Parental History of Disruptive Life Events and Household Food Insecurity

Dylan B. Jackson, PhD¹; Michael G. Vaughn, PhD²

ABSTRACT

Objective: To investigate whether a history of disruptive life events (ie, school suspension or expulsion, job termination, hospitalization for mental health, and/or criminal justice involvement) among parents is positively associated with household food insecurity.

Design: Structured interviews and self-report surveys.

Setting: Households across all 50 states in the US.

Participants: Subsample of 6,270 households that participated in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort with valid maternal and paternal data.

Main Outcome Measures: Food insecurity was measured when children were aged 9 months (wave 1), 2 years (wave 2), and 4 years (wave 3). Parental history of disruptive life events was measured at wave 1.

Analysis: Logistic regression was used to carry out the analyses.

Results: Each examined disruptive life event was associated with a significant increase in the odds of persistent household food insecurity ($P < .05$). The probability of persistent household food insecurity was >6 times as large in households with 1 or both parents reporting the occurrence of each of the disruptive life events, relative to households with none of these parental risk factors.

Conclusions and Implications: Practitioners may want to consider parental history of various disruptive life events in their assessment of familial risk of household food insecurity. Future policy efforts might include a cost–benefit estimate analysis of intervening earlier in the food insecurity–disruptive life events nexus to advocate for savings to the taxpayer for prevention services. Moreover, future research could evaluate these practice and policy-driven efforts using quasi-experimental designs.

Key Words: adverse life events, food insecurity, parents, children, health (*J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2017;49:554–560.)

Accepted April 19, 2017.

INTRODUCTION

Food insecurity, or the consistent lack of healthy household foods and the experience of frequent hunger, is an important public health issue. Food insecurity has been linked to a host of harmful outcomes for children and families, including asthma, frequent hospitalizations, obesity, and poor school performance.^{1–5} Across a number of studies, food insecurity has been found to be a harbinger for long-term negative health consequences. In particular, research has revealed that frequent experiences of hunger

during childhood increase the risk of poor health status and being diagnosed with a variety of chronic conditions by late adolescence or early adulthood.⁶ However, physical health and well-being are not the only components of health that are influenced by food insecurity. For instance, research has revealed that children who are raised in food-insecure households manifest more emotional problems, including high levels of anxiety and difficulty coping with stress² and even a higher risk of suicide ideation.⁷ Furthermore, externalizing symptoms (eg, hyperactiv-

ity, inattention) and misconduct (eg, bullying, cheating) are also more common in children who are raised in food-insecure households.^{8–10}

One clear antecedent of household food insecurity is chronic poverty.¹¹ Even so, a number of scholars have begun to examine other household factors that influence food insecurity above and beyond the influence of poverty, such as chronic disease in parents and/or adult household members^{12,13} and maternal sensitivity to children's needs.² In short, it appears that factors related to parent–child interactions and, more specifically, the qualities and traits of caregivers may influence the likelihood of food insecurity among children and may increase their likelihood of experiencing chronic hunger.²

Although it is well established that food-insecure households face a number of challenges, including chronic poverty and physical ailments, a challenge that is frequently overlooked is parental history of disruptive life events. This oversight is important to consider,

¹Department of Criminal Justice, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX

²College for Public Health and Social Justice, Saint Louis University, St Louis, MO

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: The authors' conflict of interest disclosures can be found online with this article on www.jneb.org.

Address for correspondence: Dylan B. Jackson, PhD, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Texas at San Antonio, 501 W Cesar E Chavez Blvd, San Antonio, TX 78207; Phone: (210) 458-2611; Fax: (210) 458-2531; E-mail: dylan.jackson@utsa.edu

©2017 Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior. Published by Elsevier, Inc. All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2017.04.010>

not only conceptually but also with respect to prevention. A history of disruptive life events among parents has the potential to affect various facets of social functioning and therefore may also have an impact on the household environment. Recent research has suggested that paternal incarceration, a highly disruptive event, is associated with a statistically significant increase in the risk of household food insecurity.¹⁴ It is possible that other disruptive life events, in addition to incarceration, may increase the risk of household food insecurity by disrupting family well-being and healthy functioning. This line of reasoning is consistent with recent research suggesting that adverse life experiences during childhood may also increase the risk of current household food insecurity by affecting school performance, emotional health, and job stability.¹⁵ The current study builds on this line of research and explores whether adverse, disruptive life events during adolescence and adulthood (eg, school suspension or expulsion, criminal justice involvement) also increase the likelihood of household food insecurity and its persistence over time.

Examining disruptive life events as potential risk correlates for persistent household food insecurity has important implications. If a pathway toward a food-insecure household is primarily via parental experiences of disruptive life events, for instance, efforts to reduce the prevalence of household food insecurity may benefit from considerations of broader parental and family experiences of adversity. In short, attempts to address the lack of food may not be sufficient if the household food insecurity is associated with family disruptions that may be occurring as the result of a parent or guardian being, for example, institutionalized from either an arrest or a mental health disorder.

Little research has accrued on these links between parental history of disruptive life events and household food insecurity, particularly studies that include disruptive life events during adolescence or adulthood. The objective of the current study was to better specify the relationship between disruptive life events and food insecurity by examining these associations while controlling for key covariates that might serve to confound the relationship, such as maternal and

paternal education, employment, parental involvement, and insecure attachment. The current study considered the possibility that a history of adverse or disruptive life events among parents may constitute a pathway to a food-insecure household. Consequently, the proposed hypothesis was that various disruptive life events (ie, school suspension or expulsion, job termination, institutionalization for mental health, criminal justice involvement) would be associated with a statistically significant increase in the likelihood of household food insecurity.

METHODS

Sampling and Participants

The researchers used data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) in the current study. The ECLS-B is a longitudinal, nationally representative study of 10,688 US children and their caregivers (usually the mother) from birth to early childhood. The ECLS-B researchers used a multistage, stratified sampled approach to obtain the data. To be precise, birth certificates were sampled from the National Center for Health Statistics in the 2001, allowing for coverage of approximately 99% of US births. Although mothers were typically the respondent during the parent interview, 6,270 residential fathers also participated in the study by completing self-report questionnaires concerning their life history, personality, and relationship with the child. Some children and their families were deemed ineligible (eg, if the child died or was adopted before age 9 months, if the mother was aged <15 years at the time of birth). The ECLS-B obtained data from a number of sources, including mothers, fathers, teachers, school administrators, direct assessment, and hospital records. Ultimately the study was intended to assess educational and academic development of children. Notwithstanding, the data were well-suited to the current study, because they include a large number of items tapping food insecurity across multiple waves, in addition to questions about both parents' problem behavior, mental health, and substance abuse history. Data from waves 1, 2, and 3 were included in the current study. The first wave of data was collected between 2001 and 2002, when focal children were approximately 9 months

old. The second wave of data was collected between 2003 and 2004, when focal children were approximately 2 years old. Finally, the third wave of data collection was between 2005 and 2006, when children were approximately 4 years old. These waves were included because of the availability of food-insecurity data at each wave and the available reports of paternal and maternal history of disruptive life events at wave 1, which permitted longitudinal analyses. The researchers obtained approval for the current study from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Measures

The same questions that comprise the core food-security module were used in the current study to identify homes that were food insecure (for a complete list of items, see [Supplemental Materials](#)).¹⁶ For further information on the core food security module used in the ECLS-B, see the *Guide to Measuring Household Food Security Revised 2000*, US Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, August, 2000.¹⁶ Following the recognized criterion,⁵ households in which at least 3 of the 18 questions were responded to in the affirmative were categorized as food insecure at that particular wave. In addition, households that were categorized as food insecure at multiple waves were assigned a value of 1 on the measure of persistent food insecurity, whereas all other households were assigned a value of 0 on this measure.

Four items from the first wave of data collection were employed to tap into the history of disruptive life events experienced by the parents. These events have the potential to disturb household functioning and have cascading, negative repercussions for children and families. In some cases, these events may also serve as early indicators of impaired social skills or self-regulation deficits in parents (eg, school suspension or expulsion). Both fathers and mothers were asked the following questions at this wave: *Which of these, if any, have happened to you in your whole life?*

1. School suspension or expulsion: Have you ever been suspended or expelled from school?
2. Job termination: Have you ever been fired or laid off from a job

- because of behavior, attitude, or work performance?
3. Institutionalized for mental health: Have you ever been in a facility overnight for a psychological or mental health problem?
 4. Criminal justice involvement: Have you ever been put in jail, arrested, or convicted of a crime?

Households were assigned a value of 1 on each of these items if either or both parents reported that this had happened to them at some point during their lifetime. Conversely, households in which neither parent had experienced the event were assigned a value of 0. A cumulative measure of disruptive life events (range, 0–4) was also created by summing household scores on these 4 items.

A number of control variables pertaining to the child and his or her household were included in the analysis. First, both maternal and paternal age (in years) and maternal and paternal race (1 = nonwhite) were included in the analysis.¹⁷ In addition, a measure of socioeconomic status was included as a covariate.¹⁷ The measure, which was employed in prior research,¹⁸ is a composite of maternal and paternal education, employment, and occupational prestige. The urbanicity of the household (ie, whether the residence was located in an urban, suburban, or rural area) was also included in the analysis, owing to the potential relevance of urbanicity in the effect of parental characteristics on food insecurity.¹⁹ In addition to these household variables, 2 variables pertaining to the child were included as covariates in the analysis: child sex (male = 1) and child age (in months).¹⁰ Finally, measures of the quality of the parenting and/or parent-child relationship were also employed as control variables in the analysis. The first of these measures was low parental involvement.²⁰ This measure was composed of 3 items that asked parents how often they read books, told stories, and sang songs to their child during the child's infancy. Response options for each item ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (every day). Items were reverse-coded and summed to construct the low parental involvement index ($\alpha = .67$). Finally, an indicator of attachment security was included in the analysis.²⁰ At wave 2 of data collection, when children were about aged 2 years, trained, independent raters as-

sessed the level of attachment security between the child and caregiver (usually the mother) during an observation period in their home using the Toddler Attachment Sort-45 evaluation. Children were deemed to be insecurely attached to the extent that they revealed more demanding, angry, and moody behaviors and fewer affectionate, friendly, and cooperative behaviors when interacting with the caregiver.

Analytical Plan

The analyses were carried out in a series of steps. First, univariate statistics were calculated to examine the basic patterns of household food insecurity over time, as well as parental histories of disruptive life events. Next, the unadjusted odds of food insecurity in households in which parents reported a history of disruptive life events were compared with the unadjusted odds of food insecurity in households in which parents did not report a history of disruptive life events. This was conducted for each disruptive life event individually as well as for the cumulative measure of disruptive life events. The odds of food insecurity were calculated at 3 different time points (ie, waves 1, 2, and 3); in addition, the odds of persistent food insecurity (ie, at multiple

time points) were calculated. In each case, odds ratios (ORs) were deemed statistically significant when the 95% confidence interval associated with that OR did not include 1.0. Next, the odds of food insecurity (both persistent and at specific time points) were recalculated as a function of parental history of disruptive life events after controlling for the list of these covariates. The odds of food insecurity (both persistent and at specific time points) were also calculated by the number of disruptive life events (range, 1–4, in which 0 was the reference category). Finally, the probability of persistent food insecurity across households was calculated as the number of disruptive life events increased from 0 to 4, and the pattern of results was illustrated in a figure. All analyses were conducted using StataCorp Stata Statistical Software (Release 14, StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, 2015). Because of the inclusion of maternal and paternal data and the use of pairwise deletion, sample sizes ranged from 4,721 to 6,139, depending on the specific variables analyzed.

RESULTS

The researchers calculated univariate statistics for each key variable of interest (Table 1). The means of variables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Household Food Insecurity and Parental History of Disruptive Life Events

Variable	Mean	SD	Range	n
Household food insecurity wave				
1	.098	.30	0–1	10,681
2	.072	.26	0–1	9,829
3	.093	.29	0–1	8,911
Persistent	.060	.24	0–1	8,866
Parental history of disruptive life events				
School suspension or expulsion	.368	.48	0–1	6,140
Job termination	.177	.38	0–1	6,060
Institutionalization for mental health	.068	.25	0–1	5,867
Criminal justice involvement	.221	.41	0–1	6,023
Composite	.750	1.00	0–4	5,642

Notes: Means for variables with ranges of 0–1 are proportions. Food insecurity indicates answered affirmatively to at least 3 of the 18 items on the food security module (see [Supplementary Materials](#)). Persistent food insecurity indicates food insecurity at multiple waves. School suspension or expulsion indicates ever suspended or expelled from school during lifetime. Job termination indicates fired for poor performance, behavior, or attitude. Institutionalized for mental health indicates in a facility overnight for mental health or psychological problem. Criminal justice involvement indicates ever arrested, in jail, or convicted of a crime. The composite measure of disruptive life events is a count of the number of disruptive life events experience by the parents.

with values ranging from 0 to 1 are proportions. Approximately 9.8%, 7.2%, and 9.3% of households were food insecure at waves 1, 2, and 3 of data collection, respectively. By comparison, 6.0% of households were persistently food insecure (ie, food insecure across multiple waves). Among households that were food insecure at wave 1, about half (49.3%) were persistently food insecure. Among households that were food insecure at wave 2, 64.9% were persistently food insecure. Among the households that were food insecure at wave 3, 47.4% were persistently food insecure. The percentage of homes that experienced food insecurity at least once during the 3 waves was 17.1%. In terms of parental history of disruptive life events, the most commonly experienced risk correlate was school suspension or expulsion, and the least commonly experienced risk correlate was institutionalization for mental health. Specifically, 36.8% of households reported that at least 1 parent had been suspended or expelled from school, whereas only 6.8% of households reported that 1 or both parents had been institutionalized for mental health.

By comparison, 22.1% of households reported a parental history of criminal justice involvement and 17.7% of households reported a parental history of job termination. On average, households experienced <1 of the 4 disruptive life events measured (mean, 0.75).

Subsequent to the examination of the descriptive statistics, the authors examined the findings investigating the association between parental history of disruptive life events and household food insecurity (Tables 2 and 3). The upper portions of the tables display the unadjusted ORs, whereas the lower portions display the ORs that were adjusted for potential confounders. The results consistently revealed a statistically significant association between each disruptive life event and household food insecurity. This relationship emerged across all of the examined waves and in the case of persistent food insecurity. To illustrate, the unadjusted odds of persistent household food insecurity increased by 246% with a parental history of school suspension or expulsion, 189% with a parental history of job termination, 349% with a parental history of institutionalization for mental health,

and 228% with parental history of criminal justice involvement. Consequently, the odds of persistent food insecurity were predicted to increase by a factor of 13.52 in a household in which all of the disruptive life events were experienced by 1 or both parents, relative to households in which parents experienced none of them. Once covariates were added to the models and the ORs were adjusted for them, the results were substantively identical despite a noteworthy degree of attenuation. For instance, the adjusted odds of persistent household food insecurity (ie, food insecurity across multiple time points) was predicted to increase by 99% when there was a parental history of school suspension or expulsion, 76% for a parental history of job termination, 189% for a parental history of institutionalization for mental health, and 80% for a parental history of criminal justice involvement. The findings indicated that in households in which, between the mother and the father, all of the disruptive life events were experienced, a 593% increase occurred in the adjusted odds of persistent household food insecurity

Table 2. Association Between Parental History of Disruptive Life Events and Household Food Insecurity

Parental History of Disruptive Life Events	Household Food Insecurity			
	Wave 1 OR (CI)	Wave 2 OR (CI)	Wave 3 OR (CI)	Persistent OR (CI)
Unadjusted				
School suspension or expulsion	3.14 (2.66–3.71)	3.24 (2.66–3.95)	3.09 (2.59–3.68)	3.46 (2.77–4.32)
n	6,139	5,794	5,411	5,393
Job termination	2.67 (2.23–3.18)	2.31 (1.87–2.84)	2.72 (2.25–3.30)	2.89 (2.29–3.64)
n	6,059	5,713	5,312	5,292
Institutionalization for mental health	3.48 (2.79–4.35)	3.40 (2.63–4.39)	3.66 (2.87–4.66)	4.49 (3.41–5.91)
n	5,866	5,537	5,165	5,148
Criminal justice involvement	3.03 (2.54–3.62)	2.71 (2.20–3.34)	3.16 (2.61–3.83)	3.28 (2.60–4.13)
n	6,021	5,680	5,285	5,266
Adjusted				
School suspension or expulsion	1.78 (1.44–2.19)	1.94 (1.53–2.45)	1.65 (1.32–2.04)	1.99 (1.52–2.61)
n	5,448	5,448	5,083	5,082
Job termination	1.58 (1.27–1.95)	1.44 (1.14–1.83)	1.78 (1.42–2.22)	1.76 (1.35–2.30)
n	5,405	5,405	5,021	5,020
Institutionalization for mental health	2.22 (1.71–2.89)	2.11 (1.58–2.81)	2.28 (1.72–3.01)	2.89 (2.11–3.96)
n	5,244	5,243	4,883	4,882
Criminal justice involvement	1.51 (1.22–1.87)	1.55 (1.22–1.97)	1.67 (1.33–2.10)	1.80 (1.38–2.35)
n	5,370	5,371	4,995	4,993

CI indicates confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

Notes: Logistic regression was used to carry out these analyses. All ORs are statistically significant. Statistical significance was determined to be $P \leq .05$. Models reporting adjusted ORs account for maternal age, paternal age, maternal race, paternal race, socioeconomic status, urbanicity, child sex, child age, low parental involvement, and insecure attachment. Persistent indicates food insecurity at multiple waves. Multivariate coefficient (R^2) ranges from 0.123 to 0.180 across adjusted models.

Table 3. Association Between Number of Disruptive Life Events and Household Food Insecurity

Number of Disruptive Life Events	Household Food Insecurity			
	Wave 1 OR (CI)	Wave 2 OR (CI)	Wave 3 OR (CI)	Persistent OR (CI)
Unadjusted				
1	2.13 (1.68–2.70)	2.89 (2.20–3.81)	1.84 (1.43–2.39)	2.53 (1.83–3.50)
2	3.14 (2.41–4.08)	3.32 (2.41–4.56)	2.83 (2.13–3.76)	3.59 (2.51–5.14)
3	4.60 (3.30–6.41)	4.55 (3.06–6.77)	3.58 (2.47–5.17)	5.30 (3.43–8.18)
4	11.16 (7.31, 17.04)	8.66 (5.21, 14.39)	11.36 (7.17, 18.00)	13.52 (8.01, 22.82)
n	5,641	5,335	4,980	4,964
Adjusted				
1	1.65 (1.26, 2.15)	2.18 (1.63, 2.94)	1.34 (1.01, 1.78)	2.01 (1.41, 2.86)
2	2.03 (1.50, 2.74)	2.11 (1.49, 2.98)	1.73 (1.26, 2.38)	2.41 (1.62, 3.58)
3	2.43 (1.66, 3.56)	2.46 (1.60, 3.80)	2.02 (1.35, 3.02)	3.14 (1.96, 5.04)
4	5.24 (3.15–8.72)	4.03 (2.28–7.11)	5.76 (3.41–9.72)	6.93 (3.81–12.62)
n	5,064	5,064	4,722	4,721

CI indicates confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.
Notes: Logistic regression was used to carry out these analyses. All ORs are statistically significant. Statistical significance was determined to be $P \leq .05$. Models reporting adjusted ORs account for maternal age, paternal age, maternal race, paternal race, socioeconomic status, urbanicity, child sex, child age, low parental involvement, and insecure attachment. Reference category is 0 (ie, no disruptive life events). Persistent indicates food insecurity at multiple waves. Adjusted models: multivariate coefficient (R^2) wave 1, 0.189; R^2 wave 2, 0.144; R^2 wave 3, 0.160; and R^2 persistent, 0.180.

relative to households in which parents had no history of disruptive life events. Furthermore, as illustrated in the Figure, the probability of persistent household food insecurity was 6.39 times as large in households with 1 or both parents

reporting the occurrence of each of the disruptive life events, relative to households with none of these risk factors (0.115 vs 0.018). In general, ancillary analyses revealed that the pattern of results did not vary consis-

tently by level of parental involvement, attachment security, or degree of poverty (see Supplemental Materials).

DISCUSSION

The findings of the current study suggest that the odds of household food insecurity and its persistence are associated with a parental history of disruptive life events, and that it may be particularly salient when these disruptive life events begin to accumulate. The results were consistent with prior research linking household food insecurity and associated developmental challenges to antecedent adversities¹⁵ as well as components of maternal personality² and associated diagnoses of mood or personality disorders.¹⁷ For instance, prior research identified maternal depression, low agreeableness, and high neuroticism as important correlates of household food insecurity.^{2,17} In short, households are more likely to be food insecure when maternal personality traits increase maternal insensitivity to offspring needs, which is consistent with the findings of the current study.

Maternal disorders associated with mental health have been linked to household food insecurity.²¹ To be precise, adults reporting a major mood or

Figure. Probability of persistent food insecurity, by number of disruptive life events. Probabilities are adjusted for maternal age, paternal age, maternal race, paternal race, socioeconomic status, urbanicity, child sex, child age, low parental involvement, and insecure attachment. Persistent food insecurity indicates food insecurity at multiple waves (ie, households responded in the affirmative to at least 3 of the 18 items in the food security module across multiple waves of data collection. See Supplemental Materials for food security module). Number of disruptive life events indicates count variable of whether parents had ever been: (1) suspended or expelled; (2) fired from a job for poor performance, behavior, or attitude; (3) institutionalized overnight for a mental health or psychological problem; and/or (4) arrested, put in jail, or convicted of a crime.

anxiety disorder (eg, bipolar disorder, mania, panic disorder) were more likely to experience food insecurity.¹⁷ A handful of studies also revealed an association between maternal depressive symptomatology and household food insecurity,^{17,22,23} particularly among low-socioeconomic status families.^{17,22} Whereas food insecurity is likely associated with the risk of depressive symptomatology among mothers and children,²² research also suggested that maternal depression may precede, and increase the likelihood of, household food insecurity.^{17,22} One study revealed that, after controlling for covariates, maternal depression at baseline was associated with a 50% increase in the odds of food insecurity at follow-up.¹⁷ Whereas the current study is consistent with these findings, it also builds on this body of work by tapping into maternal/paternal history of specific disruptive life events that are associated with mental health challenges and poorer life chances. Ultimately, these findings highlight the potential for a history of disruptive life events that have implications for parental mental health challenges (eg, criminal justice involvement, institutionalization) to increase the likelihood that household food insecurity occurs and persists over time.

Despite the virtues of the current study, it had limitations. First, the context of household food insecurity and the frequency and persistence of food neglect of children in particular could not be fully examined owing to data limitations. In some cases, household food insecurity may be a function of disadvantageous economic circumstances, parental neglect, or both. Parents with histories of disruptive life events may be different from those who did not experience such events in meaningful ways (eg, they may exhibit more neglectful personalities), which may have important implications for the results of the current study. In addition, there may be reciprocal causation at work between disruptive life events and food insecurity that is difficult to capture without more intensive data collection and complex statistical modeling. It is also known that many of the disruptive life events studied here have a genetic basis,²⁴⁻²⁶ which suggests the possibility of a shared cause that is at least partially genetic and can be elucidated only using

behavioral genetic designs. Second, the exact timing of the disruptive life events could not be determined. It is possible that different effects may emerge depending on how temporally proximate the disruptive life event is to the experience of household food insecurity. Third, in cases in which parents had been institutionalized for a mental health problem, definitive psychiatric diagnoses could not be gleaned from the data. Finally, as with other low-prevalence phenomena, reported ORs could have been unstable and possibly inflated.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Continued investigation into specific mental health diagnoses as predictors of household food insecurity is likely a worthwhile endeavor for future research.²¹ The current findings point to the potential for a number of disruptive life events to be associated with the persistence of household food insecurity. Addressing food insecurity is of paramount importance in light of the numerous developmental and familial risks that are associated with residing in a food-insecure household. Ultimately, the results of the current study indicate that efforts to prevent household food insecurity and its negative sequelae for children and families might be enhanced by accounting for parental histories of disruptive life events, above and beyond household economic risk. When assessing household risk of food insecurity, practitioners might consider the ways in which various disruptive life events might interfere with parents' ability to maintain a food-secure household over time. Although it may be burdensome to the practitioner, an approach worth exploring is the use of brief screening of disruptive life events that in turn might be linked to existing community mental health services and other cross-sector collaborations. Major life events such as being incarcerated and hospitalization are extremely expensive, and future policy efforts might include a cost-benefit estimate analysis of intervening earlier in the food insecurity-disruptive life events nexus to advocate for savings to the taxpayer for prevention services. Future research could evaluate these

practice and policy-driven efforts using quasi-experimental designs that permit some degree of causal inference yet do not require cumbersome experimental trials that are simply not feasible in most settings.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data related to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2017.04.010>.

REFERENCES

1. Alaimo K, Olson CM, Frongillo EA. Food insufficiency and American school-aged children's cognitive, academic, and psychosocial development. *Pediatrics*. 2001;108:44-53.
2. Belsky D, Moffitt T, Arseneault L, Melchior M, Caspi A. Context and sequelae of food insecurity in children's development. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010;172:809-818.
3. Cook JT, Frank DA, Berkowitz C, et al. Food insecurity is associated with adverse health outcomes among human infants and toddlers. *J Nutr*. 2004;134:1432-1438.
4. Martin KS, Ferris AM. Food insecurity and gender are risk factors for obesity. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2007;39:31-36.
5. Ryu JH, Bartfeld JS. Household food insecurity during childhood and subsequent health status: the early childhood longitudinal study—kindergarten cohort. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102:e50-e55.
6. Kirkpatrick SI, McIntyre L, Potestio ML. Child hunger and long-term adverse consequences for health. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2010;164:754-762.
7. McIntyre L, Williams JV, Lavorato DH, Patten S. Depression and suicide ideation in late adolescence and early adulthood are an outcome of child hunger. *J Affect Disord*. 2013;150:123-129.
8. Melchior M, Chastang JF, Falissard B, et al. Food insecurity and children's mental health: a prospective birth cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:e52615.
9. Salvo PD, Silver EJ, Stein RE. Household food insecurity and mental health problems among adolescents. *Acad Pediatr*. 2016;16:90-96.
10. Jackson DB, Vaughn MG. Household food insecurity during childhood and adolescent misconduct. *Prev Med*. 2017;96:113-117.
11. Chilton M, Chyatte M, Breaux J. The negative effects of poverty & food

- insecurity on child development. *Ind J Med Res.* 2007;126:262-272.
12. Tarasuk V, Mitchell A, McLaren L, McIntyre L. Chronic physical and mental health conditions among adults may increase vulnerability to household food insecurity. *J Nutr.* 2013;143:1785-1793.
 13. Anater AS, Zaccaro D, Emery K, Kandefer S, Kane H. Understanding triggers of food insecurity. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2015;47:53-60.
 14. Turney K. Paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity: a consideration of variation and mechanisms. *Soc Serv Rev.* 2015;89:335-367.
 15. Chilton M, Knowles M, Rabinowich J, Arnold KT. The relationship between childhood adversity and food insecurity: "It's like a bird nesting in your head." *Public Health Nutr.* 2015;18:2643-2653.
 16. Bickel G, Carlson S, Nord M. *Measuring Food Insecurity in the United States: Household Food Security in the United States 1995-98.* Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture; 1998.
 17. Garg A, Toy S, Tripodis Y, Cook J, Cordella N. Influence of maternal depression on household food insecurity for low-income families. *Acad Pediatr.* 2015;15:305-310.
 18. Moss BG, Yeaton WH. Young children's weight trajectories and associated risk factors: results from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort. *Am J Health Promot.* 2011;25:190-198.
 19. Huddleston-Casas C, Charnigo R, Simmons LA. Food insecurity and maternal depression in rural, low-income families: a longitudinal investigation. *Public Health Nutr.* 2009;12:1133-1140.
 20. Zaslow M, Bronte-Tinkew J, Capps R, Horowitz A, Moore KA, Weinstein D. Food security during infancy: implications for attachment and mental proficiency in toddlerhood. *Matern Child Health J.* 2009;13:66-80.
 21. Muldoon KA, Duff PK, Fielden S, Anema A. Food insufficiency is associated with psychiatric morbidity in a nationally representative study of mental illness among food insecure Canadians. *Soc Psych Psych Epidemiol.* 2013;48:795-803.
 22. Melchior M, Caspi A, Howard LM, et al. Mental health context of food insecurity: a representative cohort of families with young children. *Pediatrics.* 2009;124:e564-e572.
 23. Whitaker RC, Phillips SM, Orzol SM. Food insecurity and the risks of depression and anxiety in mothers and behavior problems in their preschool-aged children. *Pediatrics.* 2006;118:e859-e868.
 24. Beaver KM, Schwartz JA, Barnes JC, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on being expelled and suspended from school. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2016;90:214-218.
 25. Sariaslan A, Larsson H, Fazel S. Genetic and environmental determinants of violence risk in psychotic disorders: a multivariate quantitative genetic study of 1.8 million Swedish twins and siblings. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2016;21:1251-1256.
 26. Schwartz JA, Beaver KM. Exploring whether genetic differences between siblings explain sibling differences in criminal justice outcomes. *Compr Psychiatry.* 2014;55:93-103.

JNEB Roundtable Discussion: Why and How to Become a Reviewer of Excellence for JNEB

Saturday, July 22 | 3:45 pm – 4:45 pm
SNEB Annual Conference

Hosts: Karen Chapman-Novakofski PhD, RD, LD, University of Illinois, Editor in Chief, Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior; Mary Murimi, PhD, RD, LDN, Texas Tech University; Susan Johnson, PhD, UC Denver; Julie Reeder, PhD, MPH, Oregon Health Authority; Bret Luick, PhD, University of Alaska Fairbanks; Madeline Sigman-Grant, PhD, RD; George Woodward, Elsevier; Gail Gates, Oklahoma State University; Susan Pollock, Managing Editor, JNEB

During this interactive roundtable discussion session, the *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* Editors and Board of Editors members will answer your questions about scientific reviewing for JNEB and guide you through the process of gaining recognition, scientific expertise, and valuable networking for your efforts. Individual questions about JNEB's review policies and procedures will be answered, feedback on reviews you may have received will be given, and examples of excellent article reviews will be shared.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have not stated any conflicts of interest.