## Community, Economic, and Health Development Outcomes Related to Food Security

Darcy A. Freedman, Ph.D., M.P.H. Assistant Professor, Social Work Faculty Fellow, Institute for African American Research Faculty Scholar, Center for Research on Nutrition and Health Disparities University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC



Working together for healthier communities

## Existing Databases with Health Development Outcomes

Databases that provide information on health behaviors, health outcomes, and health care utilization across states and regions related to food insecurity.

**Examples** 

- Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (CDC)
- Youth Risk Behavioral Surveillance System (CDC)
- County Health Rankings (Population Health Institute, University of Wisconsin) (linkages to multiple databases)
- National Collaborative on Childhood Obesity Research (linkages to multiple databases)
- Federally qualified health centers (EMR, quality varies by site)
- Office of Research and Statistics (SC)

## **Office of Research and Statistics**

- Linking of varied datasets
- Organized portal for accessing data from multiple agencies
- Data warehouse provides de-identified excerpts of data or they run analyses for you
- Fee for service; available to people across US
- Example: Children aging out of foster care lost to follow up; waiver signed at 18 years of age that they could be tracked through system to find last known address



#### South Carolina's Integrated Data System



## Existing Databases with Economic Development Outcomes

Databases that provide information on economic landscape of communities, food subsidy and agricultural economy.

**Examples** 

- Decennial Census, Current Population Survey (Census Bureau)
- Census of Agriculture (USDA)
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Data System
- Minimum wage rates by state (US Department of Labor)\*



## Existing Databases with Community Development Outcomes

Databases that provide information on sociodemographics, community food environments, partnerships and coalitions.

**Examples** 

- Food Environment Atlas (USDA)
- Community-based farmers' markets (SC Department of Agriculture)\*
- Eat Smart Move Move South Carolina (list of local chapters)\*









Adult diabetes rate, 2009





Median household income, 2010





Source: U.S. Department of Labor



% Black, 2010





Farmers' markets, 2011



## Strengths of Existing Databases

- Proxy data available for a variety of health, economic, and community development outcomes related to food security/food justice
  - Provide snapshot of broader context
- Inclusion of mapping function in many databases
- Central portals for integrating a variety of outcome data
- Open access
- Relatively easy to use for research and/or community activism

## Weaknesses of Existing Databases

- Time lag in availability
- Cross sectional; difficult to establish causality related to interventions
  - Need to assess mediators and moderators





#### Type of Customer- Pick One: OFHC Staff

O FHC Patient

O Community Member (from Orangeburg area)



All Produce that can be purchased individually (e.g. apples, tomatoes, watermelons, etc.) can all be recorded as 1=1. All produce sold in a group (e.g., okra, grapes, peanuts, green beans, etc.) can be recorded as small basket or large basket. If Other unit is used (e.g., pound, pot, etc.) mark other and record and specify the unit.

PROD-Code	PRODUCE_Name	UNIT USED	OTHER UNITS, SPEC.	# UNITS	PRICE/U calculatio	NIT (for ns only)	COST
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			×	ş	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			×	Ş	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			x	\$	]. []]
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other		<u>.</u>	x	\$	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			x	Ş	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			x	\$	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			×	\$	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			×	Ş	].
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			x	\$	].[]]]
		O 1=1 O Small Basket O Large Basket O Other			×	Ş	].
			Total Cost	t \$			

#### 3197440367



Total cost from the other side:

TOTAL COST \$

#### FORMS OF PAYMENT:

Туре		Amount	To dely a series of Characteria Characteria		
Cash or Check	0	s	Is this person a Shop 'n' Save participant?		
Shop 'n' Save Vouchers	0	s ·	O Yes O No		
\$1.00 off coupon*	0	s	If Yes, Participant ID:		
EBT/SNAP*	0	s			
Senior FM Voucher	0	s .	(First Initial; Last Initial; Month; Day; Year e.g JM022112)		
WIC FM Voucher	0	s .	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
FHC Voucher	0	s .			
Other payment:	0	\$			
Amount Custom	er Pai	id: \$ .			

Comment on Sales Transaction (Select One):

	-
0	Customer paid exact price of produce
0	Customer unintentionally paid more than price of produce
0	Customer unintentionally paid less than price of produce
0	Customer bartered/used an alternative form of payment (e.g., exchanged produce)
0	Customer was given a deal that was less than the price of produce
0	Other:

\*If Shop 'n' Save voucher, \$ 1.00 off Coupon, or EBT/SNAP used,

Record Customer Name:

Dustomer signature:

For Administrator Use Only: This receipt resulted in a Shop 'n'Save Voucher. O Yes O No

\*\*A receipt MUST be provided for ALL sales transactions using Shop 'n' Save Vouchers, \$ 1.00 off Coupon, and EBT/SNAP. Farmers will NOT be reimbursed for these sales by RCFS Staff without a receipt.

Right Choice Fresh Start Farmers' Market Pilot Study, PI: Freedman

### Food Subsidy Usage At Farmers' Market Before and After Food Subsidy Matching Intervention

12 weeks before (2011) and 12 weeks after (2012)



## Weaknesses of Existing Databases

- Time lag in availability
- Cross sectional; difficult to establish causality related to interventions
  - Need to assess mediators and moderators
- Quality of measures (e.g., diet, food environment)



# **Measuring Diet**

McCormack et al., 2010. *Review of the nutritional implications of farmers' markets and community gardens: A call for evaluation and research efforts.* 

"conclusions need to be drawn with caution as many of the studies included in this review assessed dietary intake using tools with numerous limitations. ... Few studies used well-established measures of dietary assessment, such as 24-hour dietary recalls and validated FFQs or fruit and vegetable screeners."



# Measured Using Validated F/V Screener

(Greene et al., 2008; Peterson et al, 2008; Thompson et al., 2002)

Table 4. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of improvements in fruit and vegetable consumption among diabetics frequenting a FQHC-based farmers' market.

Variables	OR	95% CI
Self-reported BMI at T1	1.04	0.92-1.18
Payment type		
Study voucher only	<b>36.53</b> <sup>*</sup>	3.27-407.95
Study voucher + other form of payment	1.00	Referent
Number of farmers' market visits	2.13**	1.10-4.14
Total amount of money spent at the farmers' market	1.01	0.94-1.09
Receipt of food assistance in the past year		
Yes	0.37	0.07-2.00
No	1.00	Referent
* p<0.01		

\*\* p<0.05

Right Choice Fresh Start Farmers' Market Pilot Study, PI: Freedman

#### Inaccuracies in food environment measurement based on ground-truthing

		Disposition, %				No. of
Data Source and Type of Food Outlet	No. of Outlets Listed	Located and Open	Closed	Not Found	Post Office Box	Outlets Found but Not Listed
South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control						
All food outlets	1,694	89.2	4.2	6.6	0.0	696
Stores	417	92.6	1.9	5.5	0.0	513
Supermarket and grocery	122	95.9	1.6	2.5	0.0	44
Convenience	271	91.1	1.5	7.4	0.0	257
Dollar and variety	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	114
Drug and pharmacy	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	78
Specialty	18	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	20
Restaurants	1,277	88.1	5.0	6.9	0.0	183
Full-service	653	85.3	5.5	9.2	0.0	93
Franchised limited-service	291	95.2	2.1	2.7	0.0	36
Nonfranchised limited-service	333	87.4	6.6	6.0	0.0	54
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.						
All food outlets	1,573	77.7	7.6	12.3	2.3	985
Stores	751	75.8	5.3	14.8	4.1	330
Supermarket and grocery	157	77.7	7.0	12.7	2.5	39
Convenience	383	74.9	5.7	16.4	2.9	217
Dollar and variety	99	82.8	1.0	10.1	6.1	38
Drug and pharmacy	96	66.7	4.2	18.7	10.4	14
Specialty	16	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	22
Restaurants	822	79.6	9.6	10.1	0.7	655
Full-service	389	75.8	11.0	11.8	1.3	356
Franchised limited-service	212	93.4	1.9	4.7	0.0	115
Nonfranchised limited-service	221	72.8	14.5	12.2	0.5	184
InfoUSA, Inc.						
All food outlets	1,657	86.5	3.5	9.0	1.0	774
Stores	672	81.8	3.1	12.8	2.2	349
Supermarket and grocery	136	84.5	3.7	11.0	0.7	46
Convenience	426	82.4	3.0	13.6	0.9	153
Dollar and variety	7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	113
Drug and pharmacy	88	71.6	2.3	14.8	11.4	15
Specialty	15	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	22
Restaurants	985	89.7	3.7	6.4	0.1	425
Full-service	481	87.3	5.2	7.3	0.2	231
Franchised limited-service	267	94.4	1.1	4.5	0.0	61
Nonfranchised limited-service	237	89.4	3.8	6.7	0.0	133

Table 1. Disposition of Food Outlets Listed in Secondary Data Sources After an 8-County Field Census, South

Carolina, 2008-2009

\_

Liese et al., 2010

Kershaw and Richland Counties in central South Carolina shown with food outlet densities per square kilometer (GISbased and ground-truthed)



Van Meter et al., 2011

## Weaknesses of Existing Databases

- Time lag in availability
- Cross sectional; difficult to establish causality related to interventions
  - Need to assess mediators and moderators
- Quality of measures (e.g., diet, food environment)
- Boundaries of data don't always relate to boundaries of intervention
  - E.g., grocery store added to edge of county
- Limited measures of community-organizational factors related to food security



#### Organizational ties related to information-seeking among food systems stakeholders before and after the formation of a food security coalition (Community Food Advocates)



Limited data on organizational actors influencing food systems change and very little or no data on connections among actors.



Freedman & Bess, 2010

## Community Readiness for Food Environment Interventions

Table 2 Dimensions of readiness for establishing an environmental intervention at a health center

	-				
Indicator of readiness	Definition	Dimensions			
Capacity	Ability to mobilize health center and	Institutional support			
	community resources to implement and sustain the environmental intervention.	History of programming to increase access to healthy foods or improve diet			
Social capital	Ties and connections available that may	Partnerships and collaborations			
	be leveraged to mobilize environmental	Collective efficacy			
	interventions at the health center.	Public image			
Awareness of health problems	Understanding of community health concerns and needs and related solutions.	Ecological perspective of health problems			
and solutions		Community-informed understanding of health concerns			
		Awareness of barriers to accessing and eating healthy foods			
		Vision that farmers' market will serve as the solution to community health problems			
Logistical factors	Resources needed to implement and	Physical location			
	support an onsite farmers' market.	Patient volume			
		Access to local farms and farmers			
Sustainability	Resources needed to sustain the	Awareness of intervention demands			
	intervention.	Broad support for the intervention			
		Ownership of the intervention			
		and an an an an			



## Weaknesses of Existing Databases

- Time lag in availability
- Cross sectional; difficult to establish causality related to interventions
  - Need to assess mediators and moderators
- Quality of measures (e.g., diet, food environment)
- Boundaries of data don't always relate to boundaries of intervention
  - E.g., grocery store added to edge of county
- Limited measures of community-organizational factors related to food security
- No qualitative data
- Further data-driven but sometimes theory-limited actions

## **Grounded Theory of Food Access**



Freedman et al., under review

## Using Framing Theory to Understand Child Hunger

### Why does child hunger exist? 4

Symptom of overall insecurity



- Poverty, stress, limited community resources, limited family resources, limited program resources
- Lack of awareness of the problem
- Lack of coordination of resources
  - In communities, across sectors, silo-effect
- Politics
  - Politicians out of touch, divisiveness and partisanship, ending hunger not a priority



## Using Framing Theory to Understand Child Hunger

### Why does child hunger exist?

- Symptom of overall insecurity
  - Poverty, stress, limited community resources, limited family resources, limited program resources
- Lack of awareness of the problem
- Lack of coordination of resources
  - In communities, across sectors, silo-effect
- Politics
  - Politicians out of touch, divisiveness and partisanship, ending hunger not a priority



Ex. More jobs with

living wage



## Conclusions

- Increasingly good options for documenting health, economic, and community outcomes related to food insecurity
- However, more data are needed...
  - Longitudinal
  - Better measures
  - Qualitative
  - Community-organizational level
  - Community-engaged

What additional data, if any, do we need to communicate with policy makers and other power brokers and stakeholders to improve food security?

Is data (or lack thereof) our problem?



"...patterned, persistent inequalities are due primarily to failed political struggles and power imbalances..."



Richard Hofrichter, 2003, p. 1

# Thank you!