



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/186529/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Armstrong, B., Reynolds, C., Martins, C.A. et al. (2021) Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at the start of the COVID-19 lockdown. *British Food Journal*, 123 (9). pp. 2959-2978. ISSN: 0007-070X

<https://doi.org/10.1108/bfj-10-2020-0917>

This author accepted manuscript is deposited under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) licence. This means that anyone may distribute, adapt, and build upon the work for non-commercial purposes, subject to full attribution. If you wish to use this manuscript for commercial purposes, please contact permissions@emerald.com

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



This is a repository copy of *Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at the start of the COVID-19 lockdown*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/186529/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Armstrong, B, Reynolds, C, Martins, CA et al. (13 more authors) (2021) Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at the start of the COVID-19 lockdown. BRITISH FOOD JOURNAL, 123 (9). pp. 2959-2978. ISSN 0007-070X

<https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2020-0917>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at the start of the COVID-19 lockdown.

Journal:	<i>British Food Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	BFJ-10-2020-0917.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	food waste, COVID-19, food insecurity, cooking confidence, UK

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts

Armstrong, Beth; Reynolds, Christian; Adriano Martins, Carla; Frankowska, Angelina; Levy, Renata Bertazzi; Rauber, Fernanda; Osei-Kwasi, Hibbah; Vega, Marcelo ; Cediel, Gustavo; Schmidt, Ximena; Kluczkowski, Alana ; Akparibo, Robert; Auma , Carolyn; Defeyter, Margaret Anne; Tereza da Silva, Jacqueline; Bridge, Gemma,

“Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at the start of the COVID-19 lockdown.”

Date article was accepted for publication was: (23-Jul-2021)

This is a pre-print Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM).

Please refer to the published version DOI 10.1108/BFJ-10-2020-0917

Emerald allows authors to deposit their AAM under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial International Licence 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0). The AAM is deposited under this licence and that any reuse is allowed in accordance with the terms outlined by the licence. To reuse the AAM for commercial purposes, permission should be sought by contacting permissions@emeraldinsight.com.

For the sake of clarity, commercial usage would be considered as, but not limited to:

- o Copying or downloading AAMs for further distribution for a fee;
- o Any use of the AAM in conjunction with advertising;
- o Any use of the AAM by for promotional purposes by for-profit organisations;
- o Any use that would confer monetary reward, commercial gain or commercial exploitation.

1
2
3 **Food insecurity, food waste, food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK citizens at**
4 **the start of the COVID-19 lockdown.**
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Abstract**
11
12

13 **Purpose:** The current pilot study explored food insecurity, food waste, food related
14 behaviours and cooking confidence of UK consumers following the COVID-19 lockdown.
15
16

17
18 **Methods:** Data were collected from 473 UK based consumers (63% female) during the first
19 UK lockdown in 2020. A cross-sectional online survey measured variables including, food
20 insecurity prevalence, self-reported food waste, food management behaviours, confidence
21 and frequency of use of a range of cooking methods, type of food eaten (ultra-processed,
22 semi-finished, unprocessed) and packaging type foods are purchased in.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Findings:** 39% of participants have experienced some food insecurity in the last 12 months.
32 Being younger, having a greater BMI and living in a smaller household were associated with
33 food insecurity. Green leaves, carrots, potatoes and sliced bread are the most wasted of
34 purchased foods. Polenta, green leaves and white rice are the most wasted cooked foods.
35 Food secure participants reported wasting a smaller percentage of purchased and cooked
36 foods compared to food insecure participants. Overall, participants were most confident about
37 boiling, microwaving and stir-frying and least confident with using a pressure cooker or sous
38 vide. Food secure participants were more confident with boiling, stir-frying, grilling and
39 roasting than insecure food participants.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 **Practical Implications:** This has implications for post lockdown policy, food policies and
53 guidance for public-facing communications.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

Originality: We identified novel differences in self-report food waste behaviours and cooking confidence between the food secure and insecure consumers, and observed demographics associated with food insecurity.

Keywords: food waste, COVID-19, food insecurity, cooking confidence, UK

Article classification: Research Paper

1. Introduction

Ending food insecurity, improving nutrition and providing a sustainable food system are some of the biggest challenges featured in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), (United Nations, 2015). The UK government has pledged to reduce food waste, end hunger and provide food security for all by 2030 (UK Government, 2015). However, UK consumers throw away 6.6 million tonnes of food waste a year (WRAP, 2020a) and an estimated 2.2 million UK consumers experienced food insecurity in 2018 (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2018). Though the UK has improved mechanisms to monitor food insecurity to assess SDG progress (see Office for National Statistics, 2019), there is little in-depth understanding of the prevalence of food insecurity, and association with food waste and wider food management behaviours. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted issues in the UK's food system relating to food insecurity, poverty and health inequalities.

1.1. *Food (in)security in the UK*

Food security is achieved “when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO 2015 p. 53). It is estimated that (pre-

1
2
3 COVID-19) 21% of the UK population experienced some form of food insecurity in 2016
4
5 (NatCen Social Research, Food Standards Agency, 2017; Food Standards Agency, 2020a).
6
7 However, there is a paucity of evidence which comprehensively documents the prevalence of
8
9 food insecurity in the UK, and the impact of COVID-19 (EFRA, 2020; House of Lords,
10
11 2020). It is essential that we develop a greater understanding of food insecurity in the UK, as
12
13 identifying the scale and underlying causes of food insecurity, impact of significant events,
14
15 and impact on public health, will provide a basis to tackle the issues (House of Lords, 2020;
16
17 Long *et al.*, 2020). COVID-19 has exacerbated the prevalence of food insecurity within the
18
19 UK. Following the UK lockdown (23rd March 2020), demand for emergency food parcels
20
21 from food banks increased by 81% (Trussell Trust, 2020). In addition, 43% of consumers
22
23 highlight concern about the cost of additional food (Hubbub, 2020). Younger adults (16-24
24
25 years) and those with children have been disproportionately impacted, forming the majority
26
27 of new food bank users (National Food Strategy, 2020).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 A survey conducted between 7th-9th April 2020 gave insight into the prevalence of UK food
36
37 insecurity in the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic (MacMillan, 2020). The research
38
39 revealed that 16% of adults had experienced food insecurity, 21% didn't have enough money
40
41 to buy adequate food supplies, 50% were unable to get the food they needed from the shops
42
43 due to shortages and 25% were unable to leave their homes and had no other way to get the
44
45 food they needed. 14% of respondents reported that someone in the household had to reduce
46
47 or skip meals because they could not access or afford sufficient sustenance, 6% indicated that
48
49 someone in the household had gone hungry in the first three weeks of lockdown and 3%
50
51 reported that at least one person had gone a whole day without eating. Subsequent research
52
53 conducted in April and May 2020 echoed these findings (University of Essex, Institute for
54
55 Social and Economic Research, 2020).
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 A greater incidence of food insecurity has also been reported in vulnerable groups, such as
4 adults with physical or mental disabilities, households with children, and households with a
5 member shielding or with COVID-19 symptoms (Food Standards Agency, 2020b; Loopstra,
6 2020; National Food Strategy, 2020). Vulnerable adults are eating fewer portions of fruit and
7 vegetables, and children from lower socio-economic status (SES) households are eating more
8 junk food and snacks but fewer portions of fruit and vegetables compared to peers from
9 higher SES households (National Food Strategy, 2020). Since lockdown there has been an
10 increase in some 'negative' food behaviours, such as eating food past the use-by date,
11 presenting food safety issues. The consumption of foods past the use-by date is more
12 prevalent in those experiencing food insecurity (Food Standards Agency, 2020a, 2020b).

1.2. *Food behaviours and cooking skills*

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 COVID-19 has had an impact on the diet of the UK population. Consumers experiencing
31 poverty are less able to access healthy and sustainable diets as healthy diets cost
32 approximately three times the costs of less healthy alternatives (House of Lords, 2020,
33 Reynolds *et al.*, 2019, Scott *et al.*, 2018). Financial stress and not having sufficient money to
34 buy food has been associated with a decrease in the planning and preparation of healthier
35 foods (De Backer *et al.*, 2021). In addition, food recommended for a healthier diet carries a
36 higher risk of waste, requires more preparation, kitchen equipment and cooking time, each of
37 which has an associated cost. Low income consumers are more likely to live in 'food deserts'
38 (Wrigley, 2002), and the need to use public transport presents a barrier to accessing larger
39 supermarkets which stock fresh produce. Consequently, low income consumers are nudged to
40 source foods at local convenience shops which typically stock more processed foods (House
41 of Lords, 2020), and typically eat less minimally processed foods (e.g. tinned lentils, frozen
42 chicken) (Adams and White, 2015), less wholemeal or high fibre foods (Nelson *et al.*, 2007),
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and fewer portions of fruit and vegetables, compared to the general population (Food
4 Foundation, 2016, 2020). Similarly, vulnerable adults are eating fewer portions of fruit and
5 vegetables, and children from lower socio-economic status (SES) households are eating more
6 junk food and snacks but fewer portions of fruit and vegetables compared to peers from
7 higher SES households (National Food Strategy, 2020). Since lockdown there has also been
8 an increase in 'negative' food behaviours, such as eating food past the use-buy date,
9 presenting potential safety issues. 58% of UK consumers surveyed indicated that someone in
10 their household had eaten food past the use-by date. Bagged salad, cheese and cooked meat
11 are most often eaten past the use-by date. The consumption of foods past the use-by date is
12 especially prevalent in those experiencing food insecurity (Food Standards Agency, 2020a,
13 2020b).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Beyond access to food, COVID-19 has changed consumer food habits and skills. Post-
31 lockdown consumers engaged in more positive food management behaviours such as writing
32 a shopping list, meal planning, batch-cooking and the use/consumption of leftovers . However,
33 consumers are also shopping less frequently, eating less takeaway, cooking and eating in the
34 home more (Murphy et al., 2021; WRAP, 2020a). Although cooking skills in isolation cannot
35 ensure a healthy diet (Wilson, 2007), having the skills to prepare and cook food is considered
36 an essential element in the ability to consume a healthy and sustainable diet Perceived cooking
37 skills can vary by a range of demographic factors, such as age, gender, SES (Anderson, 2007;
38 Caraher *et al.*, 1999; Nelson *et al.*, 2007; Lam & Adams, 2017). Cooking interventions which
39 improve cooking skills and confidence have been shown to have a positive impact on
40 consumption of healthy diets (Sprake *et al.*, 2018), consumers with high levels of cooking skills
41 are less likely to consume moderately or highly processed foods (Brunner *et al.*, 2010). In
42 addition, improving cooking skills has also been reported to reduce food waste (Dyen & Sirieix,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2016).

1.3. Food waste

The food life cycle contributes to 20-30% of global greenhouse gas emissions (Kause *et al.*, 2009; Poore and Nemecek, 2018). UK consumers throw away 6.6 million tonnes of food waste a year (WRAP, 2020a), contributing to global greenhouse gas emissions and climate change (Camilleri *et al.*, 2019). Reducing food waste is a critical element in reducing the impact of the food lifecycle on the environment (Clark, 2019; Reynolds *et al.*, 2020; Tirado-Von Der Pahlen, 2017). Consequently, it is important to identify which types of foods and how much are typically being wasted, and how waste links to wider consumer food habits.

The UK's annual household food waste is reducing (2007-2018: 1.4 million tonnes reduction) but still equates to 10 billion meals (WRAP, 2020b). Though 37% of food waste is inedible (e.g. bones, peelings), (Nicholes *et al.*, 2019), 61% of waste could be avoided through better food management with 15% of food being wasted because it has passed the expiry date. Fresh vegetables and salad constitute 28% of household food waste with potatoes, bread and milk being among the most wasted foods. Waste from cooked meals (home-made and pre-prepared) significantly contributes to food waste, with cooking or preparing too much food producing 12% of waste and on-plate 'leftovers' producing 19% of waste (Quested and Murphy, 2014).

COVID-19 and lockdown has had an impact on food waste, with 33-48% of UK consumers reporting less food waste following lockdown (Hubbub, 2020; Macmillan, 2020; WRAP, 2020a). Initial research following lockdown showed that 57% of consumers who engage in 10+ food management strategies reported a reduction in food waste since lockdown (WRAP, 2020a). Adopted food management behaviours appears to have been retained as lockdown

1
2
3 restrictions have eased (WRAP, 2020c). However recent research indicates that food waste
4
5 has increased by 31% from the initial lockdown period, moving toward pre-lockdown levels
6
7 as restrictions ease (WRAP, 2020c). Reduced food waste is more prevalent in consumers who
8
9 have children at home, women, are aged 18-34 or 35-44 years, are impacted by COVID-19
10
11 (e.g. furloughed, home working) or have seen the “Love Food Hate Waste” campaign
12
13 (WRAP, 2018; WRAP, 2020a; WRAP, 2020c). However, research which has explored food
14
15 (in)secure groups (e.g. Anderson, 2007; Nelson et al., 2007) has not (pre-COVID-19)
16
17 explored the impact of food (in)security on food waste.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Although evidence regarding COVID-19 impacts on food security (EFRA, 2020; House of
25
26 Lords, 2020; Trussell Trust, 2020; National Food Strategy, 2020; MacMillan, 2020;
27
28 University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2020; Food Standards
29
30 Agency, 2020b; Loopstra, 2020), food behaviours (House of Lords, 2020; Food Foundation,
31
32 2020; National Food Strategy, 2020; Food Standards Agency, 2020a, 2020b), cooking skills
33
34 (Benson et al, 2021; Murphy et al., 2021; WRAP, 2020a) and food waste (Hubbub, 2020;
35
36 Macmillan, 2020; WRAP, 2020a; WRAP, 2020c) within the UK population are already
37
38 known, we are not aware of any research to date which explores all these factors combined
39
40 within a sample of the UK population. Addressing a gap in current understanding, the current
41
42 research aims to explore the relationship between food insecurity, food waste, food related
43
44 behaviours and cooking skills of UK consumers following the COVID-19 lockdown.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **2. Method**

52 **2.1. Participants**

53
54 UK based participants (n=473) were recruited during the first UK lockdown
55
56 (25th to 31st March 2020), (age M=35.73 years, SD= 12.67, 63% female). All
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 participants were aged 18 years or over and registered Qualtrics (an online
4 survey tool and participant pool) users who saw an advert for the study, which
5 contained a link to the survey. We sampled at a power calculation (confidence
6 level: 95%, margin of error: 5%, population proportion 50% (due to pilot),
7 population size:66650000, N=385). A convenience sample stratified by age
8 (see Otten et al., 2009; WHO 2020) was used in order to ensure greater
9 representation across age groups and reduce sampling error. Participants
10 received payment for completing the survey. Twenty participants were
11 removed from the analysis due to incomplete data.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **2.2. Design and materials**

27 A cross-sectional survey was hosted on Qualtrics. The survey combined
28 questions from existing measures and novel questions, and consisted of two
29 sections. The first section of the survey addressed dietary preferences, dietary
30 motivations, cooking habits and skills, and food shopping habits. The second
31 section of the survey presented a series of questions about 15 foods commonly
32 consumed in the UK. The foods were selected from the Waves 1-4 National
33 Diet and Nutrition Survey (Public Health England, 2018) and were chosen to
34 represent a range of popular food categories including meat (beef, chicken),
35 grains and cereals (white rice, bread roll, sliced bread, spaghetti / noodles,
36 polenta) and vegetables (green leaves, beans in sauce, lentils, carrot, tomato,
37 green beans, sweet potato, potato).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The questions used a series of visual analog scales to rate the frequency which
57 participants typically consume the 15 foods (6 point scale: every meal - less
58
59
60

1
2
3 than once a month), how many portions they would typically prepare at once
4
5 (scale: 0-25 portions), how long typical preparation (scale: 0-60 minutes) and
6
7 cooking (scale: 0-120 minutes) of the food would take, and the estimated
8
9 proportion of purchased (scale: 0-100%) and cooked (scale: 0-100%) food that
10
11 is wasted. Participants were asked to indicate the method (i.e. boiling,
12
13 poaching, steaming, shallow frying, stir frying, microwaving, grilling, over-
14
15 baking/roasting, stewing, pressure cooker, sous vide, deep frying, barbecue)
16
17 that was typically used to cook each of the 15 foods, and their confidence in
18
19 using each method (3 point scale: “Not confident” to “Very confident”, and “I
20
21 don't know this method” option). Responses were selected using the
22
23 corresponding “radio/option button” for each category. Additional questions
24
25 which addressed portion size, carbon footprint, energy content, food safety
26
27 and animal welfare were asked, however these will not be discussed in the
28
29 current research.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The survey (excluding the USDA food security questions) was developed by
39
40 the research team which included experts in cooking practices, food and
41
42 climate change, and calculations of GHGE from food production and cooking.
43
44 A pilot of the survey was conducted in 2019 from which the survey was
45
46 further developed. For example, a greater variety of cooking techniques and
47
48 appliances were included, and more detailed definitions of scratch, semi-
49
50 scratch cooking, and ultra-processed ingredients were added. The modified
51
52 version of the survey went through face validation and was used for data
53
54 collection in 2020 (Armstrong et al., 2021).
55
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

2.3. Procedure

Participants were recruited via an advert on Qualtrics, a link directed participants to the survey. Before taking part in the survey, participants were asked to read the study information and provide consent. Participants then completed the online survey. Each participant was presented with all questions and the survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

2.4. Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki. All procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Geography Department, University of Sheffield ethics panel (reference, Piloting Zooniverse to help us understand citizen food perceptions - 2nd phase no. 024356). Each participant was presented with an information sheet prior to the survey, with information about how the data would be used in research, and a statement which specified that proceeding with the study would be taken as informed consent.

2.5. Data Analysis

The survey presented six dietary preference options: vegan, lacto-vegetarian, ovo-lacto vegetarian, pescetarian, omnivore, and 'other'. These options were condensed to four categories: vegan, vegetarian (lacto-vegetarian, ovo-lacto vegetarian), omnivore (pescetarian, omnivore), and 'other' due to low counts in some categories and for ease of analysis. BMI was calculated using the height (cm) and weight (kg) values provided by participants, using the formula: $BMI = \text{weight kg} / \text{height m}^2$ (NHS, 2019). As less than 1% of UK

1
2
3 consumers have a BMI below 15 or above 50 (Farooqi, 2014, Withings, 2020),
4
5 0.4% of participants indicated a BMI below 15 and 4.9% indicated a BMI over
6
7 50, these participants were removed from analyses addressing BMI only.
8
9
10 17.9% of participants did not complete the measure of height and weight
11
12 which were used to calculate BMI, these participants were removed from
13
14 analyses addressing BMI only. Participants were classified as food insecure if
15
16 they answered 'often true' and 'sometimes true' to any of three food security
17
18 questions. All other participants were classified as food secure. Two
19
20 participants declined to answer food security questions and were removed
21
22 from analyses relating to food (in)security. Data from n=451 participants were
23
24 used to explore food (in)security questions. To calculate participant cooking
25
26 confidence, confidence ratings were converted to numerical values: 0 - I don't
27
28 know this method; 1 - Not confident, 2 - Little confident, 3- Confident, 4-
29
30 Very confident. Overall cooking confidence was calculated from the
31
32 confidence level indicated for each cooking method.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 26
41
42 (IBM, 2019) was used to conduct the analyses. A series of descriptive, Chi-
43
44 square, Kruskal Wallis H and correlation analyses were conducted to explore
45
46 the data.
47
48
49

50 51 **3. Results**

52 **3.1. *Demographics, dietary preference and motivations.***

53
54 Data from 453 UK based participants were used (63% female, mean age
55
56 =35.73 years). 65% of participants were employed (11% not working, 10%
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 student, 8% homemaker, 4% other, 2% seasonal worker) with the majority
4
5 living in small (33%) or medium (29%) sized cities. Fewer participants
6
7 indicated that they lived in large cities (18%) or rural areas (21%). The
8
9 majority of participants report living in a two person household (49%), and
10
11 33% have at least one child in the household. The average household income
12
13 is £1090.74 per week (SD= 999.59, median =£718.50). The average individual
14
15 weekly income is £506.67 (SD=640.98, median=£372.00).
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 An omnivore diet (77%) is most common, with fewer participants following a
23
24 vegetarian (9%), vegan (5%) or pescatarian (4%) diet. A small number (5%)
25
26 of participants follow other diets due to food allergies, religious beliefs or
27
28 health reasons. The majority of participants indicated concern about how the
29
30 food they eat affects their health (81%), animal welfare (73%), the
31
32 environment (66%) with fewer indicating concern about how the food they eat
33
34 affects the welfare of other humans (55%).
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 We next explored whether participants limit their meat intake, and why. We
42
43 observed that 62% of participants limit their intake of meat. The primary
44
45 reasons indicated for limiting meat intake include environmental concerns
46
47 (33%), animal welfare (32%), health (28%), cost of meat (19%) with fewer
48
49 indicating meat intake is limited due to taste preference (11%), religious
50
51 reasons (2%) or other reasons (4%).
52
53
54
55

56 **3.2. Food (in)security**

57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

39% of participants indicated that they have experienced an element of food insecurity within the last 12 months. The most common experience of food insecurity was worrying about running out of food (32%), followed by not being able to afford to eat (27%) and food running out (21%). We observed that having children in the household ($\chi^2(1)=.36$, $p=.45$), employment status ($\chi^2(5)=10.61$, $p=.06$), gender ($\chi^2(2)=.06$, $p=.97$), individual income (mean rank insecure= 3161.69, secure = 3514.13, $H(1)=52.76$, $p<.001$), household income (mean rank insecure = 2969.14, secure = 3638.96, $H(1)=190.31$, $p<.001$), and living in a urban/rural area ($\chi^2(3)=.3.37$, $p=.34$) were not associated with experience of food insecurity. However, participants who are younger (mean rank insecure= 208.31, secure= 236.65, $H(1)=5.11$, $p=.02$), living in a smaller household (mean rank insecure= 215.32, secure= 232.10, $H(1)=5.08$, $p=.02$), and have a higher BMI (mean rank insecure= 2856.71, secure= 2447.74, $H(1)=89.24$, $p=.001$) are more likely to report experience of food insecurity. Food (in)security did not vary between vegans (46%), vegetarians (49%) and omnivores (36%), however, those with 'other' dietary preferences reported a greater incidence of food insecurity (Fisher's Exact=9.87, $p=.02$).

Being food secure is associated with greater concern about how the food affects the environment (mean rank insecure= 208.66, secure= 237.20, $H(1)=5.94$, $p=.02$) and the welfare of other humans (mean rank insecure= 209.57, secure= 236.61, $H(1)=5.11$, $p=.02$). However, food (in)security was not associated with differences in concern about how food affects health (mean rank insecure= 227.14, secure = 225.26, $H(1)=.03$, $p=.87$), or animal welfare (mean rank insecure= 220.51, secure= 229.54, $H(1)=.60$, $p=.44$).

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 When we considered motivations of meat consumption, we observed that food
4 (in)security was not associated with limiting meat intake overall ($\chi^2(1)=.25$,
5 $p=.62$), or individual reasons for limiting meat intake (reason: religious,
6 $\chi^2(1)=.40$, $p=.72$; environmental concern, $\chi^2(1)=2.50$, $p=.11$; animal welfare,
7 $\chi^2(1)=.26$, $p=.61$; taste, $\chi^2(1)=.74$, $p=.39$; health, $\chi^2(1)=.63$, $p=.43$, price,
8 $\chi^2(1)=2.56$, $p=.11$; other, $\chi^2(1)=1.83$, $p=.18$).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Next we considered whether food (in)security was associated with the types of
20 food consumed. The data indicated that food insecure participants eat bread
21 rolls more frequently than food secure (means rank secure=213.35, insecure=
22 245.58, $H(1)=6.97$, $p=.01$), however, no differences were observed for any
23 other type of food featured (beef, chicken, green leaves, beans in sauce, lentils,
24 white rice, sliced bread, potato, spaghetti/noodles, polenta, carrots, tomato,
25 green beans, sweet potato). In addition, food (in)security was not associated
26 with frequency of fast-food consumption (mean rank insecure= 229.38,
27 secure= 223.82, $H(1)=.25$, $p=.62$) or frequency of preparation of food in the
28 home (mean rank insecure= 229.35, secure= 223.84, $H(1)=.23$, $p=.63$).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 Food (in)security was not associated with greater use of particular cooking
46 techniques, with the exception of using oven-baking or roasting to reheat food,
47 which was more common amongst food secure participants (mean rank
48 insecure= 207.71, secure= 237.75, $H(1)=5.97$, $p=.02$). Food (in)security was
49 not associated with greater use of particular food related activities including
50 use of a shopping list ($H(1)=.01$, $p=.95$), checking what food is in the house
51 before shopping ($H(1)=.25$, $p=.62$), preparing weekly meal plans ($H(1)=.02$,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

p=.89), cooking more than one meal at a time ($H(1)=.03$, $p=.88$), cooking and freezing meals in advance ($H(1)=.24$, $p=.63$), buying unknown foods ($H(1)=3.59$, $p=.06$), baking bread from scratch ($H(1)=.02$, $p=.90$), eating communally as a family ($H(1)=.17$, $p=.68$), enjoying food preparation and cooking ($H(1)=1.51$, $p=.22$), teaching children to cook ($H(1)=2.12$, $p=.15$), inviting children to cook ($H(1)=2.81$, $p=.09$), using a food processor ($H(1)=.65$, $p=.42$) or following a recipe ($H(1)=.18$, $p=.67$).

3.3. Food waste

3.3.1. What type of food is wasted most?

We considered two types of food waste, all food which has been purchased and thrown away uneaten (purchased waste), and food which has been cooked before being thrown away (cooked waste). First we considered all purchased food waste. Participants estimated that on average 9% of the featured purchased foods are thrown away. More green leaves (13%), carrots (11%), potatoes (11%) and sliced bread (11%) are thrown away than beef (7%) and chicken (7%). When considering cooked food, participants estimated that 7% of the featured foods are thrown away. A greater percentage of polenta (9%), green leaves (8%) and white rice (8%) are thrown away than beef (6%), chicken (5%) and bread (roll 5%, slice 6%).

3.3.2. Do demographics and food insecurity impact reported food waste?

Gender did not impact levels of cooked waste ($H(1)=1.60$, $p=.21$), however, males reported more purchased waste, ($H(1)=7.27$, $p=.007$). There was no

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 association between habitation area and cooked waste ($H(3)=5.68$, $p=.13$),
4
5 however, those living in small cities reported greater amounts of purchased
6
7 waste than those in rural, large or medium size cities ($H(3)=25.85$, $p<.001$).
8
9

10
11
12 Household income was weakly associated with waste, higher income
13
14 households report more cooked ($r(6778)=.05$, $p<.001$) and purchased food
15
16 ($r(6778)=.06$, $p<.001$) waste. Households with children report more purchased
17
18 (mean rank: children = 3656.72, no children = 3273.71, $H(1)=56.97$, $p<.001$)
19
20 and cooked waste (mean rank: children = 3872.29; no children = 3170.16,
21
22 $H(1)=193.60$, $p<.001$). Age was weakly associated with waste, younger
23
24 participants reporting more purchased and cooked waste (purchased,
25
26 $r(6778)=-.41$, $p<.001$; cooked, $r(6778)=-.07$, $p<.001$). We observed a weak
27
28 positive correlation between size of household and level of purchased
29
30 ($r(6778)=.11$, $p<.001$) and cooked waste ($r(6778)=.09$, $p<.001$). BMI is
31
32 weakly associated with waste, those with a higher BMI reported more
33
34 purchased ($r(5190)=.08$, $p<.001$) and cooked waste ($r(5383)=.04$, $p=.01$).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Next, we considered the association between self-reported food waste and
44
45 food (in)security. Food insecure participants reported more purchased (mean
46
47 rank insecure = 3738.59, secure = 3153.29, $H(1)=145.36$, $p<.001$), and cooked
48
49 food waste (mean rank insecure = 3739.19, secure = 3152.91, $H(1)=147.51$,
50
51 $p<.001$) than food secure participants. Food secure participants reported
52
53 throwing away less of all purchased and cooked foods of all food types (see
54
55
56 Table 1).
57
58
59
60

3.4. *Cooking confidence*

3.4.1. *Cooking methods and confidence*

Participants were confident with the majority of cooking methods. The majority of participants were confident (response: confident or very confident) about boiling (98%), roasting (95%), grilling (94%), microwaving (93%), stir frying (91%), shallow frying (77%), steaming (75%), stewing (72%), BBQing (60%) or poaching (59%) food. Fewer were confident about deep frying (46%), using a pressure cooker (25%) or sous vide (6%) to cook food. Sous vide was the least known cooking technique (51%). See Supplementary Materials (SM2) for information about preparation and cooking time for each food type.

3.4.2. *Demographics and confidence*

Overall, cooking confidence was not associated with gender ($H(2)=4.10$ $p=.13$), size of household ($r(448)=.07$, $p=.16$), children in the household ($H(1)=.65$, $p=.42$), habitation area ($H(3)=3.23$, $p=.36$), BMI ($r(379)=.07$, $p=.16$), dietary preference ($H(3)=1.67$ $p=.64$) or household income ($r(448)=.07$, $p=.16$). However, learning to cook at a younger age ($r(449)=-.27$, $<.001$) and being older ($r(448)=.25$, $p<.001$) were associated with greater cooking confidence.

Food (in)security was not associated with overall cooking confidence (mean rank secure = 235.58, insecure = 211.17, $H(1)=3.78$, $p=.05$).

However, we observed an association between food (in)security when individual cooking methods are considered. Food secure participants

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 reported greater cooking confidence with a range of cooking methods
4 including boiling, (mean rank secure= 235.33, insecure=211.56,
5
6 H(1)=6.87, p=.01), stir frying (mean rank secure= 234.37, insecure=
7
8 213.0, H(1)=4.43, p=.04), grilling (mean rank secure= 232.46,
9
10 insecure= 216.00, H(1)=8.00, p=.01) and roasting (mean rank secure
11
12 =236.62, insecure= 209.56; H(1)=8.39, p=.004). However, food
13
14 (in)security was not associated with greater confidence in the majority
15
16 of cooking methods (Poaching H(1)=1.85, p=.17; Steaming H(1)=1.49,
17
18 p=.22; Shallow frying H(1)=1.07, p=.30; Stewing H(1)=.22, p=.64;
19
20 Microwaving H(1)=1.74, p=.19; Sous Vide H(1)=.21, p=.65; Deep
21
22 Frying H(1)=.20, p=.65; BBQ H(1)=1.7, p=.19).

23
24 We explored the relationship between cooking confidence and food
25
26 waste, and observed that cooking confidence is weakly correlated with
27
28 lower amounts of purchased ($r(4385)=-.13$, $p<.001$) and cooked food
29
30 waste ($r(5385)=-.09$, $p<.001$).

3.5. *Ultra-processed, semi-finished or from scratch?*

31
32 59% of participants indicated that they typically cook food from scratch (e.g.
33
34 vegetables, sugar, butter), with fewer (36%) using semi-finished products (e.g.
35
36 pasta with ready-made sauce) and only 5% of participants indicated that they
37
38 primarily cook with ultra-processed foods (e.g. frozen lasagne, instant
39
40 noodles), ($\chi^2(2)=202.33$, $p<.001$). Food (in)security ($\chi^2(2)=.36$, $p=.83$), size of
41
42 household (H(2)=1.63, $p=.44$), age (H(2)=1.63, $p=.44$) and gender ($\chi^2(2)=3.23$,
43
44 $p=.20$) were not associated with greater use of foods from scratch, semi-
45
46 finished or ultra-processed products. However, cooking confidence
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (H(2)=34.25, $p<.001$) and higher household income (H(2)=6.78, $p=.03$) were
4 associated with a greater use of from scratch or semi-finished products than
5 ultra-processed foods.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Next we explored the association between remaining demographic factors and
13 the type of ingredient used. Due to the low number of participants who
14 primarily used ultra-processed food it was not possible to include this group in
15 analyses (due to minimum expected counts not being achieved). Having
16 children in the household ($\chi^2(1)=.66$, $p=.42$), dietary preference ($\chi^2(3)=1.22$,
17 $p=.75$) and urban/rural living ($\chi^2(3)=1.69$, $p=.64$), was not associated with
18 greater use of cooking from scratch or semi-finished products (employment
19 status could not be calculated due to minimum expected counts not being
20 achieved).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The most common reasons to cook were out of necessity (34%), to care for
36 family (21%) or because it's less expensive (18%) with fewer indicating they
37 primarily cook for pleasure (10%) or for health reasons (9%). Only 3% of
38 participants indicated that they do not cook (are cooked for by another), and
39 only 1 participant (0.2%) stated that they don't cook, instead tending to eat
40 out, eat takeaway or ready meals (1.8% indicate 'other' reasons for cooking),
41 ($\chi^2(7)=336.28$, $p<.001$). Next, we explored whether the main reason for
42 cooking is associated with the use of certain types of ingredients. Those who
43 cook from scratch typically do so for pleasure (86%), for health reasons (83%)
44 and to care for family (68%). Participants who cook because it is less
45 expensive primarily cook from scratch (60%) but also use semi-finished
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 products (35%). Those who cook out of necessity (which forms that largest
4
5 group) primarily use semi-finished products (55%) and fewer from scratch
6
7 foods (40%), (see Figure 1).
8
9

12 3.6. Food packaging

14 Overall, participants purchase most food (featured in the current research) raw
15
16 or fresh in packaging, raw or fresh not in packaging or dried. Fewer foods
17
18 were purchased canned, cooked and ready to eat, ready to cook, frozen (2%),
19
20 as a long-lasting product or refrigerated and ready to cook, ($\chi^2(9)=6223.30$,
21
22 $p<.001$), (see Table 2). We observed that several demographic factors were
23
24 associated with purchasing food in certain packaging types. Participants from
25
26 larger households reported purchasing more ready to cook products (mean
27
28 rank= 2798.81) and raw/fresh in packaging (mean rank= 2632.32), with
29
30 participants from smaller households being more likely to purchase products
31
32 which are refrigerated and ready to cook (mean rank= 2446.47), ($H(8)=22.05$,
33
34 $p=.01$). Gender, urban/rural living and having children in the household did
35
36 not impact the packaging type which food was purchased in (see
37
38 Supplementary materials SM3). Next we considered whether food (in)security
39
40 is associated with purchasing food in particular packaging types. Though the
41
42 analysis of food (in)security and packaging type was significant
43
44 ($\chi^2(8)=5773.11$, $p<.001$), this is driven by differences in frequency of
45
46 packaging type present in both the food secure ($\chi^2(8)=3725.17$, $p<.001$) and
47
48 insecure ($\chi^2(8)=2078.83$, $p<.001$), rather than differences between the groups,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 (see Table 2).

We observed that the type of packaging varies by food type ($\chi^2(112)=7983.76$, $p<.001$), with beans primarily being purchased in a can (77%), beef (72%) and chicken (66%) being purchased raw or fresh in packaging. Vegetables are typically purchased raw/fresh not in packaging or raw/fresh in packaging (carrots: no pack 63%, in packaging 30%; cavassa: no pack 41%, in packaging 31%; green leaves: no pack 40%, in packaging 42%; tomato no pack 51%, in packaging 36%; potato no pack 53%, in packaging 38%; sweet potato: no pack 67%, in packaging 26%). Beans are most commonly brought tinned (77%) whereas lentils (56%), rice (61%), spaghetti / noodles (64%) and polenta (53%) are typically purchased dried. Bread is typically purchased cooked and ready to eat (43%) or raw / fresh in packaging (34%), (see Figure 2). See Supplementary Materials (SM4) for an overview of packaging type varies by food of secure and insecure participants.

4. Discussion

This study demonstrates the incidence of self-reported food (in)security, food waste, cooking confidence and the types of ingredients being purchased by households following UK COVID-19 lockdown. We observed three key findings. First, 39% of participants have experienced food insecurity in the last 12 months. Second, approximately 9% of purchased and 7% of cooked foods are thrown away. Some foods were more likely to be thrown away as purchased (e.g. carrots, potatoes), whilst other foods were more likely to be wasted after having been cooked (e.g. rice, polenta). Food insecure participants self-reported a greater proportion of food waste than food secure participants. Third, participants were typically more confident with boiling, microwaving and stir fry cooking techniques. However, confidence varied by

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 food (in)security, with food secure participants having greater confidence with a range
4
5 of cooking methods (boiling, grilling, roasting).
6
7
8
9

10 4.1. *Food (in)security*

11
12 Following the House of Lords (2020) report, which was the first
13
14 comprehensive government report to explore the prevalence of food
15
16 (in)security in the UK since 2010, we provide valuable additional insight
17
18 which supplements the report. We observed that 39% of the participants
19
20 indicate that they have experienced food insecurity in the last 12 months. The
21
22 prevalence of food insecurity was greater for those who are younger, have a
23
24 greater BMI, or living in a smaller household. Given that food insecurity often
25
26 leads to the consumption of a less healthful diet (Hanson and Connor, 2014),
27
28 which can have a negative impact on long term health and wellbeing
29
30 (Gunderson and Ziliak, 2015; Laraia, 2013). It is suggested that the prevalence
31
32 of food insecurity in younger adults must be targeted by policy makers, to
33
34 prevent both the short term and long term negative impact on the health and
35
36 economic costs of poor diet (Tarasuk *et al.*, 2015).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 4.2. *Food waste and packaging*

46
47 Participants estimate that 9% of purchased and 7% of cooked foods are thrown
48
49 away. Though self-report measures can be less accurate than objective
50
51 measures (e.g. weighting of waste (WRAP, 2007; van Herpen *et al.*, 2019;
52
53 Ventour, 2008), we provided valuable insight into the amount of food waste
54
55 consumers are aware of producing and identifying foods which are being
56
57 wasted. In line with previous research, we identified that bread and fresh
58
59
60

1
2
3 vegetables (e.g. green leaves, potatoes, carrots) are the most commonly wasted
4
5 foods (WRAP, 2020b; WRAP, 2018; Quested and Murphy, 2014). Our results
6
7 also provided an update for the packaging and food waste in the UK which has
8
9 had limited investigation since 2012.
10
11
12
13

14
15 We observed that green leaves are reported as the most wasted purchased food
16
17 and second most wasted cooked food. Due to the high proportion of green leaf
18
19 food waste, we suggested that green leaves would be a valuable target of a
20
21 food waste consumer facing campaign, such as WRAP's "Make Toast Not
22
23 Waste" campaign", which highlighted how much bread is wasted, provided
24
25 information about how to store and use sliced bread to prevent waste (WRAP,
26
27 2018). By modifying packing and portion type, improving supply chain
28
29 efficiency and product life, and providing consumers with information about
30
31 how to store green leaves (e.g. store in fridge with paper towel to absorb
32
33 moisture, steaming and freezing fresh leaves) or how to use cooked left-overs
34
35 (e.g. add to an omelette), consumers can minimise waste while retaining and
36
37 benefiting from the nutritional value of the foods.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In line with previous research we observed that greater amounts of food waste
46
47 are reported in certain demographic groups (Stancu, Haugaard and
48
49 Lähtenmäki, 2016; Quested and Luzecka, 2014). We observed that some
50
51 demographic factors (age, size of household, income, BMI) were only weakly
52
53 associated with food waste. However, a study conducted with Turkish
54
55 households found a segment of careless planners and cooks, mainly
56
57 characterized by young, highly educated, full-time workers, living in a
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 household with no child, and that have low levels of planned shopping and
4
5 cooking skills, had greater food wastage behaviours. In comparison, the
6
7 segment of resourceful planners and cooks, mainly characterized by older,
8
9 married, low education, low income, larged-sized family people that
10
11 demonstrated excellent planned shopping and cooking skills, resulted in lower
12
13 levels of food waste (Özbük, Coşkun, and Filimonau, 2021). Hence, we
14
15 suggested that the improvement of certain food management behaviours, such
16
17 as better food storage and meal planning may contribute to a reduction in
18
19 purchased food waste. We observed that having children in the home was
20
21 associated with greater amounts of purchased and cooked food waste. Based
22
23 on the current findings and previous research (Quested and Luzecka, 2014) we
24
25 suggest that on-plate leftovers due to preparing too much food may be a
26
27 contributor to cooked food waste in many homes which could be targeted by
28
29 food management interventions.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *4.3. Cooking confidence*

39
40 Addressing a gap in existing literature, we explored the relationship between food
41
42 experience of food (in)security and food waste. We observed that food insecure
43
44 participants self-report a greater proportion of purchased and cooked food waste.
45
46 However, we interpreted these differences with caution . Though it is possible that
47
48 food insecure homes produce more food waste, we must also consider that food
49
50 insecure participants may perceive food to be of a relatively higher value and
51
52 therefore are more aware of food being wasted. In addition, the types of food featured
53
54 in the current study, such as predominantly fresh products (e.g. vegetables, meat)
55
56 carry a higher risk of food waste than preserved and shelf stable foods. As food
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 insecure homes are nudged toward cheaper shelf stable foods which carry less risk of
4
5 food (and financial) waste (House of Lords, 2020) it is likely that the insecure
6
7 participants would purchase (and therefore waste) the featured foods on a less
8
9 frequent basis than food secure households. This observation presents an interesting
10
11 yet complex relationship between consumers and food choices which has been
12
13 identified within the Low Income Diet and Nutrition Survey (Nelson *et al.*, 2007;
14
15 National Centre for Social Research *et al.*, 2008) and National Diet and Nutrition
16
17 Survey (Public Health England, 2018), however would benefit from further research.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 We observed that the majority of consumers are confident with boiling, roasting,
25
26 grilling, microwaving, steaming and stir frying foods. However, consumers were less
27
28 confident with cooking methods which require specialised equipment (e.g. sous vide,
29
30 pressure cooker) or may be considered higher risk or harmful to health (i.e. deep
31
32 frying), (Raber *et al.*, 2016, WHO, 2015). Notably, we observed that food insecure
33
34 participants report lower levels of confidence using specific cooking methods
35
36 including boiling, stir frying, grilling and roasting. The difference in the confidence of
37
38 using specific cooking methods may be due to familiarity with the methods, or access
39
40 to cooking equipment. As the cooking method used to prepare food can impact the
41
42 nutritional content of foods consumed (Miglio *et al.*, 2008; Yuan *et al.*, 2009), we
43
44 suggested that low levels of cooking confidence may impact the nutritional content of
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.4. *Ultra-processed, semi-finished or from scratch?*

54 Contrary to expectation, food insecurity was not associated with greater use of
55
56 processed or ultra-processed foods. However, greater higher income households
57
58 report and those with greater cooking confidence report greater use of from 'scratch'
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 and semi-processed foods than ultra-processed foods, suggesting that a combination
4
5 of factors nudge consumers toward ingredient type, nutrition, and subsequently
6
7 health.
8
9

12 **4.5. Theoretical implications**

14 There is a lack of appropriate theoretical constructs related to cooking and food skills
15
16 measures and research, and previous attempts to find appropriate theoretical models have
17
18 been unsuccessful (McGowan et al., 2017). We were unable to identify an existing theoretical
19
20 model which was applicable to the current research. Therefore, we propose that learning
21
22 cooking skills at an early age and experience of cooking may impact cooking confidence,
23
24 which in turn is associated with cooking behaviours such as cooking from scratch and levels
25
26 of food waste. Given that food security was associated with greater confidence with certain
27
28 cooking methods, such as roasting and stir frying, we suggest that experience of different
29
30 cooking methods may be associated with socio-economic status. However, as the relationship
31
32 between SES, cooking skills and cooking methods is unclear (Adams et al., 2015; Assumpção
33
34 et al., 2020), we suggest that the proposed relationship could be explored by future research.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **4.6. Practical implications**

44 Building on the House of Lords (2020) report, which was the first government report to
45
46 comprehensively explore the prevalence of food security in the UK since 2010, we provided
47
48 further evidence of the prevalence of food insecurity and highlighted vulnerable demographic
49
50 groups. In addition, we observed how food (in)security is associated with food related to
51
52 wider food behaviours and attitudes, such as food waste, cooking confidence and food buying
53
54 behaviours. Given the impact of poor diet on long term health and well being, and subsequent
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 economic costs (House of Lords, 2020) we highlighted that 39% of participants have
4
5 experienced food insecurity within the last 12 months.
6
7
8
9

10 The House of Lords (2020) and current research present data collected following the outbreak
11 of the COVID-19 pandemic. Yet, as stated by Professor Defeyter (House of Lords, 2020), it
12 is unknown whether the prevalence of food insecurity observed prevalence of food insecurity
13 is due COVID-19 or has simply been exposed following COVID-19. Regardless of the cause,
14 there is an urgency for policy makers to tackle food insecurity within the UK in order to
15 minimise the immediate and long term impacts on the health, wellbeing and economy of the
16 UK.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 We have identified how the type of food wasted varies between cooked and purchased foods.
30 This highlights which foods could be targeted by campaigns and education interventions,
31 such as the “Love Food Hate Waste” campaign (WRAP, 2018), which provide consumers
32 with tips on how to reduce food waste. By targeting the foods which are wasted most often,
33 the impact of such campaigns can be maximised. As UK consumers waste 6.6 million tonnes
34 of food a year (WRAP, 2020a), reducing the amount of food waste produced would provide a
35 key element in reducing the impact of the food system on the environment (Camilleri *et al.*,
36 2019; Clark, 2019; Tirado-Von Der Pahlen, 2017).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 4.7. Limitations

50
51 The current research presented data collected during the first UK lockdown, providing a
52 snapshot of behaviour and attitudes at the time. However, behaviours and attitudes have
53 changed in response to lockdown restrictions being eased (WRAP, 2020c), highlighting the
54 need for a longitudinal approach to this area of research. The current research reported
55
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 consumer experience of food insecurity in the last 12 months. Although COVID-19 triggered
4 an increase in the incidence of food insecurity (House of Lords, 2020; Trussell Trust, 2020)
5 we were unable to distinguish between consumers who experienced food insecurity in
6 response to COVID-19, and those who had previously experienced food insecurity. We
7 suggested that those who have previously experienced food insecurity may have different
8 food related attitudes and behaviours compared to those who had recently become food
9 insecure, which may have introduced a confound to the research.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The use of convenience sampling offers an efficient method of recruitment with many
22 advantages (see Jager, Putnick, and Bornstein, 2017). Due to the use of this method these
23 data are not generalisable to the wider UK and international populations, however, could be
24 applied to populations with similar demographic characteristics. Finally, due to this being a
25 pilot study, we did not have sufficient resources to explore the validity, reliability and
26 common method bias of our survey instrument. A full independent validation will be
27 published in the future, however, due to the critical and time sensitive nature of these results,
28 we have chosen to publish the findings first.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

4.8. *Future Research*

41
42
43
44 Consumer food behaviours have changed between initial lockdown (WRAP, 2020a) and in
45 response to lockdown restrictions being eased (WRAP, 2020c). It is probable that as we
46 return to “normal” and in response to the impactful WRAP “Love Food Hate Waste”
47 campaign, additional changes in food behaviours will be observed. These rapidly changing
48 behaviours highlight the need for a longitudinal approach to understand how consumers
49 attitudes and behaviours are changing. This understanding would allow further campaigns
50 and interventions to be developed which utilize the motivations which triggered positive food
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attitudes and behaviours following lockdown. Implementing effective campaigns and
4
5 interventions could provide a long term impact on food waste, nutrition and public health.
6
7
8
9

10 **4.9. Conclusions**

11
12 The current research provided an insight into the prevalence of food insecurity, food waste,
13
14 food behaviours and cooking confidence of UK consumers following the COVID-19
15
16 lockdown. We replicated earlier findings which demonstrate that specific foods are more
17
18 likely to be thrown away. In addition, we identified which foods are more likely to be wasted
19
20 when purchased or after being cooked. We observed that green leaves are the most
21
22 commonly wasted food and suggest a public facing campaign (based on Wraps “Make Toast
23
24 Not Waste” campaign (WRAP 2018)), and additional supply chain and operations research to
25
26 improve total open and closed shelf life. By providing a novel insight into the relationship
27
28 between food insecurity, cooking skills, food waste and types of food purchased in a post-
29
30 COVID UK food system, our results provide an evidence base for post lockdown food
31
32 policies and actions, including interventions which could improve access to healthy and
33
34 sustainable diets and reduce nutrition related health inequalities, and guidance for public-
35
36 facing communications. Subsequently this could improve the health and wellbeing of the UK
37
38 population, while reducing the environmental impact of the food system.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference

Armstrong, B., Reynolds, C., Bridge, G., Oakden, L., Wang, C., Panzone, L., Schmidt Rivera, X., Kause, A., Ffoulkes, C., Krawczyk, C., Miller, G., and Serjeant, S (2021). How Does Citizen Science Compare to Online Survey Panels? A Comparison of Food Knowledge and Perceptions Between the Zooniverse, Prolific and Qualtrics UK Panels. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* 4:575021. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2020.575021

Adams, J., Goffe, L., Adamson, A.J., Halligan, J., O'Brien, N., Purves, R., Stead, M., Stocken, D. and White, M. (2015). Prevalence and socio-demographic correlates of cooking skills in UK adults: cross-sectional analysis of data from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), 1-13.

Adams, J., and White, M. (2015). Characterisation of UK diets according to degree of food processing and associations with socio-demographics and obesity: cross-sectional analysis of UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey (2008–12). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), 160. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0317-y>

1
2
3
4
5 Anderson, A. S. (2007). Nutrition interventions in women in low-income groups in the UK.

6
7
8 *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 66(1), 25-32.

9
10
11
12 De Backer, C., Teunissen, L., Cuykx, I., Decorte, P., Pabian, S., Gerritsen, S., Matthys, C., Al

13
14 Sabbah, H., Van Royen, K. and Corona Cooking Survey Study Group, (2020). An evaluation

15
16 of the COVID-19 pandemic and perceived social distancing policies in relation to planning,

17
18 selecting, and preparing healthy meals: an observational study in 38 countries worldwide.

19
20
21 *Frontiers in nutrition*, 7,621726. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2020.621726.

22
23
24
25 Benson, T., Murphy, B., McCloat, A., Mooney, E., Dean, M., and Lavelle, F. (2021). From

26
27 the pandemic to the pan: The impact of COVID19 on parental inclusion of children in

28
29 cooking activities – a cross-continental survey. *Public Health Nutrition*, 1-17.

30
31
32 doi:10.1017/S1368980021001932.

33
34
35
36
37 Brunner, T. A., Van der Horst, K., and Siegrist, M. (2010). Convenience food products.

38
39 Drivers for consumption. *Appetite*, 55(3), 498-506.

40
41
42
43
44 Camilleri, A. R., Larrick, R. P., Hossain, S., and Patino-Echeverri, D. (2019) Consumers

45
46 underestimate the emissions associated with food but are aided by labels. *Nature Climate*

47
48
49 *Change* 9, no. 1, 53-58.

50
51
52
53 Caraher, M., Dixon, P., Lang, T., and Carr-Hill, R. (1999). The state of cooking in England:

54
55 the relationship of cooking skills to food choice. *British Food Journal*. 101 (8), 590-609.

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 Clark, M. (2019). Healthy diets as a climate change mitigation strategy. In *Environmental*
4
5 *Nutrition*, 243-261. Academic Press. Available from:

6
7 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978012811660900014X?via%3Dihub>
8
9

10
11
12 Dyen, M., and Sirieix, L. (2016). How does a local initiative contribute to social inclusion
13
14 and promote sustainable food practices? Focus on the example of social cooking workshops.

15
16 *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 40(6), 685-694. DOI:

17
18 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12281>
19
20

21
22
23 EFRA (Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2020). COVID-19 and Food Supply.

24
25 Available from:

26
27 [https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5801/cmselect/cmenvfru/263/26306.htm#_idTextAn](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5801/cmselect/cmenvfru/263/26306.htm#_idTextAnchor023)
28
29 [chor023](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5801/cmselect/cmenvfru/263/26306.htm#_idTextAnchor023). (Accessed: 15/09/2020).
30
31
32

33
34
35 Farooqi, S. I. (2014). Genetic, molecular and physiological mechanisms involved in human
36
37 obesity: Society for Endocrinology Medal Lecture 2012. *Clinical endocrinology*, 82(1), 23-
38
39 28.
40
41
42

43
44
45 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2018). The State of Food
46
47 Insecurity and Nutrition in the World, Building Climate Resilience for Food Security and
48
49 Nutrition, p 138. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/I9553EN/i9553en.pdf> (accessed 29 June
50
51 2020).
52
53

54
55
56 Food Foundation (2016). Veg Facts - A briefing by the Food Foundation.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Available at: <https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/FF-Veg-Doc-V5.pdf>
4
5 (accessed 12 October 2020).
6
7
8
9

10 Food Foundation (2020). Veg Facts 2020 in brief. Available at:
11
12 [https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Pease-Please-Veg-Facts-2020-In-](https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Pease-Please-Veg-Facts-2020-In-Brief-spreads-1.pdf)
13 [Brief-spreads-1.pdf](https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Pease-Please-Veg-Facts-2020-In-Brief-spreads-1.pdf) (accessed 12 October 2020).
14
15
16
17
18

19 Food Standards Agency (Ipsos Mori, Bright Harbour), (12th August 2020a). The COVID-19
20 consumer research. Available at: [https://www.food.gov.uk/research/research-projects/the-](https://www.food.gov.uk/research/research-projects/the-covid-19-consumer-research)
21 [covid-19-consumer-research](https://www.food.gov.uk/research/research-projects/the-covid-19-consumer-research). (accessed August 17th, 2020).
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Food Standards Agency (Ipsos Mori), (2020b). COVID-19 Consumer Tracker Waves 1-4.
29 Available at: [https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/covid-19-wave-1-](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/covid-19-wave-1-4-report-final-mc.pdf)
30 [4-report-final-mc.pdf](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/covid-19-wave-1-4-report-final-mc.pdf). (accessed September 29th, 2020).
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Gundersen, C. and Ziliak, J.P. (2015). Food insecurity and health outcomes. *Health Aff.*, 34,
38 1830–1839.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Hanson, K.L. and Connor, L.M. (2014) Food insecurity and dietary quality in US adults and
45 children: A systematic review. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 100, 682–692.
46
47
48
49
50

51 House of Lords (2020). Hungry for change: fixing the failures in food. Select Committee on
52 Food, Poverty, Health and the Environment, HL Paper 85.
53
54 <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/1762/documents/17092/default/>
55
56
57
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 Hubbub (2020). How has COVID-19 changed our eating habits? Available at:
4
5 <https://www.hubbub.org.uk/blog/how-has-covid-19-changed-our-eating-habits> (accessed
6
7 August 17th, 2020)
8
9

10
11
12 Jager, J., Putnick, D. L., and Bornstein, M. H. (2017). II. More than just convenient: The
13
14 scientific merits of homogeneous convenience samples. *Monographs of the Society for*
15
16 *Research in Child Development*, 82(2), 13-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12296>
17
18
19

20
21
22 Kause, A., Bruine de Bruin, W., Millward-Hopkins, J., and Olsson, H. (2009). Public
23
24 perceptions of how to reduce carbon footprints of consumer food choices. *Environmental*
25
26 *Research Letters* 14, no. 1, 114005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab465d>.
27
28
29

30
31
32 Kline, T. J. B. (2017). Sample issues, methodological implications, and best practices.
33
34 *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*,
35
36 49(2), 71–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000054>
37
38

39
40
41 Lam, M., and Adams, J. (2017). Association between home food preparation skills and
42
43 behaviour, and consumption of ultra-processed foods: Cross-sectional analysis of the UK
44
45 National Diet and nutrition survey (2008-2009). *The international journal of behavioral*
46
47 *nutrition and physical activity*, 14(1), 68. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-017-0524-9>
48

49
50
51 Laraia, B.A. (2013). Food insecurity and chronic disease. *Advanced Nutrition*, 4, 203–212.
52

53
54
55 Loopstra, R. (2020). Vulnerability to food insecurity since the COVID-19 lockdown
56
57 Preliminary report 14 April 2020 King's College London, Food Foundation,
58
59 <https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp->
60

[content/uploads/2020/04/Report_COVID19FoodInsecurity-final.pdf](https://www.britishfoodjournal.com/content/uploads/2020/04/Report_COVID19FoodInsecurity-final.pdf)>

MacMillan, T. (2009). What's wrong with waste? *Food Ethics*, 4 (3) p. 4.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.602.6689&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

MacMillan, T. (2020). "UK food behaviour and attitudes YouGov poll". *World Pandemic*

Research Network . WPRN-412052, 2020-04-21 at 08h24 (GMT): Available at:

<https://wprn.org/item/412052> (accessed August 17th, 2020)

McGowan, L., Caraher, M., Raats, M., Lavelle, F., Hollywood, L., McDowell, D., Spence, M., McCloat, A., Mooney, E. and Dean, M., (2017). Domestic cooking and food skills: a review. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, 57(11), 2412-2431.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2015.1072495>

Miglio, C., Chiavaro, E., Visconti, A., Fogliano, V., and Pellegrini, N. (2008). Effects of different cooking methods on nutritional and physicochemical characteristics of selected vegetables. *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 56(1), 139-147.

Murphy, B., Benson, T., McCloat, A., Mooney, E., Elliott, C., Dean, M., and Lavelle, F. (2021). Changes in Consumers' Food Practices during the COVID-19 Lockdown,

Implications for Diet Quality and the Food System: A Cross-Continental Comparison.

Nutrients, 13(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13010020>

National Centre for Social Research, Institute of Food Research, King's College London,

Nutritional Sciences Research Division, University College London, Department of

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 Epidemiology and Public Health, Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency,
4
5 University College London, Medical School. (2008). Low Income Diet and Nutrition Survey,
6
7 2003-2005. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 5808, [http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-](http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-5808-1)
8
9 5808-1
10

11
12
13
14 NatCen Social Research, Food Standards Agency. (2017). Food and You Survey, 2016. [data
15
16 collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 8193, <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8193-1>
17
18

19
20
21 NatCen Social Research, Food Standards Agency. (2020). Food and You Survey, 2018. [data
22
23 collection]. 2nd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 8574, [http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-](http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8574-2)
24
25 8574-2
26
27

28
29
30 National Food Strategy. (2020). National Food Strategy - Part One - July 2020. Available at:
31
32 <https://www.nationalfoodstrategy.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/NFS-Part-One-SP-CP.pdf>.
33
34 (accessed: August 26th, 2020).
35
36

37
38
39 Nelson. M., Erens. B., Bates. B., Church. S., and Boshier. T. (editors) (2007). Low Income
40
41 Diet and Nutrition Survey. London: The Stationery Office.
42
43

44
45
46 Nicholes, M.J., Quested, T.E., Reynolds, C., Gillick, S. and Parry, A.D., (2019). Surely you
47
48 don't eat parsnip skins? Categorising the edibility of food waste. *Resources, Conservation*
49
50 *and Recycling*, 147, pp.179-188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.03.004>
51
52

53
54
55
56 NHS. (2019). What is the Body Mass Index, BMI? [https://www.nhs.uk/common-health-](https://www.nhs.uk/common-health-questions/lifestyle/what-is-the-body-mass-index-bmi/)
57
58 [questions/lifestyle/what-is-the-body-mass-index-bmi/](https://www.nhs.uk/common-health-questions/lifestyle/what-is-the-body-mass-index-bmi/)
59
60

Office for National Statistics. (2019). Sustainable Development Goals in the UK: progress on monitoring and reporting data: November 2019. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/articles/sustainabledevelopmentgoals-taking-stock-progress-and-possibilities/november2019> (accessed 20 October 2020).

Otten, M., Aregawi, M., Were, W., Karema, C., Medin, A., Bekele, W., Jima, D., Gausi, K., Komatsu, R., Korenromp, E. and Low-Beer, D., (2009). Initial evidence of reduction of malaria cases and deaths in Rwanda and Ethiopia due to rapid scale-up of malaria prevention and treatment. *Malaria journal*, 8(1), 1-8. Doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-8-14

Özbük, R. M. Y., Coşkun, A., and Filimonau, V. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on food management in households of an emerging economy. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 101094.

Poore, J., and Nemecek, T. (2018). Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science*, 360(6392), 987-992. Available from: <http://science.sciencemag.org/>

Quested, T., and Luzecka, P. (2014). Household food and drink waste: A people focus. WRAP. Available at: https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/People-focused%20report%20v6_5%20ES.pdf. (accessed August 4th, 2020)

Quested, T., and Murphy, L. (2014). Household food and drink waste: A product focus. WRAP. Available at: https://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Product-focused%20report%20v5_3.pdf. (accessed August 18th, 2020)

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Quested, T. E., Palmer, G., Moreno, L. C., McDermott, C., and Schumacher, K. (2020).

Comparing diaries and waste compositional analysis for measuring food waste in the home.

Journal of Cleaner Production, 121263. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121263>

Raber, M., Chandra, J., Upadhyaya, M., Schick, V., Strong, L.L., Durand, C. and Sharma, S.,

(2016). An evidence-based conceptual framework of healthy cooking. *Preventive medicine reports*, 4, pp.23-28.

Reynolds, C., Boulding, A., Pollock, H., Sweet, N., Ruiz, J., and Draeger de Teran, T. (2020).

Halving food loss and waste in the EU by 2030: The steps needed to accelerate progress.

https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/WWF&WRAP_HalvingFoodLossAndWasteInTheEU_June2020.pdf

Reynolds, C.J., Horgan, G.W., Whybrow, S. and Macdiarmid, J.I. (2019). Healthy and sustainable diets that meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and are affordable for different income groups in the UK. *Public Health Nutrition*, 22(8), pp.1503-1517.

Scott, C., Sutherland, J., and Taylor, A. (2018). Affordability of the UK's Eatwell Guide

Courtney Scott, Jennifer Sutherland, Anna Taylor. Food Foundation. Available at:

https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Affordability-of-the-Eatwell-Guide_Final_Web-Version.pdf (accessed 12 October 2020).

Sprake, E. F., Russell, J. M., Cecil, J. E., Cooper, R. J., Grabowski, P., Pourshahidi, L. K.,

and Barker, M. E. (2018). Dietary patterns of university students in the UK: A cross-sectional study. *Nutrition journal*, 17(1), 90.

1
2
3
4
5 Stancu, V., Haugaard, P., and Lähteenmäki, L. (2016). Determinants of consumer food waste
6 behaviour: Two routes to food waste. *Appetite*, 96, 7-17.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Tarasuk, V., Cheng, J., de Oliveira, C., Dachner, N., Gundersen, C., and Kurdyak, P. (2015).
13 Association between household food insecurity and annual health care costs. *CMAJ* 2015,
14 187 (7), pp. E429–E436. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.150234>
15
16
17
18

19
20
21 The Trussell Trust, Food banks report record spike in need as coalition of anti-poverty
22 charities call for strong lifeline to be thrown to anyone who needs it, (1 May 2020):
23
24
25
26 <https://www.trusselltrust.org/2020/05/01/coalition-call/>
27
28
29

30
31 Tirado-Von Der Pahlen, M. C. (2017) Sustainable and Healthy dietary patterns addressing
32 climate mitigation while promoting health. Abstract retrieved from UNFCCC.
33
34
35 [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/474_Sustainable%20and%20Healthy%20dietary](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/474_Sustainable%20and%20Healthy%20dietary%20pa)
36 [%20pa](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/474_Sustainable%20and%20Healthy%20dietary%20pa) (accessed August 18th, 2020).
37
38
39

40
41
42 UK Government (2015). Sustainable Development Goals. Available at:
43
44
45 <https://sdgdata.gov.uk/goals/> (accessed 12 October 2020).
46
47
48

49
50 United Nations (2015). The 17 Goals. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available
51 at: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals> (accessed 12 October 2020).
52
53
54

55
56 University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research. (2020). Understanding
57 Society: COVID-19 Study, 2020. [data collection]. 3rd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 8644,
58
59
60

UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3 <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8644-3>
4
5
6

7
8 USDA (2012) Household Food Security Survey module.
9

10 [https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/)
11 [tools/](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/survey-tools/)
12
13

14
15
16
17 Ventour, L. (2008) The Food We Waste. WRAP. p.209. Available at:

18
19 <https://wrap.s3.amazonaws.com/the-food-we-waste.pdf> (accessed August 4th, 2020).
20
21

22
23
24 WHO (2015). Healthy Diet. Fact Sheet no. 394. Available at:

25
26 https://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/nutrientrequirements/healthydiet_factsheet394.pdf
27
28 (accessed 12 October 2020).
29

30
31
32
33 WHO (2020). *Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation protocol for*
34 *COVID-19 virus infection, 17 March 2020* (No. WHO/2019-
35 *nCoV/Seroepidemiology/2020.1*). World Health Organization.
36
37
38

39
40
41
42 Wrigley, N. (2002). 'Food deserts' in British cities: policy context and research priorities.
43
44 *Urban studies*, 39(11), 2029-2040.
45
46

47
48
49 Wilson, L. (2007). Moving on from the low income diet and nutrition survey. Sustain.

50
51 Available from: https://www.sustainweb.org/pdf/LisaWilson_LIDNS.pdf (accessed August
52
53 4th, 2020).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Withings (2020). Withings Health Observatory. Available from:

4
5 <https://obs.withings.com/uk/weight#start> (accessed September 16th, 2020)

6
7
8
9
10 WRAP (2020a). Citizen responses to the COVID-19 lockdown - food purchasing,
11 management and waste. WRAP and Icaro Consulting. Available at:

12
13 https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Citizen_responses_to_the_Covid-19_lockdown_0.pdf

14
15 (accessed August 4th, 2020)

16
17
18
19
20
21 WRAP (2020b). Food surplus and waste in the UK. Available at:

22
23 https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Food_surplus_and_waste_in_the_UK_key_facts_Jan_2020.pdf (accessed August 18th, 2020)

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 WRAP (2020c). Food waste and Covid-19 - Survey 2. Available at:

32
33 <https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Food-waste-and-Covid-9-Survey-2-Lockdown-easing.pdf>

34
35
36
37 WRAP (2018). Love Food Hate Waste. Available at: <https://lovefoodhatewaste.com/>

38
39 (accessed August 5, 2020)

40
41
42
43
44 WRAP (2007). We don't waste food! A householders survey. Wrap/Exodus Market Research.

45
46 [https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We%20don't%20waste%20food%20-](https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We%20don't%20waste%20food%20-%20A%20household%20survey%20mar%202007.pdf)

47
48 [%20A%20household%20survey%20mar%202007.pdf](https://wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We%20don't%20waste%20food%20-%20A%20household%20survey%20mar%202007.pdf)

49
50
51
52
53 van Herpen, E., van der Lans, I. A., Holthuysen, N., Nijenhuis-de Vries, M., and Quedsted, T.

54
55 E. (2019). Comparing wasted apples and oranges: An assessment of methods to measure

56
57 household food waste. *Waste management*, 88, 71-84.


UK Food insecurity post COVID-19

1
2
3
4
5 Yuan, G. F., Sun, B., Yuan, J., and Wang, Q. M. (2009). Effects of different cooking methods
6 on health-promoting compounds of broccoli. *Journal of Zhejiang University Science B*, 10(8),
7
8 580.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

British Food Journal


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. UK adults main reason for cooking and type of ingredients used.



Food Journal

Figure 2. Packaging type in which UK adults purchase foods.



British Food Journal

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Estimated food waste of food secure and insecure UK adults.

	Mean percentage of food waste			
	Purchased		Cooked	
	Insecure	Secure	Insecure	Secure
Beans	9.33	6.80**	8.27	5.59**
Beef	10.46	4.02**	8.27	3.70**
Bread Roll	9.54	6.12**	6.09	3.89**
Bread Slice	12.98	9.10**	7.23	4.66**
Carrot	13.32	9.58**	7.66	5.27**
Chicken	9.33	5.19**	6.89	4.35**
Green Beans	12.02	7.57**	9.12	4.91**
Green Leaves	16.66	10.96**	10.75	6.78**
Lentils	10.37	5.85**	10.01	5.65**
Polenta	10.99	5.39**	12.47	6.13**
Potato	12.54	9.58**	8.47	5.89**
Spaghetti/Noodles	8.77	6.50**	7.38	5.94**
Sweet Potato	12.40	6.35**	9.19	4.22**

1					
2					
3					
4					
5	Tomato	11.64	8.73**	8.32	4.56**
6					
7					
8	White Rice	9.28	6.90**	9.18	7.64**
9	<hr/>				

10
11 Sig vs insecure, $p < .001^{**}$
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

British Food Journal

Table 2. Number of products purchased in each packaging type of food secure and insecure UK adults.

	Packaging Type (%)									
	Raw or fresh no packaging	Raw or fresh in packaging	Ready to cook	Cooked - ready to eat	Dried	Canned	Frozen	Processed - long lasting	Ready to cook	Do not purchase
Insecure	607 (22.9)	664 (24.3)	78 (2.9)	110 (4.1)	305 (11.5)	186 (7.0)	36 (1.4)	54 (2.0)	20 (0.8)	615 (23.2)
Secure	886 (21.6)	1125 (27.4)	57 (1.4)	151 (3.7)	516 (12.6)	256 (6.2)	82 (2.0)	61 (1.5)	28 (0.7)	948 (23.1)
Total	1493 (22.1)	1769 (26.1)	135 (2.0)	261 (3.9)	821 (12.11)	442 (6.5)	118 (1.7)	115 (1.7)	48 (0.7)	1563 (23.1)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

British Food Journal