

Abstract

Background: Incentive programs to increase financial accessibility of fruits and vegetables (FV) may increase Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants' consumption of healthful food and support weight management. This study describes participants enrolled in a supermarket-based incentive program and compares factors for relationship to incentive engagement.

Methods: SNAP shoppers at two Rochester, NY supermarket locations completed an online survey set of validated measures including FV intake and food security (FS). Participants received two weekly discounts on their store loyalty card for \$5 off a \$10 purchase of fresh FV for 16-weeks. Baselin measures were summarized (mean, standard deviation); chi-square and independent t-tests compared differences.

Results: Participants (n=101) mostly self-identified as white (55%) or black (26%), mean age= 51 ± 16 years. Education attainment was limited; 17% did not graduate high school and 36% achieved a high school diploma, only. Mo participants were overweight/obese (24% overweight, 59% obese). Mean daily intake (cups) of common FV was low including: whole fruit (1.0 ± 1.5) lettuce $(.34 \pm .45)$, potatoes $(.17 \pm .21)$ and beans $(.16 \pm .32)$. FS was limited (23% high/marginal FS, 39% low FS, 38% very low food security). Using a 10-point scale, high levels of stress were reported (mean= 7.2 ± 2.4). Stress was significantly higher among food insecure compared to FS individuals (mean=7.8 \pm 2.0 vs. 5.4 \pm 2.7; p<.01, respectively). A subset of 70 participant who received the incentive ≥ 6 weeks demonstrated that 77% (n=55) used their incentive, and 41% (n=29) used the incentive \geq 50% of the weeks. Obe participants were less likely to use the incentive \geq 50% compared to others (p=.05). Participants redeeming the incentive $\geq 50\%$ trended toward lower reported levels of stress vs. participants with redemption < 50% (p=.07).

Conclusions: Being obese or feeling stressed may limit engagement with FV purchase incentive programs.

Objective

To compare factors related to incentive engagement among SNAP recipients participating in a supermarl based program to incentivize the purchase of F/V.

Study Recruitment and Enrollment

• Participants recruited in the community through:

* flyers posted in public locations (i.e. laundromats libraries, and physicians offices)

* in-person recruitment events at food pantries

* online Facebook advertisements



Figure. Sample recruitment material; Facebook advertise:

- Potential participants accessed a link to an online eligibility screening and consent. To be eligible, participants must: * Be current SNAP participants at least 18 years of age * Shop at two Rochester, NY supermarket locations * Provide their supermarket store loyalty card number
- Enrolled participants received two weekly discounts on their stor loyalty card for \$5 off a \$10 purchase of fresh FV for 16-weeks.

Obesity is Associated with Limited Engagement in Fruit/Vegetable Incentive Programs

Elizabeth H. Ruder, Barbara A. Lohse

			Methods
			ualtrics, Provo, UT) collected socio veight and target measures shown b
ip		Target Measurement	Instrument & Description
ne K d lost 5),	Data Collection	Food Security ¹	Possible score 0-6, raw score 0-1 marginal food security, raw score food security, raw score 5-6: very security; the two categories low f and very low food security are re combination as 'food insecure' at or marginal food security catego to as 'food secure'.
s ints ese		Stress Level ²	"Using a scale from 1 to 10, when stress' and 10 means 'an extreme stress," – how much stress would have experienced in the last year were analyzed as a continuous va
V		Fruit and Vegetable Intake	12-item survey adapted from original to estimate daily consumption of equivalents. Adapted from the N Cancer Institute Eating at America Quick Food Scan.
cket	ysis	deviation (SD)).Differences in redem	vere summarized (frequency, mean option by participant characteristi
oplemental trition stance gram	Data Analys	 ≥ 6 weeks. Redemption was dic redemption (≥ 50% of eligible weeks). Variation in baseline never and high vs. lo and independent sar 	nducted using SPSS (25.0, 2016; A
sement		significance determ	References
	from: 2. Parl 3. Nat	https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/828 ks EP et al. Pediatrics. 2012 Nov;130 ional Cancer Institute, National Inst	e: U.S. Household Food Security Module, Six-Item Sh 82/short2012.pdf
			Funder
ore	USD		is based upon work supported by the National Institu J.S. Department of Agriculture, under award number



tute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under award number 2017-70025-26616. Department ofof Food andAgricultureAgriculture Any opinions, findings, or recommendations in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Wegmans School of Health & Nutrition, Rochester Institute of Technology

io-demographic below.

1: high or re 2-4: low y low food food security referred to in and the high gory is referred

ere 1 means 'no e amount of l you say you ar?" Responses variable.

riginal scale³ of 6 FV in cup National rica's Table

an, standard

tics were he incentive for

sed, and high on (<50%)

ion (ever vs. red, fisher exact,

Armonk, NY),

Short Form. Available

Eating at America's Table

Table 1. Participant characteristics (n=1

	n (%)
Sex	
Female	87(85)
Race	
White	56(54)
Black	27(26)
Other, including multi-racial	18(17)
Age, years	
Mean (SD)	51(16)
BMI categories [*]	
Underweight	1(1)
Normal weight	14(14)
Overweight	21(21)
Obese	52(51)
Education	
Did not graduate High School	17(17)
High School diploma only	36(35)
Some College or 2 year degree	42(41)
4 year College degree or higher	6(6)
Food security ⁺	
High/marginal	23(23)
Low	39(39)
Very Low	38(38)
Stress levels	
Mean (SD)	7.2(2.4)
Weight/height not reported for 13 participants Food security not reported by n=1	

Table 3. Engagement in F/V Incentive Program by Participant Characteristics^{*}

00		0 1	T			
Characteristics	Ever used F/V incentive	Never Used F/V incentive	p-value	High F/V incentive redemption	Low F/V incentive redemption	p-value
Age, Mean (SD)	n=55 54.6 (15.1)	n=14 49.6 (17.5)	.29	n=29 54.9 (16.5)	n=40 52.7 (15.1)	.57
Stress level, Mean (SD)	n=54 6.9 (2.6)	n=13 8.1 (2.3)	.15	n=29 6.5 (2.7)	n=38 7.7 (2.3)	.07
BMI, Mean (SD)	n=50 32.4 (7.1)	n=13 35.4 (9.6)	.21	n=26 31.0 (7.7)	n=37 34.4 (7.5)	.09
BMI≥30 m/kg, n						
Yes	30	8	.92	12	26	.05
No	20	5		14	11	
Food Security, n						
Yes	16	4	1.0	10	10	.39
No	39	10		19	30	
4-year college degree or higher, n						
Yes	25	4	.25	13	16	.69
No	30	10		16	24	
Children≤18 years in household, n						
Yes	20	6	.55	12	14	.71
No	34	7		17	24	
*among $n=70$ participants receiving the ince	ntive > 6 weeks, char	acteristics with < 70 ob	servations rer	present missing survey data		

among n = 10 participants receiving the incentive ≥ 6 weeks, characteristics with < 10 observations represent missing survey data

• Low fruit and vegetable intake supported the need to study utilization of fruit and vegetable incentives. • Being obese or feeling stress shows a trend towards limiting engagement with fruit and vegetable purchase incentive programs.





Results

0	1)	
U	T)	

	n	Range	Mean (SD)
Fruit juice, cups	101	0-12.5	0.9 (1.5)
Fruit, cups	101	0-8.0	1.1 (1.5)
Lettuce, cups	101	0-3.0	0.4 (0.5)
French fries and fried potatoes, cups	101	0-1.0	0.1 (0.1)
White potatoes (not fried), cups	101	09	0.2 (0.2)
Dried beans, cups	101	0-2.5	0.2 (0.3)

Stress was significantly higher among food insecure individuals $(\text{mean}=7.8 \pm 2.0)$ compared to food secure individuals $(\text{mean}=5.4 \pm 2.7; p < .01).$

Conclusions