

Jose, K., MacDonald, F., Vandenberg, M., Williams, J., Abbott-Chapman, J., Venn, A. & Smith, K. (2020). School Breakfast Club Programs in Australian Primary Schools, Not Just Addressing Food Insecurity: A Qualitative Study, *Health Education & Behavior*, 47(4): 619-630.

Abstract

Increasingly, Australian primary schools are establishing school breakfast club programs (SBCPs) to address concerns about children arriving at school hungry and the subsequent impact on learning. This study aimed to identify the perceived benefits, impacts and challenges of running SBCPs.

Methods: Case studies with five Tasmanian and five Victorian Government primary schools from different socioeconomic and geographic areas. Focus groups or interviews were held with 142 participants: students, parents/carers, school staff and funding body representatives between July 2016 and October 2017.

Results: No schools had eligibility criteria to attend SBCPs. Thus, participating or not participating in the SBCPs was usually a matter of choice rather than a consequence of food insecurity. Participants, including children, discussed the social benefits of SBCPs (i.e., social eating, relationship building, school engagement) as well as perceived improved classroom behaviour. Challenges for program delivery included resource limitations, particularly the reliance on volunteers.

Conclusion: SBCPs offered a range of benefits beyond those of greater food security.

Implications for Public Health:

The social benefits of SBCPs were highly valued by all members of the school community, but program sustainability is constrained by resource limitations.

Introduction

In response to increased perceptions of negative consequences of children attending school without eating breakfast (1) Australian state governments and non-government organisations have supported the establishment of school breakfast club programs (SBCPs). Adequate nutrition is important for supporting physical, mental, and social aspects of child health and development (2, 3). Breakfast consumption is associated with a range of health benefits (4, 5) and cognitive performance, particularly in children with compromised nutritional status (6). However, breakfast skipping is common among Australian children. Data from the 2011–12 Australian National Nutrition and Physical Activity Survey showed that 13.2% of boys and 18.6% of girls aged 2-17 years skipped breakfast on at least one out of two days (7). Recent evidence indicates that more than 1 in 5 Australian children (22%) live in households experiencing food insecurity (defined as not having regular access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs (8)) and 18% of parents experiencing food insecurity report that their child/children would attend school without eating breakfast more than once per week (1). Almost one in ten (9%) parents living in a food insecure household report that that their child/children would miss food for a whole day at least once per week (1).

Reviews of the provision of school meals (breakfast or lunch) have reported small physical and psychosocial benefits for children from disadvantaged backgrounds (9) and improved academic performance in undernourished children (10). However, evidence that SBCP convert breakfast skippers into breakfast eaters, or improve classroom behaviour and academic performance is less clear. Three high-quality randomized controlled trials that made free school breakfasts available to all students found that they did not improve classroom behaviour or academic performance when measured using standardised tests (11-13). However, in all three studies children substituted breakfast at home for breakfast at school and the number of children who did not eat breakfast at home was low, making it difficult for these intervention studies to demonstrate any effect.

Given the expansion in the number of SBCPs being offered throughout Australia, this study investigated the perceived benefits and impacts, operational practices and challenges of running SBCP in primary schools.

Methods

Researchers in Tasmania and Victoria adopted a case study approach in order to gain an in-depth understanding of SBCPs and their role in Australian primary schools (14). The findings are presented using a cross case synthesis (15). Ethics approval was received from the Human Research Ethics Committee (Tasmania) (H0015712) and from the Department of Education (FILE 2016-22) to conduct research in Tasmanian Government schools and from Victoria University Human Research Ethics Committee (HRE17-102) and the Department of Education and Training Victoria (DET) (2016_003212) to conduct research in Victorian Government schools.

The school breakfast club programs

Tasmania

Between 2011 and 2014 the Tasmanian State Government provided financial support to schools (\$400,000 in total, up to \$5,000 per school) to establish SBCP (16). SBCP were supported to work with local communities and non-government organisations to provide students in areas of higher need with breakfast (17). Ninety-four schools received funding through this initiative (personal communication) which ceased in 2014. Programs were not evaluated at the time. Community organisations and the private sector provide support through donated food (18).

Victoria

In the 2015-16 Budget, the Victorian Government committed \$13.7 million to partner with food relief organisation, Foodbank Victoria, to establish SBCP in 500 of Victoria's most disadvantaged government primary schools during 2016-19. The aim of the SBCPs was to tackle the disadvantage children experience through the effects of hunger when they arrive at school without having a healthy breakfast (19, 20). Foodbank provides non-perishable and 'long-life' food to all schools (see Table 1) at the beginning of each term as well as assistance to schools in establishing and managing their programs.

School recruitment

The Tasmanian Department of Education provided a list of schools that received funding during 2011 to 2014 to establish a SBCP, along with their Occupational Education Needs

Index (OENI). The OENI provides a relative measure of socioeconomic status and student need for each school (21). Five southern Tasmanian primary schools from a range of OENI categories and geographic areas (i.e., rural, urban, outer urban) were initially selected. School principals were sent an approach letter and information sheet inviting them to participate in the study. Four principals declined to participate due to workloads. Declining schools ranged from high to low disadvantage. When a principal declined to participate, another school was selected. This process continued until five schools had been recruited.

The Victorian case studies were part of a larger evaluation of SBCP in 500 of the most disadvantaged primary schools (19). The level of disadvantage in Victorian schools was identified by Student Family Occupation Education (SFOE) data that is considered to be the most accurate measure of disadvantage currently available in Victoria. Foodbank Victoria identified approximately fifty schools from the larger study that matched the criteria of days offered, numbers of students attending, and no breakfast club prior to the government funded SBCP. Five principals in the Victorian schools were then contacted by phone inviting them to participate and then emailed an explanatory statement outlining the study. Four of the five schools initially approached agreed to participate. The timing of the research did not suit one school, and the sixth school approached agreed to participate.

Individual recruitment

Following enrolment of the school into the study, in both states, the coordinator of the SBCP or a nominated teacher was contacted and provided with further information about the study. Schools were provided with a sample newsletter article informing parents/carers about the study, information sheets (for staff, volunteers and parents/carers), consent forms, and advice for recruiting students, parents and school staff into the study, which was then undertaken by each school. Victorian schools were compensated with a day casual relief teacher payment in recognition of the work required to set up interviews and focus groups. Representatives of the funding bodies in Tasmania were contacted directly by researchers, sent an information and consent form and invited to participate in the study.

Surveys

In Tasmania, principals completed a short survey online or in hard copy, that collected information on eligibility criteria to attend the SBCP, number of children who usually attend,

days the program was available and the types of foods provided. Principals were also asked to report how the SBCP was funded and to provide the names and contact details for the funding bodies. In Victoria, the broader SBCP evaluation involved an annual survey of all 500 schools. As a result, surveys were not conducted with the five case study schools but questions on these issues were asked of principals and coordinators during one-on-one interviews.

Interviews, Focus groups and Observation

Two of three researchers (author initials) visited each Tasmanian SBCPs during July - November 2016. All participants completed a short questionnaire to obtain demographic data and insight into their usual involvement in the SBCP. The five Victorian case studies were conducted by the Victorian researcher (author initials) during two to three-day visits to each school between August and October 2017. During the visits to the Tasmanian and Victorian schools, observations and field notes were made about the SBCP at each site and interviews (one-on-one and group) and focus groups were conducted with staff, volunteers, parents/carers and students. Additional phone or face-to-face interviews were conducted with staff or parents/carers who were unable to attend the SBCP on the day researchers were in attendance. Representatives from funding bodies in Tasmania were also interviewed. All adults provided consent and parents/carers were required to give written consent for participating children. In Victoria, children also gave their own written consent.

The interview and focus group schedules were developed following a review of the literature and discussions with stakeholders and researchers. Interview schedules in Tasmania and Victoria were developed for each population group (i.e. students, parents, volunteers/staff) and included background information, experiences, benefits and impacts, and challenges or suggested improvements to SBCP. To facilitate communication and act as prompts to stimulate children's response feeling faces were used in focus groups with children in Tasmania (22).

Data Analysis

All focus groups and interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. Data were de-identified and qualitative data analysis software, NVivo 11 (QSR International) and Excel software, were used to support data management and analysis. Transcripts then underwent

a process of careful reading, coding and thematic analysis. Preliminary analysis was conducted separately for the Tasmanian and Victorian studies with researchers in both states meeting regularly to discuss and guide the thematic analysis process. These analyses focused on the benefits and impacts of the programs, operation and challenges of delivering the programs.

Adopting a cross-case approach (15) data was then synthesised and is presented according to the four key themes: 1) not eating breakfast at home: not just food insecurity, 2) social benefits of communal eating, 3) impact in the classroom, and 4) challenges. No systematic differences were found between the states, school size or location with respect to the key findings, although all schools had adapted their practices to the unique needs of their school community. Where there is a difference between the two states this is stated in the results below.

Results

Five schools in Tasmania and five schools in Victoria participated in the study. School populations varied from 80 to 1000 students. The reported percent of the school population accessing the SBCP ranged from 5 - 23% of school students in Tasmania and 15 – 45% in Victoria (see Table 1).

INSERT Table 1 – school characteristics

In total, 142 individuals participated in the study, including children, parents/carers, school staff, volunteers and funding body representatives (see Table 2). Some staff and volunteers were also school parents/carers. One representative of a funding body also acted as the coordinator of the program.

INSERT Table 2 – Individual Characteristics

Overview of SBCP

In both states there were no eligibility criteria for students to participation in the SBCP. SBCP were offered with varying frequency across all schools, ranging from one to five days per week. One school in Tasmania ran the program from the nearby community centre, all other schools ran the SBCP at the school. SBCPs opened any time between 8am to 9am.

Coordination of the SBCP was carried out by teaching and education support staff, school

chaplains, school cleaners, community workers or parent volunteers. All programs relied on volunteers to assist with delivering the program. Four of the Victorian schools paid welfare and educational support staff to run their programs. Some schools permitted parents or carers to attend breakfast with their children.

In Tasmania, food was sourced from food relief organisations, local businesses and donations from the community as well as food bought by the school specifically for the program. No formal audit of the food available was undertaken, but all programs in Tasmania offered toast, with spreads such as jam or Vegemite™ (See Table 1). Some schools offered cereals, fresh fruit, muesli bars, yoghurt and juice or Milo™. In Victoria, Foodbank provided schools with a range of food, but four of the five schools provided additional food sourced from local businesses and donations. Two of the schools drew from school funds to purchase additional food. Supplemented foods included toast with spreads and Milo™.

In Tasmanian schools there was limited participation by the children in delivering the SBCP. In contrast four of the Victorian schools allowed children to assist on an informal basis, with one school formalising the role with students in Year 5/6 being nominated as breakfast captains. Researchers in Tasmania observed that children usually had food prepared for them rather than preparing breakfast themselves.

Not eating breakfast at home: not just food insecurity

None of the schools collected any data about families' capacity to provide breakfast for their children. Schools based their understanding of children's access to breakfast on the informal interactions between staff, children and families with teachers believing they had a good understanding of which students were not eating breakfast at home. Parents/carers, staff and volunteers at each school indicated that the primary reason for establishing a SBCP was to provide breakfast for children who were not eating breakfast at home. Some children also spoke about the various reasons children may not have access to breakfast, including non-financial reasons.

Student 1: Well, I think that they [schools] have breakfast because a lot of people don't have breakfast at home, they don't have enough money to buy food.

Student 2: Maybe just home situations, like they just want to get out of the house really quickly.

Student 3: Or they sleep in pretty much every day (9-11 year olds, Victoria).

However, school staff considered that only a few families experienced persistent food insecurity due to financial hardship.

We have ...a certain percentage of students who every so often will come to school without breakfast. ... We also have a handful of students who come without having had breakfast on a regular basis; perhaps not every day but it would be the majority of days (Principal, Tasmania).

This was reflected in interviews with parents, with only two parents/carers indicating that the reason their child/children attended the SBCP was due to financial constraints impacting their capacity to provide breakfast at home. Some parents indicated that they could usually give their own children “*something*” for breakfast, but that the SBCP provided additional support and options.

I was working up until three months ago, I lost my job ... being on a low income, I’ve got to scrape and scratch a couple of days before payday, but they obviously have breakfast, I make sure they have something (Parent/Carer, Tasmania).

Parents/carers, staff and children identified several reasons why children did not eat breakfast at home that were unrelated to financial constraints. These included juggling family and work commitments, bus travel, leaving home early, different food options available at the SBCP and children choosing to eat at school.

No they probably wouldn’t (have breakfast at home) because by the time we got dressed and all that there would be no time so it is good here (Parent/Carer, Tasmania).

Children were also aware that family circumstances other than finances impacted their ability to eat breakfast at home. School staff considered it important that children who were missing out on breakfast at home for whatever reason could access the SBCP.

Social benefits of communal eating

School staff, parents/carers, volunteers and children at all schools discussed a range of social benefits associated with SBCPs. These included social eating, relationship building, school engagement, monitoring wellbeing (early intervention) and manners/ personal skills (see Table 3). SBCP coordinators aimed to provide a safe and welcoming place for all students to come before school, where they could interact with their friends, other children and adults. Many parents/carers stated that their child/children chose to come to the SBCP in favour of having breakfast at home, largely for social reasons. Children also indicated that the best part of the program was the opportunity to socialise.

INSERT TABLE 3 – social benefits and supplementary table.

SBCPs provided a unique opportunity for building relationships between children as students of all ages attended SBCPs; and between children and adults as SBCPs were frequently staffed by parents and older volunteers. Most interviewees discussed the social benefits of the SBCP, with both adults and children identifying that building relationships between children and adults was a key outcome of their SBCP. When asked what they liked best about SBCP, some children commented on the presence of specific adults at the program. This inter-age and cross-generation interaction between children was valued by many participants.

We [are] having lots of food to eat, and you can help out. It's fun, and every day in the morning we get to see [Coordinator and School Welfare officer] first (6 year-old, Victoria).

In Tasmania, the social elements of the SBCP had important flow on effects for the school community; for example, some participants believed that SBCP contribute to improved school attendance rates, and strengthened school-community partnerships. In contrast, in Victoria all five principals interviewed indicated that they were less sure about the impact on the broader school community.

SBCPs were recognised as avenues for identifying changes in a child's wellbeing and for engaging with children and families who may be experiencing other difficulties.

So, it's food, it's people, it's relationships, it's connection and it's trying to build those – or probably mitigate against the risk factors that our kids have in their lives and to

build that strong feeling of connectedness and belonging and food is an integral part of that (Principal, Victoria).

While most children had positive experiences of SBCP a few discussed their discomfort in the presence of older and/or “mean” children whose behaviour they did not like.

(What I don't like about the school breakfast program is) the mean people. When there's mean people here (7 year-old Tasmania).

Some staff and volunteers also reflected that some children who attended the SBCP were disrespectful towards them. Such negative experiences were discussed by only a few participants across all sites in Tasmania and Victoria.

Impact in the classroom

In addition to the social benefits most parents/carers and staff considered that eating breakfast contributed to positive learning behaviours such as concentration and better academic outcomes

There's no question that the students who have a full belly are better able to concentrate on their learning, they're better able to self-regulate their emotions, and make improved behaviour choices (Principal, Tasmania).

When children discussed the importance of eating breakfast, irrespective of where it was consumed, they talked about how it made them feel; for example, “*strong, smart, energetic, clever, run around, healthy and good*” (Children, Tasmania).

Challenges of delivering programs

The greatest challenge to delivering SBCP related to funding and staffing. These challenges were experienced by all schools and impacted on the regularity with which the program was offered, range of food available and equipment available to support program delivery. While the Victorian government provided funding to Foodbank to oversee the SBCP and support schools, they were not provided with funding to attract, or pay volunteers, and the Victorian schools discussed challenges associated with staffing SBCPs. In Tasmania, local partnerships were invaluable for providing food to support program delivery. Interviewees in Tasmania and Victoria commented on the generosity of local businesses and community members.

All schools in Tasmania and four of the five in Victoria relied on volunteers to deliver the SBCP. This raised specific challenges with respect to recruitment, rostering, training and support. The Victorian schools reported that finding volunteers to commit up to five days a week was challenging, resulting in four schools deciding to pay welfare and education support staff additional time to run the program. In Tasmania, three of the SBCPs were managed by paid staff and two by volunteers. One Tasmanian school identified the requirement for volunteers to have Working with Children Registration since 2016 as negatively impacting on their capacity to deliver the program. Hence, the sustainability of SBCPs was an ongoing concern for all schools.

I truly believe, at the moment, we've got enough, it's working, but for longevity we need to come up with a plan of how we're going to sustain it. We just haven't entered into that space. We're just in survival mode (Staff, Tasmania).

In addition to staffing and delivering the SBCP some volunteers and coordinators also discussed the challenge associated with managing food consumption by children. This included concerns related to over-consumption, managing allergies and intolerances as well as food waste.

Discussion

The provision of breakfast at school is designed to respond to concerns around the health and wellbeing of children and address the negative consequences of arriving at school hungry. In this study, skipping breakfast at home was often not about food insecurity, with many children choosing to eat breakfast at school instead of at home. Adult and child participants identified family and work commitments, bus travel, leaving home early and a different variety of foods as reasons children chose to eat breakfast at school.

Adult participants discussed a range of social and learning benefits from the communal eating of breakfast at school. Social benefits for children included relationship building, cross-generational interaction, school engagement, the development of manners and skills, and monitoring student wellbeing. The social benefits of SBCP have been previously identified (23-26) with attendance at SBCPs improving children's self-reported friendship quality and reducing experience of peer victimisation (27). A Queensland study examining the mechanisms of health-promoting schools found that opportunities for communal eating,

such as SBCP, could build relationships and promote school connectedness (28). In our study, a few children described negative interpersonal experiences, but the majority spoke positively about their socialisation. In Victorian schools, children valued their direct involvement in running their SBCP. These findings illustrate how SBCPs may generate social capital among primary school children. Social capital is associated with better health and wellbeing outcomes in children and young people (29).

Adult participants identified improved concentration, classroom behaviour and academic outcomes for students who attended. Previous studies that have shown habitual breakfast consumption is associated with better academic performance when subjectively measured, however, the benefits of breakfast are less clear when academic performance has been assessed using objective measures (30).

This study revealed that SBCPs were providing unique opportunities to monitor the wellbeing of students. This function of SBCPs has not previously been reported. The informal environment at SBCPs was considered critical to facilitating conversations between staff or volunteers and children that enabled them to identify concerns. Links to children's wellbeing were evident in both states, with welfare and wellbeing staff in Victoria and Tasmanian either coordinating the programs or regularly attending the SBCPs to engage with children and their families.

All schools reported difficulty in finding volunteers to help run their SBCP. Recruiting volunteers has been reported to be difficult in other aspects of schools, such as the school canteen (31). An additional barrier to volunteering is the requirement for individuals to have a background check and appropriate registration to work or volunteer in a school. Funding, or sourcing of food, was another challenge, particularly in Tasmania but also among the Victorian schools that wanted to provide additional fresh items. Concerns about managing over-consumption have previously been reported (32).

This study has some limitations. Despite multiple attempts, only one Tasmanian school rated as high disadvantage on the OENI agreed to participate. Families who rely on the SBCP to provide breakfast may not have participated in this study or participants may have been reluctant to indicate the extent of their need. Staff who were less supportive of the program may also have been less inclined to participate. Classroom behaviour was not assessed

objectively, but as this study was focused on perceived benefits these were captured in discussions with participants. A strength of this paper is the inclusion of children, parents, volunteers and staff and the cross-case synthesis of research undertaken in two Australian states. While there were some differences between states in school demographics and approaches, delivery methods and the sourcing of food, the perceived benefits and challenges were consistent across the ten schools and two states.

Conclusion

The primary reason for establishing SBCPs was to address concerns about children arriving at school hungry due to food insecurity. However, participants in this study identified a range of social benefits that extended beyond addressing food security. All schools, even those currently supported by the Victorian Government's partnership with Foodbank, face significant challenges in providing breakfast to students on a regular basis. However, the informal opportunities SBCP provided for monitoring the wellbeing of students ensured schools remained committed to delivering their SBCP. The range of perceived benefits identified in this study elucidate why schools remain committed to offering children the opportunity to eat breakfast together at school.

References

1. Foodbank. Rumbling Tummies: Child hunger in Australia. April 2018.
2. Black MM, Walke SP, Fernald LCH, Andersen CT, DiGirolamo AM, Chunling L, et al. Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. *Lancet*. 2017;389(10064):77-90.
3. Moore TG, Arefadib N, Deery A, Keyes M, West S. The First Thousand Days: An Evidence Paper – Summary. Parkville, Victoria: Centre for Community Child Health, Murdoch Children’s Research Institute.; 2017.
4. Frisvold DE. Nutrition and cognitive achievement: An evaluation of the School Breakfast Program. *Journal of Public Economics*. 2015;124:91-104.
5. Rampersaud GC, Pereira MA, Girard BL, Adams J, Metz J. Breakfast Habits, Nutritional Status, Body Weight, and Academic Performance in Children and Adolescents. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2005;105(5):743-60.
6. Hoyland A, Dye L, Lawton CL. A systematic review of the effect of breakfast on the cognitive performance of children and adolescents. *Nutr Res Rev*. 2009;22(2):220-43.
7. Smith KJ, Breslin MC, McNaughton SA, Gall SL, Blizzard L, Venn AJ. Skipping breakfast among Australian children and adolescents; findings from the 2011–12 National Nutrition and Physical Activity Survey. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2017;41(6):572-8.
8. World Food Programme. What is food security? 1996 [Available from: <https://www.wfp.org/node/359289>].
9. Kristjansson B, Petticrew M, MacDonald B, Krasevec J, Janzen L, Greenhalgh T, et al. School feeding for improving the physical and psychosocial health of disadvantaged students. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2007(1).
10. Adolphus K, Lawton C, Dye L. The effects of breakfast on behavior and academic performance in children and adolescents. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013;7(425).
11. Bernstein L, McLaughlin J, Crepinsek M, L D. Evaluation of the School Breakfast Program Pilot Project: Final Report. . 2004.
12. Mhurchu CN, Gorton D, Turley M, Jiang Y, Michie J, Maddison R, et al. Effects of a free school breakfast programme on children's attendance, academic achievement and short-term hunger: results from a stepped-wedge, cluster randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2013;67(3):257-64.
13. Murphy S, Moore GF, Tapper K, Lynch R, Clarke R, Rissanen L, et al. Free healthy breakfasts in primary schools: a cluster randomised controlled trial of a policy intervention in Wales, UK. *Public Health Nutr*. 2011;14(2):219-26.

14. Hancock DR, Algozzine B. *Doing Case Study Research: A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers*. New York: Teachers College Press; 2006.
15. Miles M, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis* Second ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 1994.
16. Department of Education. *Department of Education Annual Report 2011–12*. Tasmania: Department of Education; 2012.
17. Department of Treasury and Finance. *Tasmanian Budget Strong Decisions. Better Future. 2011-12 caring for Tasmanians in need*. Tasmania; 2011.
18. Vandenberg M, Jose K, Abbott-Chapman J, A V, K S. The perceived benefits and challenges of running school breakfast programs in Tasmanian primary schools. Hobart, Tasmania.: Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania, ; 2017.
19. MacDonald F. *Evaluation of the School Breakfast Clubs Program, Interim Report April 2017*. The Victoria Institute; 2017.
20. MacDonald F. *Evaluation of the School Breakfast Clubs Program, Interim Report March 2018*. Victoria University 2018.
21. Department of Education. *Department of Education Annual Report 2014/15*. Tasmania: Department of Education; 2015.
22. Fargas-Malet M, McSherry D, Larkin E, Robinson C. research with children: methodological issues and innovative techniques. *J Early Child Res*. 2010;8(2):175-92.
23. Graham PL, Russo R, Defeyter MA. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Breakfast Clubs According to Parents, Children, and School Staff in the North East of England, UK. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2015;3(156).
24. Defeyter MA, Graham PL, Prince K. A Qualitative Evaluation of Holiday Breakfast Clubs in the UK: Views of Adult Attendees, Children, and Staff. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2015;3(199).
25. Ichumar S, Dahlberg E, Paynter E, Lucey F, Chester M, Papertalk L, et al. Looking through the Keyhole: Exploring Realities and Possibilities for School Breakfast Programs in Rural Western Australia. *Nutrients*. 2018;10(3):371.
26. Byrne M, Hill S, Wenden E, Devine A, Miller M, Cross D. *Evaluation of the Foodbank WA School Breakfast and Nutrition Education Program*. 2017.
27. Defeyter MA, Graham PL, Russo R. More than Just a Meal: Breakfast Club Attendance and Children’s Social Relationships. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2015;3:183.
28. Rowe F, Stewart D. Promoting connectedness through whole-school approaches: Key elements and pathways of influence. *Health Educ*. 2011;111(1):49-65.

29. Glasgow Centre for Population Health. Social capital and the health and wellbeing of children and adolescents. 2013.
30. Smith KJ, Blizzard L, McNaughton SA, Gall SL, Breslin MC, Wake M, et al. Skipping breakfast among 8-9 year old children is associated with teacher-reported but not objectively measured academic performance two years later. *BMC Nutrition*. 2017;3(1):86.
31. Drummond C. The Complexities of Attracting and Retaining Volunteers in School Canteens, and Their Impact on Healthy Food Provision *Australian Journal on Volunteering*. 2008;13(1):39-47.
32. Harvey-Golding L, Donkin LM, Defeyter MA. Universal Free School Breakfast: A Qualitative Process Evaluation According to the Perspectives of Senior Stakeholders. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2016;4(161).

Table 1. Characteristics of the schools and the breakfast clubs

School	State	School Demographics				Breakfast Club Characteristics			Participants	
		Enrolment	Disadvantage ^a	Eligible	Location	Commenced	Availability	Attendance		Breakfast
1	Tas	100-199	High	All	Metro	2014	5 days	20	Cereal, toast, yoghurt, juice, milk, milo	Children = 5 Parents = 5 Staff/Vol = 3
2	Tas	300-399	Med	All	Metro	2008	5 days	30-50	Cereal, toast, milk, yoghurt, fruit	Children = 6 Parents = 9 Staff/Vol = 2
3	Tas	400-499	Low	All	Rural	2008	2 days	40-60	Cereal, toast, milo	Children = 11 Parents = 1 Staff/Vol = 4
4	Tas	200-299	Low	All	Rural	2013	5 days	50	Toast, fruit, milo	Children = 4 Parents = 2 Staff/Vol = 5
5	Tas	400-499	Low	All	Metro	2009	1 day	25	Toast, fruit, juice milk, milo	Children = 6 Parents = 3 Staff/Vol = 6
6	VIC	900-1000	High	All	Regional	2016	5 days	120-150 (4 campuses)	Foodbank ^b , toast and milo	Children = 5 Parents = 2 Staff/Vol = 6
7	VIC	500-600	High	All	Metro	2016	3 days	80-90	Foodbank, toast and milk	Children = 11 Parents = 3

8	VIC	80-120	High	All	Regional	2016	5 days	80-100	Foodbank, toast and milk	Staff/Vol = 7 Children = 0 Parents = 1 Staff/Vol = 3
9	VIC	50-100	High	All	Regional	2016	3 days	35-50	Foodbank, donation, school garden	Children = 8 Parents = 1 Staff/Vol = 8
10	VIC	600-700	High	All	Metro	2016	5 days	25-35	Foodbank	Children = 0 Parents = 1 Staff/Vol = 5

^aOENI = Occupational Education Needs Index is used in Tasmania and is derived from parental background data collected at enrolment. SFOE = Student Family Occupation Measure disadvantage measure and is used in Victoria and is measured by combining the student family occupation and student family education information. An average school score is determined for each school with a score ranging from 0 – 1, with 1 representing the highest level of need. Schools are classified as low, medium or high.

^bFoodbank provides cheerios, oats, wheat biscuits, muesli, baked beans, fruit cups, canned fruit, apples and long life, UHT milk

Table 2. Participant characteristics for Tasmania (Tas) and Victoria (Vic)

Participants	Tas (n = 78)	Vic (n = 64)
Children	35	24
Age (Years)		
6-7	9	3
8-9	16	9
10-12	10	12
Sex		
Male	16	14
Female	19	10
Participation in SBP		
Every day provided	16	16
Not every day provided	18	8
Did not answer	1	0
Parents/carers	17	8
Sex		
Male	2	0
Female	15	8
Number of children		
One	2	1
Two	6	6
Three or more	9	1
Staff	15	24
Sex		
Male	7	6
Female	7	18
Not stated	1	0
Role with school		
Principal	2	5
Teacher	6	15

Chaplain	2	1
Other	5	3
Years of service at school (range, years)	0.3 - 11	0.6 - 25
Years direct involvement in SBP (range, years)	0.4 - 9	1 – 2 years
Volunteers	8	8
Sex		
Male	2	1
Female	6	7
Years of school engagement (range, years)	1.5 - 9	1 -2 years
Years direct involvement in SBP (range, years)	1 – 4.5	1 -2 years
Funding bodies' representatives	3	0
Sex		
Male	1	0
Female	2	0

Table 3 Social benefits associated with SBCPs, illustrative quotes from children, parent and staff/volunteer participants

Social Benefits	Children	Parent/Carer	Staff/Volunteer
Social eating	<p>Meeting with friends. Eating communally.</p> <p><i>“(The best thing about breakfast club) for me, probably just coming together with mates and chatting. It’s like I’m at home and I get to eat breakfast with everyone, and stuff. That’s probably my favourite thing about breakfast club.” (Tas, 12 years)</i></p>	<p>Meet with friends, make new friends. Eating communally.</p> <p><i>They just love coming and talking to their friends. Because they’ll come - they’ll have their breakfast, and then they’ll go and play. (Tas)</i></p>	<p>Meeting with friends. Eating communally</p> <p><i>They love the fact that they all get to share the food together. So, to me, it’s almost like it’s a social thing. We all have food together. (Vic)</i></p>
Relationship Building	<p>Interaction with adults who run the program.</p>	<p>Interaction with children of all ages and adults delivering the program.</p>	<p>Interaction between children and the adults delivering the program.</p>

	<i>[The best art of SBCP is] seeing [coordinator] and having food, and helping out in the kitchen (Vic, 7 year-old)</i>	<i>The other thing is we usually have the same people coming to Breaky Club, and so I think that's good for them because they're cross ages, they can get to build relationships with kids outside their own classrooms. (Vic, Mum).</i>	<i>Some really nice relationships with the volunteers. It's really, really nice to see that, ... mums but also seniors in our community that they probably wouldn't meet otherwise. (Vol, Tas)</i>
School Engagement	Connecting broader school community.	Parents connecting with the school community	Connection with school by children and parents
	<i>I like to be around everybody (Tas).</i>	<i>I met [friend] here. I've met a couple of others. You get to know different people and local. You actually learn who's around so you get to know different people otherwise you probably wouldn't stop and talk (Tas)</i>	<i>But some kids will just come in because they like the atmosphere. Particularly in the colder weather it's nice to come in to somewhere and it's a lovely, warm environment for them to come in and be out of the cold before the start of the day. (Vic, Staff).</i>

Monitoring wellbeing	<p>Awareness of importance of eating breakfast and that some children are not eating this at home.</p> <p><i>You realise how well you're doing because some kids don't get breakfast and then they start feeling sick and then they have to go home (Vic, 11 year-old).</i></p>	<p>Adults to speak to about concerns.</p> <p><i>Sometimes kids that don't talk to anyone outside come in and sit beside someone here and talk to somebody here ... sometimes kids come in really upset that they haven't eaten at home or just upset in general and there's nice adults here that they can talk to as well. (Tas)</i></p>	<p>Monitor changes in children</p> <p>Engage with families</p> <p><i>It's that first adult interaction in the school in a morning for some kids. I think if you notice – it also gives you a way of reading the kids. If a kid comes in and they're teary that morning it's logged somewhere and then I can go and speak to the child, speak to the ... teachers because they perhaps haven't seen what's been happening (Vic, Staff)</i></p>
Manners and Skills	<p>Communicating with others</p> <p>Assisting with delivery SBCP</p> <p><i>Yeah, I think so, because there's certain rules. Because a lot of people now use more manners in other things than they used to, before</i></p>	<p>Communal eating skills.</p> <p>Communicating with others.</p> <p><i>Just knowing obviously the importance of having breakfast and sitting down and having the manners. To be able</i></p>	<p>Communication and skills</p> <p><i>That's the sort of thing that they would do in grandma's kitchen, they'd learn how to wash dishes, they would have a chat to the person who's drying dishes. They'll get a</i></p>

Breakfast Club started. Because you have to say please and thank you, and may I have this, may I have that. (Vic, 10 year-old).

to sit them down at a table and can eat properly with everybody else. (Tas)

cloth and they'll go and wipe down benches . (Vic, Staff).
