2023-24

Students who were food secure were significantly less stressed (*b* = -8.96, *t*(1,210) = -9.12, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -7.56, *t*(919) = -6.60, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, gender identity/sexuality, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both stress and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly less sad (*b* = -9.72, *t*(1,202) = -6.76, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -6.83, *t*(898) = -4.10, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, gender identity/sexuality, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both sadness and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly more satisfied with life (*b* = 11.18, *t*(1,218) = 8.54, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = 9.24, *t*(910) = 6.08, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, gender identity/sexuality, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both life satisfaction and food security.

2022-23

Students who were food secure were significantly less stressed (*b* = -9.23, *t*(760) = -6.91, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -6.93, *t*(528) = -4.19, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, gender identity/sexuality, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both stress and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly less sad (*b* = -10.41, *t*(773) = -5.38, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -6.01, *t*(533) = -2.54, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, gender identity/sexuality, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both sadness and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly more satisfied with life (*b* = 9.70, *t*(772) = 5.76, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = 6.88, *t*(531) = 3.35, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for disability/neurodivergence, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both life satisfaction and food security.

2021-22

Students who were food secure were significantly less stressed (*b* = -10.79, *t*(1,151) = -9.09, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -8.70, *t*(791) = -5.87, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality and socioeconomic status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both stress and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly less sad (*b* = -11.36, *t*(1,146) = -6.87, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -9.00, *t*(786) = -4.41, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality and socioeconomic status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both sadness and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly more satisfied with life (*b* = 13.05, *t*(1,148) = 8.92, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = 8.92, *t*(789) = 4.97, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both life satisfaction and food security.

2020-21

Students who were food secure were significantly less stressed (*b* = -9.23, *t*(782) = -5.90, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -8.97, *t*(751) = -5.76, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality and race/ethnicity, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both stress and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly less sad (*b* = -13.58, *t*(786) = -5.84, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = -13.12, *t*(784) = -5.70, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality, which was a potential confounding variable given its relationship with both sadness and food security.

Students who were food secure were significantly more satisfied with life (*b* = 10.55, *t*(783) = 5.37, *p* < 0.001). This relationship remained significant (*b* = 7.95, *t*(628) = 3.71, *p* < 0.001) after controlling for gender identity/sexuality, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and transfer status, which were potential confounding variables given their relationships with both life satisfaction and food security.