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## Low Income Household's Store Choices

- Policymakers are pursing initiatives to increase food access for low-income households.
- However, improved food store access will not necessarily change dietary habits and leads to a healthier diet, especially for the low income households.
- It is important to understand the determinants of store choice among low-income households before implementing policies that incentivize retailers to do business in food deserts


## Fill-in Trips

- Between regular main shopping visits, households may need to refill their pantry/refrigerator with staple items
v smaller purchased food basket
- shorter expected time for the shopping trip
- different choice of retailer: smaller retailers

The Majority of U.S. Shopping Trips are "small" or "immediate" need driven


Source: The Nielsen Company

Source: Nielsen Study, 20 II

## Small Retailers: C-Stores

- Purchases at smaller stores may have a negative impact on SNAP participants' ability to purchase healthier items and may limit their food expenditures due to higher food prices at these stores.


Source: General Mills Fill-In Trip Study, 2014

## SNAP-Authorized Retailers

- In 2016, USDA published a federal rule aimed to increase the number of healthy items in stock
" "Enhancing Retailer Standards in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)" at 81 FR 90675.
- This expanded retailer stocking requirements would likely remove many convenience stores from participation in SNAP.


## Previous Work

- Research examining the store choice of SNAP recipients is scarce
- Taylor andVillas-Boas (2016) studied the role of distance traveled on store choice
- households are willing to pay more to travel to a larger grocery store than a convenience store.


## Study

Objective:
Assess the factors that influence households store choice during fill-in trips when purchases of bread, eggs, or milk occurred.

We focus on store choices between:

- SNAP and non-SNAP participants
- Fill-in Trips and Main Shopping


## Defining fill-in trips in the FoodAPS data

## General definition:

- Fill-in trip is any trip which expenditures are below a threshold (Kahn and Schmittlein, 1989)
- We use the median of expenditures per household member as a threshold (Anić and Radas, 2006)
- Threshold was determined using IRI Academic dataset (trips data)


## Fill-in trips to buy staples:

- Fill-in Trips in which milk, bread, or eggs are purchased

Top Items most often purchased during Fill-in Trips

0$\square$
Salty Snacks ..... 28\%
Ice cream27\%

Cheese

Source: General Mills Fill-In Trip Study, 2014

## Data

## USDA's National Household Food Acquisition and Purchase

 Survey (FoodAPS),- 4,3I7 Households who reported I3,8I9 food at home purchases from stores.
- We classify shopping trips:
, Main Shopping Trip
, Fill-in Trips when bread, milk, or eggs are purchased
- Fill-in Trips (bread, milk, eggs are not purchased)
- Six Store Choices:

〉 supermarkets, superstores, convenience stores, grocery stores,

## Empirical Framework

## Multinomial Logit (Greene, 2003)

$$
p_{i j}=\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{j}=i\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{1}{1+\sum_{m=2}^{k} \exp \left(x_{j} \beta_{m}\right)}, \text { if } i=1 \\
\frac{\exp \left(x_{j} \beta_{m}\right)}{1+\sum_{m=2}^{k} \exp \left(x_{j} \beta_{m}\right)}, \text { if } i>1
\end{array}\right.
$$

where:
$p_{i j}$ : Probability that the response for the $j$ th observation is equal to the ith categorical outcome. There are $k$ categorical outcomes.
$\beta_{m}$ : coefficient vector for outcome $m$
$X$ : vector of independent variables

## Data

Table 1 Shopping Trips

| Variable | Main | Fill-in Staples | Fill-in No Staples |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Milk, bread, or eggs were <br> purchased | 0.49 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Expenditures (\$) | 94 | 26 | 15 |
| Per capita expenditures (\$) | 42 | 8 | 5 |
| Driving Distance (miles) | 7.26 | 4.83 | 6 |
| Number of USDA Food <br> Categories (out of 33) | 11 | 6 | 3 |
| Use of Coupon | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| N | 2692 | 4634 | 6160 |

II Note: * Variables in the regression

## Data

$>$ Compared to main shopping trips, low income households pay higher prices for a typical basket of food products for both fill-in trips with and without staples.

## Data

Table 2 Summary Statistics of Store Visits

| Variables | Convenience | Grocery | Supermarket | Superstore |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SNAP HH | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| WIC HH | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.14 |
| Fill-in Trip Staples | 0.25 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.35 |
| distance (miles) | 4.61 | 3.72 | 5.10 | 6.27 |
| Number of USDA <br> food categories | 2.22 | 3.43 | 5.98 | 6 |
| Coupon Use | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| N | 552 | 503 | 4673 | 5552 |

## Preliminary Results

Table 3 Average Marginal Effects Main Shopping Trips

| Coupon Use | Convenience | Grocery | Supermarket | Super |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Shopping Trips |  |  |  |  |
| High Income Household | 0.003 | $-0.004^{*}$ | 0.085 | -0.075 |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.000 | $-0.009^{*}$ | 0.113 | -0.093 |
| SNAP Household | -0.001 | $-0.015^{* *}$ | $0.156^{*}$ | $-0.160^{*}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Fill-in Trip No Staples | 0.004 | -0.000 | 0.054 | -0.035 |
| High Income Household | 0.052 | $-0.052^{* * *}$ | 0.168 | -0.072 |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | $-0.049^{*}$ | $-0.038^{*}$ | $0.266^{*}$ | -0.124 |
| SNAP Household |  |  |  |  |
| Fill-in Trip Staples | 0.007 | -0.021 | 0.075 | -0.133 |
| High Income Household | $-0.015^{* * *}$ | $-0.023^{* * *}$ | 0.161 | -0.042 |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.011 | -0.008 | 0.237 | -0.207 |
| SNAP Household |  |  |  |  |

I4 Note: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05, * \mathrm{p}<0.1$. Regressions include demographic variables and food retail environment

## Results

Table 3 Average Marginal Effects All Shopping Trips

| Variables | Convenience | Grocery | Supermarket | Super |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\log ($ Driving distance, miles) |  |  |  |  |
| Main Shopping Trips |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.000 | -0.001 | 0.065* | 0.008 |
| High Income Household | -0.001 | 0.001 | 0.050 | 0.009 |
| SNAP Household | -0.001 | 0.001 | 0.100 | -0.047 |
| Fill-in Trips No Staples |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.027 | 0.010 | 0.160 | 0.022 |
| High Income Household | -0.018 | 0.010 | 0.175 | 0.032 |
| SNAP Household | -0.042 | -0.001 | 0.157 | 0.070 |
| Fill-in Trips Staples |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.011 | -0.003 | 0.107 | -0.045 |
| High Income Household | -0.003 | 0.011 | 0.098 | -0.047 |
| SNAP Household | -0.009 | -0.003 | 0.131 | -0.032 |

I5 Note: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05, * \mathrm{p}<0.1$. Regressions include demographic variables and food retail environment

## Results

Table 3 Average Marginal Effects Main Shopping Trips

| Log(Price Paid) | Convenience | Grocery | Supermarket | Super |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Main Shopping Trips |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.001 | -0.000 | -0.105 | 0.142 |
| High Income Household | -0.002 | -0.000 | -0.122 | $0.155^{* *}$ |
| SNAP Household | -0.001 | 0.002 | -0.079 | 0.112 |
| Fill-in Trips No Staples |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.029 | -0.026 | 0.234 | 0.306 |
| High Income Household | -0.004 | 0.001 | 0.214 | 0.089 |
| SNAP Household | -0.051 | 0.021 | 0.294 | 0.201 |
| Fill-in Trips Staples |  |  |  |  |
| Non-SNAP low-income Household | -0.002 | -0.024 | 0.080 | -0.010 |
| High Income Household | -0.009 | -0.000 | 0.088 | 0.067 |
| SNAP Household | 0.006 | 0.014 | 0.003 | 0.088 |

I6 Note: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05, * \mathrm{p}<0.1$. Regressions include demographic variables and food retail environment

## Preliminary Results

- For fill-in trips in which milk, bread, or eggs were purchased, price (coupon use) was the major feature influencing the choice of the majority of options of where to shop for non-SNAP low-income households.
- During fill-in trips in which milk, bread, or eggs were not purchased (Small Trips), coupon use was the only factor associated with the choice of the majority of store options for SNAP and non-SNAP low-income households.


## Results

Table 3 Average Effects Main Shopping Trips

| Number of food categories, USDA | Convenience | Grocery | Supermarket | Super |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Shopping Trips |  |  |  |  |
| non-SNAP Low Income Household | -0.000 | -0.001 | 0.015 | -0.014 |
| High Income Household | 0.000 | -0.000 | $0.017{ }^{*}$ | -0.015 |
| SNAP Household | -0.000 | -0.000 | 0.010 | -0.009 |
| Fill-in Trips No Staples |  |  |  |  |
| non-SNAP Low Income Household | -0.004 | -0.004 | 0.012 | -0.011 |
| High Income Household | -0.002 | -0.001 | 0.007 | -0.003 |
| SNAP Household | 0.001 | -0.006 | 0.009 | -0.006 |
| Fill-in Trips |  |  |  |  |
| non-SNAP Low Income Household | 0.000 | -0.000 | 0.009 | -0.007 |
| High Income Household | -0.001 | -0.003 | 0.009 | -0.006 |
| SNAP Household | -0.001 | -0.007 | 0.010 | -0.001 |
| Observations | 13486 | 13486 | 13486 | 13486 |

## Conclusion

- During fill-in trips in which milk, bread, or eggs were purchased, price (coupon use) was the major feature influencing the choice of the majority of options of where to shop for non-SNAP low-income households. Price paid only influenced SNAP households' likelihood of choosing a Combination store.
- During fill-in trips in which milk, bread, or eggs were not purchased (Small Trips), coupon use was the only factor associated with the choice of the majority of store options for SNAP and non-SNAP low-income households.
- During main shopping trips, travel distance, number of food categories, and coupon use were important influencing high-income and non-SNAP households' likelihood to choose a store. Only price paid was associated with the likelihood to choose a Supermarket for high-income consumers.
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