



- 31 Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Writing-review & editing. C.Vogel:
- 32 Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing-review & editing.
- 33
- 34

35 **Abstract**

36 During adolescence, many young people start to make more independent food  
37 purchases. Subsequently, these independent food choices will increasingly contribute to  
38 their overall diet quality; little is known, however, about this relationship. This study  
39 aimed to examine the role adolescents' independent food purchases play in their diet  
40 quality and assess if these relationships vary according to socio-economic status.

41 A convenience sample of adolescents aged 11-18 years and attending secondary school  
42 or college in Hampshire, England, were recruited to participate in a one-week cross-  
43 sectional observational study. A validated 20-item Food Frequency Questionnaire  
44 assessed diet quality. Participants used an ecological momentary assessment mobile  
45 phone app to record food purchases.

46 Over seven days, 552 food/drink items were purchased on 253 food purchasing occasions  
47 by 80 participants. The majority of purchases (n=329, 60%) were coded as 'not adhering'  
48 to the UK Eatwell Guide, 32% were coded as 'adhering' and 9% fell between these two  
49 categories. Healthier food purchasing was associated with better diet quality ( $\beta$  0.48,  
50 (95%CI 0.01, 0.96)  $p=0.05$ ); results attenuated after adjustment for confounders ( $\beta$  0.36,  
51 (95%CI -0.15, 0.87)  $p=0.16$ ). Interaction models showed purchasing healthfulness was  
52 more strongly associated with diet quality among young people of lower SES ( $p=0.01$ ).

53 The majority of adolescents' independent food purchases did not adhere to healthy  
54 eating guidelines. For adolescents experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage, these food  
55 choices had a more detrimental impact on their overall diet quality than they did for  
56 more advantaged adolescents. Future research should focus on identifying ways to

57 support more healthful independent food choices by adolescents to reduce dietary

58 inequalities and improve health and well-being among the next generation of adults.

59

60 **Keywords:** Adolescents; food purchasing; diet quality; socio-economic status

61

## 1 Introduction

2 Poor dietary behaviours are a major contributor to the global burden presented by non-  
3 communicable diseases (NCDs) (1). Evidence from the UK's National Diet and Nutrition  
4 Survey suggests that adolescents have poorer dietary behaviours when compared to  
5 other age groups (2, 3). The dietary habits of this age group are an important public  
6 health issue as behaviours established during this period frequently track into adulthood  
7 and play a role in future health trajectories (4). Identifying ways to support healthy  
8 dietary behaviours among adolescents is therefore an important strategy to improve  
9 health and reduce the prevalence of NCDs; intervening in adolescence has potential to  
10 improve the immediate and future health of the individual as well as the health of any  
11 future offspring (5).

12 Adolescence is a time when individuals gain autonomy and independence. During this  
13 stage of the lifecourse, many young people start making more of their own food choices  
14 without supervision from parents or other care givers. While it has been shown that  
15 adolescents source the majority of their food from home and school (6-8), many  
16 adolescent autonomous food decisions are likely to be made outside of these home and  
17 school environments. A 2015 report from Food Standards Scotland showed that the  
18 majority of independent food choices made by adolescents outside of the home and  
19 school at lunchtimes are high in fat, sugar and salt; chips (fries), sugary soft drinks and  
20 energy drinks were some of the most frequently purchased items (9). Independent food  
21 choices made by adolescents are likely to represent an increasing proportion of their  
22 overall food intake and, therefore, their overall diet quality. There is limited evidence,

23 however, about how the foods adolescents purchase for themselves affect their overall  
24 dietary quality. Findings from a study in Kentucky, USA, showed that adolescents with  
25 unhealthy shopping habits (shopping three or more times per week at petrol stations,  
26 convenience stores and fast-food restaurants) ate fewer fruits and vegetables than those  
27 with healthier shopping habits (10). Understanding the contribution that independent  
28 food purchases of adolescents make to their overall dietary intake is important to design  
29 interventions and food policies that are effective at improving the diet and health of this  
30 important age group.

31 Socio-economic status (SES) has been well documented as a critical determinant of  
32 dietary quality. In the UK, adolescents living in more deprived areas and lower income  
33 households have been shown to have poorer quality diets (11-13), in particular  
34 consuming lower levels of vegetables, fibre and oily fish and more energy drinks (11-13).  
35 However, the role that adolescents' independent food purchasing decisions play in their  
36 overall diet quality and the difference by SES remains unclear.

37 In order to address this knowledge gap, this study aimed to:

- 38 1) Examine food purchasing behaviours as predictors of diet quality;
- 39 2) Assess whether SES moderated the relationship between food purchasing  
40 behaviours and diet quality of adolescents.

## 41 **Material and Methods**

### 42 **Study design**

43 A one-week cross-sectional, observational study was conducted to collect data on  
44 adolescents' independent food purchasing behaviours and diet quality as part of the Map  
45 My Food Study. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Faculty of Medicine  
46 Ethics Committee, University of Southampton (ERGO 57044).

### 47 **Participants and recruitment**

48 A convenience sample of adolescent participants was recruited from schools, colleges  
49 and youth groups based in Hampshire in the south of England, UK. Adolescents were  
50 eligible to participate if they i) were aged 11-18 years, ii) attended school or college in  
51 England and iii) owned a GPS-enabled smart phone.

52 A researcher attended the school, college or youth group to introduce the study and  
53 answer questions. Information was provided about the purpose and methods of the  
54 study. Written informed consent was obtained for all participants using an electronic  
55 consent form. Participants over the age of 16 years were able to provide consent to  
56 participate. Those aged under 16 years provided assent and parental consent was also  
57 sought for their participation.

### 58 **Data collection**

59 Data were collected between May 2021 and April 2022. Following the consent process,  
60 participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire containing demographic  
61 questions and a food frequency questionnaire (FFQ). Participants were also asked to  
62 download and use a mobile phone app for one week. The app was a modified version of

63 the Tripzoom app which was created and run by a commercial company, Locatienet (14,  
64 15). Where possible, a member of the research team aimed to be present when the  
65 participants were completing the questionnaire and downloading the study app. On some  
66 occasions, restrictions on visitors entering schools and colleges during the COVID-19  
67 pandemic prevented this happening. In these instances, participants were able to contact  
68 the research team via email if they experienced any difficulties.

69 The app used Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) methods to collect data about  
70 the food outlets adolescents used and their food purchases over the study week. EMA is  
71 an intensive longitudinal data collection technique aimed at reducing recall bias by  
72 collecting data from study participants when they are in their natural environment, and  
73 close in time to when the behaviour of interest takes place (16). EMA has been used  
74 previously with adolescents and young adults in order to provide a better understanding  
75 of the external and internal cues influencing dietary consumption (17-20). Adolescents  
76 were asked to use the app to record all their independent food and beverage purchases  
77 over the study week. Three time-based prompts were delivered through the app to  
78 remind participants to make a recording and to reduce incidences of missing data. To  
79 make a recording, adolescents could select a food or drink from a pre-defined list of food  
80 items. If an item was not present on the list, details could be entered using a free text  
81 field. Participants could also take photos of the items or receipts. These photos were  
82 used to check the accuracy of the recorded food items. In total, photos were provided for  
83 23% of entries. With each entry, participants were also asked to provide details about the  
84 purpose of the purchase (breakfast, lunch, dinner or snack). The app data collection  
85 methods were refined through feasibility testing (n=14) and a pilot study (n=12) with



86 young people to ensure acceptability (unpublished data). At the end of the study week,  
87 participants who had completed the questionnaire and downloaded the app were given a  
88 £10 Amazon voucher as an appreciation for their participation in the study.

## 89 **Exposure Measures**

### 90 Demographic data

91 Using the questionnaire, participants provided their age, gender, ethnicity and home  
92 postcode. Household-level SES was assessed using questions from the Family Affluence  
93 Scale (FAS) (21). These questions have been used in the UK What about YOUth? Survey  
94 and the International Health Behaviour in School-aged Children study (21). The questions  
95 have been validated and are shown to be easier to complete than questions about  
96 parental education and occupation (21). A binary score was created to represent  
97 household SES: low household SES (FAS 1-7), high household SES (FAS 8-14). The Index of  
98 Multiple Deprivation (IMD) (22), the official measure of relative deprivation for small  
99 geographical areas in England, was calculated for each participant using their home  
100 postcode. A binary score was created to represent neighbourhood SES: low  
101 neighbourhood SES (IMD scores 1-5), high neighbourhood SES (IMD scores 6-10).

### 102 Total number of food purchases

103 Using the food purchasing data recorded in the app, the number of food/drink items  
104 purchased over the study week was tallied for each participant. First, the number of  
105 items purchased on each food purchasing occasion was tallied; for example, if a  
106 participant purchased a burger, chips, and a sugar sweetened beverage, three items  
107 would be recorded for that food purchasing occasion. These numbers were then tallied

108 for all food purchasing occasions made by each participant to give the total number of  
109 food purchases made over the study week.

#### 110 Healthfulness of food purchases

111 All food and drink items purchased during the Map My Food Study were classified  
112 according to how well they adhered to the UK's Eatwell Guide (23). Food and drink items  
113 were classified as either 'adhering', 'not-adhering' or 'combination'. Food and beverage  
114 items which are included as part of the main food groups in the Eatwell Guide and those  
115 that individuals are encouraged to eat more were categorised as 'adhering'. Foods high in  
116 fat, sugar and salt that fall outside the main food groups in the Eatwell guide and which  
117 individuals are encouraged to limit were categorised as 'not-adhering'. Foods that could  
118 not be classified within either of these groups were classified as 'combination' foods.  
119 Table 1 shows the food purchases recorded by participants and how they were classified  
120 in terms of healthfulness. Previous research has used similar coding approaches based on  
121 the Australian Guide to Healthy Eating (6, 24).

122

123 **Table 1 Coding of food purchases against the UK Eatwell Guide**

Coding food purchases against Eatwell Guide		
Foods/drinks categorised as adhering to the Eatwell Guide	Foods/drinks categorised as not adhering to the Eatwell Guide	Combination/uncategorised foods/drinks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bread</li> <li>• Breakfast cereal (No added sugar)</li> <li>• Fermented milk drink</li> <li>• Fruit</li> <li>• Fruit Juice</li> <li>• Fruit Smoothie</li> <li>• Non-sugar sweetened carbonated drink</li> <li>• Milk</li> <li>• Nuts</li> <li>• Pasta/rice</li> <li>• Sushi</li> <li>• Tea/Coffee</li> <li>• Steak</li> <li>• Roasted chicken</li> <li>• Vegetables</li> <li>• Water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Battered Fish</li> <li>• Biscuits</li> <li>• Burgers/kebabs</li> <li>• Cakes</li> <li>• Chicken nuggets/battered chicken</li> <li>• Chips/Fries</li> <li>• Chocolate confectionary</li> <li>• Crisps</li> <li>• Energy drinks</li> <li>• Ice-cream</li> <li>• Iced Tea/ Iced Coffee/ Bubble Tea</li> <li>• Milkshakes</li> <li>• Non-carbonated sugar sweetened drinks</li> <li>• Popcorn</li> <li>• Pizza</li> <li>• Processed meat (chorizo)</li> <li>• Ready meals</li> <li>• Sauces and dips</li> <li>• Sugar confectionary</li> <li>• Sausage roll, pasty, pie</li> <li>• Sugar sweetened carbonated drinks</li> <li>• Sweet pastries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sandwich or wrap</li> <li>• Other hot drink</li> <li>• Dumplings</li> </ul>

124

125 To create Purchasing Healthfulness Scores, foods classified as ‘adhering’ were allocated  
 126 the score of ‘+1’, the ‘combination’ classification was allocated the rating of ‘0’ and the  
 127 ‘non-adhering’ foods were allocated the rating of ‘-1’. Food scores were subsequently  
 128 tallied for each food purchasing occasion and then divided by the total number of  
 129 food/drink items purchased as part of that food purchasing occasion. The same process  
 130 was used to calculate a Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score for each participant; food  
 131 scores were tallied for the entire week and then divided by the total number of  
 132 food/drink items purchased over the week. Scores ranged between -1 and 1 and were

133 used as continuous variables and presented as healthfulness units. Higher scores  
134 representing healthier independent purchasing patterns.

### 135 **Outcome Measures**

#### 136 Diet quality

137 Using a 20-item FFQ, participants recorded how frequently they consumed each food  
138 group over the previous month. These dietary data were used to calculate a diet quality  
139 score for each participant following published methodology specifically developed to  
140 assess diet quality among UK adolescents (11). This diet quality score has been validated  
141 against fourteen nutritional biomarkers, including serum folate, homocysteine, total  
142 carotenoids and vitamins B12, C and D (11).

#### 143 **Statistical analysis**

144 Normally-distributed continuous variables are summarised using mean (SD). Non-  
145 normally distributed continuous variables are summarised using median (IQR).  
146 Categorical variables are summarised using n (%). T-tests, Mann-Whitney rank sum tests  
147 and Chi-squared tests were used to compare differences in demographic characteristics  
148 between those with purchasing data and those without. Differences in Diet Quality  
149 Scores and purchasing outcomes according to demographic characteristics were assessed  
150 using unpaired t-tests and Mann-Whitney rank-sum tests. In order to retain statistical  
151 power, a test for trend was conducted for characteristics measured using an underlying  
152 continuous variable (age, IMD, and household SES).

153 To address aim 1, two separate linear regression models were fitted both using the Diet  
154 Quality Score as the outcome. The exposure for the first regression model was the

155 variable describing the number of food purchases over the study week. The exposure for  
156 the second model was the Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score. Age, gender, ethnicity,  
157 and household SES were included as confounding variables in adjusted models, reflecting  
158 their observed influence in previous studies (11, 25).

159 To address aim 2, an interaction term for Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score by  
160 household SES was added to the regression models to determine the effect modification  
161 of household SES in the relationship between food purchasing behaviours and diet  
162 quality.

163 All data were analysed in Stata version 16 (26).

## 164 **Results**

### 165 **Participant Characteristics**

166 A total of 108 participants completed the online questionnaire. Of these, 101 participants  
167 downloaded the study app and food purchasing data were available for 80 participants.

168 Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics for participants with and without  
169 purchasing data. The majority of participants with both purchasing and dietary data were  
170 girls (69%), self-identified as being of white ethnicity (79%) and had a median age of 17  
171 years (IQR 15, 17). Thirty participants (37%) were living in homes located in the most  
172 deprived half of neighbourhoods in the UK. Twenty-four participants (30%) had a  
173 household SES (Family Affluence Score) between 0-7, representing low household-level  
174 SES.

175

176 **Table 2 Characteristics of study participants**

Characteristics	Participants with purchasing and diet data (n=80)	Participants without purchasing data (n=28)
<b>Gender, n (%)</b>		
Boy	19 (24)	14 (50)
Girl	55 (69)	13 (46)
Not provided	6 (7)	1 (3)
<b>Age, median (IQR) (years)</b>	17 (15,17)	14 (13,17)
<b>Age, n (%) (years)</b>		
11-13 years	8 (10)	9 (32)
14-16 years	25 (31)	10 (36)
17-18 years	47 (59)	9 (32)
<b>Ethnicity, n (%)</b>		
White	63 (79)	25 (89)
Other ethnicities*	17 (21)	3 (11)
<b>Area-level SES (IMD), n (%)</b>		
1-5 (most deprived)	30 (37)	12 (43)
6-10 (least deprived)	34 (43)	13 (46)
Missing	16 (20)	3 (11)
<b>Household-level SES (FAS), n (%)</b>		
Low (0-7)	24 (30)	5 (18)
High (8-14)	54 (68)	23 (82)
Missing	2 (2)	0 (0)

177

178 **Food purchasing behaviours**

179 In total, 552 food/drink items were purchased during 253 food purchasing occasions over  
180 the study week. The median number of purchases made by each participant over the 7-  
181 day period was 5 (IQR 3, 8; range 1-30). As visualised in Fig 1, the most frequently  
182 purchased foods over the study period were chips (n= 47, 9% of all purchases),  
183 sandwiches (n=40, 7% of all purchases) and vegetables (n= 30, 5% of all purchases). The  
184 most frequently purchased drinks were non-sugar-sweetened carbonated drinks (n=28,  
185 5% of all purchases), sugar-sweetened carbonated drinks (n=24, 4% of all purchases) and

186 water (n=19, 3% of all purchases). The majority of purchases (n= 329, 60%) were coded as  
 187 ‘not adhering’ to the UK Eatwell Guide, 175 food items (32%) were coded as ‘adhering’  
 188 and 48 (9%) were coded as combination foods. Fig 2 presents the purchases made by  
 189 participants of high and low household SES, by the three UK Eatwell classifications. This  
 190 graph shows no difference in percentage of purchased foods categorised as adhering, not  
 191 adhering and combination between participants with high and low household SES.

192 **Fig 1. Graph illustrating the types and frequency of foods/drinks purchased by**  
 193 **adolescents during the study**

194 **Fig 2. Percentages of purchases coded in UK Eatwell Guide categories by household SES**

195 Of the 253 food purchasing occasions, participants reported that the food and drinks  
 196 purchased on 39% of these occasions were for snacks, 26% were for lunch, 26% for  
 197 dinner. Only 7% were for breakfast (Table 3). Purchases bought for snacks were less  
 198 healthy than those made for breakfast, lunch or dinner (p<0.001).

199 **Table 3 Purchasing Healthfulness Scores on food purchasing occasions according to purpose of**  
 200 **purchase**

	n	(%)*	Purchasing Healthfulness Score <sup>a</sup> (Median (IQR))	p-value
<b>Purpose of purchase</b>				
Breakfast	18	(7)	0.00 (-0.33, 0.50)	<0.001 <sup>b</sup>
Lunch	66	(26)	0.00 (-0.67, 0.33)	
Dinner	66	(26)	-0.25 (-1.0, 0.00)	
Snack	98	(39)	-1.00, (-1.0, 0.00)	
Missing	5	(2)	-	

\* % of food purchasing occasions (n total = 253)

<sup>a</sup> Purchasing healthfulness score on food purchasing occasions

<sup>b</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test with adjustment for ties

201

202 The median Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score, reflecting the overall healthfulness  
203 of all purchases made over the study week, was -0.33 healthfulness units (IQR -0.65, 0.00)  
204 indicating that for every healthy purchase made, on average two unhealthy purchases  
205 were made. Table 4 presents the median number of weekly purchases and median  
206 Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score according to participants' demographic  
207 characteristics. On average, older adolescents and girls purchased more food and drink  
208 items over the study week compared to younger adolescents ( $p=0.07$ ) and boys,  
209 respectively ( $p=0.003$ ). Adolescents of white ethnicity tended to purchase more items  
210 than those of other ethnicities ( $p=0.22$ ). Participants from more deprived backgrounds  
211 purchased more food and drink items than those from more affluent backgrounds, but  
212 findings did not reach statistical significance (IMD  $p=0.20$ , FAS  $p=0.71$ ). No notable  
213 differences were observed in Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score according to age,  
214 gender, ethnicity, and SES measures.



215 **Table 4 Participant purchases and diet quality scores according to characteristics**

<b>Participant Characteristics</b>	<b>Number of weekly purchases (Median (IQR))</b>	<b>n (n=80)</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score (Median (IQR))</b>	<b>n (n=80)</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Diet Quality Score (Mean (SD))</b>	<b>n (n=108)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Age</b>			0.07 <sup>a</sup>			0.72 <sup>a</sup>			0.77 <sup>a</sup>
11-13 years	4.50 (2.50, 5.50)	8		-0.17 (0.63, 0.00)	8		-0.05 (0.75)	17	
14-16 years	5.00 (3.00, 9.00)	25		-0.33 (-0.88, 0.00)	25		-0.07 (1.18)	35	
17-18 years	6.00 (4.00, 9.00)	47		-0.33 (-0.60, 0.00)	47		0.06 (0.96)	56	
<b>Gender</b>			0.003			0.88			0.29
Boys	3.00 (2.00, 5.00)	19		-0.33 (-1.00, 0.00)	19		-0.08 (0.17)	33	
Girls	6.00 (4.00, 9.00)	55		-0.33 (-0.60, 0.00)	55		0.11 (0.12)	68	
<b>Ethnicity</b>			0.22			0.67			0.09
White	5.00 (3.00, 9.00)	63		-0.33 (-0.63, 0.00)	63		0.06 (0.98)	88	
Other ethnicities*	4.00 (3.00, 7.00)	17		-0.07 (-0.86, 0.00)	17		-0.28 (1.05)	20	
<b>Area SES (IMD)</b>			0.20 <sup>a</sup>			0.63 <sup>a</sup>			0.10 <sup>a</sup>
1-5 (most deprived)	5.50 (4.00, 8.00)	30		-0.35 (-0.86, 0.00)	30		-0.24 (1.00)	42	
6-10 (least deprived)	4.50 (3.00, 6.00)	34		-0.33 (-0.60, 0.00)	34		0.09 (0.92)	47	
<b>Household SES (FAS)</b>			0.71 <sup>a</sup>			0.87 <sup>a</sup>			0.02 <sup>a</sup>
Low (0-7)	5.50 (2.50, 9.00)	24		-0.24 (-0.74, 0.00)	24		-0.18 (1.18)	29	
High (8-14)	5.00 (3.50, 8.00)	56		-0.33 (-0.63, 0.00)	56		0.06 (0.93)	79	

<sup>a</sup> p-value calculated using continuous variable

\* Other ethnicities include: Black African, Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Chinese, Afghan, British Indian, British Punjabi, Arabic, British Asian, Turkish, Mixed

217 **Diet quality**

218 Table 4 shows mean Diet Quality Scores according to demographic characteristics. Diet  
219 Quality Scores were similar across the three age groups but tended to be higher among  
220 girls compared to boys ( $p=0.29$ ) and higher among adolescents of white ethnicity  
221 compared to other ethnicities ( $p=0.09$ ). Diet Quality Scores were also higher among  
222 adolescents who were more affluent according to both area level SES (IMD) ( $p=0.10$ ) and  
223 household SES (Family Affluence Score) ( $p=0.02$ ).

224 ***Aim 1: To assess the associations between food purchasing behaviours and diet quality***  
225 ***in adolescents***

226 Table 5 presents the results of linear regression analyses, testing the association between  
227 food purchasing and diet quality. Unadjusted models showed no relationship between  
228 number of weekly food purchases and diet quality, and this relationship remained when  
229 models were adjusted for age, gender, ethnicity, and household SES. When the  
230 healthfulness of these purchases was considered, a positive association with diet quality  
231 was observed. Higher Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Scores were associated with  
232 higher Diet Quality Scores ( $\beta$  0.48 SDs/healthfulness unit, (95%CI 0.01, 0.96)  $p=0.05$ ).  
233 These results were attenuated after adjustment ( $\beta$  0.36 SDs/healthfulness unit, (95%CI -  
234 0.15, 0.87)  $p=0.16$ ).

235

236 **Table 5 Linear regression results for association between food purchasing (exposure) and diet quality**  
237 **(SDs) (outcome)**

Exposure variable	Unadjusted $\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted $\beta$ (95% CI)*	p-value
Number of weekly purchases	0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)	0.98	0.01 (-0.04, 0.04)	0.78
Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score (healthfulness units)	0.48 (0.01, 0.96)	0.05	0.36 (-0.15, 0.87)	0.16

\*Models adjusted for age, gender, ethnicity, and household SES.

238

239 ***Aim 2: To assess whether SES moderates the relationship between food purchasing***  
240 ***behaviours and diet quality***

241 Adding the interaction term to the regression models showed that the association  
242 between Weekly Purchasing Healthfulness Score and diet quality was stronger among  
243 participants with low household SES compared to those with high household SES ( $p$  for  
244 interaction=0.01) (Fig 3). Adjusted stratified analyses showed a positive relationship  
245 between the healthfulness of weekly purchases and diet quality for adolescents from  
246 households of lower SES ( $\beta$  1.04 SDs/healthfulness unit, (95%CI 0.26, 1.81)  $p=0.01$ ).  
247 Among adolescents with higher household SES, no clear association was observed ( $\beta$  0.27  
248 SDs/healthfulness unit, (95%CI -0.25, 0.81)  $p=0.31$ ).

249 **Fig 3. Diet quality scores by weekly purchasing healthfulness score according to**  
250 **household SES**

## 251 **Discussion**

### 252 **Summary of key findings**

253 This study provides novel insight into the independent food purchasing behaviours of  
254 adolescents and their relationship with overall dietary quality. The majority of food  
255 purchases made by adolescents participating in this study, when they were away from  
256 home and school, were not aligned with national healthy eating guidelines and had the  
257 potential to negatively impact their health. Adolescents in this study reported that 39% of  
258 their food and drink purchases were snacks rather than a main meal and these snack  
259 purchases were less healthful products according to the UK Eatwell Guide. Adolescents  
260 who made more healthful purchases over the study week tended to have better quality  
261 diets and this was particularly true for adolescents experiencing socio-economic  
262 disadvantage.

### 263 **Interpretation and comparison with previous research**

264 Previous research has shown that adolescents source the majority of their food from  
265 home and school (6, 7). This study demonstrates, however, the important role of  
266 independent food purchases from food outlets, outside of home and school  
267 environments, on adolescents' overall dietary quality. This study also provides insights  
268 into the types of foods adolescents purchase for themselves. These purchasing data offer  
269 a more nuanced understanding than previous studies which have reported adolescent  
270 purchasing of only specific food items (e.g. sugar-sweetened beverages) or unspecific  
271 categories such as junk food or snack food (27, 28). While the majority (62%) of the  
272 purchases made by participants in this study were categorised as 'not adhering' to the UK

273 Eatwell Guide, adolescents do purchase, albeit in smaller quantities, food and drink items  
274 which are aligned with healthy eating guidelines. Further research is needed to  
275 understand the factors that encourage adolescents to purchase these more healthful  
276 items, over less healthy alternatives, and if these factors vary by SES.

277 A disparity in dietary behaviours between higher and lower socioeconomic groups has  
278 been well documented in the literature. Adolescents from disadvantaged backgrounds  
279 are more likely to have poorer quality diets consisting of higher intakes of energy dense,  
280 nutrient poor foods and lower intakes of fruits and vegetables (29-31). Additionally,  
281 previous research illustrates that food purchases made by adults experiencing socio-  
282 economic disadvantage are less healthy than more affluent adults (32, 33). The findings  
283 from this study differ from those of previous studies because they show no variation in  
284 the total number or the healthfulness of purchases made by adolescents from high and  
285 low SES households. Adolescents who purchased more healthful products, however,  
286 were more likely to have better quality diets. There was no clear relationship between  
287 the number of purchases made by adolescents and their diet quality. Together these  
288 findings suggest that it is not how often adolescents purchase food for themselves that is  
289 an important contributor to their diet quality but the healthfulness of the purchases that  
290 they make regardless of how often they shop.

291 For adolescents experiencing disadvantage based on household SES, the food purchases  
292 they made for themselves played a stronger role in their overall diet quality compared to  
293 adolescents from more affluent families. One potential explanation for this finding is that  
294 independent food purchases make up a larger proportion of the overall diets of

295 adolescents from more deprived backgrounds. Since these purchases tend not to  
296 conform to healthy eating guidelines, they are likely to reduce the overall quality of these  
297 young people's diets. Another driver of this difference may be that adolescents from less  
298 affluent backgrounds are not exposed to the same health-promoting foods at home as  
299 those living in more affluent households. Previous research conducted among Scottish  
300 families with teenagers found that even though health is valued when making food  
301 choices, families from lower SES were driven to make choices that ensured all family  
302 members were fed in a quick and acceptable way (34). Backett-Milburn et al (2006)  
303 described how competing priorities within families with lower-incomes means nutrition  
304 and health fall below other factors such as affording everyday essentials, safety and  
305 worries about children engaging in other risky behaviours such as drugs, alcohol and  
306 smoking (35). Additionally, a report published in 2023 further highlighted how the cost-  
307 of-living crisis has made healthy eating seem more unattainable for many low income  
308 household due to rising food and energy costs (36). This research has also illustrated that  
309 families experiencing low-income are driven to select less healthful foods because of  
310 poor housing and food preparation facilities, having less autonomy over their working  
311 practices and to fulfil a range of social, emotional and cultural needs; financial constraints  
312 mean they are less able to fulfil these needs in other ways (36, 37). In contrast, results  
313 from a qualitative study have shown families experiencing higher SES have greater  
314 opportunity to offer experiences incorporating healthy foods and were more likely to  
315 discuss the nutritional significance of food choices in the home (34). These families  
316 described limiting their intake of sugary and fatty foods while simultaneously  
317 encouraging younger family members to try a variety of different 'spicy' or 'exotic' foods

318 to widen their taste preferences when they became adults (34). Taken together, this body  
319 of evidence suggests that adolescents from lower SES do not have the same  
320 opportunities to consume a healthy or varied diet in the home as those from higher SES.  
321 Therefore, the purchases adolescents experiencing low SES make for themselves, when  
322 out of the home, may be particularly important targets for improving their quality of their  
323 diets.

#### 324 **Research and policy implications**

325 This study suggests that finding ways to promote and encourage more healthful  
326 independent food choices among adolescents, particularly those from disadvantaged  
327 backgrounds, is likely to be an important strategy in improving their overall dietary  
328 quality and, in turn, reducing dietary inequalities. Given the challenges faced by those  
329 from low-income households in relation to affording and acquiring healthy foods, the  
330 responsibility to support adolescents to eat more healthfully should not fall solely on  
331 parents but should be the responsibility of wider society. Future public health strategies  
332 and food policies will be most effective if they aim to support adolescents to acquire  
333 healthy food from multiple different sources, including neighbourhood and school  
334 environments.

335 To enhance the accessibility of healthy foods for adolescents experiencing low SES,  
336 zoning restrictions of fast-food outlets and takeaways in disadvantaged areas may be  
337 particularly important. Previous research has shown that the most deprived areas in the  
338 UK are those that have the greatest access to unhealthy food outlets (38, 39), zoning  
339 restrictions are likely to particularly benefit those living and spending time in more

340 deprived communities. Further to this, changes to the environments inside the food  
341 outlets adolescents use most often could also help support more healthful purchases.  
342 The UK government have introduced restrictions on placing foods high in fat, sugar and  
343 salt in prominent areas of food stores. In addition, restrictions on the promotion of these  
344 items have been proposed (40). Such food policies offer the opportunity to support more  
345 healthful purchases among all young people as long as they are implemented effectively  
346 across all types of retail outlets, neighbourhoods and regions (41).

347 Snack purchases made up the largest proportion of purchases by adolescents in the  
348 current study and tended to be less healthful. This finding is consistent with research  
349 from the Netherlands which showed adolescents mainly purchased snack food items  
350 from supermarkets close to school and spent, on average €2.30 (~USD 2.45) (42).

351 Qualitative research shows that adolescents favour quick, single-serve, low-cost snack  
352 options (43). Future research and food policy development would benefit from targeting  
353 the availability of healthier snack options that are affordable and appealing to  
354 adolescents. These healthier snack options should be available in the food outlets  
355 adolescents regularly visit and offer a possibility for new product development.

356 While not specifically measured in the current study, improving the accessibility and  
357 desirability of healthy free school meals is recognised as an important strategy to support  
358 young people to source and eat more healthful foods. Currently, in England, eligibility for  
359 free school meals is means-tested but the low-income threshold means that many young  
360 people who are from working families but still living in poverty are not eligible for the  
361 scheme. Widening the eligibility criteria as well as ensuring free school meals meet the



362 school food standards could help reduce dietary inequalities, particularly if implemented  
363 concurrently to improvements to neighbourhood food environments (44). By  
364 encouraging better food consumption within schools, through enhanced provision of free  
365 school meals, the purchases of unhealthy snacks or meals after school may also reduce.

### 366 **Strengths and limitations**

367 This study is novel in its assessment of adolescents' independent food purchasing  
368 behaviours in the community setting. The EMA techniques used to collect purchasing  
369 data are a strength of the study because they allowed participants to record data as close  
370 as possible to the behaviour of interest, helping to reduce the risk of recall bias. It was  
371 not possible in this study to determine the completeness of the purchasing data because  
372 of the uncertainty regarding those who made no recordings. It was not possible to  
373 determine whether they were not using the app or did not make any purchases. While  
374 the purchasing data provided a more detailed description of purchases made by  
375 adolescents than many published studies, data about food brands, portion sizes and  
376 nutritional information were not collected. It is therefore possible that purchases could  
377 have been miscategorised in terms of healthfulness.

378 The study's small sample size reduces statistical power and the use of a convenience  
379 sample limits generalisability of the findings. The direction of the study findings, however,  
380 show promise and justify replication in a larger and more diverse population.

### 381 **Conclusion**

382 This study demonstrated that adolescents predominately purchase food and drink items  
383 that are not aligned with healthy eating guidelines. Such purchasing decisions are more

384 important for overall dietary quality among adolescents experiencing disadvantage.  
385 Findings from this study suggest that introducing food policies that support adolescents  
386 to make healthy food purchases from multiple different food environments (namely  
387 community and school) could act to reduce inequalities and improve health and well-  
388 being among the next generation of adults. Such policies may include zoning policies to  
389 limit the number of unhealthy food outlets in deprived areas, addressing placement  
390 within shops of unhealthy food promotions, widening access to free school meals and  
391 developing healthy, affordable and socially desirable snack options.

392

### 393 ***Acknowledgements***

394 The authors would like to thank the teachers and youth leader who helped with the  
395 recruitment process for this study as well as all the young people who participated. The  
396 authors would also like to thank Patsy Coakley for her assistance in preparing the data for  
397 this study.

398

### 399 **References**

- 400 1. Forouzanfar MH, Afshin A, Alexander LT, Anderson HR, Bhutta ZA, Biryukov S, et al.  
401 Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and  
402 occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks, 1990&#x2013;2015: a systematic analysis  
403 for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The Lancet*. 2016;388(10053):1659-724.
- 404 2. Bates B, Collins D, Jones K, Page P, Roberts C, Steer T, Swan G. National Diet and Nutrition  
405 Survey Rolling programme Years 9 to 11 (2016/2017 to 2018/2019). London: PHE; 2020.
- 406 3. Roberts C, Steer T, Maplethorp N, Cox C, Meadows S, Nicholson S, et al. National Diet and  
407 Nutrition Survey Results from Years 7 and 8 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2014/2015 to  
408 2015/2016). London: PHE; 2018. Contract No.: 20/07/2018.
- 409 4. Craigie AM, Lake AA, Kelly SA, Adamson AJ, Mathers JC. Tracking of obesity-related  
410 behaviours from childhood to adulthood: A systematic review. *Maturitas*. 2011;70(3):266-84.
- 411 5. Patton G, Sawyer S, Santelli J, Ross D, Afifi R, Allen N, et al. Our future: a Lancet  
412 commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *The Lancet*,. 2016;387(10036):2423-78.
- 413 6. Toumpakari Z, Haase AM, Johnson L. Adolescents' non-core food intake: a description of  
414 what, where and with whom adolescents consume non-core foods. *Public Health Nutrition*,.  
415 2016;19(9):1645-53.

- 416 7. Tyrrell RL, Greenhalgh F, Hodgson S, Wills WJ, Mathers JC, Adamson AJ, Lake AA. Food  
417 environments of young people: linking individual behaviour to environmental context. *Journal of*  
418 *Public Health*. 2017;39(1):95-104.
- 419 8. Tripicchio GL, Croce CM, Coffman DL, Pettinato C, Fisher JO. Age-related differences in  
420 eating location, food source location, and timing of snack intake among U.S. children 1–19 years.  
421 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2023;20(1):90.
- 422 9. Wills W, Kapetanaki A, Rennie K, Danesi G, Martin A, Hamilton L, Bygrave A. The influence  
423 of Deprivation and the Food Environment on Food and Drink Purchased by Secondary School  
424 Pupils Beyond the School Gate. Scotland: Food Standards Scotland; 2015.
- 425 10. Gustafson A, Jilcott Pitts S, McDonald J, Ford H, Connelly P, Gillespie R, et al. Direct Effects  
426 of the Home, School, and Consumer Food Environments on the Association between Food  
427 Purchasing Patterns and Dietary Intake among Rural Adolescents in Kentucky and North Carolina,  
428 2017. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* [Internet]. 2017; 14(10).
- 429 11. Shaw S, Crozier S, Strömmer S, Inskip H, Barker M, Vogel C, the E-BST. Development of a  
430 short food frequency questionnaire to assess diet quality in UK adolescents using the National  
431 Diet and Nutrition Survey. *Nutrition Journal*. 2021;20(1):5.
- 432 12. The Food Foundation. Dietary health disparities across socio-economic groups: a data  
433 story. London; 2022.
- 434 13. Vogel C, Shaw S, Strömmer S, Crozier S, Jenner S, Cooper C, et al. Inequalities in energy  
435 drink consumption among UK adolescents: a mixed-methods study. *Public Health Nutr*. 2022:1-  
436 28.
- 437 14. Locatienet. 2023 [cited 2023. Available from: <https://www.locatienet.com>.
- 438 15. Tripzoom. 2023 [cited 2023. Available from: <https://en.tripzoom.nl/>.
- 439 16. Shiffman S, Stone AA, Hufford MR. Ecological momentary assessment. *Annu Rev Clin*  
440 *Psychol*. 2008;4:1-32.
- 441 17. Bruening M, van Woerden I, Todd M, Brennhofers S, Laska MN, Dunton G. A Mobile  
442 Ecological Momentary Assessment Tool (devilSPARC) for Nutrition and Physical Activity Behaviors  
443 in College Students: A Validation Study. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2016;18(7):e209.
- 444 18. Grenard JL, Stacy AW, Shiffman S, Baraldi AN, MacKinnon DP, Lockhart G, et al.  
445 Sweetened drink and snacking cues in adolescents: A study using ecological momentary  
446 assessment. *Appetite*. 2013;67:61-73.
- 447 19. Rofey DL, Hull EE, Phillips J, Vogt K, Silk JS, Dahl RE. Utilizing Ecological Momentary  
448 Assessment in pediatric obesity to quantify behavior, emotion, and sleep. *Obesity*.  
449 2010;18(6):1270-2.
- 450 20. Schüz B, Bower J, Ferguson SG. Stimulus control and affect in dietary behaviours. An  
451 intensive longitudinal study. *Appetite*. 2015;87:310-7.
- 452 21. Inchley, Currie D, Cosma A, Samdal O, editors. Health Behaviour in School-aged Children  
453 (HBSC) Study Protocol: Background, Methodology and Mandatory items for the 2017/18 Survey. .  
454 St Andrews: CAHRU.; 2018.
- 455 22. Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government. English indices of deprivation  
456 2019 2019 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019)  
457 [deprivation-2019](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019)].
- 458 23. Public Health England. From Plate to Guide: What, why and how for the eatwell model.  
459 London; 2016.
- 460 24. Kelly B, Halford JCG, Boyland EJ, Chapman K, Bautista-Castaño I, Berg C, et al. Television  
461 food advertising to children: a global perspective. *American journal of public health*.  
462 2010;100(9):1730-6.

- 463 25. Winpenny EM, Greenslade S, Corder K, van Sluijs EMF. Diet Quality through Adolescence  
464 and Early Adulthood: Cross-Sectional Associations of the Dietary Approaches to Stop  
465 Hypertension Diet Index and Component Food Groups with Age. *Nutrients*. 2018;10(11):1585.
- 466 26. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.;  
467 2019.
- 468 27. Sadler RC, Clark AF, Wilk P, O'Connor C, Gilliland JA. Using GPS and activity tracking to  
469 reveal the influence of adolescents' food environment exposure on junk food purchasing. *Can J*  
470 *Public Health*. 2016;107(1):eS14-eS20.
- 471 28. Virtanen M, Kivimaki H, Ervasti J, Oksanen T, Pentti J, Kouvonen A, et al. Fast-food outlets  
472 and grocery stores near school and adolescents' eating habits and overweight in Finland.  
473 *European journal of public health*. 2015;25(4):650-5.
- 474 29. Drewnowski A. Obesity, diets, and social inequalities. *Nutr Rev*. 2009;67(suppl\_1):S36-S9.
- 475 30. WHO Regional Office for Europe. Obesity and inequities. Guidance for addressing  
476 inequities in overweight and obesity. Copenhagen; 2014.
- 477 31. Giskes K, Avendaño M, Brug J, Kunst AE. A systematic review of studies on socioeconomic  
478 inequalities in dietary intakes associated with weight gain and overweight/obesity conducted  
479 among European adults. *Obesity Reviews*. 2010;11(6):413-29.
- 480 32. French SA, Tangney CC, Crane MM, Wang Y, Appelhans BM. Nutrition quality of food  
481 purchases varies by household income: the SHoPPER study. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):231.
- 482 33. Turrell G, Hewitt B, Patterson C, Oldenburg B, Gould T. Socioeconomic differences in food  
483 purchasing behaviour and suggested implications for diet-related health promotion. *Journal of*  
484 *Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2002;15(5):355-64.
- 485 34. Wills W, Backett-Milburn K, Roberts M-L, Lawton J. The Framing of Social Class  
486 Distinctions through Family Food and Eating Practices. *The Sociological Review*. 2011;59(4):725-  
487 40.
- 488 35. Backett-Milburn KC, Wills WJ, Gregory S, Lawton J. Making sense of eating, weight and  
489 risk in the early teenage years: Views and concerns of parents in poorer socio-economic  
490 circumstances. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2006;63(3):624-35.
- 491 36. The Food Foundation. From purse to plate: implications of the cost of living crisis on  
492 health. London; 2023.
- 493 37. Isaacs A, Halligan J, Neve K, Hawkes C. From healthy food environments to healthy  
494 wellbeing environments: Policy insights from a focused ethnography with low-income parents' in  
495 England. *Health & place*. 2022;77:102862.
- 496 38. Black C, Ntani G, Inskip H, Cooper C, Cummins S, Moon G, Baird J. Measuring the  
497 healthfulness of food retail stores: variations by store type and neighbourhood deprivation.  
498 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2014;11(1):69.
- 499 39. Maguire ER, Burgoine T, Monsivais P. Area deprivation and the food environment over  
500 time: A repeated cross-sectional study on takeaway outlet density and supermarket presence in  
501 Norfolk, UK, 1990–2008. *Health & place*. 2015;33:142-7.
- 502 40. Department of Health and Social Care. Restricting promotions of products high in fat,  
503 sugar and salt by location and by price: government response to public consultation 2021  
504 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/restricting-promotions-of-food-  
505 and-drink-that-is-high-in-fat-sugar-and-salt/outcome/restricting-promotions-of-products-high-in-  
506 fat-sugar-and-salt-by-location-and-by-price-government-response-to-public-  
507 consultation#executive-summary](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/restricting-promotions-of-food-and-drink-that-is-high-in-fat-sugar-and-salt/outcome/restricting-promotions-of-products-high-in-fat-sugar-and-salt-by-location-and-by-price-government-response-to-public-consultation#executive-summary).
- 508 41. Muir S, Dhuria P, Roe E, Lawrence W, Baird J, Vogel C. UK government's new placement  
509 legislation is a 'good first step': a rapid qualitative analysis of consumer, business, enforcement  
510 and health stakeholder perspectives. *BMC Medicine*. 2023;21(1):33.

- 511 42. Huitink M, Poelman MP, Seidell JC, Dijkstra SC. The Healthy Supermarket Coach: Effects of  
512 a Nutrition Peer-Education Intervention in Dutch Supermarkets Involving Adolescents With a  
513 Lower Education Level. *Health Education & Behavior*. 2021;48(2):150-9.
- 514 43. Shaw S, Muir S, Strömmer S, Crozier S, Cooper C, Smith D, et al. The interplay between  
515 social and food environments on UK adolescents' food choices: implications for policy. *Health  
516 Promotion International*. 2023;38(4):daad097.
- 517 44. McIntyre RL, Adamson AJ, Nelson M, Woodside J, Beattie S, Spence S. Changes and  
518 differences in school food standards (2010–2021) and free school meal provision during COVID-19  
519 across the UK: Potential implications for children's diets. *Nutrition Bulletin*. 2022;47(2):230-45.






Figure 1




Figure 2






Figure 3