

1 Home food procurement associated with improved food security during the COVID-19 2 pandemic

3

4 Meredith T. Niles^{1,2*}, Ashley C. McCarthy¹, Jonathan Malacarne³, Sam Bliss^{2,4}, Emily H. Belarmino^{1,2},
5 Jennifer Laurent⁵, Scott C. Merrill^{2,6}, Sarah A. Nowak⁷, Rachel E. Schattman⁸

6

7 1 Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

8 2 Gund Institute for Environment, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

9 3 School of Economics, University of Maine, Orono, ME, USA

10 4 Rubenstein School of Natural Resources, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

11 5 Department of Nursing, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

12 6 Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

13 7 Department of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

14 8 School of Food and Agriculture, University of Maine, Orono, ME, USA

15

16 *Corresponding Author

17 355 Carrigan Wing

18 109 Carrigan Drive

19 Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences

20 University of Vermont

21 Burlington VT 05405

22

23 Sources of Support:

24 Funding for this study was provided by the Joint Catalyst Award from the Gund Institute for

25 Environment at the University of Vermont and the Northern New England Clinical and

26 Translational Research Network. Additional funding was made possible from the USDA National

27 Institute of Food and Agriculture under award proposal 2022-67023-36452 and through Hatch

28 project numbers ME022103 and ME022122 through the Maine Agricultural & Forest

29 Experiment Station, and from the UVM ARS Food Systems Research Center.

30

31 Conflicts of Interest:

32 Meredith T. Niles- no conflicts of interest

33 Ashley C. McCarthy- no conflicts of interest

34 Jonathan Malacarne- no conflicts of interest

35 Sam Bliss- no conflicts of interest

36 Emily H. Belarmino- no conflicts of interest

37 Jennifer Laurent- no conflicts of interest
38 Scott C. Merrill- no conflicts of interest
39 Sarah A. Nowak- no conflicts of interest
40 Rachel E. Schattman- no conflicts of interest

41

42 **Abstract**

43 Home food procurement (HFP), including gardening, is associated with food security and
44 improved health behaviors and outcomes. In the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, HFP
45 increased in many high-income countries; yet little evidence has demonstrated what impact
46 HFP had on food security. Furthermore, existing HFP studies are largely qualitative from
47 unrepresentative samples, limiting population-level understanding of HFP engagement and
48 impact. Using data from a representative sample of residents (n=988) in northern New England
49 in the United States conducted in Spring/Summer 2021, we explore the relationship between
50 HFP engagement in the first year of the pandemic and changes in food security status. We
51 employ matching techniques to compare food security outcomes in households with
52 observably similar demographic and social characteristics, and examine food security outcomes
53 in three periods among households who do and do not participate in HFP. Our results show that
54 nearly 60% of respondents engaged in at least one kind of HFP in the first year of the COVID-19
55 pandemic, with food insecure households being more likely to do HFP. Food insecure
56 households (both newly and chronically food insecure) were also more likely to do HFP
57 activities for the first time or more intensely than they had previously. Newly food insecure
58 households were the most likely to engage in HFP overall, especially gardening. Furthermore,
59 HFP engagement early in the COVID-19 pandemic is associated with improved food security for
60 food insecure households in the 9-12 months after the start of the pandemic, though these
61 improvements were primarily associated with newly, not chronically, food insecure households.
62 Future research about HFP should continue to explore multiple HFP strategies and their
63 potentially myriad relationships to food security, diet, and health outcomes.

64

65 **Introduction**

66 Producing or obtaining one’s own food via gardening, fishing, foraging, hunting, raising animals,
67 and/or preserving food (hereafter called home food procurement (HFP) may have important
68 effects on food security and dietary intake. Most prior research has focused on gardening (both
69 home and community), which has been shown to increase food security (1–3), increase fruit
70 and vegetable consumption (1,4), reduce food costs (5), and provide additional income-
71 generating opportunities (3). However, the prevalence of other HFP activities (e.g. fishing,
72 hunting, foraging) and their impact on food security is less understood, especially outside of
73 indigenous communities (6). Furthermore, much of the existing evidence consists of small-scale
74 studies (e.g., (7–9)) and qualitative case studies (10), with calls for more quantitative
75 population-level studies (11). As a result, population-level conclusions about the prevalence of
76 HFP and its implications for food security remain limited.

77
78 The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic brought with it a documented increase in HFP and a new
79 opportunity to explore its impact at scale. Several COVID-19-era studies have examined
80 individuals’ increased interest in HFP across diverse socioeconomic and political regions,
81 including Canada (12,13), Palestine (14), Sri Lanka (15) and Chile (16). In the context of
82 population-level disruptions to work, personal, and social lives, this literature finds various
83 motivations for the growth in HFP during the pandemic, including food security and supply
84 chain concerns (17–19), a desire to spend time in nature (13,14,20), more free time (13),
85 seeking spaces of refuge and community (in community gardens) (20,21), stress reduction or
86 mental wellbeing (16,20), and a perception that HFP activities done in the outdoors were safe
87 (22). While most pandemic-related HFP studies have focused on gardening, Clouse et al. (2022)
88 also documented an increase in urban foraging. Additionally, previous work demonstrated
89 increased participation, both in terms of rates and intensity, in fishing, foraging, hunting, raising
90 backyard animals and canning during the first six months of the pandemic (6).

91
92 While research since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic has shown an increase in HFP across
93 disparate global regions, there remains very little evidence about the effects of this increase in

94 HFP on individuals and communities. The most common documented impacts of HFP
95 engagement include benefits to mental health (16,23) and higher fruit and vegetable intake
96 among those engaging in HFP as compared to those who do not engage in HFP (6,15), though
97 these associations have been measured at only single time points. Similarly, little is known
98 about the extent to which HFP activities have continued beyond the early days of the
99 pandemic, when stay at home orders and quarantine were the norm, and people may have had
100 additional free time (13).

101
102 Barriers to undertaking and sustaining HFP are well documented, both before and during the
103 pandemic. Previously studied barriers include inadequate land access (7,16), limited knowledge
104 of how to engage in HFP practices (7,16,24), shortages of supplies such as seeds (20), and high
105 levels of pests in gardening (8). Such barriers are often enough to reduce or stop HFP
106 altogether. For example, Chenarides et al. (2021) identified a reduction in HFP between 2017
107 and at the beginning of the pandemic in 2020 in two urban gardens in Phoenix and Detroit US,
108 suggesting the fragility of participation in such activities (25).

109
110 At the outset of the pandemic, our research group deployed multiple rounds of surveys in two
111 rural US states (Vermont and Maine) to assess how COVID-19 affected food security status,
112 mental health, dietary intake, and other measures of wellbeing. Here, we build upon our
113 previous work (i.e., (6,23) and expand our analysis to include data from across the first year of
114 the pandemic related to HFP engagement before and since the COVID-19 pandemic as well as
115 food security. Quantitative survey data collected from a representative population-level survey
116 of nearly 1,000 respondents in Vermont and Maine was used to conduct our analysis using a
117 series of statistical tests and matching techniques. In particular, we assessed the following
118 research questions:

119
120 1. How did food security and HFP prevalence change during the first year of the pandemic as
121 compared to before the pandemic?

122 2. Did HFP engagement during the first year of the pandemic correlate with improved food
123 security outcomes, especially for households that were food insecure during the early part of
124 the COVID-19 pandemic?

125 3. How likely are respondents to continue HFP in the future? Who is most likely to intend to
126 continue?

127

128

129 **Methods**

130 *Data Collection*

131 Data collection was conducted in Spring/Summer 2021 in Vermont and Maine, USA. The survey
132 builds on work by the National Food Access and COVID research Team (NFACT) (26) and
133 expands the set of questions related to HFP participation and its barriers. The original NFACT
134 survey underwent validation in Vermont with 25 respondents aged 18 and over (27).

135 Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from the University of Vermont (IRB protocol
136 000000873) before beginning data collection. Data was collected via Qualtrics (Provo, UT)
137 research panels. We used recruitment quotas for our general population sample to ensure that
138 the sample was representative of the populations of Vermont and Maine with respect to race
139 and ethnicity, based on the most recent population profiles from the American Community
140 survey (28).

141


142 *Variables of Analysis*

143 We used four categories of variables in our analysis (Supplementary Table 1). These were: food
144 security, home food production since the COVID-19 pandemic (HFP COVID), increased HFP since
145 the COVID-19 pandemic (HFP More), and demographic characteristics.

146

147 Food security status was measured using the six item short-form USDA food security module
148 (29). Following the standard protocol for calculating food insecurity, respondents who
149 responded affirmatively to two or more questions out of six were classified as food insecure.
150 This binary food security measure was calculated during each of three time periods: 1) pre-

151 COVID-19 pandemic (“Pre-COVID”- i.e., in the year before the COVID-19 pandemic); 2) Early
152 COVID-19 pandemic (“Early COVID”- i.e., in the first year of the pandemic); and 3) Later COVID-
153 19 pandemic (“Later COVID”- i.e., in the last four months before the survey, corresponding to
154 Winter/Spring 2021) (Figure 1). In addition, we generated a categorical variable with three
155 categories of food insecurity: 1) never food insecure (before or during the COVID-19 pandemic),
156 2) newly food insecure (food secure before the pandemic, but food insecure in early COVID),
157 and 3) chronically food insecure (food insecure both before and in early COVID).
158



159
160 Figure 1. Time periods referenced for food insecurity in this article.

161
162 In addition to these key variables, we utilized several variables related to HFP, including “any
163 HFP since March 2020” and “increased HFP since March 2020” (engaging in a HFP activity for
164 the first time or more than before). We also explored engagement in specific HFP activities
165 including gardening, fishing, foraging, hunting, raising livestock for meat or dairy, raising poultry
166 for eggs, and preserving food. We inadvertently left “hunting more” out of our survey;
167 therefore, the analyses where we explored engaging in HFP more (for the first time or more
168 than before) include all activities except hunting.

169
170 We also report demographic characteristics of our respondents, including gender identity, race,
171 ethnicity, income, job loss experienced during the pandemic, education, and rural/urban
172 classification (as assessed using rural-urban commuting area (RUCA) codes) (30,31).

173

174 *Statistical Analysis and Matching Techniques*

175 We employed several different statistical approaches to answer our research questions. Chi-
176 Square tests were used to determine whether food insecure households were more likely to
177 engage in HFP and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to assess whether HFP varied by food security
178 status. We also used Kruskal Wallis tests (one-way ANOVA on ranks) to study future intention
179 to engage in HFP.

180

181 To further explore research questions 1 and 2, we employed a quasi-experimental matching
182 method to assess whether HFP engagement correlates with food security outcomes overall and
183 whether HFP results in improved food security outcomes from one time period to the next.
184 Matching analysis is a statistical approach to conditioning on observables in order to identify
185 the effect of a “treatment” that some individuals have received and others have not (32). In our
186 case, the treatment we are interested in is HFP engagement. We employ matching for two
187 analyses. First, we assess whether HFP engagement correlates with food security during early
188 and later COVID periods. Second, we analyze whether households that engaged in HFP during
189 early COVID had improved food security status in later COVID. Our analysis matches
190 respondents engaging in HFP to observably similar households not engaging in HFP, with an aim
191 of balancing the distribution of both observable and unobservable covariates in each group
192 (32). We match on a set of respondent characteristics including: race/ethnicity (BIPOC/non-
193 Hispanic White), income (households making less than or more than \$50,000 annually), gender
194 identity (male/female¹), job loss during the pandemic, bachelor’s degree, and rural/urban
195 status.

196

197 We use a k - nearest neighbor matching approach, which uses the k most similar non-treated
198 observations to create a comparison value for each treated observation. Previous research has
199 demonstrated that this matching approach works well with eight or fewer covariates (32,33).

¹ Our question related to gender identity included non-binary options; however, only a small sample indicated non-binary gender. Therefore, we utilize male/female gender identities only for our matching analysis.

200 We report the total number of control, treated, and matched individuals in all our models to
201 satisfy the common support condition (34). Our primary results use the Mahalanobis distance
202 between treated and non-treated observations to identify matches and weight comparison
203 values. Given the discrete nature of our matching variables, most of our matches are exact. In
204 order to assess the robustness of our primary results, we repeat our estimation, varying the
205 minimum required matches (from five down to one) and requiring that all matches be exact
206 matches.

207

208 **Results**

209 *Demographic Characteristics*

210 A total of 988 individuals, including 426 in Vermont and 562 in Maine responded to the survey.
211 Survey respondents were representative of the Vermont and Maine populations in their
212 race/ethnicity and education. There were no major differences in outcomes by state, thus,
213 Vermont and Maine respondents were combined for this analysis. Table 1 details the
214 demographic characteristics of the respondents.

215

216 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey respondents and population overall of Maine
217 and Vermont from US Census data.

Demographic Characteristic	Sample (%)	n = 988	U.S. Population (%)
Female	68.3	675	50.9
Male	30.3	299	49.1
Other gender identity/prefer not to respond	1.4	14	--
Non-Hispanic White	91.6	905	93.1
BIPOC	8.4	83	6.9
Income < \$50,000	53.3	527	42.5
Income > \$50,000	46.7	461	57.5

Job loss during pandemic	14.6	144	--
Bachelor's degree or higher	33.9	335	33.8
Rural	55.4	547	53.5
Urban	44.6	441	46.5


218

219 *Food Security Prevalence*

220 According to their retrospective responses to the USDA food security module a year into the
 221 pandemic, 27.2% of the respondents were food insecure pre-COVID-19 (i.e., prior to March
 222 2020), with 35.7% food insecure in early COVID, and 31.4% food insecure in later COVID (Figure
 223 2). Among those with early food insecurity, 24.9% were chronically food insecure (pre- and
 224 early COVID), while 10.7% of respondents were newly food insecure.

225

Food Security Status During Early COVID



Food Insecurity Prevalence



226

227 Figure 2. Percent of respondents classified by food security status during early COVID, and
 228 prevalence of food insecurity over time.


229

230

231 *Home Food Production*

232 Nearly 60% of respondents indicated that they engaged in some type of HFP activity since
 233 March 2020, with 54.1% of those engaging in HFP indicating that they either did so for the first
 234 time or did so more since the start of the pandemic (Figure 3). Gardening was the most
 235 frequently reported HFP (46.8% of respondents), while the least frequently reported was
 236 raising livestock for meat or dairy (9.9%).

237
238 We found statistically significant differences in overall HFP engagement since the onset of the
239 COVID-19 pandemic, as well as in specific types of HFP engagement, across food security status.
240 Overall, food insecure households were significantly more likely to engage in HFP since the
241 beginning of the pandemic as compared with food secure households. Newly food insecure
242 respondents were the most likely (69.1%) to engage in HFP. Newly and chronically food
243 insecure households were also significantly more likely than food secure households to engage
244 in HFP for the first time or more intensely since the pandemic ($p < 0.001$). Among specific
245 activities, food insecure households were significantly more likely than food secure households
246 to engage in all individual HFP activities with the exception of fishing ($p = 0.101$). Newly food
247 insecure households were significantly more likely to garden since the beginning of the
248 pandemic (62.8%) but food secure and chronically food insecure households gardened at nearly
249 the same prevalence (45.1% and 42.9% respectively).
250



252 Figure 3. Home food production during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic and for specific
253 activities based on food security status. *Indicates statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$)
254 across the three types of food security.

255

256

257 *Changes in Food Insecurity Associated with HFP*

258 As expected, based on the distribution of food insecure households engaging in different HFP
259 activities, our first matching analysis (Supplementary Table 2. Robustness checks in
260 Supplementary Table 6) identified positive associations between overall engagement in HFP
261 and food insecurity during the first year of the pandemic. We also find that overall engagement
262 in HFP, as well as specific HFP activities since the COVID-19 pandemic (foraging, hunting,
263 livestock, eggs, and preserving), are positively associated with food insecurity during the first
264 year of the pandemic. Looking at only later COVID food insecurity, any HFP engagement since
265 the COVID-19 pandemic or gardening are not associated with food insecurity, but nearly all
266 other activities, and engaging in them for the first time or more, continue to be positively
267 associated with food insecurity (Supplementary Table 3. Robustness checks in Supplementary
268 Table 7).

269

270 We find more nuanced results exploring these relationships conditional on initial food security
271 status (Supplementary Tables 4 and 5. Robustness checks in Supplementary Tables 8 and 9).

272 Among households that were food secure pre-COVID, those that engaged in HFP during the
273 pandemic were more likely to be food insecure in early COVID compared to those that did not.

274 These results were also consistent for gardening, preserving food, and those engaged in more
275 HFP in each specific activity (Supplementary Table 4).


276

277 Among households that were food insecure pre-COVID, however, those that engaged in HFP
278 during the pandemic were not more likely to be food insecure than those that did not engage in
279 HFP. Taking the analysis one step further, we examined whether early COVID food insecure
280 households who engaged in HFP at that time changed their food security status in later COVID.

281 Among households that experienced food insecurity early in the pandemic, those who engaged
282 in HFP were more likely to be food secure later in the pandemic compared to those who did not
283 engage in HFP (Supplementary Table 5). We found the same result for households that were
284 food insecure in early COVID and gardened or foraged more than before or for the first time:
285 they were more likely to be food secure in later COVID than those who did not. Thus, HFP
286 engagement in early COVID is associated with improved food security outcomes for food
287 insecure households in the 9-12 months after the onset of the pandemic.

288
289 These improvements in food security were primarily associated with newly food insecure
290 households. Among newly food insecure households, 21.5% became food secure in later
291 COVID, while only 9.7% chronically food insecure households became food secure ($p=0.005$).
292 Furthermore, when examining these changes by HFP participation (Figure 4), we find that newly
293 food insecure households that engaged in HFP had the highest conversion to food security in
294 later COVID (25.0%), as compared to chronically food insecure households also engaging in HFP
295 (10.7%), newly food insecure not doing HFP (13.8%) and chronically food insecure not engaging
296 in HFP (8.2%) ($p=0.010$).

297



298
299 Figure 4. Change in food security status (in the four months prior to the survey) among newly
300 and chronically food insecure households engaging or not in HFP. *Indicates statistically
301 significant difference ($p<0.05$) between food security improvement by HFP status.


302
303 *Likelihood to Continue HFP*

304 Finally, we examined the likelihood of respondents to continue HFP in the coming year (2021-
305 2022). Overall, 80.7% of respondents indicated they intended to engage in some type of HFP

306 activity in the coming year, with engagement in gardening being the most likely (70.9%) (Figure
307 5). Just over one-quarter of respondents indicated they would try a new HFP activity in the
308 upcoming year (27.7%) or engage in at least one of their existing HFP activities more than
309 previous (25.5%). Overall, both newly and chronically food insecure households were
310 significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to intend to continue all types of HFP in the coming year and
311 would increase their engagement with HFP activities.

312

313



315 Figure 5. Respondent reports of intent to continue HFP activities and intensity in the 2021-
316 2022 year. *Indicates a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.001$) among outcomes by food
317 security status.

318

319

320 Discussion

321 Despite the growth in research exploring HFP during the COVID-19 pandemic, this work is
322 among the first to directly correlate HFP during the COVID-19 pandemic with improved food
323 security outcomes for food insecure households. Our research also demonstrates that, among
324 this sample of respondents in two rural New England states, most households engage in HFP
325 and engagement in these activities continued to grow during the first year of the pandemic,
326 especially among food insecure households. This is particularly evident in comparison to
327 previous results, which found that 35% of respondents, from a sample in the same region with
328 similar demographic characteristics, engaged in HFP during the first six months of the COVID-19
329 pandemic (6). By comparison, 58% of respondents in this study engaged in some HFP activity
330 within the first year of the pandemic.

331

332 These comparisons also point towards important future research needs related to measuring
333 HFP at multiple time points throughout the year. For example, in the first six months of our
334 previous analysis, only 6.2% of respondents engaged in hunting from March to August 2020 (6);
335 but the current study shows 16.0% of respondents engaged in hunting within the first year of
336 the pandemic. The difference may be attributed to temporal variations in hunting seasons for
337 Vermont and Maine for game that occur in the late fall and early winter, a timepoint which the
338 first iteration of our survey failed to capture. Similar differences are observed for foraging,
339 where only 9.2% of individuals participated in the first six months of the pandemic (6), but
340 16.9% participated within the first year of the pandemic (accounting for fall foraging). Thus, as
341 additional research on HFP continues, especially that which focuses on multiple HFP strategies,
342 it is critical to consider the seasonality of those activities and design data collection that
343 captures these factors.

344
345 These results add nuance to the existing research on HFP and food security by separating out
346 households that have been chronically food insecure from those that were newly food insecure.
347 Evidence from the first year of the pandemic demonstrates that newly versus chronically food
348 insecure households had different demographic and social experiences with food insecurity,
349 which may have influenced their engagement in HFP. A review of food security dynamics in the
350 U.S.A. shows that chronic food insecurity is most likely to be experienced by non-white, less
351 educated individuals in households headed by women (35). It is noted that it is difficult for
352 current measures of food insecurity to fully capture the processes that lead to chronic food
353 insecurity. At the same time, it is important to better understand the dynamic ways in which
354 social and environmental shocks, like those experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic,
355 influence the severity and persistence of food insecurity (36). Likewise, motivation to engage in
356 HFP can vary based on socio-demographic factors, prior experience, available time, and other
357 factors, which not only affect whether an individual engages in HFP, but how they do so. For
358 example, a recent study found that women gardeners were more likely than men to plant a
359 diversity of plant species, and that region of origin influences crop composition choices (37).
360 Whether someone engages in HFP activities, such as hunting and fishing, as supplementary
361 versus subsistence food acquisition behaviors can be influenced by cultural traditions, such as
362 those held by some members of Tribal communities (38). Furthermore, a study of post-
363 communist countries in the European Union explored how HFP varied between being largely
364 recreational to being a coping strategy for food security, with differential impacts on well-being
365 (39).

366
367 Our previous work identified that food insecure households were not more likely to engage in
368 HFP overall, but instead were more likely to be engaging in HFP more or for the first time since
369 the onset of the pandemic (6). However, this analysis finds that the story is more complicated.
370 Newly food insecure households are the most likely to have engaged in HFP. Although, overall,
371 chronically and newly food insecure individuals equally engaged in HFP more or for the first
372 time, they engaged in certain, specific HFP activities at significantly different levels. Newly food

373 insecure individuals were significantly more likely to garden and preserve food for example,
374 while chronically food insecure households were more likely to forage. The relative influence of
375 gardening on improving food security outcomes, especially for the newly food insecure, may be
376 a function of the amount of time, resources, or knowledge dedicated to the activity. Future
377 research in this area should explore the barriers to HFP by food security status, to better
378 understand the ways to support HFP activities by diverse households.

379

380 That newly food insecure households, especially those who gardened, were more likely to
381 transition back to food security in the first year of the pandemic continues to add evidence to
382 the existing body of research demonstrating that gardening correlates with improved food and
383 nutrition security (7,40–42). Our work strengthens these findings, particularly given our large
384 sample size across representative demographics in two states, which builds upon the largely
385 qualitative or non-representative structure of previous studies. Our work also demonstrates
386 that improved food security associated with HFP and gardening occurs within crises, as well as
387 in “normal” times, as evidenced by others already (e.g. (1,3).

388

389 The prevalence of HFP during a crisis period is noteworthy, and important for future research.
390 The global COVID-19 pandemic deeply affected the global economy and food systems (43,44).
391 As the direct financial and public health restrictions and impacts from the pandemic have
392 waned, it remains unclear the extent to which the interest in HFP will continue, especially as
393 individuals resume employment and additional activities. The pandemic provided many people
394 the opportunity to engage in new activities with time commitments that may not be feasible or
395 desirable in non-pandemic crises (13). Indeed, since our measure of food security utilizes a
396 survey instrument that largely captures whether someone has enough money for food, these
397 dynamics and relationships would likely change as “normal” life resumed and people regained
398 assured access to income and groceries. At the same time, there are continued long-term
399 impacts of the pandemic, including elevated levels of anxiety and depression (45,46), which
400 may motivate many people to continue HFP for other mental health and well-being associated
401 reasons (14,16,20).

402
403 Future research may, and should, continue to track HFP engagement as well as its contribution
404 to food and nutrition security in the recovery from the pandemic. At the same time, additional
405 quantitative research could assess how the food outputs from HFP relate to food, dietary
406 intake, and related health outcomes. Most existing studies in the Global North have not
407 examined how the percent of food obtained from HFP influences food and diet outcomes.
408 Additional research in this vein could also more completely assess the varying potential impacts
409 of HFP engagement beyond food security. Indeed, other studies have demonstrated that HFP is
410 associated with improved mental health (23), physical activity (47,48), and social
411 connectedness (49,50); but rarely are the suite of these potential impacts explored together.
412 Ultimately, our work is limited in its ability to demonstrate causality because it is cross-
413 sectional; future studies using cohort models could understand how people engage in HFP and
414 its link to food security and other health and diet outcomes more concretely by tracking the
415 same people and households over time.

416 417 **Conclusion**

418 Here we show how HFP was used in different ways and intensities before and during the
419 COVID-19 pandemic across two predominantly rural U.S. states. Our results reveal notable
420 differences between segments that became food insecure during this period of upheaval and
421 those that are chronically food insecure. It is important to note that this environment in general
422 and the use of HFP is dynamic, and changes that occurred during the pandemic may reverse
423 towards a previous “normal”, solidify as a new stable state, or become exacerbated by
424 continued political, socio-ecological or economic issues such as inflation, recession, or a
425 resurgence of disease. Given the emerging evidence that HFP can contribute to positive health
426 behaviors and outcomes, our findings, and future research have public health importance, with
427 relevance to audiences interested in human health and wellbeing, as well as the social and
428 environmental consequences of mainstream food systems.

429 430 **Declarations**

431 Acknowledgements

432 We'd like to thank additional members of our teams in Vermont and Maine including Farryl
433 Bertmann and Kate Yerxa, and thank Maddie Alpaugh for her assistance with data collection.

434

435 Authors' contributions

436 MTN contributed to study design, data collection, analysis, writing, revisions, and project
437 management. ACM contributed to study design, data collection, data cleaning and revisions.
438 JM contributed to study design, data collection, data analysis and revisions. SB, EHB, JL, SCM,
439 SAN, RES contributed to study design, data collection, and revisions.

440

441 Ethics approval and consent to participate

442 Ethical approval was obtained through the Institutional Review Board at the Universities of
443 Maine and Vermont, and written consent was obtained from all participants.

444

445 Consent for publication

446 All authors consent and have approved this manuscript for publication

447

448 Availability of data and material

449 The survey instruments for this work are publicly available at Harvard Dataverse, and the
450 underlying data will be made publicly available upon acceptance.

451

452 Competing interests

453 The authors declare no competing interests

454

455 Funding

456 Funding for this study was provided by the Joint Catalyst Award from the Gund Institute for
457 Environment at the University of Vermont and the Northern New England Clinical and
458 Translational Research Network. Additional funding was made possible from the USDA National
459 Institute of Food and Agriculture under award proposal 2022-67023-36452 and through Hatch
460 project numbers ME022103 and ME022122 through the Maine Agricultural & Forest
461 Experiment Station, and from the UVM ARS Food Systems Research Center.

462

463

464

465

466 References

- 467 1. Alkert S, Diekmann L, Renvall M, Gray L. Community and home gardens increase
468 vegetable intake and food security of residents in San Jose, California. *Calif Agric*
469 2016;70:77–82.
- 470 2. Taylor JR, Lovell ST. Urban home gardens in the Global North: A mixed methods study of
471 ethnic and migrant home gardens in Chicago, IL. *Renew Agric Food Syst* [Internet]
472 2014/05/16. Cambridge University Press; 2015;30:22–32. Available from:
473 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/urban-home-gardens-in-the-global-north-a-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/urban-home-gardens-in-the-global-north-a-mixed-methods-study-of-ethnic-and-migrant-home-gardens-in-chicago-il/6092ACCA9354BA31AE13964439B31975)
474 [mixed-methods-study-of-ethnic-and-migrant-home-gardens-in-chicago-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/urban-home-gardens-in-the-global-north-a-mixed-methods-study-of-ethnic-and-migrant-home-gardens-in-chicago-il/6092ACCA9354BA31AE13964439B31975)
475 [il/6092ACCA9354BA31AE13964439B31975](https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/urban-home-gardens-in-the-global-north-a-mixed-methods-study-of-ethnic-and-migrant-home-gardens-in-chicago-il/6092ACCA9354BA31AE13964439B31975)
- 476 3. Galhena DH, Freed R, Maredia KM. Home gardens: a promising approach to enhance
477 household food security and wellbeing. *Agric Food Secur* [Internet] 2013;2:8. Available
478 from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/2048-7010-2-8>

- 479 4. Robinson-Oghogho JN, Thorpe RJ. Garden Access, Race and Vegetable Acquisition among
480 U.S. Adults: Findings from a National Survey. *International Journal of Environmental*
481 *Research and Public Health*. 2021.
- 482 5. Algert SJ, Baameur A, Renvall MJ. Vegetable Output and Cost Savings of Community
483 Gardens in San Jose, California. *J Acad Nutr Diet* [Internet] Elsevier; 2014;114:1072–6.
484 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2014.02.030>
- 485 6. Niles MT, Wirkkala KB, Belarmino EH, Bertmann F. Home food procurement impacts food
486 security and diet quality during COVID-19. *BMC Public Health* [Internet] 2021;21:945.
487 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10960-0>
- 488 7. Kortright R, Wakefield S. Edible backyards: a qualitative study of household food growing
489 and its contributions to food security. *Agric Human Values* [Internet] 2011;28:39–53.
490 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-009-9254-1>
- 491 8. Gregory MM, Leslie TW, Drinkwater LE. Agroecological and social characteristics of New
492 York city community gardens: contributions to urban food security, ecosystem services,
493 and environmental education. *Urban Ecosyst* [Internet] 2016;19:763–94. Available from:
494 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-015-0505-1>
- 495 9. Barr ML, Martin C, Luecking C, Cardarelli K. Losses, Gains, and Changes to the Food
496 Environment in a Rural Kentucky County during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Nutrients*. 2021.
- 497 10. Music J, Large C, Charlebois S, Mayhew K. Gardening from the ground up: a review of
498 grassroots governance and management of domestic gardening in Canada. *Local Environ*
499 [Internet] Routledge; 2022;27:1046–58. Available from:
500 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2022.2100880>
- 501 11. Al-Delaimy WK, Webb M. Community Gardens as Environmental Health Interventions:
502 Benefits Versus Potential Risks. *Curr Environ Heal Reports* [Internet] 2017;4:252–65.
503 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-017-0133-4>
- 504 12. Mullins L, Charlebois S, Finch E, Music J. Home Food Gardening in Canada in Response to

- 505 the COVID-19 Pandemic. Sustainability. 2021.
- 506 13. Howarth A, Jeanson AL, Abrams AEI, Beaudoin C, Mistry I, Berberi A, Young N, Nguyen
507 VM, Landsman SJ, Kadykalo AN, et al. COVID-19 restrictions and recreational fisheries in
508 Ontario, Canada: Preliminary insights from an online angler survey. Fish Res [Internet]
509 2021;240:105961. Available from:
510 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165783621000898>
- 511 14. Dawwas EB, Dyson K. COVID-19 Changed Human-Nature Interactions across Green Space
512 Types: Evidence of Change in Multiple Types of Activities from the West Bank, Palestine.
513 Sustainability. 2021.
- 514 15. Sooriyaarachchi P, Francis T V, Jayawardena R. Fruit and vegetable consumption during
515 the COVID-19 lockdown in Sri Lanka: an online survey. Nutrire [Internet] 2022;47:12.
516 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41110-022-00161-z>
- 517 16. Cerda C, Guenat S, Egerer M, Fischer LK. Home Food Gardening: Benefits and Barriers
518 During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Santiago, Chile [Internet]. Frontiers in Sustainable
519 Food Systems . 2022. Available from:
520 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2022.841386>
- 521 17. Turnšek M, Gangenes Skar S-L, Piirman M, Thorarinsdottir RI, Bavec M, Junge R. Home
522 Gardening and Food Security Concerns during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Horticulturae.
523 2022.
- 524 18. Music J, Finch E, Gone P, Toze S, Charlebois S, Mullins L. Pandemic Victory Gardens:
525 Potential for local land use policies. Land use policy [Internet] 2021;109:105600.
526 Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837721003239>
- 527 19. Purwanto, Yaumidin UK, Yuliana CI, Nurjati E, Rahmayanti AZ, Cahyono BD, Novandra R.
528 Urban farming and food security: household's adaptive strategy to COVID-19 crises. IOP
529 Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci [Internet] IOP Publishing; 2021;892:12070. Available from:
530 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/892/1/012070>

- 531 20. Falkowski TB, Jorgensen B, Rakow DA, Das A, Diemont SAW, Selfa T, Arrington AB.
532 “Connecting With Good People and Good Plants”: Community Gardener Experiences in
533 New York State During the COVID-19 Pandemic [Internet]. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food*
534 *Systems* . 2022. Available from:
535 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2022.854374>
- 536 21. Joshi N, Wende W. Physically apart but socially connected: Lessons in social resilience
537 from community gardening during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Landsc Urban Plan* [Internet]
538 2022;223:104418. Available from:
539 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204622000676>
- 540 22. Midway SR, Lynch AJ, Peoples BK, Dance M, Caffey R. COVID-19 influences on US
541 recreational angler behavior. *PLoS One* [Internet] Public Library of Science;
542 2021;16:e0254652. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254652>
- 543 23. Wirkkala KB, Niles MT, Belarmino EH, Bertmann F. The Fruits of Labor: Home Food
544 Procurement and Mental Health in the Time of COVID-19. *J Hunger Environ Nutr*
545 [Internet] Taylor & Francis; 2022;1–20. Available from:
546 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19320248.2022.2065597>
- 547 24. Ghosh S. Urban agriculture potential of home gardens in residential land uses: A case
548 study of regional City of Dubbo, Australia. *Land use policy* [Internet] 2021;109:105686.
549 Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837721004099>
- 550 25. Chenarides L, Grebitus C, Lusk JL, Printezis I. Who practices urban agriculture? An
551 empirical analysis of participation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.
552 *Agribusiness* [Internet] John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2021;37:142–59. Available from:
553 <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21675>
- 554 26. Niles MT, Belarmino EH, Bertmann F, Biehl E, Acciai F, Josephson A, Ohri-Vachaspati P,
555 Neff R. Food insecurity during COVID-19: A multi-state research collaborative. *medRxiv*
556 [Internet] 2020;2020.12.01.20242024. Available from:
557 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/12/04/2020.12.01.20242024.abstract>

- 558 27. Niles MT., Neff R, Biehl E, Bertmann F, Belarmino, Emily H.; Acciai F, Ohri-Vachaspati P.
559 Food Access and Food Security During COVID-19 Survey- Version 2.1 [Internet]. Harvard
560 Dataverse; 2020. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/4KY9XZ>
- 561 28. US Census Bureau. 2015-2019 American Community Survey Demographic and Housing
562 Estimates [Internet]. Table DP05. 2020. Available from:
563 [https://data.census.gov/table?g=040XX00US23,50&d=ACS+5-](https://data.census.gov/table?g=040XX00US23,50&d=ACS+5-Year+Estimates+Data+Profiles&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05)
564 [Year+Estimates+Data+Profiles&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05](https://data.census.gov/table?g=040XX00US23,50&d=ACS+5-Year+Estimates+Data+Profiles&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05)
- 565 29. USDA Economic Research Service. U.S. household food security survey module: six-item
566 short form [Internet]. 2012. Available from: [https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#six)
567 [nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#six](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/#six)
- 568 30. Rural Health Research Center. RUCA Maps Overview [Internet]. RUCA code four category
569 classification. [cited 2023 Mar 23]. Available from:
570 <http://depts.washington.edu/uwruca/ruca-maps.php>
- 571 31. USDA Economic Research Service. Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes [Internet]. 2010
572 Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes. 2010 [cited 2023 Mar 23]. Available from:
573 <https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-commuting-area-codes.aspx>
- 574 32. Zhao Z. Using matching to estimate treatment effects: Data requirements, matching
575 metrics, and Monte Carlo evidence. *Rev Econ Stat MIT Press*; 2004;86:91–107.
- 576 33. Rubin DB. Using multivariate matched sampling and regression adjustment to control
577 bias in observational studies. *J Am Stat Assoc Taylor & Francis*; 1979;74:318–28.
- 578 34. Caliendo M, Kopeinig S. Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity
579 score matching. *J Econ Surv Wiley Online Library*; 2008;22:31–72.
- 580 35. Lee S, Barrett CB, Hoddinott J. Food Security Dynamics in the United States, 2001-2017.
581 Available SSRN 3992668 2021;
- 582 36. Webb P, Coates J, Frongillo EA, Rogers BL, Swindale A, Bilinsky P. Measuring Household
583 Food Insecurity: Why It's So Important and Yet So Difficult to Do^{1,2}. *J Nutr [Internet]*

- 584 2006;136:1404S-1408S. Available from:
585 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022316622082633>
- 586 37. Philpott SM, Egerer MH, Bichier P, Cohen H, Cohen R, Liere H, Jha S, Lin BB. Gardener
587 demographics, experience, and motivations drive differences in plant species richness
588 and composition in urban gardens. *Ecol Soc* [Internet] The Resilience Alliance; 2020;25.
589 Available from: <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol25/iss4/art8/>
- 590 38. Emery MR, Pierce AR. Interrupting the telos: locating subsistence in contemporary US
591 forests. *Environ Plan A SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England*; 2005;37:981–93.
- 592 39. Alber J, Kohler U. Informal Food Production in the Enlarged European Union. *Soc Indic*
593 *Res* [Internet] 2008;89:113–27. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9224-1)
594 [9224-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9224-1)
- 595 40. Beavers AW, Atkinson A, Alaimo K. How Gardening and a Gardener Support Program in
596 Detroit Influence Participants’ Diet, Food Security, and Food Values. *J Hunger Environ*
597 *Nutr* [Internet] Taylor & Francis; 2020;15:149–69. Available from:
598 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19320248.2019.1587332>
- 599 41. Carney PA, Hamada JL, Rdesinski R, Sprager L, Nichols KR, Liu BY, Pelayo J, Sanchez MA,
600 Shannon J. Impact of a Community Gardening Project on Vegetable Intake, Food Security
601 and Family Relationships: A Community-based Participatory Research Study. *J*
602 *Community Health* [Internet] 2012;37:874–81. Available from:
603 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-011-9522-z>
- 604 42. Furness WW, Gallaher CM. Food access, food security and community gardens in
605 Rockford, IL. *Local Environ* [Internet] Routledge; 2018;23:414–30. Available from:
606 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2018.1426561>
- 607 43. Béné C. Resilience of local food systems and links to food security – A review of some
608 important concepts in the context of COVID-19 and other shocks. *Food Secur* [Internet]
609 2020;12:805–22. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-020-01076-1>

- 610 44. Barrett CB. Actions now can curb food systems fallout from COVID-19. *Nat Food*
611 [Internet] 2020;1:319–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-0085-y>
- 612 45. Lee CM, Cadigan JM, Rhew IC. Increases in loneliness among young adults during the
613 COVID-19 pandemic and association with increases in mental health problems. *J Adolesc*
614 *Heal Elsevier*; 2020;67:714–7.
- 615 46. Fountoulakis KN, Apostolidou MK, Atsiova MB, Filippidou AK, Florou AK, Gousiou DS,
616 Katsara AR, Mantzari SN, Padouva-Markoulaki M, Papatriantafyllou EI. Self-reported
617 changes in anxiety, depression and suicidality during the COVID-19 lockdown in Greece. *J*
618 *Affect Disord Elsevier*; 2021;279:624–9.
- 619 47. Park S-A, Shoemaker C, Haub M. Can older gardeners meet the physical activity
620 recommendation through gardening? *Horttechnology American Society for Horticultural*
621 *Science*; 2008;18:639–43.
- 622 48. van den Berg A, Warren JL, McIntosh A, Hoelscher D, Ory MG, Jovanovic C, Lopez M,
623 Whittlesey L, Kirk A, Walton C, et al. Impact of a Gardening and Physical Activity
624 Intervention in Title 1 Schools: The TGEG Study. *Child Obes [Internet] Mary Ann Liebert,*
625 *Inc., publishers*; 2020;16:S-44-S-54. Available from:
626 <https://doi.org/10.1089/chi.2019.0238>
- 627 49. Gray T, Tracey D, Truong S, Ward K. Community gardens as local learning environments
628 in social housing contexts: participant perceptions of enhanced wellbeing and
629 community connection. *Local Environ [Internet] Routledge*; 2022;27:570–85. Available
630 from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2022.2048255>
- 631 50. Pollard G, Roetman P, Ward J, Chiera B, Mantzioris E. Beyond Productivity: Considering
632 the Health, Social Value and Happiness of Home and Community Food Gardens. *Urban*
633 *Science*. 2018.

634

635