A mixed methods study evaluating food insecurity and diet quality in households accessing food aid in England

Nida Ziauddeen[1,2]*, Elizabeth Taylor[2,3]*, Nisreen A Alwan[1,2,4], Fran Richards[5], Barrie Margetts[6], Tim Lloyd[7], Marta Disegna[8], Naomi Mason[9], Ravita Taheem[10,11], Dianna Smith[2,3]

[1]School of Primary Care, Population Sciences and Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

[2]NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Wessex, Southampton, UK

[3]School of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

[4]University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

[5]PPI contributor

[6]Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

[7]Bournemouth University Business School, Bournemouth, UK

[8]Dipartimento di Tecnica e Gestione dei Sistemi Industriali, Università degli Studi di Padova, Italy

[9]Public Health Dorset, Dorset, UK

[10]Southampton City Council, Civic Centre, Southampton, UK

[11]NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding author: Dianna Smith, School of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

D.M.Smith@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

Background: Food clubs are a higher-agency food aid intervention that charge a small fee for a set number of items. Some incorporate longer-term solutions such as budgeting support and cooking skills. These are in place in England to help address inadequate reliable access to affordable, nutritious food. We used a convergent parallel mixed methods design to describe the food insecurity households accessing food clubs experience and to assess diet quality and wellbeing at the start and after at least three months of using food clubs in the South of England.

Methods: Participants accessing food clubs in Wessex from March 31 to November 3, 2022 were recruited after providing informed consent. They completed a survey at recruitment that collected data on diet and health. Food security was assessed using the modified six-item US Department of Agriculture (USDA) food security survey module; and wellbeing using the short form Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS). Follow-up surveys were conducted after using the food clubs for at least three months. Participants were invited to take part in a semi-structured interview.

Results: Of 97 participants, 55% were aged 35–54 years, 75% were female, 81% were of White ethnicity, and 72% reported having at least one dependent child. Food security status was calculated in 74 participants who answered all six questions of the USDA module, with 41% reporting low and 43% reporting very low food security. Among participants with follow-up data (n=49), very low food security reduced from 32% at baseline to 16% at follow-up, low food security reduced from 58% to 42% and high/marginal food security increased from 11% to 42%.
Eleven participants were interviewed. The clubs were well received, with participants reporting positive changes on their diet, finances, health and wellbeing and social life.

Conclusion: This study highlights the high prevalence of food insecurity in those accessing food clubs in Wessex and demonstrate improvements in diet and mental wellbeing and decrease in food insecurity after accessing food clubs. Ongoing impact evaluation will enable optimisation of interventions for the populations they serve, such as inviting other organisations/groups to attend and be available for members.

Keywords: food insecurity, diet quality, wellbeing, food aid

Introduction

Household food insecurity is a longstanding social inequality in many high-income countries (1). Sometimes referred to as food poverty, the issue describes households that experience nutritionally inadequate diets in the form of reduced portions, poorer diet quality, or skipped meals due to financial pressures (2,3). These elements of food insecurity are reflected in standard questions asked in surveys which capture this phenomenon, such as the US Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) measure (4).

Food poverty has gained increasing attention over the last few decades in the UK (5). Historically, systematic data collection on the incidence of food insecurity in UK households was minimal, with this lack of evidence masking the scale of the problem. More recently, regular surveys of households have helped to fill the evidence gap (e.g. the biannual Food and You 2 survey, the annual Family Resource Survey and the quarterly survey commissioned by the Food Foundation). These data enable researchers and governments in the UK to identify the prevalence and dynamics of household food insecurity over time, highlighting the demographic characteristics of affected households.

In light of the emerging evidence on food insecurity, the primary policy response has been to provide additional funds via welfare benefits and other means of support, particularly for households with children, such as Free School Meals, the Household Support Fund and the Holiday activities and food programmes. However, the income threshold for these government interventions is very low[1] leaving many households requiring additional or alternative forms of assistance. Emergency intervention typically takes the form of food banks, where free parcels of food are given to a household referred by another organisation, school, or General Practitioner. Usually there is little choice in terms of the food provided in these parcels as they are predominantly made up from donated or surplus food. Initially, food banks provided only ambient (tinned, dry) foods but many more now have some refrigeration capacity and offer chilled foods, alongside fresh or frozen produce.

There are known barriers to accessing food banks such as the stigma of accepting help, or where children are involved, a perceived fear among parents that intervention may risk their children being taken into care/social services (6–8). Alternatives to referral-only food banks include food pantries/clubs, where people pay a small fee each week to choose from a range of heavily discounted food or household items; community fridges, where anyone can come and collect food; or box schemes, where for a small/no fee households receive a parcel of food, perhaps around a recipe, although there is typically no choice in the food available. Among these alternatives, the food pantry or club represents a higher-agency food aid intervention. This type of intervention is often referred to as a choice model, since it allows clients to choose food rather than receive a pre-packed parcel (9–12). Despite the growing popularity of this model of food intervention, their impacts, in terms of improving food security, diet quality and wellbeing is yet to be studied in the UK.

Food insecurity is a public health issue, with observed impacts on physical health through poorer diet quality and negative outcomes for mental health (13). The food consumed in less food-secure households is often of lower nutritional quality (2,3) as less processed foods (especially fresh produce, meat, dairy) are more expensive (14). Parents reducing their portion size or skipping meals to ensure their children have more food is a common occurrence in such households (15–17) and gives rise to the co-occurrence of obesity and malnutrition (18,19). The inherent though unspoken aim of food aid interventions of any type is to provide food (calories) first, with the nutritional quality of the food a secondary

[1] In receipt of Universal credit with household income less than £7400/year or other benefits.

consideration. Given that much of the food is donated by the public, obtained through surplus food redistribution, or purchased by the providers, there is no guarantee that food from these sources will support a 'healthy' diet. Recent work demonstrates that the nutritional quality of food bank parcels is relatively poor, failing to meet nutritional requirements or cultural and health preferences (20).

The aim of this paper is to report the results from an evaluation of a study in Wessex, South of England, to assess the impacts on participants of using higher-agency food clubs and a cookery/box delivery scheme. Pre and post intervention surveys are used to collect data along with semi-structured interviews with clients during 2022, the year in which the UK's cost of living crisis was at its peak. Surveys and interview guides used in data collection are available as a toolkit for local authorities and food aid providers to use in their own evaluations.

Methods

High-agency food interventions and settings

Two membership food clubs and one cookery scheme in Wessex were involved in this project. Both membership clubs offer a range of products including fresh fruit and vegetables; snacks (cakes, chocolate, biscuits); canned food, food cupboard staples (cereals, pasta, bread, rice); and household and personal hygiene items. The items are categorised into four or five categories and members can select a pre-specified number of items from each category. All members get the same quantity of food regardless of household size. Members at both clubs can additionally help themselves to "free food" items when available which are foods that do not count towards their item limit but tend to be items available in surplus that cannot be stored such as bread. Club A is associated with a food bank and has refrigeration facilities so offers meat, dairy products and frozen items including fruit and vegetables. The cookery scheme delivers ingredients for the week's dish including a recipe, a relevant educational activity and a link to the recipe YouTube video. In some instances, the first session of the cookery scheme is a 2-hour in-person cooking workshop. The ingredients are delivered once a week for a set number of weeks.

Club A is restricted to members from a specific postcode area and operates once a week for three hours at one of four locations. Club B allows members to access any location multiple times a week, with sessions lasting two hours at two different sites. Both clubs offer hot drinks, social networking opportunities, and signposting to additional support. Club A also provides pastries from local outlets, invites representatives from various support organizations and at some sites, a "pay what you can" hot food option. During the study, two of Club A's sites opened, while Club B experienced site changes, typical in food aid services.

In both clubs, members pay a fee to select items of food which are sourced mainly from FareShare (national network of surplus food redistribution in the UK), other surplus donations or purchased from local supermarkets. At the start of the sample period most food originated from FareShare and surplus donations but as the cost-of-living crisis developed the food purchased increased and became the most common source of supply.

The cookery scheme offers workshops where children and families cook together. Two staff members set up stations, demonstrate a recipe (e.g., homemade pizza), and assist with preparation. While the food cooks, families socialize or do activities like icing biscuits; after eating together they take home ingredients and recipe cards to recreate the dish. As recipe-specific ingredients are required for the cookery scheme, the foods are usually purchased from local supermarkets.

Data collection

Participants aged 18 and over were recruited from the food clubs or cookery scheme workshops between March 31 and November 3, 2022. Members of the research team visited the sites, asked users to complete a brief survey, and invited them for an interview. Baseline data was collected retrospectively for most participants at intervention sites that were already in place when the study commenced. Newer site users needed time to settle in prior to engaging in the study and were usually recruited at the second or third visit. Written informed consent was obtained.

Surveys: Participants completed a baseline survey at recruitment that collected data on diet, food practices, demographics, and health; where they were already service users we asked them to reflect on the time before they accessed the service and to answer the questions for this time period. Follow-up surveys included the same questions as the baseline survey and were completed after use of interventions for at least three months.

We used the modified six-item USDA food security survey module (4) and the short form Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) (21) to capture a measure of wellbeing. Diet quality was assessed using a validated matrix of consumption and the associated diet quality score, composed of fruit, vegetable, oily fish, fat and non-milk extrinsic sugar intakes, was calculated (22). The diet quality score ranged from 5 to 15 with higher scores indicating better diet quality. A question on the number of portions of fruit and vegetables consumed in a day was included, as well as the main cooking methods and barriers to a healthy diet. Participants received a £5 supermarket voucher as a thank you gesture for every survey completed.

Baseline and follow-up surveys could be completed on paper and were entered into Qualtrics software by the research team or were completed by participants directly online using Qualtrics (QR code for baseline and email link for follow-up).

Interviews: Participants who completed a baseline survey were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview on Microsoft Teams. An interview guide was used for consistency. Interviews lasted between 30 to 60 minutes and were recorded and transcribed using MS Teams transcription software. Transcripts were checked for accuracy and edited as appropriate to correct inaccuracies by NZ. Participants received a £20 supermarket voucher as a thank you gesture for their time. Interviews explored pandemic experiences, their views on the food membership clubs and household eating habits.

Data analysis

Statistical analysis was undertaken using Stata 17 (23). Descriptive percentages and summary statistics were generated for the full sample and for follow-up data. Paired t-test for continuous variables and the McNemar test for categorical variables was used to assess statistical significance in outcomes for participants across the two time points.

Qualitative data was analysed using thematic analysis (24,25). Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase approach starting with familiarisation (reading and rereading transcripts to note items of interest). Initial codes were generated; themes were then generated by reviewing the coded data to identify areas of similarity. Potential themes were reviewed in relation to the coded data and the entire data set to ensure themes link to the coded data set. Themes were then defined and named; and finally the narrative of the data based on the analysis was constructed to produce the summary. Initial coding of the interviews was completed by NZ with second coding of a sample by DS using the codebook developed. No additional codes were identified on second coding.

Stakeholder and Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)

A PPI contributor (FR) was involved in the design of the study, included as a co-applicant on the research funding proposal and consulted throughout the course of this study. The PPI contributor sat on the project steering group and contributed to the direction of the overall project, including development of the survey and interview guide.

The steering group included stakeholders from local authorities and the food aid organisations. The survey was co-developed with steering group members to ensure data collected would be useful to inform decisions about the delivery of higher-agency food aid interventions, such as understanding barriers to household food security in the time and resource poor population.

Results

A total of 97 participants were recruited to the study; 56 from Club A, 34 from Club B and 7 from the cookery scheme. 49 participants completed the follow-up survey. Some participants (n=38) completed baseline and follow up surveys at the same time as they had been attending the food club for at least three months at the time of recruitment.

75 participants were invited to interview as they included their contact information on the initial survey. Invitations were prioritised to reflect a distribution across the interventions and for households with children. In total 11 participants were interviewed. One interviewee attended both the food clubs.

Survey results

Characteristics of participants are shown in Table 1. 53% of participants were aged 35–54 years, 75% were female, 81% were of White ethnicity, and 72% reported having one or more dependent children.

At baseline (recruitment), 58.5% of participants reported skipping or cutting size of meals because there was not enough money for food (Supplementary Table 1). Among participants with follow-up data, 55.3% reported skipping or cutting size of meals at baseline decreasing to 26.7% at follow-up (Figure 1).

Food security status at baseline was calculated for 74 participants who answered all questions of the USDA module, with 41% reporting low food security and 43% reporting very low food security. Among participants with follow-up data, very low food security reduced from 31.6% at baseline to 15.8% at follow-up, low food security reduced from 57.9% at baseline to 42.1% at follow-up and high or marginal food security increased from 10.5% at baseline to 42.1% at follow-up. Eleven participants with follow-up data did not answer all six questions of the USDA food insecurity measure and thus we were unable to categorise their food insecurity status. Food insecurity reduced from 71.4% at baseline to 39.6% at follow-up when using the approach used by the Food Foundation in the UK (calculated using responses to three of the six USDA module questions to capture moderate and severe experiences of food insecurity).

A third (32%) of 97 participants at baseline reported rarely or never eating fruit, with 24% eating fruit at least once a day (Supplementary Table 2). The most common reported frequency of vegetable consumption was 2–3 times a week (27%) and 4–6 times a week (24%). At follow up, only 12.2% rarely or never ate fruit and 34.7% had vegetables 2-3 times/week, with 28.6% having vegetables 4-6 times/week (Supplementary Table 3). The proportion of participants with diet quality scores of 11 or more increased from 30.6% at baseline to 46.9% at follow-up. Overall, diet quality increased in 44.9% (mean 2.0, SD 1.4), decreased in 30.6% (mean -1.3, SD 0.5) and no change in 24.5% of participants.

No respondents were classified as having high mental wellbeing at baseline, and this increased to 8.3% at follow-up. Low wellbeing reduced by a third, from 56.3% of participants

at baseline to 37.5% at follow-up. Based on scoring of responses to the WEMWBS questions, mental wellbeing increased in 61.2% of the sample (mean 4.6 points, SD 3.8), decreased in 20.4% (mean -3.0 points, SD 2.3) and no change in 18.4%.

A higher proportion of participants reported feeling confident cooking (69.4% at baseline, 89.4 at follow-up) and trying new foods or recipes more frequently (10.7 at baseline, 26.1 at follow-up).

Table 1: Characteristics of participants recruited from the food membership clubs

	Full sample		Sample with follow-up	
	n	%	n	%
Total n	97		49	
Age, categorised				
18-24	5	5.6	2	4.8
25-34	15	16.7	6	14.3
35-44	30	33.3	15	35.7
45-54	18	20.0	9	21.4
55-64	13	14.4	6	14.3
65+	9	10.0	4	9.5
Prefer not to say/no response	7	-	7	-
Gender				
Female	69	75.0	30	68.2
Male	23	25.0	14	31.8
Prefer not to say/no response	5	-	5	-
Ethnicity				
White	79	81.4	36	73.5
Asian	10	11.9	8	16.3
Mixed	4	4.1	2	4.1
Black	2	2.1	2	4.1
Other	2	2.1	1	2.0
Employment status				
Employed full-time	10	10.9	5	10.9
Employed part-time	20	21.7	10	21.7
Unemployed	48	52.2	26	56.5
Self-employed	5	5.4	2	4.3
Retired	4	4.3	1	2.2
Student/trainee	2	2.2	2	4.3
Carer	3	3.3	0	0.0
Prefer not to say/no response	5	-	3	-
Household size				
1	20	20.6	11	22.4
2	16	16.5	12	24.5
3	16	16.5	10	20.4
4	20	20.6	8	16.3
5 or more	25	25.8	8	16.3
Dependent children in household				
0	25	27.8	13	29.5
1	17	18.9	10	22.7
2	24	26.7	13	29.5
3 or more	24	26.7	8	18.2
Prefer not to say/no response	7	-	5	-
Change in household size (stepchildren or other relatives sometimes stay)				
Yes	25	27.2	7	14.9
Financial burden from change	16	17.4	4	8.5
No financial burden from change	6	6.5	3	6.4
Don't know	1	1.1	0	0.0
Prefer not to say	2	2.2	-	-
No	67	72.8	40	85.1
Prefer not to say/no response	5	-	2	-
Housing type				
Owned/mortgaged	21	25.0	7	17.9
Social rented	38	45.2	15	38.5
Private rented	18	21.4	13	33.3
Other	7	8.3	4	10.3
Prefer not to say/no response	13	-	10	-
Registered disability				
Yes	21	24.7	11	24.4
No	64	75.3	34	75.6
Prefer not to say/no response	12	-	4	-

Figure 1: Responses to the food security module questions in the sample with follow-up (n=49) at baseline and follow-up



Figure 2: Responses to the food security module questions in the sample with follow-up (n=49) at baseline and follow-up



Table 2: Food insecurity and mental wellbeing in the study sample with follow-up data (n=49)

	Baseline		Follow-up		p-value*
	n	%	n	%	
Food insecurity					
Food security status*					<0.001
High or marginal (food secure)	4	10.5	16	42.1	
Low (food insecure)	22	57.9	16	42.1	
Very low (food insecure)	12	31.6	6	15.8	
Unable to categorise	11	-	11	-	
Food security status (condensed using Food Foundation method)*					<0.001
Food secure	14	28.6	29	60.4	
Food insecure	35	71.4	19	39.6	

Diet quality					
Diet quality score					0.09
5-10	34	69.4	26	53.1	
11-15	15	30.6	23	46.9	
Change in diet quality at follow-up					-
Decreased	-	-	15	30.6	
No change	-	-	12	24.5	
Increased	-	-	22	44.9	
The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS)					
Mental wellbeing**					
High	0	0.0	4	8.3	0.26
Average	21	43.8	26	54.2	
Low	27	56.3	18	37.5	
Unable to categorise	1	-	1	-	
Change in mental wellbeing at follow-up					-
Decreased	-	-	10	20.4	
No change	-	-	9	18.4	
Increased	-	-	30	61.2	
Cooking questions					
I feel confident cooking					-
Strongly agree	15	30.6	21	44.7	
Agree	19	38.8	21	44.7	
Neither agree nor disagree	12	24.5	4	8.5	
Disagree	3	6.1	1	2.1	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	
No response	-	-	2	-	
I cook lunch or the evening meal from scratch					-
Daily	13	27.1	17	36.2	
2-3 times a week	18	37.5	18	38.3	
Weekly	12	25.0	7	14.9	
Monthly	2	4.2	2	4.3	
Less than once a month	3	6.3	3	6.4	
No response	1	-	2	-	
I plan meals before shopping					-
Almost always	15	30.6	15	32.6	
Often	3	6.1	10	21.7	
Sometimes	18	36.7	10	21.7	
Rarely	9	18.4	9	19.6	
Never	4	8.2	2	4.3	
No response	0	-	3	-	
I/we try new foods or recipes					-
Daily	2	4.3	4	8.7	
2-3 times a week	3	6.4	8	17.4	
Weekly	12	25.5	10	21.7	
Monthly	10	21.3	13	28.3	
Less than once a month	20	42.6	11	23.9	
No response	2	-	3	-	

*P-value calculated using McNemar's test for categorical variables

Qualitative data: summary of main themes

In this paper we focus on the most prominent themes from the data about impacts and experiences of food club. Additional themes included the impact of Covid, strategies for food access, trying new foods, accessibility and cost and adaptation due to cost of living which are less relevant for the aim of this paper.

Impact of food club

Participants reported various positive impacts of food club on their diet, finances, health and social life.

More varied diet

Fruit and vegetables are available at both food clubs and participants described eating more fruit and vegetables, some due to having access to these foods and some to partly avoid food waste. Participants described not wanting to waste food and thus making sure that they prioritised eating food that they thought was most likely to go off. Participants enjoyed the variety of fruit and vegetables available at the food club and reported trying to choose healthy food.

One participant described her frustration at previously having to buy biscuits as a snack for her children as it was the cheapest option available in the supermarket that would last a few days. She also described trying to ensure that her children have access to fruit (usually bananas and apples) and vegetables by shopping in budget supermarkets or buying reduced items but not being able to provide more variety of fruit. She went on to describe her joy at being able to get fruits from food club that they usually would not be able to from supermarkets more frequently due to the cost. This is in agreement with several participants who commented on diet improvement after using the food clubs - *"This has been a godsend [food club] cause it keeps us going, if that makes sense. We don't run out now or cause I or I believe the children should have. Like I don't have crisps but they should have as much unlimited fruit snacks as they want ….There's certain foods that we wouldn't normally have access…" – P8*

Some participants also described sometimes making different choices at food club compared to a supermarket. As food club is structured such that members can select a certain number of items from item groups, participants described selecting foods that they would not be willing to spend their money on in a supermarket. These were usually convenience or snack food such as crisps or sausage rolls which would normally not be part of their diet. Participants felt it was a balance of getting cheaper healthy food but also unhealthy food that may not necessarily form part of their diet if they had to pay for it in a supermarket - *"But they also had a lot of convenient food, like snacks. Hmm. Sausage rolls or crisps and all that. So some days you have to choose it because it's on the options. So we also added lots of that type of snacks, which are not healthy. And I will probably not buy if I was paying with my money in the supermarket, but they were there and they were the option. So I chose them." – P11*

Less financial pressure

Food club took the financial strain off buying food to feed the family. Participants with bigger families reported having to do a shop in a supermarket, mostly in a budget supermarket or using points and vouchers from loyalty card schemes, partway through the week between club shops. Participants attending Club B also reported going to a supermarket for essentials not provided through the club, such as milk and other dairy products, due to the lack of refrigeration facilities.

Some participants reported being able to buy foods, commonly fresh fruit, in the supermarket that were generally deemed more expensive. Participants described the balance of getting food that was acceptable for members of the family at the food club (preferred fruit or at preferred ripeness/texture) meaning that they could then get the food which others preferred in the supermarket and feel less guilty or worry less about the cost. Some participants talked about wanting to eat healthier and lose weight, but the price attached to these choices was a barrier.

Participants also reported not buying certain foods, commonly fresh fruit or meat, as it was too expensive particularly with the current rates of inflation. They reported going without prior to going to food club or in between weekly food club visits once they had run out- *"obviously plenty of veg.. fruit and veg.. which I'll get for my girls because they love their fruit and any other time it'll probably won't go and buy it in the shops of how much it is these days. It's so expensive" – P7*

Improved health, wellbeing and social interaction

Participants at Club A, which is restricted to members resident within a specific postcode area, reported walking to the food club quite frequently as the eligibility restriction meant that participants are more likely to live closer to the venue. Local participants at Club B also reported walking but others who lived further away had to travel by car or public transport to

get to the club. Participants who walked there described it being nice to get out and get some fresh air.

Participants described a sense of relief after going to the food club as it gave them the opportunity to chat with other members and volunteers in addition to the food access which alleviated worries around feeding their family. Some participants also felt that the interaction with members and volunteers helped their mental health and they looked forward to going to the club and having the time to talk to others.

Participants described a warm welcoming atmosphere at the clubs. They found it nice to see the same people every week which led to new friendships and made them feel more integrated into the local community. Others also reported that the interactions at the club may be the only social interaction for them outside of their family that day making it something they looked forward to. The additional support services available at the club such as Citizens Advice or housing advice was welcomed as participants also felt they could easily get support with concerns or issues they were facing - *There's always something going on that's the extra….So there's kind of like a gateway. So though it's just like a hub, isn't it? You know there are and it's not it's… if you want it if that makes sense it's there for you – P8.* Members also shared their experiences in managing issues such as around housing or bills with each other and any tips they had learnt as part of their experience.

Recognising time and food range limitations

Although the experience of food club varied among participants, very few limitations were reported. The most common limitation was the need to get there early to ensure the trip was worthwhile and they had plenty of choices available but added to the time it took to get the shopping done. Some participants talked about the need to get there and queue for around half an hour to an hour before the food club opened to ensure they were early in the queue. Queuing outside before food club opened could be a pleasant experience in good weather but less so in wet and/or cold weather. This was sometimes a limiting factor for those with other commitments including education or part-time work and for those with health problems who could not stand in a queue outside for the necessary time - *"The only sort of downfall is if you don't get there early, all the good stuff is gone. And I find now I'm going back into work. I just don't have the time to spend…So yeah, yeah, it's a shame if you're if you've got no other commitments, then and you can spare 2 hours, then it's fine." – P1*.

Participants then had to queue inside when food club opened but this was generally described as a positive experience as participants had the opportunity to get a hot drink (in some clubs free pastries/biscuits) and socialise with the other members and volunteers. Participants who could not attend as frequently or who had not socialised as much at the food club said that it could feel a bit lonely, though generally everyone was friendly.

The other limitation that participants reported was around the range and quality of food. Only Club A provides refrigerated and frozen food so participants attending Club B had to source these products elsewhere. Most participants reported getting these items from a supermarket and that they did not mind doing so but others have chosen to visit other food clubs where these products are provided. As some of the food is sourced from surplus, participants mentioned having to check packaged fruit and vegetables as these could sometimes be a bit mouldy or bit wrinkly but was less easy for the staff at food club to identify due to being packaged.

Sense of community

Participants described a sense of community and belonging from attending food club. The majority of participants lived locally to their club and felt they had made friends and connections locally that benefitted them outside of the access to food. Participants also

described giving back to the food club through volunteering, donating spare produce that they had grown at home or in their allotment or through spreading the word about food club which lead to others donating their spare produce - *"But on the allotment, I do talk to a nice lady and she's been donating some of her spare produce to the [food club]. So that's been positive that I've been able to get a lot more people to give produce." – P5*

Stigma

Some participants reported being reluctant to go to food club or tell some people that they were going to food club and experiencing internalised stigma, which is when people accept negative associations to be true and applicable to themselves. The reluctance described was in communicating to people (other than close friends and family) that they were going to a food club - *"I think it's not easy knowing you're going to a food club. I usually tell people I'm going shopping. At the stigma attached? Maybe." – P5*. Some participants described overcoming it after a while whereas others mentioned still working on overcoming it or choosing not to tell people. Some participants described being less worried about money or having food after attending food club for a while which helped overcome stigma - *To start with, you know, I was a bit funny because of the stigma attached to it....But then after a while, I thought, you know what, I'm not really bothered… I found myself not having to… for any type of money to live or anything like that – P3.*

However, they were very clear that the staff and volunteers and the extended support community at food club were welcoming and did not make them feel judged or stigmatised.

Discussion

The food clubs demonstrate a positive impact on the food security, diet quality and wellbeing of participants when exploring both survey and interview data. The results are encouraging and reflect the range of experiences for clients of food clubs or similar aid schemes. There are improvements in the proportion of people with higher food security and wellbeing. The diet data shows a shift to higher consumption of fruit and vegetables after accessing the clubs and this is demonstrated strongly in the interviews. Participants spoke about the relief food aid offered in terms of cost of food and quality of diet, especially for their children. There was discussion as well of the stigma around accessing such support, but overall people who used these clubs spoke positively about the experience, with improvements in wellbeing noted in survey data as well.

Food security and diet quality in households

Food security improved from 28.6% at baseline to 60.4% of participants at follow-up. This is consistent with a recent systematic review of 21 articles that noted improvements in both household food security and diet quality in food bank users (likely due to their dominance as a form of food aid) (20). However, food parcels often failed to meet nutrient and individual requirements indicating that quality of food parcels needs to improve, with greater provision of meat, fruit and vegetables; with efforts to provide for cultural and health needs (20). Another systematic review of nine studies focussing on food aid use in households with children also found improvements in food security and diet quality, with models that provide choice and support services being most effective (26). Two studies that delivered a diabetes prevention interventions to food bank users at risk of diabetes highlighted improvements in food security and fruit and vegetable consumption (27,28). A longitudinal study in Canada contrasting food banks with a choice model (similar to the food clubs studied here) also demonstrated greater improvements to household food security in those using food banks with a choice model compared to those using food banks without a choice model (9). Our positive findings were reflected in interviews across the themes of diet variety and financial

pressure with participants also reporting higher fruit and vegetable consumption in the diet questions.

Mental wellbeing and community

Wellbeing or mental health are other notable concerns in food-insecure households, and we see a trend for positive improvement in participants in this study with increased mental wellbeing in 61.2% of study participants. Comments made during the interviews pointed to reduced worry over food and financial concerns, improved diet options and the engagement with other clients and volunteers as the reasons for enhanced wellbeing. The measurable improvement observed in our work is in agreement with results from Canada after an 18 month follow-up (9). Participants in our study spoke about the negative aspect of stigma in accessing food aid, but how this also improved as time passed potentially due to the welcoming environment at the clubs, interacting with other people in a similar situation and seeing the same people every week enabling a sense of community. Overall, there were many positive reflections on the ability to talk with others; building a community for wider social support were central, as observed in other studies of food clubs (29). This role as a place to build community is echoed in the report on affordable food clubs by Feeding Britain (30).

Strengths and limitations

There are several strengths to this work. The survey tool and interview guide were developed with several local stakeholders and public input, to ensure the data collected will inform practice in the food aid settings. The combination of survey data and interviews with participants allowed us to explore the possible reasons behind patterns noted from the surveys. There is limited literature on impacts of food aid in forms other than food banks, and here we present a mixed-methods study which allowed us to follow up with participants as they settle into the intervention. Using validated measures for food security and wellbeing provide comparability for future studies into the impact of higher-agency food aid.

There are some limitations to this study. Some food clubs were established when we recruited participants, and some participants completed the baseline and follow up surveys together. We only had follow up surveys from one cookery scheme participant, this was likely influenced by them not having a set location to meet, at a specific time, so we were unable to follow up in person. There is a risk of social desirability bias for both survey and interview responses.

Conclusions

Food aid is changing as there is recognition of the need to provide a more sustainable and supportive model around food security. The shift from food banks to higher-agency food aid, such as food clubs, provides an opportunity to refine the delivery of interventions to optimise outcomes for the populations they serve, in terms of products available, recipe cards, or wraparound services available for signposting. Collecting data from clients of these services which allows comparisons over time through standardised survey modules adds valuable data about the potential benefits of food clubs/pantries. Understanding more about the experiences of clients through interviews provides new insights regarding the perceived value and opportunities for improvement in supporting diet quality and wellbeing. Uniting these methods provides a process for ongoing data collection and reflection of the relative success of food aid models until we move to a point where greater equity is achieved, and such aid is no longer embedded in the food environment.

List of abbreviations

USDA : United States Department of Agriculture
WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale

Declarations:

Ethics approval and consent to participate
Ethical approval was granted by the University of Southampton Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences committee (ERGO 68876). Informed consent was obtained from all study participants.

Consent for publication
Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials
The anonymised datasets analysed during the current study may be available from the corresponding authors on reasonable request, pending approval from the relevant ethics committee and research governance structures.

Competing interests
BM is a trustee of Southampton Social Aid Group. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding
This work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) Wessex. The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Institute of Health and Care Research or the Department for Health and Social Care. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Authors' contributions
Authors contributions were as follows: study concept (NAA, DS), study methodology (all authors), data collection (NZ, ET, NAA, DS,), data analysis (NZ, ET), drafting of the manuscript (NZ, DS), and revising for content (all authors). All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements
We would like to thank the study participants, and our PPI representatives for their time and invaluable contribution to this work. We would like to thank all the staff and volunteers at the food membership clubs and cookery scheme for facilitating study recruitment.

Authors' information
NZ and ET made equal contribution as first author.

References
1. Loopstra R. Interventions to address household food insecurity in high-income countries. Proc Nutr Soc. 2018 Aug;77(3):270–81.
2. Dixon LB, Winkleby MA, Radimer KL. Dietary Intakes and Serum Nutrients Differ between Adults from Food-Insufficient and Food-Sufficient Families: Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988–1994. The Journal of Nutrition. 2001 Apr;131(4):1232–46.
3. Kirkpatrick SI, Tarasuk V. Food Insecurity Is Associated with Nutrient Inadequacies among Canadian Adults and Adolescents3. The Journal of Nutrition. 2008 Mar;138(3):604–12.

4. United States Department of Agriculture. U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module [Internet]. Available from: https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-u-s/survey-tools/#six
5. Dowler E, Lambie-Mumford H. How Can Households Eat in austerity? Challenges for Social Policy in the UK. Social Policy & Society. 2015 Jul;14(3):417–28.
6. Thompson C, Smith D, Cummins S. Understanding the health and wellbeing challenges of the food banking system: A qualitative study of food bank users, providers and referrers in London. Social Science & Medicine. 2018 Aug;211:95–101.
7. Douglas F, Sapko J, Kiezebrink K, Kyle J. Resourcefulness, Desperation, Shame, Gratitude and Powerlessness: Common Themes Emerging from A Study of Food Bank Use in Northeast Scotland. AIMS Public Health. 2015;2(3):297–317.
8. Garthwaite K. Stigma, shame and 'people like us': an ethnographic study of foodbank use in the UK. Journal of Poverty and Social Justice. 2016 Oct;24(3):277–89.
9. Rizvi A, Wasfi R, Enns A, Kristjansson E. The impact of novel and traditional food bank approaches on food insecurity: a longitudinal study in Ottawa, Canada. BMC Public Health. 2021 Dec;21(1):771.
10. Jones CL, Ksobiech K, Maclin K. "They Do a Wonderful Job of Surviving": Supportive Communication Exchanges Between Volunteers and Users of a Choice Food Pantry. Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition. 2019 Mar 4;14(1–2):204–24.
11. Martin KS, Wu R, Wolff M, Colantonio AG, Grady J. A Novel Food Pantry Program. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2013 Nov;45(5):569–75.
12. Mukoya MN, McKay FH, Dunn M. Can Giving Clients a Choice in Food Selection Help to Meet Their Nutritional Needs?: Investigating a Novel Food Bank Approach for Asylum Seekers. Int Migration & Integration. 2017 Nov;18(4):981–91.
13. Pourmotabbed A, Moradi S, Babaei A, Ghavami A, Mohammadi H, Jalili C, et al. Food insecurity and mental health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Public Health Nutr. 2020 Jul;23(10):1778–90.
14. Monsivais P, Mclain J, Drewnowski A. The rising disparity in the price of healthful foods: 2004–2008. Food Policy. 2010 Dec;35(6):514–20.
15. Hanson KL, Connor LM. Food insecurity and dietary quality in US adults and children: a systematic review. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2014 Aug;100(2):684–92.
16. Shinwell J, Defeyter MA. Food Insecurity: A Constant Factor in the Lives of Low-Income Families in Scotland and England. Front Public Health. 2021 May 19;9:588254.
17. Armstrong B, Hepworth AD, Black MM. Hunger in the household: Food insecurity and associations with maternal eating and toddler feeding. Pediatric Obesity. 2020 Oct;15(10):e12637.
18. Crawford PB, Webb KL. Unraveling the Paradox of Concurrent Food Insecurity and Obesity. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2011 Feb;40(2):274–5.
19. Drewnowski A, Specter S. Poverty and obesity: the role of energy density and energy costs. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2004 Jan;79(1):6–16.
20. Oldroyd L, Eskandari F, Pratt C, Lake AA. The nutritional quality of food parcels provided by food banks and the effectiveness of food banks at reducing food insecurity in developed countries: a mixed-method systematic review. J Human Nutrition Diet. 2022 Dec;35(6):1202–29.
21. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2007 Dec;5(1):63.
22. Cleghorn CL, Harrison RA, Ransley JK, Wilkinson S, Thomas J, Cade JE. Can a dietary quality score derived from a short-form FFQ assess dietary quality in UK adult population surveys? Public Health Nutr. 2016 Nov;19(16):2915–23.
23. Stata Statistical Software: Release 17. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2021.
24. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2006 Jan;3(2):77–101.

25. Braun V, Clarke V. Thematic analysis. In: Cooper H, Camic PM, Long DL, Panter AT, Rindskopf D, Sher KJ, editors. APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological [Internet]. Washington: American Psychological Association; 2012 [cited 2024 Nov 14]. p. 57–71. Available from: https://content.apa.org/books/13620-004
26. Stahacz C, Alwan NA, Taylor E, Smith D, Ziauddeen N. The impact of food aid interventions on food insecurity, diet quality and mental health in households with children in high-income countries: a systematic review. Public Health Nutr. 2024;27(1):e195.
27. Seligman HK, Smith M, Rosenmoss S, Marshall MB, Waxman E. Comprehensive Diabetes Self-Management Support From Food Banks: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Am J Public Health. 2018 Sep;108(9):1227–34.
28. Cheyne K, Smith M, Felter EM, Orozco M, Steiner EA, Park Y, et al. Food Bank-Based Diabetes Prevention Intervention to Address Food Security, Dietary Intake, and Physical Activity in a Food-Insecure Cohort at High Risk for Diabetes. Prev Chronic Dis. 2020 Jan 9;17:E04.
29. Moraes C, McEachern MG, Gibbons A, Scullion L. Understanding Lived Experiences of Food Insecurity through a Paraliminality Lens. Sociology. 2021 Dec;55(6):1169–90.
30. Feeding Britain. Affordable Food Clubs Impact Report (April 2024) [Internet]. Available from: https://feedingbritain.org/affordable-food-clubs-impact-report-april-2024/