

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search http://ageconsearch.umn.edu aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.



Selected Presentation at the 2020 Agricultural & Applied Economics Association Annual Meeting, Kansas City, Missouri, July 26-28

Copyright 2020 by authors. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.



Yizao Liu, Pei Zhou

Food Environment, Diet Quality and Online Grocery Shopping The Pennsylvania State University, Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education

Background

- Food environment plays an important role in diet quality, and limited access to fresh food might cause health related issues.
- Many people in the U.S. live in neighborhoods with limited access to fresh food.
- Many proposed to policy to address the issue, and Online grocery shopping may offer a new alternative.



Data source: Nielsen Consumer Panel Data

Research Question

. What's the impact of food environment on online grocery shopping decision?

2. What's the effect of food environment on overall diet quality? Does online grocery shopping help mitigate the impacts caused by the differences in healthy food supply?





 Understanding relationship the between food environment and online grocery shopping and the cross influence on diet quality sheds light on the policy aimed to mitigate nutrition inequality.

Statements:

c. Copyright 20 by Yizao Liu, Pei Zhou. All rights reserved.

Methodology

We first estimate the logit model (1) and then use the subsample of households that have shopped grocery online in model (2):

> $onl = \alpha ENV + \beta X + \varepsilon$ (1) $freq = \alpha ENV + \beta X + \varepsilon \quad (2)$

We then use conditional quantile regression to estimate the effect of online Grocery frequency on total grocery expenditure share of each category.

 $Q_q(Share_{tt}) = \alpha_q ENV + \lambda_q ENV * freq + \theta_q X + \varepsilon$ (3)

Where onl is binary variable indicating if a household purchased grocery online in a year. *freq* is the frequency of online grocery shopping. *ENV* includes Total store number and Food Store Share. Q_a indicates the quantile q from 10%, 20%... to 90%. Share_{tt} is the expenditure share for each food category over total grocery expenditure.

| | online grocery | online grocery | | an Laurahald Tatal Dist Dealert | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|---|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|--|
| VARIABLES | shopping decision | shopping frequency | | UT HUUSETUU TULAT DIEL DASKEL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total store number | 0.0005*** | 0.0011 | | | OLS | a10 | a20 | a30 | a40 | a50 | a60 | a70 | a80 | a90 | |
| | (0.0001) | (0.0007) | | Food Store Share | 0.00/13* | 0 0021* | 0 0038** | 0.0051*** | | | 0.0055** | 0.0053* | | | |
| Food Store Share | -0.0019** | -0.0062 | VEGETABLE | rood store share | 0.0043 | 0.0021 | 0.0038 | 0.0031 | 0.0004 | 0.0070 | 0.0055 | 0.0055 | 0.0034 | 0.0080 | |
| | (0.0008) | (0.0056) | | | (0.0023) | (0.0012) | (0.0016) | (0.0017) | (0.0020) | (0.0022) | (0.0025) | (0.0029) | (0.0037) | (0.0052 | |
| Inincome | 0.0202 | -0.2804*** | | | -0 0003** | -0 0002*** | -0 0004*** | -0 0003*** | -0 0004*** | -0 0004*** | -0 0002 | -0 0003* | -0 0002 | -0 000 | |
| | (0.0158) | (0.1064) | | Food Store Share # online | 0.0005 | 0.0002 | 0.0004 | 0.0005 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.0002 | 0.0005 | 0.0002 | 0.000. | |
| marry | -0.0928*** | -0.4410*** | | grocery shopping frequency | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0001) | (0, 0002) | (0, 0002) | (0,0003 | |
| | (0.0198) | (0.1264) | | | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0000 | |
| have children under 18 | -0.2918*** | -0.6565*** | | Food Store Share | 0.0061** | 0.0030** | 0.0050*** | 0.0059*** | 0.0077*** | 0.0064** | 0.0061** | 0.0061 | 0.0070* | 0.0020 | |
| | (0.0211) | (0.1230) | | | (0.0027) | (0.0013) | (0.0016) | (0.0018) | (0.0023) | (0.0025) | (0.0030) | (0.0038) | (0.0042) | (0.0063 | |
| college | 0.1513*** | -0.0579 | | | (0.002) | (0.0000) | (0.00000) | (0.00000) | (0.00-0) | (0.00000) | (0.0000) | (0.0000) | (0.00.1) | (0.0000 | |
| | (0.0208) | (0.1391) | FRUIT | Food Store Share # online grocery shopping frequency | -0.0003* | -0.0001 | -0.0003*** | -0.0004*** | -0.0005*** | -0.0004*** | -0.0003 | -0.0003 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 | |
| Black/African American | 0.0642** | -0.1533 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (0.0285) | (0.2044) | | | (0.0002) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0004 | |
| Asian | 0.1338*** | -0.5518** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (0.0459) | (0.2387) | | Food Store Share | -0.0033 | -0.0018 | 0.0013 | 0.0027 | 0.0025 | 0.0009 | 0.0004 | -0.0045 | -0.0103* | -0.0105 | |
| Other races | 0.0452 | -0.1389 | SNACKS | | (0, 0041) | (0, 0034) | (0 0032) | (0, 0034) | (0.0036) | (0 0038) | (0, 0042) | (0 0050) | (0, 0062) | (0 0093 | |
| | (0.0427) | (0.2918) | | | (0.00+1) | (0.0034) | (0.0052) | (0.0034) | (0.0050) | (0.0030) | (0.00+2) | (0.0050) | (0.0002) | (0.0055 | |
| hispanic_origin | -0.0443 | -0.2461 | | Food Store Share # online | 0.0003 | -0.0004** | -0.0005** | -0.0003* | -0.0000 | -0.0002 | -0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0012* | |
| | (0.0381) | (0.2597) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| internet access | 0.3748*** | 0.5270* | | grocery snopping frequency | (0.0003) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0003) | (0.0004) | (0.0005 | |
| | (0.0435) | (0.2711) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Constant | -2.2152*** | 7.0975*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (0.2188) | (1.3284) | | Observations | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | 22,268 | |
| Observations | 118,449 | 22,268 | | Demographic FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| R-squared | | 0.0257 | | DMA FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| DMA FE | YES | YES | | Year FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| Year FE | YES | YES | | | . = 0 | • | | • | • | J | J | • | | | |

Discussion and Conclusion

- Household are more likely to purchase grocery online with larger number of total stores. In the areas with more food stores, households are less likely to substitute from shopping grocery offline to online.
- Food environment have different effects on total diet basket for different quantiles.
- The online grocery shopping help mitigate the nutrition inequality caused by the food environment. The mitigation effects only works for lower quantile household.

a. Researcher(s) own analyses calculated (or derived) based in part on data from The Nielsen Datasets at the Kilts Center for Marketing Data Center at The University of Chicago Booth School of Business. b. The conclusions drawn from the Nielsen data are those of the researcher(s) and do not reflect the views of Nielsen. Nielsen is not responsible for, had no role in, and was not involved in analyzing and preparing the results reported herein.

Results

Variable **Online shoppi** Online shopping Online shopping **Total Expendit Online Shoppi Online Grocery Online Grocery Total Grocery Online Grocery Food environn** Food Store Nu **Total Store Nur** Food Store Sha

Data

Table 1 Summary Statistics of Main Variables

| | Mean | Std. Dev. | | |
|------------------------|---------|-----------|--|--|
| ng behavior | | | | |
| ng | 0.4470 | 0.4972 | | |
| ng Frequency | 3.3611 | 9.4972 | | |
| ure | 7362 | 4337 | | |
| ng Expenditure | 225 | 737 | | |
| y shopping | 0.1885 | 0.3911 | | |
| y shopping Frequency | 0.7338 | 3.3893 | | |
| Expenditure | 3243 | 1831 | | |
| y Shopping Expenditure | 27 | 183 | | |
| nent | | | | |
| mber | 26.8283 | 49.1611 | | |
| mber | 91.1729 | 129.0221 | | |
| are | 25.5395 | 17.5456 | | |
| | | | | |

Future Plan

Identifying the mover sample to eliminate at least some endogeneity issues of food environment.

Including households' heterogeneity into the model.