of 2021, compared to non-LGBT people of color and all White respondents, regardless of LGBT status. Food insufficiency was reported by three times as many LGBT people of color as non-LGBT White people (17.3% vs 5.6%). In general, people with no more than a high school degree were at greater risk of not having enough food to eat as compared to those with more education. However, nearly twice as many LGBT people with a high school degree or less experienced food insufficiency than non-LGBT people with the same level of education (22.6% vs 12.6%, respectively). Food insufficiency was more common among transgender adults (19.9%), cisgender bisexual women (12.7%) and men (14.2%), and cisgender lesbian women (12.4%) relative to cisgender straight women (8.1%) and men (7.5%).

Household Pulse Survey data were further analyzed to provide information about current socioeconomic status, food resource utilization (e.g., SNAP, charitable food resources), and self-reported reasons for insufficient food among LGBT adults and their non-LGBT counterparts. More than one fifth (21.7%) of LGBT adults reported an income below the federal poverty level. Over one third (34.7%) of LGBT adults reported difficulty paying for household expenses, including but not limited to “food, rent or mortgage, car payments, medical expenses, student loans, and so on” in the last week.

Only 37.0% of income-eligible LGBT people and 38.8% of non-LGBT people were enrolled in SNAP. More LGBT people reported other barriers to accessing food than did non-LGBT people, including not being able to get out to buy food (20.2% and 11.4%, respectively) and safety concerns (15.3% and 11.3%, respectively). Details about study methods, as well as tables, are included in the Appendix.
INTRODUCTION

Previous research conducted with nationally representative samples collected between 2011-2017 found that more LGBT than non-LGBT people experienced inadequate or uncertain access to food.\footnote{Brown, T.N.T., Romero, A.P., & Gates, G.J. (2016). Food Insecurity and SNAP Participation in the LGBT community. The Williams Institute, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Food-Insecurity-SNAP-July-2016.pdf} Given the disproportionate economic impact burden of the COVID-19 pandemic on LGBT people,\footnote{Sears, R.B., Conron, K.J., & Flores, A.R. The Impact of the Fall 2020 COVID-19 Surge on LGBT Adults in the U.S.. 2021, The Williams Institute, UCLA Los Angeles, CA.} new research on food security is warranted. In 2021, nationally representative household data about food insufficiency—defined as sometimes or often not having enough to eat in the last 7 days\footnote{USDA Economic Research Service. (2021). Food Security in the U.S.: Measurement: What is Food Insufficiency? https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/measurement/#insufficiency Accessed November 2021.}—as well as sex assigned at birth, gender identity, and sexual orientation identity (SOGI) were collected by the U.S. Census Bureau on the Household Pulse Survey. This study utilizes these household data to provide current information about experiences of food insufficiency, as well as SNAP benefit and charitable food resource utilization. Differences by racial minority and majority status, educational attainment, and among LGBT population groups are also explored.
RESULTS

CURRENT SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Despite slightly higher levels of educational attainment among LGBT people relative to non-LGBT people, unemployment among those in the workforce, poverty, and difficulty paying for household experiences were more common among LGBT than non-LGBT people. More than one fifth (21.7%) of LGBT adults reported an income below the federal poverty level (FPL). Over one third (34.7%) of LGBT adults reported difficulty paying for household expenses, including but not limited to “food, rent or mortgage, car payments, medical expenses, student loans, and so on” in the last week.

Figure 1. Socioeconomic characteristics of LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (N=328,578*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th>Non-LGBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed last 7 days</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100% federal poverty level</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty paying household expenses last 7 days</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sample size (n=288,433) for poverty is smaller than the total analytic sample due to missing data on household income.

FOOD INSUFFICIENCY

Food insufficiency was more common among LGBT people than non-LGBT people; 12.7% of LGBT people reported sometimes or often not having enough to eat compared to 7.8% of non-LGBT peers.

Figure 2. Food insufficiency in the last 7 days among LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (N=328,578)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th>Non-LGBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always the kinds wanted</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than a quarter (26.8%) of LGBT people who reported earnings ≤ 130% of the federal poverty level—the amount set by the federal government to qualify for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) public assistance program—experienced food insufficiency in the past week. Food insufficiency was reported by nearly a fifth (19.0%) of those living at 131-200% of the FPL and by about one in twenty (5.2%) LGBT adults living above 200% of the FPL.

Over one-fifth (21.8%) of non-LGBT adults who earned ≤ 130% of the FPL experienced food insufficiency in the past week. Food insufficiency was reported by more than one in ten (12.2%) non-LGBT people living at 131-200% of the FPL and by few (2.7%) living above 200% of FPL.

At all economic levels, among those who provided information about household income, food insufficiency was more common among LGBT than non-LGBT people.

Figure 3. Food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, by federal poverty level (n=288,364)

**FOOD RESOURCE UTILIZATION**

Slightly more LGBT adults reported recent use of food resources, including charitable resources such as free groceries from food banks (6.7%) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (15.8%) compared to their non-LGBT counterparts (5.7% and 11.5%, respectively).

Figure 4. Use of food resources by LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (N=328,578)

---


Similar proportions of LGBT (37.0%) and non-LGBT (38.8%) adults living at ≤ 130% federal poverty level—the amount set by the federal government to qualify for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) public assistance program—reported that they or someone in their household are receiving SNAP.

Figure 5. Household receipt of SNAP benefits among LGBT and non-LGBT participants* in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, with income at or below 130% of the federal poverty level (n=35,739)

* Differences in proportions are not statistically significantly different.

Among LGBT people who were income-eligible for SNAP, food insufficiency was more prevalent among those receiving SNAP as compared to those without SNAP benefits (30.9% vs. 24.2%, respectively). Among non-LGBT people who were income-eligible for SNAP, food insufficiency also was slightly more common among SNAP recipients than those not receiving SNAP benefits (23.9% vs. 20.5%, respectively).

Figure 6. Food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT participants living at or below 130% of the federal poverty level by SNAP status in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (n=35,467)

PERCEIVED CAUSES OF FOOD INSUFFICIENCY

Most LGBT (86.0%) and non-LGBT (82.2%) adults who were experiencing food insufficiency reported that their inability to afford more food was the cause of insufficient food in their household. More LGBT people than non-LGBT people reported other barriers to accessing food, including that they could not get out to buy food (20.2% and 11.4%, respectively), for reasons including, “didn’t have

6 The proportion of LGBT people who were food insufficiency and who received SNAP was larger than the proportion without SNAP benefits, p=0.03.
transportation, have mobility or health limitations that prevent you from getting out” and safety concerns (15.3% and 11.3%, respectively).

**Figure 7.** Perceived reasons for insufficient food among food insufficient LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (N=16,196)

![Bar chart showing perceived reasons for insufficient food among food insufficient LGBT and non-LGBT participants.]

**DIFFERENTIAL VULNERABILITY TO FOOD INSUFFICIENCY**

Food insufficiency varied by race and LGBT identity; 17.3% of LGBT people of color sometimes or often did not have enough to eat in the prior week as compared with 11.9% of non-LGBT people of color, 10.1% of LGBT White people and 5.6% of non-LGBT White people. More LGBT people of color experienced food insufficiency at some point during the summer or early fall of 2021, compared to non-LGBT people of color, and White respondents regardless of LGBT status. More people of color who are not LGBT reported food insufficiency compared to White LGBT people. Food insufficiency was reported by three times as many LGBT people of color as non-LGBT White people (17.3% vs 5.6%).

**Figure 8.** Food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, by race (N=328,578)

![Bar chart showing food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, by race.]

- **People of color LGBT:**
  - Enough food: 54.5%
  - Enough food but not of the desired kind: 28.2%
  - Sometimes or often not enough to eat: 17.3%

- **People of color Non-LGBT:**
  - Enough food: 62.2%
  - Enough food but not of the desired kind: 26.0%
  - Sometimes or often not enough to eat: 11.9%

- **White LGBT:**
  - Enough food: 66.7%
  - Enough food but not of the desired kind: 23.1%
  - Sometimes or often not enough to eat: 10.1%

- **White Non-LGBT:**
  - Enough food: 78.1%
  - Enough food but not of the desired kind: 16.3%
  - Sometimes or often not enough to eat: 5.6%
In general, people with no more than a high school degree were at greater risk of not having enough food to eat as compared to those with more education. For example, over a fifth of LGBT people with a high school degree or less (22.6%), 12.0% of those with an associate degree or some college, and 4.3% of LGBT adults with a bachelor's degree or more experienced food insufficiency in the week prior to completing the Household Pulse Survey. Nearly twice as many LGBT adults with a high school degree or less experienced food insufficiency than non-LGBT adults with the same level of education (22.6% vs 12.6%, respectively).

Figure 9. Food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, by education level (N=328,578)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enough food</th>
<th>Enough food but not of the desired kind</th>
<th>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, bachelor degree or more</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, associate degree or some college</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, high school or less</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, bachelor degree or more</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, associate degree or some college</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, high school or less</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food insufficiency also varied somewhat by gender and sexual orientation. More cisgender\(^7\) bisexual men reported food insufficiency (14.2%) than straight men (7.5%). More cisgender lesbian and bisexual women reported food insufficiency (12.4% and 12.7%, respectively) than their cisgender straight women peers (8.1%). Food insufficiency was common (19.9%) among transgender\(^8\) people—more so than among most other groups.\(^9\)

---

7 Survey respondents who selected gender identity options (male or female) that were the same as their sex assigned at birth (male or female) were classified as cisgender. Those who selected gender identity options that differed from their sex assigned at birth were classified as transgender. Please refer to the methods appendix for further detail.

8 Transgender people, as a group, are diverse on gender identity and sexual orientation. In this sample, 12.3% of people classified as transgender selected male as their gender identity, 12.9% selected female, and 74.8% selected transgender as their response option from among these three gender identity options. In addition, 37.3% of transgender people identified their sexual orientation as bisexual, 23.7% as lesbian or gay, 7.0% as straight, and 28.0% as "something else." The remainder (4.0%) selected "I don’t know."

9 The comparison between the proportions of transgender people and cisgender bisexual men who reported food insufficiency was marginally statistically significant at p = 0.06, whereas the proportion food insufficient among transgender people was larger than the proportion food insufficient among other gender and sexual orientation groups.
Use of charitable food resources was similar across gender and sexual orientation groups.

Among those who met the SNAP income eligibility criterion, usage of SNAP benefits varied by gender. Cisgender women, collectively, reported higher rates of SNAP usage, with 38.2%, 41.4%, and 43.4% of lesbian, bisexual, and straight women, respectively, than other groups. About one-third of income-
eligible cisgender men reported that they or someone in their household receives SNAP, with 33.3%, 33.1%, and 32.1% of gay, bisexual, and men, respectively, reporting SNAP receipt. Income-eligible transgender participants reported SNAP coverage (28.7%) at similar levels as cisgender men. In a multivariable logistic regression model, income-eligible cisgender women, as a group, were slightly more likely to have SNAP compared to cisgender men and transgender people—a pattern that is likely due, at least in part, to the presence of children in the household.¹⁰

Figure 12. Receipt of SNAP benefits among income-eligible participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021, by gender and sexual orientation (N=35,899)

Majorities of all groups (over 80%) reported that affordability was the primary reason that they did not have enough to eat in the past week (see Table 9). More than a quarter of transgender participants (27.7%) and more than a fifth of cisgender bisexual men and women (21.1%, and 23.0%, respectively) reported that being unable to get out to buy food was a reason that they did not have enough to eat in the past week.¹¹ Just under a fifth of cisgender lesbian women (18.1%) reported the same barrier to food.¹² Slightly more than one in ten cisgender gay men, straight men, and straight women reported being unable to get out to buy food (11.7%, 11.3%, and 11.5%, respectively).

Nearly one in five transgender people (19.7%) and cisgender bisexual women (19.5%) identified safety concerns related to getting to the store as a reason that they did not have enough to eat in the past week.¹³ Safety concerns were less frequently reported by cisgender straight or gay men (12.5 and

¹¹ Larger proportions of transgender people and cisgender bisexual women than cisgender straight people reported being unable to get out to buy food at p<0.05.
¹² Differences between the proportions of cisgender lesbian women and straight women that were unable to get out to buy food were marginally statistically significant at p=0.06.
¹³ Larger proportions of cisgender bisexual women than cisgender straight women reported safety concerns at p<0.05.
7.5%, respectively) or by cisgender lesbian or straight women (10.3% and 11.7%, respectively) as reasons that they did not have enough to eat. Some (15.4%) cisgender bisexual men also reported safety concerns as barriers to food access.

Figure 13. Perceived reasons for insufficient food among food insufficient participants in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 by gender and sexual orientation (N=35,899)

Differences between transgender people and straight women were marginally statistically significant at p=0.07.
DISCUSSION

Approximately one in eight (13%) LGBT adults and 8% of non-LGBT adults report that they sometimes or often not did not have enough to eat in the past week on Household Pulse survey collected between July 21 and October 11, 2021. This disproportionality is consistent with higher rates of poverty and unemployment among LGBT versus non-LGBT people observed in this study and as noted in prior research. Food insufficiency was also far more common among LGBT people of color and those with a high school education or less as compared to those who are White, cisgender, and have more formal education. Looking at patterns by gender and sexual orientation, food insufficiency was more common among transgender people relative to most other groups and among cisgender bisexual people and cisgender lesbian women compared to their same-gender straight cisgender peers. Patterns of food insufficiency generally parallel population patterns of poverty and marginalization. Findings related to the intersections of LGBT status and race are also consistent with prior research about the disproportionate economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on LGBT people of color.

More than a third of LGBT and non-LGBT people who met the income eligibility for enrollment in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) reported that they or someone in their household are receiving SNAP. Income-eligible cisgender women, as a group, were slightly more likely to have SNAP compared to cisgender men and transgender people—a pattern that is likely due, at least in part, to the presence of children in the household. Regardless, majorities in every gender and sexual orientation group were not enrolled in SNAP. These findings indicate a need to expand efforts to enroll income-eligible people and may include tailored outreach to various communities (e.g., NYC’s Take pride in using your SNAP benefits campaign). Additionally, given high levels of food insufficiency among those with SNAP, examination of benefit levels (currently linked to income and set at a maximum of $459 per month for a household of two earning up to $1,888 per month in pre-tax income) is needed.

Use of charitable food resources was fairly similar across gender and sexual orientation groups, despite higher need among LGBT people. Food banks, many of which have been religiously affiliated, may not be viewed as welcoming places by LGBTQ people. Findings from qualitative studies in southern California and the southeastern U.S. indicate that some LGBTQ and transgender people anticipate rejection or judgement, and that others have experienced staring and looks of “disgust” at religiously affiliated food pantries.

Most LGBT and non-LGBT adults who were experiencing food insufficiency reported that their inability to afford more food was the cause of insufficient food in their household. More LGBT people than non-LGBT people reported other barriers to accessing food, including that they could not get out to buy food, for reasons including, “didn't have transportation, have mobility or health limitations that prevent [them] from getting out.” Safety concerns related to getting to the store were also more common among LGBT than non-LGBT people. Concerns related to getting out to buy food and about safety getting to the store were most common among transgender people and cisgender bisexual women relative to cisgender straight peers.

Specific transportation and safety concerns were not assessed on the Household Pulse Survey; however, other research has found that functional limitations are more common among LGBT versus non-LGBT people. In addition, studies have found that transportation problems impact help-seeking more often for transgender than cisgender people and that verbal harassment on public transportation by transit employees is not an uncommon experience for transgender people. It may also be that concerns related to COVID-19 impacted the perceived safety of going to the store.

Covering delivery charges through SNAP and considering innovative models that include the delivery of medically tailored meals, such as those offered through state Medicaid programs, or grocery delivery from food banks, may provide additional strategies to reduce food insufficiency for LGBT people and other vulnerable groups that have trouble accessing food.

LGBT vs. non-LGBT inequities in food insufficiency observed in this study repeat those previously observed, and largely reflect population patterns of poverty. On-going monitoring of food insufficiency among LGBT people through surveys such as Household Pulse, the Current Population Survey Food Security Supplement, and the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey is recommended.
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APPENDIX

METHODS

This study analyzed repeated cross-sectional data\textsuperscript{31} collected between July 21 to October 11, 2021 by the U.S. Census Bureau on the Household Pulse Phase 3.2 Survey\textsuperscript{32} (weeks 34-39). The Household Pulse Survey was developed to assess the impact of COVID-19 on employment, food and housing security, and the physical and mental wellbeing of the U.S. population. Households were enumerated via the Census Bureau's Master Address File (MAF); email addresses and cell phone numbers were appended to create a contact sampling frame for the survey which represented 81% of households in the MAF.\textsuperscript{33} Group quarters such as homeless shelters, nursing homes, and college dormitories were not sampled. On-line surveys were conducted in English and Spanish with 382,908 U.S. adults ages 18 and up. The response rate for weeks 34-39 ranged from 5.4% to 6.5%.\textsuperscript{34}

Questions about sex assigned at birth (What sex were you assigned at birth, on your original birth certificate?) and current gender identity (Do you currently describe yourself as male, female or transgender?) were added to the Household Pulse Survey starting in week 34 and were used to classify respondents as transgender and cisgender. Respondents who selected transgender as their gender identity were classified as transgender. In the remaining sample that selected male or female gender identity responses and whose sex was not imputed by the Census Bureau (e.g., AGENID\_BIRTH=2), those who selected a gender identity (male or female) that differed from their sex assigned at birth (male or female) were classified as transgender. Respondents who selected gender identity options (male or female) that were the same as their sex assigned at birth (male or female) were classified as cisgender. Those who selected “none of these” as their response to the gender identity question were excluded from classification.

Imputed sex was not used to classify transgender and cisgender respondents given concerns about the validity of the imputed sex data. Descriptive analyses conducted by Dr. Bill Jesdale indicate that the demographic characteristics of those classified as transgender based on imputed sex look more similar to those of cisgender respondents than to those of transgender respondents who answered the sex assigned at birth question.\textsuperscript{35} In addition, 171 transgender respondents who reported living in households of 10+ members were excluded from the analytic sample for this study based on descriptive analyses conducted by the Williams Institute. Our analyses suggest that these


10+ transgender households are grossly overrepresented in the sample (11.3% unweighted, 24.0% weighted) relative to cisgender households, both among cisgender LGB (1.3% weighted) and in the larger analytic sample (1.2% weighted), and in the US population as a whole (1.2% live in households of 7 or more.) These respondents, identified as both transgender and living in households of 10 or more people, were also disproportionately older (48.7% 65+ weighted), living in households with 200K+ household income (25.5% weighted), and Latino/a (66.1%) as compared to cisgender respondents living in 10+ households in Pulse (31.2%, 8.6%, and 24.6%, respectively, weighted) and transgender respondents in other population-based datasets (e.g., BRFSS and TransPop) Such patterns suggest the presence of mischievous or inattentive responders. Further methodological investigation is needed to better understand Pulse response patterns—particularly as they relate to respondents classified as transgender.

A question about sexual orientation identity (Which of the following best represents how you think of yourself?) was added to the Household Pulse Survey starting in week 34 and were used to classify respondents as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB) and straight based on their selection of these response options (gay or lesbian; straight, that is not gay or lesbian; bisexual). Respondents who selected “something else” as their identity were excluded from classification based on prior research indicating that this group is heterogeneous, and, without a follow-up write-in, cannot be classified as sexual minority or as straight. Respondents who were transgender and/or LGB were classified as LGBT while respondents who were cisgender and straight were classified as non-LGBT.

Food insufficiency was assessed with a single question, “In the last 7 days, which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household?” Using criteria articulated by the USDA, participants who indicated that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat were considered food insufficient. Although not a focus of this report, the USDA also considers those who had enough, but not always the kinds of food that they wanted to eat marginally food insufficient and those who reported that they had had enough of the kinds of food that they wanted to eat food sufficient.

Participant-reported annual household income range and size were used to create an ordinal

measure of percentage of poverty. Annual household income was recoded to the midpoint for each income range or to the lower limit of the highest income category ($200,000 or more). Recoded income was divided by household size-specific poverty thresholds\textsuperscript{42} to obtain percentage poverty (i.e., the "ratio of income to poverty" according to U.S. Census criteria).\textsuperscript{43} Respondents were then placed into one of three economic status groups: ≤ 130% (SNAP income eligible\textsuperscript{44}), 131%–200%, and > 201% of the federal poverty level.

The analytic sample was limited to 328,578 survey respondents who could be classified as LGBT or non-LGBT based on the criteria described above and who answered the Household Pulse Survey question about food insufficiency. Descriptive analyses were conducted using Stata v15.1 statistical software. Analyses included design-based F-tests (Rao-Scott chi-square tests) of differences in proportions to assess whether outcomes varied across groups at an alpha of 0.05.\textsuperscript{45} Confidence intervals (95% CI) were included to communicate the degree of uncertainty around an estimate due to sampling error.

Non-overlapping confidence intervals were deemed indicative of statistically significant differences in two proportions at an alpha of 0.05. In instances where confidence intervals appeared close, t-tests were conducted to evaluate whether two proportions were indeed different. All analyses were weighted to represent adults ages 18 and up living in U.S. households using person-level weights provided by the Census Bureau. All sample sizes (n) are unweighted.


Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of LGBT and non-LGBT adult participants (N=328,578) in the Census Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th>NON-LGBT</th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=23,599</td>
<td>N=304,979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.4, 24.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>41.1, 43.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.8, 19.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7, 9.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.4, 7.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.3, 42.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>49.8, 52.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, all reported gender identities</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5, 8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender and sexual orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender gay man</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.0, 27.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender bisexual man</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.4, 16.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender straight man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender lesbian woman</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.1, 14.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender bisexual woman</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>36.0, 38.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender straight woman</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, all reported gender and sexual identities</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5, 8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race-ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>62.8, 65.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.3, 8.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3, 4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other race alone, or more than one race</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8, 6.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a or Hispanic</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.6, 19.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.9, 31.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates or some college</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>35.9, 38.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or more</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>31.6, 33.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment past 7 days (work for pay or profit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among those in the workforce; n=203,622</td>
<td>n=16,966</td>
<td>n=186,656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>90.9, 92.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1, 9.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Food Insufficiency Among LGBT Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th>NON-LGBT</th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=23,599</td>
<td>N=304,979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean household size</strong></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 95% CI</strong></td>
<td>3.26, 3.29</td>
<td>3.15, 3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100% federal poverty level (FPL)</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-199% FPL</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% FPL</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty with expenses past week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all or a little difficult</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very or somewhat difficult</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. Bold p-values are statistically significant.

* F test for test of difference in proportions.

*The sample size (n=288,433) for poverty is smaller than the total analytic sample due to missing data on household income.
### Table 2. Food insufficiency, food resource utilization, and perceived reasons for food insufficiency among LGBT and non-LGBT adult participants (N=328,578) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th></th>
<th>NON-LGBT</th>
<th></th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=23,599</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=304,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food insufficiency in the last 7 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>61.0, 63.7</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.2, 73.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.8, 26.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.3, 20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.7, 13.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5, 8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free groceries or a free meal last 7 days (self or household member)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0, 7.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5, 5.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.4, 94.0</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.1, 94.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNAP (self or household member)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.7, 16.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2, 11.8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>83.1, 85.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.2, 88.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why did you not have enough to eat?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among respondents who sometimes or often did not have enough to eat; n=16,142</td>
<td>n=1,876</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=14,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't afford to buy more food</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>82.8, 88.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>80.9, 83.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't get out to buy food</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.6, 24.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.4, 12.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.5, 18.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.2, 12.6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2, 8.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.1, 10.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. Bold p-values are statistically significant.

* F test for test of difference in proportions.
Table 3. SNAP benefits and food insufficiency among LGBT adult participants (n=21,238) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39) by poverty level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;= 130% FPL*</th>
<th>131% - 200% FPL</th>
<th>&gt;=201% FPL</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=3,726</td>
<td>N=1,728</td>
<td>N=15,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP benefits</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>34.1, 40.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.5, 26.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insufficiency in the last 7 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>36.2, 42.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>39.0, 47.4</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.2, 37.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>33.9, 42.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>24.0, 29.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.4, 23.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. FPL: Federal Poverty Level.
* ≤ 130% FPL is the threshold for basic SNAP benefit eligibility set by the USDA
Bold p-values are statistically significant.
* F test for test of difference in proportions.

Table 4. SNAP benefits and food insufficiency among non-LGBT adult participants (n=267,126) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39) by poverty level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;= 130% FPL*</th>
<th>131% - 200% FPL</th>
<th>&gt;=201% FPL</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=32,013</td>
<td>N=18,605</td>
<td>N=216,508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP benefits</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>37.6, 39.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.3, 16.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insufficiency in the last 7 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.9, 45.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>54.0, 56.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33.1, 35.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.1, 33.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.8, 22.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.3, 13.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. FPL: Federal Poverty Level.
* ≤ 130% FPL is the threshold for basic SNAP benefit eligibility set by the USDA
Bold p-values are statistically significant.
* F test for test of difference in proportions.
Table 5. Food insufficiency among LGBT participants living at or below 130% of the federal poverty level (n=3,704) by SNAP status in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAP RECIPIENT</th>
<th>NOT A SNAP RECIPIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=1,379</td>
<td>N=2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. FPL: Federal Poverty Level. 
≤ 130% FPL is the threshold for basic SNAP benefit eligibility set by the USDA
Bold p-values are statistically significant.
* F test for test of difference in proportions.

Table 6. Food insufficiency among non-LGBT participants living at or below 130% of the federal poverty level (n=31,763) by SNAP status in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAP RECIPIENT</th>
<th>NOT A SNAP RECIPIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=11,302</td>
<td>N=20,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. FPL: Federal Poverty Level. 
≤ 130% FPL is the threshold for basic SNAP benefit eligibility set by the USDA
Bold p-values are statistically significant.
* F test for test of difference in proportions.
### Table 7. Food insufficiency among LGBT adult participants (n=23,599) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39) by select demographic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD</th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD BUT NOT OF THE DESIRED KIND</th>
<th>SOMETIMES OR OFTEN NOT ENOUGH TO EAT</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=16,837</td>
<td>N=4,871</td>
<td>N=1,891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.7, 23.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.1, 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>39.2, 42.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>42.5, 47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.7, 19.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.2, 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7, 11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1, 9.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1, 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender men</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>43.6, 46.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.9, 37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender women</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>47.3, 50.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>54.3, 59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, all reported gender identities</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1, 6.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0, 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender, gay men</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.4, 31.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.6, 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender, bisexual men</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.1, 16.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.9, 17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender, lesbian women</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.0, 14.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.2, 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender, bisexual women</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>33.5, 36.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>40.3, 45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, all reported gender and sexual identities</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1, 6.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0, 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race-ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>67.0, 70.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>56.6, 62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8, 7.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.3, 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8, 5.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1, 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other race alone, or more than one race</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9, 5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.5, 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a or Hispanic</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.6, 17.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.8, 24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.0, 25.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>31.8, 37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates or some college</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.1, 36.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>41.9, 47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or more</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>40.3, 43.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.1, 22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Food Insufficiency Among LGBT Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic

#### Table: Food Insufficiency Among LGBT Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD</th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD BUT NOT OF THE DESIRED KIND</th>
<th>SOMETIMES OR OFTEN NOT ENOUGH TO EAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=16,837</td>
<td>N=4,871</td>
<td>N=1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100% federal poverty level (FPL)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.6, 14.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-199% FPL</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3, 12.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 200% FPL</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>74.2, 77.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment past 7 days (work for pay or profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among those in the workforce; n=16,966</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>94.8, 96.6</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>94.8, 96.6</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4, 5.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.4, 18.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>31.8, 34.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.1, 20.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.5, 31.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. Bold p-values are statistically significant.

*F test for test of difference in proportions.

*The sample size (n=21,238) for poverty is smaller than the total analytic sample due to missing data on household income.
Table 8. Food insufficiency within select demographic groups (race or education and LGBT status) among adult participants (N=328,578) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD</th>
<th>ENOUGH FOOD BUT NOT OF THE DESIRED KIND</th>
<th>SOMETIMES OR OFTEN NOT ENOUGH TO EAT</th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N= 261,084</td>
<td>N=51,115</td>
<td>N=16,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and LGBT identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-LGBT</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>77.8, 78.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.0, 16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White LGBT</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>65.2, 68.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.8, 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC* Non-LGBT</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>61.4, 62.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.3, 26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC LGBT</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>52.0, 57.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.0, 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and LGBT identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, High school or less</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>61.7, 63.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.1, 25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, Associate, or some college</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>69.0, 70.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.0, 22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT, Bachelors or more</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>86.1, 86.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.1, 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, High school or less</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>45.6, 52.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.8, 31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, Associate, or some college</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>56.1, 60.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.2, 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT, Bachelors or more</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>78.5, 81.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.8, 17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: Confidence Interval. Bold p-values are statistically significant. Row percentages total 100%.

*F test for test of difference in proportions

*People of color
Table 9. Food insufficiency, food resource utilization, and perceived reasons for food insufficiency among adult participants (N=331,097) in the Household Pulse Survey, July 21 to October 11, 2021 (Weeks 34-39), by gender and sexual orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CISGENDER</th>
<th>TRANSGENDER* ALL REPORTED GENDER AND SEXUAL IDENTITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAY MEN</td>
<td>BISEXUAL MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insufficiency in the last 7 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough food of the kinds wanted</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>68.8, 73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food but not always kinds wanted</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.8, 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes or often not enough to eat</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.4, 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free groceries or a free meal last 7 days (self or household member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3, 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>93.0, 95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP (self or household member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among income eligible, n=35,899</td>
<td>n=775</td>
<td>n=430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.0, 40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.8, 73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Why did you not have enough to eat?

Among respondents who did not have enough food (or the kinds wanted); n=16,353

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GAY MEN</th>
<th>BISEXUAL MEN</th>
<th>STRAIGHT MEN</th>
<th>LESBIAN WOMEN</th>
<th>BISEXUAL WOMEN</th>
<th>STRAIGHT WOMEN</th>
<th>ALL REPORTED GENDER AND SEXUAL IDENTITIES</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t afford to buy more food</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>82.3, 94.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>72.7, 90.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>77.5, 82.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>82.3, 89.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.6, 85.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>79.1, 93.1</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>82.6, 85.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>