

Food Hardship in America: Households with Children Especially Hard Hit

September 2016

Introduction

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) has been issuing reports for several years that analyze the answers to a survey question asked by Gallup about food hardship, which is the inability of American households to afford adequate food. Most recently, in June 2016, FRAC published an analysis (pdf) of answers to Gallup’s survey in 2015 reporting national, state, and metropolitan statistical area (MSA) rates of food hardship.

In this report, FRAC looks at the data *separately for households with children and households without children*. For the national analysis, FRAC looks at data year-by-year. For the state and MSA analyses, FRAC combined 2014 and 2015 data, in order to have adequate sample sizes and smaller error rates.

The question Gallup asks is, “Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?” That question is part of the Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index survey, which also asked respondents how many children lived in their household. In 2015, 176,313 respondents answered these questions, while 176,212 answered them in 2014. FRAC counts “yes” answers to the former question as evidence of food hardship.

Given how high child poverty rates are, compared to poverty rates for households without children, it is unsurprising that the food hardship rate is considerably higher in households with children. The difference, however, underscores how

broad the harm is to children from poverty and hunger in our society. This report also shows that the size of the disparities varies widely — in some MSAs, the gap is remarkably large, while in others, it is quite small. Indeed, in a small number of MSAs, households without children are more likely to face food hardship.

National Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

As indicated in FRAC’s June 2016 report, food hardship declined from 2014 to 2015. This was true for both households with children and households without children. Indeed, the households with children rate declined more — from 20.8 percent to 19.2 percent.

Chart A

Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children, 2014-2015 — National			
Years	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
2014	20.8	15.0	1.39 **
2015	19.2	14.2	1.35 **

**Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Nevertheless, rates, especially among households with children, remain far too high. In 2015, the national food hardship rate for households with children was fully five points above that for households without children. One in five households with children suffers from food hardship, putting these children’s physical and cognitive development at risk.

State Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

Chart B

Food Hardship Rate	Number of States	
	Households With Children	Households Without Children
20% or Higher	22	2
15-<20%	23	15
10-<15%	4	28
1-<10%	1	5

Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

In 2014–2015:

- 21 states and the District of Columbia had at least one in five households with children (20 percent or more) that struggled with food hardship. This also was true of two states for households without children.
- Only five states had rates below 15 percent for households with children, while 33 states had rates below 15 percent for households without children.
- 11 of the 15 states with the worst food hardship rates for households with children were in the Southeast and Southwest (using the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service’s definitions to determine each state’s region).
- In 30 states, the food hardship rate for households with children was at least one-third higher than the rate for

households without children. In the District of Columbia, the food hardship rate among households with children was more than double the rate for households without children.

The chart below shows the 15 states with the worst food hardship rates in states among households with children. The appendix presents data on households with and without children for 49 states¹ and the District of Columbia.

Chart C

15 Highest State Rates of Food Hardship for Households with Children, 2014-2015		
State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
District of Columbia	26.6	1
Mississippi	25.1	2
Arkansas	24.9	3
Louisiana	24.6	4
Delaware	24.6	4
West Virginia	23.9	6
Kentucky	23.7	7
Tennessee	23.4	8
Alabama	23.2	9
New Mexico	23.1	10
Georgia	22.6	11
South Carolina	22.4	12
North Carolina	22.4	12
Oklahoma	22.1	14
Arizona	22.0	15

Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

The Gallup-Healthways survey also gives an in-depth look at food hardship for different types of households in the nation’s largest urban areas — Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). MSAs are Census Bureau-defined areas that include central cities plus the surrounding counties with strong economic and social ties to the central cities.

¹Maine is excluded from this report due to anomalies in Gallup’s polling data in Maine.

Chart D

Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) Food Hardship Rates		
Food Hardship Rate	Households With Children	Households Without Children
30% or Higher	1	0
20-<30%	44	7
15-<20%	44	37
10-<15%	11	49
1-<10%	0	7

Note: Portland, Maine, MSA rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Of the 100 large MSAs with Gallup data in 2014 and 2015, 45 had food hardship rates for households with children above 20 percent (see chart D), including 10 (see charts E, H, and I) with rates above 25 percent. Of the 25 highest food hardship rates for households with children, there were three MSAs in each of the following states: Florida, Ohio, and Tennessee; and two MSAs in each of the following states: California, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

Chart E shows the 25 worst MSA food hardship rates among households with children. The appendix presents data on households with and without children for all 100 MSAs represented in the Gallup data.

Chart E

25 Highest MSA Rates of Food Hardship for Households with Children, 2014-2015		
MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Columbia, SC	30.6	1
Dayton, OH	29.4	2
Chattanooga, TN-GA	28.2	3
Winston-Salem, NC	27.2	4
Greensboro-High Point, NC	26.8	5
Tucson, AZ	26.5	6
Bakersfield, CA	25.9	7
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	25.9	8
New Haven-Milford, CT	25.6	9
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	25.4	10
Fresno, CA	24.4	11
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	24.4	12
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	23.7	13
El Paso, TX	23.6	14
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA	23.5	15
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	23.4	16
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	22.8	17
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	22.7	18
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	22.7	18
Tulsa, OK	22.5	20
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.5	20
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	22.5	20
Akron, OH	22.5	20
Tulsa, OK	22.5	20
Toledo, OH	22.3	25

Note: Portland, Maine, MSA rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Conclusion

Food hardship rates are too high throughout the nation for all households, but are particularly alarmingly high for households with children. In nearly half of the states, one in five households with children suffers from food hardship, putting the health and well-being of these children at risk. Among the 100 large MSAs studied for this report, 45 had rates above 20 percent for households with children.

Recommendations

Despite an improving economy, far too many Americans — and, especially, far too many children — still live in households that struggle against hunger. Research shows that participation in federal nutrition programs, such as the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and meals provided during child care, school, afterschool, and summer, supports children's health and learning. Greater investments must be made to make these strong programs even stronger.

More robust nutrition programs mean broadened eligibility; improved access among those who are eligible (only four of the five who are eligible for SNAP receive benefits; barely half of eligible children receive school breakfast); and improved benefits, especially in SNAP.

The policy path for the nation to reduce the suffering and unnecessary costs caused by struggles with hunger, poverty, and reduced opportunity is clear: higher employment rates, more full-time jobs, and better wages and benefits; stronger income supports through unemployment insurance, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), refundable tax credits, and other means; and stronger nutrition programs.

America has the resources to eliminate hunger for all of its citizens, regardless of age or family configuration. The cost of not doing so — in terms of damage to health, education, early childhood development, and productivity — is too high.

Read FRAC's *A Plan of Action to End Hunger in America* (pdf) for eight essential strategies toward eliminating hunger in this country and creating a much healthier, better educated, and more productive society.

About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit www.frac.org.

Methodology

Results are based on Gallup's telephone (landline or cellular) interviews in 2015 for national estimates, and in 2014 and 2015 for state and MSA estimates, with randomly sampled adults, age 18 or older in 49 states and the District of Columbia. While individuals were asked a variety of questions, this report focuses on the questions regarding food hardship and household composition. The question used to measure food hardship was, "Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?" Respondents could answer "yes" or "no." A household was classified as having experienced food hardship if they answered "yes." Respondents were also asked, "How many children under the age of 18 are living in your household?" If the respondent indicated there were no children, they were classified as a "household without children." If the respondent indicated there was at least one child, they were classified as a "household with children."

Data are weighted to be representative at the national, state, and MSA levels based on known figures for age, race/ethnicity, sex, education, population density (for national estimates), region, and phone status (i.e., landline versus cellular). In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.

Total sample sizes for the food hardship and households with children questions for 2014 and 2015 were 176,212 and 176,313, respectively. Margins of error were calculated using 95 percent confidence intervals. At the national level for 2015 (sample size: 176,313) the margin of error was ± 0.36 percentage points. At the state level for 2014 to 2015 (sample size range: 806 to 34,034), the margin of error ranged from ± 0.77 percentage points to ± 6.84 percentage points.

At the MSA level for 2014 to 2015 (sample size range: 619 to 17,192), the margin of error ranged from ± 1.09 to ± 7.38 percentage points. This report includes only MSAs where at

least 300 households responded to the survey in 2014 and 2015. The Portland, Maine, MSA is excluded from the report due to anomalies in the Gallup polling data in Maine.

Chi-square tests at an alpha of 0.05 were used to test for differences between households with and without children. Most, but not all, differences between households with and without children were significant in this report. Finally, 95 percent confidence intervals were used to construct the margin of error for each food hardship rate. The tables indicate for which states and MSAs the differences between households with and without children are statistically significant.

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Randy Rosso, Senior Research and Policy Analyst at FRAC.

²Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Chart F

State Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children, 2014-2015 (Listed by Rank)

Food Hardship Rate – State 2014-2015				
State	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
District of Columbia	26.6	11.3	1	2.35**
Mississippi	25.1	22.6	2	1.11
Arkansas	24.9	16.6	3	1.50**
Louisiana	24.6	20.5	4	1.20**
Delaware	24.6	13.1	4	1.88**
West Virginia	23.9	18.9	6	1.26*
Kentucky	23.7	18.3	7	1.30**
Tennessee	23.4	18.2	8	1.29**
Alabama	23.2	19.1	9	1.21**
New Mexico	23.1	16.2	10	1.43**
Georgia	22.6	17.3	11	1.31**
South Carolina	22.4	17.1	12	1.31**
North Carolina	22.4	17.0	12	1.32**
Oklahoma	22.1	18.0	14	1.23**
Arizona	22.0	14.6	15	1.51**
Florida	21.6	15.5	16	1.39**
New York	21.4	13.8	17	1.55**
Ohio	21.3	15.7	18	1.36**
Texas	21.0	14.9	19	1.41**
Vermont	20.7	14.1	20	1.47*
Michigan	20.5	15.1	21	1.36**
Nevada	20.1	15.7	22	1.28*
Indiana	19.8	14.1	23	1.40**
California	19.4	13.3	24	1.46**
Pennsylvania	18.9	12.4	25	1.52**
Kansas	18.6	12.2	26	1.52**
Illinois	18.6	12.7	26	1.46**
Idaho	18.6	14.5	26	1.28*
Oregon	18.6	12.8	26	1.45**
New Jersey	18.3	13.5	30	1.36**
Missouri	18.1	15.3	31	1.18*
Washington	17.9	12.1	32	1.48**
Rhode Island	17.8	13.8	33	1.29

Food Hardship Rate – State 2014-2015				
State	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Maryland	17.6	10.9	34	1.61**
Connecticut	17.5	12.0	35	1.46**
Massachusetts	17.3	13.3	36	1.30**
Virginia	17.1	13.4	37	1.28**
South Dakota	16.9	10.1	38	1.67*
New Hampshire	16.3	13.3	39	1.23
Utah	16.2	11.5	40	1.41**
Wisconsin	16.1	10.4	41	1.55**
Alaska	16.1	10.0	41	1.61*
Colorado	16.0	12.1	43	1.32**
Nebraska	15.9	10.0	44	1.59**
Montana	15.0	10.7	45	1.40*
Wyoming	14.5	9.8	46	1.48
Iowa	14.3	12.1	47	1.18
Minnesota	14.2	9.4	48	1.51**
Hawaii	14.1	9.5	49	1.48
North Dakota	9.4	8.5	50	1.11

*Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Chart G

State Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children, 2014-2015 (Listed Alphabetically)

Food Hardship Rate – State 2014-2015				
State	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Alabama	23.2	19.1	9	1.21**
Alaska	16.1	10.0	41	1.61*
Arizona	22.0	14.6	15	1.51**
Arkansas	24.9	16.6	3	1.50**
California	19.4	13.3	24	1.46**
Colorado	16.0	12.1	43	1.32**
Connecticut	17.5	12.0	35	1.46**
Delaware	24.6	13.1	4	1.88**
District of Columbia	26.6	11.3	1	2.35**
Florida	21.6	15.5	16	1.39**
Georgia	22.6	17.3	11	1.31**
Hawaii	14.1	9.5	49	1.48
Idaho	18.6	14.5	26	1.28*
Illinois	18.6	12.7	26	1.46**
Indiana	19.8	14.1	23	1.40**
Iowa	14.3	12.1	47	1.18
Kansas	18.6	12.2	26	1.52**
Kentucky	23.7	18.3	7	1.30**
Louisiana	24.6	20.5	4	1.20**
Maryland	17.6	10.9	34	1.61**
Massachusetts	17.3	13.3	36	1.30**
Michigan	20.5	15.1	21	1.36**
Minnesota	14.2	9.4	48	1.51**
Mississippi	25.1	22.6	2	1.11
Missouri	18.1	15.3	31	1.18*
Montana	15.0	10.7	45	1.40*
Nebraska	15.9	10.0	44	1.59**
Nevada	20.1	15.7	42	1.28*
New Hampshire	16.3	13.3	39	1.23
New Jersey	18.3	13.5	30	1.36**
New Mexico	23.1	16.2	10	1.43**
New York	21.4	13.8	17	1.55**
North Carolina	22.4	17.0	12	1.32**

Food Hardship Rate – State 2014-2015				
State	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
North Dakota	9.4	8.5	50	1.11
Ohio	21.3	15.7	18	1.36**
Oklahoma	22.1	18.0	14	1.23**
Oregon	18.6	12.8	26	1.45**
Pennsylvania	18.9	12.4	25	1.52**
Rhode Island	17.8	13.8	33	1.29
South Carolina	22.4	17.1	12	1.31**
South Dakota	16.9	10.1	38	1.67*
Tennessee	23.4	18.2	8	1.29**
Texas	21.0	14.9	19	1.41**
Utah	16.2	11.5	40	1.41**
Vermont	20.7	14.1	20	1.47*
Virginia	17.1	13.4	37	1.28**
Washington	17.9	12.1	32	1.48**
West Virginia	23.9	18.9	6	1.26*
Wisconsin	16.1	10.4	41	1.55**
Wyoming	14.5	9.8	46	1.48

*Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Chart H
MSA Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children,
2014-2015 (Listed by Rank)

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Columbia, SC	30.6	17.3	1	1.8**
Dayton, OH	29.4	18.1	2	1.6**
Chattanooga, TN-GA	28.2	17.5	3	1.6*
Winston-Salem, NC	27.2	18.0	4	1.5
Greensboro-High Point, NC	26.8	19.7	5	1.4
Tucson, AZ	26.5	16.1	6	1.6**
Bakersfield, CA	25.9	22.7	7	1.1
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	25.9	21.5	7	1.2
New Haven-Milford, CT	25.6	15.0	9	1.7**
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	25.4	20.6	10	1.2
Fresno, CA	24.4	20.8	11	1.2
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	24.4	16.1	11	1.5**
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	23.7	21.2	13	1.1
El Paso, TX	23.6	17.6	14	1.3
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	23.5	14.7	15	1.6*
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	23.4	16.6	16	1.4**
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	22.8	10.7	17	2.1**
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	22.7	17.4	18	1.3*
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	22.7	16.3	18	1.4**
Tulsa, OK	22.5	18.5	20	1.2*
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.5	22.4	20	1.0
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	22.5	14.1	20	1.6**
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	22.5	17.6	20	1.3**
Akron, OH	22.5	13.8	20	1.6
Toledo, OH	22.3	15.2	25	1.5
Albuquerque, NM	22.1	18.8	26	1.2
Oklahoma City, OK	22.0	14.1	27	1.6**
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	22.0	11.6	27	1.9**
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	21.9	15.7	29	1.4**
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	21.8	11.4	30	1.9*
Richmond, VA	21.8	14.7	30	1.5*
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	21.6	14.9	32	1.4**
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	21.4	18.1	33	1.2

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Wichita, KS	21.4	15.4	33	1.4
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	21.4	14.5	33	1.5**
Baton Rouge, LA	21.3	21.3	36	1.0
Springfield, MA	20.8	15.2	37	1.4**
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	20.8	15.2	37	1.4**
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	20.8	14.0	37	1.5
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	20.7	18.8	40	1.1
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	20.6	14.8	41	1.4
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	20.3	15.4	42	1.3*
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	20.2	17.3	43	1.2
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	20.1	12.2	44	1.6
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	20.1	18.8	44	1.1**
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	19.9	14.9	46	1.3*
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	19.8	15.1	47	1.3
St. Louis, MO-IL	19.8	14.7	47	1.3
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	19.8	14.8	47	1.3**
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	19.7	12.8	50	1.5**
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	19.6	15.3	51	1.3
Syracuse, NY	19.4	11.2	52	1.7*
Kansas City, MO-KS	19.4	14.5	52	1.3*
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	19.3	13.5	54	1.4**
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	19.2	16.4	55	1.2
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	19.1	13.8	56	1.4**
Columbus, OH	19.0	15.3	57	1.2
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	18.9	20.0	58	0.9
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	18.8	12.3	59	1.5
Asheville, NC	18.7	19.0	60	1.0
Knoxville, TN	18.7	17.1	60	1.1
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	18.6	12.6	62	1.5**
Salt Lake City, UT	18.4	12.4	63	1.5**
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	18.4	14.1	63	1.3**
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	18.4	13.3	63	1.4**
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.4	14.1	63	1.3*
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	18.2	12.1	67	1.5**
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	18.1	15.8	68	1.1
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	18.0	13.7	69	1.3
Jacksonville, FL	18.0	15.9	69	1.1

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Worcester, MA-CT	17.8	14.0	71	1.3
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	17.6	11.3	72	1.6
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	17.6	13.8	72	1.3
Santa Rosa, CA	17.4	8.3	74	2.1*
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	17.3	15.3	75	1.1
Boise City, ID	17.3	12.3	75	1.4
Pittsburgh, PA	17.1	11.6	77	1.5**
Rochester, NY	17.0	13.6	78	1.3
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	16.9	13.2	79	1.3*
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	16.8	12.9	80	1.3**
Colorado Springs, CO	16.8	14.6	80	1.2
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	16.7	12.5	82	1.3
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	16.5	12.3	83	1.3**
Raleigh, NC	16.1	11.1	84	1.5*
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	16.1	10.8	84	1.5*
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	15.5	9.9	86	1.6**
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	15.4	14.3	87	1.1
Austin-Round Rock, TX	15.1	10.8	88	1.4*
Urban Honolulu, HI	15.1	8.2	88	1.8
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	14.9	18.5	90	0.8
Madison, WI	14.6	8.3	91	1.8
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	14.6	15.4	91	0.9
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	14.1	12.2	93	1.2
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	13.9	11.3	94	1.2
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	13.9	7.6	94	1.8**
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	13.3	9.5	96	1.4**
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	12.9	10.7	97	1.2
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	12.2	10.6	98	1.2
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	11.4	12.1	99	0.9
Provo-Orem, UT	11.2	9.1	100	1.2

*Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Note: Portland, Maine, MSA rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.

Chart I
MSA Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children,
2014-2015 (Listed Alphabetically)

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Akron, OH	22.5	13.8	20	1.6*
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	12.2	10.6	98	1.2
Albuquerque, NM	22.1	18.8	26	1.2
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	22.8	10.7	17	2.1**
Asheville, NC	18.7	19.0	60	1.0
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	21.6	14.9	32	1.4**
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.5	22.4	20	1.0
Austin-Round Rock, TX	15.1	10.8	88	1.4*
Bakersfield, CA	25.9	22.7	7	1.1
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	18.2	12.1	67	1.5**
Baton Rouge, LA	21.3	21.3	36	1.0
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	20.1	18.8	44	1.1
Boise City, ID	17.3	12.3	75	1.4
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	16.8	12.9	80	1.3**
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	13.9	11.3	94	1.2
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	20.1	12.2	44	1.6**
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	21.8	11.4	30	1.9*
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	19.8	14.8	47	1.3
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	19.2	16.4	55	1.2
Chattanooga, TN-GA	28.2	17.5	3	1.6*
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	18.4	13.3	63	1.4**
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	14.9	18.5	90	0.8
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	20.3	15.4	42	1.3*
Colorado Springs, CO	16.8	14.6	80	1.2
Columbia, SC	30.6	17.3	1	1.8**
Columbus, OH	19.0	15.3	57	1.2
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.4	14.1	63	1.3**
Dayton, OH	29.4	18.1	2	1.6**
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	20.6	14.8	41	1.4

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	16.9	13.2	79	1.3*
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	14.1	12.2	93	1.2
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	21.9	15.7	29	1.4**
El Paso, TX	23.6	17.6	14	1.3
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	19.8	15.1	47	1.3
Fresno, CA	24.4	20.8	11	1.2
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	11.4	12.1	99	0.9
Greensboro-High Point, NC	26.8	19.7	5	1.4
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	18.9	20.0	58	0.9
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	17.3	15.3	75	1.1
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	22.0	11.6	27	1.9**
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	19.3	13.5	54	1.4**
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	19.9	14.9	46	1.3*
Jacksonville, FL	18.0	15.9	69	1.1
Kansas City, MO-KS	19.4	14.5	52	1.3*
Knoxville, TN	18.7	17.1	60	1.1
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	25.9	21.5	7	1.2
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	22.7	17.4	18	1.3*
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	21.4	18.1	33	1.2
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	20.8	14.0	37	1.5**
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	24.4	16.1	11	1.5**
Madison, WI	14.6	8.3	91	1.8
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	25.4	20.6	10	1.2
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	22.5	17.6	20	1.3**
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	17.6	13.8	72	1.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	13.3	9.5	96	1.4**
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	22.5	14.1	20	1.6**
New Haven-Milford, CT	25.6	15.0	9	1.7**
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	23.7	21.2	13	1.1
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	21.4	14.5	33	1.5**
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	17.6	11.3	72	1.6
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	18.8	12.3	59	1.5
Oklahoma City, OK	22.0	14.1	27	1.6**
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	16.1	10.8	84	1.5*
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	22.7	16.3	18	1.4**
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	16.7	12.5	82	1.3
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	14.6	15.4	91	0.9
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	20.7	18.8	40	1.1

Food Hardship Rate – MSA 2014-2015				
MSA	Households With Children	Households Without Children	Rank, Households With Children	Ratio: Rate for HHs w/ Children to Rate for HHs w/out Children
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	19.1	13.8	56	1.4**
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	18.4	14.1	63	1.3**
Pittsburgh, PA	17.1	11.6	77	1.5**
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	15.4	14.3	87	1.1
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	19.6	15.3	51	1.3.
Provo-Orem, UT	11.2	9.1	100	1.2
Raleigh, NC	16.1	11.1	84	1.5*
Richmond, VA	21.8	14.7	30	1.5*
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	20.8	15.2	37	1.4**
Rochester, NY	17.0	13.6	78	1.3
Sacramento-Roseville-Arden-Arcade, CA	18.6	12.6	62	1.5**
St. Louis, MO-IL	19.8	14.7	47	1.3*
Salt Lake City, UT	18.4	12.4	63	1.5*
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	23.4	16.6	16	1.4**
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	19.7	12.8	50	1.5**
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	12.9	10.7	97	1.2
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	13.9	7.6	94	1.8**
Santa Rosa, CA	17.4	8.3	74	2.1*
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA	23.5	14.7	15	1.6*
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	16.5	12.3	83	1.3**
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	18.0	13.7	69	1.3
Springfield, MA	20.8	15.2	37	1.4
Syracuse, NY	19.4	11.2	52	1.7*
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	20.2	17.3	43	1.2
Toledo, OH	22.3	15.2	25	1.5
Tucson, AZ	26.5	16.1	6	1.6**
Tulsa, OK	22.5	18.5	20	1.2
Urban Honolulu, HI	15.1	8.2	88	1.8
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	18.1	15.8	68	1.1
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	15.5	9.9	86	1.6**
Wichita, KS	21.4	15.4	33	1.4
Winston-Salem, NC	27.2	18.0	4	1.5
Worcester, MA-CT	17.8	14.0	71	1.3

*Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**Difference between food hardship rate for households with children and rate for households without children is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Note: Maine rates omitted due to anomalies in the data.