A multilevel study of area socioeconomic status and food purchasing behaviour

Running head: Area socioeconomic status and diet

Abstract

Objective

This study examined the association between area socioeconomic status (SES) and food purchasing behaviour.

Setting

Melbourne city, Australia, 2003.

Participants

Residents of 2,564 households located in 50 small areas.

Design

Data were collected by mail survey (64.2% response rate). Area SES was indicated by the proportion of households in each area earning less than Aus$400 per week, and individual-level socioeconomic position was measured using education, occupation, and household income. Food purchasing was measured on the basis of compliance with dietary guideline recommendations (for grocery foods) and **variety of fruit and vegetable purchase.** Multilevel regression examined the association between area SES and food purchase after adjustment for individual-level demographic (age, sex, household composition) and socioeconomic factors.

Results

Residents of low SES areas were significantly less likely than their counterparts in advantaged areas to purchase grocery foods that were high in fibre and low in fat, salt, and sugar; **and they purchased a smaller variety of fruits.** There was no evidence of an association between area SES and vegetable variety.

Conclusions

In Melbourne, area SES was associated with some food purchasing behaviours independent of individual-level factors, suggesting that areas in this city may be differentiated on the basis of food availability, accessibility, and affordability, making the purchase of some types of foods more difficult in disadvantaged areas.

Introduction

A large literature has examined the association between individual-level socioeconomic position (SEP) and diet. The findings of this work typically show that socioeconomically disadvantaged groups have diets that are least consistent with recommended intakes of foods and nutrients,[1-3] and least in accord with dietary guideline messages that promote foods that are high in fibre and low in fat, salt, and sugar.[4-5] Significantly, the poorer dietary intake of disadvantaged groups contributes in part to their higher rates of mortality and morbidity for chronic disease.[6-7]

During the last decade, researchers have increasingly turned their attention to the question of whether place of residence influences diet independently of individual-level factors; and more particularly, whether living in a socioeconomically disadvantaged area is associated with a less healthy diet. Our review of this (small) literature suggested that area studies of diet can be broadly divided into two types that reflect the analytic method used; namely, studies that undertake multivariable analyses using both area- and individual-level variables but without the capacity to statistically integrate the two levels (i.e. contextual studies), and multilevel studies. Six of the former types of study[8-13] and five of the latter were identified,[14-18] and key aspects of each are summarised in Table 1.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The findings of the contextual studies were reasonably consistent in that they each found some evidence that living in a disadvantaged area was associated with a poorer diet after adjusting for individual-level socioeconomic and demographic factors. These studies however were often based on a small number of areas, and in most cases, the analytic approach did not allow for the partitioning of area- and individual-level sources of variation, hence it was unclear whether differences in diet between advantaged and disadvantaged areas were due to a composition effect (i.e. the clustering of rich and poor people in rich and poor areas) or the environmental characteristics of the areas per se (i.e. a context effect, possibly reflecting area differences in physical infrastructure, services, and facilities). The findings of the multilevel studies, which allow for area- and individual-level variation to be partitioned and quantified, present a somewhat different picture. Of the five identified, only two reported a significant difference in diet between areas after adjustment for individual-level factors.[15,17] Diez-Roux et al[14] and Ecob and Macintyre[15] found that residents of socioeconomically disadvantaged areas had poorer diets than those in more advantaged areas, although the findings of the former were weak and often not statistically significant. Area SES was not associated with food purchasing

behaviour in an Australian study[16] or with dietary intake and food choice in a Dutch study.[18]

This paper contributes to the literature on areas and diet by reporting on a multilevel study that examined the association between area SES and food purchasing behaviour in the Melbourne metropolitan region (Australia) in 2003. The relationship between SES and diet in Australia (and elsewhere) has to date been investigated primarily using 'quantitative' dietary indicators such as mean daily intakes of nutrients, nutrient density levels, or percentage contribution of food to nutrition and energy.[5] By contrast, few studies have examined the relationship using 'qualitative' indicators such as food purchasing behaviour. Clearly, people need to procure food (which usually means purchase it) before it can consumed and converted into energy and nutrients, and there are a number of compelling reasons why it is important to better understand the factors that influence the food purchasing choices of different socioeconomic groups. First, most people make dietary decisions in relation to food and not nutrients,[19] thus when shopping our food choices are more likely to be influenced by factors such as price, availability, taste preference, and convenience etc than by the vitamin and mineral content of the food. Second, research has shown that the type of food people buy influences dietary quality.[20] Third, food choice differences between socioeconomic groups translate into concomitant differences in nutrient intake.[21-22]. Fourth, knowing about the factors that influence socioeconomic differences in food purchasing is important in assessing the reach and impact of health promotion messages, many of which focus on encouraging people to make healthy food choices when shopping.[23-25]

This study investigates whether residents of socioeconomically advantaged and disadvantaged areas differ in their purchase of grocery foods, fruits, and vegetables. Specifically, three questions are examined:

1. Do areas vary in their food purchasing profiles?
2. To what extent does within-area clustering by individual-level SEP account for any observed differences between areas in their food purchasing profiles?
3. What is the relationship between area SES and food purchasing after adjustment for within-area differences in food purchasing by individual-level SEP?

Methods

Geographic scope

This paper is based on data collected as part of the Victorian Lifestyle and Neighbourhood Environment Study (VicLANES), a cross-sectional multilevel investigation of area- and individual-level factors and health-related behaviour. The target population for VicLANES comprised people living in an area extending 20km from the central business district of Melbourne city, the capital of the state of Victoria.

Sample design

The sample comprised non-institutionalised residents of private dwellings (households) and Census Collector Districts (CCD). A CCD is the smallest administrative unit used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) to collect census data. In urban areas such as Melbourne, a CCD contains an average of 200 private dwellings which are deemed to be relatively homogeneous in terms of their socioeconomic characteristics. Households and CCDs were selected using a stratified two-stage cluster design. At the first stage, all CCDs in the Melbourne metropolitan area were ranked according to the proportion of the households in each CCD with an income of less than Aus$400 per week. The resultant distribution was stratified into septiles, and a total of 50 CCDs were randomly selected from the low (n=17), middle (n=16) and high income (n=17) strata. At the second stage, we used names and addresses on the Australian Electoral Roll to identify all residents aged 18-74 years in each of the 50 CCDs. Voting is compulsory in Australia for persons aged 18 years and over, so the electoral roll provides near-complete coverage of the resident adult population. A total of 3995 households were then randomly sampled, and the person within each household who was primarily responsible for most of the food shopping was targeted for data collection.

Data Collection

The household-level data collection within each CCD occurred between September and December 2003, and was conducted using a mail-survey method described by Dillman.[26] A total of 2564 usable surveys were returned to yield a final response rate of 64.2%.

Measures

Area SES: The septiles forming the sampling strata were used as the basis for measuring area SES. In each of the three strata the average proportion of households earning less than Aus$400 per week was 7.0% (range 3.5%-8.5%), 15.3% (14.4%-16.7%), and 31.0%

(24.1%-59.6%) respectively: these strata were subsequently labelled as high, medium, and low SES. The area-level socioeconomic characteristics of the three strata were further examined using 2001 census data,[27] and they differed markedly in terms of their unemployment rate (4.0%, 6.6%, 11.0% respectively), the percentage of employees in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs (7.1%, 13.8%, 20.7%), the percentage of dwellings that were rented from the public housing authority (0.17%, 1.6%, 14.5%), and the percentage of dwellings with no motor vehicle (3.9%, 9.6%, 21.2%).

Education: Respondents were asked to provide information about whether they had attained further education since leaving school, and if so, the highest qualification completed. Respondent's education was subsequently coded as (1) bachelor degree or higher (the latter included post graduate diploma, masters degree, or doctorate), (2) diploma (associate or undergraduate), (3) vocational (trade or business certificate, or apprenticeship), and (4) no post-school qualifications.

Occupation: Respondents who were employed at the time of completing the survey were asked to indicate their job title and then to describe the main tasks or duties they performed. This information was subsequently coded to the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO).[28] For the purposes of this study, the original nine-level ASCO classification was re-coded into three categories: (1) managers/professionals (managers and administrators, professionals, and para-professionals); (2) white collar employees (clerks, salespersons and personal service workers), and (3) blue collar employees (trades-persons, plant and machine operators and drivers, and labourers and related workers). A fourth category, "not in the labour force", comprising the retired, unemployed, students, and those engaged in home duties on a full time basis, was also created.

Income: Respondents were asked to indicate their total annual household income (including pensions, allowances, and investments) using a 14 category measure that was subsequently re-coded into five groups for analysis: (1) Aus$78,000 or more, (2) $52,000-77,999, (3) $36,400-51,999, (4) $20,800-36,399, and (5) less than $20,799. Households in categories 4 and 5 received annual incomes at or below the Australian average in 2000.[29]

Confounding: Age in years (centred), sex, and household composition were used as potential confounding variables.

Food purchasing: As part of the questionnaire, information was sought about the purchase of grocery items, fruits, and vegetables.

Grocery food purchase: this was examined on the basis of 15 questions, each of which had two or more response options. For example, respondents were asked "When shopping for your household, what type of milk do you usually buy"? The response options included: 'I do not buy milk', 'extra creamy', 'full cream', 'low fat/trim', 'skim/fat free', plus others. Multiple responses were permitted for each question. The other 14 questions were structured in an identical manner and pertained to bread, rice, pasta, noodles, baked beans, tinned fruit, cheese, yoghurt, beef mince, chicken, tinned fish, cooking oils, butter, and solid cooking fat. In Australia, dietary authorities recommend that people purchase and consume a variety of foods that are relatively high in fibre and low in fat, salt, and sugar[25]; and consistent with these guidelines, we classified the foods into a recommended and regular category (Table 2). Using this classification, we developed a measure that captured the extent to which peoples' grocery purchasing patterns were consistent (or not) with dietary guideline recommendations. First, for each food-type (e.g. milk), respondents were assigned the value 1 if they reported usually purchasing only the regular option exclusively (and not any recommended options); they were assigned the value 3 if they reported usually purchasing only the recommended option exclusively (and not any regular options); and they were assigned a value of 2 if they reported usually purchasing a mix of regular and recommended options (e.g. full cream and skim milk). There were a small number of respondents who reported that they never purchased a particular type of food and these were assigned the value 0. In sum, for each of the 15 food-types, respondents were assigned a value of 0, 1, 2 or 3. Second, an initial food purchasing index was created that involved summing the scores for the 15 food-types, with those scoring 0 being excluded at this point. This initial index had a potential range of 15 – 45, with 15 denoting people who purchased the regular option for each food-type, and 45 denoting those who purchased the recommended option for all foods. It is important to note that the respondents included in this initial index reported purchasing all of the 15 food-types. Those scoring 0 for one or more food-types were excluded because their final index score would not accurately reflect their purchasing pattern. For example, someone who

purchased all 15 food-types and chose the recommended option for each item would score 45, whereas someone who purchased 13 food-types and chose the recommended option for each item would score 39. Clearly, both people have identical purchasing patterns with respect to the dietary guidelines (i.e. they are making the healthier choice for every food item) but this isn't reflected in their index score. To deal with this issue, and as a way of including the full sample in the analyses, respondents who reported not buying one or more of the food items were included in the index using the following formula: Index score = a / 15 – b. The quantity 'a' represented each respondent's initial score which was derived by summing the values (1, 2 or 3) for each of the food-types. The denominator comprised the constant '15' which represented the number of food-types in the index, and the variable 'b', which represented the number of food-types not purchased by the respondent. In effect, the formula calculated a mean food purchasing score for each respondent. Finally, the index was re-scored to range from 0 – 100, with higher scores indicating a purchasing pattern that was more consistent with dietary guideline recommendations (sample mean 47.6, SD 13.4).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Fruit purchasing: this was examined using a question that asked 'When shopping for fresh fruit, how often do you buy these types"? The respondent was instructed to include seasonal fruits, but exclude fruit juice, canned, and dried fruit. The question item-set consisted of 22 fresh fruits selected (mostly) from the food frequency questionnaire used in the 1995 Australian National Nutrition Survey.[31] For each fruit, respondents were asked to indicate their usual purchasing pattern on the basis of five-point scales: 1='Never buy', 2='Rarely Buy', 3='Sometimes buy', 4='Nearly Always Buy' and 5='Always buy'.

Using these items we created an index that measured variety of fruit purchased. For each fruit item, respondents reporting 'never' or 'rarely' buy were scored 0, and those reporting any of the other three options were scored 1. The items were then summed, with the resultant index score for each respondent indicating the variety of fruits purchased (sample mean 14.2, SD 4.1). Importantly, the variety score does not reflect the range of fruits purchased on any particular shopping trip, but rather, the types that are purchased at least sometimes over the course of many shopping episodes depending on factors such as seasonality, price, and quality. As the variety index was essentially a count-measure and non-normally distributed it was categorised into quartiles, with Q1 denoting high variety and Q4 low variety.

Vegetable purchasing: Respondents were asked to indicate how often they purchased 25 vegetables, including fresh and frozen, but excluding canned or dried vegetables. A purchasing index measuring vegetable variety was constructed using an identical format and method to that used for fresh fruit. The mean variety score for vegetables for the sample was 18.5 (SD 4.1).

Analysis

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for each of the measures used in this analysis. From the 2564 questionnaires that were returned, missing data were identified for education (n=106, 4.1%), occupation (n=83, 3.2%), income (n=903, 35.2%), sex (n=4, 0.16%), age (n=5, 0.19%), and household composition (n=55, 2.2%). In total, the proportion of the sample with completely observed data for all the variables examined (complete cases) was 57%. We have not reported results obtained by analysing only the complete cases because of the potential bias and loss of precision associated with the large proportion of missing income data: instead, we used multiple imputation. We imputed all missing data under a missing at random (MAR) assumption and adopted an inclusive strategy for the imputation model[32-34] Ten datasets with imputed values for missing items on each variable were estimated using the command 'Imputation by Chained Equations (ICE)' in Stata 9.2.[35]

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The grocery data were analysed as a two-level random intercept model in Stata. We specified three models that directly addressed the three research questions identified earlier. Model 1 (baseline) quantified the extent of area-level variation in food-purchasing behaviour conditional on the confounders. Here, the substantive interest was on the random term, which if significant, indicated that food purchasing patterns differed between the 50 CCDs. For this and subsequent models we also calculated an intraclass correlation (ICC) by dividing the between-CCD variance by the total variance, and this is interpreted as the proportion of the total variation in food purchasing behaviour that is between the CCDs. Model 2 extends Model 1 by adding education, occupation, and income as fixed effects, and examined the extent to which they account for variation in food purchasing between the CCDs. Model 3 then extended Model 2 by including the measure of area SES as a fixed effect: here the focus is on whether area SES is associated with food purchasing independently of within-area variation in age, sex, household composition and individual-level SEP.

Variety of fruit and vegetable purchase was examined using a two-level ordered multinomial logit-link model. 'High' variety (quartile 1) was denoted the reference category, hence positive regression coefficients for any of the predictor variables indicate a greater odds of purchasing a lower variety of fruits and vegetables. Three models were specified. Model 1 (baseline) quantified the extent of area-level variation in fruit and vegetable variety conditional on the confounders. Model 2 added education, occupation, and income, and Model 3 included area SES. The results are presented as odds ratios and their 95% confidence intervals.

Results

Table 4 presents the findings of the multilevel analyses which examined the independent contribution of area- and individual-level socioeconomic factors to grocery food purchase. In Model 1, the area-level random terms was statistically significant (p=0.033), indicating that the average grocery purchasing score was different (beyond chance) across the 50 CCD. Of the total variability in grocery purchase, 1.5% occurred between CCD and 98.5% between individuals. Model 2 adds the fixed (average) effects for education, occupation and income: this attenuated the between-area variation by 59.8%, and the random term was no longer significant (p=0.241). Education and income were associated with grocery purchase: respondents with no post-school qualifications and those living in low income households scored significantly lower on the index. No significant occupational effects were observed. Model 3 adds the fixed effect for area SES and the coefficients indicate that residents of medium and low-SES areas scored significantly lower on the grocery purchasing index than their counterparts from high-SES areas.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Table 5 presents the findings of the ordered multilevel logistic regression analysis which examined the contribution of area- and individual-level socioeconomic factors to variety of fruit and vegetable purchasing. Fruit variety scores were significantly different (p=0.01) across the 50 CCDs (Model 1). After adjustment for education, occupation and income (Model 2) the between-area variation in fruit variety was attenuated by 50.0% and remained marginally statistically significant (p=0.06). Respondents with no post-school qualifications had 1.72 (95% CI 1.25-2.38) times higher odds of purchasing a lower variety of fruits. The corresponding odds for respondents from low income families was 1.69 (95% CI 1.11-2.57). Model 3 adds the measure of area SES which made no appreciable difference to the between-CCD variation (relative to Model 2) although the

random term was no longer statistically significant (p=0.11). The coefficients for area SES show that residents of low SES areas had significantly higher odds of purchasing a lower variety of fruits than residents in the high SES areas (OR 1.30, 95% CI 1.00-1.67). Independent of area SES, respondents with lower levels of education, and residents of lower income households, had significantly higher odds of purchasing a more limited variety of fruits than their higher status counterparts.

Vegetable variety scores did not differ significantly across the 50 CCD (Model 1) and the inclusion of education, occupation, and income further attenuated the CCD variation (Model 2). Respondents with no post-school qualifications had a significantly higher odds of purchasing a lower variety of vegetables relative to those with a bachelor degree (OR 1.36 95% CI 1.08-1.72). There was no association between vegetable variety and occupation, income or area SES (Model 3).

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

In metropolitan Melbourne in 2003 area SES was associated with the purchase of grocery foods and fruit variety. Compared with their counterparts in high SES areas, residents of low SES areas were less likely to buy groceries that were high in fibre and low in fat, salt, and sugar; and they purchased a smaller variety of fruits. These findings are broadly consistent with the results of multilevel studies conducted in the US[14] and Scotland[15]; however, they are at odds with multilevel research conducted in the Netherlands[18] and in Brisbane, Australia.[16] Reconciling these differences, and hence being able to generalise about the relationship between area SES and diet, is difficult. In part, these difficulties stem from the limited evidence-base (i.e. the small number of multilevel studies) and methodological issues such as differences in the conceptualisation and measurement of diet, the individual-level variables used as confounders, and the number and size of the area-units used.[15] The inconsistencies between study findings however, are likely to be more than a methodological artefact, and may reflect "real" historical, cultural, political, socioeconomic, and geospatial differences between countries (e.g. US and Australia) and between regions within the same country (e.g. Brisbane and Melbourne). At present, the mixed findings of the small number of multilevel studies do not provide a sufficiently reliable basis on which to make a general call for area-level public health interventions to improve conditions in deprived areas to facilitate the procurement of foods that are conducive to a healthy diet: rather, any "call" may have to be specific and tailored to each particular geographic and spatial context.

A large literature documents an association between individual-level SEP and diet, and most of this work has focused on socioeconomic differences in food and nutrient intakes.[5] These studies usually find that socioeconomically disadvantaged groups have intakes that are consistent with their higher rates of diet-related chronic disease.[1-3] To some extent at least, the results of this food purchasing study extend and complement the findings of the intake studies by showing that those of low SEP are less likely to buy grocery foods that accord with diet-related health promotion messages and dietary guidelines. In addition, low socioeconomic groups had a significantly higher odds of purchasing a lower variety of fruits and vegetables.

Study Limitations

First, survey non-response tends to be higher in disadvantaged areas[36] and among individuals of low SEP.[37] Non-response in the VicLANES study was 35.8%, hence the sample probably under-represents the disadvantaged areas and individuals, and over-represents the advantaged, and the observed socioeconomic differences in food purchasing are likely to be an under-estimate of the actual differences in the Melbourne population.

Second, as with most multilevel studies[38]our use of a CCD to represent a neighborhood was made for reasons of sampling and analytic convenience rather than being underpinned by an explicit theory linking area SES and food purchasing; hence associations among these variables are likely to be underestimated.

Third, our finding of an association between area SES and food purchase might be confounded by individual-level socioeconomic factors not included in the models. This said however, we included the three most widely used indicators of a person's socioeconomic characteristics,[39] and given the correlation among these indicators[40] it is likely that education, occupation, and income were capturing most of the unmeasured influences of other socioeconomic factors excluded from the models. Alternatively, it may be that the inclusion of these individual-level measures resulted in 'over-adjustment' which argues for the possibility of an even stronger contextual effect on food purchase than was observed in this study. If education, occupation and household income represent part of the pathway via which area SES influences food procurement, then modelling individual-level socioeconomic variables may inappropriately attenuate the variation that is more correctly attributable to area disadvantage.[41]

Conclusion

In the Melbourne metropolitan region in 2003, differences between advantaged and disadvantaged areas in their purchasing profiles for grocery foods and fruits, and 'healthier' purchasing in higher SES areas, suggest that the areas may be differentiated on the basis of food availability, accessibility, and affordability, making the purchase of some types of foods more difficult for people living in disadvantaged areas. To date, the between- and within-country (multilevel) evidence linking area-disadvantage and diet is both sparse and inconsistent. Methodological issues notwithstanding, this might suggest that area deprivation is not universally associated with poorer access to healthy food. Cummins and Macintyre[42] reached a somewhat similar conclusion based on their review of the literature on food environments and obesity. A challenge for future area-based dietary research is to identify those ecologic characteristics (e.g. urban design, shopping infrastructure, and transport services) that promote equality of access to healthy food, and those characteristics that make its attainment difficult.

References

1. Metcalf P, Scragg R, Davis P. Dietary intakes by different markers of socioeconomic status: results of a New Zealand workforce survey. *New Zealand Medical Journal.* 2006; **26:** U2127.
2. Shahar D, Shai L, Vardi H, Shahar A, Fraser D. Diet and eating habits in high and low socioeconomic groups. *Nutrition* 2005;**21:** 559-566.
3. De Irala-Estevez J, Groth M, Johansson L, Oltersdorf U, Prattala R, Martinez-Gonzalez MA. A systematic review of socioeconomic differences in food habits in Europe: consumption of fruit and vegetables. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition.* 2000;**54:** 706-714.
4. Turrell G. Compliance with the Australian dietary guidelines in the early 1990's: have population-based health promotion programs been effective? *Nutrition and Health* 1997;**11:** 271-288.
5. Turrell G, Hewitt B, Patterson C, Oldenburg B, Gould T. Socioeconomic differences in food purchasing behaviour and suggested implications for diet-related health promotion. *Journal of Human Nutrition Dietetics.* 2002; **15:**355-364.
6. James WPT, Nelson M, Leather S. The contribution of nutrition to inequalities in health. *British Medical Journal* 1997;**314:** 1545-1549.
7. Davey Smith G, Brunner E. Socioeconomic differentials in health: the role of nutrition. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 1997;**56:** 75-90.
8. Diehr P, Koepsell T, Cheadle A, Psaty BM, Wagner E, Curry S. Do communities differ in health behaviors? *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1993;**46:** 1141-1149.
9. Forsyth A, Macintyre S, Anderson A. Diets for disease? Intraurban variation in reported food consumption in Glasgow. *Appetite* 1994; **22:**259-274.
10. Karvonen S, Rimpela A. Socio-regional context as a determinant of adolescents' health behaviour in Finland. *Social Science and Medicine* 1996; **43:**1467-1474.
11. Ellaway A, Macintyre S. Does where you live predict health related behaviours? A case study in Glasgow. *Health Bulletin.* 1996; **54:** 443-446.
12. Karvonen S, Rimpela AH. Urban small area variation in adolescents' health behaviour. *Social Science and Medicine.* 1997; **45:** 1089-1098.
13. Shohaimi S, Welch A, Bingham S, Luben R, Day N, Wareham N, Khaw K-T. Residential area deprivation predicts fruit and vegetable consumption independently of individual educational level and occupational social class: a cross-sectional population study in the Norfolk cohort of the European Prospective Investigation into

436 Cancer (EPIC-Norfolk). *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health.* 2004; **58:**
437 686-691.
438 14. Diez-Roux AV, Nieto FJ, Caulfield L, Tyroler HA, Watson RL, Szklo M.
439 Neighbourhood differences in diet: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC)
440 study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health.* 1999; **53:** 55-63.
441 15. Ecob R, Macintyre S. Small area variations in health related behaviours; do these
442 depend on the behaviour itself, its measurement, or on personal characteristics?
443 *Health and Place.* 2000; **6:** 261-274.
444 16. Turrell G, Blakely T, Patterson C, Oldenburg B. A multilevel analysis of
445 socioeconomic (small area) differences in household food purchasing behaviour.
446 *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health.* 2004; **58:** 208-215.
447 17. Ball K, Crawford D, Mishra. G. Socioeconomic inequalities in women's fruit and
448 vegetable intakes: a multilevel study of individual, social, and environmental
449 mediators. *Public Health Nutrition.* 2006; **9:** 623-630.
450 18. Giskes K, Turrell G, van Lenthe FJ, Brug J, Mackenbach JP. A multilevel study of
451 socioeconomic inequalities in food choice behaviour and dietary intake among the
452 Dutch population: the GLOBE study. *Public Health Nutrition* 2006; **9:** 75-83.
453 19. Crotty P, Rutishauser I. Cahill M. From food to nutrients and back. *Proceeding of the*
454 *Nutrition Society of Australia.* 1991; **16:** 38.
455 20. Shimakawa T, Sorlie P, Carpenter MA, Dennis B, Tell GS, Watson R, Williams D.
456 Dietary intake patterns and sociodemographic factors in the Atherosclerosis Risk in
457 Communities Study. *Preventive Medicine* 1994; **23:** 769-780.
458 21. Smith A, Baghurst K. Public Health implications of dietary differences between
459 social status and occupational category groups. *Journal of Epidemiology and*
460 *Community Health.* 1992; **46:** 409-416.
461 22. Syrette JA, Baghurst KI, Record SJ. Sociodemographic determinants of the
462 contribution of cereal foods to nutrient intake in the Australian population. *Food*
463 *Australia.* 1990; **42:** 330-337.
464 23. Dixon H, Borland R, Segan C. Public reaction to Victoria's '2 Fruit 'n' 5 Veg every
465 day' campaign and reported consumption of fruit and vegetables. *Preventive*
466 *Medicine.* 1998; **27:** 572-582.
467 24. Krebs-Smith SM, Scott Kantor L. Choose a variety of fruit and vegetables daily:
468 understanding the complexities. *Journal of Nutrition.* 2001; **131:** 487S-501S.
469 25. Strategic Inter-Governmental Nutrition Alliance (SIGNAL). *Eat Well Australia: An*
470 *agenda for action for public health nutrition 2001-2010.* Canberra, National Public

Health Partnership, 2001.
http://www.health.vic.gov.au/nhpa/resources/nu_eatwell.htm
26. Dillman DA. *Mail and internet surveys: the tailored design method.* Chichester, Wiley, 2000.
27. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *CDATA 2001. Your Census at Work CD-ROM (2nd Release).*Cat. No. 2019.0.30.001, Canberra, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003.
28. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Classification of Occupations, Second Edition.* Catalogue No. 1220.0. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1997.
29. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Income Distribution 1999-2000.* Catalogue No. 6523.0. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 2001.
30. Turrell G. Educational differences in dietary guideline food practices: are they associated with educational differences in food and nutrition knowledge? *Australian Journal of Nutrition and Dietetics.* 1997; **54:** 25-33.
31. McLennan W. *National Nutrition Survey User's Guide.* Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1998.
32. Collins LM, Schafer JS, Kam C. A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychological Methods.* 2001; **6:** 330-351.
33. Rubin DB. Multiple imputation after 18+ years. *Journal of the American Statistical Association.* 1996; **91:** 473-489.
34. Meng XL. Multiple-imputation inferences with uncongenial sources of input. *Statistical Science.* 1994; **9:** 538-573.
35. Stata Statistical Software, Release 9. College Station, Stata Corporation, Texas, 2003.
36. Turrell G, Sanders AE, Slade GD, Marcenes W, Spencer AJ. The contribution of area-level disadvantage and individual-level socioeconomic position to self-reported oral health. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology.* 2007; **35:** 195-206.
37. Turrell G, Najman JM. Collecting food-related data from low socioeconomic groups: how adequate are our current research designs? *Australian Journal of Public Health.* 1995; **19:** 410-416.
38. Boyle MH, Wilms JD, Place effects for areas defined by administrative boundaries. *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 1999; **149:** 577-585.
39. Dutton T, Turrell G, Oldenburg B. *Measuring Socioeconomic Position in Population Health Monitoring and Health Research.* Health Inequalities Monitoring Series No. 3. Brisbane, Australia, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, 2005.

505 40. Turrell G, Hewitt B, Patterson C, Oldenburg B. Measuring socioeconomic position in
506 dietary research: is choice of socioeconomic indicator important? *Public Health*
507 *Nutrition*. 2003; **6:** 191-200.
508 41. Diez Roux AV. Estimating neighbourhood health effects: the challenges of causal
509 inference in a complex world. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2004; **58:**1953-1960.
510 42. Cummins S, Macintyre S. Food environments and obesity – neighbourhood or
511 nation? *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2006; **35:** 100-104.
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519

Table 1: Studies examining the association between areal-level socioeconomic disadvantage and diet

Study and Country	Sample	Dietary Outcome	Significant area differences in diet (after adjustment for individual-level factors)	Significant association between area disadvantage and diet (after adjustment for individual-level factors)
Contextual (non-multilevel) studies				
Diehr et al,[8] US	Areas N=15 Individuals N=7863 adults 18+	Percentage of calories from fat	Yes (but very small)	Areas with higher unemployment rates had higher percentage of calories from fat
Forsyth et al,[9] Scotland	Areas N=4 Individuals N=691 adults 40 & 60 years	Reported consumption of vegetables, potatoes, fruit, fish, bread, cereals, cakes, pastries & biscuits, confectionary, savoury snacks, meat, spreads, sugar, milk, & soft drinks	Area differences in consumption of fruits, vegetables, fried or roasted potatoes, white bread, brown/wholemeal bread, meat (all), processed meat, poultry, shallow fat frying	Residents of disadvantaged areas were less likely to use polyunsaturated fatty acids, brown/wholemeal bread, & natural fruit juice; and more likely to add sugar to drinks & consume soft drink
Karvonen et al,[10] Finland	Areas N=460 Individuals N=9121 adolescents 16 & 18 years	Percentage using high-fat milk and butter daily	Yes	Consumption of high-fat products was higher in areas with fewer services (boys); and lower in less educated areas (girls)
Ellaway et al,[11] Scotland	Areas N=4, Individuals N=691 adults 40 & 60 years	'Healthy' and 'Less healthy' food consumption indexes	Yes	Not explicitly stated; however, bivariate analyses suggested that residents of disadvantaged areas consumed a less healthy diet
Karvonen et al,[12] Finland	Areas N=33 Individuals N=1048 adolescents aged 16 & 18 years	Abstaining from use of milk and fat-containing spreads	Could not be determined	Among girls, rates of abstinence from dietary fat were higher in areas with lower rates of prolonged unemployment; no area effects for boys
Shohaimi et al,[13] England	Areas (not reported) Individuals N=22 562 adults 39-79 years	Mean intakes (g/day) of fruits (n=11) and vegetables (n=26) combined	Could not be determined	Residents of disadvantaged areas (Townsend Index) were more likely to report lower intakes of fruits and vegetables

Table 1 Continued: Studies examining the association between area-level socioeconomic disadvantage and diet

Study and Country	Sample	Dietary Outcome	Significant area differences in diet (after adjustment for individual-level factors)	Significant association between area disadvantage and diet (after adjustment for individual-level factors)
Multilevel studies				
Diez-Roux et al, [14] US	Areas (not reported) Individuals N=13 095 adults 45-64 years	Energy adjusted daily intakes of fruits, vegetables, meats, and fish. Daily intake of saturated and polyunsaturated fat, and cholesterol. Keys score: extent to which diet increases serum cholesterol	No	Lower income neighborhoods typically had lower energy adjusted intakes of fruits, vegetables, fish, and increased intake of meats, but the associations were weak and often not significant. Inconsistent associations between neighborhood income and intakes of fats and cholesterol.
Ecob et al,[15] Scotland	Areas N=52 Individuals N=3036 persons 15, 35 & 55 years	Consumption of five foods (fresh fruits and vegetables, wholemeal bread versus white, soft margarine vs butter, & low fat milk vs full cream) scored as a 'good' diet (i.e. consumes 4+ healthy options) and 'bad' diet (no healthy options)	Yes ('bad' diet only)	Residents of disadvantaged areas (Carstairs-Morris deprivation index) were significantly more likely to have a 'bad' diet and less likely to have a 'good' diet.
Turrell et al,[16] Australia	Areas N=50 Individuals N=970 adults 18-94 years	Three indexes measuring purchase of fruits, vegetables, and grocery foods	No	Advantaged and disadvantaged areas did not differ significantly in their food purchasing patterns.
Ball et al,[17] Australia	Areas N=45 Individuals N=1347 women 18-65 years	Servings of fruits and vegetables each day (1, 2, 3-4, 5 or more)	Fruit: no. Vegetables: yes	Not reported
Giskes et al,[18] The Netherlands	Areas N=85 Individuals N=1339 adults 25-79 years	Index measuring food choices consistent with Dutch dietary guidelines; fruit consumption (servings per day); breakfast consumption (days per week); total and saturated fat intake (% of energy)	No	Advantaged and disadvantaged areas did not differ significantly in their grocery food purchasing patterns, their consumption of fruit and propensity to skip breakfast, nor in terms of their total and saturated fat intake

Table 2: Classification of grocery food-types into 'recommended' and 'regular' categories

Food-type	Recommended	Regular
Bread	Wholemeal, multigrain, white high in fibre, rye, soy and linseed	White
Rice	Wholemeal or brown	Plain white and other white rice (basmati, jasmine, Arborio)
Pasta	Wholemeal or brown	Other pasta (white, spinach, herb)
Noodles	Wholemeal or brown	Other noodles (white, egg, spinach)
Baked Beans	Salt-reduced or unsalted	Regular salt
Tinned Fruit	In natural juice	In syrup
Cheese	Reduced Fat (25% less fat), low fat (<10% fat)	Full fat
Milk	Reduced fat, low fat, high calcium, high calcium skim, high iron, high protein, reduced lactose, no cholesterol, soy or soy & linseed (Skim)	Extra Creamy, full cream, soy or soy & linseed (full cream)
Yoghurt	Low-Fat (plain and fruit)	Full fat (plain and fruit)
Beef Mince	Lean (Trim/Premium)	Regular (Choice/Fine Grade)
Chicken (uncooked)	Without skin, with skin (and remove before eating)	With skin (and eat skin)
Tinned Fish	In water/spring water	In oil or brine
Vegetable Oil	Canola, sunflower, safflower, olive, corn, soybean, peanut or sesame, grape seed or macadamia	Blended oils, coconut oil, palm oil
Butter	Salt-reduced, unsalted	Regular salt
Solid Cooking Fat	Cooking margarine, solidified oil	Solid animal fat (lard, beef dripping), vegetable shortening, Ghee or butter (and use for cooking)

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the socioeconomic and demographic variables and the measures of food-purchasing behaviour (Melbourne city, Australia, 2003)

N=2564	N	%
Area-Disadvantage		
Low	914	35.7
Medium	895	34.9
High	755	29.5
Education		
Bachelor degree or higher	815	31.8
Diploma	290	11.3
Vocational	393	15.3
No post-school qualifications	1006	41.6
Occupation		
Professionals	861	33.6
White collar	485	18.9
Blue collar	140	5.5
Not in the labour force	1078	42.0
Income		
Aus$78,000 or more	702	27.4
$52,000 - $77,999	605	23.6
$36,400 - $51,999	398	15.5
$20,800 - $36,399	391	15.3
$20,799 or less	468	18.3
Sex		
Female	2181	85.1
Male	383	14.9
Household composition		
1 adult, no children	427	16.7
1 adult, 1 or more children	207	8.1
2 or more adults, no children	911	35.5
2 or more adults, 1 or more children	1019	39.7
Age (mean, SD)	49.0	13.5

Table 4: Area- and individual-level socioeconomic effects on the purchase of grocery foods consistent with dietary guideline recommendations (Melbourne city, Australia, 2003)

	Groceries [a, b, c]					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β	se	β	se	β	se
Intercept	43.0	1.5	41.5	1.1	42.8	1.1
Area SES						
High					--	
Medium					-2.09	0.70**
Low					-2.43	0.76***
Education						
Bachelor Degree or higher			--		--	
Diploma			0.35	0.99	0.45	0.98
Vocational			0.22	0.93	0.20	0.93
No post-school qualifications			-1.73	0.79**	-1.54	0.78*
Occupation						
Professionals			--		--	
White collar			-0.09	0.89	-0.07	0.88
Blue collar			0.41	1.38	0.64	1.37
Not in the labour force			-0.85	0.80	-0.83	0.80
Income						
A$78,000 or more			--		--	
$52,000 - $77,999			-0.86	0.81	-0.70	0.80
$36,400 - $51,999			-1.08	0.94	-0.78	0.93
$20,800 - $36,399			-2.47	0.99*	-2.06	0.99*
$20,799 or less			-2.98	1.05**	-2.31	1.06*
Random effects						
Area variance	2.54	1.2	1.02	0.9	0.182	0.7
p-value for area variance	0.033		0.241		0.784	
Intra-class correlation (%)	1.5		0.60		0.10	

a. Model 1: Baseline model adjusted for age, sex, and household composition,
b. Model 2: Model 1 plus education, occupation and income
c. Model 3: Model 2 plus area SES
p-value significant at * ≤0.05, **≤0.01, ***≤0.001

Table 5: Area- and individual-level socioeconomic effects on variety of fruit and vegetable purchasing (Melbourne city, Australia, 2003) [a]

	Fruit Variety [b, c, d]				Vegetable Variety			
	Model 1	Model 2		Model 3	Model 1	Model 2		Model 3	
		OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Area SES									
High				1.00				1.00	
Medium				1.07	0.84-1.37			0.88	0.70-1.11
Low				1.30	1.00-1.67			1.06	0.83-1.35
Education									
Bachelor Degree or higher		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Diploma		1.27	0.84-1.91	1.26	0.94-1.68	1.08	0.78-1.48	1.07	0.79-1.45
Vocational		1.44	0.99-2.11	1.45	1.11-1.89	1.01	0.75-1.36	1.01	0.76-1.34
No post-school qualifications		1.72	1.25-2.38	1.70	1.35-2.14	1.36	1.06-1.75	1.36	1.08-1.72
Occupation									
Professionals		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
White collar		0.85	0.59-1.22	0.85	0.66-1.10	1.02	0.77-1.35	1.02	0.78-1.33
Blue collar		0.94	0.54-1.64	0.93	0.62-1.37	1.14	0.74-1.76	1.15	0.76-1.73
Not in the labour force		0.91	0.66-1.27	0.91	0.72-1.15	1.13	0.88-1.46	1.12	0.88-1.43
Income									
A$78,000 or more		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
$52,000 - $77,999		1.26	0.90-1.75	1.25	0.99-1.58	0.19	0.93-1.56	1.21	0.95-1.55
$36,400 - $51,999		1.09	0.74-1.60	1.07	0.81-1.40	0.88	0.65-1.18	0.88	0.66-1.17
$20,800 - $36,399		1.43	0.95-2.13	1.39	1.04-1.85	1.12	0.81-1.53	1.12	0.83-1.52
$20,799 or less		1.69	1.11-2.57	1.59	1.18-2.16	1.17	0.84-1.63	1.16	0.84-1.60
Random effects									
Area variance & se	0.08 0.03	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03 0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01 0.02
p-value for area variance	0.01		0.06		0.11	0.11		0.30	0.41

a. <u>High variety (quartile 1) was denoted the reference category, hence odds ratios greater than one indicates an increased likelihood of purchasing a lower variety of fruits and vegetables</u>

b. Model 1: Baseline model adjusted for age, sex, and household composition

c. Model 2: Model 1 plus education, occupation and income

d. Model 3: Model 2 plus area SES